Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects

8-2012

Centering English Language Learners in the Praxis of Dialogic Pedagogy

Ching-Ching Lin
Montclair State University

CENTERING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN

THE PRAXIS OF DIALOGIC PEDAGOGY

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of

Montclair State University in partial fulfillment

of the requirements

for the degree of Doctor of Education

by

CHING-CHING LIN

Montclair State University

Upper Montclair, NJ

2012

Dissertation Chair: Rebecca A. Goldstein

MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

We hereby approve the Dissertation

Centering English Language Learners in the Praxis of Dialogic Pedagogy

of

Ching-Ching Lin

Candidate for the Degree:

Doctor of Education

Dissertation Committee:

Department of Secondary
and Special Education

Dr. Rebecca A. Goldstein
Dissertation Chair

Certified by:

Dr. Joan Ficke,
Dean of The Graduate School

Dr. David Schwarzer

7/30/12

Date

Dr. Tyson Lewis

Dr. Kathryn G. Herr

ABSTRACT

CENTERING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN THE PRAXIS OF DIALOGIC

PEDAGOGY

by Ching-Ching Lin

The mainstream classroom poses critical challenges to ELL students in the era of

standardization. As English is used both as a language of instruction and assessment for

all content subjects in the mainstream classroom, ELL students have to master a

cognitively loaded and culturally specific curriculum while learning basic English.

Through the standardization of curriculum and assessment, English exerts a normalizing

power for ELL students. Given the role of language in regulating consciousness and

controlling access to dialogic process, *how does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the*

relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream,

content-area classrooms?

Using Pierre Bourdieu's theory of language and symbolic power as my theoretical

framework, and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a research method that focuses on

language as an instrument that mediates power and privileges, this study explored the

effects of dialogic pedagogy as a discourse on ELL students. Based on an examination of

over two hundred and seventeen dialogic pedagogy texts published since NCLB (2001)

was signed into effect, analysis of the data demonstrated that critical pedagogy failed to

address the specificity of challenges facing ELL students in mainstream classrooms. The

discourses of dialogic pedagogy normalized the notion of dialogue at the expense of

addressing linguistic and cultural diversities. The findings call for a reconceptualization

of dialogic pedagogy to incorporate the notion of linguistic and cultural diversity into its

theorizing and literacy practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

This study examines how the praxis of dialogic pedagogy addresses the relationships between language and power facing English Language Learners (ELLs) in mainstream classrooms where English is the language of instruction and assessment. Dialogic approaches to learning and teaching have increasingly become an important concept to incorporate into classroom practices in the last few years. For many, it embodies the very concept of democratic education that promises equal access to learning for all students (e.g. Alexander, 2005; Arce, 2004; Brydon, 2004; DeTurk, 2006; Ghahremani-Ghajar, 2005; hooks, 2003; Jupp, 2001; Kapellidi, 2007; Kramer, 2001; Lyle, 2008; Skidmore, 2006). Given the increasing number of students who speak a language other than English at home enrolling in more and more schools across the nation, examining how dialogic pedagogy theorizes about English Language Learners is important if teachers who work with all students are to effectively practice dialogic pedagogies while simultaneously meeting the unique needs of ELL students.

Dialogic pedagogy has been used as an umbrella term to represent a form of constructivist teaching and learning that foregrounds the active role of students in shaping the classroom agenda through dialogic interaction. Informed by diverse theoretical traditions and authors like Mikhail Bakhtin (1981), Paulo Freire (1998), Jurgen Habermas (1984), feminists such as Elizabeth Ellsworth (1994) and bell hooks (2003) and Matthew Lipman (2003), founder of the educational movement known as Community of Inquiry,

dialogic pedagogy optimizes social interaction as a means to nurture a diverse range of civic skills. It fosters relative responsibility, engages in active listening, and recognizes difference in a shared inquiry while still enables students to develop important literacy and numeracy skills. The collaborative inquiry built on such a foundation provides a learning context to foster civic values considered essential to democratic life (Alexander, 2005; Bakhtin, 1981; Biesta, 1995; Ellsworth, 1994; Freire, 1998; Habermas, 1984; hooks, 2003; Keis, 2006; Kennedy, 2006; Kramer, 2001; Lipman, 2003; Lyle, 2008; Morrell, 2004; Skidmore, 2003). By emphasizing direct participation in civic discussion as essential to democracy building, dialogic pedagogy can be used to include those who are historically marginalized such as ELL students in our shared democratic life.

Including ELL students in civic participation is essential to the empowerment of ELL students. Given its goal of empowering all students to engage in active citizenship, how does dialogic pedagogy help engage ELL students in participating in dialogic discussion in mainstream classrooms? This question could not be more pertinent and timely, given the current practice under No Child Left Behind (NCLB)[1] to mainstream ELL students after three years and its immense impact on their educational experience. In order to hold schools and teachers accountable for student learning and raise student achievement levels, NCLB (2001) requires all states to identify ELLs, measure their English proficiency, and include them in state testing programs that assess academic skills (Abedi, Lord, Hofstetter, & Baker, 2000; Coltrane, 2002; Mazzeo, Carlson, Voelkl,

---

[1] While the Obama Administration has begun the review and reauthorization of NCLB, it is difficult to ascertain what changes will affect English Language Learners. Thus, for the purposes of moving the study forward, I use NCLB as the federal policy context in which I explored my research question.

& Lutkus, 2000). In compliance with this legislation, schools nationwide have mainstreamed ELL students into content area classrooms in which English is used as the language of instruction and assessment, without fully considering the impact on ELL students' learning and schooling experiences (Abedi, Hofstetter, & Lord, 2004; Haynes, 2005).[2]

Content area disciplines like the sciences, social studies, language arts, the arts, and health/physical education, however, pose critical challenges to ELL students. Content area curricula are coded in culturally specific and complex languages in English to which ELL students have had little exposure, and they are expected to learn these complex concepts, while leaning basic English (Abedi, Hofstetter, & Lord, 2004; Ahmad, 2010; Haynes, 2005). For example, social studies often contain references to popular cultures and historical narratives from the history of the United States that ELL students may have no or little exposure to (or have learned a completely different set of ideas and references altogether) in their previous life. Given their schooling experiences in other nations, they may also have been exposed to very different content and terminology (Ahmad, 2010; Hayes, 2005). As a result, content subject curricula may be difficult for ELL students to relate to cognitively or emotionally (Ahmad, 2010; Hayes, 2005). One has to wonder how and to what extent ELL students are empowered to meaningfully participate in mainstream classrooms where dialogue is adopted as a mode of instruction given these challenges.

Reflecting upon the general claims of dialogic pedagogy and imagining the

---

[2] I will elaborate upon this more toward the end of Chapter 1.

learning experiences of English Language Learners in English-only content area classrooms in which dialogic pedagogy is enacted, ultimately led me to question: How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the needs of English Language Learners in mainstream classrooms? (Abedi, 2004; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008; Lenski, 2006; Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005). My experiences as an English Language Learner, as well as a public high school teacher who teaches mainstream Social Studies classes that comprise a significant percentage of ELL students, have led me to conclude that the "symbolic power" of language plays a critical role in the assimilation and acculturation of ELL students to the mainstream culture and as such it deserves its own place in the studies of dialogic pedagogy (Bourdieu, 1994).[3]. These considerations have brought me to a more complex question, one best reflecting my overarching research question:

> *How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language,*
>
> *power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?*

This overarching research question can be further broken down into the following questions:

a) How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the particular issues that ELL students face in mainstream, content-area classrooms?

b) How does dialogic pedagogy account for the needs of ELL students when theorizing about the relationships of language and power?

---

[3] A brief overview of Bourdieu's work and how his explication of the relationships of language and symbolic power serves as a theoretical framework for my research will be discussed more extensively in Chapter 2.

c) How might taking into account the particular issues facing ELL students in the dialogic process help to inform a new understanding of dialogic pedagogy and perhaps a new practice of democratic pedagogy?

Thus, this study examines how dialogic pedagogy theorizes about the needs of ELL students in mainstream classrooms where linguistic and cultural capital in English are required to master academic material and meaningfully participate in dialogic discussions. I believe such an exploration is important to help fulfill the democratic vision of educational equity and justice that dialogic pedagogy partakes in. By theorizing about the relationships of language and power in the dialogic process, the study will contribute to the field by addressing a theoretical gap within the literature of dialogical pedagogy regarding ELLs.

Purpose of the Study

My questioning of the democratic rhetoric of dialogic pedagogy has stemmed from my own experience as a struggling English Language Learner. I remember not being able to follow most of the class discussions and as a result, constantly feeling defeated and frustrated. I now see those same struggles with ELL students in my role as a New York City public high school teacher who teaches mainstream Social Studies classes comprising a significant percentage of English Language Learners. Working with them reminds me of my own experience at the graduate school. I recall, due to language barrier, how I was at loss with class discussions (Ahmad, 2010; Haynes, 2005). Such experiences have induced me to call into question the capacity of dialogic pedagogy to address the need of ELL students in the context of general education classrooms in which ELL

students face the challenge of culturally specific content area studies in a language that they are in a process of acquiring fluency.

My own struggle with dialogic pedagogy started twenty years ago when I came to the United States in pursuit of a master's degree in philosophy. For a Taiwanese who grew up in the wake of the post cold war era, the U.S. was the epicenter of advanced learning, and English, emerging as an international language, became the required cultural capital for economic success and social advancement in many parts of the world (Crystal, 2003; Pennycook, 1998). I enrolled in the philosophy program at the City University of New York, but soon realized that years of studying English did not prepare me for understanding and using the language in classrooms that dealt with theoretically loaded and culturally specific concepts. My English classes in Taiwan mostly focused on grammar and the reading comprehension of everyday English and not so much on the language specific to a disciplinary field such as philosophy. Nor did it adequately prepare me to converse and interact with my mostly native English-speaking peers in academic discussions. Topics such as the ontological status of mental events totally evaded my understanding. Growing up in a philosophical tradition that did not have the concept about the duality between mind and body, I was unfamiliar with the terminology and cultural assumptions required to make sense of the topic and carry out the corresponding conversation (Davidson, 1974; Putnam, 1975). Frustrated by such experiences of not understanding and not being able to make myself understood, I gradually retreated to silence. Silence, however, was not an 'option' in an environment in which one's academic ability and potential was judged by the extent of one's vocal participation in academic

discussions. Class participation, that is, engaging in dialogue, was always a course requirement.

Growing up in a conformist educational culture that reveres tradition and authority, and having received mostly lecture-based instruction in my undergraduate education, I recalled feeling apprehensive at the prospect of having to speak publicly and of what I perceived to be my crippled ability to do so (for the comparison and analysis of U.S. and Chinese educational culture, see Chen, 1994; Ng & Ng, 2007). I started taking refuge in silence, with my life gradually splitting into two worlds: the public domain where I lived only in marginality and the private corner in the comfort of my native language that I clung to in desperation.

Years later, life has seemed to come full circle. I am a public high school Social Studies teacher in New York City. In a reversed situation, I stand on the platform, endeavoring to involve students to participate in classroom discussions, at a school where 20% of the students were federally identified as 'Limited English Proficient': 26% for 2008-2009 and 22% for 2007-2008 (New York State School Report Card Accountability and Overview Report 2009-2010, Washington Irving High School).[4] Due to my own experience as a foreign student and fellow English Language Learner, I found myself more attuned to how ELL students perform academically, socially and behaviorally in mainstream classrooms. I experienced first hand ELL students' personal triumphs and

---

[4] LEP is used by the federal government to determine students' eligibility for ESL services. Garcia, KLeifgen & Falchi (2005) and others argued that the term "LEP" represents a deficit theorization of ELL students. It focuses on the presumed deficit in the student, as opposed to the assests that they no doubt possess (Crawford, 2004; Garcia, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2005). Those writers also urged to approach ELL students positively, focusing on their abilities, as human beings who happen to speak another language better than they speak English. They advised teachers to avoid the use of the "LEP" label and bear in mind that ELL students' "limited English proficiency" is only temporary.

perils, and their stories offered me a glimpse of immigrants' struggles on a larger scale. Many of the ELL students I knew struggled with meeting graduation requirements two to three years after their cohort graduated, due to their repeated failure on the Regents Exams in content area studies such as sciences or social studies. Some of them may never manage to graduate.

What happened at the school at which I work mirrors the statewide statistics of New York. According to the school's 2009-2010 accountability ad overview report, only 32% of ELLs graduated within five years. The overall graduation rate for all students is 43%.[5] Nationally the graduation rates of ELLs are just as troubling. According to the 2007 American Community Survey, nineteen percent of ELL students who had entered the US before the age of 18 were out of school and had not received a high school degree, double the rate of their English speaking, native peers[6]. Clearly schools need to develop more effective pedagogies and forms of assessment that meet the needs of ELL students.

Searching for ways to help ELL students with their struggle has been a source of my frustration and disappointment in my teaching life. I was constantly caught in between the frustration over an educational culture that narrowly focuses on high-stakes standardized tests at the expense of losing sight of the democratic origin of public education, and over my own constant regression into a didactic, regimented mode of teaching in surrender to the pressure of a test-driven school agenda. It is this felt inconsistency between what I believe and what I practice that aroused in me a dire need to re-evaluate my professional life.

---

[5] http://www.thenyic.org/images/uploads/NYIC_ELLBRIEF_FINAL.pdf
[6] http://otrans.3cdn.net/f81d5d35ab048f5c8a_xrm6iyf6f.pdf

In search for a meaningful pedagogical approach that can better address the needs of my students, I re-encountered dialogic pedagogy at Montclair University. This time I was not merely a participant in dialogic discussions. I became a researcher who studies dialogic pedagogy as my dissertation topic. Having taken many courses that re-oriented me to dialogue as a method of constructivist learning has rekindled my interest in dialogic pedagogy. I learned that dialogic pedagogy, as a pedagogical approach that capitalizes dialogic interaction, focuses on fostering a wide range of competencies and world-views to understand and respond to human and social dilemmas and to prepare students for participating in an increasingly diverse democracy (Keis, 2006; Kennedy, 2006; Kramer, 2001; Lyle, 2008; Morrell, 2004; Skidmore, 2003). Judging from the increasing appearance of dialogic pedagogy in the educational literature, I generalized that dialogic pedagogy has become the very embodiment of democratic education (Alexander, 2005; Biesta, 1995; Keis, 2006; Kennedy, 2006; Kramer, 2001; Lyle, 2008; Morrell, 2004; Skidmore, 2003). As a pedagogical approach that is conducive to promoting equity through classroom dialogue, one wonders how dialogic pedagogy might account for the needs of the historically marginalized students such as ELL students?

The Hegemony of English

While intrigued by the democratic claims of dialogic pedagogy as discussed earlier, a question kept circling back to me: how does dialogic pedagogy address the challenges facing ELL students in a classroom where English is the language of instruction? In particular, I wondered how dialogic pedagogy addresses the 'hegemonic' effects of

English on ELL students, as embedded in the institution of schooling (including classroom instruction, curriculum development, and means of assessment) (Macedo, Dendrinos & Gounari, 2003). In their book, *The Hegemony of English*, Macedo, Dendrinos & Gounari (2003) contended that the debate about language use or policy is also a debate related to issues of economic and socio-political control as well as of cultural domination. Throughout their book, they argued that the agenda of the English-only movement in public education cannot be evaluated without recourse to its latent political and cultural dimensions (Macedo, Dendrinos & Gounari, 2003). Their view supports the Gramscian logic of hegemony that language is not merely reflective, but always already laden with cultural and ideological significance.

As one of the most influential Marxist thinkers in the 20th century, Grasmci develops the concept of cultural hegemony to denote a form of control in modern society (Fontana, 2001; Gramsci, 1982; Suarez, 2002). For Gramsci (1982), hegemony is as a form of power relations that exists between dominant and the subordinate groups, and achieves through mass consent and persuasion (Fontana, 2001; Gramsci, 1982; Suarez, 2002). It is a non-coercive form of domination where the dominant group exercises control over subordinate groups via the development of collective consciousness, rather than an exertion of overt force. In particular, it is a form of control that is exercised via the 'manufacturing' of mass consent through the control of mass media and institutions such as education (Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

Gramsci suggested that the hegemonic mode of control in modern society has produced a 'total system' of control that includes more than previously recognized

mechanisms of class domination (Suarez, 2002). It produces a mode of persuasion that infiltrates ideas and beliefs of normalcy in daily life that come to be accepted as common sense (Fontana, 2001; Suarez, 2002). Through the influence of mass media and public education, the subordinate comes to accept the dominant ideologies as correct, just and natural, and hence legitimate.

Hegemony, understood in this Gramscian sense, can be aptly used to describe the role of English in public domains in the U.S. where English functions as an instrument or tool that appears to be politically and socially neutral, to be manipulated by those who possess it in whatever way they choose (Suarez, 2002). Macedo, Gounari, & Dendrinos (2003) maintained that the role of English in the contemporary world is by no means politically or socially neutral:

> [T]he purpose of English language education in the contemporary world order cannot be viewed as simply the development of skills aimed at acquiring the dominant English language. This view sustains an ideology that systematically disconfirms rather than makes meaningful the cultural experiences of the subordinate linguistic groups who are, by and large, the objects of language polices. For the role of English to become understood, it has to be situated within a theory of cultural production and viewed as an integral part of the way in which people produce, transform, and reproduce meaning. Thus, the role of English must be seen as a medium that constitutes and affirms the historical and existential moments of lived experience which produce a subordinate or a lived culture. It is an eminently political phenomenon, and it must be analyzed in the

context of a theory of power relations and with an understanding of social and cultural reproduction and production (Macedo, Dendrinos & Gounari, 2003, p.14). In other words, English is much more than an instrument or tool for communication. It is a mechanism of cultural production and reproduction. Through an institutionalized learning process, English operates as the discursive power apparatus that filters the content of learning and regulates its accessibility for ELL students and their families (Abedi, 2004; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Roseberry McKibbin, 2005; Tollefson, 1991).

The hegemonic effects of English for ELL students cannot be understood without considering how ELL students are incorporated into the neoliberal agenda in a globalized economy (Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Saunders, 2010). As a political ideology dominating since post World War II to represent the revived spirit of economic expansionism, neoliberalism has increasingly reshaped the U.S. society, including public education, into competitive markets (Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005). Because economic productivity become critical to remain the dominant power in global capitalism, education becomes increasingly focused on developing skills and knowledge required for an individual to become an economically productive member of a capitalist society (Apples, 2004; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005; McLaren & Jaramillo, 2005; Saunders, 2010). Schools' focus on industrial skills and knowledge required for globalized market competition often means the neglect of the special needs of ELL students in school curricula and instructional practices (Cummins, 2000; Pennycook, 1998; Pappamihiel, 2002).

In consistent with such an assimlilationist agenda of neoliberalism, English serves as an instrument of mass education and cultural assimilation. NCLB (2001) reinforces the neoliberal agenda by adopting English as the language of instruction as well as measurement (Cummins, 2009; Crystal, 2003; Degener, 2001; Pennycook, 1998). The administering of standardized tests in English especially presents a high stake challenge to ELL students whose lack of economic, cultural and social capital that are required to succeed in the U.S. society place them at a great disadvantage. While some ELL students do thrive in schools, many repeatedly fail the standardized tests and risk of dropping out (Noguera, 2004; Suarez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004).

As the U.S. has grown into the dominant force in the world economy, English has become the world's lingua franca (Cummins, 2000; Pennycook, 1998; Pappamihiel, 2002). English becomes an important tool for ELL students' vision of economic aspiration and social mobility. Through the use of the English language, young, inexperienced ELL students have internalized the Western cultural norms and standard in the use of the English language. Being under the hegemonic sway of English has inhibited ELLs from questioning its dominant status (Cummins, 2000; Pennycook, 1998; Pappamihiel, 2002). By establishing English as a cultural climate and norm, the school system in the U.S. sustains and reinforces a hierarchical system of language use that glorifies English to the exclusion of other heritage languages. The prioritization of English as the language of instruction and assessment positions all other languages as subordinate and illegitimate. Being rationalized and internalized as normal and natural, this hierarchy convinces many ELL students who fail to meet the school curriculum

standard that favors and privileges English to view their failure as being the result of their own inadequacy (Cummins, 2000; Pennycook, 1998; Pappamihiel, 2002). Given the hegemonic force of English, it is important to consider how dialogic pedagogy addresses the role of censorship and regulation of language use and human interaction in mainstream classrooms for ELL students.

Addressing the Hegemony of English

In addressing the hegemonic role of English in the U.S. public education that I have personally experienced as a student and as a teacher, I have chosen to use English, in its scientific format, as the language to express myself.

I am aware of the inherent contradiction in my using the very language that I have claimed suppresses the subjectivity of ELL students including myself as a means of communication for this study. My language choice reflects the stance or positioning that I take within my interaction with other language users. My choice of the language I employed to convey this study is informed by my belief in the possibility, however flimsy it is, of a rational engagement in our relationship with power. While accepting the argument that power is immanent through social networks and we, as subjects, are deeply embroiled in power relations at our daily interactions with others, I believe that power cannot be overthrown through openly defiant acts alone (Bourdieu, 1994; Foucault, 1980). As much as it is important to challenge the hegemony of English in addressing the special needs of ELL students, I suggest that there is an obligation for critical educators to actively and rationally engage in theorizing ways to create a linguistically and culturally diverse learning environment within the school structure.

This is not to deny the potential danger in reproducing the power structure through the use of the language of the dominant class. We risk of reinforcing the hegemony of English by continuing to accept it as normalcy. But there is no obviation from such risk for us except to engage it through ongoing critique. Hence, despite still being haunted by a profound sense of inadequacy, despite being constantly reminded of my "wild,' alien tongue (Anzaldua, 1987, p. 53), of what others may view as my 'idiosyncratic', 'jagged' English grammar, I endeavor to speak the 'good', 'standard' English, as opposed to insisting on my Chinese-informed English, hoping that I will be taken seriously and understood. As Gloria Anzaldua so beautifully and eloquently enunciated:

> [I]t is not enough to stand on the opposite river bank, shouting questions, challenging patriarchal, white conventions. A counterstance locks one into a duel of oppressor and oppressed; ….The counterstance refutes the dominant culture's views and beliefs, and for this, it is proudly defiant. …. But it is not a way of life. At some point, on our way to a new consciousness, we will have to leave the opposite bank, the split between the two mortal combatants somehow healed so that we are on both shores at once and, at once, see through serpent and eagle eyes (Anzaldua, 1987, pp. 78-79).

In a project that engages dialogic pedagogy in theorizing the needs of ELL students, I wish to contribute to the building of a bridge of communication and understanding between 'opposite banks'. Given the imbalanced language and power relationships in mainstream classrooms and their impacts on ELLs, this study will contribute to the field

by theorizing how dialogue can simultaneously provide a constraining and enabling space for ELL students.

Significance of the Study

My interest in studying the democratic relevance of employing a dialogic approach with ELL students, while deeply personal, is more than projecting my own desire to come to terms with my life as an immigrant. Given the changing demographics of the United States over the past 20 years and the projected changes over the next 30 years, this study addresses a timely educational issue that has broad pedagogical implications for the education of ELL students in mainstream classrooms (The U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000; Lenski, et al., 2006; Roseberry-McKibbin, et al., 2005). In light of the recent mainstreaming of ELL students into content-area courses that are fraught with complex academic languages and terminology, and the ever looming presence of English in public education through the instrument of assessment standardization (Abedi, 2004; Crawford, 2004; Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003), it is imperative for practitioners of dialogic pedagogy to consider how it accounts for both the enabling and debilitating effects of English on ELL students in mainstream classrooms - if the democratic claim of dialogic pedagogy is to be supported (for instance, see Abedi, 2004; Carlo, Augustus, & McLaughlin, 2004; Hasen-Thomas, 2008; Karathanos, 2009; Mirza, Brown & Balaban, 1986; Mantero & McVicker, 2006).

To further explore how dialogic pedagogy might address the special needs of ELL students in mainstream classrooms, I utilized perspectives from the recent literature of ELL education to help delineate the critical challenges facing ELL students in

mainstream classrooms in which English is used as the language of instruction and assessment. In particular, I focused on the language and power relations transpired in mainstream classrooms that ELL students face in their assimilation and acculturation to the US society.

Organization of the Dissertation

The interest and focus of the study is how the praxis of dialogic pedagogy theorizes the needs of ELL students. In Chapter Two, I introduce Bourdieu's theory of language and symbolic power as my theoretical framework. In order to address social and educational inequality, Bourdieu develops a conceptual framework including concepts such as cultural capital, symbolic power, field and habitus to delineate the ways language as a social practice shape educational discourses and practices. I use his work as a lens through which one might address the relationships of language and power facing ELL students in mainstream classrooms. Chapter Three outlines issues challenging ELL students in mainstream classrooms. Because the focus of this study is how the relationship of language and power might create a simultaneously enabling and constraining space for ELL students in mainstream classrooms, this study does not aim for a comprehensive review of ELL education. However, as described in Chapter Three, where possible, the study charts an overview of the history of ELL education in the U.S. and outlines the critical challenges facing ELL students in mainstream classrooms.

Chapter Four elaborates upon the research method employed in this study. I employed Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as my methodological framework in facilitating with data collection and analysis. I also adumbrate the data of this study and

explain the procedure of data analysis.

Chapter Five begins the analysis of texts of dialogic pedagogy, focusing on critical pedagogy, for its prominent representation in the literature of dialogic pedagogy. This chapter presents the descriptive findings of my study, outlining how dialogic pedagogy theorizes the challenges facing ELL students. In Chapter Six, I present the discursive findings of my study. I discuss how dialogic pedagogy's theorization of ELL students is closely related to its discursive formations of ELL students as a research object. CDA is employed as a research method to illuminate how the relationship of language and power is embedded in the discourse of dialogic pedagogy and has both enabling and constraining effects for ELL students.

Chapter Seven discusses the major themes that arise in addressing the questions guiding the research. It discusses the limitation of these findings. It considers the implications of the research findings for ELL students. In the end, I answer the research questions that guide this study. The research questions point to new alternative discourses and pedagogical practices that hold the idea linguistic diversity seriously.

Definitions of Terms

Democratic education. In this study I use democratic education as envisioned by John Dewey (Dewey, 1938) and Paulo Freire (Freire, 1998). As part of the progressive movement in education unfolding since 1830s, Dewey's vision of education is connected with the question of preparing people for active citizenship in a participatory democracy (Dewey, 1938; Gibboney, 1994). In *Experience and Education* (1938), Dewey stated that "democratic social arrangements promote a fuller quality of human experience, on which

is more widely accessible and enjoyed" (p. 34). To that end his vision of democratic education is one that instills in youth the necessary knowledge and ideals in order to actively participate in a democratic society.

In addition to Dewey, I am also indebted to Freire (1998) for his vision of democratic education. Freire advocates that education is a political act and its goal is to allow the oppressed to regain their humanity and overcome their condition (Freire, 1998). From this perspective, helping students to be conscientized about injustice and inequality and take corresponding actions is a main tenet of democratic education. Education makes sense only when individuals can make and remake themselves through learning what they know and what they don't know, and ultimately, fight for the transformation of oppressive social conditions and the recovery of their stolen humanity (Freire, 1998).

For both Dewey and Freire, education for democracy is to be measured by the extent that young people are able to access and participate in an open, vibrant learning community that they belong to (Dewey, 1938; Freire, 1998). This should hold true for all students, even those who are new to English-only content area classrooms.

ELL (English Language Learner). ELL is a term used to refer to students in the U.S. whose first language is not English, who are in the process of learning English, but have not yet reached the level of proficiency, regardless of their proficiency/skill levels in their heritage languages (Garcia, et al., 2008; Nieto, 2009; Wright, 2005). ELL as a term is widely used in educational literature for its relatively positive intent to focus on students' potential. In contrast to 'ELL'. Limited English Proficient (LEP) is used by the federal government to determine students' eligibility for ESL services. By focusing on

ELL students' deficiency in the English language, but not what they do know and understand, 'LEP' as a term reinforces a deficit view of ELL students. In this study, I have avoided the use of LEP and used ELL instead to signal a positive intent toward the student population who are in the process of developing their proficiency/skills in English. I will address this more extensively in the literature review.

Mainstreaming or mainstream classroom. These terms refer to the practice of integrating students into general education classes in all subject areas where English is the language of instruction and assessment regardless of the diverse range of student proficiency or skill levels in English. Because NCLB requires that all students be evaluated uniformly, many schools nationwide have turned to mainstreaming in hopes of better preparing students for annual progress evaluations (Abedi, Lord, Hofstetter, & Baker, 2000; Mazzeo, Carlson, Voelkl, & Lutkus, 2000). I will address the issue of mainstreaming English language learners more extensively in literature review.

Dialogic pedagogy. I employ dialogic pedagogy as an umbrella term to denote a form of constructivist teaching and learning that enables students to play an active role in shaping classroom agenda through dialogic interaction. Dialogic pedagogy presents dialogic inquiry as a learning context in which students consider multiple view points and perspectives, experience implications of commitment and explore issues of mutual responsibility in dialogue with others (Bakhtin, 1981; Freire, 1998; Habermas, 1984; hooks, 2003; Lipman, 2003). Such educational practices provide opportunities for students to develop their abilities in critical inquiry and foster civic values that are considered essential to prepare a new citizenry for our increasingly pluralistic democracy

(Alexander, 2005; Biesta, 1995; Keis, 2006; Kennedy, 2006; Kramer, 2001; Lyle, 2008; Morrell, 2004; Skidmore, 2003).

Constructivist. Many of the characteristic tenets of dialogic pedagogy are consistent with constructivist approaches to education like Dewey's and Freire's. Despite of the differences of the theoretical underpinning in their pedagogical approaches, both Dewey and Freire, an avid advocate of dialogic pedagogy, share the constructivist belief that learning is an active process in which students actively engage in meaning making and construct their understanding and knowledge of the world through action and reflection (Dewey, 1938; Freire, 1998).

Critical pedagogy. Heavily influenced by the Brazilian educator, Paulo Freire, critical pedagogy is an educational theory of teaching and learning that seeks to create learning conditions in which students become 'conscientized' regarding oppressive social conditions in the hope that such knowledge will prompt them and enable them to take action against the oppressive elements of the reality (Giroux, 1997; Shor, 1992). To this end, critical pedagogy is particularly concerned with reconfiguring the traditional student/teacher relationship characterized by the process of knowledge transmission that contributes to the perpetuation of social inequalities (Freire, 1993; Kincheloe, 2008). In contrast to the more teacher-centered pedagogical frameworks, critical pedagogy envisions the classroom as a site where new knowledge is constructed through meaningful conversations between students and teachers (Freire, 1993; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Giroux, 1997; Giroux & McLaren, 1992; hooks, 2003; McLaren, 1991; Shor, 1992; Kincheloe, 2008).

Praxis. I understand praxis as referring to the process in which theory and practice are enacted and reflected upon simultaneously. This understanding of praxis can be found in the work of Paulo Freire who defines praxis as "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1993, p.36). Through praxis, people can acquire a critical awareness of their own condition, and take action to strive for liberation (Freire, 1993). Praxis hence is a process of engaging, applying, exercising, reflecting and practicing ideas.

Hegemony. The term 'hegemony' is indebted to Gramsci (1982) for its popularity in cultural studies, and to Macedo, Dendrinos & Gounari (2003) in the context of addressing the needs of ELL students. In my study, I followed those authors in using the term to denote the mode of control exerted by the dominant group over the subordinate groups particularly through the control of education and the media (Gramsci, 1982; Macedo, Dendrinos & Gounari, 2003). It is a form of power relationship that is exercised and achieved through consent and persuasion, rather than the use of overt external force. It also produces a total system of control in which the subordinate groups come to view it as natural, just and legitimate. The term, as Gramsci (1982) and Macedo, Dendrinos & Gounari (2003) have intended it, not merely applies to the power effects of the ruling class, but also includes its ability involved in maintaining and reproducing its power among those who are ruled by encouraging their support (Gramsci, 1982; Iseri, 2007; Macedo, Dendrinos & Gounari, 2003; Smith, 2010).

Cultural capital. The term 'cultural capital' was developed by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu to address the problematic that economic obstacles alone

cannot sufficiently explain the achievement gaps among different social classes

(Bourdieu & Passeron, 1979). According to Bourdieu (1994), cultural capital can be

understood as the cultural habits and dispositions (such as the possession of certain

linguistic skills or know-how) that comprise a resource of power and allow individuals to

appropriate and monopolize it to their advantage. As a form of power that can be

transmitted from one generation to another and under appropriate conditions, cultural

capital can be used to create opportunities for exclusive advantage (Bourdieu, 1994). I

will address more extensively in Chapter two how I incorporated Bourdieu's cultural

capital as part of the theoretical framework that guides my methodology.

  Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a

methodological framework that allows its practitioners to combine textual and interactive

elements to explore "how discourse figures in relation to other social elements in

processes of social or institutional change" (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003, p.

5). As a research method, CDA emphasizes the practitioner's self-reflection and seeks to

uncover the power relations functioning within different discursive formations by

facilitating the questioning of the basic assumptions of research methods. More about

CDA will be discussed in Chapter Four.

Chapter Two

Theoretical Framework

As discussed earlier, the critical challenges ELL students face in mainstream classrooms have their roots in the relationship between language and power. To facilitate investigating the power effects of English on ELL students, Bourdieu's critical analysis of language and power has attracted many critically minded educators who specialize in the area of ELL education (Canagarajah, 2004; Carlo, 2004; Fairbanks and Ariail, 2006; Handsfield, 2006; Jiménez, Smith and Martínez-León, 2003; Lenski, 2006; Marsh, 2006). Bourdieu's work has informed their discourses and practices about ELL students and shaped their understandings of the relationship between language and power (Canagarajah, 2004; Carlo, 2004; Fairbanks and Ariail, 2006; Handsfield, 2006; Jiménez, Smith and Martínez-León, 2003; Lenski, 2006; Marsh, 2006). As I will illustrate in the coming discussion, his theory provides a useful lens through which one might address the hegemony of English that faces ELL students in mainstream classrooms and can be used to help explore how dialogic pedagogy theorizes the needs of ELL.

Bourdieu on Language as a Form of Capital

Bourdieu is a French sociologist, anthropologist and philosopher known for his analysis of power relations in everyday life (Bourdieu, 1979, Bourdieu, 1994). Much of his view on language and its role in mediating power and privilege evolves from his critique of Marxist theories of the role of economic capital in social positioning (Bourdieu, 1979). Bourdieu views language as a form of capital which cannot be reduced to economic capital but can be translated into material rewards. By expanding the notion

of capital to include language as a form of cultural components that contribute to the perpetuation of social stratification and class distinctions, Bourdieu's work can be used to better address social and educational inequalities (Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

To address the role of language in mediating educational outcomes, Bourdieu develops a theoretical framework that includes concepts such as 'cultural capital', 'symbolic power', 'symbolic violence', 'habitus', and 'field' to delineate the ways language as a social practice channels power and privileges in education and beyond (Handsfield, 2006;Weininger & Lareau, 2003). These interwoven concepts are instrumental to my study in understanding how the English language as a source of power is subject to manipulation and domination and how ELL students' lack of previous contact to English becomes a structural constraint to their opportunities for success (Handsfield, 2006;Weininger & Lareau, 2003). In this section, I will take up a discussion of those key elements of Bourdieu's thinking and writing, and will relate their usefulness to the study at hand.

Cultural Capital. A key concept that Bourdieu utilized to analyze power in education is language as a form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1979, Bourdieu, 1994)). In accord with Marx, Bourdieu defined capital as the resource, the command of which enables one to maintain a position in the status hierarchy of society (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu, 1986). "Capital" in this sense is capable of ordering the relation between people in any given part of social space (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu, 1986).

By identifying language as a form of capital, Bourdieu broke with the Marxist

tradition that views capital as modeled on material phenomena. While accepting that
"economic capital" is the dominant principle of domination in a capitalist society,
Bourdieu maintained that the efficacy of economic capital as a principle of domination
can be challenged by fractions of the dominant class (e.g. professionals, academics,
artists, etc.) (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu, 1994). From this perspective, someone can be
relatively poor in economic capital but rich in cultural or other forms of capital. By
virtue of his social role, he then can strive to promote his own specific form of capital as
a rival principle of domination (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu, 1994). Based on such
examples, Bourdieu contended that the concept of economic capital alone cannot explain
the dynamics of power relations in social arenas and the resulted social inequalities
(Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu, 1994). In order to explain social inequalities more effectively
than what he believed Marx's concept of economic capital can provide, he expanded
Marx's concept of capital to include both material and non-material phenomena
(Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu, 1994) and argued that the acquisition of these various
material and non-material forms of capitals gives access to power and ultimately to
material wealth (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu, 1986).

For Bourdieu, to justify the concept of forms of "non-economic" capital is to
establish that they can be ultimately converted into economic capital (Bourdieu, 1979;
Bourdieu, 1994). Depending on the field in which a form of capital functions, and on the
precondition for its efficacy in the field in question, Bourdieu identified four fundamental
forms of capital: as *economic capital*, which is what can be directly and immediately
convertible into money and wealth and institutionalized in the forms of property rights; as

social capitals, as a form of resources, which is based on relationships, networks of influence and support; as *cultural capital*, which is a form of resources in the form of cultural products that are embedded in the human mind and body; as *symbolic capital*, which is what is available to individuals on the basis of mutual recognition, and functions as an authoritative embodiment of social value (Bourdieu, 1979).

Among different forms of capital, Bourdieu has identified language as a form of cultural capital. Given the importance of the role of the relationships of language and power in my study, it is given extended attention in this section as follows.

Bourdieu introduced cultural capital, among other forms of non-material capital, in order to explain that "[e]conomic obstacles are not sufficient to explain" disparities in the educational attainment of children from different social classes (Bourdieu & Passeron 1979, p. 8). Bourdieu defined cultural capital as "the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 119). From this perspective, cultural capital can also be understood as an "embodied" form of capital. Its examples include "competence" or skill that cannot be separated from its "bearer" (that is, the person who "holds" it) (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). As a form of human labor, the acquisition of cultural capital necessarily presupposes the investment of time devoted to learning and/or training and is closely related to social origin (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Cultural capital is a crucial source of power that reproduces and reinforces domination and privileges. The struggle for domination over cultural capital is not

dissimilar to the struggles over landed property, industrial capital or finance capital. For example, in *Language and Symbolic Power*, (1994), Bourdieu elaborated the role of language as a form of cultural capital in perpetuating social class privileges and class distinctions through mediating educational outcomes. Possession of the capacity to define what is academic success by the dominant classes whose control of linguistic capital allows them to be in a position to monopolize the interpretation of academic standards and success. In the U.S. educational system, access to linguistic competency in English can be translated into access to the discursive practices of school curricula. For ELL students who enter mainstream, content area classrooms with limited competency in English, access to the content of school curricula could be more difficult.

In societies characterized by a differentiated social structure and a system of formal education, linguistic competency is closely associated with academic success and material reward (Bourdieu, 1994, p.37-38; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). Bourdieu stated:

Since mastery of the legitimate language many be acquired through familiarization that is, by more or less prolonged exposure to the legitimate language, or through the deliberate inculcation of explicit rules, the major classes of modes of expression correspond to classes of mode of acquisition, that is, to different forms of the combination between the two principal factors of production of the legitimate competence, namely, the family and the educational system (Bourdieu, 1994, pp. 61-62).

By privileging a language controlled by the dominant group, schools perpetuate a social structure that maintains power over ELL students who hold the least of linguistic

competency in English (Handsfield, 2006; Weininger, 2005). Language hence plays an important role in maintaining and perpetuating class distinctions. In the U.S. a middle class student who is born into English speaking parents and has been exposed to English since the early years of his or her life, is more likely to gain a competence in the language and becomes academically and economically successfully (Handsfield, 2006; Weininger, 2005). Since the competency to use English is highly valued in schools and other institutional settings, it becomes an embodied form of capital that allows access to power and privileges. In contrast, the lack of exposure to English may put ELL students at a disadvantage and limit their access to the content or knowledge of school curricula that requires the competency in English.

Language, Symbolic Power, Dialogue and Symbolic Violence

Given the role of language in mediating power and shaping educational outcomes, language is more than simply a means of communication/dialogue (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). As Bourdieu has argued, language background is a form of power that can be converted to material reward. Since access to legitimate languages is not always equal, linguistic competence is often monopolized by some (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992).

Symbolic power. Classroom interaction relies heavily on the possession of linguistic competency and invokes relations of *symbolic power* in which the power relations between speakers are actualized (Bourdieu, 1994). Understood as the power to enhance social distinction and perpetuate status in social hierarchy, Bourdieu employed 'symbolic power' to addresses the relations between language, stratification, and power

(Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992; Bourdieu, 1994). He contended that the struggle for power or social distinction is a fundamental dimension of all social life. In such struggle, individuals and groups are compelled to appropriate cultural resources such as linguistic capital in competitive and self-perpetuating hierarchies of domination (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Bourdieu, 1994).

Symbolic power of language is particularly manifested in classroom interactions in which discussion is employed as the primary mode of classroom instruction (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Bourdieu, 1994). Within the social studies classrooms, for example, legitimate participation is acquired and achieved through a competence in the classroom dialogic interactions (Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Students must be able to display a discursive competence that incorporates a linguistic competence, if they are to be seen as competent learners. Discussions in mainstream, content area classrooms are particularly imbued with cultural and linguistic components that facilitate or inhibit access to the content of the discussions (Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). The lack of access to English in their family milieu often places ELL students at a disadvantage in dialogic interaction and affects their prospect of academic success.

The symbolic power of language, as a form of domination is also part of the symbolic process of cultural and social reproduction (Handsfield, 2006; Weininger, 2005). By privileging English as a primary medium of classroom instruction and assessment, therefore as the dominant capital for academic success, schools reproduce power relations that place ELL students at a great disadvantage (Handsfield, 2006; Weininger, 2005). Through the normalcy of schools, the symbolic power of English is concealed and

rendered as legitimate and natural. Such form of power imbalance inherent in the school structure is what Bourdieu called symbolic violence, as it is not always recognized and mostly unnoticed as violence by the dominated social agents (Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Misrecognition of social space characterized by asymmetrical power relations is integral to symbolic violence (Collins and Makowsy, 1993, p. 259). Symbolic violence is fundamentally acted on the thought and perception of dominated social agents who perceive the existing social order as just (Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). As such, symbolic violence is even more powerful than physical violence since it is embedded in everyday life and escapes the conscious scrutiny of social agents. As an example, the use of English is accepted as the norm and established as a learning expectation through the incorporation of English in school curricula and standardized tests. ELL students are especially vulnerable to symbolic violence as they tend to internalize the social values and standard embedded in English, and judge themselves in its image (Bleakly, 2007; Canagarajah, 2000; Canagarajah, 2004; Pappamihiel, 2002).

To understand symbolic power and symbolic violence that the policy of language use in classrooms exercises over language minorities, Bourdieu urged to take into account "the totality of the structure of the power positions that is present, yet invisible", in dialogic exchange (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 146). To this end, Bourdieu argued that language must be understood as the linguistic component of a universe of practices that include 'fields' and 'everyday habitus'. According to Bourdieu, 'field' and 'habitus' are two interdependent causal series underlying the use of language as a social practice (Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). First, people with certain socially

constructed dispositions of linguistic and cultural 'habitus' enter a specific 'field' which operates as a system of sanctions and censorship; and secondly, the 'field' frames sites of struggle through which individuals and institutions seek to maintain or challenge the existing distribution of cultural capitals such as language (Bourdieu, 1994, p.37-38; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). In what follows, I will discuss each term in turn.

Field. Bourdieu developed the concept of field as a network of positions defined by a particular distribution of capital (as in education, politics, economy and the arts) endowing that field with its own specific rules and schemes of domination (Bourdieu, 1990, 1994; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Handsfield, 2006; Wacquant, 1998).

Understood as such, a field is a social arena of struggle over the appropriation of certain forms of capital and is where social practice takes place. Fields are organized both vertically and horizontally. Vertically fields are partially analogous to classes, being dominated and controlled by the dominant classes of a society. Horizontally, although each field has its own logic, different fields are interrelated. The field of power exists 'horizontally' through all of the fields. In Bourdieu's schema, this means that cultural capital interacts with economic and other forms of capital, and domination of capital in one field can be converted to another field (Bourdieu, 1994).

Closely associated with capital, fields can be characterized as area of struggle through which individuals and social institutions fight over the preservation or overturning the existing distribution of capital (Wacqaint, 2008). Individuals entering a field such as education or practices of law must acquire a minimum of cultural capital such as linguistic competency in the relevant language and must abide by the rules and

regulations of the field in question. In addition, individuals in a field may try to challenge the hierarchy by accumulation of capital through their practices in the field (Wacquant, 2008).

Habitus. Bourdieu defines "habitus" as a system of social dispositions that are rooted in one's life history (Bourdieu, 1994; Handsfield, 2006). Such dispositions are socially inculcated in response to the social conditions in which people are embedded, are structured, linked to, and reflect the social conditions that they learn. Such dispositions are transposable, capable of generating a multiplicity of social practices beyond the field that they are originally acquired (Bourdieu, 1994; Handsfield, 2006). Understood as such, habitus is socially and historically grounded, informing individuals' daily behavior while reproducing and reinforcing the social structure in which it is situated (Handsfield, 2006).

Habitus is important to Bourdieu's concept of language as a form of cultural capital, as Bourdieu viewed much of cultural capital as derived from an individual's habitus. Defined as the structure and force that predisposes an individual to think and act in certain way, habitus is developed not only in the family of individuals but also reproduced in their daily interaction with others in broader social contexts. From this perspective, linguistic habitus must comprise individuals' cultural and family backgrounds. Students' family milieu and cultural practices need to be considered when we theorize the needs of ELL students.

From this perspective, habitus is a form of power that enables and constrains at the same time the choices and decisions ELL students make in their daily lives as they navigate their ways through the school system. Bourdieu emphasized that habitus, in

addition to being a structured structure, is also a "structuring structure, which organizes practices and the perception of practices (Bourdieu, 1979, pp. 171-172). This means that the rules and regulations underlying a social field can be manipulated within certain limits and an individual's habitus allows him to interact with the field in ways to manipulate the practical logic of social practice in the field within certain constraint (Bourdieu, 1994, p.71). Although his concept of habitus has been criticized as overly deterministic (Pennycook, 2001; Schirato & Webb, 2003), Bourdieu insisted that "habitus is creative, inventive, but within the limits of its structures, which are the embodied sedimentation of the social structures which produced it" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 19).

While insisting that individual habitus is not completely determined by one's position in the social space that one inhabits, Bourdieu emphasized that individual habitus is not free from social constraints. Bourdieu acknowledged that "the capacity to manipulate is greater the more capital one possesses" (p. 71). This carries strong implications for issues of power and equity for ELL students when one takes into the consideration that the processes through which classroom procedures or discussions are able to value one language and devalue others might put language minorities at a great disadvantage (Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Field, Habitus and Capital

Bourdieu viewed 'field', 'habitus' and 'capital' are closely related. While fields are constitutive of the people who participate in them, it is individuals who imbue meaning into a given field by incorporating their know-how of the field into their habitus.

As a social field, schools have its own rule of domination that favors and privileges certain forms of cultural capital. Nevertheless we should bear in mind that while school culture and classroom structure shape and inform the educational choices of ELL students, it is the understanding individuals enact and the action they undertake within the school system that contribute to the production and reproduction of the power structure that shapes individual students' schooling experience. Hence it is important to take into consideration ELL students' potential to transform the existing social structure through challenging the hegemony of English when we theorize the needs of ELL students.

By invoking the distinction of habitus (the mental structure through which people deal with the social world) and field (a network of social relations among the objective positions within it), Bourdieu warned against overstressing the oppressive aspect of power, which he argued would risk of the obliteration of agency and the possibility of political intervention from the discourse of power (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Wacquant, 1998). Bourdieu explicitly described the fundamental purpose of his concepts as that of "escaping both the objectivism of action understood as a mechanical reaction 'without an agent' and the subjectivism which portrays action as the deliberate pursuit of a conscious intention" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 121). Bourdieu insisted that any inquiry into social production and symbolic interaction must be composed of both of its objective and subjective moments. Instead of merely focusing on the institutional role of linguistic capital in classroom discussions or dialogue and its potential tendency to reproduce social structure of a field, one must also examine the 'singularity' of ELL students' experiences, and how they bring 'the diversity of their instruments of symbolic

appropriation' to the socially characterized relation as inherent in classroom interactions (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 39).

Bourdieu's theory enables us to make sense of the agency of individuals and allow room for political intervention and change while recognizing that individuals' trajectories are shaped by social structures which individuals are complicit of reproducing and reinforcing (Bourdieu, 1990; Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Handsfield, 2006; Wacquant, 1998; Weininger, 2005). By refusing to succumb to the pitfalls of subjectivism and objectivism, Bourdieu provides a perspective of social practice that defies a deterministic view of social practice. Social actions are neither a mechanical reaction 'without an agent' nor a deliberate pursuit without being socially constrained. This perspective reminds me that while looking at the institutional constraints and barriers that limit the choices and actions of ELL students within school structures, I must respect that they are social agents who are capable of appropriating and reinventing social resources to their advantage, however marginal their actions are.

Synthesis and Reflection

Bourdieu's analysis of the symbolic power of language delineates the role language as form of capital play in the reproduction and perpetuation of power and finds its echo in the US system (Handsfield, 2006, Weininger & Lareau, 2003). By Bourdieu's account, schools as social institutions are the site of struggles in which individuals or groups who hold more of cultural capital tend to monopolize discourses to their advantage, conscious or not. Language/discourse is an interwoven fabric of spoken, written and symbolic texts of institutional bureaucracies (e.g., policies, curriculum, and

classroom protocols) that reflect and channel cultural capital specific to certain groups (Bourdieu, 1994, Handsfield, 2006, Weininger & Lareau, 2003). Within these institutions, human subjects are defined and constructed both in generic categories (e.g., as "children" and "teachers") and in more specialized and purposive categories (e.g., as "professionals", "ELLs", "linguistic deficit"). These discourse constructions serve both as institutionalized mechanism of power, implemented and enforced by official authorities, and as perpetuated in the socially constructed disposition of linguistic habitus that shapes self-discipline and identity of human subjects (Bourdieu, 1994, Handsfield, 2006, Weininger & Lareau, 2003).

Bourdieu's concept of language as a form of cultural capital is particularly relevant to my study. It illuminates how power is produced in education as a field where the hegemony of English is upheld through classroom instructions and school practices. Through NCLB (2010)'s emphasis on standardized tests, English is positioned as the legitimate language through which academic success, and by association, economic success is defined or achieved. However, English, as a necessary linguistic capital, is also a tool of social reproduction. School curricula and practices tend to be structured around the hegemony of English and make few, if any, direct references to ELL students' heritage languages and cultures (Abedi, 2004; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008; Pappamihiel, 2002; Roseberry-McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005). As such, the hegemony of English can enable and constrain ELL students through classroom instruction. This is especially self evident in mainstream classrooms in which dialogue is used as the primary mode of classroom instructions where linguistic

competency in English is required to meaningfully participate in the process. As a pedagogy that is rooted in the political tradition of participatory democracy, that commits itself to equity and justice, dialogic pedagogy cannot afford to ignore the institutional enabling and constraining forces built on the cultural capital of English that shape ELL students' school experience and learning outcomes.

Rancière's critique of Bourdieu

Bourdieu's theory has not been accepted without meeting criticisms. To subject Bourdieu's theory to critical appraisal, it is useful to consider a critique of Bourdieu by one of Bourdieu's contemporaries, Jacques Rancière. Rancière is a French philosopher. He is known for his early collaboration with Louis Althusser and his revisionism of Marxism (Hemel, 2008; Pelletier, 2008). He has devoted his writing to the practice of an emancipatory politics. Instead of ascribing cultural deficiency to the historically marginalized, he is committed to the concept of equality that seeks to empower them by giving them the presumption of intelligence (Lewis, 2009; Pelletier, 2008). One of Rancière's arguments with Bourdieu is that Bourdieu's theory reinforces inequality by assuming that individuals can understand themselves only if with the help of the intellectual elites. Rancière's critique of Bourdieu warns us against the repressive potential of any putatively progressive theory. I will explain his critique of Bourdieu more in depth in the following.

Like Bourdieu, Rancière offered in his writings a form of emancipatory pedagogy that affirms the subjectivity of social agents instead of postmodern critique (Hemel, 2008, p. 16; Pelletier, 2008; Ranciere, 1983/2004). They, however, differ on how emancipation

should be conceptualized. In his critique of Bourdieu's theory, Ranciere argued that rather than closing the economic or educational gap between the privileged and the poor as Bourdieu has claimed, Bourdieu's theory of social practice reproduces the social categories that are part of the oppressive machine. Ranciere maintained that by focusing on the economic, cultural, social and symbolic forms of capital that sustains class distinctions, Bourdieu theory reinforces the very logic of the power relations of production and reproduces the status quo (Hemel, 2008; Pelletier, 2008; Ranciere, 1983/2004).

Rancière's argument with Bourdieu hinges on Bourdieu's discourse of misrecognition, and Bourdieu's definition of sociology as a science of the hidden. In explaining educational exclusion and differential outcomes, Bourdieu argued that schools exclude by forcing students who are excluded to believe and thereby 'misrecognize' that the educational system treats everyone as equal. According to Rancière, this line of Bourdieu's discourse presumes that those who are marginalized in the education system are so *because* they are fooled or disillusioned and educators or the intellectual elites control the knowledge to penetrate social illusions (Hemel, 2008; Pelletier, 2008; Ranciere, 1983/2004).

Thus understood, Ranciere argued, Bourdieu conceptualization of emancipation is rooted in a specialized form of knowledge that only the intellectual elites can have access to (Hemel, 2008; Pelletier, 2008; Ranciere, 1983/2004). From this perspective, the role of the intellectual is to expose a layer of meaning that is hidden and misrecognised by agents. Rancière contended that this discourse of misrecognition reaffirms the distance

between the dominant group and the oppressed. It ascribes cultural deficiency to those who are marginalized such as ELL students and fixes them in their already marginalized sociological location (Hemel, 2008; Pelletier, 2008; Ranciere, 1983/2004).

According to Rancière, rather than challenging this "misrecognition", Bourdieu effectively reproduces and reinforces the 'language' used by the oppressive regime and the social hierarchy embedded within it. Rancière argued that in Bourdieu's critique of cultural hierarchies, Bourdieu continues to distinguish between the privileged from those who are not. Rancière maintained that Bourdieu's theory reproduces the same logic of inequality that has been appropriated by many oppressive agenda in the name of social progress or reform. As Rancière viewed it, the fact that Bourdieu speaks from a superior moral stance when delivering his theory as a sociologist, and yet camouflages in the disguise of scientific inquiry, adds to "the simple violence of the relations of power" (Rancière, 1983/2004, p. 177). For it is precisely by denouncing the existing educational institution as an ideological illusion, and by assuming a purer, reflective form than the perceived status quo for his own theory that Bourdieu, the sociologist, assigns himself the task of speaking for those 'down and poor' "whose presumed ignorance grants [him his] domain" (Ross, 1991, p. xviii).

Ranciere's critique of Bourdieu is ultimately hinged on Ranciere's epistemology that social theories should not be checked against a presumed given, empirical reality, but on the basis of what a theory brings to presence, defined as the ideological effects of a theory potentially have on the subject of its theorization (Rancière, 1983/2004; Pelletier, 2008). Rancière's specific methodological approach is to treat social sciences texts in a

similar way to performance arts. It involves asking, of any theory discourse: what performative effects does it have on the subject (Pelletier, 2008, p.5)? Such methodological approach allows Rancière to question a theory or discourse on the basis of the ideological effects it has. By saying what he is saying, an educator helps enact reality into or out of being, making things more or less real. Rancière's argument with Bourdieu's theory is precisely with the way in which it makes an oppressive reality more real by reinforcing the power relations of production within a society.

Rancière's approach to the truth claim of a theory is valuable when we address the need of ELL students. Rancière's critique of Bourdieu cautions me against the repressive potential that a theory might generate despite its alleged intention to address inequality. For example, by signaling the message that students who are being caught in oppressive conditions may not be capable to know the reality and have to wait for an intellectual elite to teach them what he 'knows', By doing so, Bourdieu unwittingly denies students the power of self knowledge, and with that, the possibility of social transformation that conditions on the critical awareness of individuals (Rancière, 1983/2004; Pelletier, 2008). Rather than empowering ELL students, Bourdieu's focus on the role of linguistic capital in reproducing class distinctions risks of reaffirming the distance between the dominant group and the underprivileged and in doing so helps camouflage social inequalities.

An appraisal of Rancière's critique of Bourdieu

While Rancière's critique of Bourdieu is well taken, equally dangerous is his conflation of the ontological difference between, say, neoliberalists' intentional manipulation of educational resources to privilege the wealthy and powerful, and

Bourdieu's critique of the role of education in perpetuating social inequality that Rancière argued Bourdieu's theory entails. While both acts might be phenomenologically indiscernible in terms of the efficacy of the performative effect resulting from their respective acts, it would be intellectually and socially irresponsible to equate the two positions by arguing that both reproduce the logic of oppression on the basis that both positions start with the premise of social inequality. To deny the potential difference between the two political acts is to deny the very idea of political and pedagogical intervention.

What Rancière raises is the normalizing and repressive potential that is inherent in any attempt of emancipatory pedagogy to speak against inequality by offering (its own) knowledge as its remedy. Hence the real object of Rancière's critique of Bourdieu is the "science of the hidden" that belies the force of the relation of production, the division of power that grants Bourdieu's theory its pedagogical authority and its alleged status of scientific truth in the first place (Rancière, 1983/2004; Pelletier, 2008). The problematic that Rancière introduces here is a perennial struggle of human endeavor: how do we as educators or social theorists transform the implicit, accumulated knowledge of inherited culture (our accumulated knowledge of 'the reality') into elements of emancipatory or libertarian pedagogy? The danger that Rancière warns us against is a danger that is inherent in any reform act in the name of emancipatory/libertarian pedagogy that are always caught up in the relations of power – both of its enabling and constraining forces.

It is justifiable to assume that Bourdieu is aware of the danger of the normalizing effects of the discourses of social theories including his own when he insists on the

importance of reflective sociology in which a sociologist is engaged in sustained engagement with ideas and social issues with conscious attention to the effects of her own position within a field, his set of internalized structures and ideological beliefs, and how they might have permeated his practices. Bourdieu particularly insisted that there is a need for a sociologist to continually turn the instruments of social science back upon itself, and employ reflexivity as an indispensable component of the research method. A sociologist must be cognizant of his own stakes and interests in the academic field and aim at exposing the socially conditioned unthought structures that underlay not only the formulation of theories but also perceptions of the social world (Wacquant, 2006).

Even if thus conceded to Bourdieu, Rancière's point is worth taken: the repressive potential of any pedagogical reform or intervention is a human peril that should not be taken lightly. As Lewis (2009) accentuated, in his reference to Rancière, genuine democratic reform is essentially a social "act" that aims at "symbolic redistribution" of "the material relations of production" within the educational system and helps "create new communities of possibility that will expand who participates in utopian thinking and planning" (Lewis, 2009, p. 297). For Rancière, this entails a new pedagogical approach that "challenges the authority of the teacher as someone who knows" (Lewis, 2009, p. 296) and taps into the potential of students. Student voice must be included to counter teachers' repressive potential of their position. But one can argue, via the application of Rancière's own argument, that denouncing teacher authority is already a "misrecognition" itself that risks escaping the instantiation of the self critique of emancipatory pedagogy. As Bourdieu would have agreed, we as social actors not only

exercise power, but also are the target for the exercise of power, perpetually implicated in power relations. Hence any proposed pedagogical reform, no matter how 'sincere' it is, carries with it the repressive potential and needs to subject to vigilant watch.

By examining the performative effects of a theory or discourse, Rancière's critique of Bourdieu serves as a valuable reminder for the repressive potential of any self-proclaimed democratic discourses. With this in mind, it remains that Bourdieu's theory of the symbolic power of language provides a useful theoretical framework to guide my research. Bourdieu directs our attention to the role of language in mediating power and privileges and, in particular, 'relations of symbolic power' in classroom discussions or dialogue in which the power relations between speakers are actualized. Via Rancière's critique of Bourdieu, we nevertheless should keep in mind that the relationship of language and power is a two-way relationship. As much as language plays an important role in reproducing the production of power relations, it can also provide opportunities for individuals to appropriate or reinvent social resources to transform the oppressive conditions inherent in social realty.

Hence Bourdieu's theory of the symbolic power of language is used in this study as a theoretical lens through which to pursue my overarching research question: *How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?*

This question can be further expanded as follows, and will guide the identification and collection of data:

a. How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the particular issues that ELL

students face in mainstream, content-area classrooms?

b. How does dialogic pedagogy account for the needs of ELL students when theorizing about the relationships of language and power?

c. How might taking into account the particular issues facing ELL students in the dialogic process help to inform a new understanding of dialogic pedagogy and perhaps a new practice of democratic pedagogy?

Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital is useful in examining the critical challenges facing ELL students in the mainstream classroom that I identified in my literature review and will be discussed in Chapter Three. The cultural specificity of school curricula that alienates ELL students from learning, and educational practices that suppressed ELL students' heritage languages and identities all point to the hegemony of English as a cultural capital. The dominant role of English as implicated in the complex patterns of social stratification in the United States is consistent in its particular mix of cultural capital and economic capital. Schools have become the very instruments that help to perpetuate social inequality by favoring the literacy skills and competence that channel and legitimate the values of the dominant classes who are endowed heavily with such capital. Bourdieu's theory helps explain the interrelatedness of the issues facing ELL students and allows me to link the microanalysis of the role of language in mainstream classrooms to the macroanalysis of power and social inequality (Bourdieu, 1994).

Chapter Three

Review of Literature

As a pedagogic approach, dialogic pedagogy positions itself as aiming to empower students and providing equal access for all. Given its democratic and progressive rhetoric, examining the praxis of dialogic pedagogy and how it theorizes about the needs of English Language Learners in mainstream classrooms becomes particularly important when we consider the hegemonic role English plays in classrooms across the United States. However, to better understand the wider context in which this study about dialogic pedagogy is situated, it is important to understand the needs of English Language Learners. The purpose of this review of literature is to examine research on the specific learning needs and strengths that ELL students bring to the classroom.

In this chapter, I discuss the issues facing ELL students in mainstream classrooms that one might expect dialogic pedagogy to address. I provide an overview of the major social trends, educational practices and policies relating to ELL education in the U.S. history leading to the legislation of No Child Left Behind Act (2001). I discuss the impacts of NCLB for ELL students through its primarily focusing on English proficiency of ELL students and resulting in the mainstreaming of ELL students by schools nationwide (Ahmad, 2006; Crawford, 2004; Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003; Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005; Spaulding, Carolino, & Amen, 2004). I discuss the implications and impacts of mainstreaming for ELL students. Finally, I identify and outline critical challenges confronting ELL students in mainstream classrooms where the relationships between language and power come to the fore. In particular, I will highlight

how the persistent practice of employing English as the official language in public

education does so at the expense of linguistic and cultural diversification, and above all,

academic achievement of ELL students.

Overview of ELL Education

Since pre-colonial days, political battles have been fought to ensure the use of English

as the language of the land (Crawford, 1998; McCarty, 2002; Nieto, 2009). In order to

ensure the linguistic and cultural control of any newly added territory, the early US

government adopted strategies to defer the approval of statehood of a territory until the

English-speaking settlers became the majority of the new territory (Crawford, 1998;

McCarty, 2002; Nieto, 2009; Stein, 2008). In the1800s, English nativism intensified and

culminated in the Nationality Act of 1906 in which Texas designated English as the only

language to be taught in schools (Crawford, 1998; McCarty, 2002; Nieto, 2009). In 1917,

Congress cemented the status of English as the *de facto* official language by passing the

Burnett Act, which required all new immigrants to pass a literacy test in English (Nieto,

2009; Schmid, 2001; Wiley, 2002).

Simultaneously, racial and ethnic diversification increased due to the demand of

immigrant industrial labor (Crawford, 1998; McCarty, 2002; Nieto, 2009). As English

established its hegemonic presence in public education, the hostile climate against other

languages increased. The instituting of English as the language of classroom instruction

without at the same time providing auxiliary support for English Language Learners

resulted in the lack of access to a meaningful education for ELL students and blocked

their upward mobility (Crawford, 1998; McCarty, 2002; Nieto, 2009).

However, the specific strengths and needs of English Language Learners in public education did not become a focus of public campaign until the Civil Rights movement and groups such as the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund (MALDEF) fought to gain the recognition for the fundamental language and cultural differences between the non-English speaking minorities and the English-speaking mainstream (Del Valle, 2003; Nieto, 2009; Tollefson, 2002; Urban & Wagoner, 2003). In response to the mounting public outcry for a meaningful education for ELL students, Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, also known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Crawford, 1998; Nieto, 2009). The act marked the first federal recognition ELL students have special educational needs. It offered few guidelines for the instruction of ELL students. Nevertheless, it encouraged instruction in a language other than English as well as cultural awareness by providing funds in the form of competitive grants directly to school districts that developed programs designed to address the need of ELL students (Crawford, 1998; McCarty, 2002; Nieto, 2009; Tollefson, 1991; Urban & Wagoner, 2003).

The 1974 Lau v. Nichols (414 U.S. 5637) Supreme Court case was also instrumental in securing more equitable educational opportunities for ELL students. The guidelines of the 1968 Bilingual Education Act were not specific and participation was voluntary (Ovando & Collier, 1998). This prompted civil rights litigation claiming that equal opportunities were being denied ELL students. Congress amended the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 to clarify the intent and design of programs for ELL students. The case involved a class action suit representing 1,800 Chinese students who alleged

discrimination on the grounds that they could not achieve academically because they did not understand the instruction of their English-speaking teachers (Lau v. Nichols, 1974; Hakuta, 1986; Lyons, 1990; Ovando & Collier, 1998). The U.S. Supreme Court ruled unanimously that equal education was being denied to ELL students. In his opinion, Justice William O. Douglas stated that "there is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education" (Lau v. Nichols, 1974, See Crawford, 1987, p.24). The Lau Decision marked the Court's recognition that equal treatment of English-speaking and non-English-speaking students did not constitute equal educational opportunity (Hakuta, 1986; Lyons, 1990; Nieto, 2009; Ovando & Collier, 1998). The Lau verdict and the following Lau Remedies of 1975 upheld the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 and eventually led to the institutionalization of ELL programs. Schools were required to reverse their "sink-or-swim" practices pertaining to ELL students and provide some kind of "meaningful instruction" to address their needs (Nieto, 2009, p. 63).

Since then a broad range of ELL programs with diverse philosophical underpinnings and teaching strategies, from "assimilation as quickly as possible" ('immersion programs') to "separatism without discrimination" ('transitional or developmental bilingual programs') have been introduced to satisfy the spirit of the law (Ovando, 2003, p.9, see also Hakuta, 1986; Lyons, 1990; Nieto, 2009; Ovando & Collier, 1998). In general, ELL programs can be classified as follows:

1) 'Structured immersion programs': There is no use of the native language in

these programs, but students are provided specialized ESL instruction tailored to levels of English proficiency (Nieto, 1998; Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2003).

2) 'Partial immersion programs': These programs provide ESL instruction, and allow a small amount of time to be set aside for instruction in the native language, but the goal is to move ELL students into the mainstream classroom in a speedy manner (Nieto, 1998; Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2003).

3) 'Transitional bilingual programs': These programs provide extensive instruction in the native language as well as in English. Again, the goal is to help ELL students exit into a monolingual English program as quickly as possible (Nieto, 1998; Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2003).

4) 'Maintenance or developmental bilingual education': Extensive instruction in the native language as well as in English is provided. Unlike in 'transitional bilingual education', these programs allow students to continue receiving part of their instruction in the native language even after they are tested proficient in English (Nieto, 1998; Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2003).

5) 'Two-way immersion programs': In these programs, the English speaking students are placed together with ELL students to learn each other's language and to work academically in both languages. The goal is to have students of both language to become and bilingual and biliterate (Nieto, 1998; Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2003).

Despite the inconsistency in the implementation of the Lau Remedies, they redirected school districts to provide stronger versions of bilingual education by charting

suitable pedagogical approaches for ELL students and establishing standards for bilingual teachers and professionals (Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2003). It required school districts to provide evidence that they had effective programs to meet the academic, linguistic, and sociocultural needs of ELL students. School districts that failed to comply with the guidelines could risk of forfeiting federal funds (Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003). Under the Lau Remedies, students were allowed to access academic content through their heritage languages while learning the English language in ESL until they could eventually reach a level of English proficiency competitive to their peers of the same grade level in monolingual English classrooms (Hakuta, 1986; Ovando & Collier, 1998; Ovando, 2003).

Despite heightened awareness of the needs of ELL students in the 1970s, ELL programs remained controversial. Despite evidence showing that ELL programs enabled students to strengthen literacy skills using their native languages and promoted successful transfer of those skills to English, there has been mounting opposition against programs allowing use of languages other than English (Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003; Ovando & Collier, 1998). The Reagan administration managed to dismantle some of the bilingual mandates specified under the Carter administration's Lau Regulations, though some of them were restored later under the Clinton Administration (Ovando, 2003). Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the sentiment of anti-bilingualism expressed by pressure groups such as U.S. English and English First continued to gain momentum (Ovando, 2003; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Ovando & Collier, 1998)[7].

---

[7] The English Only movement is the organized effort to make English the official language of the United States. U.S. English and English First are the two national groups promoting the use of English

In 1996, the House of Representatives approved the designation of English as the nation's official language and banned the use of other languages in government agencies and offices. Though the bill did not pass in the Senate, 'Proposition 227' that eliminated instructions in any language other than English was adopted in California in 1998 (Crawford, 2004; Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003). Similar propositions that sought to institute English as the official language were approved in the year 2000 in Arizona and in 2001 in Colorado (Crawford, 2004; Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003). In 2002, the sentiment of anti-bilingualism reached its high point with George W. Bush's No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (Nieto, 2009, p.64). Though the law itself did not officially outlaw bilingual programs, it imposed a high-stakes standardized testing that promoted and encouraged the adoption and implementation of English-only instruction (Crawford, 2004; Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003).

The Mainstreaming of ELL Students under NCLB

Meanwhile, the number and the percentage of ELLs in public education have continued to increase rapidly. Between 1990 and 2000, the number of U.S. residents born outside the United States increased by 30%, from 19.8 million to 25.8 million (Hakuta & Beatty, 2000). According to the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, in 2004-2005, the total number of ELLs in the public schools was more than

---

as the only official language in the United States. Both groups started in the mid-1980s. Dr. John Tanton and U.S. Senator S. I. Hayakawa founded a political lobbying organization, U.S. English in 1983, while Larry Pratt founded English First in 1986. Drawing support mainly from direct-mail contributions, these groups have grown steadily in budgets, staffs, and influence. H. R. 123, the leading "Language of Government" bill in the 104th Congress, boasted nearly 200 cosponsors. U. S. English and English First have successfully lobbied for the passage of English Only laws in 18 states (out of 22 total English Only states) since its founding in 1980s. (Ovando, 2003; Montecel & Cortez, 2002; Ovando & Collier, 1998).

5.1 million students, or 10.5% of the total school population (Payan & Nettles, 2008).

Under pressure to meet the education demand of the rising number of ELL students in the

face of falling budgets, school districts throughout the country were unwilling to develop

bilingual education programs (Ahmad, 2006; Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon,

2005; Spaulding, Carolino, & Amen, 2004). The lack of educational resources resulting

from budgetary crises made it difficult for school districts to provide what were needed to

implement bilingual programs, such as separate-scheduling of classes, maintaining a

trained corps of bilingual teachers across all subject areas, etc. (Ahmad, 2006).

NCLB is a step backwards for bilingual education. As a federal legislation, NCLB

has had a great influence on the ELL policies across the nation. It requires all states to

identify ELLs, measure their English proficiency, and include them in state testing

programs that assess academic skills (Abedi, Lord, Hofstetter, & Baker, 2000; Mazzeo,

Carlson, Voelkl, & Lutkus, 2000). In order to comply with NCLB's mandate for school

accountability in an era of budgetary crisis, schools have instituted the mainstreaming of

ELL students in all content area subjects (such as the sciences, social studies and

mathematics, etc.). They have done so primarily in the form of sheltered-English content

area instruction in which a content area course is team-taught by a content-area teacher

and a TESOL instructor, or taught by a content-area teacher with specific professional

training to make content accessible for ELL students (Spaulding, Carolino, & Amen,

2004). Many schools, instead of providing full or partial sheltered-English content-area

instruction across the disciplines for ELL populations simply integrate ELL students into

mainstream content-area courses with no explicit ELL facilitation (Ahmad, 2006;

Spaulding, Carolino, & Amen, 2004; U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Such school

practices have done a disservice to ELL students. Until concerted efforts are made across

schools to meet the needs of ELL students, we will continue to perpetuate the

achievement gap between ELL students and the dominant groups.

Emerging Issues Facing ELL Students in Mainstream Classrooms

The mainstreaming of ELLs in content area courses brings to the fore the need to

explore issues shaping ELL students' schooling experiences in a learning environment

where English maintains its hegemonic presence as the language of instruction and

assessment. Though there is a growing body of literature dedicated to addressing the

unique needs and strengths of ELL students in mainstream classrooms, the majority of

research approaches ELL education from a narrowly defined pedagogic perspective and

focuses mostly on literacy instruction (e.g., basic and functional reading and writing)

without reference to broader social contexts (for example, see Lenski, 2006; Hansen-

Thomas, 2008; Collier & Thomas, 1989). However, researchers have given limited

attention to power relations in mainstream classrooms that inform and shape ELL

students' learning experiences.

Some preliminary research on ELL students' struggles in mainstream classes that

reflect limited sociological insights, however, are available (Abedi, 2004; Ahmad, 2006;

Ajayi, 2005; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008;

Pappamihiel, 2002; Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005; Tollefson, 1991).

Within ELL literature, there have been efforts to incorporate sociological insights into

literacy learning in deciding the 'needs' and 'interests' of ELL students in their

assimilation to the mainstream cultures (Abedi, 2004; Ajayi, 2005; Ahmad, 2006; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008; Pappamihiel, 2002; Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005; Tollefson, 1991). In the review that follows, I particularly focus on those studies that reflect such efforts in order to address the multiple ways that the language and power relationships in the mainstream classroom could have promoted or constrained ELL students' opportunity for success.

Based on my review of the literature regarding the strengths and needs of ELL learners, I have identified the following critical challenges shaping ELL students' experience in the English-only monolingual classrooms:

(1) Specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum. ELL students' in mainstream classrooms have to master content-area curricula that are inherently culturally specific (Ahmad, 2006; Thornton, 2005). Consider a secondary social studies course as an example. Social studies curricula derive their content from a wide range of academic disciplines such as history, political science, sociology, anthropology, geography, and economics (Ahmad, 2006; Thornton, 2005). Each of these disciplines contains its own specialized language and concepts rooted in both the American historical narrative and popular culture (Ahmad, 2006; Thornton, 2005). However, ELL students' lack of prior exposure to the culture that frames a context in which social studies knowledge is constructed has placed them at a disadvantage (Abedi, 2004; Ahmad, 2006; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008; Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005; Tollefson, 1991).

For example, a school course on civic education is essentially an introduction to

the U.S. political system and covers themes relating to the structure and functions of the U.S. government. Children growing up in the US are initiated into these themes through their incorporation into American civic life since their early years. The knowledge they have thus accumulated is a form of 'cultural capital' that gives them advantages over their ELL peers (Ahmad, 2006; Bourdieu, 1994). In contrast, such prior knowledge is not so readily available to most ELL students whose parents are also struggling to make an entry into a new life and can provide no or little intellectual support for their children (Abedi, 2004; Ahmad, 2006; Cummins, 2000; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008; Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005; Tollefson, 1991). As the acquisition of cultural capital depends heavily on learning performed within the family from the earliest days of life, the lack of parent and family support puts ELL students at a disadvantage and has profound impacts on ELL students' academic success.

An additional challenge for ELL students is the fact that "Social studies [as well as other content area studies] is closely bound to literacy skills" (Short, 1994, p.36). ELL students may be at a disadvantage because these essential skills are required to comprehend and construct knowledge in content area studies. Thus in mainstream content area classrooms ELL students struggle to learn both content as well as English (Abedi, 2004; Ahmad, 2006; Cummins, 2000; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008; Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005; Tollefson, 1991). To master the content-driven curriculum in a new language and to cope with the pressure of passing tests can cause ELL students tremendous emotional stress and anxiety and can profoundly influence their interest in learning (Abedi, 2004; Ahmad, 2006; Pappamihiel, 2002).

2) Bias of the hidden curriculum. In addition to meeting the academic language demand of the school curriculum, ELL students experience the 'hidden curriculum' as the unstated 'social norms and moral beliefs tacitly transmitted through the socialization process that structures classroom social relationships' (Giroux, 1983. P.48). Nieto (1995) contended that the attitudes and practices of schools, communities and society control the opportunities for success among historically marginalized population, especially ELL students. If a society or community does not embrace the idea of linguistic and cultural diversity, it is probable that schools and many teachers and staff will not embrace them, either. This, in turn, will detrimentally impact the quality of education ELL students receive (Nieto, 1995; Reeves, 2006; Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004).

Indeed, there is increasing recognition that the social structure of the classroom, how teachers view linguistic and cultural diversity, and in particular, how mainstream teachers perceive ELL students, shape the self perception of ELL students and ultimately affect their opportunities for success (Nieto, 1995; Reeves, 2006; Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004). Several qualitative studies exploring the schooling experiences of ELL students have alluded to mainstream teacher attitudes toward ELL students (Reeves, 2006; Schmidt, 2000; Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004). Reeves (2006) illustrated that mainstream teachers' attitudes toward linguistic and cultural diversity informs their concern for educational equity and shapes their classroom practices. One example is mainstream teachers' attitude toward the use of first languages in mainstream classrooms. Research supports that the use of the native language aids in the meaning-making process by allowing learners to read words they know and sentences they understand, to use

context effectively, and to self-correct efficiently (Cummins, 1996; Reeves, 2006). Though research has highlighted the importance of continued first-language use in developing second-language literacy, many mainstream teachers question the value of ELL students' continued use of their first language in classrooms and schools (Cummins, 1996; Krashen, 1981; Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003; Reeves, 2006; Schwarzer, 2001; Wong Fillmore, 1991). Mainstream teachers' conceptions of language-acquisition may shape their attitudes toward ELL students, sometimes leading them to misdiagnose learning difficulties or wrongly attribute student failure to lack of intelligence or effort (Reeves, 2006).

In another qualitative study that addresses teacher attitudes toward culturally and linguistically diverse students, Pang and Sablin (2001) concluded that underlying racist and biased beliefs might contribute to negative teacher attitudes. Racially biased mainstream teachers tend to believe that ELL students brought too many deficits to mainstream classrooms. In their studies, 65% of the teachers they studied reported that no matter how hard they tried, even with the best teaching practices, they would not make any difference in ELL students' academic success (Pang, 2001; Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004). Such self-defeating attitudes on the part of teachers can be rooted in their deep-seated racist beliefs and may have a profound impact on ELL students' learning experience.

Given this cycle of racism, teacher negative attitudes and a lowered sense of teacher efficacy, how will one expose the bias of hidden curriculum as they unavoidably filter into the culture and structure of schools and classrooms? To achieve equitable student

outcomes, it is important that dialogic pedagogy should be able to address the impacts of hidden ideological messages inscribed on classroom walls and pages of every textbook for ELL students.

     3) The hegemony of English to the exclusion of heritage languages. The above-mentioned issues facing ELL students point to the dominance of English in the U.S. educational system and its powerful effects in shaping the learning experiences of ELL students (Cummins, 2009; Crystal, 2003). In the new standardization climate under NCLB, 'literacy' has come to refer only to reading and writing in the English language. Literacy abilities in languages other than English and in modalities other than the written modality are generally ignored (Celine & Necochea, 2004; Cummins, 1996; Krashen, 1981). These normalized assumptions find expression in the absence of reference to students' heritage languages and their corresponding cultural practices and values in most curriculum documents, instructional manuals, and assessment protocols, even in contexts where a very significant proportion of students in the school system come from non-English-speaking home backgrounds (Celine & Necochea, 2004; Cummins, 1996; Krashen, 1981). Celine & Necochea (2004) argued that the linkage between language and identity is so strong that taking away one's language is tantamount to taking away one's identity. Indeed, the importance of a strong, effective, and resourceful native language support system in classrooms cannot be overstated for the profound impact on schooling and learning (Celine & Necochea, 2004; Cummins, 1996; Krashen, 1981; Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003; Schwarzer, 2001). Cummins (2009) and Celine & Nocochea (2004) have maintained that the success or failure of ELL students may well be

partially determined by how adept teachers are at integrating home languages for facilitating academic success.

4) The suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity. As the dominant language used in U.S. schools and beyond, English is able to insert itself into the consciousness of ELL students through its symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1994). Studies indicate that ELL students develop attachment or identification with the English language and in so doing form their self-perception, to some extent, in relation to its image (Ajayi, 2005; Bleakly, 2007; Canagarajah, 2000; Canagarajah, 2004; Pappamihiel, 2002). They tend to see themselves in the eyes of the school curriculum standard that they try to live up to, and perpetually feel inadequate to it. For example, some ELL students, instead of seeing themselves as emerging or accomplished bilinguals, come to see themselves as someone who cannot 'speak good English' (Bleakly, 2007; Canagarajah, 2000; Canagarajah, 2004; Pappamihiel, 2002).

Studies illustrate that language is a site of struggle for identities and subjectivities (Ajayi, 2005; Bleakly, 2007; Canagarajah, 2000; Pappamihiel, 2002). The term 'subjectivity' has been used by Feminist poststructuralists like Christine Weedon (1997) to serve as a constant reminder that how we give meaning to our various social relations is both fostered and constrained by our access to the legitimate languages recognized by a society: "language, in the form of an historically specific range of ways of giving meaning to social reality, offers us various discursive positions" through which we can consciously live our lives (Weedon, 1987, p. 26). It is one's access to the legitimate languages that offers one a range of modes of "subjectivity" (Weedon, 1987, p. 35).

As Bourdieu also notes, whenever we speak, we are negotiating and renegotiating our sense of identity through our access to existing discourses (1994). In a study that documented the survival strategies of ELL students employed to cope with their emotional stress in confronting the mainstream culture, Canagarajah (2000) reported that many ELL students constructed an imaginary community – a 'safe house' -- in which a counter-culture discourse was practiced, "adopting conformist identities in public spaces and displaying subversive identities in safe houses" (Canagarajah, 2004, p.130). Such dual relationship to the dominant discourse creates possibilities for ELL students to construct identities other than how the society views them, and provides them a safe space to challenge school or teacher authority and negotiate the conflicts for identities. Though the study inconclusively explores to what extent can such 'safe house' strategies alter the power relations within the schools and classrooms and effectively challenge the dominant culture, it does illuminate how classrooms and schools are sites of struggle for subjectivity and identity through the control of language (Canagarajah, 2004).

It is through language that experiences are organized and identities negotiated (Norton, 1997). It is important to understand how language use within mainstream classrooms promotes or constrains the conditions under which ELL students express themselves. It is also important to understand the diverse ways in which ELL students may appropriate or challenge both subtle and overt forms of power relations, and what implications this has for ELL students (Ajayi, 2005; Bleakly, 2007; Canagarajah, 2000; Canagarajah, 2004; Norton, 1997; Pappamihiel, 2002). To theorize the need of ELL students in mainstream classrooms, it is important to understand that their voice,

subjectivity and identity are constituted by and constitutive of the relationships of language and power within school structures and how those power relations play an integral role in their learning experience.

Synthesis/Discussion/Relevance to Study

The inclusion of ELL students in mainstream content area classrooms poses a great challenge to ELL students and can profoundly shape their learning experiences. The cultural specificity of content-area course curricula and hidden curriculum embedded in the classroom and school practices may profoundly impact ELL students and limit their access to safe and productive learning environments. Considering the exclusion of the use of heritage languages and the suppression of subjectivity and identities in the context of the mainstream classroom helps to expose the relationship of language and power in the current paradigm of educational thinking and practices (Abedi, 2004; Ahmad, 2006; Canagarajah, 2004; Cummins, 2000; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008; Tollefson, 1991).

Given the specific issues identified above, one might think that dialogic pedagogy, which in its ideal form is practiced to provide a conducive learning environment for all students, might be a good fit for ELL students who need to develop their language and literacy skills in English. As I have delineated above, the issues facing ELL students in mainstream classrooms in which the hegemonic effects of English are experienced by ELL students in multiple levels, provide a rationale for dialogic pedagogy to address the needs of ELL students in the mainstream classrooms in which English is used as the language of instruction and assessment. Given critical challenges ELL students experience in the mainstream classrooms as I outlined above, it is crucial to explore how

dialogic pedagogy addresses the needs of ELL students in its theory and praxis in such a way to address the language and power relationships in mainstream classrooms.

The presence of dialogic pedagogy in the studies regarding ELL students is not completely lacking. Within the ELL research literature, critical pedagogy, as a form of dialogic approach, has been advocated as a means to sensitize linguistically marginalized students to multiples layers of hegemonic structures (for example, see Arce, 2004; Auerbach, 1995; Jupp, 2001; Haneda & Wells, 2008). However, those studies were typically confined to the setting of ESL or bilingual classes in which students were given the specialized instruction tailored to their proficiency level in English with the goal to gradually move them to the monolingual English classes (Arce, 2004; Auerbach, 1995; Jupp, 2001; Haneda & Wells, 2008). Though the hegemony of English as a language of instruction and assessment has been documented, these studies fail to explore the critical challenges that ELL students face in mainstream, content area classrooms. The hegemonic effects of English are particularly evident in mainstream classes in which English is used to teach content fraught with complex terminologies and concepts in content area subjects such as social studies and sciences (Abedi, 2004; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 2000; Roseberry-McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005).

Critical pedagogy, Dialogue and Addressing ELL students

Discussions about dialogic pedagogy most often are found within the work of critical pedagogy (Alexander, 2005; Bartolome, 2004; Burbules, 2000). The advantages of critical dialogue in classrooms have been a focal point within the literature of critical pedagogy (Arce, 2004; Freire, 1986, 1998; Giroux & McLaren, 1992; hooks 2003;

McLaren, 1991). Critical pedagogy focuses on developing critical consciousness as a means to effect conditions for social change by sensitizing students to oppressive sociopolitical conditions. As part of this pedagogical approach, student-centered dialogue is privileged in facilitating the development of critical consciousness, knowledge, and action (Freire, 1986, 1998; Giroux, 1983; Giroux & McLaren,1992; McLaren, 1991; Shor, 1992).

Critical pedagogy, given its prominent representation in the literature of dialogic pedagogy and the inroads it has made in the ELL literature (as previously noted), provides a point of departure for me to further inquire into the capacity of dialogic pedagogy to empower ELL students (Arce, 2004; Freire, 1986, 1998; Giroux & McLaren, 1992; Haneda & Wells, 2008; hooks 2003; McLaren, 1991). I built upon the existing studies of critical pedagogy regarding ELL students and extended such an exploration to the mainstream classroom in which the learning perils of ELL students and hence the presence of English's hegemony is most defined. Hence I have limited my study sample to the texts of critical pedagogy. I explain the justification for my proposed data set in more detail in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four

Methodology

In light of the challenges facing ELL students due to the specificity of cultural literacy and other forms of language/power relations and their inclusion in mainstream classrooms, it is important to explore how dialogic pedagogy addresses the specific needs and interests of ELL students. As a pedagogic approach claiming to empower students and promising to provide equal access for all, one would hope to find explicit discussions about the needs of ELL students in classrooms in which dialogic pedagogy is employed. Given its claim of providing equal access to all and its commitment to democratic education, dialogic pedagogy should account for the critical challenges facing ELL students in its praxis of dialogic inquiry in the context where English sustains its hegemonic influence. This study aims to better understand how dialogic pedagogy explores the linkages between the needs of ELL students and their encounters with the hegemony of English.

In this chapter I will 1) provide an overview of my choice of a methodological framework which was heavily influenced by Bourdieu (1994) and Fairclough (1995); 2) describe CDA as a research method and its appropriateness to study dialogic pedagogy. I will then, 3) explain my data collection and sampling. Finally, 4) I discuss the validity and limitations of my study.

Overview

The review of literature examining the needs of English Language Learners identified four issues ELL students encounter in mainstream classrooms: 1) the

specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum; 2) the bias of hidden curriculum; 3) the hegemony of English to the exclusion of heritage languages, and 4) the suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity. In light of the role that English presents and limits students choices and possibilities for action, a pedagogy that claims transformative potential for all must not only focus on the enabling features of classroom approaches informed by theoretical perspectives that enact the empowerment of students. It must also address their constraining forces, in particular, the relationships of language and power facing historically marginalized students such as ELL students. These considerations have led me to pose the following overarching research question: *How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?*

Given the specific needs of ELL students in mainstream classrooms, it is also necessary to further refine my initial research question by recasting it in light of the findings of the literature review, yielding four sub-questions:

1) What does the data reveal about the specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum?

2) What does the data reveal about the bias of hidden curriculum for ELL students in mainstream classrooms?

3) What does the data reveal about the hegemony of English in mainstream classrooms?

4) What does the data reveal about the role of English in the suppression of students' voice, subjectivity and identity for ELL students?

In exploring how dialogic pedagogy theorizes about the specific needs of ELL

students in mainstream classrooms, I have come to question how dialogic pedagogy accounts for the hegemonic presence of English in the praxis of dialogic inquiry. Specifically, I have ruminated upon how dialogic pedagogy, given its concern with democratic causes, addresses the dominant role of the English language in the classroom in relation to the perpetuation of existing social structures and inequalities. A methodology that is sensitive to the role of language in mediating power and privilege is necessary if one is to adequately explore such issues.

While a wealth of recent research has successfully identified critical challenges facing ELL students in mainstream classrooms, most of them documented studies that employed different research methodologies that failed to connect to issues facing ELL students to language and power. For example, drawing upon a wide range of literature, Abedi (2004) discussed factors that potentially have a great impact on the equity and fairness of assessment for the ELL student populations. Through literature review, Ahmad (2006) outlined the challenges and successes in developing an effective instructional environment for teaching secondary-level social studies curriculum with specific focus to address the needs of ELL students in mainstream classroom. Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi (2008) employed a meta-analysis to illustrate the dissonance between educational research and policies relating to ELL students. Reeves (2006) distributed surveys to examine secondary teacher attitudes toward English-Language Learners in mainstream classrooms. Pappamihiel (2002) applied comparison study to issues of English language anxiety. Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon (2005) conduct surveys to study how university coursework addressed and explored assessment

instruments of ELL students. Though their studies have contributed to our understanding of the critical challenges that ELL students experience in mainstream classrooms, the methodologies they employed have restricted them from interacting with texts so as to prevent them from examining the role of language use in broader social contexts. Few studies that I reviewed connect the microanalysis of texts to the macroanalysis of the power relations and social formations that these texts index and construct. As a result, they have been unable to sufficiently theorize about the challenges facing ELL students in relation to the role of language in the reproduction of power and social stratification.

The very nature of my research question requires me to recognize the powerful role of language in educational settings. It is crucial that I actively engage with the literature of dialogic pedagogy, to critically examine and uncover the discursive relationships that constitute dialogic pedagogy. Turning my lens of inquiry to the discourses of dialogic pedagogy as a corpus will contribute to a more nuanced theoretical understanding within the literature of dialogic pedagogy and how it addresses the language and power relationships that shape ELL students' learning experiences. Accomplishing this goal requires employing a methodological lens that enables me to uncover the interwoven discourses and their corresponding relations. Reflecting upon these important considerations, I believe that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the most appropriate methodology, because practitioners of CDA seek to uncover the underlying power relations within and between texts (for example, see Fairclough, 1995; Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui & Joseph, 2005; van Dijk, 1995; Willig, 2008; Wodak, 2000). In this chapter I will first establish how the use of CDA as an analytic

process provides a useful lens through which one might examine the role of language in the reproduction of power and privileges (Fairclough, 1995; Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui & Joseph, 2005; van Dijk, 1995; Willig, 2008; Wodak, 2000). It enables me to explore the discursive relationships within dialogic pedagogy that affect ELL students. Bourdieu's influence on the development of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) also presents CDA as a practical choice for a methodological framework for what I wish to better understand.

As an analytic research method, CDA combines textual analysis and social theory and provides a means to systematically tackle an intractable amount of data. Its value of openness and flexibility allows me to derive theoretical and sociological insights from linguistic/semiotic analysis as well (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Smythe, 2006). As I outline below, drawing broadly on critical discourse analysts like Fairclough (1995), Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui & Joseph, 2005 (2005), Smythe (2006), van Dijk (1995), Willig (2008), Wodak (2000), and others, I employed an analytic procedure involving the following four CDA concepts: discursive formation, normalizing strategy, styles, and discursive effect to guide me through the process of data analysis.

In the next section, I discuss my methodological framework more in depth.

Research Method

My research question "How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?" calls for a research approach that sensitizes me to the role of

language in mediating power and privileges and provides me the flexibility to actively

engage with the literature of dialogic pedagogy. Given the nature of my research question,

I need a qualitative research approach that allows me to combine textual and interactive

elements to uncover and reconstruct meaning. As a subgenre of textual analysis that also

includes content analysis, narrative analysis, conversation analysis and discourse analysis,

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a method that examines the dialectic relations

between language and power, in theory and in use, and allows the researchers to

empirically filter and examine the efficacy of truth claims by taking into consideration

broader social theory (Klein & Truex, 1996; Wodak, 2000). As a research perspective,

CDA has a strong theoretical basis that merges textual analysis and social theory focusing

on language as a social practice that mediates power and privileges (Rogers,

Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui & Joseph, 2005; Wodak, 2002). Indeed within the

review of extant ELL literature, researchers have relied on diverse methods such as

quantitative methods (Pappamihiel, 2002), document studies that involve research review

(Abedi, 2004; Ahmad, 2006), surveys (Roseberry McKibbin, Brice & O'Hanlon, 2005),

case studies (Wainer, 2006), or ethnography (Phillion, 2002) that though useful, do not

allow an alternate, back and forth, interplay between textual analysis and other interactive

elements of social reality. In particular, those research methods do not adequately

highlight the role of language as a social practice implicated in complex patterns of social

inequality. CDA practitioners' concern with the dialectic relationships between language

and society and the compatibility of their work to Bourdieu's framework makes CDA a

fit choice for my methodology. Both CDA practitioners and Bourdieu share the concern

that language can be used in various expressions and manipulations of power and insist on the dialectic among social categories, theoretical perspectives, and research methods (Bourdieu, 1994; Fairclough, 2003; Rogers, et al, 2005). In the following section, I provide an overview and justification of my choice of CDA as my primary research method (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997).

Overview of CDA

As a qualitative methodology, CDA is similar to other versions of textual analysis in the respect that it is informed by the "linguistic turn" developed during the post World War II era that views language as providing a "finely articulated vehicle for differences in power within hierarchical social structures" (Wodak, 2002, p.11), and uses the study of language as an approach to qualitative research (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Luke, 1995/1996; Phillips, 2007; Rogers et al, 2005; Threadgold, 2006; van Dijk, 1993; van Dijk, 1995; Wodak, 2002). Evolving since the post World War II era and influenced by overlapping trends such as critical social theory (e.g. Adorno, 1981; Habermas, 1971; Gramsci, 1982), discourse studies (e.g., Bourdieu, 1990; Derrida, 1978/1981; Foucault, 1984), feminism and post-structuralism (Ellsworth, 1994; Foucault, 1984), and critical linguistics (e.g., Hodge & Kress, 1988; Pecheux, 1982; Pennycook, 2001), CDA seeks to go beyond semantic structure and underlying meaning of language and text by focusing on language as a social practice that mediates relationships of power and privilege in social interactions and vice versa (see, for example, Bourdieu, 1994; Foucault, 1984; Fairclough, 1995; Luke, 1995/1996).

Those who employ CDA acknowledge a crucial awareness of the social influences on the use of language and vice versa (Bourdieu, 1994; Fairclough, 1995). On the one hand, the critical stance of CDA compels researchers who employ it to go beyond mere description and explanation of texts and relate the linguistic analysis to the social and political context of language in use, as the primary purpose of CDA is concerned with how language can be used to perpetuate asymmetrical power relations. On the other hand, CDA affirms that a close analysis of language contributes to understandings about power relations and ideology in discourse (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Luke, 1995/1996; Phillips, 2007; Rogers et al, 2005; Threadgold, 2006; van Dijk, 1993; van Dijk, 1995; Wodak, 2002). Using analytic concepts that CDA practitioners find most useful in doing close textual analysis, concepts that are most fruitful in allowing the analyst to pursue the stated aims and purposes of the analysis, CDA is able to show how discourse often serves the interests of powerful forces over those of the less privileged (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Luke, 1995/1996; Phillips, 2007; Rogers et al, 2005; Threadgold, 2006; van Dijk, 1993; van Dijk, 1995; Wodak, 2002).

As a research method, CDA is extremely eclectic and draws upon theoretically diverse influences such as the work of Foucault, Marx, Bourdieu, critical theory, interactive symbolism, and others (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Under the label of CDA, Wodak and Meyer (2009) included diverse approaches such as Discourse-Historical Approach (Ruth Wodak and Martin Reisigl), Sociocognitive Approach (Teun van Dijk), Social Actors Approach (Theo van Leeuwen), Dispositive Analysis (Siegfried Jäger and Florentine Maier), Corpus-Linguistics Approach (Gerlinde Mautner), and Dialectical–

Relational Approach (Norman Fairclough). The guiding methodology for CDA is driven

by one's research question and theoretical lens (Fairclough, 1989/2001; van Dijk, 1993;

Wodak, 2002). Hence how the data is collected, parsed, and analyzed will vary depending

upon one's research project. Despite of the diversity within the practices of CDA, they

share some common features and concerns. Based upon a review of the methodological

literature, I have identified the following characteristics of CDA:

1) CDA conceptualizes language use (whether in writing or speech) as a discourse,

defined as ways of representing the world from particular perspectives, and as a social

practice that implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and

the wider context that frames it (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski,

2003; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). The perspective enables the researcher who

employs CDA to be better attuned to discursive effects of language uses, ideological

consequences that contribute to the reproduction of the power relations between social

classes. CDA is an appropriate methodological lens for this study as it alerts me to the

power relations inherent in dialogic inquiry, even as I examine how the praxis of dialogic

pedagogy addresses the need of ELL students.

2) CDA maintains that all analyses of language are embedded in power relations and take

an explicit sociopolitical stance (Luke, 1995/1996; Phillips, 2007; Rogers et al, 2005;

Threadgold, 2006; van Dijk, 1993; van Dijk, 1999). The primary focus of CDA is to

move beyond interpreting and understanding the role of language in the social worlds, in

order to expose language as part of a social practice, "showing how it is determined by

social structures", and what "reproductive effects" language can cumulatively have on

those structures, whether it sustains or transforms them (Fairclough, 1989/2001, p. 135). To this end, the practitioners of CDA use analytic concepts focusing on specific kinds of textual, discursive, and contextual features to help them delve deeper into the sociopolitical aspects of a research topic (Fairclough, 1989/2001). In other words, by insisting on a fine-grained textual analysis with socio-political aspects of discursive manipulation, CDA can be used as a means to challenge and transform the condition of inequality by exposing the hegemonic role of language as embedded in social institutions (Luke, 1995/1996; Phillips, 2007; Rogers et al, 2005; Threadgold, 2006; van Dijk, 1993; van Dijk, 1999). This aspect of CDA is important for me as it reminds me that my study of dialogic pedagogy and its equity claim is motivated by my concern for ELL students and their contested positionality in American society.

3) CDA is a valuable tool to analyze texts critically and expose the ideological effects of discourse. The primary purposes of CDA is concerned with how people are manipulated by discourse and thereby subjected to abuses of power. To make an examination socio-politically engaging requires the practitioners of CDA to analyze the text reader interaction in a more critical fashion (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Rogers, et al, 2005). At the heart of any form of discourse analysis are the analytic concepts that practitioners find most useful in pursuing the stated aims and purposes of their studies. Since the main purpose of CDA is to expose the relationships of language and power, CDA analysts have generally focused on those aspects of language that often facilitate the manipulation of power. These concepts are applied at different levels of texts, ranging from single words to entire texts. Since my goal in using CDA is concerned with how dialogic pedagogy

theorizes about the power and language relationships concerning ELL students, I have focused on the patterns of a fairly large corpus of texts to see patterns of discursive practice within the discourse of dialogic pedagogy and examine their ideological effects for ELL students.

4) CDA practitioners emphasize that it is a critical practice and reject any prescribed, ready-made research method. Bourdieu, for example, warned against treating social categories as pre-constructed objects. As discourse classifies and constructs people, things, places, events, etc., into 'objects of research', he maintained that social categorization is seen as operating within the dynamics of social positioning, reflecting social relationships, and shifting across time (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992).

Building on Bourdieu, Fairclough suggested that the way that 'objects of research' are constructed from research topics involves the choice of theoretical frameworks, perspectives and categories to bring to bear on the research topic. Understood this way, my choice of the ways to delineate ELL students as an object of research are themselves "elements of discourses" which are associated with "particular strategies for change, and therefore with particular interested representations" (Fairclough, 2001, p.9). In this sense, the four categories of Bourdieu I have employed in organizing the findings from the review of the literature and later in facilitating with my data collection and analysis: 1) specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum, 2) Bias of hidden curriculum, 3) the hegemony of English to the exclusion of heritage languages, and 4) the suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity – are to be seen as devices and concepts maneuvered to pursue my research question. They are points of reference I utilized to

help me sensitized to the large amount of information in the text of dialogic pedagogy and to expose the relationships of language and power facing ELL students in dialogic interaction.

CDA and Fairclough

As discussed above, the defining characteristic of CDA is that it is a text-based, critical approach that explores text as 'discourses that act in the world in ways that both define and distribute power' (Smythe, 2006, p. 23). CDA approaches and thinks about a research problem by moving back and forth between reflecting and constructing social practices or phenomena. To create a methodology with which to analyze dialogic pedagogy's theorization of the needs of ELL students in the mainstream classrooms, I pulled from various CDA approaches to develop a methodological framework tailored to my study sample. I relied particularly upon Fairclough's contributions to the field (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003). I highlighted Fairclough's CDA approach in the following.

Fairclough. Fairclough's work is informed by a broad tradition of CDA such as Bakhtin (1981), Gramsci (1982), Althusser (1969), Foucault (2002) and Bourdieu (1990). His work in mass-crafted discourse phenomena explores the overlapping between language and social institutional practices and of 'wider' political and social structure. His commitment to uncovering ways language contributes to the mediation of power and privileges makes him a natural referent for my methodology (Fairclough, 1989/2001). Focusing upon social conflict from the Marxian tradition, Fairclough seeks to detect class conflicts and power imbalance as manifested in discourses, in particular "elements of

dominance, difference and resistance" (Wodak and Meyer, 2009, p. 27).

In order to better capture more nuanced understanding of discourse as a social practice that mediates power and privileges, Fairclough presented a three stage CDA analysis: 1) description of text, 2) interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction, and 3) explanation of the relationship between interaction and social contexts.

1) Description of text: In this stage, researchers who employ CDA are mostly concerned with what is in the text by drawing upon formal features of different levels of texts which range from single words to entire texts. In order to interpret the features actually present in a text, it is generally necessary to take account of what other choices might have been made, (for example, interpreting a discourse as viewing ELL students from a deficit view vis-à-vis attributing to them positive characteristics). Hence there is a sense in which description presupposes interpretation. Consequently, in analyzing texts, one's focus is constantly alternating between what is there in the text, and the discourse types the text draws upon.

2) Interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction. In this stage, CDA is concerned with the relationship of what is in the text and what is 'in' the interpretation, in the sense of what the interpreters/researchers bring to interpretation. CDA conceptualizes language as social practice and its associated structural effects (on knowledge construction, social relationships, and social identities, etc.). As such, Fairclough maintained that one can never directly extrapolate from the formal structure of a text its structural effects (Fairclough, 1989/2001, p. 117). Rather, as texts are embedded in social interaction, they are mediated through a background of 'common sense'

assumptions against which texts are produced and interpreted. Fairclough referred to the common sense assumptions in the sense theorized by Gramsci (Fairclough, 1989/2001). They are substantially ideological, taken for granted in the practical activities of social life. Through employing appropriate analytic concepts that help the interpreter/researcher sensitized to such implicit assumptions, CDA can be used to expose the ideological premises that given texts are built upon. In line with such method, in my study, I used CDA concepts to help me better attuned to the assumptions regarding the relationships of language and power as implicitly manifested in the discourse of dialogic pedagogy in order to address the need of ELL students.

3) Explanation of the relationship between interaction and social contexts. The third stage focuses on viewing the meaning of a text as part of the institutional and societal processes of social struggle. Fairclough viewed explanation as having two dimensions: The broader power struggle that discourses are 'determined' by and parts of, and the ideological effects that are the outcome of such struggle (Fairclough, 1989/2001, p. 135). The social determinations and effects are mediated by ideological assumptions that produce and are reproduced by the text as discourse (Fairclough, 1989/2001, p. 135). The stage of explanation hence involves a specific perspective that views those assumptions of the text as well as the interpretative procedures of the interpreter/researcher, as ideologies about culture, social relationships, and social identities. Those ideologies produce and are reproduced by particular power relations in discourses. As such, they can either sustain or transform the power relations (Fairclough, 1989/2001, p. 138).

Each of theses three stages contributes to our understanding of power relations in the discourse of dialogic pedagogy with regarding to ELL students. Though they are characterized in procedural terms, Fairclough emphasized that there is a sense that each stage presupposes and anticipated what is in next stage. The stage of description presupposes the interpretative procedure, as the values of the textual features of a text are always embedded in social interaction and therefore always call for interpretation. The stage of interpretation demands the stage of explanation as the interpretative process of making implicit assumptions explicit does not explicate the power relations built in such assumptions.

Thus conceptualized, Fairclough's CDA framework is better understood involving an analytic procedure of multiple levels, from surface to deeper levels. Moving from description of text to interpretation of the relationship between texts, the purpose of CDA is to go beyond the textual level and make explicit what is generally implicit in the text, such as the dependence of a discourse practice on the unexplicated assumption of a research method. Moving from to interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction to explanation of the relationship between interaction and social contexts, CDA seeks to expose these assumptions as ideologies and explain how these assumptions are incorporated into the production of the texts as part of the process of social struggle. Thus understood, Fairclough's work facilitates the identification of the ideological assumptions underlying the discourse of dialogic pedagogy and addresses their power effects for ELL students.

By viewing discourses of dialogic pedagogy as part of the process of social

struggle, CDA can help us to address the need of ELL students through the process of explicating the power relations operative in the discourse of dialogic pedagogy. Ultimately, it can be used to address whether the discursive practices of dialogic pedagogy contribute to sustaining existing power relations or transforming them.

In the following section, I outline some CDA concepts that I culled from Fairclough's and other CDA analysts' frameworks and explained how they constitute my approach to analyzing the data relevant to my research question.

Relevant CDA Concepts

        Discursive formation. An essential feature of CDA is a concern with discourse that represents or is connected to broader world-views that are considered common sense and yet camouflage power relations (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Foucault, 2002; Rogers, Malanchuruvil-Berkes, Mosley, Huie, & O'Garra Joseph, 2005; van Dijk, 1993). A discursive formation connects the text to the social by connecting statements in the text to broader world-views (such as political ideologies) and is indicated in 'the regularity among seemingly unconnected groups of statements and the rules that govern this regularity' (Smythe, 2006, p. 26). The uncovering of rules that govern the regularity within text is not an incidental or random act of researchers. In his employment of CDA to research the phenomenon of citizenship, Fairclough argued that a discursive formation can only reveal itself in the dialectical relationship between the processes and relations and patterns one can discern in text and talk, and wider social relations and structures (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003). To identify discursive formations within text requires a researcher's being actively engaged with

texts in search of a dialectic within which individual texts and other interactive elements in the wider social context juxtapose and negotiate meaning. An example would be neo-Marxist discourses such as Giroux's or McLaren's theorizing ELL students as part of the social struggle against the neo-liberal social order, thereby obliterating the specific oppressive conditions that inform and shape ELL students' educational experience (Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005). Only by taking into consideration of the broader social contexts that the neo-Marxist discourse is part of, can we adequately understand the power effects of the neo-Marxist discourse on ELL students. Methodologically, such considerations inform my inquiry into the ways that dialogic pedagogy theorizes ELL students, as the nature of my study requires me not to take text at its face value, rather to see it as a discourse, as a social construction of ELL students as a research object.

In identifying the discourses or discursive formations of dialogic pedagogy theorizing about the needs of ELL students, I attended to the interrelationships within and across texts of dialogic pedagogy. For example, in a method of coding that I piloted in order to better understand how best to approach this study, I noted that both Degener (2001) and Coloma (2008) identified English as the dominant language in imposing the mainstream ideology, but they drew different conclusions from that premise. While Degener retained her faith in dialogic rationality as an instrument of political intervention in addressing social inequality, Coloma, drawing upon the post-colonial subject position in the U.S., called for a need to challenge a monolingual educational system that he argued is modeled on the vision of a homogeneous nation state. Hence the two discourses express different world-views and should be considered as distinct and separate for the

purpose of analysis as they entail different solutions and have different implications for potential student outcomes in addressing the needs of ELL students (Degener, 2001; Coloma, 2008).

Discursive strategy. Discursive strategy can be characterized as the ways a discourse constitutes its object that seek to normalize subjectivities and exclude others (Bourdieu, 1994; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Foucault, 2002; Smythe, 2006). A discursive strategy can also be understood as situating a statement within a broader social and historical context in such a way that renders it true (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Foucault, 2002). Strategies of normalization and exclusion may be recognized as comparing, ranking, classifying, hierarchizing, and dividing (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Foucault, 2002; Smythe, 2006, p.36). Implicit in the attention to discursive strategies is a concern for their effects upon how a research object is constituted and what actions are proscribed within a discursive formation of the object.

In this study, I attended to these strategies deployed in texts of dialogic pedagogy with a particular focus on the ways in which discourses normalize and legitimate the practices of the English language at the expense of suppressing ELL students' subjectivity and voice. For example, from the pilot study I conducted in 2008 exploring the democratic promise of dialogic pedagogy, DeTurk (2006) & Duarte (2006) generalized that dialogue can be used to help the marginalized groups foster their voice and challenge the hidden norms and power relations in the educational system that serves to perpetuate social inequality, but failed to take into considerations the diverse needs among those whom they identified to be marginalized (DeTurk, 2006 & Duarte, 2006).

By taking for granted the required skills and competency in English a student needs to possess in order to participate in classroom discussions, they normalized the practice of the English language and failed to recognize dialogue itself is a manifestation of a form of cultural capital rooted in class distinctions and power disparity. Such discursive strategy can potentially contribute to the marginalization of ELL students. By employing CDA to uncover the discursive strategies of a discourse, it is my hope to identify how a given discourse delineates ELL students as an object of research (such as presenting it in such a way as to enable or constrain their subjectivity) and explores its discursive effects for ELL students.

Style. Another area that CDA is concerned about is access to discourse and communication (Bourdieu, 1994; Fairclough, 2001b; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; van Dijk, 1993). CDA theorists assume that people may have more or less active or passive access to discourses or communicative events, as is usually the case for intellectuals or professors when writing for, or speaking to, a more or less passive audience. There exists a parallelism between subject position and discourse access: the more discourse genres, contexts, audience, scope and text characteristics a group actively control, the more powerful they are and vice versa (Fairclough, 1989/2001; van Dijk, 1993).

In CDA literature, style is understood as a way of theorizing or constructing subject positions, "ways of identifying, constructing or enunciating the self, including both social and institutional identities" (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003, p.6). This theorization of subject position has been embraced by CDA theorists like

Fairclough. Following the influence of Foucault (1984) and Bourdieu (1994), Fairclough argued that discourses create subject positions with which individuals negotiate their own personal identity (Fairclough, 1989/2001). Individuals become social subjects with a certain identity as they are positioned in the discourses where their social activity takes place. This notion is important in studying how the discourse of dialogic pedagogy theorizes ELL students, since how it theorizes ELL students will depend on what subject position the author ascribes to ELL students vis-à-vis himself in discourse.

Fairclough discussed subject positions as being specific to discourse types (Fairclough, 1989/2001). What characterizes the discourse of dialogic pedagogy is the discourse of emancipatory pedagogy – in which critical educators often position themselves as saviors, as a special kind of subject positions with which ELL students will negotiate their individual identities. By uncovering the style of a text, CDA can help identify the subject positions that ELLs are placed within in a discourse and traces the consequence or ideological effect of such subject positioning for them.

From this, we can posit that it is important to look for styles of a discourse found within text that reveal ELL as discursive constructions (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Smythe, 2006). Style of a discourse can be revealed by the following questions: Who has access to which discourses, and who has the power to impose and enforce constraints on access? (Fairclough, 1989/2001, p. 52) Individuals are positioned within complex sets of shifting power relations, rendering individuals as powerful at times and powerless at other times (Baxter, 2002, Davies, 1994, Foucault, 1977, 1978). As such, access to discourse is an important issue to consider when we theorize the

subject position of ELL students in the discourse of dialogic pedagogy.

Style is linked to and reflects a process of power and identity formation that is situated. It implies a way of seeing discourses being able to construct subjects as well as objects and as a result, makes available positions within the discourse that a language user can take up as well as place others within (Smythe, 2006; Taylor & Robinson, 2009; Willig, 2008). For example, the discourse of Jennings and Lynn (2005) in their theorization of racial minorities indicates their oscillation of being black in the wake of post civil right struggles and their identity as black male teachers who resort to critical pedagogy as a practical intervention to effect educational change. In their discourse, they have sought to control the access to the discourse of emancipatory pedagogy by prioritizing race as the prototype of civil rights struggle. By doing so, they have positioned themselves as the champion of such social struggles. The notion of style directs me to identify the subject position they place ELLs within their discourse and allows me to uncover the power relations in their theorization of ELL students.

CDA's notion of style is useful for my analysis of dialogic pedagogy. Discourse place individuals within complex sets of power relations. By theorizing the subject position of ELL students in the discourse of dialogic pedagogy, the notion of style can be used to help us disentangle the ideological assumptions of dialogic pedagogy about ELL students and allows me to examine whether it challenges or transforms the existing power relationship.

Discursive effects. As it is in the effects of discourse where power and language come together, discursive effects are 'concerned with who gains and who is denied of

power through discourses and the implications of this for the reproduction of unequal

relations of power' (Smythe, 2006, p.42). The wide ranges of discourses about ELL

students as an object of research within the text of critical pedagogy raise the question of

how dialogic pedagogy theorizes the special needs of ELL students within this research.

As an important CDA concept, 'discursive effect' helps me maintain a direct focus on

ELL students as the object of research in an ongoing process of data collection and

analysis in my study (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003;

Smythe, 2006). By keeping in mind that a discourse is part of a broader social struggle

for power and domination and has ideological effects for the marginalized who have less

access to dominant discourses, we are better positioned to explore how a discourse

contributes to sustaining or transforming existing power relations that ELL students face

within the school structure.

It is important to interpret the notion of discursive effect so that makes room for

seeing individuals as being capable of negotiating the boundary of power while

navigating their paths in history. It is important not to conceive ELL students as the

normative-hegemonic effects of dominant discourses, rendering them as passive, but to

enact ELL students' agency and provide them access to possibilities of resistance and

insurgence, no matter how marginal or small those acts of resistance are compared to the

extent of oppression they may experience.

The concept of discursive effect indicates a reflective process that attempts to make

the link between the discursive formation, discursive strategies, and style found in each

text and their implications for ELL students. To uncover the underlying relationships

between these elements of a text and its theorization of ELL students, it is useful to keep the following questions in mind while attending to the power effects of discourse: Who benefits from the discourse of dialogic pedagogy? Who is left out and what is forgotten? What are the effects of the discourse for ELLs? How does it constrain or enable ELL students? (Foucault, 1980; Smythe, 2006) For example, Cahill (2007) exposed and challenged the stereotype that portrays young urban women of color as 'insane', 'overemotional', 'oversexed' that has been used to justify the society's racist approach toward women of color (Cahill, 2007, p.277). Using a feminist poststructuralism-informed dialogic approach that views identities as socially and culturally contextualized, Cahill problematized racial identities as a normalized social order and argued that how one sees herself cannot be divorced from their classed, gendered, and raced identities. By doing so, the author provides an enabling space for minorities to see their identities as socially constructed and therefore negotiable (Cahill, 2007). However, by focusing on teacher education and teacher voice in her discourse, she also risks reinforcing teacher authority and runs counter to the defining tenet of dialogic pedagogy that views education as the process of human interaction in which both teachers and students learn from each other.

The process I engaged in to analyze the data of this study sensitizes me to better identify and observe the complexity and contradictions of different discourses within dialogic pedagogy about ELL students, recognize their respective social positioning, and identify the social relationship and tensions that they imply (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Smythe, 2006). The CDA concept of discursive effects alerts me to

recognize, to respond to and counter these powerful and implicit articulations about ELL students within the text of dialogic pedagogy, should their presence be identified. Hence my study involves an exploration of the dynamic relationship between the normative, and theoretical pre-constructions of ELL students and their discursive effects that include how they contribute to the enabling and constraining effects for ELL students. In exploring the discursive effects of dialogic pedagogy for ELL students, I not only identified the structure and process dialogic pedagogy imposes in dialogic process that potentially disadvantage ELL students, I also considered the opportunities that the same structure and process dialogic pedagogy creates might have provided for ELL students, enabling them to enact their agency and chart for their own emancipation.

Thus, my overarching research question "*How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms*?" would be well-served by employing CDA as a methodological lens. By approaching the text on multiple levels, starting with broader concepts and increasingly closing in, using the following CDA concepts: (1) discursive formation; (2) discursive strategy; (3) style; and (4) discursive effect (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Smythe, 2006), CDA allows me to actively engage the literature of dialogic pedagogy, critically challenging its assumptions and hidden motivations. Doing so better enables me to explore how dialogic pedagogy theorizes the needs of ELL students in its praxis of dialogic inquiry (Huckin, 2002; Juzwik, 2006; Luke, 1995/1996, Phillips, 2007; Rogers et al, 2005; Threadgold, 2006; van Dijk, 1993; van Dijk, 1995).

Based on the methodological considerations above, I elaborate in the next section on the following potential methodological and analytical moves (see Table 1):

1. Limitations: I provide the rationale for limiting my data to texts that fall within the Freirean tradition of dialogic pedagogy.

2. Data collection: Some of the data were derived from a pilot study I completed in 2008. Using databases available through the Montclair University Library I added to the data from the pilot study to build a preliminary, raw data set.

3. Identifying the data set: I specify my criteria of including and excluding data. Articles that fall outside the parameters of my research question "*How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?*" were excluded. Reasons for exclusion were noted.

4. Collecting and sorting instances: I explain my use of an analysis chart as a base to analyze all the data I collect for my study. The analysis chart was organized around the four sub-questions derived from my research question on the basis of my literature review of ELL education.

Data

Table 1

Summary of Methods

Limitations	Limited data to what falls within the Freirean tradition of dialogic pedagogy
Data Collection	• Search terms: 'critical pedagogy', 'dialogue', and 'ELL Students' • Databases: EDUCATION FULL TEXT, EDUCATION RESEARCH COMPLETE, ERIC EDUCATION and GOOGLE SCHOLAR
Identifying the data set	Excluded articles that fell outside the parameters of my research question. Yielded 127 of 217 articles.
Collecting and sorting instances	Sorted data around the four ELL issues: 1) Specificity of Cultural literacy in the school curriculum; 2) Bias of Hidden Curriculum; 3) the hegemony of English to the exclusion of the heritage languages; 4) the suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity.
Analyzing	Employed CDA concepts: 1) Identifying Discursive formation; 2) Identifying discursive strategies; 3) Identifying styles; 4) Identifying discursive effects.

The data I collected to answer my research question "*How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?*" are a selection of texts that are representative of the body of work affiliated with dialogic pedagogy. Freire's commitment to historically marginalized groups, and his profound impact on educational theorizing oriented toward addressing underserved students makes his work's legacy a natural choice for me to pursue my research question within the trajectory of his influence (Jupp, 2001; Arce, 2004; Haneda & Wells, 2008). Hence I limited my data to

texts that fall within the Freirean tradition of dialogic pedagogy.

The data set I used for this current study was built upon a particular data set developed for the pilot study, in which I investigated the coherence of dialogic pedagogy as an example of democratic education. In that study, I used the various cognates of the key word 'dialogue' (such as 'talk', 'discussion', 'communication,' 'dialogical inquiry') in conjunction with the words 'pedagogy' and 'democracy', as the primary search terms in order to compile the characteristics of dialogic pedagogy as defined by luminaries in the field like Bakhtin (1981), Freire (1993), Habermas (1984), and hooks (2003) whose work together provide the primary theoretical paradigms that inform the development of dialogic pedagogy (Bakhtin, 1981; Freire, 1993; Habermas, 1984; hooks, 2003). The pilot study allowed me to develop an overview of those theories but did not include data involving ELL students. It was, however, instrumental in leading me to wonder how dialogic pedagogy might have addressed ELL students. Incorporating the term 'ELL' and its various cognates into the search terms I used for the pilot study, I expanded upon the previous data set develop the current one.

The analysis of data from the initial pilot study revealed that dialogic pedagogy is used as an umbrella term to denote a form of constructive teaching and learning that enables students to play an active role in shaping classroom agenda through dialogic interaction (Alexander, 2005; Biesta, 1995; Keis, 2006; Kennedy, 2006; Kramer, 2001; Lyle, 2008; Morrell, 2004; Skidmore, 2003). My findings also revealed that different accounts of dialogic pedagogy often have different political ends-in-view and different ontological and epistemological commitments, but share their commitment to dialogue as

the very pedagogical instrument to foster active citizenship in participatory democracy. The pilot study enabled me to begin to develop congruence between my theoretical and methodological concerns. While a very small data set, I was left unsettled about the discussions regarding the needs of ELLs (or lack there-of). Ultimately, that pilot study helped me to hone the research questions I hope to answer here, and ultimately served as starting point for this larger study.

Limitations

Though there are numerous emerging accounts of dialogic pedagogy informed by disparate theoretical sources that promote dialogue as an important concept to classroom practices, I chose to limit my data to texts that fall within the Freirean tradition of dialogic pedagogy (see, for instance, Bakhtin, 1941; Bakhtin, 1981; Freire, 1998; Habermas, 1971; Habermas, 1984; hooks, 2003; Lipman, 1993; Lipman, 2003). My reason for this choice is twofold: 1) Freire conceptualizes dialogic inquiry in classrooms as a means to develop critical consciousness. His notion of dialogue focuses on using the problematization of language to help individuals 'conscientize' the existence of the oppressive regime of power/knowledge in the hope to move individuals to take action to transform society (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Giroux & McLaren, 1992; McLaren, 1991), and; 2) Freire's pedagogical approach has been shaped by his concern with politically, economically and linguistically marginalized populations and has had a profound influence on educational theorizing that aims to empower individuals and groups to action that changes their lives (Freire, 1993; Freire, 1998; Jupp, 2001; Arce, 2004; Haneda & Wells, 2008). I explain these reasons in turn.

1) For Freire, dialogue is essentially an integral part of human struggle to be free (Freire, 1994; Freire, 1998; Glass, 2001). Dialogue is linked to intentional action seeking to transform the world (including the self) (Freire, 1990; Glass, 2001). The conditions that compel humans to seek liberation also produce the human capacity and desire for knowledge (Freire, 1990; Glass, 2001). To this goal, educators of critical pedagogy accentuate dialogue as a method of problem posing in which both students and teachers engaged as fellow dialoguers approach the historical and cultural world as transformable (Apple, 2004; Giroux, 2004; hooks, 2003; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; McLaren, 2005; Kincheloe, 2008; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999).

Freire refused to reduce his dialogic approach to a programme. For Freire, teaching is essentially a human act grounded in the interaction between students and teachers. Seen from this perspective, the transformative potential of dialogue is intrinsically embedded in the profound importance of language for individuals' being in the world. In order to achieve the authentic human existence that liberation entails, dialogue must begin with the experience of the students and aims at empowering students (Freire, 1986; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Freire 1998; Giroux, 2004; hooks, 2003; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; McLaren, 2005; Kincheloe, 2008). In Freire's notion of dialogue, students' experiences are recognized and honored as a major source of their own knowledge. Freire and Macedo (1987) insisted that students are not passive receptacles: "Educators must develop radical pedagogical structures that provide students with the opportunity to use their own reality as a basis of literacy and help students develop their voice" (Freire & Macedo, 1987, p. 151). For my purpose of studying critical pedagogy's

theorization of ELL students, it is especially important to value ELL students' experience and help them to use their experience to transform the reality.

Focusing on the transformative potential of dialogue, critical pedagogy educators view dialogue broadly as an integral part of the literacy practice that seeks to help students problematize language in their meaning making of the relation of word and world. To facilitate liberatory education, Freire insisted that the oppressed (including ELL students) must be able to *read* the world and themselves in a critical way that reveals the processes of historical formation in order to *express* their power of humanization and *write* their thoughts (Freire, 1990; Freire, 1994; Glass, 2001). Freire's notion of dialogue as a problem posing method is important especially for ELLs as languages can have both enabling and constraining effects for them. In order to address the special needs of ELL students, dialogue must seek to create situations in which students can more deeply express their own hopes and intentions, hence enables them to "speak a true word" and overcome their "silencing" (Freire, 1990; Freire, 1994; Glass, 2001).

2) Freire's idea of meaningful dialogic communication as a critical link in a collective struggle against oppression and power inspired and has been systematically explored by a copious body of scholarly work in dialogic pedagogy and gave rise to critical pedagogies whose major proponents significantly expand Freire's dialogism with their engaged discourses with postmodernism and post-structuralism (Ellsworth, 1994; Giroux, 1997; McLaren, 1991; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Giroux & McLaren, 1992; Shor, 1992; Kincheloe, 2008; Lensmire, 1998). Despite significant differences existing within the tradition of critical pedagogy, the shared vision of its practitioners is to develop a

critical consciousness of "the mechanisms of oppression imposed by the established order" from the perspective of the "dispossessed and oppressed" (McLaren, 2005, p.7). Given the commitment of critical pedagogy to the underprivileged, it is natural for me to wonder how it theorizes the special need of ELL students.

Considering Freire's critical approach to dialogue and his commitment to the historically marginalized groups, and his profound influence among progressive educators, I limited my data to dialogic pedagogy that falls within his trajectory of influence in addressing my research question: *How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?*

Data Collection

Like in my pilot study, I employed the search terms 'critical pedagogy' in conjunction with 'dialogue', and 'ELL Students' to identify the relevant articles, using EDUCATION FULL TEXT, EDUCATION RESEARCH COMPLETE, ERIC EDUCATION and GOOGLE SCHOLAR, as the primary research data bases and aggregators. This search yielded 5 articles, clearly not a date set. My preliminary research suggested that within the text of critical pedagogy that specifically theorized dialogue as a means of empowerment, very few texts addressed ELL students per se, but only obliquely referred to them in general umbrella terms such as 'the underprivileged', 'the oppressed', 'the marginalized', etc. My initial finding hence compelled me to re-conceptualize the object of my research to include the texts of critical pedagogy that do not easily separate broader populations of the underprivileged from ELL students. This

move implies that the indiscriminate treatment of different groups of the 'underprivileged' within critical pedagogy will be part of my data analysis. As a result, I broadened my search by using the combination of the terms 'critical pedagogy' and 'dialogue' only, and found 217 relevant articles that are available in PDF format in full text, after double-checking each article for duplication.

Identifying the Data Set

In this procedure, I reviewed each article to determine its inclusion and exclusion. Articles that fall outside the parameters of my research question "*How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?*" are excluded. Only texts of critical pedagogy that focus on dialogue as a method of instruction in the setting of general education in which English is used as the language of instruction and assessment are included as the study sample.

A preliminary survey of my collected study sample revealed that many articles are studies conducted in countries other than the U.S. I limited my data to those that were set in the context of the U.S. alone or in a comparison with other countries as I am concerned with ELL students in the U.S. schools.

Given my research question were concerned with the mainstreaming of ELL students, I selected texts that were published from 2001 to the present, as 2001 is the year when NCLB was signed into law. NCLB requires all students including ELL students to take the same standardized tests as their native-speaking peers. To comply with such a requirement of NCLB, schools nationwide are encouraged to mainstream ELL students in

content area classes. As was discussed previously in the chapter of literature review,

being in mainstream classrooms poses critical challenges for ELL students and

profoundly shapes their learning experience.

Since my research question was only concerned with ELL students in mainstream

classrooms, I selected items that referred to studies taking place in the context of general

education, which included articles about K-12 and higher education since they all

involved classrooms in which English is used as a means of instruction as well as

assessment.

In addition to articles published since NCLB took effect, I included articles or

books that are considered to be core texts of critical pedagogy based on the frequency of

their citation. My choice of core texts is not intended to be comprehensive, but to build an

appropriate size of data. For the convenience of coding, I preferred items that are

available in electronic format whenever possible.

An example of an item to include for analysis is Giroux's "Education and the

Crisis of Youth: Schooling and the Promise of Democracy" (2009). It involves a general

education setting and the use of dialogue in discussing social justice and democracy.

After discussing how it addresses the four issues emerging in the review of ELL literature,

I employed the CDA concepts that I have discussed previously to identify its discursive

formation, discursive strategies and styles, and explore the discursive effects of its

discourse for ELL students. An example of excluded item is Akbari's "Transforming lives:

introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms" (Akbari, 2008). The study refers to a

classroom setting in which English is taught as the subject. It was excluded since it is not

set in a mainstream classroom and hence falls outside of the direct scope of my research

question. As the application of the research question would require interpretation, each

article was closely examined for its content and context.

For each article that was excluded, reasons for its exclusion were noted in the

analysis chart that I used to organize the data. The number of my study sample resulted

from this including/excluding procedure was 127.

Table 2

Including and Excluding Items

	Include (texts that fall within the parameter of my research question) (n=127)	Exclude (texts that fall outside the parameter of my research question) (n=90)
Core texts	(n=10) (Such as Burbules, 2000; Ellsworth, 1994; Freire, 1993; Freire, 1998; Giroux, 1997; Gore, 1993; McLaren, 1991; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Giroux & McLaren, 1992; Shor, 1992)	
Texts (2001- the present)	(n=117) (For example, Apples, 2004; Coffey, 2009; Degener, 2001; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Van Duinen, 2005/2006; Wolk, 2003)	(n=90) (For example, Barrett, 2005; Breunig, 2005; DeVeriese, 2008; Elliott, 2007; Haque, 2007; Sonn, 2008)

Collecting and Sorting Instances

To ensure that I approached the literature in a systematic and consistent manner,

as well as to minimize the possibility of overlooking or ignoring certain issues relevant to

dialogic pedagogy's theorization of ELL students, I created an analysis chart that is used

as a base to analyze all the data I collect for my study. The analyzing categories I

employed are —1) specificity of required cultural capital in the school curriculum; 2)

bias of hidden curriculum; 3) the exclusion of heritage languages; 4) the suppression of

student voice, subjectivity and identity. I uncovered these objects of research in the

review of the ELL literature using Bourdieu's analysis of the symbolic power of language

as a filter. I analyzed one article at a time, moving through the chart each theme at a time.

I stopped to review my coding continuously, to ensure that I was applying the analytic

framework consistently. I then was able to engage in uncovering the intertextual aspects

of the data. In addition, I asked other researchers familiar with my work to review my

coding, and to apply my coding scheme to triangulate findings.

I identified how each article addresses each of the issues that face ELL students in

general education in which English is used as the language of instruction and assessment.

I looked for any instance of an analyzing category included in each article. When I

discovered any, I noted what I found, where in the article it was found, and highlighted

relevant texts for later reference.

Analysis Procedure

Once the chart was completed, I employed the selected CDA concepts (Discursive

Formation, Discursive Strategy, Styles and Discursive Effect) that I outlined earlier to

engage in a more in-depth analysis of the data (Bourdieu, 1994; Fairclough, 1989/2001;

Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003). The procedure included the following

recursive steps:

Identifying discursive formation. Having identified all the responses to each issue

facing ELL students within a section of text, I identified types of discourses or discursive

formations by searching for regularities within and across texts of critical pedagogy (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Smythe, 2006). As a way of representing broader world views, a discourse or discursive formation can be indicated by "the regularity among seemingly unconnected groups of statements and the rules that govern this regularity,' (Smythe, 2006; p. 26). To identify discourses about ELL students within the text of critical pedagogy, I looked for trends and patterns in the instantiation of each analyzing category within and across the study sample. Similarities and differences of various discourse types were noted. For example, an argument against neo-liberal, pro-capitalist educational policies grounded in a neo-Marxist framework was identified to be a different discourse from one speaking from the post-colonial perspective that emphasized the autonomy of local communities and indigenous forms of knowledge and should be noted as such (Apple, 2004; Bowers, 2008). Each of these discourses represented different ways of framing ELL in the broader social relations and was considered separately for their implications for the theorization of ELL students.

Identifying deployed discursive strategies. After identifying types of discourses by searching the regularities within and cross texts of dialogic pedagogy, I attended to discursive strategies deployed within the text that excludes ELL students. A discursive strategy can be characterized as the ways a discourse constitutes its object that seek to normalize subjectivities and exclude others (Bourdieu, 1994; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Foucault, 2002; Smythe, 2006). For example, in the studies of Ardizzone (2007) and Chapman (2004), English was normalized as the standard linguistic practice and the literacy competency and skills that ELL students developed in

their heritage languages were not accounted for. In this instance the deployed discursive strategy created the effect of excluding ELL students' subjectivities.

    Identifying competing styles. The next level of analysis identified competing styles of discourses that reveal them as social construction (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Smythe, 2006). In this study, style was characterized as ways of identifying, constructing or enunciating the self, including both social and institutional identities. The notion of style was employed to reveal the subject position(s) of the researcher and how the subject position regulates access to discourse by placing ELL students and others within the space created by the discourse. Styles in discourses can be revealed by the following questions: Who has access to which discourses, and who has the power to impose and enforce constraints on access? (Fairclough, 1989/2001, p. 52) Thinking of styles within the analysis implies thinking of the ways that discourse construct people into a wide range of subject positions. For example, theorists from the tradition of Neo-Marxism, feminism, or Critical Race Theory may have different ways of positioning themselves vis-à-vis ELL students and that may inform their theorization of dialogic pedagogy and the needs of ELL students in a dialogic process.

    Identifying the discursive effects. Discursive effects are concerned with who gains or who is denied of power through discourses and the implications of this for the reproduction of imbalanced power relations. This level of analysis involves a reflective process that sensitized me to the complexity and contradictions of different discourses within the text of critical pedagogy about ELL students, discursive strategies deployed in normalizing or excluding ELLs, and subject positions taken up by authors/speakers and

the social relationship and tensions that they implied (Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Smythe, 2006). But mostly importantly, focusing on the effects of discourses about ELL students within the text of critical pedagogy urged me to recognize, to respond to and challenge the powerful and implicit preconceptions about ELL students that create potentially enabling and constraining spaces simultaneously for ELL students. For example, Jennings and Lynn (2005) focused on the responsibility of African American teachers in their problematization of racial minorities as a normalized order. While empowering students by revealing identities as socially, culturally and historically constructed, their choice of focus may have unwittingly reinforced teacher authority and limited the active role (as I described previously) that dialogic pedagogy has entrusted to students for their learning and personal growth (Freire, 1998). Such an analysis led me to realize that a viable pedagogical approach that enables and fosters cultural and linguistic diversity must allow 'plural openings' and cannot merely depend on the initiatives of teachers (Taylor & Robinson, 2009). Linguistic and cultural diversity must be incorporated into school curriculum and structure if schools are to create a positive enabling space that empowers ELL students.

By approaching my samples in this way, I systematically identified ways in which dialogic pedagogy theorizes ELL students. The procedure allowed me to look at the completed charts and identified discursive formations across the study sample, to analyze the discursive effects of critical pedagogy and thus enabling me to draw conclusions about how dialogic pedagogy theorizes ELL students, to suggest areas for future research, to point out issues that needs to be further addressed, and to recommend school policies

and classroom practices.

Issues of Validity and Limitations

CDA, because of its integration of textual analysis and social theory, enables an in-depth analysis of text and its relation to the social world. As CDA is deeply interpretive and value-based, and to a large extent is a deconstructive reading of the text, there may not be 'hard data' provided through discourse analysis that is acceptable in the positivist sense (Lather, 1986). However, it does not mean that critical discourse analysis is arbitrary. In wake of the inadequacies of positivist assumptions when examining the complexities of human experience, Lather has argued that there is no reason why a self-correcting element cannot be built into an openly value based research (Lather, 1986). In "Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a Rock and a Soft Place" (1986), she examined the validity claims of 'openly ideological research' such as Carol Gilligan's feminist research, Michael Apple's critical ethnography and Freire's 'empowering' research, and proposed a reconceptualization of validity appropriate for openly value-based research (Lather, 1986; Reason and Rowan, 1981). With this frame of reference, she argued that a research design must give confidence in the trustworthiness of data by accounting for the following validity considerations:

1. Triangulation of methods, data sources, and theories (Lather, 1986, p.78)

2. Reflexivity (documentation of how the researcher's perspectives have been affected by the logic of the data) (Lather, 1986, p.78)

3. Face validity (established by recycling categories, emerging analysis, and conclusions back through at least a sub-sample of respondents) (Lather, 1986, p.78)

4. Catalytic validity (documentation that the research process has led to insight and activism on the part of the respondents as in an interview or survey) (Lather, 1986, p.78)

I addressed triangulation and reflexivity only, as face validity and catalytic validity did not apply to my research. I met the validity consideration of triangulation by specifying criteria for including/excluding data, building an appropriate size of study sample, and grounding my theoretical validity in the critique of critical pedagogy in its theorization of ELL students. In addition, after applying the preliminary coding strategies, I asked colleagues to apply those same strategies to code a randomly identified subset of item to check for triangulation. We then compared and discussed our responses. In doing so, I was able to confirm the context validity as well as hone certain elements of the analytic process. Reflexivity was met by an ongoing, back and forth, process of checking, revising and triangulating my coding when appropriate, and tracking those changes, to make them part of the analysis as well. Even so, CDA remains, to a large extent, interpretative and indeterminate. It does not excuse one to ignore empirical accountability for demonstrating data credibility, but it does indicate that the validity of one's research rely on one's methodological discipline and on the force and logic of one's argument.

My study, however, ran the risk of all textual analysis, that is, I risked neglecting historical and material practices. I was not attempting a complete representation of all texts pertaining to the democratic discourse of dialogic pedagogy. The published texts included as data in this study represent only a fraction of the phenomenon that I struggled to make sense of. It should be acknowledged from the start that my analysis of dialogic pedagogy will be partial, as it was relative to my own perspective in terms of intellectual

interests, practical and political concerns which will be brought to bear upon the analysis of critical pedagogy in its relation to addressing the special needs of ELL students in the mainstream classroom where English is used as the language of instruction and assessment.

Conclusions

A research project investigating how the praxis of dialogic pedagogy theorizes the relationships between language and power in mainstream classrooms to account for its simultaneously constituting a constraining and enabling space for ELL students would help address what dialogical pedagogy has failed to take into account: the role of language in mediating power and privileges in U.S. education and shaping the learning experience of ELL students. My study investigated the capacity of dialogic pedagogy in addressing some of the timely issues that emerge in the recent mainstreaming of ELL education and helped enrich the theoretical understanding of dialogic pedagogy in support of its democratic promise of providing equal access for all.

Chapter Five

Descriptive Findings

Introduction

This chapter presents the descriptive findings of the data analysis of my research in search of answering on the research question: "*How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the relationships between language, power and the needs of ELL students in mainstream, content-area classrooms?*" The "descriptive" findings are organized around the four categories I employed as sensitizing concepts derived from my literature review of ELL education (specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum; bias of hidden curriculum; the hegemony of English to the exclusion of heritage languages; the suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity) and focus primarily on the content of my data.

Though this stage of my analysis was intended to be descriptive, it may not be purely descriptive (Fairclough, 1989/2001). My description of the texts relied on my interaction with data, reproducing texts against background assumptions that help me identify the structural effects of critical pedagogy as a form of dialogic pedagogy for ELL students (Fairclough, 1989/2001). For example, what I described as critical pedagogy's ability to construct counter-discourses to dominant ideologies, like neoliberalism, may not be conceptualized by others as such (for example, see Chapman, 2004; Cook-Sather, 2007; Ellsworth, 1994; Gur Zeev, 2005). The dependence of description on background assumptions makes it important that I am aware of the ideological properties of my assumptions and I must also account for them. To that end, I engaged an ongoing self-

reflection on my own ideological assumptions whenever possible. I summarize my reflection on the research method in Chapter Seven.

Here, I describe the data set in terms of its theorization of ELL students. I will illustrate that, overall, the data failed to substantially address the need of ELL students on any level, with few exceptions. Through this descriptive analysis I illustrate the impacts of this 'absence' of ELL students from the wider discussions revealed in my data set. In Chapter Six, I turn to a discussion of what the CDA process uncovered.

Summary of Descriptive Findings

Employing the critical challenges faced by ELLs in mainstream classrooms as "objects of research," the data were examined how it revealed about how critical pedagogy as a form of dialogic pedagogy theorizes the needs of ELL in content-area mainstream classrooms. In particular, I explored the following four sub-questions conjoining to my overarching research question:

1) What does the data reveal about the specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum?

2) What does the data reveal about the bias of hidden curriculum for ELL students in mainstream classrooms?

3) What does the data reveal about the hegemony of English in mainstream classrooms?

4) What does the data reveal about the role of English in the suppression of students' voice, subjectivity and identity for ELL students?

As mentioned earlier in the methodology chapter, the pursuit of my research question generates a data size of 217 articles. 127 of 217 items were included in my study

sample after excluding those that fall outside the parameter of my research question. In

my descriptive analysis, I examined how each included item theorizes each of the issues

expressed in the four sub-questions derived from the ELL literature review. I first

examine its relevance to the issues relating to ELL students. Once this is decided, I

further examined its relevance to ELL students. Following such a procedure, I grouped all

the included items into the following categories: 'no reference to the issue', 'reference to

the issue/reference to ELLs', 'reference to the issue/no reference to ELLs/Some

implication for ELLs', and 'reference to the issue/no reference to ELLs/ No implication

for ELLs' (See Table 3).

Table 3

Numerical Property of Descriptive Findings

Issues facing ELL students	No reference to the issue	Reference to the issue/reference to ELLs	Reference to the issue/no reference to ELLs/ some Implication for ELLs	Reference to the issue/no reference to ELLs/no implication for ELLs
Specificity of Cultural Literacy of school curriculum	n=114/127 (89%)	n=1/127 (0.07%)	n=12/127 (9%)	n=0/127 (0%)
Bias of Hidden curriculum	n=24/127 (18%)	n=1/127 (0.07%)	n=102/127 (80%)	n=0/127 (0%)
Hegemony of English	n=119/127 (93%)	n=3/127 (2%)	n=5/127 (3%)	n=0/127 (0%)
Suppression of voice, subjectivity, and identity	n=71/127 (55%)	n=2/127 (1%)	n=54/127 (42%)	n=0/127 (0%)

Preliminary analysis of data revealed that for the most part, dialogic pedagogy/critical pedagogy failed to theorize about the needs of ELL students. As illustrated by the data, overall, there are high numbers of the texts that made no reference at all to the issues relating to ELL students, n=114/127 (89%) for "specificity of cultural literacy of school curriculum", n=24/127 (18%) for "bias of hidden curriculum", n=119 (94%) for "the hegemony of English", and n=71/127; (55%) for "suppression of voice, subjectivity and identity". Among those that did refer to the issue, only a low number of items made reference to ELL students, n=1/127 (0.7%) for "specificity of cultural literacy of school curriculum", n=1/127 (0.07%) for "bias of hidden curriculum", n=3/127 (2%) for "the hegemony of English", and n=2/127 (1%) for "suppression of voice, subjectivity and identity". Given the lack of reference to the issues pertaining to ELL students or lack of reference to ELL students at all, the data's failure to address ELL students is conspicuous.

In what follows, I summarize my descriptive findings in depth. Within each section, I 1) describe my coding and present my findings in a table term; 2) summarize the findings relating to each sensitizing category as described above; 3) reflect on the implications of the findings for ELL students.

Specificity of Cultural Literacy in the School Curriculum

As mentioned earlier, the data revealed that 114 of 127 items in my study made no reference at all to the specificity of cultural literacy of school curriculum. 12 of 127 referred to the issue (for example, see Degener, 2001; Bowers, 2007; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2006; Graham, 2007; Kincheloe, 2008). Among

them, only one item specifically referred to ELL students (Degener, 2001).

Within the data, the references to the specificity of cultural literacy of the school curriculum were indicated by terms such as 'Western cultural heritage', 'European centered view', 'Western knowledge', 'Western knowledge/values' and their other variations. The use of such terms suggests that critical pedagogy theorizes the school curriculum to be embedded in specific sets of cultural beliefs or assumptions that may have discriminating effects for minority students (see Table 4).

Table 4

Coding for Specificity of Cultural Literacy in the School Curriculum

Sensitizing Category	Example from the data	Interpretation
Specificity of cultural literacy of the school curriculum	Indicated by terms such as "Western cultural heritage" (Degener, 2001, p.32), Euro-centered view (Bowers, 2007, p. 112), Western knowledge (Chan-Tiberghien, 2004), western knowledge/values (Giroux, 2006, p. 30), etc.	According to critical pedagogy/dialogic pedagogy, school curriculum refers to American culture that is profoundly shaped by western heritages (primarily Eurocentric perspectives). Such perspectives are informed by different sets of beliefs, assumptions or references than what ELL students have learned in their earlier life. The access to such knowledge is a form of cultural capital for students who come from other cultural backgrounds.

Despite the infrequent reference to ELL students in the data, the data as a whole provided a general discussion of school curriculum as a source of inequality and domination. As such, it has the following key implications for ELL learners:

- The school curriculum is rooted in Western culture and is culturally specific (n=8/127 of the data set; 6%) (For example, see Braa & Callero, 2006; Degener, 2001; Bowers, 2007; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2006; Graham, 2007; Kincheloe, 2008).

- The school curriculum favors the cultural capital representative of the dominant groups and neglects students' local knowledge (n=10/127; 7%) (For example, see Braa & Callero, 2006; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2010; Graham, 2007; Lensmire, 1998).

- Critical pedagogy promotes literacy practices that build on the dialogic relationship between students and teachers to uncover the dominant ideologies (n=12/127; 9%) (For example, see Degener, 2001; Allington, 1998; Ardizzone, 2007; Coffey, 2009; Morrell, 2002; Naidrich, 2009; Shor, 1999).

The school curriculum is rooted in Western culture and is culturally specific (n=8/127). Despite no explicit allusion to ELL students, 8/127 of the data maintained that the school curriculum is heavily couched in a language that reflects cultural specificity (Bowers, 2007; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Giroux, 2006; Kincheloe, 2008). For example, in a meta-analysis that examined the 'educational globalization' developing in the U.S. and other countries that are fueled by global competition, Chan-Tiberghien (2004) lamented the privileging of western cultures in those educational restructurings. She stated that "the globalization of knowledge and Western culture" constantly reaffirms the West's view of itself as "the center of legitimate knowledge, the arbiter of what counts as knowledge" and the source of "civilized" knowledge' at the expense of the minority students who has

no previous exposure to the "civilized knowledge" (Chan-Tiberghien, 2004, p.197). By doing so, she acknowledged the relations of power which operate in the school curriculum and classroom practice for marginalized groups.

Kincheloe (2008) contended that by schools often "privilege capitals that may deny access to the minority students by ways of knowing, acting, and being" (Kincheloe, 2008, p.110). In addressing the failure of literacy programs in schools to address culturally and linguistically diverse populations, Degener (2001) argued that those who defend a "Western cultural heritage" fail to recognize that marginalized groups do not possess the same cultural capital as those in the dominant group, such failure contributes to unequal power relations in schools. As a result of the influence of such political ideologies, "teachers tend to value students more highly who more closely represent the mainstream in their language, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, language, and life experiences than those of nonmainstream groups" (Degener, 2001, p.33).

From the perspective as illustrated above, the lack of prior access to the school curriculum that privileges Western cultures implies that ELL students are placed at a disadvantage in competing with their English-speaking monolingual peer (Bowers, 2007; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Degener, 2001; DiAngelo, 2006; Giroux, 2006; Graham, 2007; Kincheloe, 2008).

The school curriculum favors the cultural capital representative of the dominant groups and neglected students' local knowledge (n=10/127). Analysis of the data revealed, 7% of the items uphold the view that within schools, particular knowledge is legitimated and promoted over other forms of knowledge and those in power are the

ones who generally decide what knowledge is to be privileged, thus excluding groups whose lack of previous exposure to such knowledge prevents them from contributing to the process and production of the validation of that knowledge (Graham, 2007; Van Dulnen, 2005/2006).

For example, Van Dulnen (2005/2006) noted that "teachers often value dominant forms of discourse and literacy practices when they make decisions about how students should show what they have learned". The "wording, style and format of traditional tests and quizzes" emphasize academic literacy skills that can put students with limited exposure to the academic language used in schools at a disadvantage (Van Dulnen, 2005/2006, p.146). As was discussed earlier, the specific form of linguistic capital required to master the school curriculum and pass the standardized tests presents critical challenges to ELL students.

In an article stressing the importance of students' local knowledge in students' construction of social reality, Graham (2007) argued that under NCLB, "mainstream American education reform is deeply committed to a standards and testing culture that tends to ignore the peculiarities of places in order to standardize the experiences of students" (Graham, 2007, p. 375). The specificity of the school curriculum is hence reinforced and perpetuated through the standardization of curriculum and assessment (Giroux & McLaren, 1989; Graham, 2007; Kincheloe, 2008).

Because the school curriculum privileges cultural capital that favors the dominant group, knowledge valued by ELL students and other underrepresented social groups are dismissed as unimportant. ELL students risk of being further marginalized by a school

culture that is already alienating to the majority of students (Braa & Callero, 2006; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2010; Graham, 2007; Lensmire, 1998).

Critical pedagogy promotes literacy practices that build on the dialogic relationship between students and teachers to uncover the dominant ideologies (n=12/127). In order to resist ideologically laden curriculum that channels culturally specific viewpoints, some critical educators (12/127 of the data) focused on the dialogic interaction between students and teachers as a means to sensitize students to the ideological messages in school curricula. For example, rooted in the Freirean tradition that views literacy as aiming at challenging and transforming "dominant ideologies and culture" that "dictate educational practices" (Degener, 2001, p.32), Degener (2001) suggested that literacy should "encourage a dialogic relationship between teachers and students" and should be "designed around the backgrounds, needs, and interests of students" (Degener, 2001, p.27). She argued that the purpose of literacy practices in classrooms is to provide a structure "where students are able to use their developing literacy skills to analyze critically their place in society, understand how certain cultural assumptions and biases have put them and their families at risk, and ultimately learn how to challenge the status quo" (Degener, 2001, p. 40). To this end, she particularly emphasized the importance to develop literacy practice that validates "the histories, dreams, and experiences" students bring to schools and encourages them to use their languages and cultures to make sense of their learning (Degener, 2001, p. 40).

In an article criticizing that standardized assessments impose "dominant forms of discourse and literacy practices" on marginalized students, Van Dulnen (2005/2006)

proposed that assessments should be "a partnership between students and teachers" and "involve ongoing communication and feedback and provide opportunity for teachers and students to learn from and with each other" (Van Dulnen, 2005/2006, p.144). She particularly emphasized that "students' historicity is recognized and placed within the context of problem-posing education, education that uses real world problems and struggles of human beings in their relations with the world" (Van Dulnen, 2005/2006, p.146). The recognition that students' cultural heritages and local knowledge can contribute to the enrichment of school curriculum and cultures is an important means to empower minority students.

From this perspective of critical pedagogy, dialogue is considered as part of a broadly defined literacy practice that aims at the fulfillment of collective emancipation. Students are expected to play an active role in classroom communications. The emphasis on students' historicity and local knowledge is particularly important to ELL students as it provides ELLs and other marginalized students alternative perspectives to challenge the dominant ideologies embedded in the school curriculum (Degener, 2001; Van Dulnen, 2005/2006; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Kincheloe, 2008).

Implications for ELL students

Analysis of the data revealed that 13 out of 127 critical educators recognized that the specificity of cultural literacy inherent in school curriculum and classroom practices might create a discriminating educational context that leads to negative educational outcomes for minority students (Degener, 2001; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999; Van Duinen, 2005/2006; Wolk, 2003). Within the Freirean tradition, critical educators

recommended dialogic interaction between students and teachers as a classroom literacy practice that aims at exposing and transforming the cultural and political ideologies (Coffey, 2009; Degener, 2001; DiAngelo, 2006; Kincheloe, 2008; Shor, 1999). Nevertheless, the data illustrated that except for a few exceptions, critical pedagogy as a whole failed to address the specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum for ELL students.

Bias of the Hidden Curriculum

Within the data, 103 of 127 (80%) addressed the bias of the hidden curriculum but only one (Degener, 2001) discussed the bias of the hidden curriculum for ELL students.

As described previously, by "hidden curriculum", I had in mind "the unstated social norms and moral beliefs tacitly transmitted through the socialization process that structure classroom social relationships" (Giroux, 1983, P.48). In search of references to hidden curriculum, I paid particular attention to terms alluding to the impacts for students resulting from educational polices, classroom practices, teachers' beliefs, attitudes, and interests of schools, communities and society (See table 5).

Table 5

Coding for the Bias of Hidden Curriculum

Sensitizing category	Examples from the data	Interpretation
The bias of "hidden curriculum"	Educational policies (Apple, 2004, p.40; Saunders, 1010, p.65); classroom practice (Ardizzone, 2007, p.51); visions or roles of teachers (Ayers, Michie, and Rome, 2004, p.27; Allen, 2009); discursive emphasis, (Cahill, 2007, p. 269); racism, (McLaren, 2005, p.14); schooling structure and discourse (Weiner, 2007, p. 62).	Hidden curriculum is understood as beliefs, assumptions that can be transmitted through educational policies or practices, teachers' attitudes toward students and other aspects of the socialization process.

Despite few references to ELL students, critical pedagogy's analysis of the bias of hidden curriculum has important implications for ELL students and can be recapitulated as follows:

- Schools are shaped by the hidden agenda of corporate interests and solely focus on industrial skills that reinforce inequality (n=29/127; 22%). (For example, see Apple, 2004; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005; McLaren & Jaramillo, 2005; Saunders, 2010).

- To uncover hidden curriculum, critical pedagogy urges teachers to constantly challenge and interrogate their own beliefs and values in the cycle of praxis and reflection (n=13/127; 10%) (Adams, 1997; Allen, 2004; Chen, 2005; Giroux, 2009; Goldstein, 2007; Jennings & Lynn, 2005).

- Critical pedagogy calls for teachers to dialogue with students the meaning and

purposes that schools play in their relationship to the demands of the broader society (n=23/127; 18%) (Apples, 2004; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005; McLaren & Jaramillo, 2005; Saunders, 2010)

Schools are shaped by the hidden agenda of corporate interests and solely focus on industrial skills that reinforce inequality (n=29/127). Most of the discussion within the data relating to the bias of hidden curriculum took place in the context of the critique of neoliberalism. Critical educators like Apple (2004), Giroux (2004) and McLaren (2005) believed that hidden-curriculum is fueled by the ideological forces of neoliberalism (Apple, 2004; Ainley & Canaan, 2005; Chan-Tiberghieh, 2004; Gallagher, 2005; Giroux, 2004; Hill, 2006; McLaren, 2005; McLaren & Jaramillo, 2005; Pangllenian, 2009; Saunders, 2010). Within the tradition of critical pedagogy, the term "neoliberalism" has been used to denote a prevailing ideological paradigm that extends the logic of market economy into social, cultural, political and in particular, educational practices and policies (Cahill, 2007; Carr, 2010; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2010). Initially as a response to the capitalist crisis gradually unfolding in the last few decades after the World War II with its shrinking profit rates, neoliberalism has since arisen to represent the revived spirit of economic liberalism that mandates marketing principles in both private and public sectors of the society (for example, see Apple, 2004; Cahill, 2007; Carr, 2010; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Giroux, 2010). According to Saunder (2010), since the era of the Reagan administration, public education in the U.S. has been increasingly reshaped into competitive markets by the

force of neoliberalism (also see Apple, 2004; Cahill, 2007; Carr, 2010; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Giroux, 2010; Saunders, 2010). Because economic productivity has become critical to remain the dominant power in global capitalism, education in the U.S. becomes less concerned with developing the well-rounded citizens and more concerned with developing the skills required for an individual to compete in the marketplace and become an economically productive member of society (Apples, 2004; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Gallagher & Lorti, 2005; Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005; McLaren & Jaramillo, 2005; Saunders, 2010). From the perspective of neoliberalism, knowledge that reflects and celebrates the cultural heritages of ELL students is often not part of the school curriculum.

Critical educators like Apple (2004), Giroux (2004), and McLaren and Jaramillo (2005) have described extensively how neoliberalism has shaped school culture and literacy practices. Apple (2004) commented that "neo-liberal visions of quasi-markets are usually accompanied by neo-conservative pressure to regulate content and behavior through such things as national curricula, national standards, and national systems of assessment" (Apple, 2004, p.25) that "favor economic and social capitals that are privileged in terms of race and class (Apple, 2004, p.40). According to Apple (2004), the neoliberal educational policies that focus on literacy skills that support economic productivity "reintroduce class and race restratification within the school" (Apple, 2004, p. 40). Within the school system, more attention is generally given to "gifted" children and "fast-track" classes, whereas students who were seen as "less academically able" were considered "less attractive" (Apple, 2004, p. 40). Giroux (2010) argued that

education today is "defined through the corporate demand and narrowly defines skills, knowledge, and credentials at the expense of the minority students" (Giroux, 2010, p.191). McLaren & Jaramillo (2005) contended that "U.S. globalizing capitalist agenda generates bias hidden effects" for the minority population such as ELL students. The neoliberal educational policy and school practices view minority groups merely as a "bountiful cheap source of labor" and engage in a "politics of erasure" to their cultures (McLaren & Jaramillo, 2005, p. 418).

The neoliberal focus on narrowly defined literacy skills that cater to industrial and corporate interests results in discriminating effects for ELL students. Classroom instructions and literacy practices that address the special needs of ELL students are generally ignored. These critical educators brought to our attention the hidden effects of neoliberalism for ELL students. As schools increasingly become training grounds for industrial labor, ELL students and other marginalized groups are left to the caprice of market competition.

Critical pedagogy urges teachers to constantly challenge and interrogate their own beliefs and values in the cycle of praxis and reflection (n=13/127). To expose and interrogate the hidden curriculum in the mainstream school culture, numerous critical educators emphasized the importance of teachers' role in addressing the bias of hidden curriculum within schools (Adams, 1997; Allen, 2004; Chen, 2005; Giroux, 2009; Jennings & Lynn, 2005). Teachers are considered to be mediators between the students' primary culture and the industrial/consumer culture. While teachers can be part of the hidden curriculum that contributes to the perpetuation of social inequality, they can also

play an important role in exposing and challenging the bias of hidden curriculum.

Braa and Callero (2006) pointed out that "hidden curriculum whereby students are socialized and behaviorally conditioned to accept hierarchical structures of power" continues to perpetuate when teachers "promote a set of cultural ideologies that serve to legitimate existing class dominance" (Braa and Callero, 2006, p. 357). Giroux (2003) argued that educators need to "address the meaning and purpose that schools might play in their relationship to the demands of the broader society while simultaneously address issues emerging from the context of interacting with a diverse body of students" (Giroux, 2003, p. 33). Goldstein (2007) contended that "teachers need to be aware of the hidden power that circulates in the classroom as teachers and students construct and struggle with knowledge. Educators must not only be well-versed in the theories, they also must understand the implications of critical praxis and be willing to integrate that praxis into their daily lives" (Goldstein, 2007, p. 27). As ELL students are often vulnerable to the bias hidden in school cultures and classroom practices, it is particularly important for mainstream teachers to critique with students the structures and values that serve as social norms as well as to demonstrate how these norms can be challenged and confronted.

In order to address the hidden curriculum camouflaged by the deceiving agenda of neoliberalism and other influences that dominates school cultures and students' lives, critical educators emphasized the need of teachers to constantly challenge and interrogate their own beliefs and values in the cycle of praxis and reflection and social actions (Chen, 2005; Coffey, 2010; Goldstein, 2007). Given the role of classrooms as a space of racial, economic, and social tensions for ELL students, it is particularly important for teachers to

discuss and interrogate with students social values and norms that have hidden effects for ELL students and other minorities.

Critical pedagogy calls for teachers to dialogue with students the meaning and purpose that schools play in their relationship to the demands of the broader society (n=23/127). In order to address the hidden curriculum of neo-liberalism in mainstream settings, critical educators suggested the use of dialogue between students and teachers as a means to bring hidden curriculum to the surface, and expose it for critical discussion and reflection (Apples, 2004; Chan-Tiberghieh, 2004; Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005; Pangllenian, 2009).

To facilitate the contestation of power in schools, critical pedagogy advocates the construction of ideological critique in opposition to the dominant ideology. This can be achieved by exposing class contradictions in students' lives through classroom dialogue and encouraging them to think how dominant capitalistic ideologies and corporate interests may work against their own material interests (Apple, 2004; Chan-Tiberghieh, 2004; Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005; Pangllenian, 2009). For example, Quintero (2007) argued that "the problem-posing method of critical literacy can lead students to base new learning on personal experience in a way that encourages critical reflection and active participation" (Quintero, 2007, p.204). Shor (1999) maintained that dialogic interaction between students and teachers understood as a broadly defined literacy practice can be used to challenge "the status quo in an effort to discover alternative paths for self and social development" and "offer an alternative literacy that connects the political and the personal" (Shor, 1999, p.1). Student and teacher dialogue can be used to encourage

students, particularly ELL students, to think how dominant capitalistic ideologies may work against their own material interests and help them articulate their visions for social change.

Within the framework of critical pedagogy, students are encouraged to examine the roles of schools and other institutions, individuals, groups, and histories in perpetuating capitalist social order. Built on a collaborative inquiry between students and teachers, critical pedagogy can be used as a means to address issues and challenges ELL students face in the mainstream cultures (Braa & Callero, 2006; Shor, 1999).

Implications for ELL students

Public education in the U.S. has been profoundly shaped by the hidden agenda of neoliberalism and chronically gives in to corporate interests that solely focus on literacy skills relevant to capitalist production. As a result, public schools express little interest in democratic values and the welfare of the underprivileged (Apple, 2004; Chan-Tiberghieh, 2004; Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005; Pangllenian, 2009). Critical educators called for a need to examine with students the meaning and purpose that schools might play in their relationship to the demands of the broader society through class communications and inquiries.

Given the attitudes of teachers as part of hidden curriculum, the examination of the bias of the hidden curriculum through classroom discussions is especially relevant to ELL students, as ELL students are among the social groups that are most subject to capitalist exploitation and abuse. The neoliberal educational agenda focuses on high stake tests and on literacy skills that privilege cultural capital to which ELL students have no or

little exposure. The hidden curriculum of schools increases the odds against ELL students in a life already perforated with uncertainties and challenges. However, as analysis of the data revealed, few items specifically refer to ELLs when considering the hidden power of neoliberal educational polices and practices. The conspicuous absence of ELLs in the data points to the existence of a 'hidden curriculum' of critical pedagogy about ELL students themselves.

The Hegemony of the English Language to the Exclusion of Heritage Languages

Only 8 of 127 (6%) items referred to the hegemony of English and only 3 (2%) (Calderon 2003; Degener, 2001; DiAngelo, 2006) made specific reference to ELL students.

In this study, the hegemony of English is understood as the process of forging a 'standard' language, regulating all the linguistic practices. Within the data, I attended to how critical pedagogy theorizes about English being privileged as the language of instruction and assessment (See Table 6).

Table 6

Coding for The Hegemony of the English Language to the Exclusion of Heritage

Languages

Sensitizing category	Examples from the data	Interpretation
The Hegemony of the English Language to the Exclusion of Heritage Languages.	"Schools have the power to privilege certain languages over others" (Degener, 2001, p.39), "How the simple denial of language and culture can be used as a form of oppression" (Calderon, p. 1). "[T]his focus on the language barrier positions the international students as different (and thus racialized) and positions the White students and instructors as neutral (and thus unracialized) (DiAngelo, 2006, p. 1995).	The 'hegemony' of English is derived from English being accepted without being questioned as the language of instruction and assessment in classrooms at the expense of excluding other languages.

Though only 8 of 127 of the data made reference to the hegemony of English,

they represented attempts to address the issue within the framework of critical pedagogy

and deserve to be explored for their implications for ELL students. Their discussions

cover the following three areas of concern for ELL students:

- The United States upholds English as the official language to the exclusion of

  other languages (n=3/127; 2%)

- English plays an important role in defining literacy (n=4/127; 3%)

- Critical pedagogy promotes literacy strategies that can be used to address the

  hegemony of English (n=3/127; 2%).

The United States upholds English as the official language to the exclusion of other languages (n=3/127). Though the aim of critical pedagogy is to transform the uneven societal power relationship by challenging the unstated assumption in everyday situations in classrooms, the status of English as an official language in American education has been taken for granted within the literature of critical pedagogy. With the exception of a handful of critical educators who worked in the area of ESL education (for example, see Akbari, 2008; Arce, 2004; Luke & Dooley, 2010; Norton & Toohey, 2004) the unequal relationships of English and other languages were rarely addressed.

Among those who challenged the hegemony of English in public schools, Degener (2001), for example, questioned the hegemonic presence of English in public schools: "This privileged culture has more of what critical theorists refer to as cultural capital, which means that its mainstream cultural practices are more highly valued than those of marginalized groups" (Degener, 2010, p.33). In a study focusing on how the ideology of racism (whiteness) informs and shapes the interaction of Asian international students and their English speaking peers, DiAngelo (2006) argued:
"When students of color are also second-language learners, another layer is added to the hierarchical differential in power. Power relation plays a crucial role in social interactions between language learners and target language speakers" (DiAngelo, 2006, p. 1985). The language and power relations within English monolingual classrooms can be a constraining force for ELL students.

Both Degener (2001) and DiAngelo (2006) exposed the power relationships existing in dialogic process where the normalizing potential of English is visibly present.

From this perspective, the hegemony of English produces a framework and environment that the voices and perspectives of ELL students are trivialized and deemed irrelevant.

English plays an important role in defining literacy (n=4/127). Some critical educators exposed how the hegemony of English is enforced in classrooms and defines literacy. Degener (2001) stated:

> Too often teachers who place great importance on learning to speak, read, and write in the standard language representing the mainstream delegitimize the language experiences that students bring with them to the classroom (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Macedo, 1994). When the dominant language is most highly valued in the learning process, minority language speakers (including those who speak nonstandard English) are automatically devalued, and their words and ideas are seen as less important—if they are heard at all (Degener, 2001, p.38).

The equation of literacy skills with speaking, reading and writing skills in English reproduces the hegemony of English and has the effect of discouraging ELL students from participating in classroom discussions (Calderon, 2003; Degener, 2001, Leonardo, 2002).

To uncover the hegemony of English, critical educators like Degener (2001), Calderon (2003) and others stressed that it is important to understand literacy as a social activity, where meaning-making is shaped by the complex sociocultural dynamics of a monolingual classroom: the histories, cultures, collective memories, desires, politics, and power relations (Calderon, 2003; Degener, 2001). To equate literacy with speaking and writing in English compels ELL students to assign a negative value to their own

languages and cultural heritages (Calderon, 2003; Degener, 2001, Leonardo, 2002).

Critical pedagogy promotes literacy strategies that can be used to address the hegemony of English (n=3/127). To address the hegemony of English, a handful of critical educators proposed that critical literacy involves not just learning how to read and write but also learning how to use literacy to examine critically one's position in life in terms of socioeconomic status, educational background, gender and race (Coffey, 2010; Freire, 1993; Freire& Macedo, 1987; Giroux & McLaren, 1992; Shor, 1999).

Instead of focusing on literacy in a technical and normalizing sense, critical educators like Shor (1999) understood literacy as social interaction through language use that develops us as "agents inside a larger culture", and critical literacy as "learning to read and write as part of the process of becoming conscious of one's experience as historically constructed within specific power relations" (Shor, 1999, p.1). From this perspective, literacy is seen as a social activity, shaped by the complex sociocultural dynamics of classrooms: the histories, cultures, collective memories, desires, politics, and power relations (Coffey, 2010; Degener, 2001). Critical educators believe that such literacy practice is particularly helpful to facilitate ELL students to challenge the commonly held assumptions and beliefs and make personal connections (Coffey, 2010; Freire, 1993; Freire& Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999).

Critical educators such as Shor (1999) and Coffey (2010) argued that there is not just one literacy, but many. This argument has important implications for addressing ELL students. Within such broadly construed notion of critical literacy, an ELL student will be provided opportunities to develop various kinds of literacy experience or practice to

critically interact with language in texts to interrogate how she is positioned by the text. From this perspective, critical pedagogy can be used to empower ELL students and help them fulfill their role in transforming the society (Coffey, 2010; Freire, 1993; Freire& Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999).

Implications for ELL students

Theorists of critical pedagogy viewed language use as essentially a political phenomenon. A few critical educators recognized that language policies control what is to be valued and what is to be excluded in the curriculum and can be seen as ideological constructs that reflect and (re)produce the distribution of power within society (Calderon, 2003; Coloma, 2008; Degener, 2001; DiAngelo, 2006; Leonardo, 2002; Yosso, 2005). Critical educators like Shor (1999) and Coffey (2010) rejected the equation of literacy skills with reading and writing in English and consider literacy broadly as a social practice. However, the hegemony of English and its effects for ELL students are conspicuously under-represented within the discourse of critical pedagogy.

Suppression of ELL Students' Voices, Subjectivity and Identity

Through the hegemony of English, ELL students experience learning and other related issues in mainstream classrooms. The hegemony of English is reflected in culturally specific curriculum, discriminatory classroom practices and homogenizing school cultures and profoundly shaped ELL students' voice, subjectivity and identity (Allington,1998; Calderon, 2003; Coloma, 2008; Degener, 2001; DiAngelo, 2006; Leonardo, 2002; Yoon, 2005; Yosso, 2005).

56 of 127 (40%) in my study sample discussed the suppression of student voice,

subjectivity and identity, while only 2 (1%) of them referred specifically to ELL students.

For reference to the suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity, I paid

particular attention the texts' referencing to conditions that implies power of suggestion,

telling someone who he is, how he should behave or feel, i.e. conditions that shape the

images students have of themselves, and influence their relationships with others (see

Table 7).

Table 7

Coding for the Suppression of Student Voice, Subjectivity and Identity

Sensitizing category	Examples from the data	Interpretation
The suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity	"People of color internalize the white model of humanity and the stereotypes of their own group" (Allen & Rossatto, 2009, p.129). "Students are often treated as categories, rather than socially constitutive beings" (Cahill, 2007, p. 273), "Schools see students as nothing more than vessels to be filled, not capable of pursuing knowledge on their own" (Coffey, 2010, p.8), Minority students are often "alienated and marginalized" within the school (Cook-Sather, 2007, p.395), "one of the most pressing problems facing poor communities is low self-esteem" (Morrell and Duncan-Andrade, 2005/2006, p.8)	Through educational policies, culture, and classroom practices, schools create conditions that shape the images students have of themselves, inform how they should carry themselves, and influence their relationships with others.

While 56 of 127 focused on ELL students when discussing the suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity, they also raised questions that have important implications for ELL students. Their discussions of enacting student agency shared the following understanding and will be further elaborated subsequently:

- Critical pedagogy recognizes that minority students tend to see themselves in the image of the dominant culture and attribute their experience of hardship at schools to the failure on their own parts (n=6/127; 4%) (Ayers, Michie, & Rome, 2004; Allen, 2004; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Leonardo, 2002).

- Dialogic discussion provides an educational context that helps students construct their subjectivities and identities through problematizing language that promotes dominant interests (n=43/127; 33%) (Cahill, 2007; DeTurk, 2006; Endres, 2003; Giroux, 1997; Graziano, 2008; Lynn, 2004; Van Duinen, 2005/2006; Wolk, 2003).

Critical pedagogy recognizes that minority students tend to see themselves in the image of the dominant culture and attribute their experience of hardship at schools to the failure on their own parts (n=6/127). Among some critical educators, there was awareness that due to the hegemonic impacts of power, personal critical awareness and promptness to actions do not happen automatically (Allen & Rosatto, 2009; Lynn, 2004). It is especially a difficult struggle for the culturally and linguistically marginalized students to recognize the process by which they have come to accept as "common sense" serves the interest of those in power (Allen & Rosatto, 2009; Lynn, 2004). Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) pointed out that "members of minority groups internalize the stereotypic images that certain elements of society have constructed in

order to maintain their power" (Ladson-Billings and Tate, 1995, p. 57). Since minority

students internalize the values of the dominant group and accept them as natural, and not

as oppressive, they may react to challenges to the dominant values with unease and

indifference even. Cook-Sather (2007) contended that minority students are often

alienated and marginalized within the school. For them, reform and change within the

school has nothing to do with them, and is not worth their effort (Cook-Sather, 2007,

p.395). For example, a school's efforts may run counter to an ELL student's immediate

priorities or interests and are impositional.

As a result of internalizing the dominant ideologies that may oppress them,

marginalized students such as ELL students may exhibit ideological beliefs and behaviors

that are consensual with their own oppression (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Lynn, 2004).

Several critical educators emphasized that changes in consciousness and concrete action

require critical thinking skills and resources to enact critical understanding (Giroux, 2010;

Lynn, 2004; Van Duinen, 2005/2006).

Dialogic discussion provides an educational context that helps students

construct their subjectivities and identities through problematizing language that

promotes dominant interests (n=43/127). To help student challenge the oppressive

societal structure that suppresses their voice, subjectivity and identity, critical educators

believed that critical dialogue provides "an educational context that draws students out of

their everyday lives to take new perspectives on social relationships" (Endres, 2002,

p.63). Endres (2002) elaborated:

Political liberation for disadvantaged people requires their active participation in

creating and reproducing knowledge and therefore requires an educational method

that allows all students to actively critique and revise traditional knowledge based

on their own social and economic situation. Education that is liberating thus

requires a method that emphasizes mutual discussion and investigation of issues

and themes related to the students' daily life (Endres, 2002, p. 63).

The engagement in transformational action requires new understandings and ways of

being in the world. Critical educators like Cahill (2007) maintained that student/teacher

dialogue can provide such link to actions by functioning as a place where students could

reflect, question, and wrestle with different perspectives and 'in so doing work through

contraction of their everyday lives' (Cahill, 2007, p.287).

While emphasizing the importance of empowering students' voice, critical

pedagogy also accentuates the need to question their voice. Within the framework of

Freire's tradition, the ability of dialogue to enact new understanding and new mode of

being in the world is through problematizing:

In problem- posing education, people develop their power to perceive critically

the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves;

they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in

transformation (Freire, 1997[1970], p. 64).

From this perspective, students' voices, like the voices of teachers and other adults, are

bound to reflect or express a particular viewpoint of the world that enables certain

knowledge while constraining others (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Lynn, 2004; Lensmire,

1998). As was mentioned earlier, some critical educators argued that the oppressed

students might not even believe that they are oppressed. Consequently, student voices should not be assumed. Instead, they should be actively engaged and questioned (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Lynn, 2004; Lensmire, 1998). Critical educators' insistence on helping students problematize their own experience and language is especially pertinent for ELL students, especially their experience and language are infused with political ideologies that seek to legitimate the unequal social reality.

Implications for ELL students

56 critical educators of 127 recognized that school cultures perpetuate the dominant values and norms and may lead to the suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity (Allington, 1998; Calderon, 2003; Coloma, 2008; Degener, 2001; DiAngelo, 2006; Leonardo, 2002; Yoon, 2005; Yosso, 2005). Seeking to empower historically marginalized students, critical educators emphasized that students' experience should not be merely assumed but need to be actively engaged. Critical pedagogy features dialogic discussion as an important link to help students challenge school curriculum through problematizing language that promotes dominant interests (Cahill, 2007; DeTurk, 2006; Endres, 2003; Giroux, 1997; Graziano, 2008; Lynn, 2004; Van Duinen, 2005/2006; Wolk, 2003).

However, the fact that only 2 of 127 items within the data referred to ELL students illustrates the discrepancy between critical educators' discourse about emancipatory education and their praxis. Analysis of the data revealed the disturbing extent to which critical pedagogy has failed to address the suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity for ELL students.

As a method that employs dialogue to sensitize students to oppressive societal conditions in society, critical pedagogy's failure to attend critical challenges facing ELL students is alarming. Such a failure points to a theoretical gap in the literature of critical pedagogy and compels me to examine the power relations within the discourse of critical pedagogy for ELL students. This will be discussed in next chapter.

Chapter Six

Discursive Findings

The descriptive findings from this study provide valuable information to the field of critical pedagogy as a social and pedagogical practice. Among the four issues facing ELL students (specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum, the bias of the hidden curriculum, the hegemony of English to the exclusion or inclusion of students' heritage languages, the suppression of students' voice, subjectivity and identity), critical pedagogy provides extensive discussions of the bias of hidden curriculum (103/127; 80%) and the suppression of students voice, subjectivity and identity (56/127; 44%) in U.S. schools, but its coverage of the hegemonic power of English (8/127; 6%) and the specificity of cultural literacy in school curriculum (13/127; 2%)- the two issues most specific to the needs and experiences of ELL students – is minimal. As I noted in the previous chapter, the failure to address these two issues is detrimental to ELL students. My preliminary findings of critical pedagogy's theorization of ELL students, hence, points to an important gap in the literature of critical pedagogy that calls for further exploration.

Given the role language use plays in structuring, reproducing, and perpetuating the unequal power structures and relations in public education that profoundly shape ELL students' schooling experiences, one is left wondering how such a gap can be made sense of in terms of its impacts for ELL students. The purpose of this chapter is to explore this gap and its effects for and on ELL students by employing CDA to uncover the ideological assumptions of the discourse of critical pedagogy. CDA's focus on the relationship of

language and power makes it a useful tool to explain the gap in the field of critical

pedagogy regarding ELL students. I engaged in CDA by utilizing the following CDA

concepts: (1) discursive formation; (2) discursive strategies; (3) styles, and (4) discursive

effect, to help me deepen my probing into the implications of critical pedagogy as a

social and pedagogic practice for ELL students (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Fairclough, 1995;

Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003). In this chapter, I 1) identify the major

discourses within critical pedagogy, and 2) uncover the discursive formation, normalizing

strategies, styles, and discursive effects for ELL students within these discourses.

Major Discourses within Critical Pedagogy

The analysis of my descriptive findings revealed that there is an intimate

relationship between critical pedagogy's theorization of ELL students and the discourse

in which it is embedded. Each discourse has both enabling and constraining effects for

ELL students. Analysis of the data revealed three major discourses within the discourse

of critical pedagogy: 1) neo-Marxism, 2) feminism, and 3) Critical Race Theory (See

Table 8). Among them, I discerned two broader discursive formations. While neo-

Marxism remained committed to the modernist assumption that views the development of

a unified critical consciousness as the possibility of social action and change, the other

two problematized this assumption and represented a post-modern turn within critical

pedagogy (see Allen, 2004; Coloma, 2008; DiAngelo, 2006; Ellsworth, 1994; hooks,

2003; Jennings & Lynn, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Viola, 2008). In contrast to

the neo-Marxist notion of the subject as a self-subsisting reality, "post-discourse" theories

such as feminism and Critical Race Theory conceptualize subjectivity as socially situated

and historically constructed, changing across time and space (Ellsworth, 1994; Lather, 1991). Each discourse represents a distinctive ideological world-view that informs its theorization of ELL students as a social construct.

Before explaining how each discourse theorized ELL students in more depth, I wish it to be understood that the discourses I reconstituted from analysis of the data represent what Max Weber terms "ideal types" (Weber, 1904/1949). As ideal constructs are formed by the "one-sided *accentuation* of one or more points of view" (Weber, 1904/1949, p. 90), it is expected that the 'boundaries' among these systems of thought may not be well defined. Particular texts may embody more than one discourse, or be too eclectic to fit into any, such as some discourse of critical pedagogy was informed by both feminism and post structuralism, (for example, see Cahill, 2007; Yoon, 2005). The construction of these discourses is useful for its value in helping expose how critical pedagogy theorizes about ELL students reflects and is embedded in, particularly, what it normalizes, and how the author positions himself and others. The point was not to exhaust categories, but to identify the discursive formations that delineate critical pedagogy as a field. My goal is to map the relationships of language and power in which ELL students are caught. Some discourses that inform critical pedagogy such as and post-structuralism (n=8/127) and postcolonial theories (n=3/127) were not included because there were so few of them within the data set. While important in their own rights, they, however, had a marginal influence on the discursive formations of critical pedagogy as a field.

Table 8

Discursive findings at a glance

Coding	Discursive formation	Discursive strategies	Style	Discursive effects
Marxism (n=89/127) (70%)	Relative autonomy Class consciousness	Essentialist humanism Normalizing dialogue	Transformative intellectual	Enabling Accounted for agency and political change Constraining: Overlooked the specificity of oppressing facing ELLs. Reproduced the power asymmetry between students and teachers
Feminism (n=14/127) (11%)	Rejecting essential humanism Re-conceptualizing difference/ otherness.	Normalizing difference and diversity	Surrogate for the Other	Enabling: Validated ELL students' experience. Constraining: Trivialized the truth claims of ELL students Reproduced the power asymmetry between students and teachers
Critical Race Theory (n=23/127) (18%)	Centering race Challenging the deficit view of racial minorities	Normalizing difference	Progressive racial minorities	Enabling: Complicated racial theorizing Validated student experience Constraining: Reproduced the power asymmetry between students and teachers.

My analysis presents critical pedagogy as a form of power that is deeply

embedded in its own, perhaps unexamined and conflicted ideological assumptions,

democratic visions and political ends-in-view. To effectively explicate each discourse and its relation to critical pedagogy's discourse about ELL students, I sometimes resorted to the existing literature outside my study sample to place it in broader discursive contexts. When this occurs, I explain why it is used and how it is connected to my data.

In what follows, I outline the dominant discourse within critical pedagogy. For each discourse, I describe how I coded the data and engaged in CDA by considering its discursive formation, discursive strategies, styles and discursive effects for ELL students.

1) Neo-Marxism

89 of 127 (70%) from my study sample were identified as neo-Marxist discourse, either through self identification (such as Freire, 1998; McLaren, 2005), cross references (the authors' citing prominent neo-Marxist authors in support of their arguments, e.g., Chan-Tiberghien, 2004; Saunders, 2010; Braa & Callero, 2006), or common themes of neo-Marxist discourse, such as critiques of capitalism, and corporate interests (e.g., Cahill, 2007; Martin, 2006; Saunders, 2010) (See Table 9). By and large, neo-Marxist critical pedagogy failed to address the needs of ELL students. It discussed extensively the hidden curriculum of schools (n=77/89; 86%) and suppression of student voice, subjectivity and identity (n=41/89; 46%), but made few references to ELL students. It ignored issues that are most specific to ELL students such as the specificity of cultural literacy of the school curriculum and the hegemony of English.

Table 9

Coding for the Discourse of Neo-Marxist Critical Pedagogy

Coding	Examples
Self identification	"Even before I ever read Marx I had made his words my own" (Freire, 1998, p.115).
Cross reference	- Chan-Tiberghien (2004, p.193) citing Apple (2000), Freire (1973), and Giroux (1996) - Saunders (2010, p. 43) citing Apple (2001), Giroux (2005), and McLaren (2005); - Braa & Callero (2006, p.358) citing Freire (1974), Apple (1990) and McLaren (2003)
Commonly shared neo-Marxist themes such as 'anti-capitalism', 'anti-corporation', critique of 'right wing', 'neo-liberalism' 'neo-conservative', 'class consciousnesses, 'class struggle'.	'Critique of neoliberalism' (Cahill, 2007; Farahmandpur, 2005; Gallagher and Lortie, 2005; Martin, 2006; Saunders, 2010), 'class dominance' (Braa & Callero, 2006, p.357) 'class struggle' (Martin, 2006, p.16)

Discursive Formations within Neo-Marxist Discourse. Discursive formation refers to the regularities and patterns that reflect the authors' ideological assumptions within and across texts (Fairclough, 1989/2001; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003). Analysis of the data revealed two prominent discursive formations within the discourse of neo-Marxism: relative autonomy and class consciousness. I discuss these more in depth in the next section.

Neo-Marxist critical educators like Apple (2004), Braa & Callero (2006), Giroux (2004), Martin (2006), McLaren (2005), and others viewed the Marxist critique of class relationships within capitalist societies as a valuable tool for educators to interrogate the role that schools and individuals play in the reproduction of social inequality (Apple,

2004; Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005). While allowing schools and individuals agency and accounting for the possibility of political intervention by rejecting Marx's thesis of economic determinism, Neo-Marxist educators remain theoretically committed to the Marxist notion that class consciousness and struggle are the driving force of history and social transformation. As I will illustrate later, their premise of essentialist humanism that treats all oppressed groups indiscriminately explained their failure to adequately address the normalizing potential of dialogic pedagogy for ELL students. In what follows, I discuss how discursive formations within neo-Marxist critical pedagogy relate to their theorization of ELL students.

Relative autonomy. Neo-Marxist theorists like Apple (1995), Giroux (2010) and McLaren (2005) built their discourse of educational practices and policies on Althusser's "relative autonomy" of the superstructure from its economic base (Althusser, 1971). Following Althusser (1971), Apple (1995) emphasized that "[T]here was as dynamic interplay between the political and economic spheres which was found in education" (Apple, 1995, p.26). The recognition that the relative autonomy of the 'superstructure', which includes culture and social institutions, cannot be reduced to the economic base is what distinguishes Neo-Marxism from the traditional Marxism that views economy as the sole determinant of social relations (Au, 2006; Saunders, 2010; Stanley, 2007).

Neo-Marxists' assertion of the 'relative autonomy" of the superstructure acknowledges human intervention through cultural practices and establishes schools as spaces where the possibility of social transformation might be created. As discussed previously, while neo-Marxist theorists believed that educational institutions today are

heavily influenced by neo-liberalism's role in perpetuating inequality and oppression, they also insisted that schools and individuals can evade the economic determination to a certain degree (Au, 2006; Giroux, 2009, Saunders, 2010; Stanley, 2007). For example, Giroux (2009) stated, "academics can, in part, exercise their role as public intellectuals via such curricula by giving students the opportunity to understand how power is organized through the enormous number of popular cultural spheres" (Giroux, 2009, p. 17). The recognition of the relative autonomy of schools and individuals is important for marginalized students such as ELL students. Neo-Marxist critical educators are able to account for the possibility of resisting oppressive societal structures and enacting social transformation by individuals or institutions.

Analysis of the data revealed examples that illustrate resistance of individuals to dominant social relations. For example, Morrell and Duncan-Andrade (2005/2006) documented an inner city hip hop project as an act of resistance in which students took photographs that depicted the impact of hip-hop culture and music on youth in their communities. Through classroom dialogue, students discussed to what extent did hip-hop music represent a critique of the dominant ideologies and to what extent it reproduced the consumer culture of capitalist societies. In other words, by examining "the multiple roles that hip-hop music and culture played in their lives", students emerged as more critical consumers of hip-hop culture (Morrell and Duncan-Andrade, 2005/2006). By engaging in critical reflection, students learned to take an empowering position vis-à-vis the curricular offerings at their school. Giroux (2009), likewise, emphasized the role of dialogue in helping inner city youth to develop a potent counter-narrative of life. Being able to do so

is particularly empowering for ELL students as it allows them to challenge the dominant discourse about them and creates their own realities.

For neo-Marxist critical educators, the diverse responses of individuals in the school community to the school structure challenged the hidden curriculum of the neoliberal educational agenda and classroom practices and defied the mechanistic view of the relationship of schools as part of the social superstructure and its economic base. Neo-Marxist theorists illustrated that critical pedagogy can be used to account for student agency and subjectivity for ELL students (Au, 2006; Giroux, 2009, Saunders, 2010; Stanley, 2007).

Class consciousness. As evidenced in numerous examples of individual resistance to the school structure, schools and educational process provide a site of resistance for individuals to question and challenge dominant social relations and as such they embody the possibility of political actions and changes (Morrell & Duncan-Andrade, 2005/2006; Seas, 2006). On the other hand, individuals and schools can play an active role in the reproduction of the capitalist structure (for example, see Gruenewald, 2003; Seas, 2006).

While recognizing the possibility of political action and agency, Neo-Marxist critical educators argued that the capitalist influence on education represents a force limiting the autonomy of the superstructure. As discussed earlier, the hegemony of the dominant capitalist groups exercises control over the mass through 'manufactured consent' (Fontana, 2001; Gramsci, 1982; Suarez, 2002) Critical educators like Apple (2006), McLaren (2005), and Giroux (2004) have contended that through the control of

media and educational processes, individuals can unwittingly become the accomplices of an agenda that ultimately increases social inequality. For ELL students, schools are more likely to constitute a significant part of their marginalized existence in the U.S. society. Given the hegemonic role of corporate interests on educational policies and schooling, capitalism can have a profound influence in shaping their consciousness that it is especially difficult for ELL students to question, not to say resist, its power and influence (Au, 2006; Giroux, 2009, Saunders, 2010; Stanley, 2007).

Neo-Marxist critical educators warned against the invasive nature of capitalist hegemony and called for a pedagogical approach to help students cut through the "thick fog of ideological illusions" (Viola, 2009, p.7). Despite of their rejection of the reductionist interpretation of Marx's theory of capitalist production, the Marxist conception of class contradiction and conflicts remains mostly unchallenged by critical educators. For critical educators like Giroux (2004) and McLaren (2005), it is through the development of class-consciousness of social inequality perpetuated by capitalist exploitation that individuals are moved to challenge and disrupt the capitalist establishment. McLaren stated, "the best way to transcend the brutal and barbaric limits to human liberation set by capital are through practical movements centered around class struggle" (McLaren, 2005, p. 12). To achieve the goal of human liberation, he argued that the key is to "understand how capitalist relations of exploitation provide the ground from which other forms of oppression are produced" (McLaren, 2005, p. 12). Neo-Marxist critical educators have tactically resorted to class consciousness as the driving force of the history and the possibility of political actions that disrupt the oppressive political

structure (Giroux, 2004; McLaren, 2005).

Neo-Marxists' focus on the development of class consciousness as a medium of social transformation, however, may preempt them from adequately addressing the specificity of oppression and challenges facing ELL students in capitalist societies. Particularly, it blinded them from seeing the impact of the hegemony of English on ELL students. Noting individual resistance to critical pedagogy, McLaren & Giroux (1995) expressed the concern that "critical pedagogy has failed to articulate a vision of self empowerment and social transformation" (McLaren & Giroux, 1995, p. 34). Despite the calls for a re-conceptualization of critical pedagogy that engages individuals in transformational actions from *within* the tradition of critical pedagogy (for example, see Ardizzone, 2007; Ellsworth, 1994), the development of class consciousness has remained the primary lens through which neo-Marxist critical educators examine the problems of formal schooling.

Given critical pedagogy's commitment to social transformation, one can't help being amazed at the extent to which it has failed to address the need of ELL students. In the next section, I turn to uncover the underlying theoretical and ideological assumptions of neo-Marxist critical pedagogies by identifying the discursive strategies they deploy in enforcing the set of beliefs or assumptions they have promoted through their discourse. I illustrate how those underlying ideologies contribute to Neo-Marxists' failure to address the oppressive conditions facing ELL students.

Discursive Strategies

Within neo-Marxist critical pedagogies, two discursive strategies have been deployed to exclude the subjectivity of ELL students: 1) the deployment of essentialist definitions and categories that pass themselves off as transparent and self-evident, and 2) the assumption of the emancipatory implication of dialogue.

Normalizing essentialist conceptions of humanity. To enact agency and resist capitalist hegemony, neo-Marxist educators focused their interpretation of critical pedagogy on developing the critical consciousness of the relations of domination and subordination that lead to conditions of oppression (Apple, 2006; Apple & Pedroni, 2005; Freire, 1986; Freire, 1998; Giroux & McLaren, 1989; McLaren, 2005). The neo-Marxist's essentialist use of terms like "oppressors" and "oppressed" (Allen and Rossatto, 2009; McLaren, 2005), "critical consciousness" (Farahmandpu, 2005; Keyes, 2009; Weiner, 2007) and "class consciousness" (Braa & Callero, 2006; Martin, 2006; Weiner, 2007) invoked the concept of essentialized humanity that failed to address the specific conditions of oppression each individual or group endures (Apple, 2006; Apple & Pedroni, 2005; Freire, 1986; Freire, 1998; Giroux & McLaren, 1989; McLaren, 2005). The failure to attend the specific challenges facing ELL students has the effect of excluding the subjectivities of ELL students from being represented in the discourse of critical pedagogy.

The focus on class distinction has compelled neo-Marxist critical educators to treat those who are considered to be oppressed as a monolithic group in order to use them to create a space for political action. In such space created, the specific oppressive

conditions facing each minority group are suppressed in order to create a unified front in their joint struggle against oppression. This prevents neo-Marxist educators from specifically addressing the difference among and between the oppressed. Feminist critical educators like Ellsworth (1994) contended that the essentialist conception of humanity as reflected in the discourse of the Freirean pedagogy ignored the situated historicity of students' subjectivity such as gender, race and linguistic differences that have contributed to the oppressive condition of each minority group. Each group deserves a careful study in its own right. As class is not always the primary mode of oppression, there is a need to examine how different groups experience different forms of oppressions in different ways. From this viewpoint, neo-Marxist critical educators have failed to investigate the specificity of cultural capital such as language and forms of knowledge that play in the perpetuation of social and political oppression. Such an oversight has prevented neo-Marxist educators from acknowledging the challenges facing ELL students due to the lack of previous access to dominant forms of cultural capital.

Normalizing dialogue. As discussed previously, it is widely assumed among critical educators that teaching with and through dialogue helps students develop critical consciousness (DeTurk, 2006; Ghahremani-Ghajar, 2005; hooks, 2003; Kapellidi, 2007). Nevertheless, the ideal of dialogue has received extensive criticism among some critical educators who argued that dialogue embodies a form of hegemonic dominance that belies the power relations within the dialogical interaction (Burbules, 2000; Ellsworth, 1994; Gore, 1993; Gur-Zeev, 2005). Such critics insisted that the assumption of essentialist humanism within the discourse of critical pedagogy has tended to submerge the voices

and concerns of marginalized groups such as ELL students, who may already feel themselves marginalized in the process of discussion, either by being reduced to token participation or by being compelled to conform to the dominant norms of communication (Burbules, 2000; Ellsworth, 1994; Gore, 1993; Gur-Zeev, 2005).

Insisting that difference is regarded as a starting point for reflection and action, Giroux (2003) claimed that the common goal that dialogue as a joint inquiry is moving toward is merely serving as a regulative ideal that is not intended to suppress differences but aims at forging a point of view acceptable to all (Burbules, 2000; Giroux, 2003). Ellsworth (1997), however, contended that dialogue is essentially normalizing. She explained that dialogue as a "mode of address" that positions teachers and students in a purportedly egalitarian relation, has the normalizing effect of constraining the possibilities of communicative exchange, no matter how "open" it aspires to be:

> Communicative dialogue works only when we act as if its mode of address is a neutral conduit of reality, and not itself a rhetoric — not itself a mediation of knowledge and of its participants relations to knowledge (Ellsworth, 1997, p.82).

For Ellsworth and other critics of neo-Marxism, the presupposition of a language as the ground rule for participation serves to camouflage the asymmetries of power and privilege in dialogic pedagogies (Ellsworth, 1997; Burbules, 2000). Since language is the medium through which understanding and communication are enacted, inviting ELL students to dialogue in a language that they have a limited understanding without addressing the relationships of language and power substantively constrains rather than enables ELL students' access to the dialogic process.

Both Ellsworth (1997) and Burbules (2000) argued that the normalizing and regulatory functions of critical pedagogy as a form of dialogic pedagogy derive from the disciplinary force of language (Burbules, 2000; Ellsworth, 1997; Gore, 1993; Gur-Zeev, 2005). Linguistic and cultural diversity pose a challenge to the regulatory goal of dialogue. Burbules (2000) and Degener (2001) explained that when certain voices or perspectives are consistently excluded from possible participation through the filtering of language, the medium of dialogue then becomes a production of unequal exchange. In a cultural climate in which the legitimate status of English is taken for granted, linguistic difference fundamentally belies a power disparity that continues to be perpetuated in dialogue. For ELL students, the normalization of English to the exclusion of other heritage languages and cultures masks the repressive potential of a dialogical engagement and has a silencing effect for ELL students.

Style

In the CDA literature, style reflects a researcher's subject positioning. Through discourse, speakers claim identities for themselves and assign similar or contrasting identities to others, a process referred to as the negotiation of identities (Fairclough, 1989; Fairclough, 1995). In adopting the perspective of essentialist humanism, Neo-Marxists theorists positioned themselves as "transformative intellectual" (Yoon, 2005, p. 718), providing moral guidance to the oppressed. In this section, I examine how the subject positioning of neo-Marxists within the literature of critical pedagogy informs their vision of the goal of critical education and how ELL students are positioned.

"Transformative intellectual". Despite neo-Marxist critical educators' commitment to social transformation, 64 of 89 (71%) articles reflected the perspective of neo-Marxism, either explicitly about teachers' education or from educators' perspectives (for example, see Apple, 2004; Braa and Callero, 2006; DeTurk, 2006; Keyes, 2009; Rodriguez, 2008; Stanley, 2007; Weiner, 2007). By viewing class consciousness as essentialized and ready to be enacted through dialogic interaction between students and teachers, critical educators like Giroux (2004) and McLaren (2005) positioned themselves as transformative intellectuals, who believe they can transcend their socially and economically privileged background to speak for the oppressed. For example, in an article discussing "the crisis of youth", Giroux (2009) stated:

> If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to provide opportunities for students to learn that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory; that their histories and experiences matter; and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them" (Giroux, 2009, p.16).

In making this statement, Giroux seems, on the surface, advocating on behalf of students. He made a moral and ethical appeal to educators to recognize the normalizing potential of their own teaching. His passage implies an important active role for the teacher, the primary audience for his text. He was *encouraging* teachers to identify themselves with the image of the transformative intellectual he had promoted. The antiauthoritarian message of his passage reflects that Giroux adopted a paternalist attitude toward the

teacher and the youth, positioning them as would-be "transformative intellectuals" who

nevertheless need inspiration, guidance and encouragement (Giroux, 1993; Giroux, 2009;

Keyes, 2009; Rodriguez, 2008). In doing so, he has succumbed to the normalizing

potential of critical pedagogy without interrogating his own role as both a reproducer and

producer of oppressive cultures.

According to "post theorists" like Cahill (2007) and DiAngelo (2006), the

normalizing effects of essentialist humanism as expressed in neo-Marxist versions of

critical pedagogy on ELL students consisted in the fact that it represents the role of

English in student and teacher dialogue as "ways of thinking about oneself and others,"

and imposes them on the marginalized such as ELLs. It is the unmarked-ness and

naturalization of English that explains why the representation of ELL is so starkly absent

or marginal in the theorizing of the leading critical pedagogy theorists. Analysis of the

data revealed that ELL students were often referred to in generic terms such as "poor,

illiterate, and under-represented citizens" (Goodman, 2008, p.28), "students in high

minority, low socioeconomic status environments" (Vescio, Bondy and Pockert, 2009, p.

6) "individuals from Diasporas from the most economically depressed parts of the world"

(Kincheloe, 2008, p.3) or being submerged in the generalization of "Latino/a, and Asian

students" (McLaren, 2005, p.8). In these characterizations, ELL students were positioned

as "outside the play" (DiAngelo, 2006, p. 1996). They are objects to be defined,

categorized, and classified. The ability of Neo-Marxist educators to know, guide and

counsel ELL students and other marginalized groups is dependent on their ability to

position themselves as unmarked and legitimate. The normalizing effect of English on

ELL students is profoundly evidenced in the literature of critical pedagogy.

Given the scanty discussion of the hegemony of English within critical pedagogy, as discussed previously, one is likely to argue that English-speaking transformative intellectuals have treated the relationships of language and power as insubstantial. DiAngelo (2006) contended that for the dominant group, ELL students provided a necessary "backdrop" that provided those in power their very identity, a backdrop that gives English speaking teachers and students more cultural capital in the mainstream educational environment (DiAngelo, 2006, p. 1995). It is through the contrast against this backdrop, that critical educators position themselves as *transformative* and claim that much of what they have been granted by virtue of privilege is universal. By denying that there might be self-interested investment in these inequitable arrangements of language and power, Neo-Marxist educators used ELL students, albeit unconsciously, to affirm their identity and place.

Discursive Effects

Neo-Marxism with its commitment to the oppressed, while reiterating the Marxist assertion about the relationship between schools as superstructure and the reproduction of power relations within capitalist societies, emphasized that individuals within those schools possess agency and consciousness which allows them to resist the dominant social relations reproduced through institutions and broader social formations (Apple, 2006; Apple & Pedroni, 2005; Giroux & McLaren, 1989; McLaren, 2005). The discourse of the relative autonomy of schools and individuals can be used to enact agency for ELL students, and thereby empower them.

However, as many "post" critical educators contended, the normalizing nature of dialogue set up a potentially repressive 'we' that with its pretense of pursuing a joint inquiry into truth alienates minorities. ELL students are particularly vulnerable to the sway of the symbolic power of English. Very often, they are marginalized or compelled to comply in classroom discussions, either out of desire to conform or out of fear to deviate (Burbules, 2000; Ellsworth, 1994; Gur-Zeev, 2005). The essentialist humanism of neo-Marxist critical pedagogy accounted for the under-representation of ELL students in the literature of critical pedagogy. The unmarkedness of Neo-Marxist theorists positioning of themselves and ELL students resulted in the omnipotence of the cultural and political manipulation of consciousness that have contributed to ELL students' further subjectification under the watchful gaze of 'transformative intellectuals'.

2) Feminism

14 out of 127 (11%) in the data set could be identified as feminist pedagogies. 6 out of 127 (4%) self identified as feminist critical educators while 8 out of 127 (6%) could be identified so through cross-reference, key terms or themes employed by feminist discourses (See Table 10). Within feminist traditions, there are eclectic sources of influence that inform feminist discourses. Though united by their validation of difference, there is significant disagreement among feminists within critical pedagogy in terms of how subjectivity should be theorized (Gore, 1993; Gur- Zeev, 2005). For example, feminist critical educators like hooks (2003) emphasized feminism sharing with critical pedagogy the vision of collective emancipation and pedagogical strategies that "create ruptures in the established order, that promote modes of learning which challenge

bourgeois hegemony" (hooks, 1994, p. 185). In contrast, post-structural feminists like Cahill (2007) and Yoon (2005) focused on how subjectivity is informed by the interplay of discourse and power in their attempts to challenge metanarratives of agency, truth and history (Cahill, 2007; Gore, 1993; Yoon, 2005)[8].

My descriptive analysis disclosed that, like neo-Marxist discourse within critical pedagogy, feminist discourses equally failed to address the needs of ELL students. None of the feminist critical educators specifically referred to ELL students in their studies. However, analysis of the data revealed that in contrast to neo-Marxist critical educators, Feminist educators within critical pedagogy emphasized and validated personal experience as part of developing a critical consciousness of inequality and oppression. In doing so, they helped expose the normalizing power of critical pedagogy as reflected in neo-Marxist discourses.

---

[8] The feminist discourse within critical pedagogy marks the contribution of a growing critique of the first wave of feminism that is white led and marginalizes the activism and perspectives of the women of color. Focusing mainly on the United States, the first wave feminists treated sexism as the ultimate oppression (Gur-Zeev, 2005; Hoodfar, 1992). The feminism within critical pedagogy has since moved towards a more emphasis on class and race analysis, incorporating the point of view of women of color and white antiracist women. For example, critical feminists like bell hooks (2003) and Cahill (2007) told the history of oppression from the perspective of the women of color. Their discourse about the oppression of women of color reflects a more attention to interlocking oppressions facing minorities and helps us better addressing the special needs of ELL students.

Table 10

Coding for Discursive Formation

Method of identification	Examples
Self identification	Cahill (2007); Ellsworth (1994); Gore (1993); hooks, (2003); Kleinerman (2010); Meyer (2008)
Cross reference	Yoon (2005) (citing hooks, Ellsworth)
Key terms or themes	Validating personal experience (Kleinerman, 2010, p. 18; Liston, 2008, p. 390; McKay, 2010; Yoon, 2005, p.738); respecting 'otherness' (Liston, 2008, p. 390; Yoon, p. 738)

Discursive Formations within Feminist Discourse

While sharing with neo-Marxist critical educators the assumption about oppression and vision of social transformation, feminist critical educators challenged the essentialist humanist vision reflected in the discourse of critical pedagogy (Ellsworth, 1994; hooks, 2003; Gur-Zeev, 2005; Lather, 1991). There are two tenets commonly held by feminist critical educators: rejecting essential humanism and re-conceptualizing difference/otherness.

Rejecting essentialist humanism. One of the elements that mark feminist critical educators' stance toward critical pedagogy is the critique of essentialist humanism that views all the oppressed groups indiscriminately (Ellsworth, 1994; Goldstein, 2007; Gore, 1993; Gur-Zeev, 2005; hooks, 2003; Lather, 1991). Feminist critical educators believed that critical and "political understandings are developed through an analysis of personal experiences" (Cahill, 2007, p.273). For example, in her argument for teachers' critical awareness in enacting critical pedagogy, Goldstein (2007) recited how a professor who

subscribed to egalitarian ideals of critical pedagogy, had resorted to a normalizing and regulatory posture that reinstated teacher authority in classrooms when encountering student resistance to critical pedagogy's tenets. In her argument, she grounded her critique of critical pedagogy in her own personal experience as a graduate student, as well as a college professor whose encounter with critical pedagogy shaped her critical stance (Goldstein, 2007). Meyer (2008) examined patterns of gendered harassment among students in secondary schools by applying a critical feminist lens to student experiences by introducing a more complex awareness of the power relations within the school (Meyer, 2008). Both studies resorted to individual experience as a source of knowledge in their critique of critical pedagogy in its suppression of student voices. The validation of individual experience can be used as a means to help ELLs and other underprivileged students develop critical consciousness and empower them. By utilizing their own experience to develop a counter narrative to the dominant discourses, ELL students are afforded a position to disrupt the oppressive structure facing them.

Reconceptualizing difference/Other-ness. Feminist critical educators' assertion of the primacy of personal experience is based on an epistemological and philosophical critique of the dominant assumptions of essentialist humanism that are reflected in many works of critical pedagogy. Ellsworth argued that generic terms such as 'empowerment,' 'student voice,' 'dialogue,' and even the term 'critical' found in the dominant discourse of critical pedagogy – tend to overlook the specificity of oppressive conditions facing different groups of individuals including ELL students (Ellsworth, 1994, p. 298). From this perspective, these terms represented "repressive myths that perpetuate relations of

domination" (Ellsworth, 1994, p. 298) that can be persistently used to subjugate ELL students.

In what is famously referred to as the Ellsworth-Giroux debate (Lather, 1992, pp. 124-126), Ellsworth challenged the oppressive potential of the "we" as actualized in Giroux's concept of dialogue in classrooms where students are supposed to manifest "trust, partnership and commitment to develop human conditions" (Giroux, 1988, p. 72; also see Ellsworth, 1994). Though Giroux reiterated that the specific terms critical pedagogy sets for dialogue are not predetermined, Ellsworth insisted that he cannot escape the entrapment created by his own admission that the 'logic' of the dialogue compels its participants to move, whether willing or not, toward a consensus concerning the dialogue. In the dialogic scheme of critical pedagogy, all voices and differences are compelled to unite in a collective effort to form a communal dialogical experience. As such, it is obliged to repress any marked differences that resist or are not susceptible, to be assimilated through dialogic process (Ellsworth, 1994; Gur-Zeev, 2005). From such perspective, critical educators like Giroux (1988) push towards some sort of norm that may have repressive potentials for ELL students.

Within the tradition of critical pedagogy, post-structural feminists focus on the complex issues of identity and difference. Using a critique of structures underlying power relations such as language and discourse, post-structural feminists emphasized that subjectivity and identity are shaped by the struggle against power, and cannot be essentialized or reified. For example, using participatory action research to challenge the stereotype of young urban women of color, Cahill (2007) emphasized that subjectivity as

a "relational construct", is "unstable, multiple, contradictory, and in process; continuously being shaped in discourse and other material social practices as we interpret and act upon the world" (Cahill, 2007, p. 269). From this perspective, subjectivities continuously produce and reproduce within a discourse that accords them legitimacy or illegitimacy. In a study that promoted the use of personal narrative to facilitate classroom dialogue, Chapman (2004) argued that language, power, and knowledge work together to construct identities and behaviors in both students and teachers (Chapman, 2004). If we accept this notion that there are a multiplicity of discourses constructing one's understandings of self and the world, then we are compelled to question and challenge the power of discourses that shape and construct ELL students' subjectivity.

The feminist focus on difference and identities encourages one to believe that underlying power structures – whether economic, social, linguistic or hegemonic – can be discovered and resisted. By attending to individuals' historicity such as gender, race and language that structurally contribute to the perpetuation of the oppressed, feminist critical educators helped expose the repressive potential of critical pedagogy. From this perspective, feminist critical pedagogy can be viewed as being more open to addressing the needs of ELL students.

Discursive Strategies of feminism

Normalizing difference and diversity. A feminist critique of critical pedagogy, however, has its own moment of predicament. The valorization of experience and difference, instead of serving as a foundation for mutual respect and civility, can easily reverse itself to become the ultimate justification of reified difference, thus creating

essentialist assumptions as a source of oppression. For example, in her study of the relationship of women's learning journey in singing and their development of leadership, Kleinerman (2010) spoke of their increasing awareness of the "erotic symbolism" of the female mouth and sound, and their "hunger to be acknowledged" (Kleinerman, 2010, p. 19). Though viewing this awareness as a process, she risked falsely dichotomizing the difference between men and women (Kleinerman, 2010).

The valorization of experience can create the effect of trivializing the truth claims of the marginalized. Since all knowledge claims are grounded in certain experience, they are treated the same and as if they are equal. Seen from such a perspective, feminist ideology failed to differentiate different political agenda - oppressive or not (Gur-Zeev, 2005; McLaren, 2005). McLaren seemed to have this postmodern, feminism-inspired interpretation of critical pedagogy in mind when he lamented that this undiscriminating treatment of differences may lead to uncritical multicultural "feel-good" curricula such as the celebration of 'ethnic' holidays and themes such as 'black history month' and 'Cinco de Mayo' designed to justify the dominant group's exploitation of difference in the name of respecting difference' (McLaren, 2005, p.8).

In stressing the primacy of individual experience, feminist critical pedagogy provided needed space to move toward recognizing of the different capital that students bring to classrooms. By validating the experience, language, and cultural knowledge of students considered to be marginalized and oppressed, it helps embrace the multiple positions required for democratic participation. In the context of addressing the needs of ELL students, it helps direct our attention to what thus far has been the repressed truth

about the hegemony of English and its impacts for ELL students. The hegemony of

English creates power inequality in mainstream classrooms and can be a constraining

force for ELL students. However, feminists' rejection of the essentialist claim of human

experience while seeking to enact social transformation also serves to undermine the

validity of ELL students' claims of oppressed experiences. Its valorization of difference

and failure to provide a theory of truth and knowledge claims that will address issues of

injustice and hegemony could easily fall into the danger of political 'indifference', as

previously discussed in McLaren's critique of feminism (McLaren, 2005).

Style

Surrogate for the Other. In prioritizing personal experience and respecting

differences and otherness, feminist critical educators positioned themselves as the

surrogate for "the other". Ellsworth maintained that the paternalist positioning of critical

pedagogy "fails to come to grips with issues of trust, risk and operations of fear and

desire" (Ellsworth, 1994, p.317). Grounding her argument in a critique of the rationalist

epistemology dominant in critical pedagogy, she argued that feminism is privileged in

terms of its ability to account for affective/emotive factors as provoked by institutions of

power (Ellsworth, 1994, p. 314). For example, in a study addressing "the relation of the

ideologies, affective investments, and material conditions" facing Asian Americans (Yoon,

2005, p. 743), Yoon (2005) claimed that feminists are more susceptible to feel "the pains

of the minority" (Yoon, 2005, p. 744). By taking into consideration other dimensions of

subjectivity that can play an important role in mediating the efficacy of critical pedagogy,

feminist discourses help one to envision new subjectivities and alternative ways of

theorizing about ELL students.

By adopting this stance, feminist critical educators positioned themselves as deviating from a tradition they believed has resulted in critical pedagogy's failure to address what constitutes an important part of our notion of self that is important for critical education, and presented themselves as the surrogate for critical education. In other words, they positioned themselves as stewards to protect those who cannot protect themselves, thus carving their own expert territory.

However, given the paucity of representation of ELL students in the literature of critical pedagogy, one wonders how effective the intervention of this feminist vision is. While paying tribute to the experience and the knowledge of the oppressed, feminist educators like Ellsworth (1994) and hooks (2003) consciously attempted to construct their pedagogy to recognize and encourage the capacity of their students to theorize about and to recognize their own power (Ellsworth, 1994; hooks, 2003). In this respect, there is no difference between the "paternalistic" dimensions of Freire's critical pedagogy and those of feminist critical pedagogy. To empower the oppressed students such as ELLs, it might not be enough to simply rely on the 'kind' intention of the feminist intellectuals. Some more radical reconciliation between theoretical walk and practical talk may be necessary.

Discursive Effects

Feminists challenged the potentially repressive discourse of some versions of critical pedagogy (Ellsworth, 1994; hooks, 2003; Gur-Zeev, 2005; Lather, 1991). Though sharing Freirean pedagogy's vision of social change and the critical potential of

experience and consciousness, feminists emphasized the historicity of human experience/consciousness and criticized the normalizing potential of dialogic pedagogy because it suppressed all voices and differences under the 'we'. The feminist critique of critical pedagogy complicates our thinking about identity and difference in the theorization of critical education. By validating individual experience, feminists help us recognize what Yosso (2005) calls the 'wealth of cultural capital" that ELL students and other minority students bring to the mainstream culture and reveal a need for critical educators to theorize differently about ELL students and their assets (Yosso, 2005, p.75).

In contrast to the essentialist humanism of Freirean pedagogy that advocates a unitary account of the self, thus leaving no room for the recognition of radical others, feminist critical educators emphasized features of selfhood that valorize experience of minority students (Ellsworth, 1994; hooks, 2003; Gur-Zeev, 2005; Lather, 1991). However, as evidenced in their discourse about women and other minorities, feminists reproduced the power asymmetry between teachers and students, and by doing so, inadvertently assumed the role of 'transformative intellectuals' that they argued have created repressive and normalizing potentials for the marginalized.

3) **Critical Race Theory**

23 out of 127 (18%) in my data could be identified as Critical Race Theory (CRT), either through self identification (such as Jennings & Lynn, 2005; Ladson-Billings and Tate, 1995), cross-reference (such as Yosso, 2005) and/or common themes that emerged within the data (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; McKay, 2010) (See Table 11).

Analysis of the data revealed that all Critical Race Theories but one addressed the

challenges facing address ELL students (DiAnglo, 2006). Nevertheless, by emphasizing

the intersection of racism and other oppressive factors in American society, Critical Race

Theory directed our attention to the specificity of oppression facing marginalized students.

By complicating the racial thinking within critical pedagogy, Critical Race Theory helps

one to bring in different layers of consideration when addressing ELL students. Hence

their discourses can be used to move toward more fully addressing the special needs of

ELL students.

Table 11

Coding for Critical Race Theory

Identification	Examples
Self identification	Allen & Rossatto (2009); Jennings, & Lynn (2005); Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995)
Cross reference	Yosso (2005, citing critical race theorists such as Landson-Billings, Jennings & Lynn, etc.)
Key terms or themes	Prioritizing race (Allen & Rossatto, 2009, p.167; Jennings & Lynn, 2005, p.24; Yosso, 2005, p.82); challenging the deficit view of the racial minority (Ladson-Billings and Tate, 1995; McKay, 2010; Yosso, 2005)

Discursive formations within Critical Race Theory

Critics within the tradition of the Freirean pedagogy point out that Critical

Pedagogy in its neo-Marxist interpretation that promotes collective consciousness and

essentialist view of humanity, has alienated people of color and other minorities

(Husband, 2010; Jennings & Lynn, 2005; McKay, 2010; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995;

Simmons, 2008; Yosso, 2005). To correct this shortsightedness, some critical educators

developed Critical Race Theory to address specific social, political, educational, and

economic concerns of race, and realign the goals of critical pedagogy with an individual's

reality (Allen, 2004; Husband, 2010; Jennings & Lynn, 2005; McKay, 2010; Ladson-

Billings & Tate, 1995; Leonardo, 2002; Lynn & Jennings, 2009; Price, 2000; Simmons,

2008; Yosso, 2005). Within critical pedagogy, Critical Race Theory focuses on centering

race in critical pedagogy and challenging the deficit view taken about racial minority.

Centering race in critical pedagogy. Critical Race Theorists argued that racism

is deeply entrenched in American consciousness, and seek to re-center race in the debates

over schooling and democratic education in public schools (Jennings & Lynn, 2005;

McKay, 2010; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Price, 2000; Yosso, 2005). Influenced by

the post-modern critique of master narratives such as feminism (Ellsworth, 1994; hooks,

2003) and post-structuralism (Bourdieu, 1994; Foucault, 1984), CRT educators called

into question the notion that there exists an objective truth unspoiled by the subjective

nature of human experience, and argued that subjective experience should be sought as a

primary source to uncover the historicity of racially subjugated peoples (Jennings & Lynn,

2005; McKay, 2010; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Price, 2000; Yosso, 2005). For

example, Berry (2007) discussed how, through *Les Petites et Les Grandes Histoires*, the

oppressive structure facing the poor and marginalized was told from personal

perspectives. Through the juxtaposition of personal experience and the dominant

narrative of history, issues of personal significance are examined, critiqued, and

connected to historical, political, and economic racism that have perpetuated inequality

(Berry, 2007, p.94). This practice can be pertinent to ELL students as it helps materialize the abstractness of the contradictions inherent in social relations that constitute the normalcy of their life and makes possible for them to develop a critical consciousness of oppressive social conditions facing them.

In order to address the complex and multi-layered dynamics of racial identities in American society, CRT theorists drew upon a wide range of teaching and literacy strategies such as storytelling, family history, biographies, scenarios, parables, chronicles, and narratives to help students challenge the prevailing ideas about them. For example, the above-mentioned 'writing as talking' approach to literacy and classroom instruction utilizes students' personal experiences and can be easily adapted to support linguistically marginalized students in classroom discussions (Berry, 2007; Lynn and Jennings, 2009). Cultural or linguistic factors sometimes inhibit students from participating in class discussions. The literacy approach adopted by CRT allows racially marginalized students including ELLs to tell their own stories from their personal perspectives. It helps create a more culturally and linguistically diverse environment within classrooms for racial minorities to negotiate conflicts and differences and thereby empowers the voice of the silenced.

Challenging the deficit view of racial minorities. Critical Race theorists worked to shift the discourse regarding minorities to a more positive one and learned from the array of cultural knowledge, skills, abilities and social networks possessed by socially marginalized groups that the mainstream culture has failed to acknowledge and recognize (Anzaldúa, 1990; hooks, 2003; Yosso, 2005). Instead of adopting the deficit view that

positions communities of color as places constitutive of deficits, full of cultural poverty,

disadvantages, and 'lacking' the social and cultural capital required for social mobility,

Critical Race Theory theorists like Anzaldúa (1990) and Yosso (2005) turned our

attention to various forms of capital nurtured through cultural wealth that students of

color bring with them from their homes and communities into classrooms and school life.

By expanding the discourse of race in a more nuanced way that includes the linguistic

experience of ELL students, it helps us position ELL students in such a way that accounts

for their struggle to make meaning and enact resistance to oppressive societal structures.

Discursive Strategies

   Normalizing racial difference. By reinstating race at the center of critical

pedagogy, CRT theorists worked to acknowledge the specificity of oppression and helped

create new openings for marginalized groups including ELL students to address issues of

social injustice and domination. Its use of narrative and storytelling is especially relevant

to ELL students as it helps empower student voice and create counter discourses to

dominant ideologies. However, CRT incurs a similar criticism as encountered by feminist

critical pedagogies that ground their discourses in the self evident knowledge of the

oppressed. By not being able to provide a viable theory to go beyond the logic of self-

evidence, it proves to undermine the notion of intercultural dialogue and trivializes the

experience of the oppressed such as ELL students'. But above all, by privileging race in

the theorization of critical education, it might unwittingly monopolize the discourse of

oppression and risk distracting our attention from other oppressive challenges facing ELL

students.

Among theorists of CRT, there were attempts to push toward more complex racial theorizing to include the experience of ELL students. While generally sharing the assumption that race occupies the pivotal place in the collective struggle for emancipation, LatCrit theorists like Anzaldúa (1990), Solorzano (1993) and Yosso (2005) argued that the black/white binaries exclude people of other color from participating in the discourse about race and fails to enhance broadly based race consciousness that allows for political agency (Anzaldúa, 1990; Arce, 2004; Delgado, 1997; Solorzano, 1993; Yosso, 2005). For example, Anzaldúa (1990) and Yosso (2005) extended critical race discussions to address the layers of racialized subordination such as language and power relationships that comprise Latina/o experiences (Anzaldúa, 1990; Arce, 2004; Yosso, 2005). Their arguments introduced a new concern with English language learners within the discourse of race and has noticed that ELL students are denied due opportunities to success because of who they are (Anzaldúa, 1990; Arce, 2004; Yosso, 2005).

Style

Progressive racial minorities. CRT affirmed that the experience of racial minorities such as African Americans, Hispanic/Latino Americans and Asian Americans speaks closely to how issues of race, oppression, identity and resistance are negotiated in America. In this respect, they argued that the perspective of racial minorities should be privileged in educational theorizing that aims for equality. By including such methods as storytelling and personal narratives that build on students' experience, CRT helped recognizing the experiential knowledge of people of color such as ELL students' as legitimate and critical to understanding and analyzing about power relations in the field

of education (Allen, 2004; Anzaldúa, 1990; Arce, 2004; hooks, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Lynn and Jennings, 2009; Padilla and Chavez, 1995; Solorzano, 1993; Yosso, 2005).

However, by privileging perspectives of educators and students of racial minorities, CRT educators also risked monopolizing the discourse of critical pedagogy to the exclusion of other perspectives such as ELL students'. For example, Lynn and Jennings (2009) contended that "within the context of American education, the mothering done by Black teachers helps to affirm the multiple identities of their students as part of the process of ensuring the survival of the African-American community" (Lynn & Jennings, 2009, p.178). By emphasizing the knowledge, dispositions, and experience of racial minority teachers, Critical Race Theory reinforced the power relations between students and teachers that they contended are problematic within the discourse of critical pedagogy. This positioning has the effect of undermining the emancipatory potential of CRT for ELL students.

As discussed above, one normalizing effect of critical pedagogy is to pose the teachers as superior than the students. The reproduction of teacher as a figure of moral authority within CRT has the effect of erasing the ways in which critical pedagogy is posing as an intervening force to end oppression for marginalized students. The quandary this stance presents is testified by the evidence in the data that ELL students do not always share the vision of democracy that CRT educators have envisioned on their behalf (Coloma, 2008; DiAngelo, 2006; Viola, 2009; Yoon, 2005). For example, Coloma (2008) documented his experience as a Filipino ELL student in "English and social studies

courses that incorporated African American narratives and histories" (Coloma, 2008, p.35). He reported that his struggle "to find images and stories that reflected his experiences in culturally relevant language arts and social studies courses" often left him "frustrated, confused, and erased" (Coloma, 2008, p.35). From this perspective, the multicultural education as envisioned by Critical Race Theory reflects a need to incorporate ELL students into the mainstream culture that reinforces the hegemony of English.

Discursive Effects

CRT helped contextualize critical pedagogy's theorization of ELL students by prioritizing race and its intersection with other modes of oppressions such as language, gender and other hegemonic forces (Allen, 2004; Husband, 2010; Jennings & Lynn, 2005; McKay, 2010; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Leonardo, 2002; Sonn, 2008). However, Critical Race Theory's focus on race and racism might risk eclipsing other forms of oppressions under the general umbrella of racial theorizing. Clearly marginalization and oppression are complex social processes that are found along many axes of social difference, not just race. By failing to expand its focus to include other forms of oppression other than racial or ethnic categories, CRT ran the risk of reproducing the hegemony of English as an aspired social order.[9] It, however, helped contribute to the

---

[9] Within the tradition of Critical Race Theory, there have been discussions about how the meaning of the linguistic practice of racial minorities such as Ebonics and other languages operates as markers of racial identity (O'Connor, Lewis and Mueller, 2007; Yosso, 2005). Race, however, remains to be the focus of racial discourses in this tradition. Hence there is still a need for continued progression in researchers' efforts to develop ever more complex renderings of cultural and linguistic experience in relation to race.

mobilization of ELL students in the service of maintaining the hegemony of English in education and other public domains.

In order to empower ELL students and enact their success in schools some LatCrit theorists have noted there is a need to expand the discourse of race in a more nuanced way that includes the linguistic experience of ELL students (Anzaldúa, 1990; Arce, 2004; Delgado, 1997; Solorzano, 1993; Yosso, 2005). In doing so, it would help imagine new subjectivity, and perform new resistance stances for ELL students in their struggle to make meaning and exercise agency.

Conclusions and Reflections: The Discursive Effects of Critical Pedagogy as a field for ELL students

While critical pedagogy helps redirect our attention to the power effects of language and its role in the reproduction of oppression, it is to the credit of essential humanism within the discourse of critical pedagogy that we lose another opportunity to address challenges facing ELL students. Freire and neo-Marxist critical educators have the foresight to prioritize the problematization of language as the key feature of his dialogic approach. By doing so, they institute critical pedagogy as a genre of social critique. However, neo-Marxists' essentialist humanism makes them systematically overlook the historicity of language and its contribution to the specificity of oppression that faces ELL students.

By prioritizing personal experience in their efforts to challenge the normalizing potential of dialogic pedagogy that risks submerging student voice and differences in the dialogic process, post theories such as Feminism and Critical Race Theory helped move

toward the recognition of the historicity of oppressions that face marginalized students. Their discourses signaled a methodological shift within critical pedagogy. Expanding the notion of dialogic approaches to include narratives and story telling, they help ELL students to gain access to the dialogic process in classrooms.

Nevertheless, the theorization about ELL students within critical pedagogy remains abstract. By normalizing diversity, both feminists and Critical Race Theorists within critical pedagogy risk reducing diversity to categorical differences. Post theorists' failure to highlight the materiality of English as an arbitrator of classroom discussions and academic achievement illustrates that a politically correct response to the oppressive potential of the modernist rhetoric of emancipation may not offer a new, alternative, viable beginning for the struggle against the hegemonic power-relations within the educational system and beyond. In the end, it does not represent a genuine regard for ELL students and other oppressed groups, but merely reflects a self serving stance of elitism.

This is evident in the fact that within my study sample, the majority of the articles were either about teachers' role or seeking to enact the teacher's voice in the implementation of critical pedagogy (n=96/127; 75%) (for example, see Allen and Rossatto, 2009; Apple, 2004; Braa and Callero, 2006; DeTurk, 2006; Keyes, 2009; Rodriguez, 2008; Stanley, 2007). While there were a few studies that documented students' appropriation of popular culture to resist the dominance of the mainstream culture (for example, see Ardizzone, 2007; Cahill, 2007; Morell, 2002), critical pedagogy, overall, failed to authorize students' perspectives. Given the under-represented status of ELL students in the data sample, there is a need for critical educators to authorize ELL

students' perspectives to address their special needs in dialogic pedagogies.

By failing to reveal the role of English underlying power relations in schools and classroom, critical educators have reaffirmed the hegemonic power of English. As previously discussed, hegemony not only manifests itself in the form of overt political control, but also in the hidden form of regulating and controlling consciousness in presenting itself as natural and legitimate.

The hegemonic power of English is especially telling in the naming of English Language learners. Within critical pedagogy, ELL students have been referred to in generic terms such as 'the oppressed' (Apple, 2006; Apple & Pedroni, 2005; Freire, 1986; Freire, 1998; Giroux & McLaren, 1989; McLaren, 2005). Instead of ascribing them characteristics that they positively possess, ELL students are referred to by the terms that reflect the values of the dominant group. From this perspective, equally bias and negative is the term 'ELL students', which suggests that learning English is the only thing that counts for those who have not possessed it already.

Until I undertook this study, it did not occur to me that I *am* an English language learner, and was surprised to know how I am labeled. In its ubiquitous presence in educational discourses, the power of English appears unmarked and is considered as content empty and ideologically free, marked only by its functionality as a tool of communication and learning. This, however, testifies the scope and extent of its hegemony. English as a hegemonic form of social control is the habitus and as a set of everyday practices that allow the dominant group to identify and categorize others, but not themselves.

As hegemonized subjects, ELL students are reduced to a category and yet cling passionately to their forced identity, for it is in relation to power that oppresses them that they derive their names and identities. Is it possible to reconceptualize the relationship of language and power in such a way to restore the full humanity to ELL students? The very possibility of my project depends on an affirmative answer to this rhetorical question. As a teacher and researcher, I feel it is my obligation to utilize whatever power and resources that remain at my disposal to rename the reality in order to transform it.

I believe in the possibility to reconceptualize the language and power relationship in such a way that linguistic diversity is recognized as the norm rather than exception; that language contact is the order of things and we are obligated to recognize the communicative contribution of other languages and cultures. From this perspective, linguistic diversity is the reality instead of deviations from the norm. Such a conception of language provides more linguistic freedom and space for language minorities and allows their experience and knowledge to be expressed, recognized and appreciated. I articulate more on this in next chapter.

Chapter Seven

Conclusions

In this final chapter I first reflect upon the lens and research method adopted in this study, the limitations of the study, and implications of these for my research findings. I then describe the research findings in light of the research questions that guide this study:

a) How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the particular issues that ELL students face in mainstream, content-area classrooms?

b) How does dialogic pedagogy account for the needs of ELL students when theorizing about the relationships of language and power?

c) How might taking into account the particular issues facing ELL students in the dialogic process help to inform a new understanding of dialogic pedagogy and perhaps a new practice of democratic pedagogy?

Within this discussion, I identify the effects of the discourse of critical pedagogy for ELL students, explore implications of this study for classroom and literacy practice and conclude with recommendations for further research, school policies and classroom practices.

Research Methods and Limitations

Bourdieu's discourse on language and power constitutes a theoretical framework that provides the consistent structure through which to guide my research (Bourdieu, 1994). By accommodating both the objective and subjective dimensions of social practice, his theory of language and symbolic power allows me to formulate the constraining and

enabling aspects of dialogic pedagogy as a social practice. I incorporate his 'language' into my overarching question and the accompanying sub-questions as described previously.

Bourdieu explication of language as a social practice manifested in the relationships of field, capital and habitus provides me a unifying focus when discussing the critical challenges facing ELL students as emerging from my review of ELL literature that I have used to guide my data collection and analysis. However, as my research progressed, I grew more aware of the ways Bourdieuian framework has shaped the direction of my research. In focusing on the role of linguistic capital in the reproduction of power, I might have unwittingly accentuated the imbalance and inequality between social structure and agency to the point that I am guilty of reinforcing the deficit theorizing of ELL students and contributing to the production of negativity - raising the specter of Ranciere's critique of Bourdieu as was discussed earlier (Ranciere, 2007).

While Bourdieu's cultural capital expands the Marxist notion of capital and provides room for cultural autonomy, his repertoire of cultural capital such as linguistic competence, education, knowledge of rules, is restricted to those that play a role in the capitalist production of wealth and status, and hence risks of reducing cultural capital to a special case of economic capital (Bourdieu, 1994). Via Ranciere's 'performance effect' argument, we may argue that Bourdieu's focus on the capitals that favor the dominant class and in terms of whose deficiency ELL students are defined contributed to the reinforcement of the hegemony of English. Reminded by critical educators such as DiAngelo (2006) and Yosso (2005), I need to bear in mind that 'English Language

Learners' are more than just English language learners. As human beings, ELL students carry with them a 'community wealth' of cultural heritages that the mainstream culture fails to recognize, but contains within itself the possibilities important to the flourishing of humanity (Yosso, 2005). A re-conceptualization of 'capital' that celebrates and provides "plural openings" (Taylor & Robinson, 2009) is called for in order to empower ELL students.

As a theoretical framework that incorporates textual analysis and social theory in the challenge of domination, CDA was used in my study to theorize the gap existing in the literature of critical pedagogy regarding its conspicuous lack of reference to ELL students. Seeing social categories such as 'ELL students' operating within the dynamics of power relations in society, CDA compelled me to go beyond the semiotic level of the texts. Instead of stopping at what critical pedagogy literally said about ELL students, CDA prompted me to go beyond the surface of the text, probing into the ways the discourses of critical pedagogy construct ELL students as an object of research and the discursive formations in which it is embedded.

Adopting CDA as an analytic lens allowed me to explore the way my identities are invested in my study. At the center of CDA is the premise that discourses are political (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). The political dimension of CDA inevitably calls into question the objectivity of the researcher's standing with regarding to the interpretation of the text and touches upon the positionality of this study. As a researcher as well as an ELL myself, I am part of the language practices I study. I live both inside and outside the social reality that I endeavor

to understand and transform at the same time. This positioning shaped my interpretations of critical pedagogy as a complex interplay of both oppression and promise. In my analysis I have utilized CDA to uncover critical pedagogy's constraining and enabling effects for ELL students.

My role as a researcher required me to demonstrate the trustworthiness of my research. One way to do this is through the triangulation of data, by juxtaposing different perspectives found in the data. This is compatible with the critical stance of CDA according to which, it would be wrong to conceptualize its goal as aiming to understand discourses as unified and integrated. This is not the aim of CDA, nor is its intended outcome. On the contrary, as a strategy to understand how language works as a cultural practice to mediate power relations (Fairclough, 1995; Rogers, 2003), CDA privileges the disrupting of the impositional power of the text, helping to reveal the discourse of critical pedagogy as contradictory, caught in the web of its often unstated assumptions and motives. I have endeavored to achieve this by recovering conflicting voices and counter discourses within the discourse of critical pedagogy, not only to expose the contradictions that often exist between the claims of its discourse and its effects, but also to reveal the inner contradiction within critical pedagogy as a field.

To further reduce the caprice of my interpretation, I often quoted extensive sections of texts so that readers could draw their own interpretations. I also tried as much as possible to describe the discursive context in which the discourses of critical pedagogy could be interpreted, often relying on the existing scholarship to do so. However, the work of my analysis involves constructing identities for authors that they themselves may

not recognize. For example, bringing the Bourdieuian discourse of language and power to my analysis, I have interpreted some discourses of critical pedagogy as neo-Marxist — arguing that they were potentially normalizing and aimed to reproduce the status quo that represses ELL students and other minorities rather than disrupting its reproduction. But it is doubtful whether those authors of critical pedagogy see themselves as oppressors or would interpret their work as regulatory. Most likely they viewed themselves as social reformers, sacrificing their time and energy, working hard on behalf of the oppressed for the benefit of the general. In treating neo-Marxist discourses as a well-defined entity with an essence of their own, I might have risked of simplifying their arguments that might be more complex than I have presented.

There is perhaps no definite way to completely eliminate the essentializing tendency of human reason. A strategic use of essentialism may be justified by recourse to practical considerations with regarding to the purpose of this study. For example, in amplifying some elements of the discourses of critical pedagogy, we help expose their normalizing potential and examine their effects on ELL students.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that by essentializing the others we risk of reifying the perspectives of the others and deprive them of agency and subjectivity that are due to them. The issue of essentialism is particularly relevant to ELL students because of its implications regarding the possibility of individual agency and political change. Essentialist views of ELLs imply that ELL students have no autonomy and by doing so, contribute to the perpetuation of their subjugation in a hierarchical social structure that puts them at a disadvantage.

To attenuate the pernicious damage from the unavoidable essentialist use of categories and terms in deploying my arguments in this study, I have employed CDA to help me attend to the nuances within the discourses of critical pedagogy. As a research method that sees theory formation as a social practice that implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the wider context that frames it (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, Pardoe and Szerszynski, 2003; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997), CDA makes it possible to de-link critical pedagogy's unstated assumptions from its claims to truth and allows for a critical reading of critical pedagogy by exposing contradicting voices and counter discourses within it, revealing its simultaneously enabling and constraining power, as I have endeavored to do so. For example, in this study, I have juxtaposed the discourses of feminist critical pedagogies and Critical Race Theory with that of neo-Marixst critical pedagogies to uncover their underlying assumptions and in doing so, expose the normalizing potential for ELL students of each discourse. I also have taken measures to attenuate the essentialist potential of my own discourses. In criticizing the essentialist humanism of neo-Marxist discourses, I have stressed that while insisting that normative disputes can be settled through rational dialogue, neo-Marxist critical educators such as Giroux regarded difference not as fixed, but as a starting point for reflection and action (Burbules, 2000; DeTurk, 2006; Ghahremani-Ghajar, 2005; Giroux, 2003; hooks, 2003). Hence I have endeavored to present neo-Marxist arguments in their subtlety and complexity.

In the following section I return to my research questions and discuss implications of my research findings.

How does dialogic pedagogy theorize about the particular issues that ELL students face in mainstream, content-area classrooms?

The juxtaposition of different discursive formations within the field of critical pedagogy allows me to expose both the empowering and repressive potential of critical pedagogy as a form of dialogic pedagogy for ELL students (Anzaldúa, 1990; Coloma, 2008; Ellsworth, 1994; Peters, 2009; Viola, 2009; Yoon, 2005; Yosso, 2005). Despites of its regard for the oppressed, dialogic approach promoted by critical pedagogy often abstracts its operations from historical and cultural particulars that are intrinsic to make sense the specificity of oppression ELL students experience (such as the specificity of cultural literacy in the school curriculum, the bias of hidden curriculum, the hegemony of English, and the role of English in the development of students' voice, subjectivity and identity) (Burbules, 2000; Ellsworth, 1994; Gur-Zeev, 2005; Viola, 2009; Yoon, 2005; Yosso, 2005).

Through the lens of post theories such as feminism and Critical Race Theory, I come to realize that the radical difference of ELL students - difference that resists assimilation to the mainstream culture such as language – could be rendered inexplicable or denied in the dialogic process in mainstream classrooms. As Ellsworth (1994) and others rightfully pointed out, the regulative nature of dialogic approach tends to reinforce the political and cultural manipulation of consciousness and not only prevents certain voices or perspectives from emerging in dialogic process, but the medium of dialogue itself becomes complicit with the repressive agenda of reproducing inequality (Burbules, 2000; Ellsworth1994; Gore, 1993; Gur-Zeev, 2005).

Through exposing the discursive effects of critical pedagogy as a discourse, I realize that the essentialist humanism manifested in the discourses of critical pedagogy could become a normalizing education and exert a normalizing power for ELL students in classroom discussions. Post theorists' attempts to escape the normalizing effect of critical pedagogy's essentialist humanism are far from offering anti-elitism or any genuine new critical potential. In fact, all classroom practices are potentially normative. In support of ELL students' struggle for liberation and freedom, it is not enough to simply acknowledge the repressive potential of critical pedagogy. In the wake of such possibility, we are compelled to search for an approach of pedagogical approach that simultaneously empowers ELL student voice, validates diversity and difference, and in particular, address the link of language and power (Burbules, 2000; Degener, 2001; DiAngelo, 2006; Ellsworth1994; Gore, 1993; Gur-Zeev, 2005; Yoon, 2005; Yosso, 2005). From this perspective, there is a need for theorists and practitioners of dialogic pedagogies to attend to what is developing in the field of ELL education and draw upon the relevant studies to inform its praxis of dialogic pedagogies.

How does dialogic pedagogy account for the needs of ELL students when theorizing about language and power?

This study has demonstrated that critical pedagogy as a form of dialogic pedagogy failed to account for the normalizing potentials of dialogue as a method of classroom instruction for ELL students. In particular, it failed to turn its critical gaze against itself, to realize that its own ideological assumptions are potentially fraught with treacherous ideological pitfalls and may create effects that are contradictory to what are originally intended for

ELL students. When teachers fail to reflect on how their ideology affects the lives of their students and constantly question whether or not their underlying assumptions are helpful or harmful to the reality of their lives, they more they perpetuate the oppressive structure that perpetuates the subordinated status of students who are not part of the dominant culture. Only when teachers reflect critically on their practices—that are aware of the political and cultural nature of their work—can they be on guard to ensure that their own cultural beliefs and values do not become oppressive to minority students who may have ideologies that differ from dominant values.

Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that critical pedagogy's approach signals a shift from the previous 'non-political' models of learning and brings us closer to addressing ELL students. Related to this vision of critical education is a pedagogy, or way of conceptualizing that teaching and learning experience, that relies on student and teacher dialogue to bring students to self-understanding, hopefully to a point where they can see through the ideological misrecognition in all forms of communication on their own (Apple, 2004; Freire, 1990; Freire, 1994; Giroux, 2004; hooks, 2003; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; McLaren, 2005; Kincheloe, 2008; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999). Through student and teacher dialogue, critical pedagogy encourages students to use the strategy of problem-posing to contest and interrogate their initial response to school curricula – embedded in the relationships of language and power and other oppressive, normalizing assumptions, which produce inequitable and unjust effects for those who have no voice. It invites them to take up multiple perspectives through classroom discussions that disrupt the taken-for-granted assumptions in any normalizing

education, hoping that in the process they will become aware of the power of dominant ideologies.

Despite the fact that critical pedagogy may not escape the normalizing and regulatory perils facing the traditional pedagogy, and despite what may seem like a retraction from many of the emancipatory promises that critical pedagogy seems to offer, we still can say that critical pedagogy as a field has contributed significantly to the theorizing of critical education. I have come to realize that what we do as teachers has an impact on our students, and what and how we learn has an impact on us. As teachers, we need to consciously view literacy or literacy instruction as a political act that can transform, reinforce or reconstruct the existing oppressive structure and judiciously exercise our responsibility.

My engagement with critical pedagogy has compelled me to adopt a more critical lens toward the teacher/student dialogue and its discursive effects for ELL students. Rather than simply accepting dialogue as an innocent instructional tool, I have started to interrogate the claims and assumptions of dialogic pedagogy. The challenges facing ELL students in mainstream classrooms expose the normalizing potential of dialogic pedagogies for ELL students. I realize that there is a need for critical educators to integrate ELL studies and dialogic pedagogies. Until concerted efforts are made across disciplines, we will continue to do a disservice to ELL students. Thus, my research suggests areas of interdisciplinary collaboration between ELL studies and critical pedagogy that we should explore further in a practical sense – in our rethinking about curricula and literacy approaches with ELL students.

As reflected in this study, a pedagogy that addresses cultural and linguistic diversity has not been readily explored within the literature of critical pedagogy. There is a need to expand the concept of literacy to track the literacy understandings of educators in mainstream classrooms in which linguistic and cultural diversities become normalizied, and promote discussion about literacy and classroom practices to address the special needs of ELL students.

By engaging the discourses of critical pedagogy, we were reminded that teachers could increase their resources for students, and in particular, for ELL students, and expand their understandings of rich literacy experiences that occur in the students' homes and communities (McKay, 2010; Yosso, 2005). From this perspective, a viable literacy approach that integrates critical pedagogy and ELL studies should place continued focus on the incorporation of students' home cultures and languages into the school curriculum. In a study that took place in a classroom with students from linguistically diverse backgrounds, Cummins, Bismilla, Chow, Giampapa, Cohen, Leoni, Sandhu and Sastri (2005) envisioned a classroom that teachers create environments that students are actively and critically engaged in language and literacy activities by taking into account how cultural assumptions and beliefs shape identity investment as a core component of learning. A classroom that takes the concept of cultural and linguistic diversity seriously would be a learning community in which parents and school faculty and staff closely collaborate with each other, thereby allowing teachers to draw from the students' prior experiences and interests. In such a learning environment, in-school literacies have a purpose beyond the classroom and students, including ELLs, enjoy a full range of

positive literacy experiences and are able to make text to text, text to self, and text to world connections.

How might taking into account the particular issues facing ELL students in the dialogic process help to inform a new understanding of dialogic pedagogy and perhaps a new practice of democratic pedagogy?

In looking for a pedagogical and literacy approach that takes into account the particular issues facing ELL students in the dialogic process, I actively seek to build culturally and linguistically diversified practices that will address ELL students within mainstream classrooms and beyond. Through the findings of my study, I realize that the mere recognition of the normalizing potential of dialogic pedagogy and other pedagogical practices for ELL students is not enough to be conducive toward this goal. As Bourdieu (1994) and many others have reiterated, a viable pedagogical approach must be not only critical of the constraining force of school structure, but also look for the productive force within the school community that addresses and empowers ELL students (Bourdieu, 1994; Ranciere, 1983; Lewis, 2009; Yosso, 2005). A viable pedagogical approach to address ELL students, hence, must actively approach linguistic/cultural diversity not as deficit, but as a vital source for learning, and actively seek its incorporation within the curriculum and school community.

This exploration takes as my point of departure the notion of multiliteracies – used to represent a multi-modal literacy approach to linguistic and cultural diversity in globalized societies (Albright, 2009; Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Holloway, 2004; Masney & Cole, 2009; Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003; Ryan, 2005). I

argue that this approach won't be meaningful unless it builds critical elements into it, that is, unless it enables all students in a linguistically and culturally diverse classroom to critically interrogate the power relations within the school structure and allow students to negotiate their identities in a historically constituted and socially contextualized world that gravitates towards the reproduction of power and privileges (Freire, 1990; Freire, 1994; Coffey; 2010; hooks, 2003; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Kincheloe, 2008; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999).

Multiliteracies. Borrowing a term that was originally coined by the New London Group (1996) and gaining recognition through authors such as Cummins (2006), Street (2005) and Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen (2003), I use it to capture the increasingly complex range of multimodal literacy approach in response to the multilingual and culturally diverse society that the United States has become (Albright, 2009; Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Holloway, 2004; Masney & Cole, 2009; Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003; Ryan, 2005). Due to the reality of migration, the linguistic reality today is complex. Though English remains to be the dominant, global language, the promotion of linguistic and cultural diversity is crucial to any serious attempt to realize a truly multicultural oriented education, which would equip students to develop a means of intercultural communication that fosters trust and yet at the same time addresses power imbalance between cultures (Cummins, 2007; Holloway, 2004; Schwarzer, 2001; Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003).

Multiliteracies understood in this sense challenges the notion of literacy that sees literacy as simply speaking, reading and writing in a monolingual setting (English in our

example), and argues that such notion of literacy cannot make sense of our lived experiences in a linguistically diverse society (Albright, 2009; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Masney & Cole, 2009; Ryan, 2005). As critical educators such as Freire (1994) and Shor (1999) emphasized, reading (and writing) is always with an understanding that is socially and culturally ascribed (Freire, 1990; Freire, 1994; Coffey, 2010; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999). In today's culturally and linguistically diversified world, different kinds of text require different backgrounds and skills if they are to be read and write critically and productively (Albright, 2009; Coffey, 2010; Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Holloway, 2004; Masney & Cole, 2009; Schwarzer, 2001; Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003; Shor, 1999; Ryan, 2005). Multiliteracies seek to incorporate the rich forms of students' cultural and linguistic capital into the curriculum and school communities, rather than focusing on a narrow range of monolingual, text-based literacies.

While in many schools, minority students' diverse cultural and linguistic capital might have been incorporated into extra-curricular and occasional curricular activities, such inclusion often amounts to no more than token representations of minority cultures, as a bland gesture of multiculturalism on the part of schools (Ryan, 2005; Taylor & Robinson, 2009). In the mainstream education, minority cultures/languages remain extraneous to content and skills development within the curriculum. To authentically address cultural and linguistic diversity within the school community, not only classroom environments need to validate cultural diversity (at least in terms of teacher attitudes and school climates), their home languages and literacies must be seen as vital funds of

knowledge and forms of literacy and incorporated into the formal/academic learning. In an article that calls for a pedagogy to foreground multiple voices and narratives, C. Jewitt (2008) described multiliteracies as:

> multiliteracies sets out to stretch literacy beyond the constraints of official standard forms of written and spoken language to connect with the culturally and linguistically diverse landscapes and the multimodal texts that are mobilized and circulate across these landscapes. Therefore, multiliteracies can be seen as a response to the remaking of the boundaries of literacy through current conditions of globalization and as a political and social theory for the redesign of the curriculum agenda (Jewitt, 2008; p. 245).

Multiliteracies, as a response to the globalized, linguistically and cultural diverse reality we inhabit, can be used to approach classroom instructions through students' linguistically and culturally situated practices within an inclusive classroom learning community in which linguistic and cultural diversities are respected (Albright, 2009; Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Holloway, 2004; Jewitt, 2008; Masney & Cole, 2009; Schwarzer, 2001; Ryan, 2005; Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003).

However, the adoption of multiliteracies is less meaningful if it does not also create enabling environments that allow students to develop critical consciousness and skills to recognize the power relations inherent in the curriculum and school structures, and empower them to renegotiate their identities within the dominant discourses (Freire, 1990; Freire, 1994; Coffey; 2010; hooks, 2003; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Kincheloe, 2008; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Ryan, 2005; Shor, 1999).

Multiliteracies and critical literacy. Multiliteracies must be critical literacy simultaneously. As described previously, critical literacy as a subgenre of critical pedagogy takes a questioning stance in reaction to texts, which involves the consideration of multiple perspectives. An approach of critical literacy that takes the critique of the post discourses seriously will recognize that identifying issues of conflict and power is fundamental to critical literacy. Critical literacy informed of post discourses' understanding of identity and power/knowledge involves the recognition of a struggle for power, and consequently enables the silenced voices and lived ELL experiences of students to be heard, provides spaces for ELL students to renegotiate their identities in the wake of the oppressive structure that they face in the mainstream culture, and helps shift the power balances within the school structure (Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; DiAngelo, 2006; Ellsworth1994; Gore, 1993; Gur-Zeev, 2005; Lather & Clemens, 2008; Yoon, 2005; Yosso, 2005).

As I have discussed previously, within the framework of critical pedagogy, multiliteracies in fact have been practiced by juxtaposing different viewpoints in search for the underlying ideological messages in text, exploring why certain perspectives are left out in text, etc. (Coffey, 2009; Degener, 2001; Shor, 1999; Van Duinen, 2005/2006; Wolk, 2003). At the core of critical pedagogy is the belief that the goal of classroom practices is empower students to understand how classroom teachings have influenced their understanding of the society. Through such awareness, critical pedagogy helps eliminate, to some extent, the disadvantages experienced by ELL students as a result of their lack of dominant cultural capital within specific cultural contexts (Coffey, 2009;

Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Degener, 2001; Shor, 1999; Van Duinen, 2005/2006; Wolk, 2003).

Such understood, critical pedagogy and multiliteracies must be integral to each other. A viable pedagogical approach successfully infusing the two must do more than urging teachers towards the inclusion of linguistic and cultural diversities beyond what is presented in traditional curriculum in mainstream classrooms. In addition, it must challenge teachers towards transforming the power relations at work through the practice of multiliteracies with students (Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Degener, 2001; Ryan, 2005; Yosso, 2005).

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings of this study, certain recommendations for future research should be considered. My aim in providing these recommendations is to propose future research that will further help us address the relationship of language and power facing ELL students in dialogic pedagogies in the era of globalized capitalism. Three areas of study warrant additional attention and research. Although each area of study has been tentatively identified and discussed in the chapters, targeted research may reveal how each area of study specifically impacts on ELL students in dialogic pedagogies. These areas include 1) incorporating studies that are set outside the U.S., 2) conducting studies that authorize ELL students' perspectives, and 3) comparing claims and assumptions of different formulations of dialogic pedagogy to build a fuller understanding of the notion of dialogic pedagogy.

The first recommendation is for researchers to follow up this study by

incorporating articles that were not set in the U.S. by using the same research design to conduct studies that better addresses the hegemonic effects of English as a global language. Such research will include and expand upon articles of dialogic pedagogy that were excluded from my data because they fell outside of the parameter of my research question. The expanded data is important in terms of addressing ELL students because it can further reveal the conditions facing ELL students in dialogic pedagogies as socially and historically constituted. Juxtaposing the proposed study with the current study can reveal different discursive formations within dialogic pedagogies and shed more light on the normalizing effects of the U.S. school system on ELL students. For example, Lavia (2006) employed a post colonial perspective to problematize the praxis of dialogic pedagogy in the context of the Caribbean. She argued that a historical narrative informed by post colonial theories can provide "some insight into the dilemmas and vicissitudes" of struggle through which the post-colonial Caribbean subjects have passed and continue to pass (Lavia, 2006, p. 285). Post-colonial studies like hers can be drawn upon by researchers to compare with the normalizing aspects of the education in the United States. Particularly, researchers can focus on how the hegemony of English and its effects on ELL students are manifested in acts of repression and moments of resistance in both contexts.

Such proposed study can also provide us with a perspective to scrutinize the notion of intercultural dialogue within mainstream classrooms in U.S. schools. Intercultural dialogue between the dominant group and who are considered to be oppressed may not be intended to be an equal exchange between participants but as a

process in which the superiority of the dominant culture was generated, established and reinstated over time. This partly explains why the establishment of a meaningful dialogue between 'unequal partners' in dialogic pedagogies has been, and still is, very challenging. Such unequal relations within mainstream classrooms highlight the importance to establish a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom culture in order for participants in dialogic pedagogies to question and negotiate the framework of communication (Bowers, 2008; Coloma, 2008; Peters, 2009; Viola, 2009).

The second recommendation is that researchers authorize the perspectives of ELL students within critical pedagogy in the context of mainstream classrooms. As reported in Chapter six, most of the articles in my data are teacher-centered, focusing on either the role of teachers' in implementing literacy strategies promoting dialogic pedagogies (n=96/127; 75%) (for example, see Allen and Rossatto, 2009; Apple, 2004; Braa and Callero, 2006; DeTurk, 2006; Keyes, 2009; Rodriguez, 2008; Stanley, 2007). A pedagogy that is mostly based on adults' ideas about the conceptualization and practice of education runs counter to the democratic claims of dialogic pedagogy to empower the oppressed. Authorizing student perspectives introduces into critical conversations the missing perspectives of ELL students whose views have been underrepresented within the literature of dialogic pedagogy. As discussed earlier, ELL students have a unique perspective on what happens in schools and classrooms and have a lot to contribute to the school community (DiAngelo, 2006; Yosso, 2005). Hence there is a need to take ELL students' perspective seriously and attend them as knowledgeable participants in classroom discussions. Conducting such studies may require different research design.

Mostly interview is the most appropriate avenue in collecting the data. Rigorous interview are feasible. These studies might make use of experimental designs to evaluate the kinds of insights and knowledge that are most likely to produce positive theorizations toward ELLs.

The third recommendation is to include other dialogic pedagogies other than critical pedagogy to expand the notion of dialogue. As was discussed earlier, critical pedagogy does not have a thematic treatment of dialogue and is not specific about how it can be implemented in classrooms. Within critical pedagogy, the notion of dialogue is largely locked into a variety of ideological frames, and its concept of dialogue pedagogy is limited. A fuller understanding of the notion of dialogue, one that recognizes and analyzes different conceptualizations of the term across epistemological and pedagogies boundaries is called for, such as Bakhtin's dialogism (1981), Lipman's community of inquiry (2003) and Noddings' ethics of care (1995). Only by brining in various formulations of dialogic pedagogies into contact with each other through a comprehensive dialogism, that one can compare claims and assumptions of different dialogic pedagogies and start to engage alterative way of seeing in our attempt to better address the needs of ELL students.

Recommendations for Practice

Based on the findings of this study, certain recommendations for changes in policy in school districts and in classroom practices should be considered.

School Policy. This study illustrates, though rather tentatively, that significant association exists between teachers' linguistic and cultural experiences and their attitude

toward ELL students. This study, through the data relating to Critical Race Theory and other discourses that challenge neo-Marxist critical pedagogy, shows that teachers who had personal experiences with languages other than English had greater sensitivity than other teachers to challenges facing ELL students and their willingness to adopt literacy strategies that they believe will address linguistic and cultural diversity (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Jennings, & Lynn, 2005; Ladson-Billings and Tate, 1995). A reasonable recommendation to districts is that they provide teacher professional development that focuses on raising teachers' awareness of the challenges facing ELL students and the conscious use of literacy strategies to the effect of promoting what are effective to address the special needs of ELL students in mainstream classrooms and on cultural responsiveness in general. Requiring teachers to acquire some level of foreign language fluency and a basic understanding of second language aquisition might result in increasing teachers' understanding of issues of linguistic and cultural diversity.

Furthermore, if the ability to speak another language has been found to be associated with positive attitudes toward speakers of other languages, school districts might wish to consider certain changes in their curriculum policies. In particular, they might want to consider including exposure to other languages in the school curriculum, through some degree of immersion to builds on the connection between foreign language instruction for native-born Americans and English-language instruction for ELL populations (i.e. Coltrane, 2003; Cummins, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Such a practice provides a positive view of ELL students whose cultures enrich the culture and intellectual life of the school community. By doing so, one helps promote the notion of

linguistic and cultural diversity as a norm of school culture rather than an exception.

Classroom Practices. As previously discussed, literacy involves not just learning how to speak, read and write in English, but a way of critically interacting with language (Coffey, 2010; Freire, 1993; Freire& Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999). There is not just one literacy, but many. Teachers need to use varied forms of presentation and encourage students to represent their knowledge and understanding in a variety of ways in order to respond effectively to linguistic and cultural diversity within the student population. Students, including both ELL students and native-born students, should be provided with opportunities to develop various kinds of literacy experience and learn how to use literacy to examine critically one's position in life in terms of socioeconomic status, educational background, gender and race (Coffey, 2010; Freire, 1993; Freire& Macedo, 1987; Giroux & McLaren, 1992; Shor, 1999). Such literacy practices will help students challenge the commonly held assumptions and beliefs and make personal connections (Coffey, 2010; Freire, 1993; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Shor, 1999).

Though it is as yet unclear what types of literacy strategies or practices would be most effective to facilitate a linguistically and culturally diverse environment and address issues of diversity and social justice, the following literacy practices are recommended based on the findings of this study.

Create a linguistically and culturally diverse classroom. Classroom environments have a significant effect on ELL students' literacy experience. Teacher beliefs and attitudes toward ELLs and other cultures can profoundly shape students' learning experience and affect their achievements. It is important to create climate of cultural

acceptance/respect that supports a linguistic and culturally diverse classroom. An important dimension of creating such an environment is to integrate, whenever possible, students' first languages, cultural beliefs, and values into all aspects of classroom life so that students feel positive about themselves as an integral part of the class. For example, a discussion about the global nationalist movement in the wake of the collapse of European imperialism in the 20th century can take advantage of students' linguistic and cultural knowledge of the nationalist struggles in their home countries.

Furthermore, there is considerable evidence that ELL students' literacy experience in their first language can be transferred to, and built upon to support, their learning in a second language (Coltrane, 2003; Cummins, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Thus, it is important to encourage students to use their background knowledge to interact with the texts in the school curriculum.

Use cooperative learning strategies. Cooperative learning groups can provide opportunities for ELL students to interact orally with their peers in a small, non-threatening, non-judgmental forum. Students can work in small groups, can talk in a more intimate setting than a large class discussion, and can work together to create a more comfortable environment (Peregoy and Boyle, 2005; Stevens & Slavin, 1995). They are able to ask questions they might be hesitant to pose in front of the whole class. Use bilingual students as peer can help emerging English language learners to understand key concepts of a topic in their first languages. Research studies indicate that the use of carefully structured learning groups has many positive outcomes in terms of academic achievement, communication skills, race relations, the development of socially

responsible and cooperative behavior and attitudes (Peregoy and Boyle, 2005; Stevens & Slavin, 1995).

Promote multiliteracies and critical literacies. Multiliteracies refer to the range of ways which allow the processes of meaning making to be supported by their context (Albright, 2009; Holloway, 2004; Jewitt, 2008; Masney & Cole, 2009; Ryan, 2005). Students and particularly ELL students rely on contextual prop such as the use of visual support of all kinds. It allows the meaning of the text to be distributed in various ways and become more accessible to ELL students. Using accessible, interesting alternative texts, teachers can encourage more students (and this would include ELL students) to participate in conversations about social issues that have been stifled by sterile reading material contained in textbooks (Coffey, 2009).

In addition to use alternative texts, students should be given opportunities to create their counter discourse. This study shows that some literacy strategies or practices promoted by critical educators such as creating counter discourses to the school curriculum are effective in addressing some of the special needs of ELL students (Coffey, 2009; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Van Duinen, 2005/2006; Wolk, 2003). Students should be encouraged to experiment with various forms of media to represent their understanding. Such literacy practice provides students opportunities to speak from the point of view of those voices that are often silenced or marginalized, thereby empowering them (Coffey, 2009; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Van Duinen, 2005/2006; Wolk, 2003). This literacy approach to curriculum can serve to validate the thoughts and feelings of underrepresented groups such as ELL students.

As an example of using and creating alternative texts, in a unit lesson on World War that I taught in a global studies class, I designed a collaborative learning project in which students worked in small groups to write a screen play about the causes of World War I and produced a puppet show to demonstrate how nationalist claims and imperialist expansion clashed in World War I. Previously I supplemented the textbook with multiple texts which included visual supports such as pictures and video presentations to contextualize students' understanding of the topic. Students were encouraged to research the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand on their own and if they choose, in their first languages. (Computers were used in classrooms to facilitate this activity). As a process of formative evaluation, I asked students to produce a counter text in which they recreated the story from a 'what if' point of view. This project drew upon the diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds of the students and allowed them to create a 'common language' for the students to represent their understanding of the topic. Instead of focusing on literacy in a technical and normalizing sense, such approach allows student choice in actively engaging in cultural studies while providing ways for ELL students to participate in classroom discussions in the 'language' of their own choice.

Concluding Remarks

The significance of critical understandings of language and power/knowledge lies in the implications for understanding empowerment and identity investment in ELL students' trajectories of learning (Coloma, 2008; Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Degener, 2001; Leonardo, 2002; Yoon, 2005; Yosso, 2005). From this perspective, a critical pedagogy that aims for ELL students' empowerment can only take place in a

classroom of multiliteracies that take linguistic and cultural diversity seriously. To facilitate empowering ELL students, critical pedagogy must involve a process of redefining the mainstream curricula by developing learning activities that locate non-dominant or oppressed "funds of knowledge" as central to the learning of ELL students. Such understanding has been introduced into theorization of second language education by critical educators working in the field of ESL education, such as Luke (2004) and Norton & Toohey (2004), but remains to be incorporated within the context of general education/the mainstream classrooms.

As was mentioned earlier, the inclusion of diverse learners' funds of cultural and linguistic knowledge is often extraneous to content and skills development within the school curriculum. There is a need to incorporate students' local knowledge into the formal learning in such a way that ELL students' cultural and linguistic capital will be recognized and asserted as vital funds of knowledge and forms of literacy. This may open up alternative forms of classroom communication in which ELL students are positioned as subjects rather than objects. In this sense, the rich funds of ELL students' cultural and linguistic capitals may participate in the development of multiliteracies in the school community, which will benefit all students in their adaptation to an ever diversified society (Albright, 2009; Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Holloway, 2004; Jewitt, 2008; Masney & Cole, 2009; Schwarzer, 2001; Schwarzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003; Ryan, 2005).

Mainstream educators must begin to explore ways to link cultural and linguistic capital of minority students with curriculum. By incorporating multiliteracies into

mainstream classrooms, mainstream teachers will help create learning environments in which multiple voices and narratives are foregrounded, and give space for informed critique and knowledge construction (Coloma, 2008; Cummins, 2007; Cumming-Potvin, 2007; Degener, 2001; Leonardo, 2002; Yoon, 2005; Yosso, 2005). Such multiliteracies approach enacts emancipation for ELL students by enabling the silenced voices and lived experiences of ELL students to be heard and to begin accounting for and "naming their own worlds" (Freire and Macedo, 1987).

References

Abedi, J., Lord, C., Hofstetter, C., & Baker, E. (2000). Impact of accommodation strategies on English language learners' test performance. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 19*(3), 16-26.

Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher, 33*, 4-14.

Abedi, J., Hofstetter, C., & Lord, C. (2004). Assessment accommodations for English language learners: Implications for policy-based empirical research. *Review of Educational Research*, 74 (1), 1–28.

Abrahams, F. (2005). Critical pedagogy in the community music education. *International Journal of Community Music*.

Ada, A. F. (2007). Feature Articles: Theory, research, policy, and practice. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 6*(2), 103-118.

Agnello, M. F. (2007). Public understanding to political voice: action research and generative curricular practices in issues and reform. *The social Studies*, 217-225.

Ahmad, M. Y. S. I. (2010). Making social studies meaningful for ELL students: Content and pedagogy in mainstream secondary school classrooms [Electronic Version].

Ainley, P., and, Canaan, Joyce E. (2005). Critical hope in English higher education today, constraints and possibilities in two new universities. *Teaching in Higher Education, 10*(4), 435-446.

Ajayi, L. J. (2005). A sociocultural perspective: Language arts framework, vocabulary activities and English language learners in a second grade mixed classroom.

Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32(3), 180-195.

Akbari, R. (2008). Education is filled with politics. *ELT Journal 62/3*, 292-293.

Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: Introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal, 62*(3), 276-284.

Albright, J., Walsh, C., and Purohit, K. D. (2009). Towards a theory of practice: Critical transdisciplinary multiliteracies. In D. M. V. E. McInerney, Shawn and Dowson, Martin (Ed.), *Standards In Education* (pp. 93-116): Information Age Publishers.

Alexander, R. (2005). Culture, dialogue and learning; Notes on an emerging pedagogy. paper presented at the Education, Culture and Cognition: Intervening for Growth, 10th international conference, University of Durham, UK

Allen, R. L. (2004). Whiteness and critical Pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 121-137.

Allen, R. L., and Rossatto, Cesar Augusto. (2009). Does critical pedagogy work with privileged students? *Teacher Education Quarterly, Winter* (163-179).

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and state apparatuses. In L. Althusser (Ed.), *Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: New Left Books.

Amsler, S., Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., Motto, S., and Singh, G. (2010). C-SAP critical pedagogy/popular education group. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 11-15): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Amsler, S. S. (2010). Education as a critical practice. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E.,

Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 20-23): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Apple, M. (1999). Rhetorical reforms: Markets, standards and inequality. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 1*(2), 6-18.

Apple, M. W. (2004). Creating difference: Neo-Liberalism, Neo-Conservatism and the politics of educational reform. *Educational Policy, 18*(1), 12-44.

Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum (2nd.)*: New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and power (2nd.)*: New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2005). Making critical pedagogy strategic - on doing critical educational work in conservative times. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 95-113): University of Haifa.

Arber, R. (2000). Defining positioning within politics of difference: negotiating spaces `in between.' *Race Ethnicity and Education, 3*(1), 45-63.

Arce, J. (2004). Latino bilingual teachers: the struggle to sustain an emancipatory pedagogy in public schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*(2), 227-247.

Ardizzone, L. (2007). Listening to youth voices; activism and critical pedagogy. In R. Goldstein (Ed.), *Useful Theory: Making Critical Education Practical* (pp. 49-63):

Peter Lang.

Armstrong, P. (2005). Satire as critical pedagogy. Paper presented at the *'What a Difference a Pedagogy Makes: Researching Lifelong Learning and Teaching'*, Third International Conference on Research in Lifelong Learning, Stirling.

Au, W. (2006). Against economic determinism: Revisiting the roots of neo-Marxism in critical educational theory. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 4*(2), 11-35.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL QUARTERLY 27*(1), 1-18.

Auerbach, E. R. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and Inequality in Language Education*: Cambridge University Press.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Ed.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

August, D., and Shanahan, Timothy (Ed.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language minority children and youth.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ayers, W., Michie, G., & Rome, A. (2004). Embers of hope: In search of a meaningful critical pedagogy. *Teacher Education Quarterly, winter*, 123-130.

Baker, B. (2005). State-formation, teaching techniques, and globalization as aporia. *Discourses: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26*(1), 45-77.

Bakhtin, M. (1941). *Rabelais and his world*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas.

Banks, O. C. (2010). Critical postcolonial dance pedagogy: The relevance of West African dance education in the United States. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 41*(1), 18-34.

Barrett, M. J. (2005). Making (some) sense of feminist post-structuralism in environmental education research and practice. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 10*(Spring), 79-93.

Bartlett, L. (2005). Dialogue, knowledge, and teacher-student relations: Freirean pedagogy in theory and practice. *Comparative Education Review, 49*(3), 344-364.

Bartolome, L. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(1), 97-122.

Bartolome, L. I. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64*(2), 173-194.

Barton, A. C. (2001). Capitalism, critical pedagogy and urban science education. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38*(8), 847-859.

Bashyal, G. P. (2007). Reflection and critical pedagogy. *Journal of NELTA, 12*(1&2), 24-26.

Bayne, G. U. (2009). Joe L. Kincheloe: Embracing criticality in science education. *Cultural Study of Science Education 4*, 559-567.

Beaubouef-Lafontant, T. (1999). A movement against and beyond boundaries: Politically relevant teaching among African-American teachers. *Teachers College Record*

100(4), 702-723.

Belanger, K. (2001). Social justice in education for undocumented families. *Journal of Family Social Work, 6*(4), 61-73.

Bell, A., & Russell, C. (2000). Beyond human, beyond words: Anthropocentrism, critical pedagogy, and the poststructuralist turn. *Canadian Journal of Education. 25*(3), 188-203.

Berry, K. (2007). Locations (or not) of critical pedagogy in *Les Petites et les Grandes Histoires*. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 79-96): Peter Lang.

Biesta, G. (2005). What can critical pedagogy learn from postmodernism? - Further reflections on the impossible future of critical pedagogy. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 143-159): University of Haifa.

Biesta, G. J. J. (1995). From manipulation to communication: communicative pedagogy and the postmodern crisis of the subject. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research association, San Francisco, CA.

Bingham, C. (2002). On Paulo Freire's debt to psychoanalysis: Authority on the side of freedom. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*, 447-464.

Blackledge, A., and A. Pavlenko. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *The International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*(3), 243-257.

Borjas, G. J. (2006). Making it in America: Social mobility in the immigrant population. *The Future of Children, 16*(2), 55-71.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (R. Nice, Trans.): Sage Publications, London.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1979). *The inheritors: French students and their relations to culture*: University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*: Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Language & symbolic power*. Cambrige, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bowers, C. A. (2007). A response to McLaren's revisionist interpretation of Freire. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism, 18*(1), 109-119.

Bowers, C. A. (2008). Why a critical pedagogy of place is an oxymoron. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 325-335.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: educational reform and the contradictions of economic life (1st ed.)*. New York: Basic Books.

Braa, D., and Callero, P. (2006). Critical pedagogy and classroom praxis. *Teaching Sociology, 34*, 357-369.

Bradley, J. (1993). Methodological issues and practices in qualitative research. *Library Quarterly, 63*(4), 431-449.

Breault, R. A. (2003). Dewey, Freire, the pedagogy of the Oppressor? *Multicultural Education* (Spring).

Breuing, M. (2009). Teaching for and about critical pedagogy in the post-secondary classroom. *Studies in Social Justice, 3*(2), 247-262.

Breuing, M. (2011). Problematizing critical pedagogy. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3*(3), 2-23.

Breunig, M. (2005). Turning experiential education and critical pedagogy theory into praxis. *Journal of Experiential Education, 28*(2), 106-122.

Brito, I., Ambrizeth Lima, and Elsa Auerbach. (2004). The logic of nonstandard teaching: A course in Cape Verdean language, culture, and history In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 181-200): Cambridge University Press.

Brizic, K. (2006). The secret life of language. Origin-specific differences in L1/L2 acquisition by immigrant children. *International Journal of applied Linguistics, 16*(3), 339-362.

Brody, H.S., Ennis, R. H. & Krimerman, L.I. (1973). *Philosophy of educational research*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Chap. 5, pp. 271-79; Ch. 8.

Bronte, Charlotte. (2009). *Jane Eyre*. Wilder Publications.

Bromley, H. (1989). Identity politics and critical pedagogy. *Educational Theory, 39*(3), 207-223.

Browne, C. (2007). *East Van television: Creating a critical pedagogy to explore citizenship and community video.* Simon Fraser University.

Brun, H., Forman, L., and Brodsky, H. (2004). *Global history and geography: The growth of civilizations*: Amsco.

Bruna, K. R., and Chamberlin, Dennis. (2008). Illuminated by the shadow: U.S.-Mexico schooling and pedagogies of place. *Multicultural Perspectives, 10*(3), 123-132.

Brydon, D. (2004). Cross-talk, postcolonial pedagogy, and transnational literacy. *Situation Analysis, 4*, 70-87.

Brydon, D. (2004). Post-colonialism now: Autonomy, cosmopolitanism, and diaspora. *http://www.globalautonomy.ca/global1/article.jsp?index=.*

Brydon, D. (2010). Critical literacies for globalizing times. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices 4*(2), 16-28.

Bulter, J. (2010). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist Theory. In C. M. S. Kim (Ed.), *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives* (pp. 419-430). New York: Routledge.

Burbules, N. (2000). The limits of dialogue as a critical pedagogy. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Revolutionary Pedagogies: Cultural Politics, Instituting Education, and the Discourse of Theory* (pp. 251-271): Psychology Press.

Burbules, N., & (1993). The dialogical relation. In *Dialogue in Teaching* (pp. 19-49).

Burbules, N. C. (1993). *Dialogue in Teaching: Theory and Practice*. New York: Teachers College.

Burbules, N. C. (2005). Dialogue and critical pedagogy. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a New Critical Language in Education* (pp. 193-201): University of Haifa.

Butler, J. (2004). Violence, mourning, Politics. In *Id., Precarious Life. The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso.

Butte, S. (2010). Freire, informal education as protest. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 8*(1), 151-180.

Cahill, C. (2007). The personal is political: developing new subjectivities through participatory action research. *Gender, Place and Culture, 14*(3), 267-292.

Calderon, J. (2003). Partnership in teaching and learning: Combining the practice of critical pedagogy with civic engagement and diversity. *Peer Review (AAC&U), Spring*, 22-24.

Canaan, J. E. (2010). Introduction to "Why critical pedagogy and popular education matter today". In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 5-10): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the 'native speaker fallacy': Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2000). Negotiating ideologies through English: Strategies from the periphery. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies* (pp. 121-132). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of world English in composition: Pluralization continued. *CCC 57*(4), 586-619.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses, and critical learning In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 116-137): Cambridge University Press.

Cannella, G. S. (1997). *Deconstructing early childhood education: Social justice and*

revolution. New York: Peter Lang.

Carabine, J. (2001). Unmarried motherhood 1830-1990: A genealogical analysis. In M. Wetherell, and Taylor, S., and Yates, S. (Ed.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*. London: Sage.

Carlo, M., Augustus, D., McLaughlin, B. et al. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs of English language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*(2), 188-215.

Carnoy, M. (1982). Education, economy, and the state. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education: Essays on Class, Ideology and the State* (pp. 79-126). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Carr, P. R. (2010). Re-thinking normative democracy and the political economy of education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 18*(1).

Casey, K. (1993). *I answer with my life: Life histories of women teachers working for social change*. New York: Routledge.

Chan-Tiberghien, J. (2004). Towards a 'global educational justice' research paradigm: cognitive justice, decolonizing methodologies and critical pedagogy. *Globalization, Societies and Education, 2*(2), 191- 214.

Chapman, V.-L. (2004). Using critical personal narratives: A post-structural perspective on practice. In R. S. Clair, and Sandlin, Jennifer A. (Ed.), *Promoting Critical Practice in Adult Education* Jossey-Bass.

Chege, M. (2009). Literacy and hegemony: Critical pedagogy vis-à-vis contending paradigms. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*

21(2), 228-238.

Chen, H.-J. (2005). The rationale for critical pedagogy in facilitating cultural identity

    development. In *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue* (pp. 11-22): Information

    Age Publishing.

Chen, X. (1994). Reading mother's tale-reconstructing women's space in Amy Tan and

    Zhang Jie. *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, and Reviews, 16*, 111-132.

Choules, K. (2007). Social change education: Context matters. *Adult Education

    Quarterly*(February), 159-177.

Clark, C. (2005). Diversity initiatives in higher education: Intergroup dialogue as

    pedagogy across the curriculum". *Multicultural Education, 12*(3).

Coffey, H. (2010). Critical literacy. *http://www.learnnc.org/lp/pages/4437?style=print*.

Coldblatt, P. (2004). School is still the place: stories of immigration and education.

    Multicultural Review (Spring), 49-54.

Collet, B. A. (2007). Islam, National identity and public secondary education:

    perspectives from the Somali diaspora in Toronto, Canada. *Race Ethnicity and

    Education, 10*(2), 131-153.

Collier, V., & Thomas Wayne. (1989). How quickly can immigrants become proficient in

    school English? *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students,

    5*, 26-38.

Collins, R., and Makowsky, M. (1993). *The discovery of society*: New York: McGraw-

    Hills.

Coloma, R. S. (2008). All immigrants are Mexicans, only Blacks are minorities, but some

of us are brave: Race, multiculturalism, and postcolonial studies in U.S. Education. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing 24*(1), 32-46.

Colwell, R. (2005). Taking the temperature of critical pedagogy. *VRME Special Edition, http://www.rider.edu/~vrme*.

Constantino, R. (1994). A study concerning instruction of ESL students comparing all-English classroom teacher knowledge and English as a second language teacher knowledge. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 13*, 37-57.

Cook-Sather, A. (2007). Resisting the impositional potential of student voice work: Lessons for liberatory educational research from poststructuralist feminist critiques of critical pedagogy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28*(3), 389-403.

Cowden, S. (2010). The moment of critical pedagogy. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 24-27): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Crawford, James. (1987). Bilingual education: Language, learning, and polities. *Education Week.* April. pp. 19-50.

Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice* (4th ed. ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.

Crawford, J. (1999). What now for bilingual education? *Rethinking Schools, 13*(2).

Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom*

(5th ed). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crowther, J. (2010). Why critical pedagogy and popular education matter. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 16-19): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Cruddas, L. (2007). Engaged voices - dialogic interaction and the construction of shared social meanings. *Educational Action Research, 15*(3), 479-488.

Crystal, D. (1997, 2003). *English as a global language*: The University of Cambridge.

Culpan, I., and Bruce, Judy. (2007). New Zealand physical education and critical pedagogy: Refocusing the curriculum. *International Journal of Sports and Health Science, 5*, 1-11.

Cumming-Potvin, W. (2007). Scaffolding, multiliteracies, and reading circles *Cacadian Journal of Education 30*(2), 483-507.

Cummins, J. (2000). Beyond adversarial discourse: Searching for common ground in the education of bilingual students. . In C. J. O. P. Mclaren (Ed.), *The Politics of Multiculturalism and Bilingual Education: Students and Teachers Caught in the Cross Fire* (pp. 126-148). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, & pedagogy: Bilingual children caught in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (2007). Promoting literacy in multilingual contexts. *What works? Research*

into Practice, 1-4.

Cummins, J. (2009). Pedagogies of choice: challenging coercive relations of power in classrooms and communities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(3), 261-271.

Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Giampapa, F., Cohen, S., Leoni, L., Sandhu, P. and Sastri, P. (2005). Affirming Identity in Multilingual Classrooms, *Educational Leadership*, 63 (1), 38-43.

Cutler, A. (2010). In the age of stupid: A call for popular education and critical pedagogy both inside and outside the university. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 48-56): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Daniel, B.-J. D. (2009). Conversations on race in teacher education cohorts. *Teaching Education, 20*(2), 175-188.

David, C., and Kienzler, Donna. (1999). Towards an emancipatory pedagogy in service courses and user departments. *Technical communication quarterly, 8*(3), 263-283.

Davidson, C. (2008). *Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: Bridging the gap.* Paper presented at the European Council of International Schools Conference, Geneva.

Davidson, Donald. (1980). *Essays on actions and events*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Davies, B., and R. Harre´. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20*(1), 43-63.

Davies, B. (2008). *A body of writing*. Oxford: Rowan & Littlefield.

Degener, S. C. (2001). Making sense of critical pedagogy in adult literacy education. In *Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy* (pp. 26-62).

Delgado, R. (1997). Rodrigo's fifteenth chronicle: racial mixture, Latino-critical scholarship, and the Black-White binary. Texas Law Review, 75, 1181-1201.

Denzin, N. K. (2003). Performing [auto] ethnography politically. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 25*, 257-278.

Denzin, N. K. (2007). The politics and ethic of performance pedagogy. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* : Peter Lang.

Denzin, N. K. (2009). A critical performance pedagogy that matters. *Ethnography and Education, 4*(3), 255-270.

Derrida, J. (1967/77). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore/London.

Derrida, J. (1978/1981). *Writing and difference*: London/Henley.

DeTurk, S. (2006). The power of dialogue: Consequences of intergroup dialogue and their Implications for agency and alliance building. *Communication Quarterly, 54*(1), 33-51.

DeVriese. (2008). *Lessons from the classroom: Renegotiating critical and feminist pedagogy in the Middle East.* Paper presented at the APSA TLC Conference.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*: New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience & education*: New York, NY: Touchstone.

DiAngelo, R. J. (2006). The production of Whiteness in education: Asian international students in a college classroom. *Teachers College Record 108*(10), 1983-2000.

Dillabough, J.-A. (2002). Dialogue: The "hidden injuries" of critical pedagogy. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32*(2), 203-215.

Domine, V. (2007). "Doing technology" in the classroom: Media literacy as critical pedagogy. In R. Goldstein (Ed.), *Useful Theory: Making Critical Education practical*: Peter Lang.

Dotson-Blake, K. P., Foster, Victoria A., and Gressard, Charles F. (2009). Ending the silence of the Mexican immigrant voice in public education: Creating cultural inclusive family-school-community partnerships. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(3), 230-239.

Doughty, H. A. (2008). Book review: Peter McLaren: Capitalism & conquerors: A critical pedagogy against empire. *The Innovation Journal: The public Sector Innovation journal 13*(2), 1-5.

Drainville, A. C. (2003). Critical pedagogy for the present moment: Learning from the avant-garde to teach globalization from experience. *International Studies Perspectives, 4*, 231-249.

Duarte, E. (2006). Critical pedagogy and the praxis of worldly philosophy. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 40*(1), 105-115.

Duarte, E. M. (2005). Learning as freedom - the letting be of learning together. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 317-328): University of Haifa.

Duncan-Andrade, J., and Morrell, E. (2007). Critical pedagogy and popular culture in an urban secondary English classroom. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.),

Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now? : Peter Lang.

Duncan-Andrade, J., and Morrell, E. (2008). Contemporary developers of critical

pedagogy. In *The Art of Critical Pedagogy: Possibilities for Moving from Theory*

to Practice in Urban Schools (pp. 23-49): Peter Lang.

Dunn, R., Griggs, Shirley A., and Price, Gary E. (1993). Learning styles of Mexican

American and Anglo-American elementary school students. *Journal of*

Multicultural Counseling & Development, 21(4), 237-247.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. New York: Routledge.

Elliot, D. J. (2007). Puerto Rico: A site of critical performative pedagogy. *Action,*

Criticism, and Theory for Music Education Electronic Article, 6(1), 2-23.

Ellison, S. (2009). On the poverty of philosophy: The metaphysics of McLaren's

"Revolutionary critical pedagogy". *Educational Theory 59*(3), 327-351.

Ellsworth, E. (1994). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive

myths of critical pedagogy? In *The Education feminism reader* (Vol. 300-327):

Routledge.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching position: differences, pedagogy and the power of address*.

New York: Teacher College Press.

Endres, B. (2002). Critical pedagogy and liberal education: Reconciling tradition, critique,

and democracy. *Philosophy of Education*, 59-68.

Erevelles, N. (2005). Rewriting critical pedagogy from the periphery: Materiality,

disability, and the politics of schooling. In S. L. Gabel (Ed.), *Disability Studies in*

Education: Reading in Theory & Method Peter Lang.

Errington, J. (2008). *Linguistics in a colonial world: A story of language, meaning, and power*. Malden, MA, Oxford, and Carleton, Victoria: Blackwell.

Escort. (2001). The Help! Kit: A resource guide for secondary teachers of migrant English language learners. *www.escort.org*.

Evans, R. W. (2008). The (unfulfilled) promise of critical pedagogy. *Journal of Social Studies, 3*(2), 16-25.

Exposito, S., and Favela, Alejandra. (2003). Reflective voices: Valuing immigrant students and teaching with ideological clarity. *The Urban Review, 35*(1), 73-90.

Fairbanks, C. M., & Ariail, M. (2006). The role of cultural resources in literacy and schooling: Three contrasting case studies. *Research in the Teaching of English, 40*(3), 310-354.

Fairclough, N. (1989/2001). *Language and power.* London: Pearson Education.

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

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In T. M. Wetherell, S., and Yates, S. (Ed.), *Discourse as data*. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.

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

Farahmandpur, R. (2005). The revolutionary critical pedagogy of Peter McLaren. In M.

Pruyn, Chalres, L., M. H. (Ed.), *Teaching Peter McLaren: Paths of Dissent* (Vol. 126-146): Peter Lang.

Farralelli, M. (2009). Using a critical literacy approach in the EFL class. *Journal of NELTA, 14*(1-2), 28-33.

Fassbinder, S. D. A review of critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, and planetary crisis. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 8*(1), 461-484.

Fecho, B., & Botzakis, Stergios. (2007). Feasts of becoming: imagining a literacy classroom based on dialogic beliefs. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50*(7), 548-558.

Feigenbaum, A. (2007). The teachable moment: feminist pedagogy and the neoliberal classroom. *The review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 29*, 337-349.

Fiedler, M. (2007). Postcolonial learning spaces for global citizenship. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 50-57.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Flores-Koulish, S. A. (1006). Media literacy: An entree for pre-service teachers into critical pedagogy. *Teaching Education, 17*(3), 239-249.

Fobes, C., and Kaufman, P. (2008). Critical pedagogy in the sociology classroom: challenges and concerts. *Teaching Sociology, 36*(1), 26-33.

Foucault, M. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (2002). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of*

Whiteness. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Fredricks, L. (2007). A rationale for critical pedagogy in EFL: The case of Tajikistan. *The Reading Matrix, 7*(2), 22-28.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Herder and Herder.

Freire, P. (1986). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*: New York: Continuum.

Freire, P., and Donald Macedo (1987). *Literacy: reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of the oppressed (20th anniversary edition)*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage* (P. Clarke, Trans.). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc

Gadamer, H. (1975). *Truth and method*. New York: Crossroad.

Gale, T. (2001). Critical policy sociology: historiography, archaeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(5), 378-393.

Gallagher, K., and Lortie, P. (2005). How does knowing my business make you any safer?: critical pedagogy in Dangerous Times. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 27*, 141-158.

Garcia, O., Kleifgen, J. A., and Falchi, l. (2008). *From English language learners to emergent bilinguals: Equity perspective*: Teachers College: Columbia University.

Garcia-Moriyon, F., Rebollo, I., and Colom, R. (2005). Evaluating philosophy for

children: A meta-analysis. *Thinking: the Journal of Philosophy for Children, 17*(4), 14-22.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Ghahremani-Ghajar, S., and Mirhosseini, Seyyed Abdolhamid. (2005). English class or speaking about everything class? Dialogue journal writing as a critical EFL literacy practice in an Iranian high school. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 18*(3), 286-300.

Gibboney, R. A. (1994). *The stone trumpet: A story of practical school reform*: SUNY Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education*: New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings*: Boulder, CO. Westview.

Giroux, H. A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: theory, culture, and schooling: a critical reader.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). Critical pedagogy and the postmodern/modern divide: Towards a pedagogy of democratization. *Teacher Education Quarterly*.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). Public pedagogy and the Politics of Neo-Liberalism: Making the political more pedagogical. *Policy Futures in Education, 2*(3 & 4), 494-503.

Giroux, H. A. (2006). Academic freedom under fire: The case for critical pedagogy. *College Literature, 33*(4), 1-43.

Giroux, A. H. (2009). Education and the crisis of youth: Schooling and the promise of democracy. *The Educational Forum, 73*, 8-16.

Giroux, H. A. (2010). Bare pedagogy and the scourge of Neoliberalism: Rethinking
    higher education as a democratic public sphere. *The Educational Forum, 74*, 184-
    196.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1992). America 2000 and the politics of erasure: Democracy
    and cultural difference under siege. *The International Journal of Educational
    Reform 1*(2), 99-110.

Giroux, H., and McLaren, P. (1989). Introduction: Schooling, cultural politics and the
    struggle for democracy. In H. Giroux, and McLaren, P. (Ed.), *Schooling, Cultural
    Politics and the Struggle for Democracy* (pp. xi-xxxv): State University of New
    York, Albany.

Glass, R. D. (2001). On Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and the foundations of
    liberation education. *Educational Researcher*. 30 (2), 15–25

Glazer, N. (1998). Pluralism and the new immigrants. *Society*, 232-238.

Gleason, M. (1999). *Normalizing the ideal: Psychology, schooling and the family in
    postwar*. Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gleason, M. (1999). "They had a bad effect": Crime comics, parliament and the
    hegemony of the middle class in postwar Canada. . In J. A. Lent (Ed.), *Pulp
    Demons: International Dimensions of the Postwar Anti-Comics Campaign* (pp.
    129-153). Madison: Fairleagh Associated University Press.

Goldstein, R. (2007). It is a conceptual thing: Learning to live critical pedagogy. In R.
    Goldstein (Ed.), *Useful Theory: Making Critical Education Practical*: Peter Lang.

Goldstein, R. (2007). The perilous pitfalls of praxis: Critical pedagogy as "Regime of

Truth". In R. Goldstein (Ed.), *Useful Theory: Making Critical Education Practical*: Peter Lang.

Goldstein, T. (2004). Performed ethnography for critical language teacher education. In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* Cambridge University Press.

Goodburn, A., and Ina, B. (1994). Collaboration, critical pedagogy, and struggles over difference. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 14*(1), 131-147.

Goodman, G. S. (2008). Coming to a critical constructivism: Roots and branches. In *Educational Psychology: An Application of Critical Constructionism* Peter Lang.

Goodman, M. L. (2008). "Did Ronald McDonald also tend to scare you as a child?": Working to emplace consumption, commodities and citizen-students in a large classroom setting. *Journal for Geography in Higher Education, 32*(3), 365-386.

Gore, J. (1988). On the limits to empowerment through critical and feminist pedagogies. In M. W. Apple, and Carlson, D. (Ed.), *Power/knowledge/pedagogy: The Meaning of Democratic Education in Unsettling Times* (pp. 271-288): Westview Press.

Gore, J. M. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. New York: Routledge.

Graham, M. A. (2007). Art, ecology and art education: Locating art education in a critical place-based pedagogy. *Studies in Art Education, 48*(4), 375-391.

Gramsci, A. (1982). *Selections from the prison books*: Lawrence and Wishart.

Grant, R. A., Wong, S., D., and Osterling, J. P. (2007). Developing literacy in second

language learners: Critique from a heteroglossic, sociocultural, and multidimensional framework. Essay book review: Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language minority children and youth. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(4), 598–609.

Grant, S., and Hurd. (2010). Incorporating critical pedagogy into the scholarship of teaching and learning: Making the journey alongside our students. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 4*(2), 1-12.

Granziano, K. j. (2008). Walk the talk: Connecting critical pedagogy and practice in teacher education. *Teaching Education, 19*(2), 153-163.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing imagination*: New York: Jossey-Bass.

Gregorcic, M. (2009). Cultural capital and innovative pedagogy: a case study among indigenous communities in Mexico and Honduras. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 46*(4), 357-366.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher, 32*(4), 3-12.

Gruschka, A. (2005). Critical pedagogy after Adorno. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 241-260): University of Haifa.

Guilhenme, M. (2006). Is there a role for critical pedagogy in language/culture studies? An interview with Henry A. Giroux. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 6*(2), 163-176.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2004). Beyond postmodern feminist critical pedagogy: Toward a diasporic philosophy of counter-education. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical theory and critical pedagogy today*: http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~ilangz/feministpeda91.pdf.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2005). Beyond postmodern feminist critical pedagogy - Toward a diasporic philosophy of counter-education. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 160-192): University of Haifa.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2005). Feminist critical pedagogy and critical theory today. *Journal of Thought* (Summer), 55-73.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests* (J. J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston: Beacon.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, Vol. 1: Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language* New York: Basic Books.

Hakuta, K., & Beatty, A. (Ed.). (2000). *Testing English-language learners in U.S. schools*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Handsfield, L. J. (2005, April). *Reconciling Bourdieu's reflexive sociology and narrative inquiry: Examining researcher and participant performances of race and ethnicity.* Paper presented at the Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Haneda, M., and Wells, G. (22008). Learning an additional language through dialogic inquiry. *Language and Education, 22*(2), 114-136.

Hanisch, C. (1969). The personal is political.

Hansen, M. (2006). *Polis: An introduction to the ancient Greek city-state*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hansen-Thomas, H. (2008). Sheltered instruction: Best practices for ELLs in the Mainstream. *KAPPA DELTA PI RECORD* 165-170.

Haque, E. (2007). Critical pedagogy in English for academic purposes and the possibility for 'tactics' of resistance. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 15*(1), 83-106.

Hargreaves, A., Margarida Fernandes and Maree Dinanthompson. (2003). Big change question: does critical theory have any practical value for educational change? *Journal of Educational Change 4*, 181-193.

Harkin, J. (1998). In defense of the modernist project in education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 46*(4), 428-439.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of Neoliberalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press

Haynes, J. (2005). Challenges for ELLs in content area learning. Presented at the *2003 TESOL Annual Convention*, Baltimore, MD.

Heilman, E. E. (2005). Escaping the bind between utopia and dystopia - Utopic critical pedagogy of identity and embodied practice. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 114-142): University of Haifa.

Henry, A. (1998). *Taking back Control: African Canadian women teachers' lives and practice*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Hill, D. (2003). Global neo-liberalism, the deformation of education and resistance. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, Online at http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=7 1*(1).

Hill, D. (2006). Class, capital and education in this neoliberal and neoconservative period. *Information For Change, http://libr.org/isc/issues/ISC23/B1%20Dave%20Hill.pdf 23*

Hill, J. (2009). Review; Joseph Errington, linguistics in a colonial world: A story of language, meaning, and power. *Language in Society, 38*, 108-111.

Hodge, D. C., Magolda, M. B. B., and Haynes, C. A. (2009). Engaged learning: Enabling self-authorship and effective practice. *Liberal Education, Fall*, 16-24.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1988). *Social semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity.

Holloway, J. (2004). Multiliteracies. *Accent, 10*(3), 1-2.

Hollstein, M. S. (2006). *Critical pedagogy; Preservice teachers' perspectives.* The College of Education of Ohio University.

Horning, A. S. (2004). Digital critical literacy for generation 1.5 and everyone else. *The Reading Matrix 4*(3), 134-144.

Hoodfar, H. (1992). Feminist anthropology and critical pedagogy: The anthropology of classrooms' excluded voices. *Canadian Journal of Education 17*(3), 303-320.

Hoofd, I. M. (2007). The neoliberal consolidation of play and speed: Ethical issues in series gaming. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 6-15.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community - A pedagogy of hope*. New York and London: Routledge.

Housee, S. (2008). Should ethnicity matter when teaching about 'race' and racism in the classroom? *Race Ethnicity and Education, 11*(4), 415-428.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288.

Huckin, T. (2003). Critical discourse analysis and the discourse of condescension. In E. Barton and G. Stygall (Ed.), *Discourse Studies in Composition*. Hampton: Hampton.

Hudalla, J. (2005). Transforming my curriculum, transforming my classroom: Paulo Freire, James Banks, and social justice in a middle school classroom [electronic version], 1-52.

Huerta-Charles, L. (2007). Pedagogy of testimony: Reflections on the pedagogy of critical pedagogy. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 249-261): Peter Lang.

Husband, J., T. (2010). He's too young to learn about that stuff: Anti-racist pedagogy and early childhood social studies. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 5*(2), 61-76.

Hussein, S. (2009). The praxis of teaching thinking: A case study about student-teachers' experiences in the Malaysian classrooms. *The International Journal of Learning, 16*(9), 117-127.

Hyland, N. E. (2010). Social justice in early childhood classrooms: What the research tells us. *Young Children*(January), 82-88.

Ibrahim, A. (2007). Linking Marxism, globalization, and citizenship education: Toward a comparative and critical pedagogy post 9/11. *Educational Theory, 57*(1), 89-104.

Iseri, E. (2007). Neo-Gramscian analysis of US hegemony today: http://www.in-spire.org/archive/Previous/ei02062007_Neo-Gramscian_US_Hegemony.pdf.

Jackson, S. (2007). Freire re-viewed. *Educational Theory, 57*(2), 199-214.

Janesick, V. (2007). Reflections on the violence of high-stakes testing and the soothing nature of critical pedagogy. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 239-249): Peter Lang.

Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: a synthesis for critical literacy education. *Educational Review, 52*(2), 175-187.

Jennings, M. E., and Lynn, M. (2005). The house that race built: Critical pedagogy, African-American education, and the re-concentration of a critical race pedagogy. *Educational Foundations*, 15-32.

Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms [Electronic version]. *Review of Research in Education, 32*, 241-267.

Jimenez, R. T., Smith, P. H., & Martínez-León, N. (2003). Freedom and form: The language and literacy practices of two Mexican schools. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*(4), 488-508.

Johnson, E. C. (2006). *Seeking for critical literacy: A case study on how middle childhood preservice teachers for critical literacy in the social studies.* The Ohio State University.

Jupp, J. C. (2001). Rio Grande valley: Border crossing, diversity within diversity, and rethinking categorical language. *Multicultural Review 35*, 34-41.

Juzwik, M. M. (2006). Performing curriculum: Building ethos through narratives in

pedagogical discourse. *Teachers College Record 108*(4), 489-528.

Kahn, R. (2007). Review: Pedagogy and praxis in the age of empire: Toward a new

humanism by Peter McLaren and Nathalia Jaramillo. 1-6.

Kapellidi, C. (2007). The speaking subject in communication: 'Subjectivity and the

(gendered) self'. *Camling*, 112-119.

Karathanos, K. (2009). Exploring US mainstream teachers' perspectives on use of the

native language in instruction with English language learner students.

International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12(6), 615-633.

Keis, R. (2006). From principle to practice: Using children's literature to promote

dialogue and facilitate the "coming to voice" in a rural Latino community.

Multicultural Perspectives, 8 (1), 13-19.

Kellner, D. (2005). Toward a critical theory of education. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical

Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a New Critical Language in

Education* (pp. 49-69): University of Haifa.

Kennedy, D. (1994). Community of inquiry and educational structure. In *Thinking,

Children and Education*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Kennedy, D. (2006). *Well of being*. Albany: State University of New York.

Kepa, T. M. A. (2000). Language matters: The politics of teaching immigrant adolescents

school English in the secondary school. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,

32*(1), 61-71.

Keyes, D. (2009). Narratives of critical literacy: Critical consciousness and curriculum-

making at the middle level. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 3*(2), 42-55.

Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2003). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. D. Y. Lincoln (Ed.), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research* (pp. 433-488). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). Critical pedagogy and the knowledge wars of the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 1-22.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer*: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. London: Springer.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). The vicissitudes of twenty-first century critical pedagogy. A review of Ilan Gur Ze'ev (ed.) (2005). Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy Today. Toward a New Critical Language in Education. Haifa: Studies in Education (University of Haifa). *Studies in Philosophy and Education 27*, 399-404.

Kleinerman, K. (2010). Singing for leadership: Fostering the development of female leaders through voice. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal, 30*(4), 1-24.

Kopald, J. (2008). Immigrant challenges and opportunities in civic education [Electronic version].

Kramer, K. (2001). Educating through meeting: reflections on a dialogic pedagogy for teaching religious studies. *Teaching theology and religion, 4*(2), 64-70.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. 2nd edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kubota, R. (2004). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B. Norton,

and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 30-52): Cambridge University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate IV, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record 97*(1), 47-58.

Lambert, C., and Parker, Andrew. (2006). Imagination, hope and the positive face of feminism; pro/feminist pedagogy in 'post' feminist times? *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(4), 469-483.

Lambert, C. (2010). 'A location of possibilities?': Critical pedagogy in the university classroom In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 33-35): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

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

Lather, P. (1991). Post-critical pedagogies: A feminist reading. *Education and Society, 9*, 1-2.

Lather, P. (1991). Staying dumb? Student resistance to liberatory curriculum. In *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy with/in the Postmodern* (pp. 123-152): New York: Routledge.

Lather, P., & Clemens, J. (2008). Postmodern studies in educational foundations. In B. G. a. A. H. Steve Tozer (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Social Foundations of Education*: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lavia, J. (2006). The practice of postcoloniality: A pedagogy of hope. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 14*(3), 279-293.

Lazar, S. (2010). Schooling and critical citizenship: Pedagogies of political agency in El Alto, Bolvia. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 41*(2), 181-205.

Ledwith, M. (2007). On being critical: uniting theory and practice through emancipatory action research. *Educational Action Research, 15*(4), 597-611.

Lee, C. D. (1992). Profile of an independent Black institution: African-centered education at work. *Journal of Negro Education, 61*(2), 160-177.

Lenski, S. D., Ehlers-Zavala, F., Daniel, M., and Sun-Irminger, X. (2006). Assessing English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *International Reading Association* 24-34.

Lensmire, T. J. (1998). Rewriting student voice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 30*(3), 261-291.

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 5*(1), 29-50.

Leonardo, Z. (2004). Introduction. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 117-120.

Leong, J. (2005). Critical pedagogy and the visual arts curriculum in the Singapore art museum. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 1*(1), 8-25.

Leung, C., Roxy Harris, and Ben Rampton. (2004). Living with inelegance in qualitative research on task-based learning In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 242-268): Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, T. (2008). Defining the political ontology of the classroom: toward a

multitudinous education. *Teaching Education, 19*(4), 249-260.

Lewis, T. E. (2009). Education in the realm of the senses: Understanding Paulo Freire's aesthetic unconscious through Jacques Rancie`re. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 43*(2), 285-299.

Lewison, M., Flint, A. S., and Sluys, K. V. (2002). Taking on critical literacy: The journey of newcomers and novices. *Language Arts, 79*(5), 382-392.

Li, R. M., McCardle, P., Clark, R.L., Kinsella, K., and Berch, D., eds. (Ed.). (2001). *Diverse voices—Inclusion of language-minority populations in national studies: Challenges and opportunities.* Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Aging and National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2004). Introducing a critical pedagogical curriculum: A feminist reflexive account In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 271-290): Cambridge University Press.

Linton, A. (2007). Spanish-English immersion in the wake of California Proposition: five cases. *Intercultural Education, 18*(2), 111-128.

Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in education*. New York,: Cambridge University Press.

Lipman, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Thinking, children and education*: Kendall/Hunt publishing Company.

Liston, D. P. (2008). Critical pedagogy and attentive love. *Studies in Philosophy and Education 27*, 387-392.

Lopez, N. (2008). Antiracist pedagogy and empowerment in a bilingual classroom in the U.S., circa 2006. *Theory Into Practice, 47*, 43-50.

Luke, A. (1998). Theory and practice in critical discourse analysis. In L. Saha (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the sociology of education* (pp. 47-60). Oxford: Elsevier.

Luke, A. (1999). Critical discourse analysis. In J. K. G. Lakomski (Ed.), *Issues in Educational Research* (pp. 161-173). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Luke, A. (2004). Two takes on the critical. In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 21-29): Cambridge University Press.

Luke, A., and Dooley, Karen. (2005). Critical literacy and Second Language Learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. II): Routledge.

Luke, A. (1995/1996). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Review of Research in Education, 21*, 3-48.

Luke, A. (1997). Theory and practice in critical discourse analysis (www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/Luke/SAHA6.html accessed 15.11.2004). In L. Saha (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Sociology of Education* (pp. 50-57). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Luke, C. (1994). Feminist pedagogy and critical media literacy. *Journal of Communication Inquiry 18*(2), 30-47.

Lukinbeal, C., and Allen, C. D. (2007). Virtual egalitarianism, critical pedagogy, and geographic Education. *Journal of Geography, 106*, 199-205.

Lyle, S. (2008). Dialogic teaching: Discussing theoretical contexts and reviewing

evidence from classroom practice. *Language and Education, 22*(3), 222-242.

Lynn, M. (2004). Inserting the 'race' into critical pedagogy: Analysis of 'race-based epistemologies'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 153-166.

Lynn, M., and Jennings, M. E. (2009). Power, politics, and critical race pedagogy: a critical race analysis of Black male teachers' pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 12*(2), 173-196.

Lyons, J. J. (1990). The past and future directions of federal bilingual education policy. In C. B. Cazden, & Snow, C. E. (Ed.), *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Vol. 508, pp. 66-80). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Macartney, B. (2007). What is normal and why does it matter? Disabling discourses in education and society. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 29-41.

Macedo, Dendrinos, and Gounari (2003). *The hegemony of English*. Michigan: Paradigm Publishers

Mantero, M., and McVicker, P. (2006). The impact of experience and coursework: Perceptions of second language learners in the mainstream classroom. In *Radical Pedagogy*: ICAAP.

Marri, A. (2005). Building a framework for classroom? Based multicultural democratic education: Learning from three skilled teachers. *Teachers College Record*(May).

Marsh, J. (2006). Popular culture in the literacy curriculum: A Bourdieuian analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(2), 160-174.

Marshall, J. D. (2005). Michael Foucault - From critical "theory" to critical Pedagogy. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a New*

Critical Language in Education (pp. 289-299): University of Haifa.

Martin, G. (2006). Remaking critical pedagogy: Peter McLaren's contribution to a collective work. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 2*(3), 1-26.

Martin, G. (2007). The poverty of critical pedagogy. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 239-249): Peter Lang.

Masny, D., and Cole, D. R. (Ed.). (2009). *Multiple literacies theory A Deleuzian perspective*: Sense Publisher.

Mason, M. (2005). Critical theory and critical pedagogy after postmodernism- From the South African experience, a defense of reason and rationality. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 300-316): University of Haifa.

Massa, J., and pinhasi-Vittorio, L. (2009). Critical literacy development in action! *Theory in Action, 2*(2), 45-45.

Masschelein, J., and Ricken, N. (2005). "Bildung" and the problems of critique - Some reflections on the relations between bildung and power. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 208-224): University of Haifa.

Mathews, D. (1985). Civic intelligence *social education*, 678-681.

Matthews, J. (2005). Visual culture and critical pedagogy in "terrorist times". *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26*(2), 203-224.

Mayo, P. (2007). Critical approaches to education in the work of Lorenzo Milani and Paulo Freire. *Stud Philos Educ, 26*, 525-544.

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 1*(2).

Mazzeo, J., Carlson, J.E., Voelkl, K.E., & Lutkus, A.D. (2000). *Increasing the participation of special needs students in NAEP: A report on 1996 NAEP research activities* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

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.

McKay, C. L. (2010). Community education and critical race praxis: The power of voice. *educational foundation* (Winter-Spring), 25-38.

McKenzie, M. (2008). The places of pedagogy: or, what we can do with culture through intersubjective experiences. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 361-371.

McLaren, P. (1988). The liminal servant and the ritual roots of critical pedagogy. *Language Arts, 65*(2), 164-179.

McLaren, P. (1991). Critical pedagogy, multiculturalism and the politics of resistance: a Response to Kelly and Portelli. *Journal of Education, 173*(3), 29-59.

McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture: Oppositional politics in a postmodern world* New York: Routledge

McLaren, P., & Giroux, H. (1995). Radical pedagogy as cultural politics: Beyond the discourses of critique and anti-utopianism In P. McLaren (Ed.), *Critical pedagogy and Predatory Culture* (pp. 29-57). New York: Routledge.

McLaren, P. (2005). Critical pedagogy in the age of terror. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical*

Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a New Critical Language in Education (pp. 70-94): University of Haifa.

McLaren, P., & Jaramillo, M. (2005). The struggle against imperial punditry and reactionary anti - humanism: critical pedagogy, latina/o education, and class struggle in the age of empire. *Educação Porto Alegre, 3*(57), 391- 436.

McLaren, P. (2010). Afterwords. *Educational Theory, 60*(3), 391-394.

McMurray, A. J. (2007). The role of discussion and dissent in creating civic understanding. *American secondary education, 36*(1).

Mellor, B., & Patterson, A. (2004). Post-structuralism in English classrooms: Critical literacy and after. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*(1), 85-102.

Meyer, E. J. (2008). A Feminist reframing of bullying and harassment: transforming schools through critical pedagogy. *Erudit, 43*(1), 33-48.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Miller, P. C., and Hidehiro Endo. (2004). Understanding and meeting the needs of ESL students. *PHI DELTA KAPPAN*, 786-792.

Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E., & Alexander, L. (1990). *In-depth interviewing: Researching people*. Hong Kong: Longman Cheshire.

Mirhosseini, S.-A. (2004). Book reviews: Critical pedagogies and language learning In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Language, Culture and Curriculum* (pp. 186-

190). Cambridge: Cambridge.

Mirza, R., Brown, L. Balaban, T. (1986). Mainstreaming and the ESL/D Program: the Highgate public school experience. *TESL CANADA JOURNAL/REVUE TESL DU CANADA*(1), 185-192.

Mohr, J. M. (2008). Hate studies through a constructivist and critical pedagogical approach. *Journal of Hate Studies, 6*, 65-80.

Moissio, O.-P. (2005). Max Horkheeimer on the mimetic element in education. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical theory and critical pedagogy today-toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 261-279): University of Haifa.

Montecel, M. R., & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*(1), 1-21.

Morgan, B. (2004). Modals and memories: A grammar lesson on the Quebec referendum on sovereignty In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 158-178): Cambridge University Press.

Morrell, E., & Duncan-Andrade, J. (2005/2006). Popular culture and critical media pedagogy in secondary literacy classroom. *The International Journal of Learning, 12*, 1-11.

Morrell, E. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of popular culture: Literacy development among urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 46*(1), 72-77.

Morrell, E. (2004). Bakhtin's dialogic pedagogy. *Journal of Russian and East European*

Psychology, 42(6), 89-94.

Morrow, R. A., & Torres, Carlos Alberto. (2002). *Reading Freire and Habermas*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Muller, R. (2001). Teacher training with emphasis on immigrant pedagogy. *European Education, 33*(3), 54-67.

Munoz, L. C. A. (2006). Interview: The globalization of capital, critical pedagogy, and the aftermath of September 11. In *Rage and Hope: Interviews with Peter McLaren on War, Imperialism, & Critical Pedagogy* (pp. 57-110): Peter Lang.

Nainby, K., Warren, J., and Bollinger, C. (2003). Articulating contact in the classroom: Towards a constitutive focus in critical pedagogy. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 3*(3), 98-213.

Nero, S. J. (2005). Language, identities, and ESL pedagogy. *Language and Education, 19*(3), 194-211.

Nevin, A., Smith, R., and McNeil, M. (2008). Shifting attitudes of related service providers: A disability studies & critical pedagogy approach. *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 4*(1), 1-13.

Ng, T. & Ng, W. W. (2007). *Chinese culture, western culture: How cross-cultural views of history, philosophy and human relationships will change modern global history*: iUniverse, Inc.

Niesz, T. (2006). Beneath the surface: Teacher subjectivities and the appropriation of critical pedagogies. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 39*, 335-344.

Nieto, D. (2009). A brief history of bilingual education in the United States. *Perspectives*

on Urban Education (Spring).

Nieto, S. (1999). *Affirming diversity: The sociocultural context of multicultural education (3rd ed.)*. New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2006). Creating multicultural learning communities strategies for reaching all Students.

Noddings, N. (1995). "Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education." Rpt. in *Justice and Care*, Ed. Virginia Held. Boulder, CO: Westview: 7-30.

Noguera, P. A. (2004). Social capital and the education of immigrant students: Categories and generalization *Sociology of Education, 77*(2).

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

Norton, B., and Karen Vanderheyden. (2004). Comic book culture and second language learners In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 201-221): Cambridge University Press.

Norton, B., and, Kelleen Toohey. (2004). Critical pedagogies and language learning: An introduction. In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 1-18): Cambridge University Press.

Nover, S., Andrews, J., and Everhart, V. (2001). *Critical pedagogy in deaf education: Teachers' reflections on implementing ASL/English bilingual methodology and language assessment for deaf learners*: New Mexico School for the Deaf.

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R. and Prendergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue: understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*.

New York: Teachers College Press.

O'Connor, C., Lewis, A., and Mueller, J. (2007). Researching "Black" educational experiences and outcomes: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations. *Educational Researcher*, 36 (9), 541–552

Okihiro, G. Y. (1984). *Margins and mainstreams, Asian in American history and cultures*. Seattle, W.A. : The University of Washington Press.

Olssen, M. (1996). In defense of the welfare state and of publicly provided education. *Journal of Education Policy, 11*, 337-362.

O'Malley, M. P. (2007). Conceptualizing a critical pedagogy of human soul: Ethnographic implications for curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 4*(1), 84-113.

Orland-Barak, L. (2009). Unpacking variety in practitioner inquiry on teaching and teacher education. *Educational Action Research, 17*(1), 111-119.

Orner, M. (1992). Interrupting the calls for student voice in "liberatory" education: A feminist poststructuralist perspective. In C. Luke, and Jennifer Gore (Ed.), *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*: Routeledge.

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

Ovando. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current Issues1 *Bilingual Research Journal, 27*(1).

Ovando, C. J., and Collier, V. P. (1998). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pangilinan, R. (2009). Against Alienation: The emancipative Potential of Critical Pedagogy in Fromm. *Kritike, 3*(2), 1-29.

Pappamihiel, E. (2002). English as a Second Language Students and English Language Anxiety: Issues in the Mainstream Classroom *Research in the teaching of English, 36*, 327-345.

Pappamihiel, N. E. (2001). Moving from the ESL Classroom into the mainstream: An investigation of English language anxiety in Mexican girls. *Bilingual-Research-Journal, 25*(102), 31-38.

Parenti, C. (1999). Atlas finally shrugged: Us against them in the me decade. *The Baffler, 13*, 108-120.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pavlenko, A. (2004). Gender and sexuality in foreign and second language education: Critical and feminist approaches In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 53-71): Cambridge University Press.

Payan, R. M., & Nettles, M. T. (2008). *Current state of English-Language learners in the U.S. K-12 student population.* Paper presented at the English Language Learner Symposium, Princeton, NJ.

Pêcheux, M. (1982). *Language, semantics and ideology.* New York: St Martin's Press.

Peckham, I. (2003). Freirean codification: Changing walls into windows. *Pedagogy: critical approaches to teaching literature, language, composition, and culture, 3*(2), 227-245.

Pelletier, C. (2008). Question of performativity. *Discourse, October*, 1-16.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2004). Critical moments in a TESOL praxicum In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 327-346): Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, A. (2004). The myth of English as an international language. *Literacy learning The Middle Years, 12*(1), 26-35.

Pennycook, A. (2007). Language, localization, and the Real: Hip-hop and the global spread of authenticity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 6*(2), 101-115.

Peregoy, S. F. and Boyle, O. F. (2005). *Reading, writing, & learning in ESL: A resource book for K-12 teachers*. Longman Publishers USA.

Perumal, J. (2008). Student resistance and teacher authority: the demands and dynamics of collaborative learning. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 40*(3), 381-399.

Peters, M. (2005). Critical pedagogy and the futures of critical theory. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a New Critical Language in Education* (pp. 7-34): University of Haifa.

Peters, S. K. H. (2009). resistance and education: An exploration of anti-colonial struggles and implications for critical, reflexive pedagogy. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education, 2*(1), 1-9.

Peterson, R. E. (2003). Teaching how to read the world and change it: Critical pedagogy in intermediate grades. In A. Darder, Torres, R., and Baltodano, M. (Ed.), *The*

Critical Pedagogy Reader (pp. 365-387). New York: Routledge.

Phillips, L. M. (2007). Critical discourse analysis: An example of the good mother in literacy-advice texts. *Literacies #7, fall 2007 - available at www.literacyjournal.ca*, 4-47.

Pipino, M. F. (2005). Resistance and the pedagogy of ethnic literature. *Melus, 30*(2), 175-190.

Plato. (1974). *The republic*. London Hackett Publishing.

Plato. (1987). *Early Socratic dialogues*. New York: Penguin Books.

Pozo, M. (2006). Interview: Toward a critical revolutionary pedagogy. In *Rage and Hope: Interviews with Peter McLaren on War, Imperialism, & Critical Pedagogy* (pp. 11-28): Peter Lang.

Price, J. (2000). *Against the odds: The meaning of school and relationships in the lives of six young African-American men*: JAI Press

Price, J. N. (1998). Accommodation and critique in the school lives of six young African-American men. *Curriculum Inquiry, 28*(4), 443-471.

Pucci, B., and de-Ollivera, N. (2005). Catharsis from Greeks to culture industry. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a New Critical Language in Education* (pp. 280-288): University of Haifa.

Putnam, Hilary. (1975). *Mind, language and reality: Philosophical papers.* Volume 2. CUP.

Quintero, E. (2007). Critical pedagogy and young children's worlds. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 202-209):

Peter Lang.

Rabikowska, M. (2009). The ethical foundation of critical pedagogy in contemporary academia: (self)-reflection and complicity in the process of teaching. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 17*(2), 237-249.

Radigan, J., and Whitford, Sheila. (2004). *Teaching for social justice: Critical literacy project.* Paper presented at the Annual TACHE Conference.

Raiker, A. (2009). Transformational learning and e-portfolios: A pedagogy for improving student experience and achievement. *The International Journal of Learning, 16*(8), 313-324.

Rancière, J. (2004). *The philosopher and its Poor* (A. Parker, Trans.): Duke University Press Books.

Rancière, J. (2006). Thinking between disciplines: an aesthetics of knowledge. *PARRHESIA, 1*, 1012.

Reynolds, W. M. (2003). *Curriculum: A river runs through it* (Vol. 108): Peter Lang.

Rikowski, G. (2006). Critical pedagogy reloaded. In *Rage and Hope: Interviews with Peter McLaren on War, Imperialism, & Critical Pedagogy* (pp. 355-375): Peter Lang.

Rimon-Or, A. (2005). Power-relations and liberation - critical pedagogy beyond Freire and Giroux. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a New Critical Language in Education* (pp. 329-340): University of Haifa.

Rivera, C., Stansfield, C.W., Scialdone, L., & Sharkey, M. . (2000). *An analysis of state policies for the inclusion and accommodation of English language learners in*

state assessment programs during 1998–1999. Arlington, VA: The George

Washington University, Center for Equity and Excellence in Education.

Rodriguez, A. (2008). Toward a transformative teaching practice; criticity, pedagogy and

praxis. *The International Journal of Learning, 15*(3), 345-354.

Rogers, R., Malanchuruvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Huie, D., & O'Garra Joseph, G.

(2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review*

of Educational Research, 75(3), 365-395.

Romero, A., Arce, S., and Cammarota, J. (2009). A Barrio pedagogy: identity,

intellectualism, activism, and academic achievement through the evolution of

critically compassionate intellectualism. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 12*(2),

217-233.

Romo, J. (2005). Border pedagogy from the inside out: An autoethnographical study.

Journal of Latinos and Education, 4(3), 193-210.

Roseberry-McKibbin, C. B., Alejandro Brice; Hanion, Laureen O'. (2005). Serving

English language learners in public school settings: A national survey. *Language,*

Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 36, 48-61.

Ross, K. (1991). Introduction. In J. Rancière, *The ignorant schoolmaster: five lessons*

in intellectual emancipation (vii-xxiii). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rossatto, C. A. (2002). Critical pedagogy applied praxis: A Freirean interdisciplinary

project and grassroot social movement. In J. Slater, Rossatto, C., and Fain, S.

(Ed.), *Freirean Legacy: Educating for Social Justice* (pp. 157-171): Peter Lang.

Rudestam. K. & Newton, R. (1992). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide*

to content and process. Newberryi Park, CA: Sage. Ch 2.

Rury, J., &Mirel, J. (1997). The political economy of urban education. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 22, pp. 49-110). .Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Russell, M. (2010). Why popular education matters. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 39-41): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Ryan, M. (2008). Youth and the critical agenda: Negotiating contradictory discourses. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 35*(2), 71-89.

Ryan, M. E. (2005). Beyond critical pedagogy: An account of youth enactment in multiliterate culture. In J. Young (Ed.), *Proceedings Pleasure, Passion, Provocation: AATE/ALEA National Conference*. Gold Coast, Qld, Australia.

Sadeghi, S. (2009). *Critical pedagogy in an EFL teaching context: An Ignis Fatuus or an alternative approach?* Paper presented at the Englishes and literatures-in-English in a Globalised World: Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on English in Southeast Asia.

Sanchez, R., Araujo, B., and O'Donnell, J. (2008). Mediation, resistance, and resolve: Critical pedagogy and multicultural education in a cross-cultural context. *Multicultural Perspectives, 10*(3), 133-141.

Sandlin, J. A., Kahn, R., Darts, D., and Tavin, K. (2009). To find the cost of freedom: Theorizing and practicing a critical pedagogy of consumption. *Journal for*

Critical Education Policy Studies, 7(2), 99-128.

Saunders, D. B. (2010). Neoliberal ideology and public higher education in the United States. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 8*(1), 42-79.

Scandrett, E. (2010). Popular education in the university. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 42-47): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Schilling, J. (2006). On the pragmatics of qualitative assessment: Designing the process for content analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 22*(1), 28-37.

Schwabenland, C. (2009). An exploration of the use of disruption as a pedagogic intervention. *Educational Action Research, 17*(2), 293-309.

Schwarzer, D. (2001). *Noa's Ark: One child's voyage into multiliteracy*: Heinemann.

Schwarzer, D., Haywood. A., & Lorenzen, C. (2003). Fostering multiliteracy in a linguistically diverse classroom. *Language Arts, 80*(6), 453-460.

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

Sellar, S., and Gale, T. (2009). Review essay: Pedagogies of critique: struggling with what and how to think. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 17*(1), 103-114.

Seltzer-Kelly, D. (2009). Adventures in critical pedagogy: A lesson in U.S. History. *Teacher Education Quarterly*(winter), 149-163.

Shirazizadeh, M., and Momenian, M. (2009). From EFL to ELF: Spotting the blind spots. *English as International Language 4*, 44-66.

Shohamy, E. (2004). Assessment in multicultural societies: Applying democratic principles and practices to language testing In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 72-92): Cambridge University Press.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shor, I. (1997). What is critical literacy? *Journal for pedagogy, pluralism & practice*, 1-27.

Short, D. J. (1994). The challenge of social studies for limited English proficient students. *Social Education*, 58(1), 36-38.

Simmons, J. C. (2008). *Neutralizing resistance to critical pedagogy in teacher preparation: A model for pre-service teacher preparation programs.* Paper presented at the Preparing Democratic Leaders for quality teaching and student success: A Time for Action.

Simpson, J. S. (2010). "I'm More Afraid of the Four of You Than I Am of the Terrorists": Agency, dissent, and the challenges of democratic hope [Electronic Version]. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 177-205.

Singh, G., and Cowden, S. (2010). From 'anti-racist' to 'post-racist' education: Problems and possibilities. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 28-32): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Skidmore, D. (2000). From pedagogical dialogue to dialogical pedagogy. *Language and Education, 14*(4).

Skidmore, D., Perez -Parent, M., Arnfield, S. (2003). Teacher-pupil dialogue in the guided reading session'. *Reading: Literacy and Language, 37*(2), 47-53.

Skidmore, D. (2006). Pedagogy and dialogue. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 36*(4), 503-514.

Smith, D. G. (2009). Critical Notice: Engaging Peter McLaren and the new Marxism in Education. *Interchange, 40*(1), 93-117.

Smith, K. (2010). Gramsci at the margins: subjectivity and subalternity in a theory of hegemony *International Gramsci Journal, 2*, 39-50.

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

Solorzano, Daniel.(1993). The road to the doctorate for California's Chicanas and Chicanos: A study of Ford Foundation minority fellows. Berkeley, CA: The California Policy Seminar.

Sonn, C. C. (2008). Educating for anti-racism: producing and reproducing race and power in a university classroom. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 11*(2), 155-166.

Souyri, E. (2010). The French movement against neoliberalism in universities. In S. Amsler, Canann, J. E., Cowden, S. M., and Singh, G. (Ed.), *Why Critical Pedagogy and Popular Education Matter Today* (pp. 36-38): C-SAP: Higher Education Academy Subject Network for Sociology, Anthropology, Politics.

Spatig, l., Swedberg, A., Legrow, T., and Flaherty, P. (2010). The power of process: A story of collaboration and community change. *Community Development, 41*(1), 3-20.

Spaulding, S., Carolino, B., and Amen, K. (2004). *Immigrant students and secondary school reform: Compendium of best practices*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Stanley, W. B. (2007). Democratic realism, neoliberalism, conservatism, and a tragic sense of education. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 371-390): Peter Lang.

Starfield, S. (2004). "Why does this feel empowering?": Thesis writing concordancing, and the corporatizing university In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 138-157): Cambridge University Press.

Stein, Mark (2008). *How the States Got Their Shapes*. New York: Collins (Harper Collins Publishers) [Smithsonian Books]. pp. xvi + 334. ISBN 978-0-06-14319-5.

Stein, P. (2004). Representation, rights, and resources: Multimodal pedagogies in the language and literacy classroom In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 95-115): Cambridge University Press.

Stevens, K., Gerber, D., and Hendra, R. (2010). Transformational learning through prior learning assessment. *Adult Education Quarterly, 60*(4), 377-404.

Stevens, R. J., & Slavin, R. E. (1995). The cooperative elementary school: Effects on students' achievement, attitudes, and social relations. *American Educational*

Research Journal, 32, 321- 351.

Stevenson, R. B. (2008). A critical pedagogy of place and the critical place(s) of

pedagogy. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 353-360.

Stovall, D. (2006). Urban poetics: Poetry, social justice and critical pedagogy in

education. *The Urban Review, 38*(1), 63-80.

Street, B. (2005). New literacy studies and literacies across education contexts. In

B. Street (Ed.), *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating learning*

and teaching (pp. 1- 21). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Suarez-Orozco, M., and Qin-Hilliard, D. (2004). Culture and education *in the new*

millennium. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sunderland, J. (2004). Classroom interaction, gender, and foreign language learning In B.

Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning*

(pp. 221-241): Cambridge University Press.

Sung, K. (2007). Globalizing critical pedagogy: A case of critical English language

teaching in Korea. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy:*

Where Are We Now? : Peter Lang.

Suoranta, J., and Moisio, Olli-Pekkaekka (2006). Critical pedagogy as collective social

expertise in higher education. *International Journal of Progressive Education,*

2(3).

Szpara, M., & Ahmad, I. (2006). Making social studies meaningful for ELL students:

Content and pedagogy in mainstream secondary school classrooms [Electronic

Version]. Retrieved 02 March 2010.

Taylor, C., and Robinson, Carol. (2009). Student voice: theorising power and participation. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 17*(2), 161-175.

Taylor, L. (2007). Developing Critical Affective Imagination: Building feminist anti-colonial embodied reading practices through Reader Response. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 58-73.

Teitelbaum, H., & Hiller, R. J. (1977). Bilingual education: The legal mandate. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*, 138-170.

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types & software tools*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Thornton, S. J. (2005). *Teaching social studies that matters: Curriculum for active learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Threadgold, T. (2006). Cultural studies, critical theory and critical discourse analysis: Histories, Remembering and Future. *Linguistik online, 14*(2/03).

Toh, G. (2003). Response 2. *World English, 22*(4), 568-569.

Tollefson, J. (1991). Planning language, planning inequality. *1*(1), 234.

Toohey, K., and Bonnie Waterstone. (2004). Negotiating expertise in an action research community In B. Norton, and Kelleen Toohey (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Language Learning* (pp. 291-310): Cambridge University Press.

Tubbs, N. (2005). The philosophy of critical pedagogy. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a new Critical Language in Education* (pp. 226-240): University of Haifa.

Twain, Mark. (2011). *The adventure of Tom Sawyer*. SoHo Books.

Van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4.*

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

van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Academic Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Principles of critical discourse analysis. In a. S. J. Y. S. T. M. Wetherell (Ed.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader*. London: Sage.

Van Duinen, D. V. (2005/2006). Authentic assessment praxis with power. *International Journal of Learning, 12*(6), 141-149.

Vescio, V., Bondy, E., & Poekert, P. E. (2009). Preparing multicultural teacher educators: Toward a pedagogy of transformation. *Teacher Education Quarterly* (Spring), 5-24.

Viola, M. (2009). The Filipinization of critical pedagogy: Widening the scope of critical educational theory. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 7*(1), 1-29.

Vlieghe, J. (2010). Judith Butler and the public dimension of the body: Education, critique and corporeal vulnerability. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vol. 44, No. 1, 2010, 44*(1), 153-170.

Wacquant, L. (2006). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key Contemporary Thinkers*. London and New York: Macmillan.

Waghid, Y. (2007). University education and critical pedagogy. *SAJHE, 21*(2), 360-363.

Wainer, A. (2006). The new Latino south and the challenge to American public education. *Internation Migration, 44*(5), 129-165.

Waller, M. R. (2005). Epistemology of engagement. *college literature, 32*(3), 154-170.

Wang, H. (2005). *Aporias, Responsibility, and the im/possibility of teaching multicultural*

education (Vol. 55).

Watt, D. R., Hetty. (2001). The dynamics of ESL drop-out: "Plus ca change". *Canadian-Modern-Language-Review, 58*(2).

Watts-Taffe, S., & Truscott, D. M. (2000). Focus on research using what we know about language and literacy development for ESL students in the mainstream classroom. *Language Arts, 77*(3).

Weber, M. (1904/1949). Objectivity in social science and social policy. In Edward Shils and Henry Finch (Ed.), *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. New York: Free Press.

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Weiner, E. J. (2003). Beyond "doing" cultural studies: Toward a cultural studies of critical pedagogy. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 25*, 55-73.

Weiner, E. J. (2007). Critical pedagogy and the crisis of imagination. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 57-77): Peter Lang.

Weininger, E. B. (2005). Foundations of Pierre Bourdieu's class analysis. In E. O. Wright (Ed.), *Approaches to Class Analysis*: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic Enquiry: towards a sociocultural practice and theory of*

education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Werry, M. (2008). Pedagogy of/as/and tourism: Or, shameful lessons. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 30*, 14-42.

Wertsch, J. V. (2004). Postscript on Bakhtin's dialogic pedagogy. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology, 42*(6), 50-52.

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

Winch, C. (2004). Developing critical rationality as a pedagogical aim. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 38*(3), 467-485.

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

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for critical discourse analysis. Second edition*: Sage Publication.

Wolk, S. (2003). Teaching for critical literacy in social studies. *The Social Studies, May*, 101-107.

Wood, B. (2007). Conflict, controversy, and complexity: Avoiding the 'slippery stuff' in social studies. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 42-49.

Woodin, T. (2007). 'Chuck out the teacher': radical pedagogy in the community. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 26*(1), 89-104.

Wright, W. E. (2005). *Evolution of federal policy and implications of No Child Left Behind for language minority students policy brief*. Tempe, Arizona: Education Policy Studies Laboratory

Ya'akovy, T. (2006). A re-thinking of critical pedagogy: A review of critical theory and critical pedagogy today: Toward a new critical language in education Edited by Ilan Gur-Ze'ev, Haifa, Israel: University of Haifa Press, 2005. *Journal of Thought* (Winter), 161-166.

Yılmaz, K. (2009). Elementary school teachers' views about the critical pedagogy. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher 18*(1), 139-149.

Yoon, K. H. (2005). Affecting the transformative intellectual: Questioning "noble" sentiments in critical pedagogy and composition. *JAC, 25*(4), 717-759.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A Critical Race Theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 69-91.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2007). Global citizenship & study abroad: It's all about U.S. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 16-28.

Zygmantas, J. (2009). Understanding critical pedagogy and its impact on the construction of knowledge. *ACTA PAEDAGOGICA VILNENSIA, 23*, 63-78.

Appendix: Data

Allen, R. L. (2004). Whiteness and critical Pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 121-137.

Allen, R. L., and Rossatto, Cesar Augusto. (2009). Does critical pedagogy work with privileged students? *Teacher Education Quarterly, Winter* (163-179).

Apple, M. (1999). Rhetorical reforms: Markets, standards and inequality. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 1*(2), 6-18.

Apple, M. W. (2004). Creating difference: Neo-Liberalism, Neo-Conservatism and the politics of educational reform. *Educational Policy, 18*(1), 12-44.

Ardizzone, L. (2007). Listening to youth voices; activism and critical pedagogy. In R. Goldstein (Ed.), *Useful Theory: Making Critical Education Practical* (pp. 49-63): Peter Lang.

Au, W. (2006). Against economic determinism: Revisiting the roots of neo-Marxism in critical educational theory. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 4*(2), 11-35.

Ayers, W., Michie, G., & Rome, A. (2004). Embers of hope: In search of a meaningful critical pedagogy. *Teacher Education Quarterly, winter*, 123-130.

Baker, B. (2005). State-formation, teaching techniques, and globalization as aporia. *Discourses: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26*(1), 45-77.

Bakhtin, M. (1941). *Rabelais and his world*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas.

Banks, O. C. (2010). Critical postcolonial dance pedagogy: The relevance of West African dance education in the United States. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 41*(1), 18-34.

Bashyal, G. P. (2007). Reflection and critical pedagogy. *Journal of NELTA, 12*(1&2), 24-26.

Bayne, G. U. (2009). Joe L. Kincheloe: Embracing criticality in science education. *Cultural Study of Science Education 4*, 559-567.

Berry, K. (2007). Locations (or not) of critical pedagogy in *Les Petites et les Grandes Histoires*. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 79-96): Peter Lang.

Bingham, C. (2002). On Paulo Freire's debt to psychoanalysis: Authority on the side of freedom. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*, 447-464.

Bowers, C. A. (2007). A response to McLaren's revisionist interpretation of Freire. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism, 18*(1), 109-119.

Bowers, C. A. (2008). Why a critical pedagogy of place is an oxymoron. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 325-335.

Braa, D., and Callero, P. (2006). Critical pedagogy and classroom praxis. *Teaching Sociology, 34*, 357-369.

Burbules, N. (2000). The limits of dialogue as a critical pedagogy. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Revolutionary Pedagogies: Cultural Politics, Instituting Education, and the Discourse of Theory* (pp. 251-271): Psychology Press.

Butte, S. (2010). Freire, informal education as protest. *Journal for Critical Education*

Policy Studies, 8(1), 151-180.

Cahill, C. (2007). The personal is political: developing new subjectivities through

    participatory action research. *Gender, Place and Culture, 14*(3), 267-292.

Calderon, J. (2003). Partnership in teaching and learning: Combining the practice of

    critical pedagogy with civic engagement and diversity. *Peer Review (AAC&U),*

    Spring, 22-24.

Carr, P. R. (2010). Re-thinking normative democracy and the political economy of

    education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 18*(1).

Casey, K. (1993). *I answer with my life: Life histories of women teachers working for*

    social change. New York: Routledge.

Chan-Tiberghien, J. (2004). Towards a 'global educational justice' research paradigm:

    cognitive justice, decolonizing methodologies and critical pedagogy.

    Globalization, Societies and Education, 2(2), 191- 214.

Chapman, V.-L. (2004). Using critical personal narratives: A post-structural perspective

    on practice. In R. S. Clair, and Sandlin, Jennifer A. (Ed.), *Promoting Critical*

    Practice in Adult Education Jossey-Bass.

Chege, M. (2009). Literacy and hegemony: Critical pedagogy vis-à-vis contending

    paradigms. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*

    21(2), 228-238.

Chen, H.-J. (2005). The rationale for critical pedagogy in facilitating cultural identity

    development. In *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue* (pp. 11-22): Information

    Age Publishing.

Chen, X. (1994). Reading mother's tale-reconstructing women's space in Amy Tan and Zhang Jie. *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, and Reviews, 16*, 111-132.

Coffey, H. (2010). Critical literacy. *http://www.learnnc.org/lp/pages/4437?style=print*.

Coloma, R. S. (2008). All immigrants are Mexicans, only Blacks are minorities, but some of us are brave: Race, multiculturalism, and postcolonial studies in U.S. Education. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing 24*(1), 32-46.

Cook-Sather, A. (2007). Resisting the impositional potential of student voice work: Lessons for liberatory educational research from poststructuralist feminist critiques of critical pedagogy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28*(3), 389-403.

Degener, S. C. (2001). Making sense of critical pedagogy in adult literacy education. In *Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy* (pp. 26-62).

Denzin, N. K. (2009). A critical performance pedagogy that matters. *Ethnography and Education, 4*(3), 255-270.

DeTurk, S. (2006). The power of dialogue: Consequences of intergroup dialogue and their Implications for agency and alliance building. *Communication Quarterly, 54*(1), 33-51.

DiAngelo, R. J. (2006). The production of Whiteness in education: Asian international students in a college classroom. *Teachers College Record 108*(10), 1983-2000.

Dillabough, J.-A. (2002). Dialogue: The "hidden injuries" of critical pedagogy. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32*(2), 203-215.

Doughty, H. A. (2008). Book review: Peter McLaren: Capitalism & conquerors: A

critical pedagogy against empire. *The Innovation Journal: The public Sector Innovation journal 13*(2), 1-5.

Duarte, E. (2006). Critical pedagogy and the praxis of worldly philosophy. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 40*(1), 105-115.

Duncan-Andrade, J., and Morrell, E. (2008). Contemporary developers of critical pedagogy. In *The Art of Critical Pedagogy: Possibilities for Moving from Theory to Practice in Urban Schools* (pp. 23-49): Peter Lang.

Ellison, S. (2009). On the poverty of philosophy: The metaphysics of McLaren's "Revolutionary critical pedagogy". *Educational Theory 59*(3), 327-351.

Ellsworth, E. (1994). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy? In *The Education feminism reader* (Vol. 300-327): Routledge.

Endres, B. (2002). Critical pedagogy and liberal education: Reconciling tradition, critique, and democracy. *Philosophy of Education*, 59-68.

Erevelles, N. (2005). Rewriting critical pedagogy from the periphery: Materiality, disability, and the politics of schooling. In S. L. Gabel (Ed.), *Disability Studies in Education: Reading in Theory & Method* Peter Lang.

Evans, R. W. (2008). The (unfulfilled) promise of critical pedagogy. *Journal of Social Studies, 3*(2), 16-25.

Farahmandpur, R. (2005). The revolutionary critical pedagogy of Peter McLaren. In M. Pruyn, Chalres, L., M. H. (Ed.), *Teaching Peter McLaren: Paths of Dissent* (Vol. 126-146): Peter Lang.

Flores-Koulish, S. A. (1006). Media literacy: An entree for pre-service teachers into critical pedagogy. *Teaching Education, 17*(3), 239-249.

Fobes, C., and Kaufman, P. (2008). Critical pedagogy in the sociology classroom: challenges and concerts. *Teaching Sociology, 36*(1), 26-33.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Freire, P., and Donald Macedo (1987). *Literacy: reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage* (P. Clarke, Trans.). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc

Gallagher, K., and Lortie, P. (2005). How does knowing my business make you any safer?: critical pedagogy in Dangerous Times. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 27*, 141-158.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). Critical pedagogy and the postmodern/modern divide: Towards a pedagogy of democratization. *Teacher Education Quarterly*.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). Public pedagogy and the Politics of Neo-Liberalism: Making the political more pedagogical. *Policy Futures in Education, 2*(3 & 4), 494-503.

Giroux, H. A. (2006). Academic freedom under fire: The case for critical pedagogy. *College Literature, 33*(4), 1-43.

Giroux, A. H. (2009). Education and the crisis of youth: Schooling and the promise of democracy. *The Educational Forum, 73*, 8-16.

Giroux, H. A. (2010). Bare pedagogy and the scourge of Neoliberalism: Rethinking higher education as a democratic public sphere. *The Educational Forum, 74*, 184-

196.

Giroux, H., and McLaren, P. (1989). Introduction: Schooling, cultural politics and the
    struggle for democracy. In H. Giroux, and McLaren, P. (Ed.), *Schooling, Cultural
    Politics and the Struggle for Democracy* (pp. xi-xxxv): State University of New
    York, Albany.

Goldstein, R. (2007). It is a conceptual thing: Learning to live critical pedagogy. In R.
    Goldstein (Ed.), *Useful Theory: Making Critical Education Practical*: Peter Lang.

Goldstein, R. (2007). The perilous pitfalls of praxis: Critical pedagogy as "Regime of
    Truth". In R. Goldstein (Ed.), *Useful Theory: Making Critical Education
    Practical*: Peter Lang.

Goodman, G. S. (2008). Coming to a critical constructivism: Roots and branches. In
    Educational Psychology: An Application of Critical Constructionism Peter Lang.

Goodman, M. L. (2008). "Did Ronald McDonald also tend to scare you as a child?":
    Working to emplace consumption, commodities and citizen-students in a large
    classroom setting. *Journal for Geography in Higher Education, 32*(3), 365-386.

Gore, J. M. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as
    regimes of truth*. New York: Routledge.

Graham, M. A. (2007). Art, ecology and art education: Locating art education in a critical
    place-based pedagogy. *Studies in Art Education, 48*(4), 375-391.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place.
    Educational Researcher, 32(4), 3-12.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community - A pedagogy of hope*. New York and London:

Routledge.

Horning, A. S. (2004). Digital critical literacy for generation 1.5 and everyone else. *The Reading Matrix 4*(3), 134-144.

Housee, S. (2008). Should ethnicity matter when teaching about 'race' and racism in the classroom? *Race Ethnicity and Education, 11*(4), 415-428.

Hudalla, J. (2005). Transforming my curriculum, transforming my classroom: Paulo Freire, James Banks, and social justice in a middle school classroom [electronic version], 1-52.

Huerta-Charles, L. (2007). Pedagogy of testimony: Reflections on the pedagogy of critical pedagogy. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 249-261): Peter Lang.

Husband, J., T. (2010). He's too young to learn about that stuff: Anti-racist pedagogy and early childhood social studies. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 5*(2), 61-76.

Hyland, N. E. (2010). Social justice in early childhood classrooms: What the research tells us. *Young Children*(January), 82-88.

Ibrahim, A. (2007). Linking Marxism, globalization, and citizenship education: Toward a comparative and critical pedagogy post 9/11. *Educational Theory, 57*(1), 89-104.

Jackson, S. (2007). Freire re-viewed. *Educational Theory, 57*(2), 199-214.

Janesick, V. (2007). Reflections on the violence of high-stakes testing and the soothing nature of critical pedagogy. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 239-249): Peter Lang.

Jennings, M. E., and Lynn, M. (2005). The house that race built: Critical pedagogy,

African-American education, and the re-concentration of a critical race pedagogy. *Educational Foundations*, 15-32.

Kahn, R. (2007). Review: Pedagogy and praxis in the age of empire: Toward a new humanism by Peter McLaren and Nathalia Jaramillo. 1-6.

Keyes, D. (2009). Narratives of critical literacy: Critical consciousness and curriculum-making at the middle level. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 3*(2), 42-55.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). Critical pedagogy and the knowledge wars of the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 1-22.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer*: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). The vicissitudes of twenty-first century critical pedagogy. A review of Ilan Gur Ze'ev (ed.) (2005). Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy Today. Toward a New Critical Language in Education. Haifa: Studies in Education (University of Haifa). *Studies in Philosophy and Education 27*, 399-404.

Kleinerman, K. (2010). Singing for leadership: Fostering the development of female leaders through voice. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal, 30*(4), 1-24.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate IV, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record 97*(1), 47-58.

Lather, P., & Clemens, J. (2008). Postmodern studies in educational foundations. In B. G. a. A. H. Steve Tozer (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Social Foundations of Education*: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ledwith, M. (2007). On being critical: uniting theory and practice through emancipatory

action research. *Educational Action Research, 15*(4), 597-611.

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 5*(1), 29-50.

Leonardo, Z. (2004). Introduction. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 117-120.

Lewis, T. (2008). Defining the political ontology of the classroom: toward a multitudinous education. *Teaching Education, 19*(4), 249-260.

Lewis, T. E. (2009). Education in the realm of the senses: Understanding Paulo Freire's aesthetic unconscious through Jacques Rancie`re. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 43*(2), 285-299.

Liston, D. P. (2008). Critical pedagogy and attentive love. *Studies in Philosophy and Education 27*, 387-392.

Lukinbeal, C., and Allen, C. D. (2007). Virtual egalitarianism, critical pedagogy, and geographic Education. *Journal of Geography, 106*, 199-205.

Lynn, M. (2004). Inserting the 'race' into critical pedagogy: Analysis of 'race-based epistemologies'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 153-166.

Lynn, M., and Jennings, M. E. (2009). Power, politics, and critical race pedagogy: a critical race analysis of Black male teachers' pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 12*(2), 173-196.

Macartney, B. (2007). What is normal and why does it matter? Disabling discourses in education and society. *Critical Literacy; Theories and Practices, 1*(2), 29-41.

McKay, C. L. (2010). Community education and critical race praxis: The power of voice. *educational foundation* (Winter-Spring), 25-38.

McKenzie, M. (2008). The places of pedagogy: or, what we can do with culture through intersubjective experiences. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 361-371.

McLaren, P. (2005). Critical pedagogy in the age of terror. In I. Gur-Ze'ev (Ed.), *Critical Theory And Critical Pedagogy Today-Toward a New Critical Language in Education* (pp. 70-94): University of Haifa.

McLaren, P., & Jaramillo, M. (2005). The struggle against imperial punditry and reactionary anti - humanism: critical pedagogy, latina/o education, and class struggle in the age of empire. *Educação Porto Alegre, 3*(57), 391- 436.

Meyer, E. J. (2008). A Feminist reframing of bullying and harassment: transforming schools through critical pedagogy. *Erudit, 43*(1), 33-48.

Mohr, J. M. (2008). Hate studies through a constructivist and critical pedagogical approach. *Journal of Hate Studies, 6*, 65-80.

Morrell, E., & Duncan-Andrade, J. (2005/2006). Popular culture and critical media pedagogy in secondary literacy classroom. *The International Journal of Learning, 12*, 1-11.

Morrell, E. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of popular culture: Literacy development among urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 46*(1), 72-77.

Nainby, K., Warren, J., and Bollinger, C. (2003). Articulating contact in the classroom: Towards a constitutive focus in critical pedagogy. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 3*(3), 98-213.

Nevin, A., Smith, R., and McNeil, M. (2008). Shifting attitudes of related service providers: A disability studies & critical pedagogy approach. *International*

Journal of Whole Schooling, 4(1), 1-13.

Niesz, T. (2006). Beneath the surface: Teacher subjectivities and the appropriation of critical pedagogies. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 39*, 335-344.

O'Malley, M. P. (2007). Conceptualizing a critical pedagogy of human soul: Ethnographic implications for curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 4*(1), 84-113.

Pangilinan, R. (2009). Against Alienation: The emancipative Potential of Critical Pedagogy in Fromm. *Kritike, 3*(2), 1-29.

Quintero, E. (2007). Critical pedagogy and young children's worlds. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 202-209): Peter Lang.

Rodriguez, A. (2008). Toward a transformative teaching practice; criticity, pedagogy and praxis. *The International Journal of Learning, 15*(3), 345-354.

Romero, A., Arce, S., and Cammarota, J. (2009). A Barrio pedagogy: identity, intellectualism, activism, and academic achievement through the evolution of critically compassionate intellectualism. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 12*(2), 217-233.

Sandlin, J. A., Kahn, R., Darts, D., and Tavin, K. (2009). To find the cost of freedom: Theorizing and practicing a critical pedagogy of consumption. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 7*(2), 99-128.

Saunders, D. B. (2010). Neoliberal ideology and public higher education in the United States. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 8*(1), 42-79.

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

Sellar, S., and Gale, T. (2009). Review essay: Pedagogies of critique: struggling with what and how to think. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 17*(1), 103-114.

Seltzer-Kelly, D. (2009). Adventures in critical pedagogy: A lesson in U.S. History. *Teacher Education Quarterly*(winter), 149-163.

Shor, I. (1997). What is critical literacy? *Journal for pedagogy, pluralism & practice*, 1-27.

Simmons, J. C. (2008). *Neutralizing resistance to critical pedagogy in teacher preparation: A model for pre-service teacher preparation programs.* Paper presented at the Preparing Democratic Leaders for quality teaching and student success: A Time for Action.

Simpson, J. S. (2010). "I'm More Afraid of the Four of You Than I Am of the Terrorists": Agency, dissent, and the challenges of democratic hope [Electronic Version]. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 177-205.

Spatig, l., Swedberg, A., Legrow, T., and Flaherty, P. (2010). The power of process: A story of collaboration and community change. *Community Development, 41*(1), 3-20.

Spaulding, S., Carolino, B., and Amen, K. (2004). *Immigrant students and secondary school reform: Compendium of best practices*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Stanley, W. B. (2007). Democratic realism, neoliberalism, conservatism, and a tragic

sense of education. In P. McLaren, and Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 371-390): Peter Lang.

Stevenson, R. B. (2008). A critical pedagogy of place and the critical place(s) of pedagogy. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 353-360.

Stovall, D. (2006). Urban poetics: Poetry, social justice and critical pedagogy in education. *The Urban Review, 38*(1), 63-80.

Street, B. (2005). New literacy studies and literacies across education contexts. In B. Street (Ed.), *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating learning and teaching* (pp. 1- 21). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Suarez-Orozco, M., and Qin-Hilliard, D. (2004). Culture and education *in the new millennium*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Van Duinen, D. V. (2005/2006). Authentic assessment praxis with power. *International Journal of Learning, 12*(6), 141-149.

Vescio, V., Bondy, E., & Poekert, P. E. (2009). Preparing multicultural teacher educators: Toward a pedagogy of transformation. *Teacher Education Quarterly* (Spring), 5-24.

Viola, M. (2009). The Filipinization of critical pedagogy: Widening the scope of critical educational theory. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 7*(1), 1-29.

Weiner, E. J. (2003). Beyond "doing" cultural studies: Toward a cultural studies of critical pedagogy. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 25*, 55-73.

Weiner, E. J. (2007). Critical pedagogy and the crisis of imagination. In P. McLaren, and

Kincheloe, J. (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* (pp. 57-77): Peter Lang.

Wolk, S. (2003). Teaching for critical literacy in social studies. *The Social Studies, May*, 101-107.

Yoon, K. H. (2005). Affecting the transformative intellectual: Questioning "noble" sentiments in critical pedagogy and composition. *JAC, 25*(4), 717-759.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A Critical Race Theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 69-91.