Gaging the Transformative Potential of Second Language Education:

Language Educators' Understanding of Interculturality and Criticality

by

Gregory Scott Ogilvie

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Secondary Education

University of Alberta

ABSTRACT

Second language education is well suited to promote transformative outcomes due to its unique character (the importance of both declarative and procedural knowledge), the close connection between language and culture, and the entrenched humanistic tradition within the field (Musumeci, 1997; Guilherme, 2002). Nonetheless, second language pedagogy is commonly portrayed as having an exclusive linguistic focus, as evidenced by the professed professional knowledge base of second language educators (e.g., Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Andrews, 2003; Liddicoat, 2006; Mullock, 2006). This study sought to explore the transformative potential of second language education by investigating how professional second language educators understand 'criticality' and 'interculturality' – two complex, heterogeneously defined concepts that have received increased attention in the field and have a significant impact on how pedagogy is enacted.

As the primary unit of inquiry was understanding, an interpretive approach was adopted grounded in post-formal thinking, Gadamerian hermeneutics, and critical pedagogy. Data for the study was collected from ten highly educated, dedicated second language instructors with experience teaching in higher education institutions. Data was collected in the form of extensive interviews and the analysis of resources deemed important in guiding instruction.

The results of the hermeneutic investigation demonstrated that the educators defined the function of second language education and the central concepts of the study (criticality and interculturality) in diverse ways. The varied conceptualizations illuminated different aspects of criticality and interculturality and their influence on pedagogy from a practitioner perspective. Moreover, they revealed that all the educators conceptualized second language education as a transformative act, but to differing degrees and with different foci. Among the central factors

influencing the transformative potential of second language pedagogy were the domains in which criticality was applied. Although all of the educators applied criticality to information introduced in the classroom (in relation to the source, validity, etc. of information), only some of the educators applied criticality to the domains of the subject, content introduced, pedagogical practices and epistemology, thus greatly influencing the transformative potential of instruction. The results of the study also revealed the presence of discourses that had an inhibitory effect on second language education as a transformative endeavour. These included the discourse of political correctness, the discourse of narrow instrumentality, and the discourse of decisive deference. The discourses demonstrate how the trends towards standardization and de-professionalization rampant within the field of education have had an adverse impact on how second language educators understand their role in the pedagogical process and enact pedagogy.

PREFACE

This thesis is an original work by Greg Ogilvie. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project Name "Gaging The Transformative Potential of Second Language Education: Language Educators' Understanding of Criticality and Interculturality", Pro 00040607, July 12, 2013.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Contemporary society is characterized by increased change and uncertainty stemming from the consumptive patterns of a swelling population. The trend towards heightened consumption has contributed to ecological exploitation and irreversible environmental degradation. In fact, anthropogenic environmental degradation has reached new heights, significantly undermining the ability of the Earth to support living organisms. Dodds (2008) summarized: "Our environmental impact is expanding, as evidenced by accelerating increases in global population, energy use, economic activity, water use, greenhouse gas emissions, ozone depletion, deforestation, loss of cropland, species extinction, and species introduction" (p. 187). The growing impact of humanity on the environment has been primarily attributed to population growth accompanied by increased affluence (Dietz, Rosa, & York, 2007). While the desire for material wealth has rapidly increased the rate of resource depletion and altered human expectations about levels of consumption, the Earth possesses a finite capacity to sustainably support life (Kasser, 2002; Dodds, 2008). This raises serious questions about the sustainability of current consumptive trends, in particular when projections estimate that within an eight year period the human impact on the environment will increase by over one-third (Dietz, Rosa, & York, 2007).

Increased consumption and its accompanied effect on the environment have also influenced human interactions. Ecological devastation has prompted increased migration, placing a growing number of people in ever decreasing areas of habitable land. Moreover, competition for the rapidly dwindling supply of resources (in particular hydrocarbons, on which the current economic system is based) has led to increased militarization and geopolitical maneuvering, further promoting instability and conflict in many regions around the world (Klare, 2002;

1

Coulby, 2011). The competitive ethos fostered by a global economic system based on heightened consumption has not only contributed to increased conflict, but has also influenced human relationships. Kasser (2002) claimed that a strong emphasis on consumption and materialistic values may lead to treating people like objects. Similarly, Berry (cited in Molnar, 2005) observed: "It seems that we have been reduced almost to a state of absolute economics, in which people and all other creatures and things may be considered purely as economic 'units,' or integers of production, and in which a human being may be dealt with, as John Ruskin put it, 'merely as a covetous machine'" (p. 176). In reducing people to economic units, it is easier to justify an exploitative economic system that has contributed to growing inequity within and between societies (Reich, 1997; Stromquist, 2002). Nonetheless, the sustainability of a polarized society is questionable, as evidenced by growing discontentment around the world.

The issues facing the global community do not just threaten peace and prosperity, but the sustainability of human existence as we know it. In this context, an educational response is needed that will transform how individuals perceive the world and their relationship with each other and nature. Curren (2010) argued that education for global citizenship and survival (a form of transformative education) is fundamentally necessary as a prerequisite for meeting students' needs. The author contended that survival is the foundation from which all other objectives are grounded; therefore, regardless of the rationale ascribed to education - historically educational philosophers have postulated the function of education in society in a few prominent manners including the promotion of knowledge for its own sake, the development of knowledge and skills to flourish, preparation for economic participation, and the creation of contributing citizens (Brighouse, 2006; Marples, 2010) – a transformative dimension must be integrated.

Transformative Education

Transformation is a concept that has been broached in the literature from multiple perspectives (Baumgartner, 2001; Fisher-Yoshida, Geller, & Schapiro, 2009). Numerous theorists highlight transformative learning as an individualistic process. For example, according to the cognitive rational approach, most often represented by the work of Mezirow (1990, 1991, 2000) and Cranton (1994), transformation is viewed as a cognitive process entailing the resolution of dilemmas or contradictions. Discrepancies between individual's beliefs, values, or assumptions and new information introduced are believed to bring about a state of disorientation, stimulating critical self-reflection (Cranton, 1994). According to Mezirow (1990), reflection upon one's underlying meaning making system may reveal epistemic, sociocultural, and psychic distortions that had been uncritically assimilated. By revealing and engaging with these uncritically adopted norms, individuals would be able to reformulate assumptions "to permit a more inclusive, discriminating, permeable, and integrative perspective" (Mezirow, 1990, p. 14), or in other words prompting a transformation in one's worldview.

For scholars from the social emancipatory paradigm, individual liberty cannot be attained unless accompanied by social emancipation. As a result, Freire (2002) advocated that conscientization involved not only greater awareness about oneself and the effects of the sociocultural environment on one's life, but also awareness about one's ability to effect change. As such, Freire's conception of transformation is grounded in praxis or the continual interplay between reflection, engagement, and action. The emphasis on praxis ensures that concurrent transformation occurs on multiple levels so that individual emancipation is not strictly cognitive, but also includes changes in one's social reality.

While Freire advocated for critical consciousness to transform awareness and social realities, O'Sullivan (1999, 2012) called for a new cosmology to redefine human relations with the planet and each other. O'Sullivan (1999) claimed that the current planetary vision is grounded in market globalization, which he viewed as "a morbid process that is toxic to the earth and all its inhabitants" (p. 17). The toxic character of global capitalism relates to its utter disregard for ecological sustainability and its destruction of communal ties, but also its ability to engender a worldview based on instrumental value, thus denigrating deep connections between humans and the planet that sustains them. To counter this trend, the author advocated for transformative learning as a holistic process involving cognitive, spiritual, and social transformation. Within this conceptualization, O'Sullivan (2012) highlighted the tripartite educational goal of survival (creating conditions for the continuance of life), critique (cultural criticism to invoke healing), and creation (the development of a new, sustainable planetary vision). Based on this complex multi-dimensional view, O'Sullivan (cited in Goulah, 2006) defined transformative learning in the following manner:

> Transformative learning involves experiencing a deep structural shift in basic premises of thought, feelings and actions. It is a shift of consciousness that dramatically and permanently alters our way of being in the world. Such a shift involves our understanding of ourselves and our self-locations; our relationships with other humans and with the natural world; our understanding of relations of power in interlocking structures of class, race, and gender; our body-awareness; our visions of alternative approaches to living; and our sense of possibilities for social justice and peace and personal joy. (p.203)

This comprehensive definition, which incorporates elements of the aforementioned paradigms, highlights transformation as a process characterized by substantial, meaningful change. This

contrasts normative forms of education that often have an enculturative effect, socializing individuals to the norms of a particular society (e.g., Freire, 1993; Brown, 2011; Chomsky, 2011). As Hunter (2008) explained, normative change occurs when cognitive dissonance brought about by a disorienting dilemma is addressed through accommodation to existing meaning perspectives. She wrote: "Previous ideas and concepts are reorganized to allow room for the disparate information. This strategy results in learning but does not demonstrate a change in perspective" (Hunter, 2008, p.95). Hence, the majority of learning that takes place in education is normative in character, as it provides additional knowledge and prompts the minor restructuring of meaning schemes, without affecting the overall meaning perspective of individuals required to address contemporary challenges.

Second Language Education and the Potential for Transformative Learning

Second language education is well suited to promote transformative learning. Historically, scholars have recognized the humanistic value of language education. For example, the fifteenth century Italian language educator, Guarino Guarini, proposed the *studia humanitatis* as the basis for the second language curriculum (Musumeci, 1997). Guarini believed that the study of prominent scholars in the areas of history, philosophy and science would not only facilitate linguistic development, but would also assist the student in becoming a more knowledgeable and well-rounded individual. In more contemporary times, scholars have also recognized the transformative potential of second language learning. In the 1970s, numerous scholars responded to the trend of over-emphasizing grammatical accuracy through repeated drills and text manipulation by proposing second language learning systems and curricula that had a more humanistic focus (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Rather, than deeming the emotional, spiritual, physical, etc. needs of the learner as extraneous to the learning process, these curricula

sought to promote language learning within a more holistic framework. In addition, since the beginning of the new millennium a number of works have been published that attempt to re-formulate second language education as a means of promoting global citizenship and social justice (e.g., Guilherme, 2002; Reagan & Osborn, 2002; Osborn, 2006; Birch, 2009).

Furthermore, second language education is uniquely situated to promote transformative learning. In most subject areas, the focus of instruction is on the subject itself; for example, history courses are dominated by the analysis of historical characters and events. Nonetheless, in the process of investigating historical topics, learners are not only exposed to historical facts, but also subject-specific ways of expressing ideas. Moreover, as topics are explored through a linguistic medium, content knowledge is developed concurrently with general linguistic abilities.

In contrast to most subject areas, second language education is unique in that the content of investigation and the medium of interaction are the same. Although historically many methods and approaches have included healthy doses of mother tongue usage (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001), it is generally understood within the field that the target language must be a prominent medium of interaction in order to foster language acquisition (Krashen, 1992; Lightbown, 2000; Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Furthermore, the content of second language education has clearly focused on language in the form of the knowledge and skills required to communicate effectively, as evidenced by the linguistic/communicative focus in prominent textbooks (e.g., Brown, 2001; Harmer, 2007; Johnson, 2008) and analyses of the professional knowledge base of second language educators (e.g., Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Andrews, 2003; Liddicoat, 2006; Mullock, 2006). As the content of second language education includes knowledge (declarative knowledge) and skill (procedural knowledge), the use of the target language as the medium of interaction will develop procedural

knowledge, while leaving vacant the specific content of the interaction. Some authors have advocated for the utilization of linguistic analysis (communicative grammar tasks) as the content of interaction in the second language classroom (e.g., Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Fotos, 1994). While this offers great potential in addressing both procedural and declarative knowledge, it is difficult to envision grammatical analysis as the exclusive focus of interaction in a classroom in which the learners remain motivated to participate. As a result, an opening remains for the selection of non-linguistic-based content to provide the basis for interaction. This opening makes second language education the ideal location to discuss and analyze critical issues affecting contemporary society, thus promoting transformative learning.

The divide between procedural and declarative knowledge has been exploited in numerous approaches to second language instruction. For example, task-based language teaching (TBLT) has become very prominent in second language education over the past two decades (Ellis, 2003; Kumaravadivelu, 2006). TBLT is the strong form of communicative language teaching (Wesche & Skehan, 2002), which is premised on the idea that communication fosters language acquisition and the process of developing communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980; van Ek, 1986). The central component of TBLT, the task, has been defined in diverse ways in the literature (e.g., Breen, 1987; Prabhu, 1987; Skehan, 1998; Nunan, 2004; Samuda, 2005), but is generally viewed as being meaning-based, outcome-oriented, and promoting 'authentic' use of language. This means that tasks could be utilized to explore transformational themes. Therefore, TBLT provides the perfect framework within which to promote transformative learning.

Another prominent approach that provides a framework for transformative learning in the language classroom is content-based instruction (CBI). Similar to TBLT, CBI is premised on the

notion that linguistic development will be ideally fostered when engaged in meaningful language usage. CBI draws its theoretical foundations from socio-cultural theory (e.g., Vygotsky, 1962; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) and functional linguistics (e.g., Halliday, 1994), which emphasize the interrelationship between language, thought, and meaning construction. According to this view, language cannot be learned in isolation from the context in which content was derived and, therefore, must be integrated. The integration of content and language instruction has taken place in immersion (such as French Immersion in Canada) and sheltered instruction settings. Echevarria and Graves (2007) defined sheltered instruction as "a means for making grade-level content, such as science, social studies, and math, more accessible for English language learners (ELLs) while also promoting English development" (p.56). In both these settings content is the organizing principle of the curriculum, but subject-specific content and language garner equal attention (Lyster, 2007). Despite the emphasis on pre-existing school subjects, CBI could easily be applied to ecological and cosmological investigation leading to transformation.

While second language education is ideally suited to promote transformative outcomes as a result of its humanistic roots and separation of declarative and procedural knowledge, the close link between language and culture also makes it an ideal location for transformative learning. The relationship between culture and language has been the source of scholarly debate within a variety of academic fields (Lange & Paige, 2003; Risager, 2006,2007; Liddicoat, 2009). Nonetheless, the prominence of scholarship postulating a close relationship between language and culture, such as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis and Kaplan's (1966) contrastive analysis of cultural thought patterns, combined with ever-increasing attention to the integration of culture in the language classroom (Damen, 1987; Kramsch, 1993; Fantini, 1997) has resulted in the general sentiment that language instruction invariably involves cultural learning. Culture pedagogy in the

second language classroom has often revolved around investigating superficial aspects of culture; however, Goulah (2006) advocated that this has undermined the efficacy of second language education, as it prevents the development of deeper associations or what Riley-Taylor (2002) referred to as "relational knowing." In contrast, Goulah (2006) advocated for the development of a deeper form of consciousness through the exploration of what he termed 'deep culture.' Goulah (2006) defined deep culture as "a more abstract, personal worldview based on the culture embedded in the language" (p. 210). He associated the concept with the Vygotskyan notion of 'sense' - "the sum of all the psychological events aroused in our consciousness" (Lantolf, 1999, p.36) – and the notion of 'rich points' - "surface forms that tap deeply into the world that accompanies language, where that world can be represented by systems of interpretive frames" (cited in Goulah, 2006, p. 211) - advocated by Agar (1991). The deep cultural beliefs and values embedded in rich points and the 'sense' of language assist in the acquisition of tacit codes that facilitate communication. Moreover, according to Goulah (2006) deep culture provides the foundation on which other layers of culture are built - a planetary, cosmological layer of culture where significant transformation can be evoked. In other words, the exploration of deep culture can facilitate substantive changes associated with transformative learning.

Transformative Potential through Hermeneutics of Criticality and Interculturality

The potential to promote transformativity is embedded within the fabric of second language pedagogy; nonetheless, the actual transformative character of second language education is dependent upon the instructional decisions made by teachers, as they interpret and translate the curriculum into practice, a process affecting the operational curriculum (Posner, 1995), hidden curriculum (Apple, 1990), and null curriculum (Flinders, Noddings, & Thornton, 1986). The act of interpreting curricula and designing educational experiences is mediated by

teachers' understanding of the purpose/function of their work supported by their pedagogical philosophies and political commitments. As a result, investigating how teachers rationalize and generally understand their work would provide valuable insight into how second language pedagogy is conceptualized as a transformative endeavour and how a transformative dimension could be incorporated into the core of second language education in the future.

How teachers rationalize and understand their work is complex, multi-dimensional and dependent on numerous factors, including teachers' understanding of the subject matter, various approaches and techniques, and the purpose of their work. As a result, it is an area that is difficult to investigate. Nonetheless, the manner in which teachers politicize their work, conceptualize the deeper meaning of their pedagogy, define the goals of instruction, and frame epistemological issues – in other words how they understand and approach pedagogy – is revealed through their understanding and application of two concepts central to second language pedagogy – criticality and interculturality. The two concepts have been recognized as having a significant bearing on second language education (e.g., Pennycook, 2001; Sercu, 2006; Byram, 2009; Pennycook, 2010); however, the meaning of the terms is not homogenous, as they have been applied in the literature in diverse ways based on different theoretical foundations and with significantly different pedagogical implications (Kincheloe, 2000; Ogilvie, 2013). For example, interculturality has been defined variably as a process, product, project, and policy related to movement between or the intermingling of cultures, while criticality has been taken up as a form of inquiry or analysis to enhance knowledge formation and critique pedagogical practices. As a result, the manner in which teachers understand and apply interculturality and criticality will provide insight not only into how they rationalize and conceptualize second language pedagogy, but also the transformative quality of their work.

Moreover, as it is recognized that understanding is shaped by experience and contextual factors (Kozulin, 1998; Fosnot, 2005), the investigation of how educators understand interculturality and criticality will provide a new layer of insight into the concepts. 'Intercultural' is a concept that has been investigated from the educators' perspective (e.g., Deardorff, 2006a; Sercu, 2007); however, these investigations strictly adhered to a narrow paradigm of intercultural and utilized a methodology with large samples that facilitated insight into trends rather than a rich description of interpretations of the concept. As a result, the literature related to interculturality has a strong scholarly flavour that largely ignores the practitioner perspective. The literature related to criticality is also very theoretical in composition. The focus when engaging with criticality has been on outlining components (Ruggiero, 2009), differentiating between paradigms (Burbules & Berk, 1999; Kincheloe, 2000), and engaging in a theoretical analysis of education (McLaren, 2003; Giroux, 2011). The esoteric character of discussions on how criticality can be infused in education, thus forming a critical pedagogy, has caused critics to question whether they have a role in clarifying pedagogical practices (e.g., Gore, 1993). Thus, a hermeneutic investigation into interculturality and criticality would provide insight into the perceived transformative character of second language education.

Investigating teachers' understanding of the semantic meaning of terms in isolation would potentially be a fruitless endeavour, as numerous teachers may lack familiarity with the words. Moreover, simply gaging how educators understand the conceptual composition of interculturality and criticality would also limit the value of the investigation, as it would turn the research into an intellectual exercise involving the provision of definitions. This does not mean that these avenues of inquiry lack value or will be avoided in the current investigation, but rather that the manner in which interculturality and criticality are understood must be analyzed on

multiple levels (semantic, conceptual, applied, philosophical) to understand how the concepts tacitly penetrate and influence how second language pedagogy is understood and enacted.

Furthermore, as it is recognized that understanding is not autonomously developed in a vacuum but rather constructed in a particular time and space, an investigation of how interculturality and criticality are understood must include analysis of the social influences on interpretation. This means unraveling and exposing the tacit discourses (McLaren, 2003) that frame how teachers rationalize and understand their pedagogical practices.

Research Questions

In accordance, the primary research questions that will be utilized to investigate the transformative potential of second language education are: 1) How do second language educators understand (in a broad, multi-dimensional sense) interculturality? 2) How do language educators understand criticality? 3) What discourses influence how interculturality and criticality are taken up by second language educators?

Guiding Principles and Significance

Two central principles provide the foundation for the current study. The first principle is that education is an inherently practical endeavour, so research must be attentive to the lived realities of educators and how they understand their work. Teachers are at the forefront of educational endeavours. They not only interpret the specific and broader objectives of programs, but also translate curricular documents into educational experiences. Therefore, it is not surprising that curricular undertakings that ignore teacher input (in other words, top-down approaches to innovation) are rarely successful (i.e., Woodward, 1996; Markee, 1997; Lamie, 2005). In fact, as Rogers (2003) highlighted, the implementation of innovative practices is often based on teachers' interpretation of the new practices as being beneficial, comprehensible, and

compatible with current practices and philosophies. As a result, any project aimed at altering teaching practices must attend to classroom realities and teachers' conceptualizations of their work.

Moreover, recognizing knowledge as socially and experientially constructed, it is apparent that educators will bring a different (often more pragmatic) perspective to interpreting concepts than academics. The exclusive portrayal of concepts from a scholarly, theoretical perspective (which regularly occurs in the literature) will often not encapsulate the complex, multi-layered character of the concept. It can also contribute to the perceived theory-practice divide within education (e.g., Gordon & O'Brien, 2007). Therefore, attending to teachers' understanding of concepts is important to foster a broader portrayal of the dimensions of concepts and how they cohere with desired practices.

The second principle is that promoting an agenda of change is a complex, ongoing process. Substantive change does not occur easily or in a linear manner, but rather over time as the result of numerous smaller changes. I view my work as providing preliminary contributions to more tangible long-term changes. For example, much of my earlier work related to the advancement of task-based language teaching. Although this may be viewed as the simple advancement of a particular approach, I viewed it as a preliminary step in setting the stage for infusing content related to critical interculturality into second language pedagogy. The field of second language education has often adopted the position that language is the content (in terms of declarative and procedural knowledge) and medium (at least in more advanced classes) of instruction. As a result, the selection of content for inclusion in second language classes is often based on the vocabulary, forms, and functions deemed necessary to meet students' needs, or language materials containing topics that are deemed to be of interest to students, thus,

promoting the desire to engage with the topic using the linguistic resources available to them. I believe this tendency has undermined the potential of second language education to address important issues confronting an increasingly globalized society. Nonetheless, TBLT provides a framework for language instruction that recognizes the content-medium divide but is not bound to pre-determined content, such as in content-based language instruction, thus creating spaces for non-linguistic focused content to be infused into instruction. Advocacy for TBLT was not viewed as an end in itself, but rather a beginning point for more meaningful changes in the structure of second language education.

The two aforementioned principles are central in outlining the significance of the current study. I believe second language education has the potential to be a truly transformative experience in that it can promote intercultural understanding and dialogue about issues that define our world. This is not to say that promoting dialogue between cultures and engaging in critical discussions in the classroom about issues that influence how we live and interact in the world are going to revolutionize society, but they may provide the impetus for looking at the world differently and questioning taken-for-granted norms, thus spawning novel ways of thinking and being that may contribute to creating a more equitable, sustainable society. My belief in this potential role for second language education is grounded in literature (as evidenced by the literature review); however, it is also based on my experiences as a language educator. Bringing to fruition an understanding of the inherently transformative character of language pedagogy is, as outlined in principle two, a long-term process requiring many small steps. I believe this research contributes to this process in many ways.

First, the current study provides a novel categorization of the central concepts – interculturality and criticality - through a comprehensive literature review (please refer to

Chapter Three and Four). These conceptual categories provide a heuristic for clarifying and further investigating the concepts, thus providing the impetus for pedagogical discussion.

Second, the research project offers an alternative perspective on concepts that have been deemed central to second language pedagogy. The literature related to criticality and interculturality is predominantly approached from a scholarly perspective. Although numerous examples exist of the practical application of the concepts in education (e.g., Byram, 1997; Morgan, 1998; Wallerstein & Auerbach, 2004; Wink, 2005; Osborn, 2006), these examples have been provided by individuals who are very actively engaged in scholarship. This does not mean that the value of their contributions is diminished, but rather that they are not representative of a practitioner perspective. The absence of a practitioner perspective can also be seen in research investigating the meaning of a specific concept. For example, Deardorff (2006b) investigated how intercultural communicative competence was understood, but she only investigated it from the perspective of administrators and scholars identified as experts on the topic. In published work where a practitioner perspective was elicited (e.g., Sercu, 2007), broad quantitative data collection methods were used, thus limiting responses and preventing a thorough investigation of how the concept was understood. Thus, this study contributes a novel perspective – the practitioner perspective – to the literature on criticality and interculturality, adding important layers of depth and complexity to conceptual understanding within the field.

Third, teacher accounts of their work and how they rationalize what takes place in the classroom provide the basis for identifying ways to promote the transformative character of second language education. According to Bhaskar (2008), the empirical domain provides insight into actual events and the underlying structures and mechanisms that influence them (See Chapter Five for further clarification). Hence, how teaching is empirically experienced and

articulated through interviews may provide insight into tacit impediments to the promotion of second language learning as a transformative endeavour. Moreover, teacher explications of how they understand their work can offer important information about inconsistencies between the theoretical and practical domains, assisting in the evolution of the concepts in question to make them more relevant to classroom contexts. Hence, the study provides invaluable information about teachers' experiences and understanding about their work that can assist in the process of infusing a transformative dimension into second language education.

CHAPTER TWO: DIFFERENTIATING INTERCULTURALITY

Multicultural Education

In order to understand the various dimensions and interpretations of the concept 'interculturality', it is first important to differentiate it with other similarly sounding concepts that have sometimes erroneously been used interchangeably (e.g., multiculturalism). Numerous concepts/ educational policies have been developed by adding a prefix to the root 'cultural.' The most common of these in North America is 'multicultural', with a common variation 'multiculturalism.' The prefix 'multi' denotes plurality, highlighting a multiplicity of cultures co-existing. The adjectival form of the term is often used in a descriptive sense to label plural societies. Multiculturalism is also used to denote a particular philosophy that has significantly influenced educational discourses.

Multicultural philosophy was born out of opposition to western chauvinism supported by the epistemological shackles of positivism. Rather than supporting an assimilationist agenda through advocacy for the superiority of one particular culture, multiculturalism adheres to the principle of cultural relativity, which posits that all cultural traditions have value and cannot be judged from the perspective of another culture. As a result, narrow exposure to a singular cultural tradition would be deemed harmful from this vantage point, as it would narrow the scope of one's experience and limit exposure to the knowledge encapsulated in diverse communities. As such, the primary goal of multicultural education is to develop awareness of and respect for cultural diversity (Portera, 2011). Inherent in this educational philosophy is respect for human dignity and the promotion of social justice and greater equity within society (Bennett, 2007). Multicultural education is further predicated on reducing discrimination, promoting enhanced self-understanding through expanding one's cultural lens, and liberating individuals from the

restraints of cultural boundaries (Eckermann, 1994; Banks, 2008), conceptualized by Bennett (2007) as multicultural competence (she also uses the term intercultural competence in a very similar fashion). Although multicultural education is often perceived as primarily benefitting minority groups, this is an erroneous assumption, as dominant groups often have a limited cultural scope based on the perceived superiority of their own culture reinforced through societal norms (Banks, 2001; Ghosh, 2002). Thus, multicultural education would assist students from the dominant culture by challenging their tacit assumptions of superiority and developing more diverse cultural understandings.

Although the basic assumptions of the philosophy are relatively consistent, there are diverse approaches that fall within the rubric of multicultural education. Banks (2004) identified four approaches that demonstrate different levels of integration of multicultural content. The first level was labeled the 'contributions approach' because it focuses on introducing tangible components of diverse cultures in the form of holidays, prominent historical figures, etc. The second level, the additive approach, involves the addition of diverse cultural content, concepts, and themes without changing the basic structure of the curriculum. These first two approaches, which have been labeled 'liberal multiculturalism,' have been the most prominent form of multicultural education implemented in schools (Kubota, 2004a). The last two levels, which fit under the rubric of 'critical multiculturalism' (May, 1999; Kubota, 2004a; May & Sleeter, 2010b), have been labeled the 'transformation approach' and the 'social action approach.' The former involves transforming the curriculum by viewing content from diverse perspectives, while the latter approach takes it one step further by having students make decisions about important social issues that they then enact.

Transcultural Education

Another term commonly utilized within the literature is 'transcultural.' The prefix 'trans' denotes movement across or through; therefore, transcultural refers to phenomena spreading across or through cultures. As a result, cultural phenomena that have spread across the globe, such as sushi, basketball, kindergarten, and individualism, could be considered as transcultural, as they have permeated diverse cultures. As phenomena become further entrenched in diverse cultures, they begin to lose their original associations and take on new associations. This was the intended meaning of transcultural ascribed by its originator, Cuban sociologist Fernando Ortiz, to counter the reductive nature of the concepts 'assimilation' and 'acculturation' (Pratt, 1991). Whereas many of his contemporaries viewed cultural diffusion as a process characterized by imposition and imitation, Ortiz ascribed greater agency to minority groups by claiming that they influence what components are absorbed and how they are used. As such, the concept 'transcultural' refers to the spread of phenomena across cultures and the unique adoption and adaptation of phenomena in different cultural contexts.

The term 'transcultural' has also gained favour among post-modern, hybridization theorists. Traditional conceptualizations of culture often postulate the concept as being stable and bound to a particular geographic location. This territorialized version of culture is based on a narrow understanding of the concept (e.g., as related in a limited fashion to nationality and/or linguistic community) and premised on homogeneity within cultural boundaries and heterogeneity between cultural boundaries. However, in an increasingly interconnected global community in which cultures are constantly intermingling and evolving, cultural hybridity is a more accurate description of the modern setting. Delanoy (2006) exclaimed that transculturality highlights "people's participation in different value systems, their divided and changing group

loyalties, their often futile attempts to level out or downplay contradictions, and their creative efforts to combine disparate elements" (p. 234). In this way transculturality avoids the essentialism often tied to nation-based conceptions of culture and recognizes the messiness and complexity of the post-modern world. Furthermore, the concept dispels the notion of autonomous development that has been used to advocate for western superiority by recognizing that phenomena always develop based on interaction between and influence from diverse cultures. As a result, Delanoy (2006) wrote: "Transculturality is often praised as a concept permitting a more inclusive, critical and democratic understanding of culture" (p. 234).

While transculturality has proven to be a valuable concept for scholarly analysis, it also translates into a distinct educational philosophy (although it has not been very influential in educational literature). Similar to multicultural education, transcultural education seeks to affirm the dignity of all human beings. Nonetheless, multicultural and transcultural education differ significantly in that the former is based on cultural relativity, while the latter is grounded in cultural universalism, evolving from Emanuel Kant's concept of cosmopolitan education (Portera, 2011). Cultural universalism dictates the existence of universal principles that defy cultural boundaries. These cross-cultural principles, which include respect for human rights, are thought to be valid regardless of the context. Therefore, transcultural education does not advocate for acceptance of all cultural positions, but rather the development of values and principles that transcend cultures.

As the focus of transculturality is the intermingling of diverse groups, transcultural education seeks to break down rigid divisions between people. Rather than portraying individuals as exclusively belonging to a particular group that is rigidly defined as bounded and static, transculturality seeks to highlight the complex and dynamic nature of humans. Zamel

(1997) wrote: "Transculturation assumes and celebrates the selective, generative, and inventive nature of linguistic and cultural adaptation" (p. 350). This means that language and culture cannot be viewed as concrete products previously determined, but rather as sites of contestation. Furthermore, it would mean the eradication of traditional divisions between the self and other (Delanoy, 2006), as the bounded categories often used to define ourselves would become less relevant and, thus, have a less divisive effect. This would have significant repercussions for the language classroom, as it would bring into question traditional practices focused on developing knowledge of native-speaker culture and language. Rather than promoting mimicry of native-speaker norms, transcultural education would recognize the agency of all individuals to appropriate language and culture for their own means. Moreover, transcultural education would develop an interpretive frame that would undermine the validity of the native speaker as a homogenous construct and promote awareness about cross-cultural commonality and individual uniqueness. Thus, transcultural education seeks to promote harmonious relations by minimizing the significance of rigid categories that divide humans and highlighting commonalities that transcend cultures.

Intercultural Education

A third term that has become very popular within the field of second language education over the past fifteen years is 'intercultural.' The most common denotation of the prefix 'inter' is 'between', meaning that intercultural denotes engagement between cultures. As all second language learning endeavours and communication between culturally and linguistically diverse individuals involve interaction between multiple cultures, intercultural has been naturally adopted by second language educators and scholars as a conceptual tool. Nonetheless, intercultural has been conceptualized within the literature as being based on slightly different

premises. For example, Schulze-Engler (cited in Delanoy, 2006) asserted that intercultural implies respectful dialogue between cultures viewing themselves as homogenous groups separate from other cultures. As such, Schulze-Engler ascribed a narrow, reductive definition of culture to the concept intercultural. This is problematic (as shall become clear later in this section) because it assumes a uniform understanding of the term. Moreover, there is nothing inherent in the prefix 'inter' that would indicate that engagement between cultures would necessarily be between clearly-defined, homogenous cultures. It should be noted that the term 'intercultural' (and multicultural for that matter) could ascribe to a definition of culture as static and uniform, whereas transcultural could not due to its emphasis on intermingling. Nonetheless, the secondary definition of 'inter' – namely "together, mutually, or reciprocally" (Collins Dictionary, p. 428) – would indicate that intercultural contact results in cultural alteration. Therefore, the assumption that cultures are mutually exclusive and homogenous when relating to intercultural interactions is unwarranted. Schulze-Engler has simply outright ascribed a particular definition of culture to the concept intercultural, ignoring the possibility for other variations.

A slightly different understanding of intercultural was propagated by Abdallah-Pretceille. Abdallah-Pretceille (cited in Portera, 2011) asserted that "the prefix *inter-* implies relations, interaction, exchange of two or more elements" (p. 20). Thus, intercultural refers to the establishment of relations and mutual exchange between cultures. This understanding of intercultural is more closely related with the notion of reciprocity encapsulated in the second definition of 'inter', as it invokes a sense of respect and openness to change. Moreover, it ascribes to a different, less rigid definition of culture according to which notions of homogeneity would be impossible.

Although there are various conceptualizations of intercultural with subtle differences, at its core intercultural education involves engagement between cultures. Open, respectful dialogue between cultures, which is at the heart of intercultural education, is believed to promote cross-cultural sensitivity and increased understanding, not only about diverse cultures encountered but also about one's own culture and the general influence of culture on how we perceive and interact in the world. Based on the centrality of dialogue and openness to difference in intercultural education, the intercultural perspective derives its foundations from the principles of liberalism and hermeneutics.

Liberal philosophy is grounded in the ideas of freedom and equality. Historically, liberal analysts have been critical of policies and philosophies that privilege culture, as they perceive them as undermining individual choice and social harmony (Feinberg, 1995). However, Tamir (1995) argued that liberalism and multiculturalism are not as incongruent as often portrayed (I would contend this also applies to interculturality). Tamir (1995) highlighted two different forms of liberalism – autonomy-based and rights-based. Autonomy-based liberalism views autonomy as the over-riding focus of liberal philosophy; therefore, tolerance for difference is predicated on the degree of freedom promoted within a society. In essence, this form of liberalism is intolerant of illiberal cultures, as it seeks to assimilate them. Therefore, this form of liberalism contradicts notions of respect for and openness to difference essential to intercultural philosophy. In contrast, rights-based liberalism privileges individual decision-making regardless of the source of the decision. As such, rights-based liberalism supports individuals' rights to live as they want according to the cultural traditions they choose to follow. From a rights-based perspective, liberalism and interculturality are thus complimentary.

Intercultural engagement is predicated on a willingness to open oneself to the cultural other. Without commitment to genuinely engage with different cultures, intercultural interaction is unlikely to be successful or fruitful, in fact it is likely to lead to frustration and the further entrenchment of counterproductive stereotypes. A liberal perspective is thus needed because illiberalism rejects openness to plural dialogue and only engages with diversity out of necessity (Tamir, 1995). From the perspective of illiberal philosophy, interaction with diverse groups is counterproductive, as it threatens rather than enhances the closed, authoritarian conceptions of society propagated within the group. Thus, illiberal communities will not engage in intercultural education. In contrast, liberal communities will engage in cross-cultural dialogue because exposure to diverse ideas is viewed as productive in providing individuals with a broader knowledge base and additional options from which to make decisions.

Openness to otherness in order to foster understanding is also supported by hermeneutic theory. From a hermeneutic perspective, understanding is facilitated by one's prejudices or prejudgments. Prejudgments, which are formulated consciously or unconsciously through one's experiences and the traditions one is exposed to, are preconditions of understanding as they provide the foundation from which new information is interpreted. Gadamer (2001) exclaimed: "We are not just stamped by our 'genes' but also by the socialization through which we are in a position to gain access to our world and to the traditions in which we exist . . . it is only through [these characteristics] that we have a horizon at all and are able to encounter something that broadens our horizon" (p. 43). As such, it is impossible to make 'objective' decisions because the self cannot be removed from the process of understanding or interpreting new phenomena. This has repercussions for interaction because it means that absolute understanding independent of interlocutors is not possible. Furthermore, it means that misunderstanding due to the imposition

of one's own meanings is always a risk, in particular in cross-cultural situations. In order to approach genuine understanding by avoiding the projection of one's meanings onto the other, an individual must open herself to dialectical interaction, thus prompting what Gadamer (1989) labeled the 'fusion of horizons.' This can be facilitated by exposing one's prejudices and disempowering those prejudices that prove to be negative, thus inhibiting accurate interpretation (Gadamer, 2001). Gadamer (1989) wrote: "The important thing is to be aware of one's own bias, so that the text [interlocutor] can present itself in all its otherness and thus assert its own truth against one's own fore-meanings" (p.269). Without opening oneself to the other in this way, genuine understanding will be inhibited.

The notion that one must open oneself to the other to establish common understandings would seem to support the principles of cultural universalism; however, intercultural education is not predicated on the imposition of uniformity, but rather the development of broader understandings through cross-cultural exposure. Hermeneutic theory dictates that understanding is tenuous as it is based on the finitude of human existence (Grondin, 1994). Individual prejudices and experiences in addition to the imprecision of language, through which all understanding is formed, make the notion of universality untenable, in particular in a multi-cultural setting. After all, if understanding is contextually dependent, it must be subject to continual revision when confronted by alternative evidence and understandings (Grondin, 2002). That is why Gadamer advocated that true experience results in an understanding of the tenuous nature of interpretation. In commenting on Gadamer's position, Grondin (2002) wrote:

> Most experience, true experience that is, that delivers insight, is negative. . . Gadamer
> draws from this the conclusion that true experience must thus lead to an openness to ever
> newer experience. Someone with experience, he argues, will also be ready to leave things

open, to even tolerate plurality of possible interpretations, because no single one can

really be exhaustive. (p. 44)

This understanding about the plurality of interpretation is a hallmark of intercultural education. Moreover, it highlights the problematic nature of claims to universality that transcend cultural and contextual boundaries.

While intercultural education rejects cultural universalism, it also denies the validity of cultural relativism. Similar to multicultural education, intercultural education values plurality as a tool for self-enhancement and seeks to promote respect for diverse cultures. Nonetheless, whereas multicultural education advocates acceptance of all cultural perspectives as equal, an intercultural perspective does not call for the suspension of judgment on cultural matters. Intercultural philosophy highlights the importance of understanding through intercultural dialogue; however, understanding and agreement are not synonymous. For example, I can understand the rationale provided by the French government for the banning of the *birqa* in public spaces – namely that it is a religious symbol that goes counter to the secular focus of French society. Nonetheless, despite understanding the premise behind the law, I do not agree with the law because it goes counter to the liberal principles of freedom of choice and freedom of expression. I can genuinely understand the perspective of the other without agreeing with it based on my principles. Therefore, openness to difference and the expansion of understanding through cross-cultural dialogue is central to intercultural education, but blanket acceptance of all cultural perspectives and practices is not.

Furthermore, the viability of relativism is questionable. Grondin (2002) wrote: "We can never transcend the realm of prejudices (because we are always implied in our understanding), but we can transcend those that have proven inept or fruitless" (p.45). This means that while we

can struggle to overcome negative prejudices that interfere with understanding, we cannot deny who we are by outright suspending our judgments to accept all options as equal. Prejudices that have been established over time through experience will inevitably influence interpretations and the viability of new ideas encountered. Thus, cultural relativity can only be achieved on a superficial level.

Cultural relativism also contradicts intercultural principles in that it exempts cultural phenomena from investigation. Inherent in the principles of cultural relativism is protection from critique. This means that culture can only be approached from a descriptive perspective without any judgment applied. This privileging of cultural phenomena is problematic as it excludes cultural content from meaningful dialogue. Rather than questioning and engaging with cultural difference in order to foster more well-developed understandings, individuals are thus forced to simply accept the cultural descriptions of informants on face value. To do otherwise would be considered critical of cultural difference and, thus, disrespectful, as cultural relativism equates respect with abstaining from criticism (Lukes, 1995).

In contrast, intercultural education views critical engagement with cultural phenomena as a necessary precursor to meaningful cross-cultural understanding. Communication between culturally diverse individuals without allowing for cultural differences to be investigated undermines the value of the interaction, as it restricts interlocutors to topics that do not exploit the unique positioning of the second language classroom as a plural community. Moreover, the restriction on critique assumes that criticism only occurs in overt verbal forms; however, the mere presence of cultural difference is itself a critique, as it represents alternative forms of being and interacting in the world that are obviously deemed more appropriate (superior) by the individuals adhering to them. Intercultural education does not seek to artificially cover up these

differences out of fear that it may be perceived as disrespectful or create conflict, but rather seeks to exploit plurality to foster cross-cultural understanding through encouraging the interaction of differences (Portera, 2011). Cross-cultural differences are viewed as positive opportunities for growth not only because they broaden exposure, but also because they force the re-evaluation of one's own cultural perspective (a form of criticism). In this way, respect from an intercultural perspective does not involve abstaining from criticism, but rather engaging in dialogic critique in a manner that recognizes the viability of a multitude of perspectives and seeks to genuinely understand from the perspective of the other.

Inherent in the promotion of dialogic interaction is the recognition of the influence of power in intercultural education. Portera (2011) wrote: "Intercultural Education rejects immobility and cultural or human hierarchy, and is meant to encourage dialogue and relationship on equal terms, so that people do not feel constrained to sacrifice important aspects of their cultural identity" (p. 20). This does not mean that power is denied influence or outright ignored within intercultural education (such as occurs in liberal forms of multiculturalism), as power is inevitably present in all contexts and interactions (Foucault, 1980), but rather that power is overtly recognized and engaged with in order to create spaces for mutually beneficial dialogic interaction. Failure to recognize inter-group power differentials may lead to the establishment of imperialistically motivated cultural hierarchies based on ethnocentric critiques; however, ignorance to intra-group power dynamics is also harmful, as it must be recognized that cultural phenomena have been established in a particular time and space that privilege particular actors over others. Thus, to protect traditions on grounds of preserving cultural sanctity would be to solidify beyond reproach the privilege enjoyed by particular groups. This brings into question the merit of cultural relativism because the philosophy assumes that cross-cultural criticism is

negative because it involves the application of one set of homogenous cultural norms on another. This erroneously presupposes the existence of homogenous cultural wholes with unified, coherent moral principles, denies the potential for membership in multiple cultural groups, and assumes a clear divide between insiders and outsiders (Lukes, 1995), all assumptions that are difficult to justify in the post-modern era. Therefore, recognizing the influence of power and engaging with it avoids the pitfall of privileging particular positions in intercultural education, thus opening space for divergent perspectives.

In sum, intercultural education is predicated on dialogic interaction in order to foster greater self-awareness and broader cultural understanding with the hope of promoting social justice. While intercultural education shares commonalities with multicultural education and transcultural education (e.g., the promotion of cross-cultural respect and understanding), there are significant differences in terms of their educational philosophy and the use of the root terms as descriptors (see Table One). Intercultural education denies the existence of absolutes, but rather advocates that all understanding is mediated by individuals' unique composition (what Gadamer would label their 'horizon') influenced by multiple cultural memberships, traditions, experiences, linguistic heritage, etc. (Gadamer, 1989). As such, interaction is not simply a form of communicating ideas but rather a confrontation with difference, challenging one's prejudices and prompting the expansion of understanding. The productive nature of intercultural engagement is premised on the openness of interlocutors to engage with the other by acknowledging the plurality of possible interpretations and attempting to understand the other on her terms. This does not mean the general acceptance of all options as valid, which could denigrate into a form of nihilism, because the outcome of intercultural interaction is not uniform

for interlocutors and uniformity in perspective (i.e., acceptance of all positions) is not imposed,

nor deemed viable.

Table One: Variations in the Use of Terms with the Root 'Cultural'

Prefix	Descriptive Usage	Educational Philosophy
Multi	• Plural societies (e.g., Canada is a multicultural society)	• Promote respect for all cultures • Grounded in cultural relativism
Trans	• Process of cultural adaptation • Status of diffused cultural phenomena • Recognition of cultural hybridity	• Endorse transcendental values • Based on cultural universalism
Inter	• Cross-cultural interaction • Product of training/ educational endeavours	• Encourage engagement between cultural groups • Supported by liberalism and hermeneutics

CHAPTER THREE: DEFINING THE INTERCULTURAL

Second language education invariably promotes interaction between multiple cultures, thus, second language learning has been promoted as an intercultural endeavour (Sercu, 2004, 2006). Within this framework, the second language classroom is not just a site for memorizing vocabulary, cultural facts, and grammar rules, and formulating accurate, fluent utterances, but also a location to explore one's identity and the foundations of one's worldview and the worldview of others. As such, language pedagogy is not guided by the certainty of positivism (as has typically been the case historically) but rather the tenuous, interpretive character of hermeneutics and post-modernism. According to Sercu (2007), this further solidifies the language classroom as intercultural because the concept fits well with post-modern conceptions of the individual in interaction: "All encounters always encompass interactions between multiple identities of social actors and their perceptions of each other's identities. They are therefore always intercultural" (p.66). Thus, it is natural that the concept 'intercultural' has become ubiquitous in the second language literature.

Despite its ubiquity, 'intercultural' is a concept that is understood in diverse ways due to its variable and often contradictory usage. It is evident that people with nominal familiarity with a concept will possess significantly different understandings of the concept; however, even among people with intimate familiarity (e.g., Sercu, 2005) or those considered experts (e.g., Deardorff, 2006a, 2006b) there is great divergence in how intercultural is understood. Ogilvie (2013) highlighted that the term 'intercultural' has been utilized in three distinct ways in the literature: as a process, product, and project. A fourth usage could be added to this list, as intercultural has also been prominently used as a policy. Therefore, although the term 'intercultural' and the concept 'intercultural education' have relatively stable meanings, as

outlined in the previous section, the use of the term in various contexts has resulted in it acquiring subtle, yet significantly different nuances.

Intercultural as Process

Monologic Process

As a process, intercultural denotes movement between cultures. This movement can occur in two manners: monologic or dialogic. The monologic form of intercultural involves unidirectional adaptation, also known as enculturation or assimilation, towards the target culture. The term 'intercultural' here is closely associated with the applied linguistic concept 'interlanguage', referring to the language produced by learners in the process of learning an additional language (Selinker, 1972). Richards and Schmidt (2002) explained: "Since the language which the learner produces . . . differs from both the mother tongue and the target language, it is sometimes called an interlanguage" (p. 267). As such, interlanguage refers to the 'imperfect' language utilized by learners as they move from their native language norms to the norms of the target language. Kordes (1991) noted that a similar transitional stage, which he labeled 'interculture', occurred in the process of learning additional cultures. This mirrors 'intercultural as process', which refers to the partial, imperfect understanding of cultural norms, as learners progress from their native culture norms to the norms of the target culture.

Intercultural as a monologic process draws its foundation from the influential linguistic concept 'communicative competence' (e.g., Hymes, 1972; Canale & Swain, 1980; van Ek, 1986), in which the communicative norms of an idealized native speaker are upheld as the ultimate goals of language instruction (Kramsch, 1998; McKay, 2003). Communication involves systemic (properties of language) and schematic (socially acquired meanings of the world) knowledge (Widdowson, 1990; Alptekin, 1993); therefore, learners must not only study the

linguistic system, but also the culture associated with the target community. As language and

culture are generally closely associated with the nation-state (Scollon, 2004; Risager, 2007),

language instruction within the 'intercultural as process' paradigm would focus on knowledge

about the culture of a particular nation-state that would facilitate effective communication.

Through exposure to the culture of the native speaker of a particular nation-state, individuals

would move from their partial, 'tainted' understanding of and competence in the target culture to

a more native-like understanding and competence.

'Intercultural' is a label that is not commonly used to describe this uni-directional form of

learning. Nonetheless, this understanding of second language pedagogy, often labeled as the

'foreign cultural approach' (Risager, 1998) or 'communicative language teaching' (to develop

communicative competence), is prominent in second language education and, therefore, warrants

attention as an intercultural phenomenon. Despite its prevalence in second language education

discourses and its influence on pedagogical practices, the 'intercultural as monologic process'

paradigm is theoretically problematic.

The monologic form of the 'intercultural as process' paradigm is predicated on an

essentialist conception of culture. The culture of the target language community is portrayed as

homogenous and monolithic, thus facilitating the easy identification of cultural attitudes and

knowledge to be acquired. Furthermore, culture is postulated as a static entity impervious to

human influence. As a result, exposure to appropriate cultural products and perspectives,

presented as absolute truths for learners to digest (Sercu, 2005), would facilitate learners

becoming more 'authentic' in their thinking and demeanour.

Furthermore, this paradigm is based on the idealization of the monolingual, native

speaker (Byram, 1997; Alptekin, 2002). Second language learners are encouraged to analyze the

linguistic and cultural norms of the native speaker as models of appropriate communication. In this way second language learners are posited as incomplete native speakers and are required to abandon their previous linguistic and cultural knowledge in order to not only comprehend but also mimic the behaviour of native speakers (Liddicoat, 2008). This goal is not only unrealistic and counterproductive, but creates a hierarchical power differential between those who embody the language as native speakers and those who strive to be like them (Byram, 1997). The appropriation of power through the linear positioning of people in this way mirrors the approach of modern, colonial language study (Kramsch, 2002).

Along similar lines, 'intercultural as a monologic process' neglects the social reality of contemporary cross-cultural communication (Liddicoat, 2008). The inherent assumption in the model is that second language communication will exclusively take place between the learner and a native speaker of the language. As a result, knowledge about the target culture will facilitate effective communication. However, this viewpoint assumes a macro perspective that ignores the heterogeneity found within any culture and the possibility of communicating with individuals for whom the culture associated with the language is also foreign (as in any situation where a *lingua franca* is used).

Moreover, this paradigm promotes the view that cultural knowledge can be obtained in a passive, uni-directional manner. The focus on target culture norms, without consideration for the learner's culture or experiences, would result in the exclusive use of target culture teaching materials (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999). The assumption is that the provision and reinforcement of target community norms will result in the acquisition of a second cultural code that individuals can draw upon. This perspective denies the influence of culture as an epistemological phenomena affecting interpretation, a position that is widely accepted by many social scientists

34

and educators (e.g., Geertz, 1973; Fantini, 1997). Furthermore, it fails to challenge learners' pre-existing cultural perspectives, thus, potentially reinforcing ethnocentric biases. Liddicoat (2007) wrote that treated in this manner culture pedagogy is "external to the learner and is not intended to confront or transform the learner's existing identity, practices, values, attitudes, beliefs and worldview" (p. 20.3). Pedagogy would thus not satisfy its transformative potential and could even lead to incorrect interpretations of the target culture, as individuals would rely on schemata from their native culture to interpret 'foreign' phenomena. To rectify this, Jaeger (1995) contended that educators should "stress the necessity of learning more about and becoming more conscious of one's own cultural background as a prerequisite for engaging in learning processes involving knowledge of other cultures" (p. 31). A balance must be struck between both the native culture and the target culture, as failure to do so could result in ethnocentric bias or what Risager (cited in Risager, 1998) labeled 'secondary ethnocentrism' – ethnocentrism related to the norms of the target culture. Thus, the exclusive focus on the target culture, inherent in the monologic form of 'intercultural as process', is counterproductive.

Dialogic Process

In contrast to the monologic form of intercultural as process, which involves uni-directional movement towards target norms, the intercultural as a dialogic process involves bi-directional movement, thus postulating language learning as involving multiple cultures. According to Kumaravadivelu (2002), this makes interaction in the second language classroom truly intercultural: "Intercultural communication involves *inter*action between languages, between cultures, between people. . . Any cultural construct that is based on interpretations of only one side of the cultural spectrum will remain unprincipled and uninformed for the simple reason that one-sided interpretations can lead only to narrow versions of cultural reality" (p.4).

As such, the dialogic paradigm of 'intercultural as process' is not about the enculturation of learners, but rather the exploration of multiple cultures leading to individual cultural evolution.

As a dialogic process, intercultural has a strong interpretive character. Culture is understood as influencing how people perceive and interact in the world; therefore, the process of developing the ability to operate in multiple cultural settings does not involve mimicry, but rather inquisitiveness to question one's own perspective and openness to the perspective of others. Moreover, as each interlocutor brings a unique cultural frame to an interaction, the resulting cultural basis for communication will also be unique. In Gadamerian hermeneutics, an individual's 'horizon' provides the basis for all understanding (Grondin, 2002). When individuals engage in a meaningful manner with each other, their horizons fuse, resulting in the alteration of each of the horizons. Similarly, Kramsch (1993) postulated that when individuals interact they do not simply operate within their native culture or the culture of the interlocutor, but in a 'third space' at the interstices between cultures. Rathje (2007) labeled this space a 'fleeting interculture', which she claimed was "characterized by uncertainty or perhaps disorientation with the specific form of differentiation encountered" (p. 262). The state of disequilibrium caused by the encounter with difference forces an individual to seek to bring about a semblance of normality and cohesion. Rathje (2007) proposed that individuals use their cross-cultural knowledge and ability to mediate diverse situations to transform the uncertain 'interculture' to a cohesive 'culture'. Although the nebulous third space can promote discomfort, it can also be a space of great enlightenment. Kramsch (1993) advocated that when engaging in this space, individuals must name and interpret the world in alternative ways, leading to novel understandings about their own culture and the culture of the interlocutor. Thus, intercultural

interaction is a unique process for every individual, as the third space will be variously located depending on the context and the interpretive frame of the interactants.

The dialogic variant of 'intercultural as process' will result in significantly different pedagogical practices in the second language classroom. Rather than promoting the acquisition of native-speaker codes of communication, Kramsch (1993) advocated that educators assist learners in investigating cultural fault lines. This entails facilitating a "clash between the familiar meanings of the native culture and the unexpected meanings of the target culture, meanings that were taken for granted are suddenly questioned, challenged, problematized" (Kramsch, 1993, p.238). In other words, the focus of language pedagogy would be on promoting critical awareness about cultural boundaries, rather than the construction of cultural bridges. In this way, Kramsch advocated for foreign language pedagogy that would promote epistemological investigation into the ways people interpret and understand the world. One aspect of this process is teaching culture as it is mediated through language (Kramsch, 1998), which Byram and Kramsch (2008) advocated could be accomplished through the critical analysis of literature.

As a dialogic process, intercultural is pedagogically appealing, but also theoretically supported. This conceptualization of the intercultural adheres to contemporary definitions of culture as plural, dynamic, and multi-faceted. Moreover, by postulating culture as a site of negotiation between interlocutors, the dialogic variant of the intercultural as process is supported by post-modern theory (Crawford & McLaren, 2003). Furthermore, the dialogic paradigm fits well with the concepts of cultural hybridity (e.g., Clifford, 1992; Bhabha, 1994; Kramsch & Uryu, 2012) and cosmopolitanism (e.g., Hannerz, 1990; Pollock, Bhabha, Breckenridge, & Chakrabarty, 2000; Turner, 2002).

Cultural hybridity portends that all cultures are the product of cultural intermingling, thus, the notion of a 'pure' culture is strictly hypothetical. It also asserts that interaction between cross-cultural phenomena does not lead to the acquisition of an additional culture (as is theorized within the intercultural as monologic process paradigm), but rather the development of a third culture (Bhabha, 1994) that "represents a state of ambivalence, of in-betweenness, of border-crossing" (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p.124). As a result, hybridity has been advocated by post-colonial scholars as a means to overcome the hegemony of imperial definitions because hybridity provides an opportunity for the oppressed to negotiate and re-translate meanings, thus enabling new positions to emerge.

Closely connected to the concept of cultural hybridity is the notion of cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism has a long intellectual history tracing back to the Stoics and the Enlightenment theory of Immanuel Kant (Brown, 2009). Nonetheless, the concept defies precise definition "precisely because specifying cosmopolitanism positively and definitively is an uncosmopolitan thing to do" (Pollock et al., 2000, p.577). Cosmopolitanism celebrates the uncertainty of the myriad of possibilities provided by diversity. Hollinger (2005) wrote: "Cosmopolitanism promotes multiple identities, emphasizes the dynamic and changing character of many groups, and is responsive to the potential for creating new cultural combinations" (p. 3-4). As a result, it denies the validity of traditionally defined boundaries and advocates for individually determined affiliations. Cosmopolitans may define themselves in part because they do not belong to a particular culture, but seek out and are able to adapt to a variety of cultures. As a consequence, cosmopolitans are often perceived as 'different' by cultural insiders (locals), a notion that is highlighted by the fact that cosmopolitans have emerged from the taken-for-granted character of

the cultural insider to view the world through a more critical lens that problematizes what is often deemed as natural (Hannerz, 1990).

Despite its strong theoretical foundation, the intercultural as dialogic process paradigm has been criticized as being overly idealistic and elitist. The paradigm is idealistic in that it denies the existence of a power differential between interlocutors. Nonetheless, inequality between interactants is inevitable as it results from differences in political or socio-economic positioning or an imbalance in language ability. Kumaravadivelu (2008) wrote: "Clearly, the colonizer and the colonized are not positioned on an equal footing" (p. 129). Similarly, the native speaker and non-native speaker do not enjoy equal status, as the language and associated 'languaculture' (Risager, 2006) utilized in an interaction are more closely aligned with one individual than the other. A similar imbalance is likely to occur in any context, but particularly in an educational context where the power of a particular form of culture and language are legitimized through the authority of the institution, instructor, or credentials associated with particular content. As such, the location of the third culture established between interlocutors is likely to be less intercultural - denoting 'betweenness' as outlined by Kumaravadivelu (2002) – and more closely linked with the dominant culture. In this way, the monologic and dialogic paradigms of 'intercultural as process' are not significantly different.

Intercultural as Product

Unlike the aforementioned paradigm in which intercultural is posited as a monologic or dialogic process, the 'intercultural as product' paradigm posits intercultural as a desired product of cross-cultural training or language instruction, most often expressed as intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997), intercultural competence (Jensen, 1995; Deardorff, 2006a; Sercu, 2006; Rathje, 2007), intercultural sensitivity (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman,

2003; Bennett & Bennett, 2004), or the intercultural speaker (Kramsch, 1998; Byram, 2009; Wilkinson, 2012). There are many variations of intercultural within this paradigm based on different theoretical foundations and traditions; however, two central developments have been particularly influential in shaping intercultural as a product - the creation of the Foreign Service Institute in the United States and the promotion of second language education as a means to stimulate social cohesion and mobility by the Council of Europe (Ogilvie, 2013).

Historical Influences

Following World War Two, the United States adopted a more prominent role in world affairs, necessitating the creation of an institution to prepare diplomats and other professionals to deal with the rigours of cross-cultural interaction. The result was the creation of the Foreign Service Institute in 1947 (Moon, 1996). Under the guidance of its most influential member, Edward Hall, the institute adopted a pragmatic agenda, focusing on the analysis of tangible cultural and linguistic information. Although Hall was skeptical about the efficacy of such an approach to training, bureaucratic restrictions, practical application pressures, and resistance from trainees resulted in a more objective-oriented, concrete curricula being adopted (Moon, 1996). This resulted in the treatment of culture as an objective entity that could be analyzed and categorized down to its specific components (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990).

Hall's work at the Foreign Service Institute was not only successful in preparing many Americans for engaging in international affairs, but also revolutionized how culture was viewed and investigated in numerous fields. According to Hinnencamp (2009), Hall's work had a significant effect on the field of intercultural communication. This influence included a shift from focusing on one culture to the comparison of multiple cultures, a move from focusing on culture as a general phenomenon to the analysis of smaller units of culture, a focus on

communication as patterned, learned and dissectible, and the use of cross-cultural dyadic

interaction as the basis for analysis (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990). In addition, Pusch (2004) advocated

that Hall's work was influential in the development of the field of intercultural training. She

claimed that Hall's use of reflective and experiential activities would act as the basis for common

activities utilized by intercultural trainers:

> [Hall] set a baseline for intercultural training that continues to this day and includes the
>
> use of experiential learning techniques; emphasis on awareness of one's own cultural
>
> conditioning; training for actual everyday encounters between people who are culturally
>
> different, and accepting differences in a nonjudgmental manner. (Pusch, 2004, p.15)

Thus, Hall's influence was both theoretical and practical. As the fields of intercultural

communication and intercultural training have had a significant impact on the development of

intercultural understanding in second language pedagogy (e.g., Damen, 2003; Lafayette, 2003;

Smith, Paige, & Steglitz, 2003; Odgers, 2011), Hall's influence has also filtered into the second

language classroom.

Hall's work at the Foreign Service Institute was not specifically addressed at influencing

second language pedagogy, but the work of scholars associated with the Council of Europe (most

notably Michael Byram and Genevieve Zarate) has been directly linked with developing

intercultural competence in the second language classroom. The Council of Europe is an

intergovernmental political organization formed in 1949 in response to numerous threats to

European prosperity (Trim, 1996, 2012). In addition to the collapse of cooperation between

former allies and the menacing threat of the 'Iron Curtain', slow economic recovery threatened

the social and political cohesion of numerous European nations. To counter these ominous

developments, the Council of Europe adopted the mandate to promote European unity through

the protection and strengthening of human rights and democracy, the identification of solutions to societal issues, and the promotion of a European cultural identity (Trim, 1996).

The Council of Europe has faced numerous obstacles in meeting its mandate, prime among them being the unprecedented demographic diversity caused by intra- and inter-continental migration. During the period of economic recovery following the Second World War the composition of European societies became more plural as a result of the continent's colonial legacy and increased worker migration. Movement between countries within the continent was further enhanced by the formation of an economic union with a singular currency through the signing of the Treaty of Maastricht. The formation of the economic bloc, which was designed to challenge the economic dominance of the United States of America, led to the opening of borders to facilitate greater mobility and efficiency. Byram and Zarate (1996) wrote: "The rights of citizens of the European Union to live and work anywhere within the Union are the current embodiment of the principle of mobility, the realisation for the individual of the political intentions at the level of the state" (p. 239). The expansion of the European Union into Eastern Europe would add an additional dimension of diversity, as members of more impoverished nations sought employment in more developed economies. Glaser, Guilherme, Garcia, and Mughan (2007) noted: "The expansion of the European Union in 2005 created waves of migrants from low-wage countries wishing to seek work in Europe's more advanced economies. Not only do these workers contribute labour, they also become part of the host community, contributing to its culture and diversity and drawing on its social, educational and health resources" (p. 20). The acceptance of more permanent migration as an aspect of European solidarity is a marked change from the earlier perspective of migrant workers as temporary guests providing a short-term service for local communities, rather than permanent settlers. The consequence of this change

was the need to prepare the European populace to deal with increased linguistic and cultural diversity.

The desire to enhance mobility and social cohesion within Europe has provided the backdrop for developments in second language education in the continent over the past three decades. Rather than simply assisting learners to develop the ability to communicate using an alternative linguistic code, second language education was henceforth postulated as a means to foster a plurilingual and pluricultural European identity and enhance communication and relations between diverse populations (Byram, 2008; Butler, 2009). In his opening remarks to the European Centre for Modern Languages, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Terry Davis, commented: "Language and language teaching are essential to the promotion of the Council of Europe values of democracy and human rights . . . [L]anguage skills help people to understand and respect each other, as well as talk and listen to each other" (Davis, 2009, p.18). In this address, Davis was clearly framing language education as serving a much larger social function than simply enhancing communication, as he tied language pedagogy to the aims of the Council of Europe. Central among this focus was the promotion of citizenship in the language classroom. One aspect of citizenship education was the incorporation of a European dimension "to bring the peoples of Europe together by fostering awareness of and enhancing a common European identity" (Planet, 2000, p.26). Although less commonly advocated, a second element of citizenship development in the language classroom was the promotion of democracy and human rights. Starkey (2003) advocated that democracy and human rights are closely linked: "Democracy depends on individuals having freedom of conscience, freedom of movement, the right to peaceful assembly and media constrained only by the need to protect the rights and

freedom of others" (p. 68). As a result, the coupling of democratic and human rights principles was natural in the promotion of citizenship education in the European context.

In order to satisfy the objectives of the Council of Europe it was also important for language educators to develop a common framework for discussing and assessing linguistic and cultural development. In the early years of the project the concept of the 'threshold level' was developed to outline the knowledge and skills learners needed in order to engage in everyday activities in another country (e.g., van Ek & Trim, 1984; van Ek, 1986; van Ek & Trim, 1991). The notion of the threshold level was closely linked with the native/foreign dichotomy, in which the native speaker was upheld as the reference point to determine the level of a learner's competence (Zarate, 2003a). The native speaker model was problematic though, as it was not only unattainable by the second language learner but also promoted competences that were counterproductive in a plurilingual, pluricultural Europe. Byram and Zarate (1997) wrote: "Native speakers live at the centre of a system of values and beliefs, from which they – ethnocentrically- perceive their own sociocultural experience and their contact with other cultures" (p. 9). In a setting of constant cross-cultural interaction, individuals need to be able to shift cultural frames, thus making the native speaker model inadequate. In contrast, interaction in the European context requires learners to constantly act as cultural and linguistic intermediaries. As a result, the intercultural speaker has been adopted as the new objective and model of assessment for second language education (Byram & Zarate, 1997; Zarate, 1997; Byram, 2009).

Intercultural Competence Model

The intercultural speaker is able to mediate diverse cultural settings and resolve cross-cultural confusion and conflict as a result of her intercultural competence. Consequently, intercultural competence has replaced communicative competence as the guiding skills,

knowledge and attitudes to be developed in the second language classroom. This does not mean that communicative competence has been abandoned in the second language classroom; on the contrary, communicative competence occupies a central position in models of intercultural communicative competence (e.g., Byram, 1997). Furthermore, Sercu (2004) noted: "When discussing intercultural competence in foreign language education, it is important to underline that 'intercultural competence' always implies 'communicative competence', and therefore always also has a linguistic, sociolinguistic and discourse component" (p. 75).

The model of intercultural competence advocated in Europe included four types of competence linked to a series of objectives (Byram, 1995; Byram & Zarate, 1997; Zarate, 1997). The first competence, existential competence, also labeled as 'savoir-etre', relates to an individual's ability to relinquish ethnocentric attitudes. This competence involves numerous capacities including empathy, "curiosity and openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one's own" (Byram, 1997, p. 57). Byram (1995) noted that fostering positive attitudes and tolerance for difference has often been included in policy documents related to foreign language instruction; therefore, it is natural for language educators to incorporate into instruction. While 'savoir-etre' includes both affective and cognitive dimensions, 'savoirs' is exclusively cognitive as it relates to declarative knowledge. Byram (1997) defined 'savoirs' as "knowledge of social groups and their products and practices in one's own and in one's interlocutor's country, and of the general processes of societal and individual interaction" (p.58). Zarate (1997) highlighted that the knowledge encapsulated by 'savoirs' was indicative of traditional cultural content presented in the language classroom. In contrast, the third competence outlined, 'savoir-apprendre', relates to an individual's ability to learn. Byram and Zarate (1997) defined this competence as "an ability to produce and operate an interpretative

system with which to gain insight into hitherto unknown cultural meanings, beliefs and practices, either in a familiar or in a new language and culture" (p.16). This highlights the importance of a disposition towards discovery in any intercultural interaction. The final competence, 'savoir-faire', involves a learner's ability to incorporate all three previous competences in cross-cultural interaction. Byram (1995) noted that "[s]*avoir-faire* is the skill of operating at several levels – relating own and foreign culture, interpreting new phenomena in situ, explaining one's own cultural assumptions and behaviours to the other" (p.64). According to Zarate (1997), this competence is relational and cannot be directly applied to the learning of an additional language, as it depends on the specific nature of the two linguistic and cultural systems at play in any given context.

In a subsequent publication, Byram (1997) made slight modifications to the model of intercultural competence. First, he combined two previously autonomous competences into a singular competence labeled 'savoir-apprendre/faire', which was defined as the "ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction" (Byram, 1997, p.61). Second, he developed a competence to replace the fourth competence when the two competences were melded together. This competence, 'savoir-comprendre', was defined as "the ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one's own" (Byram, 1997, p.61). Finally, he developed a fifth competence, 'savoir s'engager', which he placed at the center of the model. Byram (1997) defined savoir s'engager as "an ability to evaluate, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries" (p. 63). This savoir emphasizes the importance of critical cultural awareness and the necessity for political

knowledge on a global level. Within the modified model, the five savoirs form the basis of intercultural competence, which is utilized in conjunction with linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, and discourse competence in situations in which a foreign language is being used.

The notion of intercultural competence aligned with the model of the intercultural speaker has been closely associated with the contemporary framework adopted in Europe for guiding language pedagogy. The framework devised as part of the Modern Language Project draws heavily on two tools – the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and the European Language Portfolio (ELP). Although intercultural competences are not overtly outlined within these tools and a linguistic focus exists, concepts closely related to intercultural competence, such as social cohesion, are stressed (Zarate, 2003a). Moreover, awareness about the deficiencies of the CEFR and ELP has resulted in proposals to more closely fuse intercultural competence with the framework (Byram, 2003a; Zarate, 2003a). The close association between intercultural competence and the European agenda for second language education is significant because it has strongly influenced pedagogical understandings and practices. The adoption of the European framework for language pedagogy has not only influenced practices throughout the continent, but around the world (e.g., Byrnes, 2012; Sugitani & Tomita, 2012; Parmenter & Byram, 2012). As a consequence, the understanding of intercultural competence outlined within the European program has had a significant influence on how the concept has been globally understood.

The work of the Council of Europe and the Foreign Service Institute in the United States of America has not been the only stimuli for developing understanding about intercultural as a product. Nonetheless, these agencies have significantly shaped the discourses related to this

paradigm and, therefore, warrant elaboration to explicate the context in which notions of the intercultural as product have been developed. The fact that theoretical developments related to intercultural competence have been strongly influenced by two intellectual traditions does not mean that there is homogeneity in conceptualizations of the intercultural as product; on the contrary, different representations of the concept exist with varying theoretical orientations (see Table Two for a list of varied definitions). The diversity of definitions applied to intercultural competence was highlighted by Deardorff (2006a, 2006b). In her study, Deardorff (2006a, 2006b) investigated how administrators at higher education institutions committed to internationalization and prominent intercultural scholars define and understand intercultural competence. Her findings demonstrated that intercultural competence is an evolving concept that, although understood in divergent ways, embodies certain key characteristics.

Responses by administrators highlighted divergent perspectives on intercultural competence. Out of nine definitions provided for administrators to critique, only two definitions, those provided by Byram (1997) and Lambert (1994) (see Table Two), scored above 3.0 on a four point Likert scale. This demonstrates a lack of consistency in how intercultural competence is understood. Nonetheless, when asked to share their own definition of intercultural competence developed at their institutions, administrators demonstrated a commonality in their preference for general definitions that could be flexibly adapted to different situations. Moreover, administrators highlighted common elements associated with intercultural competence, including "the awareness, valuing, and understanding of cultural differences; experiencing other cultures; and self-awareness of one's own culture" (Deardorff, 2006b, p.247).

Table Two: Definitions of 'Intercultural Competence' from the Literature

Meyer (1991) - "Intercultural competence, as part of a broader foreign speaker competence, identifies the ability of a person to behave adequately and in a flexible manner when confronted with actions, attitudes and expectations of representatives of foreign cultures. Adequacy and flexibility imply an awareness of the cultural differences between one's own and the foreign culture and the ability to handle cross-cultural problems which result from these differences. Intercultural competence includes the capacity to stabilise one's self-identity in the process of cross-cultural mediation, and to help other people to stabilise their self-identity" (p.137).

Lambert (1994) – "Five components: World knowledge, foreign language proficiency, cultural empathy, approval of foreign people and cultures, ability to practice one's profession in an international setting" (cited in Deardorff, 2006a, p.237).

Byram (1997) – "Knowledge of others; knowledge of self; skills to interpret and relate; skills to discover and / or to interact; valuing others' values, beliefs, and behaviours' and relativizing one's self. Linguistic competence plays a key role" (as adapted by Deardorff, 2006a, p.237).

Fennes & Hapgood (1997) - "The expandability, flexibility, and adaptability of one's frame of reference/ filter" (p.xx).

Liddicoat (2002) – "Intercultural competence means being aware that cultures are relative, that is, being aware that there is no one 'normal' way of doing things but rather that all behaviour is culturally variable. Applied to a particular language it also involves knowing some of the common cultural conventions that are used by speakers of the language" (p.10).

Bennett (2003) - "Intercultural competence is the ability to interpret intentional communications (language, signs, gestures), some unconscious cues (such as body language), and customs in cultural styles different from one's own. Emphasis is on empathy and communication" (p.32-33).

Bennett & Bennett (2004) – "In general terms, intercultural competence is the ability to communicate effectively in cross-cultural situations and to relate appropriately in a variety of cultural contexts" (p.149).

Deardorff (2006a) – Ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (p.239).

Deardorff (2006a) – "Ability to shift frame of reference appropriately and adapt behaviour to cultural context; adaptability, expandability, and flexibility of one's frame of reference/filter" (p. 239).

Lustig & Koester (2006) - "Intercultural communication is a symbolic, interpretive,transactional, contextual process in which people from different cultures create shared meanings" (p. 46).

In contrast to the administrators, intercultural experts provided a greater range of definitions, but also expressed a higher degree of agreement on what constitutes intercultural competence. Seven definitions achieved at least 80% agreement among the respondents polled, with the top two definitions receiving almost unanimous support (see Deardorff, 2006a in Table One). Deardorff (2006b) expressed that numerous specific skills were agreed upon by experts: "Of the specific components of intercultural competence noted, many of them addressed an individual's personal attributes, such as curiosity, general openness, and respect for other cultures. Other delineated components involved cultural awareness, various adaptive traits, and cultural knowledge" (p.248). The author added that the only element to receive one hundred percent agreement was 'an understanding of others' world views.'

Although consensus cannot be achieved in defining intercultural competence or its key components, certain commonalities pervade most conceptualizations of intercultural as a product. Ogilvie (2013) summarized key commonalities of the intercultural as product paradigm well and, thus, will be quoted extensively:

> In this paradigm culture is commonly postulated as a cause of miscommunication and potentially conflict between culturally diverse people. As such, the primary objective is to promote harmony (or efficiency as is often the case in the contemporary world emphasizing global competitiveness) through facilitating increased intercultural communication and, thus, understanding. One's cultural heritage is viewed as an impediment to cross-cultural understanding, therefore, the suspension of judgment and openness to difference are considered important skills to develop. An attitude of openness can only be facilitated if an individual is comfortable when confronted with difference. As a result, emphasis is given to reducing anxiety through simulated confrontations with

difference and awareness about cultural diversity. Awareness-raising is not restricted to knowledge of the other, as awareness of one's own culture and cultural biases is deemed essential in fostering communication and understanding. As such, cultural instruction would involve both culture-general and culture-specific investigation, including comparisons between cultural norms and perspectives. The presentation of cultural information often assumes the form of neat dichotomies (e.g., Hall, 1959; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005) of cultural values or descriptions of cultural practices. In promoting awareness about difference it is believed that the tentativeness of one's own perspective, as just one of many possible perspectives, will become clear, leading to a process of de-centering. As the state of being intercultural is posited as a product or outcome in contexts in which accountability is often emphasized (i.e., in education and business training), a focus is often given to the tangibility and measurability of the construct (Byram, 1997; Korhonen, 2010; Sercu, 2010). Pedagogy based on 'intercultural as product' provides opportunities for personal development through the confrontation of stereotypes and the expansion of one's worldview. In the process of developing intercultural competence, learners not only enhance their command of a language but also their awareness about cultural differences and their ability to adapt to divergent contexts. (p.11-12)

Appeal of Paradigm

The intercultural as product paradigm, as embodied by the concept of intercultural competence, is very appealing to practitioners, administrators and theoreticians for numerous reasons. First and foremost, the intercultural as product paradigm is pervasive in the literature, as it is commonly applied in numerous fields including intercultural communication, intercultural

training, and second/foreign language education. The application of the concept in diverse fields

of investigation has resulted in it being richly developed using a variety of perspectives. This has

contributed to conceptual clarity and ease of access to the concept in various professional

contexts. Moreover, the prominence of the intercultural as product paradigm in the literature has

resulted in it dominating discourses related to the intercultural. For example, in the

second/foreign language education literature it is rare to find discussions about intercultural that

do not cohere with the notion of the concept as a product, in particular when the 'intercultural'

label is explicitly used. Thus, the prominence of intercultural as a product promotes familiarity

and inspires comfort.

The well-developed nature of intercultural as a product has contributed to its ease of use.

As authors have attempted to outline the various characteristics of intercultural competence and

how they can be developed (e.g., Byram, 1997; Weber, 2003), the product-version of the concept

has assumed a tangible form. For example, Byram (1997) thoroughly outlined the component

parts of each of the five competences identified as part of intercultural competence. In doing so,

he made the concept more concrete and, thus, accessible. Furthermore, Byram (2012) advocated

that the use of intercultural competence as the unit of analysis in the second language classroom

is beneficial because it is based on observable behaviours that provide a window into implicit

understandings, abilities and attitudes. Byram (2012) wrote: "The emphasis on behaviours as

indicators of understanding and as performance skills would, in the same vein, allow us to

observe and to measure people's interculturality as a state of mind, as well as their ability to act

interculturally" (p. 87). Thus, although levels of intercultural competence have not been

established and assessment of the construct is fraught with difficulties (e.g., Liddicoat & Scarino,

2010; Sercu, 2010), the concrete nature of the product form of intercultural makes it relatively

amenable to gaging development in the second language classroom. This has significant repercussions, as the tangible nature of the concept makes it easier for teachers to use as the basis for planning and assessing instruction.

An additional strength of the intercultural as product paradigm is that it is coherent with current global developments. In contemporary society, mobility has contributed to increased cross-cultural interaction, resulting in the alteration of linguistic norms. One form of change has been the development of linguistic variations to meet the needs of local communities (for example, Singlish). An additional alteration is the more common use of a *lingua franca* to communicate with people from different cultures. These developments have contributed to a more complex linguistic landscape that has rendered the traditional native speaker model as inadequate. In contrast, the intercultural speaker model (e.g., Kramsch, 1998; Byram, 2009) recognizes the diversity of interactants that will be encountered and the importance of being able to communicate with native speakers and non-native speakers alike. Furthermore, the intercultural as product paradigm places culture in a more prominent position within second language pedagogy, recognizing the vital importance of culture in shaping perceptions and framing communication. As a result, the product form of the intercultural counters the unproductive dominance of the native-speaker norm, while solidifying the role of a more sophisticated conceptualization of culture in the second language classroom.

Deficiencies of Paradigm

While intercultural as a product is appealing due to its prominence in pedagogical discourses and relative ease of application, the concept has numerous theoretical deficiencies. Central among the issues associated with the paradigm is its close association with positivism and, thus, its denial of other theoretical frameworks. Although it may seem natural for a concept

based on the outcome of education or training to adopt a positivistic foundation, as it emphasizes the empirically verifiable, the adoption of positivism was not based on principled decision-making as much as a response to circumstance. As previously noted, the product paradigm has been significantly influenced by the work of Edward Hall at the Foreign Service Institute. According to Leeds-Horwitz (1990), Hall's work was very influential in shaping future developments related to intercultural phenomena; however, his work was also shaped by the conditions at the Foreign Service Institute. She wrote: "Much to the astonishment of the anthropologists, many participants in the seminars viewed the concept [the anthropological view of culture] itself as vague and viewed discussing it as a waste of time; instead, they wanted concrete information about how to interact with persons in the specific culture to which they were being sent" (Leeds-Horwitz, 1990, p.268). Confronted by bureaucracy, pressure for instant results and a general lack of respect for academic rigour, Hall decided to capitulate to the demands of seminar attendees and focus on what he termed 'microcultural analysis', including tone of voice, gestures, time and spatial relationships as part of intercultural communication (Moon, 1996). Each of these areas could be empirically investigated and verified, making them more attractive than abstract cultural investigation. Although these focal areas emerged out of practical circumstances rather than scholarly interest, they would become central to future work related to developing intercultural competence.

Similar to the situation at the Foreign Service Institute, the development of intercultural competence in various fields was as much a result of the contextual circumstances as principled scholarship. Moon (1996) outlined how in the field of intercultural communication culture was conceptualized in diverse ways and various analytical methods were used to investigate intercultural phenomena prior to 1977; however, after 1977 a restricted version of culture as

relating to nation-states was almost exclusively used and culture was mainly postulated as a variable in positivist research projects. Deetz (1978) contended that adherence to positivistic norms was based on the desire to be considered scientific, thus, gaining the prestige and validation afforded other scientific fields. Moon (1996) further elaborated that the shift to a more scientific foundation coincided with important political developments – namely the rise of the political right in the United States and Great Britain. Thus, the shift to positivism could be seen as a strategic development to garner prestige and maintain government funding.

As with the influence of positivism in intercultural communication, the theoretical framework has also been dominant in the field of intercultural training. Intercultural training is a field that developed as a result of growing demand for competent individuals to spread American influence (both in the form of diplomats and volunteers, such as Peace Corps workers) and engage in international commerce. The expanding influence of American commerce following World War II necessitated the development of individuals who could effectively negotiate with counterparts from diverse cultures (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). Moreover, the proliferation of transnational organizations (primarily based in the United States) heightened the need for managers and workers who could maintain efficient production by effectively mediating the demands of an intercultural workforce (e.g., Earley & Peterson, 2004; Kansanen & Vohlonen, 2010; Zoels & Silbermayr, 2010). In order to justify its existence and prosper in an environment dominated by corporate interests, the field of intercultural training had to adhere to the expectations of those it catered to in the business world. This meant rationalizing programs through cost-benefit analyses and promising tangible results related to measurable changes. This is one of the reasons why neat dichotomies that are easy to digest and validated instruments, such

as the Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer & Bennett, 2003), have become prominent tools in intercultural training.

Similarly, the form of the intercultural adopted in second/foreign language education was largely based on the intellectual climate prevalent in the field. The education of language professionals has largely fallen under the purview of applied linguistics rather than education. As a late emerging discipline, applied linguistics was faced with an uphill battle in establishing its legitimacy, thus contributing to the decision to appear more scientific by adopting positivistic norms. Although the assumption that language can be neatly dissected, categorized and analyzed is problematic, as it erroneously treats language as a reified object and ignores subtle linguistic variation (Reagan, 2004), applied linguists have predominantly adhered to positivistic norms, with alternative theoretical positions, such as socio-cultural theory, only recently becoming more widely utilized and accepted.

Furthermore, the trend in education over the past few decades has been towards increased accountability related to test scores. Standardized tests have become a common political tool to undermine the influence of teachers' unions and provide the stimulus for educational reform. Governmental policies, such as 'No Child Left Behind' in the United States, have placed increased emphasis on standardized test scores as a measure of student and teacher performance, linking the results to teacher advancement (or dismissal), the funding provided to schools, and the influence of schools in curricular matters. Although the results of standardized tests have less significant consequences in many other countries, they are still considered important tools in promoting a free market system in education. Free market ideology, as propounded by Freidrich von Hayek and Milton Friedman, advocates that access to information is a necessary prerequisite for individuals to make informed decisions that will serve their interests, thus creating a system

that is beneficial for all (Lauder, 1997; Brown, 2011). In the realm of education, standardized test scores provide a measure of comparison between schools, offering parents an additional means of deciding what school best meets the needs of their children and pressuring schools to offer an improved product that will result in improved test scores. In such an environment where test scores carry significant weight, language education will emphasize aspects of linguistic and cultural development that are tangible and can be easily measured. This favours emphasizing grammatical accuracy and other easily measured aspects of linguistic development, but also a product form of the intercultural that adheres to positivistic standards of evidence.

The fact that a form of intercultural adhering to positivistic norms has become so prominent due to circumstance rather than intellectual rigour is significant because of the deficiencies of the paradigm. Positivism propounds that knowledge is valid only when it is empirically verifiable and can be established with certainty. Because life is inherently complex and defies simple categorization, researchers who investigate social phenomena using positivism attempt to isolate specific variables, thus establishing with certainty the characteristics of the variables in question. As a result, the reductionist nature of positivistic research sacrifices complexity in order to promote clarity. In research related to intercultural interaction this often results in the portrayal of culture as a static, reified entity that is closely associated with a nation-state whose citizenry is largely portrayed as homogenous. Holliday (2007) labeled this practice the 'methodological nationalist' tradition and critiqued it as having "been preoccupied with stereotypical national differences that do not reflect the complex multiplicities of identities and blurred boundaries found in the real world" (p.362). By emphasizing national cultures and oversimplifying them as homogenous, the influence of alternative cultural markers is de-emphasized. This is problematic because social class, socio-economic status, gender, etc. all

57

have a significant impact on the culture of the individual. For example, Shuter (1977) demonstrated that gender influences non-verbal communication patterns, rendering Hall's (1959) assumption about the generalizability of cultural patterns untenable. It should be noted that scholars such as Hall and Hofstede recognized the methodological limitations of their work; however, in an atmosphere where certainty and measurability are emphasized (i.e., in educational or intercultural training contexts) the categorizations of national cultures are commonly portrayed as absolute facts (Holliday, Hyde, & Kullman, 2004).

The certainty provided by portraying cultures as monolithic facilitates one of the hallmarks of intercultural training within the product paradigm – comparisons between cultures. According to Byram (2009a), cultural comparison assists linguistic development, as key cultural phenomena and their linguistic manifestations are exemplified through the process. Although cultural phenomena are very influential in how humans perceive and interact in the world, they generally are only tacitly understood. As a result, it is believed that the comparative method makes cultural characteristics more overtly perceptible, leading to greater cultural awareness. This would assist learners in avoiding becoming what Bennett (1997) labeled 'a fluent fool' or "someone who speaks a foreign language well but doesn't understand the social or philosophical content of that language" (p.16). The emphasis within the culture-contrast approach on both the mother culture and the target culture would also overcome the deficiency of traditional language education that exclusively focuses on the linguistic and cultural norms of the target community (Planet & Byram, 2000), thus facilitating greater self-awareness. Liddicoat (2002) wrote that "it is only possible to understand another culture by comparing it with one's own" (p.9). Furthermore, Byram, Morgan, et al. (1994) advocated that "[b]y making comparisons, learners are deliberately led into relativisation of their own perspective through prioritization of the

perspective of others. . . It also serves as a step towards the acceptance of other perspectives, and the valuing of them as equally acceptable within their own terms" (p.177). Thus, comparison serves the function of broadening awareness about tacit phenomena that influence how we interpret and interact in the world.

While the cultural comparative approach professes to provide numerous benefits, it is based on questionable premises. Comparison is facilitated by a narrow version of culture that portrays the concept in concrete terms related to static national cultures. As reified objects, cultures are easily compared; however, if viewed as multi-layered, dynamic, and discursive constructs, cultures would be difficult to compare, as they would be in a constant state of flux. Furthermore, comparison leads to the formation of simplistic difference-similarity dualisms and the solidification of the perception of 'us' versus 'them' (Edwards & Farghaly, 2006). The reinforcement of difference through this process highlights inter-group homogeneity, while also concealing intra-group diversity. This is significant because the ascription of cultural difference is not a neutral, objective fact, but rather a politically and ideologically motivated construction (Kubota, 2004b). Willinsky (1998) contended that cultural difference has been coopted by hegemonic discourses in order to advance the superiority of a particular group and establish their practices as norms from which all others are compared and judged. Furthermore, Kubota (2004b) argued that "cultural difference can be employed to accomplish different political interests and establish particular relations of power between the Self and the Other" (p.34). Thus, the simplified form of culture necessitated through comparison not only reinforces counterproductive stereotypes, but also facilitates the positioning of groups as superior or peripheral.

Numerous intercultural scholars have advocated for the suspension of judgment not only when comparing cultures but also when engaging in ethnographic analysis (e.g., Byram, 1997; Planet & Byram, 2000). The suspension of judgment could occur by refraining from applying pre-constructed meanings to descriptions of culture (Papatsiba, 2006) or by de-centering, thus viewing phenomena from an alternative perspective. This would avoid the reification of cultural phenomena and the potential creation of cultural hierarchies. The problem is that notions of judgment suspension and decentering are often vague and theoretically suspect.

On one hand, decentering could relate to the process of adopting an alternative perspective. This point of view assumes that individuals can attain critical distance, thus promoting objective analysis and the adoption of divergent perspectives. This perspective is outlined in the following quote: "On a basis of such understanding, learners no longer need to judge the actions and values of others from within their own world; they have the possibility of understanding and judging from within the perspective of others and their worlds. . . An evaluation of learners' own culture and society from that other perspective may then lead to critical distancing and decentring from it" (Byram, Morgan, et al., 1994, p.177-178). This quote insinuates that individuals can move between cultural perspectives, adopting and discarding frames of reference at will. It also assumes homogeneity in perspective, as adopting an alternative view is portrayed as being a uniform process rather than one influenced by idiosyncrasy and an individual's unique experiences. This contradicts constructivist and hermeneutic theory as it portrays understanding as a dis-embodied phenomenon in which knowledge is separate from the knower.

It should be noted that ethnographers recognize the inherent danger in ascribing meaning to unfamiliar phenomena, in particular social phenomena. When conducting ethnographic studies

anthropologists emphasize the need to develop epistemological relativity, which "involves recognizing one's own assumptions about knowledge, and how it is legitimized in one's own society, so as to be able to view the knowledge of other societies with a more open mind" (Roberts, et al., 2001, p.93). The issue is to what extent humans are able to be self-reflective and rise above the limitations of their own frame of reference, regardless of the training undertaken or the method employed. It is obvious that reflection will lead to greater awareness; however, to assume that blind spots can be avoided and an objective position assumed (thus making observations facts rather than interpretations) is epistemologically arrogant and naïve. The history of ethnographic studies has demonstrated that interpretive bias (often fostered by political or ideological motivations) has resulted in adverse portrayals of non-Occidental people (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Vidich & Lyman, 1994). Awareness of this fact through the emergence of the ethnographic Self (Brown & Dobrin, 2004) is not sufficient to prevent alternative biases from infiltrating future ethnographic work whether couched in a guise of objectivity or not.

On the other hand, decentering could be postulated as movement from one's core perspective. In this way, it is recognized that knowledge is constructed and, therefore, the knower can never be eliminated from the process. This perspective is relayed in the following statement taken from the same resource as quoted above (thus demonstrating the lack of clarity surrounding the concept): "Learners cannot simply shake off their own culture and step into another. It is not a question of putting down their 'cultural baggage', for their culture is a part of themselves, has formed them and created them as social beings" (Byram, Morgan, et al., 1994, p.43). This point of view acknowledges that human perspective (culture) is constantly broadening and evolving as a result of experiential stimuli, but can never be abandoned. While this perspective is theoretically supported, it makes the notion of cultural relativity advocated by

interculturalists (e.g., Hammer and Bennett, 2003; Roberts et al., 2001) untenable. Cultural relativity is predicated on acceptance of all cultural perspectives as viable and valid; however, if individual perspective is grounded in one's experiences and one can never separate oneself from the process of interpretation, then true cultural relativity would be impossible to attain. This would also be the case because cultural relativity erroneously assumes the neutrality of language. A common moniker promoted by those in favour of cultural relativity is that 'cultures should be described without judgment.' This assumes that words are simply neutral conduits of meaning and that descriptions are not grounded in perspective. However, this is obviously erroneous as humans express agency in the selection of phenomena to pay attention to and the words used, which have an array of denotative and connotative meanings associated with particular historical perspectives (see for example Moore, 1976; Nilsen, 2001). Thus, description is equally subjective as interpretation, rendering true cultural relativity implausible. Moreover, it is questionable whether cultural relativity is truly desirable, as it demands the de-humanizing response of suspending emotion and denying the value of the wealth of knowledge established over a lifetime, thus creating a state of nihilism.

Contradictions can be further identified in the foundations of the intercultural as product paradigm. Drawing on positivism, scholars within the paradigm generally advocate for objectivity by removing bias. This is accomplished through careful methodological selection and application, and the validation of instruments used to collect data. In doing so, researchers can claim with certainty that their results are absent of bias and can be considered valid and reliable. The claim that research is unbiased is not representative of reality though, as much as an absence of self-reflection. According to Deetz (1978), the positivistic paradigm lacks awareness about its own prejudices, thus causing it to claim objectivity. For interculturalists working within this

paradigm this creates a contradiction. On one hand, interculturalists rationalize the importance of their work by portraying culture as rigidly and pervasively influencing how people perceive the world and engage with others – culture as the software of the mind (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). On the other hand, culture is claimed to be absent from research and general claims about intercultural phenomena, thus, portraying culture as a phenomenon that can be exchanged or bracketed out, undermining the rationale for training to move beyond ethnocentrism. Widdowson (1979) attempted to address this contradiction by claiming that academic disciplines are secondary cultures that are able to mitigate the influence of primary cultures. The problem with this assertion is that it assumes that primary cultures can be eliminated or disassociated from language. While it is true that academic cultures utilize unique vocabulary and adopt discourses of their own, the language used to express ideas is still grounded in a primary culture (languages develop in specific contexts influenced by particular cultural influences). Therefore, primary cultural influences will inevitably be present whenever language is utilized. Regardless, claims of objectivity would be untenable, as academic cultures contain their own biases that influence what is considered important and how it can be investigated. Thus, the absence of critical reflection on epistemological issues has created contradictions in the work of interculturalists.

The absence of awareness about prejudice has undoubtedly contributed to ethnocentrism within the realm of intercultural work. The majority of the work within the field of intercultural studies has been conducted by Americans and Europeans (notable exceptions include the work found in Cushner, 1998; Deardorff, 2009). As a result, it stands to reason that an American and European bias would prevail within the work of most scholars. According to Miike (2003) and Parmenter (2003), this assumption is correct, as the historical, political conditions in which the

notion of intercultural competence developed are very different from other societies around the world. Parmenter (2003) wrote:

> "Intercultural communication is not neutral, but operates within a framework of political-economic-historical concepts and concerns. . . In Asia, there is no political, economic or historical equality, and this reality is bound to have an effect on intercultural communication at all levels. In this respect, the Euro-American accounts of ICC [intercultural communicative competence], based as they are on principles of equality and plurilingualism/pluriculturalism, bear little relation to Asian reality." (p.143)

Although Parmenter's focus was exclusively on Asia, a similar critique could be offered for other regions across the globe. In addition to the contextual differences that have shaped how intercultural competence is defined, epistemological differences are also apparent. Much of the work in the intercultural as product paradigm has focused on understanding isolated characteristics of culture and then categorizing various cultures based on these characteristics (e.g., Hall, 1959; Hofstede, 2001). According to Nisbett (2003), this approach is based on Western epistemological assumptions. In tracing the historical development of Eastern and Western epistemology, Nisbett (2003) concluded that thinking in the West is based on the Greek tradition of breaking concepts down into their component parts, while Eastern thought is based on a more holistic, organic view of the world. Although the practice of dichotomizing epistemological traditions in this way is problematic, as it oversimplifies inter-group similarity and intra-group difference, Nisbett's work still provides insight into cultural differences that could account for the particular form of intercultural competence advanced in the literature. As a result, the promotion of intercultural competence as an objective, scientifically established fact

(product) is actually a form of cultural imperialism, as it imposes culturally derived definitions and norms on diverse people.

The imposition of meaning does not only occur at the foundational level in defining intercultural competence, but also in framing intercultural interactions within the product paradigm. The presentation of 'facts' about specific cultures, often in the form of neat dichotomies or generalized traits, promotes a sense of certainty when engaging in intercultural communication. Interculturalists rationalize the presentation of culture-specific information as a means to reduce anxiety and foster efficient communication. In the process of reducing uncertainty, however, interculturalists promote the objectification of the cultural other, thus denying their agency. Intercultural interlocutors are no longer viewed as dynamic agents with whom to negotiate the terms of interaction (a dialogic process), but rather as reified beings limited by the characteristics ascribed to their culture. As a result, adaptation and/or negotiation become uni-directional processes in which individuals from cultures portrayed as norms (i.e., European or American) demonstrate their flexibility by catering to the cultural other. This is exemplified by the fact that cultural guides tend to be written for a European and American audience and, therefore, exclude them as the subjects of analysis.

The attempt to define interactions in definitive terms in order to promote comfort is inappropriate for an intercultural framework. Intercultural interaction is characterized by diversity; thus, interlocutors require a disposition of curiosity and openness to difference to manage the various conditions of engagement. In contrast, the portrayal of interlocutors as operating within a definitive paradigm of communication promotes a sense of assuredness that undermines openness to variation. This sense of certainty would be more appropriate within the native speaker model of interaction, as the non-native speaker is expected to adopt the

interactional norms of the target linguistic community. In this way the presentation of culture-specific information would be beneficial in preparing individuals for adapting to a new standard of communication. However, in intercultural interaction, in particular where a *lingua franca* is being used in communication, dialogic negotiation is required.

Another issue with the product paradigm of the intercultural is the form of product (outcome) promoted. Moosmuller and Schonhuth (2009) contended that there are two main approaches to conceptualizing intercultural competence – the efficiency approach and the growth approach. The efficiency approach is predicated on facilitating efficient, effective communication. This approach is prominent within the fields of intercultural communication and intercultural training and would be the basis for most work conducted in a business setting. In contrast, the growth approach aims to promote the development of individuals and groups. The promotion of intercultural competence in education would often draw upon both approaches, as fostering efficient communication is a fundamental goal of language education, while personal and societal development are always underlying goals of any education system.

In order to evaluate the product of both approaches to intercultural competence, it is necessary to differentiate between the different abilities that may be developed. Feinberg (1995) made an important distinction between manifestations of ability by delineating the difference between competence and understanding. According to Feinberg (1995), competence involves the ability to navigate through interaction: "Cultural competence is what we have when we are able to recognize and participate in the routines of another way of life and thereby guide a part of our own development by its conceptions of performance and excellence. The more competent we are the more smoothly we interact through gestures, expressions and everyday linguistic utterances" (p.54). Competence is thus an unconscious ability that facilitates smooth communication. In

contrast, understanding is the conscious ability to recognize behaviours, etc. as cultural manifestations and to situate them accordingly. Feinberg (1995) wrote: "An understanding of the culture enables us to place this behaviour in a social and historical context. It helps us to understand just why it evokes the response it does" (p.55). As such, understanding and competence both assist with the development of the other – when people interact they become more cognizant of cultural difference, while understanding the roots of cultural phenomena can assist in effectively communicating – but can also be present in isolation from the other. Feinberg (1995) demonstrates this by referring to the anthropologist who studies societies but lacks the ability to operate effectively within them, and the intuitive individual who can successfully navigate communication without understanding the reasons for particular behaviours.

Drawing on the distinction made by Feinberg (1995), it is apparent that the efficiency approach focuses predominantly on the development of competence. As the primary goal of this approach is the development of communicative ability, communicative competence is far more important than an understanding about the nuances of communicating with the cultural other. This does not mean that understanding will be absent from pedagogy focused on efficiency, but rather that understanding would be less valued and addressed with less vigour. Although there is great value in becoming competent within multiple linguistic and cultural codes, the experience itself is unlikely to be transformative, as it would not promote tangible analysis of cultural assumptions or cause cognitive dissonance though challenging taken-for-granted norms. Individual transformation would only occur if the individual were enlightened by interactions with people facilitated by competence within an alternative code.

In contrast, the growth model of intercultural competence would place greater emphasis upon both competence and understanding. Competence enables personal growth through facilitating interaction with a variety of people, while understanding about one's own and other cultures would lead to personal development. The growth model offers greater opportunity for individual transformation than the utilitarian-based efficiency approach to intercultural communication; however, the transformative nature of this form of development is still highly questionable. The intercultural as product paradigm focuses on the development of intercultural sensitivity, tolerance of difference, open-mindedness, and the ability to mediate the unknown in cross-cultural interaction. As a result, the form of competence and understanding developed would contribute to minimizing difference in order to facilitate communication. Although Byram and Feng (2004, 2005) contended that instruction to promote intercultural competence is moving towards a critical perspective, power is generally absent from conceptualizations of intercultural as a product. Byram and Feng (2004, 2005) cited growing interest in political education, the teaching of culture as a dialogic process, and the questioning of knowledge as evidence of the trend towards the inclusion of a critical perspective. While the contentions of the prominent authors are correct, the evidence provided to support the development of criticality fails to apply power as a central concept in knowledge formation (while this was touched upon in the sections related to scrutinizing culture and dialogically constructing notions of culture, it was neither explicitly nor adequately developed) and the promotion and maintenance of structural inequality. In fact, in discussing the issues associated with the presentation of knowledge as unquestioned facts, Byram and Feng (2005) concluded: "It may well lead to the teaching of stereotypes" (p. 917). This presents the absence of epistemological investigation as simply resulting in the

promotion of stereotypical views, covering up the deeper issues associated with the portrayal of cultures as facts.

The absence of power as an analytic tool (that moves beyond superficial accounts) within the product paradigm undermines its effectiveness. By ignoring the influence of power in communication, interaction is simply portrayed as the exchange of messages. As a result, miscommunication is portrayed as a deficiency attributable to an inability on the part of the interlocutors to meditate difference through negotiation. This would mean that resistance through the cognizant selection of language and behaviour that protects one's identity and counters hegemonic intentions would be erroneously portrayed as a form of incompetence. Furthermore, by eliminating power, intercultural interactions would be portrayed as taking place in a vacuum devoid of historical, political and economic context. This decontextualization could lead to the misrepresentation of conflict as a source of miscommunication (lack of intercultural competence) rather than political and social issues (e.g., Blommaert, 1987; Friedlmeier, 2010). The portrayal of a phenomenon outside of the context in which it operates not only ignores how the phenomenon developed historically to reach its current form, but also undermines its applicability and, thus, significance in addressing social issues. Gorski (2008) lamented: "We expend much energy fighting symptoms of oppressive conditions (such as interpersonal conflicts) instead of conditions themselves" (p. 519). As a result, without attending to power or context, the growth approach to the development of intercultural competence would only promote a superficial, individualistic form of transformation, rather than a transformative experience that could lead to meaningful change both on an individual and communal level.

A final issue associated with the intercultural as product paradigm, regardless of whether the growth or efficiency approaches are utilized, is its traditionally instrumental focus. The

historical development of intercultural competence in various fields has been accompanied by an explicitly instrumental rationale, often serving particular business or political interests (Dahlen, 1997). The promotion of intercultural competence for instrumental purposes rather than the promotion of a social agenda would have a significant influence on the type of intercultural understanding developed. For example, based on Martin Buber's concept, Roy and Starosta (2001) advocated that interlocutors could adopt either an 'I-Thou' relationship or an 'I-It' relationship. The 'I-Thou' relationship is characterized by openheartedness, honesty, mutuality, and spontaneity – characteristics associated with dialogic understanding leading to mutual transformation. On the other hand, an 'I-It' relationship involves using the other person as an object for personal benefit. In this manner, promoting intercultural understanding could be instrumentalized as a strategic weapon to dominate or exploit others, a trend that accurately describes most historic intercultural contact (Coulby, 2006). Furthermore, an instrumental focus could denigrate the development of intercultural competence to the elimination of corporate culpability. For example, Phipps (2010) argued that the quality of training provided by organizations is often inconsequential, as the process of providing training in and of itself is adequate to satisfy legal obligations and promote the perception that ethical responsibilities have been met. Thus, the promotion of intercultural competence with a narrow, utilitarian focus may inhibit the transformative potential of the understanding developed.

Intercultural as Project

In contrast to the previous paradigms that define intercultural as a process of movement between cultures or a predetermined outcome of education facilitating cross-cultural communication, this paradigm posits intercultural as an ongoing project characterized by dialogic engagement to foster deeper understanding about issues that define our world. Unlike

70

the 'intercultural as product' paradigm in which diversity is viewed as a problem to be addressed, the 'intercultural as project' paradigm posits multiculturalism as an opportunity for enrichment and development (Portera, 2011). Thus, diversity is not just celebrated, but postulated as an important tool to overcome monoculturalism, parochialism and forms of prejudice. In this way, difference is viewed in positive terms as not only fostering individual growth, but also facilitating intercultural engagement to address systemic issues plaguing society. The use of intercultural in this paradigm is closely aligned with the concepts 'critical interculturality' (Ogilvie, 2013) and 'intercultural education' as advocated by the International Association for Intercultural Education (IAIE) (e.g., Gundara, 2000; Gorski, 2008; Gundara & Portera, 2008; Coulby, 2011; Aikman, 2012).

The International Association for Intercultural Education was founded at the beginning of the 1980s by various European scholars (Gundara, 2000). The founders of the association were concerned with the treatment of immigrants in European education systems and the resulting cycle of unfulfilled potential and socio-economic impoverishment. Immigrant learners were often labeled as 'deficient' and placed in special education programs that undermined future employment opportunities and led to the perception that they were an unproductive 'drain' on society (Gundara & Portera, 2008). Thus, it was apparent that educational policies not only had an effect on school performance, but also opportunities to participate in social, political, and economic life within the community. This provided the impetus for the mandate adopted by the IAIE: "The formation of the IAIE was a result of understanding how overt and covert racism, xenophobia and marginalization through social class was leading to not only educational but political and economic injustices, and that social and public policies were necessary to address these mounting social exclusions" (Gundara & Portera, 2008, p. 464). As a result, intercultural

71

education was advocated as a means to promote equality in educational opportunity and social justice.

<u>Foundational Characteristics of Paradigm</u>

The historical roots of intercultural education are significant in that social justice is embedded in the fabric of its pedagogy. As all forms of education are understood to be inherently political, intercultural education does not hide behind the pretense of neutrality, but rather openly assumes a position advocating to "address not only distributional inequalities but inequalities of recognition" (Aikman, 2012, p. 250). As a result, intercultural education is committed to critically confronting the status quo in order to promote transformation. This is one of the central differences between this paradigm and conceptualizations of intercultural as a product. Whereas the development of intercultural competence *may* result in significant changes in how an individual perceives the world, the primary goal is to promote efficient communication. In contrast, the intercultural as project paradigm aims to provoke a deep shift in consciousness, providing the impetus for tangible change in society as a whole. This does not mean a shift in consciousness toward a singular, pre-determined outcome, such as movement from false consciousness to critical consciousness, but rather an expansion of one's consciousness to question political, social, and economic realities (Borrelli, 1991).

The expansion of consciousness to promote social justice hinges on exposing and analyzing sources of inequality and the systems that maintain them. As a result, power and the way it circulates through discourses (Foucault, 1980; McLaren, 2003), hegemonic structures (Gramsci, 1981), language (Moore, 1976; Fairclough, 2010), etc. are central concepts in all intercultural analyses. Placing power at the center of analyses is important to contextualize the knowledge formation process, as it emphasizes that all knowledge is grounded in a particular

time and space and derived from an agent with subjective interests. This counters the tendency of scientific accounts of phenomena to accentuate existing social and political hierarchies by ignoring contextual influences (Gorski, 2006). In particular when analyzing intercultural phenomena, the decontextualized portrayal of culture shifts attributions of inequality to the individual rather than hegemonic structures (Gundara, 2000). This serves to reinforce notions of meritocracy (McNamee & Miller, 2004) and deficit theory (Gorski, 2008) that attribute inequality to individual effort, ethical character, or intellectual capacity, thus reinforcing and further embedding current inequities. Emphasizing power in intercultural engagements is, thus, essential to avoid intercultural education degenerating to a tool of control for societal elite. Gorski (2008) wrote: "I cannot effectively enact authentic intercultural education so long as I – in mind and soul – am colonized; so long as I do the bidding of the powerful through well-intentioned, colonizing practice" (p. 524). Therefore, intercultural engagement in this paradigm involves intervention into societal practices, not affirmation of the status quo (Borrelli, 1991).

To avoid becoming a tool of oppression, investigation of the historical roots of knowledge is central to efforts within the intercultural as project paradigm. This entails problematizing and critically investigating the foundational assumptions underlying the epistemology of both teachers and learners. Ongoing critical analysis is required on the part of educators to avoid falling into the trap of subjugating learners to dominant discourses embedded in well-intentioned pedagogy, while the content of intercultural education should challenge learners to question and investigate the assumptions underlying their thinking. This involves the investigation of cultural norms, which have become a more prominent component of second language education in recent years, and also political, economic, and social discourses that shape

our perceptions, but have traditionally not played a central role in the second language classroom.

The absence of consideration for political, economic, and social phenomena would have an adverse effect on the potential to promote social justice. For example, Coulby (2006) contended that contemporary patterns of interculturalism cannot be adequately understood without sophisticated understanding about global competition for resources and the causes of demographic movement. Similarly, citing critical pedagogues, Lasonen (2005) stated that familiarity with market-based policies is essential to transform economic activities from emphasizing profit to promoting the common good. Failure to consider contextual influences would lead to the portrayal of incidents as isolated and unrelated to other events. For example, the intercultural as product paradigm generally focuses on the minimization and resolution of conflict. Although this is a noble sentiment, it has the effect of de-contextualizing conflict, portraying both parties as equally culpable and sharing similar circumstances. In this way, the social, economic, and political roots of conflict are ignored, potentially skewing the origins of the conflict (e.g., Blommaert, 1987) and undermining the potency for true justice to be enacted. As a result, Gorski (2008) strongly advocated that intercultural education promote social justice before seeking conflict resolution.

Another key feature of intercultural education – the promotion of educational opportunity for all - was premised on the idea that education could promote equality, while maintaining a high standard of quality. Traditionally, Western education systems have been based on the accomplishments of White Europeans tracing their roots back to the Romans and Greeks (Dussel, 2000). The narrow curricula advocated in these systems have not only been based on Eurocentric content, but also advocate forms of learning that are based on European cultural

norms. As a result, the cultural content and forms of knowing associated with non-European groups have been largely ignored, thus putting minority learners in a disadvantageous position. In order to highlight the superiority of European education compared with other traditions from around the world, curricular fictions have been propagated that "reinvent the past with notions of an imagined and glorious history which excludes their neighbours and disregards their common foundations" (Gundara, 2000, p. 136). By portraying traditions as autonomous, the superiority of particular traditions would be solidified, thus providing the rationale for their exclusive inclusion in the curriculum. From this perspective, the inclusion of alternative content from 'inferior' traditions would result in diluting the quality of education provided. This has been the foundation for critiques offered against multicultural curricula (Nieto, 1995). However, if the claim to autonomous development is critically investigated (e.g., Hobson, 2004), it is clear that the development of various traditions has occurred in concert with one another. Thus, each tradition is the outcome of unique circumstances highlighted by the inimitable combination of interrelationships with other societies. The elimination of the historical influence provided by a particular society would thus result in the alteration of the tradition itself. From this perspective employed by advocates of intercultural education, the inclusion of ways of knowing and voices that have been traditionally silenced not only provides a more inviting, equitable pedagogical environment for all learners, but also enhances the quality of education received. Through the expansion of the curriculum, minority learners would be empowered, while members of the dominant group would be liberated from their miseducation (Gorski, 2006) and self-imposed ignorance of a multitude of traditions.

Advocacy for expanded curricula that give a voice to all members of the learning community is based on the notion that dialogic engagement can lead to mutual transformation. If

one narrow perspective is advanced, such has often been the case historically, the inevitable result of education will be a form of inculcation (Coulby, 2006). In contrast, the intercultural as project paradigm advocates for the inclusion of multiple perspectives to foster a deeper, more nuanced form of understanding. Aikman (1997) wrote: "[I]ntercultural education has the potential to become a site for dynamic interaction between cultural practices, epistemologies and perceptions of the world, and also a site where the definitions and practices of different interacting traditions are negotiated" (p. 474). As such, the encounter with difference is not a passive process, but rather an active process of meaning-making. According to Luciak and Khan-Svik (2008), this means that culture cannot be presented to students as facts to be digested, but rather education "should offer the opportunity for cultural values to be comprehended, experienced, and shaped by all students" (p. 496). In this way, the intercultural classroom is more democratic in its composition, as concepts (including the language itself) are not presented as unified truths for students to consume (Westheimer, 2008), but rather as open content to be dialogically engaged with and critically analyzed. Through active exposure to and engagement with difference, learners' epistemological foundations, tacit assumptions, and identities will be challenged, prompting revised reflection on previous experiences and new ways of looking at and experiencing the world in the future (Martins, 2008).

The transformative potential of the intercultural as project paradigm is dependent on the willingness of individuals to engage with difference. This does not mean artificial engagement in the sense of engaging in a conversation, but rather an openness and willingness to change and be changed (Ryoo, Crawford, Moreno, & McLaren, 2009). "This intercultural approach supposes more than simply accepting the 'other'; it implies 'hosting' the 'other' within us and accepts being transformed within that encounter" (National Strategy for the European Year of

Intercultural Dialogue cited in Pratas, 2010, p. 317-318). Openness to difference at a transformative level requires that individuals refrain from protecting the sacredness of particular cultural and epistemological positions (Aikman, 1997; Nieto, 2010) because to do so would not only close them off from scrutiny and solidify their stature as unquestioned truths, but also inhibit the ability of the individual to welcome alternative interpretations. This is one of the issues with the portrayal of scientific knowledge as neutral and universal; it denies the validity of alternative possibilities and protects the 'facts' it creates as inscrutable. Openness to difference does not mean that intercultural education advocates relativism or nihilism though. On the contrary, understanding that knowledge is tenuous and that multiple valid perspectives may be adopted based on different cultural or epistemological frames does not imply accepting all ideas or values as equal. In fact, intercultural education is premised on the understanding that dialogue creates spaces to question, revise, validate, and reform our tentative understandings (Grondin, 2002). Therefore, openness to difference requires continual questioning of the foundations of our thoughts and perceptions and those of others; however, it does not rule out valuing particular perspectives more than others.

While difference is viewed as important in harnessing the potential of humanity, the intercultural as project paradigm also values the development of mutuality. Historically, humans have separated themselves into groups based on inherent or acquired divisions (e.g., family heritage, geographical origin, linguistic affiliation) and/or artificially created barriers (e.g., race and nationality). Over time these divisions have become embedded norms that have undermined the interrelatedness of humankind. Similarly, the ascension of scientific knowledge to a position of prominence has restructured the relationship between humans and nature by portraying the latter as exploitable for gain (Coulby, 2006). Renner, Brown, Stiens, and Burton (2010) wrote:

77

"We let go of nature's hand, and in time lost our place in the universal order of living things. What we were left with was our own ideas progressively disconnected from the order, symbiosis and continuous affirmation that nature had once provided" (p. 48-49). This does not mean that humanity as a whole has forgotten the importance of nature, as many cultures still maintain a symbiotic relationship with Mother Earth, but that Western discourses embedded in a competitive, utilitarian ethos have been elevated in stature to a position of prominence. The prominence of these discourses, embedded in neo-liberal philosophy, has been the result of political maneuvering on the part of the global elite (Petras, 1999; Stromquist, 2002), but is also attributable to the ability of the philosophy to create conditions that maintain its influence. Neo-liberal philosophy has disrupted traditional values, replacing them with a valuation system that privileges economic imperatives over all others. The promotion of flexibility and efficiency in production, rationalized as a prerequisite to compete in the global market, has necessitated increased transience and displacement. This has resulted in increased economic instability and the fracturing of communal affiliations that have maintained traditional values. Thus, neo-liberalism has not only solidified a valuation system that undermines the interconnectedness of humans with the environment, but has also created a system that erodes traditional connections uniting people.

In this contemporary context, intercultural as project advances mutuality based on two grounds. First, intercultural engagement is premised on the benefits of investigating multiple perspectives. Hegemonic discourses, thus, are viewed as adversely limiting the diversity of options available. As a result, advocacy for mutuality in the form of more ecologically-based discourses that counter scientific, neo-liberal trends would raise consciousness about and validate alternative perspectives. Second, intercultural education seeks to promote a sustainable, common

future. Intercultural engagement is inherently about reciprocal relationship building. Mutual

transformation through intercultural dialogue is not possible in fleeting intercultural interaction;

it requires sustained engagement in a setting of mutual trust and respect. The reciprocal character

of engagement is essential to avoid the denigration of interaction to a form of 'unequal

interculturality' or exploitation (Aikman, 1997). Furthermore, the forging of a sustainable future

is dependent on re-establishing the symbiotic relationship between living organisms (Lasonen,

2005). The fragmentation of humanity has concealed the commonality of our origin and our

destiny and, thus, poses a threat to our prosperity as a species, as it enhances the likelihood of

conflict. In order to promote a future characterized by peace and prosperity, we need to re-

establish our roots in humanity. As Ouellet (cited in Martins, 2008) noted in his definition of

intercultural education from the 1990s, this involves the "ability to participate in social

interaction, developing a sense of identity and common belonging to humanity" (p. 203). Re-

establishing the interrelatedness of humans with other organisms and the planet that sustains us is

also essential to maintain balance within ecosystems and avoid the inevitable violence and

destruction caused by ecological displacement and competition for depleting resources.

In summation, the intercultural as project paradigm views dialogic intercultural

engagement as a powerful tool to combat parochialism and prejudice, and provide the impetus

for re-imagining the world in a more humanizing, equitable and sustainable form. Although

diversity is cherished for its ability to enrich the fabric of humanity, mutuality is also considered

important in fostering a sustainable future characterized by widespread peace and prosperity. As

the explicit goal of education within this paradigm is the promotion of social justice, intercultural

educators are committed to critiquing the status quo by identifying and addressing sources of

inequality. Furthermore, in order to foster a deep expansion in consciousness, intercultural

education seeks to politicize and contextualize knowledge, exposing the historical roots (social, political and economic) of prominent discourses and our epistemological foundations.

Although it is applicable across the curriculum, intercultural education is particularly well suited for the second language classroom. The emphasis on procedural knowledge in second language pedagogy coheres well with the emphasis on dialogic engagement in intercultural education. In both contexts, meaningful interaction is necessary to meet desired outcomes. Furthermore, second language learning inevitably brings learners into contact with cultural difference. Commonly utilized forms of pedagogy celebrate diversity in an artificial manner that does not accurately encapsulate historical trends in intercultural relations (Sleeter & McLaren, 1995; Kubota, 2004a; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; May & Sleeter, 2010a). These forms of pedagogy, variously labeled as 'liberal multiculturalism' (Kubota, 2004a), the 'food, festival, folklore, and fashion approach' (Ryoo & McLaren, 2010), the 'sari, steel drum and samosa approach' (Ghosh, 2004) or the 'spaghetti and dance syndrome' (Lippman cited in Aveling, 2010), address culture in superficial terms, promoting a sense of assuredness without challenging the privilege of dominant groups. In contrast, intercultural education provides a framework to address difference in a meaningful manner not only by giving a voice to silenced minorities, but also by ensuring that encounters with difference are politicized and contextualized. As a result, intercultural education provides a theoretical framework and content to enrich interaction and transform the second language classroom into a site of transformative learning.

Problematic Character of Paradigm

Despite its transformative potential (or perhaps because of its transformative qualities), pedagogy in the intercultural as project paradigm may be difficult for current teachers to enact. Bleszynska (2008) contended that intercultural educators require "topical knowledge, methodical

and educational capacities, as well as high ethical standards" (p. 543). Included in the competences outlined by Bleszynska (2008) were knowledge about multicultural societies, acculturation processes, and the acquisition of intercultural competence; the ability to support students in exploring cultural borderlands; and the capacity to shape attitudes of respect, tolerance, and openness to difference. The list provided would not be adequate in preparing educators to enact intercultural pedagogy in project form, as it lacks a critical dimension and knowledge about historical, social, economic, and political influences on contemporary society. Nonetheless, the competences outlined differ significantly from the competences commonly advocated in the second language education literature that focus on linguistic knowledge (e.g., Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Andrews, 2003; Mullock, 2006). If this literature is indicative of the competences currently developed in teacher education programs, second language educators are unlikely to have the skill set necessary to enact intercultural education.

Furthermore, pedagogy in the intercultural as project paradigm is flexible, undefined, and contextually-based. The application of intercultural education to different contexts will assume divergent forms based on the composition of the class and its position within society and the global community as a whole. As a result, no content or approaches can be deemed to be universally applicable, rendering the identification and utilization of a textbook or singular source ineffective. This means that teachers must not only acquire knowledge that is traditionally not associated with second language pedagogy, but also identify or create materials that are appropriate for the context. This creates a burden on teachers, minimizing the likelihood that the principles of intercultural education will be adopted (Markee, 1997; Waters, 2009b).

Moreover, the adoption of pedagogical content and practices based on the intercultural as project paradigm involves a degree of risk for instructors. Promotion of the status quo is safe as it

is already grounded in tradition and embedded norms. As Gundara (2000) noted, old knowledge is often conceptualized as neutral, while new knowledge is portrayed as advocacy for particular interests. Although this claim is erroneous, as all forms of knowledge advance a particular position (traditional perspectives simply conceal subject origins better), the prominence of this perspective means that teachers who advocate for change need to repeatedly rationalize and defend their position. As intercultural education is not just advocating for change, but substantial transformation, the situation is further complicated. Schoorman and Bogotch (2010) claimed that teachers are apprehensive to promote social justice as it is viewed as too controversial, abstract, and irrelevant to the real world. As a result, engaging in intercultural education would require strong personal conviction and/or collegial support in the form of 'a critical mass of teachers' (View, 2010).

Intercultural as Policy

The term 'intercultural' has also been prominently used as a policy or approach. The inclusion of intercultural as a policy in national documents has a significant influence on second language education practices. Parmenter (2003) advocated: "Once accepted, education policy is generally assured the unified commitment of teachers, students and parents" (p.137). Although stakeholders may be committed to implementing the intercultural policies advocated by national organizations, this does not ensure their uniform application. On the contrary, contextual, interpretive, material, political, financial and preparatory factors can all influence how the official curriculum, as outlined by the policy, is implemented.

European Policy

The development of a continent-wide governing body has facilitated increased interest in the intercultural as policy in Europe. Historical events rooted in globalization have contributed to

increased diversity within the continent; however, the creation of the European Union has further contributed to the need to foster intercultural understanding between people from diverse nations. The White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue decreed: "The Council of Europe believes that respect for, and promotion of, cultural diversity on the basis of the values on which the Organisation is built are essential conditions for the development of societies based on solidarity" (Bergan & Restoueix, 2009, p.147). Although diversity is recognized as beneficial for society, it is tempered by the need for unity. In order to promote harmony among diverse groups, the paper declared: "It reasons that the intercultural approach offers a forward-looking model for managing cultural diversity" (Bergan & Restoueix, 2009, p.147). According to Byram (2008), managing diversity also entailed fostering European solidarity through the establishment of a continental identity. Without the benefit of a shared language, culture, or history, Europe has had to find alternative means to promote allegiance not only to individual nation-states but also to the continental union. The future success of the European Union hinges upon achieving a new sense of identity among the populous of its member states. As a result, the promotion of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism (within an intercultural framework) as defining characteristics of a unified Europe has been advocated as a potential solution (Byram, 2008). As a result, foreign/second language education based on an intercultural approach has assumed a prominent role in union building by facilitating intercultural dialogue and engaging students in the critical analysis of ethnocentrism, cultural difference, otherness, and citizenship. In this way intercultural is viewed as a policy to support a political organization – the European Union.

Japanese Policy

While Europe has utilized an intercultural policy as a means to bring disparate groups of people together, Japan has formulated the intercultural as a way to emphasize the unique

characteristics of the Japanese. According to Liddicoat (2007), interculturality has been postulated in Japan in very narrow terms as an encounter between Japanese and the English-speaking world. The cultures of the two entities involved in this encounter are posited as being restricted by a rigid cultural boundary, creating a clear separation between the Japanese and the Anglophone (Kubota, 2002). Moreover, the interaction between cultures is viewed as having a unidirectional effect on participants, resulting in the affirmation of Japaneseness among members of the Asian nation, and the development of an 'accurate' understanding of Japanese characteristics among non-Japanese. This is accomplished in the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language by carefully packaging Japanese culture in an imagined rather than real form, and helping non-Japanese to understand and appreciate the world from a Japanese perspective (Kubota, 2002). Similarly, intercultural interaction in the learning of English is not viewed as affecting Japanese attitudes or values, but rather in solidifying learners' Japanese identity by reinforcing their distinct character in comparison to other cultures (Liddicoat, 2007). Thus, intercultural education is a policy in Japan that promotes the interests of the Japanese.

Quebecois Policy

Similar to Japan, Quebec (a province in Canada) has adopted an intercultural policy as a means to solidify and protect the Quebecois culture. Although no official legislation exists, the espousal of an intercultural policy in Quebec has been a direct response to the formal promotion of multiculturalism in Canadian federal policies such as the Constitution Act of 1982 and the Multiculturalism Act of 1988 (Chiasson, 2012; Ghosh & Galczynski, 2014). Multiculturalism was first entrenched in Canadian society as a response to perceived internal and external threats to national unity during the tenure of Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau (Legare, 1995). The official recognition of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework was "intended to ground

Canadian nationhood in an identity that could be differentiated from threatening Others both within and without" (Handler, 1988, p. 125). The policy of multiculturalism was rejected by the Quebec government, however, for being overly relativistic in treating all cultures as equal. As a result, multiculturalism was not viewed as recognizing the distinct character of the French-Canadian culture (Quebecois nation) or adequately protecting it from external influences (Ghosh, 2004). In place of multiculturalism, Quebec adopted an intercultural policy that promotes diversity while recognizing the special status of the French culture. One of the central differences between Canadian multiculturalism and Quebec interculturalism is the former denies the existence of a majority culture, while the latter embraces a dual framework that recognizes the needs of the majority culture (Bouchard, 2011; Chiasson, 2012). As such, Quebec interculturalism encourages reciprocal engagement and recognizes diversity as a source of enrichment, while protecting Quebecois heritage. In describing the policy Gerin-Lajoie (2008) wrote: "Interculturalism involves establishing a dialogue among diverse cultural groups and integrating newcomers to the host society, the intent being to define together a new francophone social order where every culture finds its place" (p. 18). In this way, the intercultural policy promotes dialogue between various cultural groups to develop a new, common identity within a Francophone framework. In this policy, the French language, and therefore French language education, serves an important role as providing the medium for developing a pluralistic yet unified society.

Peruvian Policy

A policy predicated on intercultural principles was also developed in Peru. Peru is a diverse society with a relatively large indigenous population that has suffered from decades of exploitation and discrimination. The residual effects of colonialism have resulted in a

Eurocentric hegemonic system in which the knowledge and values of indigenous people have not been valued (Aikman, 1997). Out of concern for the maintenance and prosperity of indigenous languages and cultures and to address the systemic discrimination experienced by indigenous people, a policy of intercultural education was developed (Aikman, 2012). Interculturalism was viewed as a dialogue between diverse cultures, thus breaking down the dichotomy between indigenous and national cultures and promoting more equitable relationships in order to foster a truly democratic society (Aikman, 1997). Interculturalism was also perceived as addressing historical factors that contributed to the marginalization of indigenous people by preparing them for participation in mainstream society, while also giving credence to the value of indigenous knowledge. One of the key strategies in promoting these goals was the development of bilingual education programs in place of traditionally Spanish-only education (Trapnell, 2003). Another strategy was the involvement of local communities in infusing indigenous knowledge into the curriculum. As such, the intercultural policy involved changes in content and medium of instruction.

While the foundations of the Peruvian intercultural policy seemed to provide exciting opportunities for redefining the society along democratic lines, the connection between theory and practice proved it to be somewhat problematic. Aikman (2012) noted how international discourses on intercultural education posit it as a model of good practice for inclusive learning. The assumption is that the use of an appropriate language and the inclusion of culturally sensitive pedagogical practices (often based on a reified notion of culture) will resolve marginalization. As Aikman (2012) noted though, the intercultural policy not only maintained the status quo by ignoring power as an important dimension in intercultural encounters, but actually further marginalized indigenous populations by further excluding them from mainstream

society. Moreover, implementation of the policy proved problematic as inadequate support was provided by the central government (Aikman, 1997; Trapnell, 2003) and teachers lacked adequate preparation for implementing the policy, including support for dealing with diverse populations and conflict management skills to navigate conflicts that arose (Trapnell, 2003).

Irish Policy

Unlike the aforementioned intercultural policies that were designed to promote or protect a particular cultural identity, interculturalism in Ireland was unapologetically based on an economic imperative. According to Bryan (2010), the prosperity associated with the Celtic Tiger era was accompanied by mass immigration and the transition from a relatively monocultural to multicultural society. To address the swiftly evolving demographics in society, intercultural education policies were developed that Bryan (2010) characterized as 'corporate-style multiculturalism' or 'celebratory interculturalism.' These policies aimed to promote diversity not for the benefits that may be accrued through diversification itself, but rather the economic benefits that may be enjoyed as a result of social cohesion and intercultural understanding. Equality was promoted as part of the policy; however, it was an illusory egalitarianism as it was based on equality of opportunity to compete. As a result, the intercultural policy was not about celebrating diversity or promoting a more equitable society, but rather advancing diversity for national interests. According to Bryan (2010), this defined migrants' value exclusively in terms of their contributions (primarily economic) to the nation, and reinforced the privileged status of the dominant group.

Overview of Policy Variation

The brief survey of intercultural policies utilized in various countries demonstrates great divergence in interpreting the meaning of the term (for additional examples refer to Ciges &

Lopez, 1998; Leeman & Reid, 2006; Luciak & Khan-Svik, 2008; Martins, 2008; Pratas, 2010). Although each policy is predicated on interaction between diverse cultures, the application of policies based on this form of interaction varies significantly. While the European version of intercultural engagement may be characterized as "interculturality with equality", the other countries (province) have adopted policies of "unequal interculturality" in which one cultural group is privileged over others (Aikman, 1997, p. 468).

Although policies may be neglected or adapted, they still have an influential effect on teacher practices, as they establish discourses that mitigate how teachers interpret their work. As such, the aforementioned intercultural policies would have grave implications for pedagogical practices. For example, in the Japanese context the exclusive focus on promoting Japaneseness would likely enhance ethnocentrism and undermine opportunities for developing more cosmopolitan perspectives. Moreover, the importance attributed to the maintenance of cultural purity could result in impoverished notions of culture as a museum artefact being used as the basis for cultural integration in the classroom. Similarly, the Quebec policy of interculturalism would likely lead to assimilatory pedagogical practices. The emphasis on the maintenance of the Quebecois heritage and identity, and the insistence upon French as the medium for cross-cultural engagement would create pedagogical interactions in which Quebecois culture is at the center, with other cultures always positioned in relation to French Canadian culture on the periphery. As the two examples demonstrate, the policies may lead to particular practices being followed; however, this is not solely dependent on the policy itself, but rather how it is interpreted and applied in specific contexts. The specific manifestation of intercultural policies (in the form of intercultural as a process, product, or project) is thus contextually dependent. As a result, the

intercultural as policy paradigm has limited value as an analytic tool; it simply clarifies an additional context in which intercultural is used.

Summary

As outlined above, intercultural is a term that has been used in divergent ways to represent a process of moving between cultures, a product of education/training to facilitate cross-cultural communication, a project to encourage dialogic engagement about global issues, and a policy in educational documents. Each of the paradigms draws on different theoretical foundations and is based on different fundamental principles. Hence, their application will result in significantly different educational practices and outcomes. This is why intercultural is such a central concept in second language education philosophy and the rationales provided for instructional practices in the second language classroom, and why investigating teachers' understanding of the concept is central to the promotion of transformative learning.

The delineation of intercultural into four paradigms was not meant to insinuate that other methods of categorizing differences are less valid. On the contrary, it is recognized that differences in the use of the concept could be categorized using a multitude of classifications. Moreover, the separation of the concept into four neat categories was not meant to denote that uses of intercultural do not overlap between paradigms or that views within each paradigm are homogenous. Conceptualizations of intercultural within each paradigm are divergent; therefore, categorization risks oversimplifying and misrepresenting how others use the concept. Nonetheless, general trends and commonalities within paradigms/ differences between paradigms do exist, which make the creation of the four paradigms a useful heuristic in organizing how intercultural is used in the literature and analyzing how teachers understand and apply the concept.

CHAPTER FOUR: DEFINING THE CRITICAL

The term 'critical' is commonly used in educational contexts in expressions such as 'critical thinking', 'be critical', and 'critical analysis.' Despite the common usage of the term and the comfort with which educators apply it, 'critical' is a rather elusive, amorphous term due to its inconsistent application. The Oxford Dictionary of English defines 'critical' as "expressing adverse or disapproving comments or judgements" (Cresswell, 2009). This definition adheres to the tone of its cognates, 'critique' and 'criticism', as it portrays the concept in a negative light as being closely related to faultfinding. Summers (2004) expanded the definition of the term to include the following meanings: "Very important or dangerous" and "examining and judging analytically and without bias" (p. 194). In the former definition, critical is portrayed as a marker of emphasis with an underlying tone of negativity. While this definition is similar to the Cresswell (2009) definition in that it possesses negative connotations commonly associated with the term 'critical' (Ruggiero, 1990; Facione, 2011), the latter definition provided by Summers (2004) has a more positive tone commonly associated with critical thinking.

Generic Criticality

The term 'critical thinking' has been variably defined by scholars from different fields (for an overview see Johnson, 1992 and Fasko, 2003); however, in its most widely used form, meaning "generic critical ability" (Moon, 2008), the concept has a common foundation. According to Fasko (2003), this paradigm of critical thinking has a long tradition in Western thought dating back to the Greek philosopher Socrates, who used probing questions to lead his pupils from speculative thinking to rational understanding. Critical thinking in this tradition refers to the process of analyzing and evaluating the reasonableness of ideas or propositions – a form of higher level cognitive activity commonly associated with the upper levels of Bloom's

Taxonomy (Ennis, 2003; Boostrom, 2005). An important aspect of this process is the development of "critical distance" (Pennycook, 2001) in order to promote a more objective, reasoned line of thinking. Critical distance is promoted by analyzing the biases and assumptions associated with particular ideas and contexts (Brookfield, 1987; Leicester, 2010), thus enabling the individual to adopt a more "objective" position from which to make an evaluation. For example, in the following definition of critical thinking provided by Ruggiero (2009) critical distance is implied through the notion of contemplating thought: "[Critical thinking is] reviewing the ideas we have produced, making a tentative decision about what action will best solve the problem or what belief about the issue is most reasonable, and then evaluating and refining that solution or belief" (p.185). In this definition thought is separate from the individual (adhering to the Cartesian divide between mind and body), thus allowing for an objective judgment to be made. In this way critical thinking is not a generative process, but rather a restrictive process narrowing the focus of the individual through evaluation (Ruggiero, 1999). This does not mean that critical thinking is rigid; on the contrary, flexible thinking through the exploration of alternatives is a key aspect of critical thinking (Brookfield, 1987; Pirozzi, 2000). However, the primary goal in exploring alternatives is to promote "reflective skepticism" in order to make a more sound judgment (Brookfield, 1987).

While critical thinking is generally viewed as a teachable skill and an essential component of formal education across the curriculum (e.g., Halpern, 1997), skepticism has arisen about its assumed universal appropriacy. For example, Brookfield (2003) raised questions about the applicability of critical thinking among cognitively undeveloped children. Characterizing critical thinking as primarily an adult endeavour, he wrote: "Although encouraging critical thinking in children is a valid and important educational objective, I believe

that it is in adulthood that critical thinking is learned and lived at its deepest and most significant

level" (Brookfield, 2003, p.144). Similarly, Atkinson (1997) questioned the universality of

critical thinking along cultural lines. He argued that critical thinking is more closely related to a

social practice developed in particular cultural contexts than a teachable set of behaviours.

Therefore, he questioned the value of including critical thinking in second language curricula.

Finally, Olson and Babu (1992) asserted that critical thinking is most appropriately applied when

analyzing literature. They wrote: "The primary forum for critical thinking, indeed, the context in

which one learns how to think critically is in the analysis of written texts" (p.184). Therefore,

they advocated that "the interpretation, analysis, and criticism of written texts is what critical

thinking is and what it is for" (Olson and Babu, 1992, p.184).

Despite significant variance in defining 'critical thinking' and delineating its educational

function, certain commonalities can be identified in this paradigm of criticality. First, this notion

of critical implies an objective positioning of the knower separate from the object of

contemplation. In this way, distance promotes a more reasoned, accurate analysis. Second, the

neutrality inherently postulated through objectivity means that criticality is only possible through

adopting an apolitical stance. Thus, politics are denied a role in knowledge formation and

interpretation. Third, in denying the validity of subjectivity, this form of criticality strictly

adheres to positivistic ways of knowing. The biography of the knower is thus denied credence

and forms of knowing are postulated as unrelated to time or context. As such, history is removed

from the process of knowledge generation.

Critical Tradition

In contrast to this paradigm of criticality, which will be labeled 'generic criticality',

another view of 'critical' has emerged over the past century derived from critical theory. The

term 'critical theory' first emerged in a seminal essay published in 1937 by Max Horkheimer under the title *Traditional and Critical Theory*. In this essay, Horkheimer (1982) critiqued the foundations of scientific knowledge, traditional theory, by outlining the weaknesses in its assumptions – namely the denial of human agency and historical context in conditioning knowledge, the privileging of methodological validity over social relevance, and the anti-reflexive nature of the theory in guarding its own objectivity as a force for knowledge generation. In opposition to the apolitical, ahistorical nature of traditional theory, Horkheimer postulated a critical theory that viewed the social world not as an externality to human consciousness, thus preserving the potential for objective knowledge generation and application, but rather as a central component in epistemological endeavours. In a postscript to the original essay, Horkheimer (1976) wrote: "The critical theory of society . . . has for its object [humans] as producers of their own historical way of life in its totality" (p.222). Thus, the subject and object of investigation cannot be isolated in an historical vacuum. For Horkheimer (1976), the separation of theory from the social world was problematic because it imposed limitations on the goals of investigation to "existent ways of life" (p.223). This contradicted his desire to promote "the abolition of social injustice" (Horkheimer, 1982, p.242) and "[hu]man's emancipation from slavery" (Horkheimer, 1976, 224) through the development of all the potentialities of humanity.

Although the term 'critical theory' first emerged in Horkheimer's work, it is commonly associated with the scholarly activities of Horkheimer's colleagues at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Frankfurt, who later became known as the "Frankfurt School." The Frankfurt School came into existence during a time of great turmoil in Europe characterized by economic and social upheaval. The rise of fascism, the failure of the proletariat to unite against bourgeois oppression in Central Europe, and a forced relocation to America where empirical

traditions went largely unchallenged in the social sciences, provided the backdrop for the intellectual development of the German scholars. Pessimism brought on by historical developments caused members of the Frankfurt School to begin to re-appraise Marxist theory, which had provided the grounding for their work (Bottomore, 1984). The narrow emphasis on economics as the determining factor in social development was viewed as a significant weakness of Marxism (Jay, 1973). Moreover, developments in Marxist theory moving it from the realm of philosophy to a more scientific, positivistic approach undermined its utility as a critical force in social theory. As Jay (1972) wrote: "Marxist theory of society, which, despite (or perhaps because of) its scientific pretensions, had degenerated into a kind of metaphysics not unlike that which Marx himself had set out to dismantle" (p.229). Thus, the Frankfurt School tried to reinvigorate Marxist theory by providing a contemporary spin on the concerns of the Left Hegelians of the previous century (Jay, 1972). This manifested itself in the adoption of a multi-disciplinary approach, integrating philosophy and social analysis, to critique closed philosophical systems. It also resulted in a reinvigorated attempt to develop a materialistic form of dialecticism and to explore the potential for the human transformation of society, a notion labeled "immanent critique" by Frankfurt School theorists (Jay, 1973; Bronner & Kellner, 1989).

Although there were common theoretical threads and over-lapping research interests (e.g., the role of mass media and mass culture, and the critique of positivism) in the work of members of the Frankfurt Group, they never spoke with a unitary, unified voice (Prasad, 2005). In fact, members of the Frankfurt Group often pursued research in divergent areas, even sometimes straying away from the original foundations and objectives of the group's early work (Bottomore, 1984). The divergence of the work of the Frankfurt Group was representative of trends in critical theory in general. The critical tradition has constantly been in a state of

evolution, as new scholars add layers to the tradition through their application of new theories and concepts to critiques of varying contexts. Thus, critical theory has expanded to various fields, including education in the form of critical pedagogy.

The origins of critical pedagogy have been commonly associated with the work of Brazilian scholar Paulo Freire (Kincheloe, 2007, 2008; McLaren, 2003). Freire began his professional life as a literacy instructor for impoverished peasants in Brazil. In this role he was confronted by an authoritarian education system that denied his students a voice and marginalized their experiences. Within this system, which Freire (1993) labeled the 'banking model of education', students were expected to absorb the prescribed content of the curriculum, based on the values and norms of dominant society, and then regurgitate it at the appropriate time to demonstrate their mastery. In this way, the assumptions underlying the content of the curriculum (for example, why particular content was chosen, or whose knowledge was privileged through the selection of content) were never brought forward as objects to be questioned, and alternative ways of knowing or viewing the world were never investigated. According to Freire (1993), this form of monologic education contributes to the "submersion of consciousness", resulting in the establishment of dominant forms of knowledge as assumed norms.

To empower his students and combat the dehumanizing effect of the banking model of education, Freire sought to employ a dialogic approach to education. Rather than viewing educational encounters as uni-directional didactics, in which teachers fill passive students with knowledge, Freire (1993) postulated pedagogical encounters as including neither teachers, nor students, but rather a "teacher-student with students-teachers" (p.61). In reconfiguring pedagogy in this manner, Freire sought to unravel the monopolistic power of teachers to dictate pedagogical content, and to emphasize the mutually beneficial character of cooperative

investigation (undertaken through dialogue) in revealing reality. According to Freire, reality is concealed when inquiry is inhibited by the unquestioned authority of a singular discourse. As a result, he advocated that students be treated as "Subject[s] in the world and with the world" (Freire & Macedo, 1998, p.85). In this way, the ontological dimension of education is protected by engaging students as active agents of inquiry, rather than passive receptacles.

While dialogue is essential in empowering students and giving them a voice, it is not adequate, in and of itself, to bring about substantial change. On the contrary, Freire believed that dialogue needs to be grounded in the experiences of participants and organized around the process of questioning societal norms and other forms of oppression within society. This problem-posing form of education uses historicity as the starting point from which to unravel the complex web of causality contributing to current conditions (Freire & Macedo, 1998). As such, students learn to dissociate ideas from their normative forms and view all concepts as historically conditioned phenomena. In this process, students also become aware of their own historicity and subjectivity in influencing a dynamic world. This is what Freire (2002) called 'conscientization' – the process of moving from naïve consciousness, predicated on a static view of the world in which facts are perceived as separate from and under the control of human intellect, to critical consciousness.

For Freire, reflection in the form of conscientization was not adequate to bring about a truly emancipatory pedagogy. While reflection is unquestionably a critical component in transforming one's world, in isolation it simply promotes self-satisfaction through feeling better about oneself (Kincheloe, 2008). In order for the reflection to be truly transformative, it must be accompanied by action. Freirean philosophy dictates that reflecting and acting upon the world – praxis – leads to the creation of new cultures and the transformation of society (Heaney, 1995).

Therefore, Freirean pedagogy always sought to promote not only critical awareness but also critical action in transforming the world.

Freire's pedagogical philosophy has had a significant impact on the development of contemporary critical pedagogy. Inspired by the Brazilian scholar's work, numerous works have been written to elaborate upon critical pedagogy and its potential application in various educational settings (e.g., Morgan, 1998; Kanpol, 1999; McLaren, 2006; McLaren & Kincheloe, 2007; Kincheloe, 2008; Giroux, 2011; Au, 2012). Freire's work has also inspired pedagogical work dedicated to promoting social justice (e.g., Reagan & Osborn, 2002; Osborn, 2006) and democratic principles (e.g., Giroux, 2011). The diversity of work completed within the realm of critical pedagogy makes the field difficult to precisely define. Nonetheless, certain characteristics of criticality may be identified that are prominent within critical theory and critical pedagogy, which will be referred to as the critical tradition.

One central characteristic of criticality within the critical tradition is its denial of objectivity. The critical tradition and generic criticality share common roots in the eighteenth century Enlightenment. Both traditions are interested in avoiding singular, narrow ways of approaching concepts by promoting oppositional thinking (Smith, 1999). Nonetheless, the objectives of this oppositional thinking are very different. In generic criticality, oppositional thinking is promoted to create distance between the observer and the item of observation, thus enhancing the reasoned nature of thinking and maintaining the perception of objectivity through the reduction of bias. In the critical tradition, oppositional thinking is linked with dialecticism in that contradictions and tensions within a system create opportunities for the development of more equitable, alternative systems. Scrutinizing ideas in order to detect bias and identify optimal alternatives is an important part of being critical within the critical tradition; however, it

is not grounded in the objectivist reduction of knowledge to the ahistorical, atemporal, and acontextual (Giroux, 1997). In contrast, it recognizes the subjectivity of humans in and with the world (Freire & Macedo, 1998) and grounds all critical activity and interpretation in the subjective position of compassionately working to promote a more just and equitable society. Aronowitz (1982) wrote:

> Critical theory proceeds from the theorist's awareness of his own partiality. Thus theory is neither neutral nor objective. Its partisanship consists in its goals: the reconstruction of society based on non-exploitative relations between persons; and the restoration of [humans] to center place in the evolution of human society as a self-conscious, self-managing subject of social reality. (p. xiii – xiv)

Thus, to be critical within the critical tradition is not to hide under the objectivity of scientific knowledge, but rather to challenge it from the subjective position of human compassion (Kincheloe, 2008).

Another central trait of criticality within the critical tradition is its focus on analyzing systems that promote and maintain social injustice. According to Aronowitz (1982), the role of the critical theorist is "to penetrate the world of things to show the underlying relations between persons" (p. xii). Therefore, the act of being critical cannot focus on the superficial or the transparent, but must engage with the tacit, relational aspects of a system in order to identify and address sources of inequity. Inherent in this process is the understanding that neutrality is impossible; all ideas and concepts are grounded in a particular time and space with inequitable social relations determining the eventual solidification of particular concepts as normative. Hence, the function of criticality is to unravel normativity by bringing the taken-for-granted into

the spotlight of interrogation, and to uncover the ways that various systems that promote inequity are created and maintained.

The process of identifying and addressing oppressive systemic structures requires intimate knowledge about power and the politicization of knowledge. In a world characterized by complexity, injustice is often maintained in subtle ways that are not apparent to those affected (Kincheloe, 2008). For example, Gramsci (1973) advocated that hegemonic power is exercised through consensual acceptance of domination, enhanced by various cultural institutions such as schools and the media. Thus, he argued that modern forms of oppression relied less on overt coercion than on the acquiescence of those oppressed to the oppressive structures in place. Acquiescence to hegemonic structures is promoted through various tacit means. For example, Fairclough (2010) demonstrated how language is used to frame issues in a particular manner, thus, embedding the power of particular groups in normative discourses. Similarly, ideology has been identified as a central component in promoting consent for domination (Giroux, 1997). Within Marxist theory, ideology is viewed as restricting the ability of individuals to act against domination by distorting the truth. Ideology is grounded in partial truths, causing individuals not to question its validity. Nonetheless, the partial and fragmented nature of reality as portrayed through ideologies restricts critical consciousness and promotes the maintenance of the status quo (what Marx termed 'uncritical, reproductive praxis') (Allman, 2007). As a result, engaging in critical activities (analysis) is an inherently political endeavour that focuses on uncovering complex power structures.

A final characteristic that differentiates portrayals of criticality in the critical tradition and generic criticality paradigm is the outcome of the act of being critical. In the generic criticality paradigm, being critical results in an informed, well-reasoned decision, which may lead to a

particular action in response. Although action may be coordinated between numerous

individuals, it is generally associated with the critical decision-making of a particular individual.

In other words, the act of being critical can reside exclusively within the individual domain.

Thus, critical thinking within this paradigm is commonly associated with individualistic cultures

(Atkinson, 1997). In contrast, the outcome of being critical within the critical tradition is linked

to praxis – the integration of reflection (theory) and action. Praxis may take place within the

individual domain, but only if it is intended to result in changing individual or small-scale

circumstances. If systemic change that eliminates forms of inequity is the desired result, praxis

must be undertaken in a dialogic, communal manner. This requires a unified effort, but it also

relies on a sense of immanence that the world is in the process of becoming, and therefore,

humans possess the capacity to promote change. Thus, being critical within the critical tradition

relies on a sense of hope for a better future that provides the grounding for human action in

bringing about change.

Table Three: Comparison of Two Paradigms of Critical

Paradigm of Critical	Positionality	Foundational Goals	Political Orientation	Outcome
Generic Criticality	Objective	Rational decision-making	Knowledge as neutral, detached	Reasoned, individualistic action
Critical Tradition	Subjective (compassion)	Promote social justice, equality	Knowledge as political	Praxis through communal action (immanence)

Criticality in Second Language Education Literature

The term 'critical' has been commonly used in educational literature; however, as

demonstrated in the previous section, the meanings attached to the word vary in subtle yet

significant ways. Although there are tangible differences between extreme examples of generic

criticality, as embodied in critical thinking, and the critical tradition, delineating between these paradigms becomes much more complex when dealing with work that is not explicitly attached to a particular tradition. Moreover, as highlighted by numerous critical scholars (e.g., Pennycook, 2001; McLaren, 2003; Morgan & Ramanathan, 2005; Kincheloe, 2008), it is perilous to discuss the critical tradition in the singular form, as numerous forms of critical theory and critical pedagogy exist that have discernibly different contextual roots and orientations. Therefore, the act of reviewing criticality within the second language education literature becomes a subjective undertaking in which I, the author, must interpret the critical orientation of particular work and apply labels to the literature. The act of limiting the review to literature specifically related to second language education poses a further complication, as education is a very broad field that encompasses various sub-fields. Therefore, the following review is not intended to be an exhaustive overview of critical work related to second language education, but rather an investigation of the central themes that emerge in second language pedagogical work dedicated to the critical tradition.

Criticality in Mainstream Second Language Education Literature

Criticality entered the world of second language education in a relatively belated manner (Canagarajah, 2005; Troudi, 2005). Whereas critical analyses have been prominent within the general educational literature for numerous decades (e.g., Freire, 1970; Aronowitz, 1973; Apple, 1979), criticality was largely absent from second language education literature until the 1990s (three notable exceptions being Graman, 1988; Peirce, 1989; Pennycook, 1989). Historically, second language education has fallen under the purview of applied linguistics. Thus, the research agendas, epistemological frameworks, and methodological options available to scholars, and the relationship between theory (academics) and practice (educators) within second language

education were largely determined by the traditions of applied linguistics. Although applied linguistics is inherently interested in social processes – language use and the teaching and learning of languages – the field has tried to align itself with the natural sciences through the adoption of structuralist, positivistic orientations. According to the positivistic paradigm, knowledge can be separate from the knower. Thus, objective, universal truths can be discovered if subjective biases, emotions, and interpretations are eliminated (for example, using the scientific method) and empirical evidence is available to validate the knowledge. As a consequence, language has been reduced to an objective entity (fact) that simply transmits messages reflecting reality (Pennycook, 1990; Reagan, 2004; Shohamy, 2006). The historical, social, political, cultural, and economic conditions influencing the evolution (or static nature) of language are deemed irrelevant, as language is postulated as a fact independent of time and space. This apolitical, ahistorical, asocial orientation has rendered language and any processes associated with language, such as language diffusion (e.g., Phillipson, 1992), as neutral and natural (Pennycook, 1994a). Moreover, it has depoliticized the language classroom by formulating the content as "just the language" and pedagogy as "just teaching" (Pennycook, 1994a, p.295).

Frustration surrounding the de-politicized nature of second language education and the adverse effects it was having on classroom practices prompted scholars to turn to critical pedagogy as a source of inspiration for reinvigorating the field. One of the earliest and most prominent advocates for infusing criticality into second language pedagogy was Pennycook (1990; 1999; 2001; 2010). Pennycook (1990) asserted that the structuralist, positivistic foundations of second language education had a limiting effect on the questions posed by academics and teachers, and served to isolate the field from broader educational theories. He

believed that isolation from interdisciplinary knowledge, particularly within the social sciences, had an impoverishing effect on the field of second language education because it denied consideration for broader contextual (including cultural, social, and political) influences on pedagogy. This was particularly concerning for Pennycook because of the political nature of second language education. Pennycook (1990) viewed language as inherently politically based, as he perceived it "standing in a difficult relationship to the questions of the status of dialects and standard forms, and intimately connected to the development and maintenance of the nation state" (p. 305). Moreover, he viewed the very act of education as being highly political because "teaching practices always imply larger visions of society" (Pennycook, 1994b, p. 179); therefore, educational encounters are inherently sites of conflict and negotiation between different worldviews, in which some cultures gain privilege and prestige over others. This is particularly relevant in relation to English language teaching because Pennycook (1994b) viewed English instruction as being intimately linked to Western discourses: "English language teaching beliefs, practices and materials are never neutral, and indeed represent very particular understandings . . . Such understandings, in turn, are also not merely random views but rather are very much part of a broader range of discursive and cultural practices that emanate from the 'West'" (p. 178). As a result, Pennycook (1990) advocated for critical pedagogy as a means to expand how second language pedagogy is conceptualized.

In advocating for critical pedagogy in second language education, Pennycook (2001) differentiated between two different forms of criticality. The first form of criticality, labeled 'emancipatory modernism', was grounded in the neo-Marxist critical tradition. This form of critique, which Pennycook (2001) attributed to critical discourse analysis (e.g., Fairclough, 1989) and various forms of critical applied linguistics (e.g., Phillipson, 1992), was predicated on

revealing the ways that language restricts ways of knowing by representing the world in a particular manner that privileges certain groups over others. As such, the objective of critical work within this tradition is to promote awareness of a 'true form' of reality to help individuals move from false consciousness (an ideologically obscured awareness of reality) to critical consciousness (a deeper, politically-engaged form of awareness). Critical analyses from this perspective were based on rigid dichotomies (e.g., oppressed and oppressor) with a narrow focus (e.g., class and economic production). Moreover, criticality from this perspective was grounded in the modernist concept of emancipation through human rationality. Pennycook (2001) thus rejected this form of criticality as being too dependent on the concepts of scientific knowledge, objectivity and absolute truth, and overly reductionist and deterministic in nature.

In contrast to emancipatory modernism, Pennycook (2001) advocated a form of criticality he labeled 'problematizing practice' or 'applied linguistics with an attitude.' Whereas emancipatory modernism was grounded in scientific certainty (scientific knowledge providing the means for the socially oppressed to reach a pre-determined epistemological and ontological state of emancipation), problematizing practice was based on uncertainty and complexity. As post-modernism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism, etc. provide the foundation for Pennycook's form of criticality within second language education, all forms of grand narratives or absolute truths were rejected in favour of a skeptical, questioning stance to all forms of knowledge. Inherent in this problematizing perspective is the need to understand power, inequality, and knowledge as fluid concepts constantly in a state of flux. Thus, analyses cannot adhere to a pre-formulated, deterministic framework, but must involve a form of self-reflexivity that always questions the limits of theories and knowledge.

The underlying objective of problematizing practice is to push pedagogical thinking in provocative ways. According to Pennycook (2010), decentering is a critical concept in this endeavour as it seeks "to challenge an assumed center, where power and privilege lie, and to rework both the politics and the language that sustain them" (p. 16.4). This involves constantly questioning the theoretical and ideological foundations of the second language education field and one's personal approach to language education; however, it also involves creating spaces within the second language classroom for 'silenced knowledge' to re-emerge. In this way, de-centering is a form of inclusionary pedagogy, as it reduces the absolute authority of the teacher by creating dialogic spaces of negotiation. De-centering cannot simply involve opening up spaces for critique though, as Pennycook (2001) warns that language of critique must be accompanied by language of hope. As such, problematizing practice is not simply about critiquing one power structure in order to replace it with an alternative, "but rather of imagining and bringing into being new schemas of politicization" (Pennycook, 2001, p. 171). This is similar to Benesch's (1999) notion of dialogic critical thinking in which the goal is "expanding students' [and teachers'] understanding beyond what they may have already considered to promote tolerance and social justice" (p. 573).

While Pennycook sought to expand critical work in applied linguistics beyond class-based analyses, Kubota (2004a; 2004b) aimed to develop criticality specifically directed towards portrayals of race and culture in second language education. Kubota (2004a) identified three common forms of education: conservative, liberal multiculturalism, and critical multiculturalism. Whereas conservative education advocates the importance of Eurocentric educational knowledge and practices and attributes social divisiveness to cultural difference, liberal multiculturalism celebrates diversity. Liberal multiculturalism, which Kubota (2004a) claimed is the most

common form of pedagogy ascribed to by second language educators, promotes an egalitarian view of the world in which all individuals are considered equal, with equal opportunities within society. As a result, this form of pedagogy advocates for open-mindedness and the acceptance of difference through promoting awareness of cultural difference. Such an endeavour often manifests itself in the form of cultural events or celebrations.

Although liberal multiculturalism is a preferred form of pedagogy in comparison with conservative approaches, Kubota (2004a) was critical of its limiting effect in addressing social issues. According to the author, liberal multiculturalism promotes an essentialized, static view of culture through the creation of a 'similarity-difference dualism.' On the one hand, the liberal approach emphasizes commonalities among cultures. This politically-correct approach of ignoring difference is intended to promote an egalitarian society; however, it actually serves to undermine social justice by concealing the historical conditions that have contributed to contemporary inequity. As a result, it contributes to what Kubota (2004a) has labeled 'color-blindness.' On the other hand, liberal multiculturalism promotes an emphasis on cultural difference by emphasizing the exotic nature of the cultural other. The emphasis on cultural similarity and difference is problematic because it portrays cultural groups as homogenous in composition and reifies cultural traits, thus denying the agency of the individual (Kubota, 2004b). Furthermore, the liberal multicultural approach tends to ignore the influence of power in the construction and maintenance of particular cultural meanings. Thus, power (often embedded in particular ideologies) is denied a role in knowledge formation and interpretation.

In order to address the deficiencies of liberal multiculturalism, Kubota (2004a) advocated for criticality in second language education. Critical multiculturalism was postulated as a means to raise critical awareness about various forms of domination and oppression and to aid learners

in becoming producers of counter-hegemonic discourses. At the center of this process was the understanding that culture is discursively constructed. As a result, culture cannot be portrayed as a tangible, objective truth uniformly possessed by members of a particular group, but rather a dynamic, contested, contextually dependent entity that always influences and is influenced by relations of power. In this way multicultural education can move beyond the superficial celebration of difference to analyze the ways that culture, race, etc. are constructed and implicated in unequal power relations.

Similar to Kubota (2004a), Guilherme (2002) sought to enhance the efficacy of foreign language education in preparing students for living in a globalized world through the integration of criticality. Guilherme (2002) believed that the adoption of critical perspectives was natural in the foreign language classroom because "learning/teaching a foreign language/culture implies taking an ideological view of the world beyond our cultural borders which reflects the way we perceive ourselves within our own culture and its position towards the Other" (p. 155). Because culture acts as a filter through which we perceive the world, and the learning of a second language inherently necessitates adopting a perspective based on alternative cultural codes, the second language classroom was postulated as an ideal location to address critical themes. Guilherme (2002) believed that the confrontation of multiple realities (with inherently different cultural, political, and ideological assumptions) characteristic of interaction in the foreign language classroom promoted greater awareness about the limitations of knowledge and traditions, and provided the basis for critical cultural revitalization. Thus, based on post-modern and critical theory, Guilherme (2002) attempted to reformulate the agenda of foreign language education as the development of critical citizenry, critical intercultural competence, and critical cultural awareness.

In addition to drawing on various theoretical traditions, Guilherme (2002) also adopted an eclectic foundation for her vision of second language pedagogy. The author identified five central dimensions of second language education – cultural, educational, political, ethical, and interaction between self and other. In order to address each of these dimensions, Guilherme (2002) adopted an interdisciplinary approach drawing upon cultural studies, intercultural communication, critical pedagogy, human rights education, and education for democratic citizenship. She also developed a critical cycle for investigating the beliefs, values and attitudes of oneself and others at the local, national and global level. Importantly, Guilherme (2002) warned that the cycle was not inherently critical, but required educators to define and apply it based on the principles of critical pedagogy and post-modernism.

In contrast to Guilherme's (2002) focus on foreign language education as a means to develop critical cultural awareness and critical intercultural competence, Reagan and Osborn (2002) advocated for the foreign language classroom as a site for promoting critical language awareness. The authors noted that historically foreign language education has been promoted as a means to achieve cognitive (e.g., critical thinking), cultural (e.g., tolerance), and/or pragmatic (e.g., employment, national security) goals; however, such a utilitarian focus ignores the broader potential of language education. According to Reagan and Osborn (2002), language is instrumental not only in constructing and organizing knowledge, but also the diverse realities in which we live and interact. As such, the language classroom should not be limited to the study of pre-determined linguistic codes or cultural content, but should be a dialogic site of critical investigation. Drawing on constructivism, Reagan and Osborn (2002) argued that interaction and collaboration are required in the language classroom in order to avoid the misconstruction of knowledge. However, interaction in the language classroom was promoted not simply as a means

to ensure the development of 'correct' knowledge, but also to encourage democracy through promoting awareness about the situated and tenuous nature of knowledge construction and openness to dissenting voices.

In addition to redefining the rationale for foreign language education, Reagan and Osborn (2002) also outlined the characteristics of a critical language curriculum. Similar to Guilherme (2002), Reagan and Osborn (2002) advocated a holistic approach to foreign language pedagogy with overarching disciplinary boundaries. The authors noted that language/culture pedagogy is intimately linked to other fields; therefore, language education should draw upon these fields to enrich instruction. Furthermore, the authors drew inspiration from the work of Paulo Freire in advocating for a problem-posing approach in which the development of critical language awareness, rather than the acquisition of linguistic skills, was the ultimate goal. Reagan and Osborn (2002) believed that people have the power to shape discourses; therefore, language instruction should not only explore words, but also the relationship between the world and the words used to describe it. In this way language instruction will assist students in challenging hegemonic ideologies and liberating themselves from oppressive discourses. In order to accomplish this goal, Reagan and Osborn (2002) urged educators to move beyond the presentation of content in neat dichotomies with a focus on sterile topics (e.g., family, health and weather) to investigate topics relevant to students' lives from multiple perspectives, acknowledging the complexity inherent in all knowledge construction.

The importance of relevance is a common theme addressed in the second language education literature advocating criticality. Akbari (2008), for example, adopted a critical perspective to analyze the ways that relevance was undermined by center-dominant pedagogies. The author claimed that textbooks and curricula developed in publishing hubs (i.e., English-

speaking nations and regional capitals) ignore the contextual realities of most students and instead present an anesthetized version of life. In such textbooks and curricula, central issues that define human existence, such as poverty, discrimination, and violence, are outright ignored or portrayed as pertinent only in distant contexts (Gray, 2002; Akbari, 2008).

Moreover, the language and themes presented in the language classroom often reflect the interests of a dominant group. Akbari (2008) claimed that the language commonly introduced in ESL classes reflects the needs and desires of the upper and middle classes. Cameron (2002) echoed this sentiment claiming that the norms advocated in English language classrooms represented the interests of Western/Anglo traditions and the social elite. Similarly, Fredricks (2007) espoused the importance of considering the religious and political orientation of students. Drawing on Tajikistan as an example, Fredricks (2007) demonstrated how traditional Russian instruction and more contemporary English instruction have applied ideologically charged content and culturally insensitive methods that do not complement learners' backgrounds. In fact, the socialist rhetoric embodied in Russian instruction and the Western Christian or secular pedagogy characteristic of English instruction often have come in direct conflict with the Muslim heritage of learners. Insensitivity to the local contexts in which language instruction takes place has caused Akbari (2008) to lament that often "ELT classes suffer from vague generalities and socio-political numbness" (p.282) that prevent them from becoming sites of social transformation.

In order to enhance the relevance of second language education, critical pedagogues have advocated for the increased autonomy and influence of learners in shaping class structures and activities. Troudi (2005) purported the second language classroom as a location not simply for learning discrete language skills, but as "a community where ideologies and meanings are co-

constructed and personalities are developed" (p. 123). Thus, linguistic-based curricula that deny the importance of student input inhibit opportunities for divergent minority voices to shape the discourses attended to in the language classroom. The result is the promotion of scientific knowledge (as embodied in standardized versions of language packaged as the content in language courses) as the lone legitimate form of knowledge and the continued hegemony of unexamined dominant discourses through the "banking model of education" (Freire, 1998). In contrast, the classroom as learning community opens up spaces for dialogic inquiry and the co-construction of classroom identities and meanings (Troudi, 2005).

For Crookes and Lehner (1998), a learning community is not simply a space where learners are given the opportunity to express their views and influence course content, but rather a democratic space of responsibility sharing. According to the authors, teachers and learners should mutually share responsibility for all aspects of the learning process – from selecting and introducing material to identifying appropriate forms of assessment. A key consideration for Crookes and Lehner (1998) in maintaining the principles of critical pedagogy in the classroom was the diminishment of traditional structures that maintain unequal power relations. This meant not only reducing the power associated with the selection of the material taken up in class and the right to speak, but also interaction between the teacher and learner at the interpersonal level. Thus, the authors advocated that they often remained silent, rather than directing class discussions and intervening to address what they perceived as erroneous interpretations, as such actions would re-affirm the authority of the teacher and promote inequitable relations with students.

The notion that critical pedagogy can enhance the meaningfulness of second language instruction was also taken up by Graman (1988). As an inexperienced teacher, the author was

tasked with the responsibility of improving the linguistic skills of immigrant workers in rural Colorado. Guided by the materials provided by the institution where he was working, Graman engaged in instruction that focused on drilling learners about grammar and pronunciation. He explained, "The class degenerated into sessions in which I, like a trainer, would get the students, like parrots, to make sounds and repeat sentences and phrases that in no way reflected the immediate reality of the challenges of their lives" (Graman, 1988, p. 434). As a result, the author lamented that "focusing on language per se destroyed language's function as a tool" (Graman, 1988, p. 434). Inspired by the work of Paulo Freire, Graman sought to reinvigorate the classroom through problem-posing and authentic dialogue. The author believed that intellectual and linguistic development would be accelerated if learners were encouraged to analyze their own experiences and to develop a vocabulary to describe and better understand these experiences. As a result, he moved away from using the textbook as the foundation for the course to drawing on learners' experiences and existential, political, and axiological issues related to these experiences as the basis for developing linguistic skills.

Similar to Graman (1988), Morgan (1998) adopted critical pedagogy as a means to enhance linguistic development by increasing the relevance of the content introduced and, thus, the motivation of learners to engage with the target language in the language classroom. Morgan (1998) was motivated by the author's concern over the power differential between academics and practitioners, leading to a top-down emphasis in the development of second language pedagogy. The author claimed that English language training has largely been based on the areas of linguistic description, cognitive acquisition, and psycholinguistics; thus, language structure has been separated from the contextual and historical realities that have shaped it. Inherent in this separation is the belief that applied linguistic research is universally generalizable as truth,

whereas the locally derived knowledge of teachers is contextually dependent. The result is the privileging of knowledge developed by academics and the denial of language education as a political expression bound in unequal power relations. Morgan (1998) was concerned that the prioritization of neutral structures in language education over meaningful content was having a negative effect on language acquisition in classrooms. As a result, the author advocated for community-based critical ESL education in which social issues and community concerns would act as the starting points for instruction and assessment would include linguistic criteria and engagement in social tasks. According to Morgan (1998), community-based critical instruction should challenge learners to investigate the partiality of their knowledge and to question common sense norms, but it must be done in a "thought-provoking manner that engages rather than threatens people and opens up possibilities for critical reflection" (p. 16). Therefore, second language educators must challenge learners to critically investigate issues, while also developing an environment in which learners feel safe to engage in critical reflection and dialogue. This mirrors Benesch's (2009) claim that the aim of critical language education may be to create safe spaces where learners can adopt alternative identities without being penalized for breaking perceived norms.

On a more specific level, Pennycook (1994b) argued for the critical analysis of discourses associated with English as a means to address the contextually-dependent needs of English language learners. The author stated that language educators often introduce controversial social issues (e.g., abortion or euthanasia) as a means to inspire interaction and promote a critical dimension in the classroom. Nonetheless, he warned that "such issues often remain tangential both to students' lives and to the position of English" (Pennycook, 1994b, p. 312). As issues related to English are directly relevant to all ESL learners, Pennycook (1994b) advocated for the

worldliness of English as a central topic in the critical English language curriculum. "It is precisely to the worldliness of English that a curriculum of critical English pedagogy can turn in the first instance. Thus, it is the connections between English and popular culture, development, capitalism, dependency, and so on that can make up part of the 'content' of a critical pedagogy of English" (Pennycook, 1994b, p. 313). Thus, the meaningfulness of English, not only in directly influencing learners but also in indirectly influencing their lives through its connections with global issues, makes it an optimal topic for critical investigation in the language classroom.

While numerous authors have applied critical pedagogy to enhance the relevance of second language education for learners, Osborn (2006) sought to enhance the relevance of critical pedagogy for teachers by demonstrating how it could be applied within a national standards framework. Although the notion of standards is commonly critiqued by critical scholars as embodying forms of cultural domination (e.g., Apple, 1996), Osborn (2006) clearly believed that the dominance of the standards movement within the United States made it impossible to ignore when advocating for critical pedagogy in the language classroom. Osborn (2006) lamented that contemporary rationales for foreign language education are commonly based on market and nation-state perspectives. These rationales are antithetical to the development of cross-cultural perspectives (commonly advocated as an objective for second language learning) and the promotion of social justice. As a result, he advocated for the promotion of social justice through the adoption of criticality in the foreign language classroom. Osborn (2006) warned that any attempt to develop a guide to critical pedagogy would be doomed to failure, as it would contradict the very foundations of the critical movement. In accordance, the author did not provide a neat recipe for how to apply criticality in the language classroom, but rather outlined opportunities for promoting critical pedagogy within the framework

established by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Program

Standards. As part of this task, Osborn (2006) presented a critical inquiry cycle consisting of four

stages (informed investigation, inductive analysis, tentative conclusions, and mutual critical

reflection) and outlined central tenets for addressing social justice in the language classroom,

including resisting positivist aspects of teaching, incorporating spirituality, and applying

descriptive rather than prescriptive examples of value-normative facets of language and culture.

As such, the author aimed to encourage curricular adaptation through the infusion of criticality at

the local level.

Although numerous authors have taken up critical pedagogy as a means to enhance the

meaningfulness of language pedagogy through employing more democratic classroom structures

and engaging with contextually-relevant content through a critical lens, it must be cautioned that

critical pedagogy is not designed simply as a means to inspire enthusiasm about learning

(Benesch, 2001). Pedagogy with such an objective is based on an individualistic orientation in

which the educational needs of the individual learner are emphasized over any other potential

goals (as generally reflected in North American education). Critical pedagogy, on the other hand,

inherently involves a non-individualistic orientation, as it is predicated on moving beyond "one's

available explanatory texts and discourses – a denaturalization and discomfort and 'making the

familiar strange'" (Luke, 2004, p. 206-207) in order to promote a more equitable and just

society. Hence, Aronowitz (1993) cautioned that "the task of this revolutionary pedagogy is not

to foster critical self-consciousness in order to improve cognitive learning, the student's self-

esteem, or even to assist in 'his' aspiration to fulfill his human 'potential'" (p. 11). Similarly,

Pennycook (1994b) warned that student-centered pedagogies should not be too closely conflated

with critical pedagogy, as the exercise of autonomy does not necessitate the promotion of criticality.

Criticality in English for Academic Purposes Literature

Criticality has not been exclusively addressed in the general literature on second language education, as it has also been taken up by English for Academic Purposes (EAP) scholars. The status of EAP researchers and instructors in the university setting has been historically very low (Benesch, 1993; Morgan, 2009). A lack of subject specific expertise (caused by the fact that EAP instructors work with scholars from diverse fields) and superficial coverage of content in EAP courses with a general focus have led to the general perception of EAP instructors as mere technicians or service providers for the 'serious' work being conducted in other university departments (Pennycook, 1997; Morgan, 2009). This impoverished view of EAP has contributed to a pragmatic emphasis within the field that posits the sole objective of EAP instruction as preparing students for the academic demands of study in various fields. Although such a pragmatic orientation can manifest itself in divergent forms (Allison, 1996), a common version of pragmatism, often referred to as 'vulgar pragmatism' (Cherryholmes, 1988; Pennycook, 1997; Benesch, 2001), employs strict criteria of efficiency and utility to curricular decisions. Reid (1989) summarized this perspective: "In short, writing teachers of NNS [non-native speakers] must be pragmatists. They must discover what will be expected in the academic contexts their students will encounter, and they must provide their students with the writing skills and the cultural information that will allow the students to perform successfully" (p. 232). Thus, EAP is considered as a field that simply supplements other fields and, therefore, uncritically follows the norms and standards advanced within those fields.

Supporters of a pragmatic focus in EAP argue that such an approach is necessitated by contextual factors. Johns (1993), for example, argued that the absence of ideological discussion among ESL composition faculty related to the burden of their workload and the perceived irrelevance of the topic among practitioners. Similarly, Santos (1992) argued that socio-political and ideological issues were not appropriate in the ESL classroom due to the nature and composition of the class. Whereas such topics may be appropriate in L1 composition classes grounded in critical literacy theory and serving learners from a homogenous national context, Santos (1992) claimed they were not appropriate in a second language context where the social and cultural norms of learners made the application of critical pedagogy more problematic. The author further claimed that the scientific roots of the field of second language education have rendered ideological concerns irrelevant to practitioners and researchers.

The alliance of the field of second language education with traditions of scientific inquiry has promoted the discourse of neutrality in language teaching. Scientific standards of investigation dictate adherence to neutrality and objectivity. This entails limiting political and cultural bias through careful methodological selection and application, and the restriction of inquiry to the descriptive level. It also inherently involves postulating language as an independent and neutral conduit of information – a simple tool to convey meaning (Pennycook, 1997; Morgan, 2009). Furthermore, scientific inquiry limits the validity of knowledge claims to concepts that are tangible and empirically verifiable. As such, a scientific orientation limits the discursive options available to those operating within the field and solidifies the neutral, pragmatist stance as "an ethically viable one" (Pennycook, 1997, p. 257).

Critical pedagogues have countered the vulgar pragmatic position by questioning the claim to neutrality inherent in pragmatic discourses. Benesch (1993) argued that curricular

117

decisions are never neutral as they are always grounded in a particular social, economic, and political context that represents certain interests over others. Thus, the pedagogical decisions teachers make always reflect a varying degree of resistance or compliance with pre-established norms. She wrote: "Teachers' decisions about subject matter, teaching methods, and assessment reflect a range of political positions, from wholehearted endorsement of the status quo in school and society, to tacit approval, to critical dissent" (Benesch, 1993, p. 707). Shor (1992) added: "No curriculum can be neutral. All forms of education are political because they can enable or inhibit the questioning habits of students, thus developing or disabling their critical relation to knowledge, schooling, and society. Education can socialize students into critical thought or into dependence on authority" (p. 13). In other words, education reflects particular aspirations and dreams that "are always *someone's* dreams and to the degree that they are implicated in organizing the future for others they always have a moral and political dimension" (Simon, 2001, p. 144). As a result, the pragmatist claim of neutrality cannot be supported, as the absence of acknowledgement or discussion about politics does not preclude notions of power from pedagogy.

If instructional decisions and practices are deemed not to be neutral, there will be significant implications for the organization of the EAP classroom. Under the guise of scientific neutrality and the promotion of science as an over-arching, cross-societal culture (Barron, 1991), the sole focus of the EAP classroom is the mimicry of subject-specific norms of communication. However, if education is recognized as a site of struggle and contestation between various forms of knowledge (Giroux, 2001; Apple, 2012), the appropriacy of a pedagogy that is designed simply to assimilate learners into a particular community is highly questionable. Thus, numerous scholars have advocated for a critical perspective in the EAP classroom, sometimes referred to as

'critical pragmatism' (Cherryholmes, 1988; Pennycook, 1997; Benesch, 2001, 2009). According to Cherryholmes (1988), "Critical pragmatism results when a sense of crisis is brought to our choices, when it is accepted that our standards, beliefs, values, guiding texts, and discourses-practices themselves require evaluation and reappraisal" (p.151). In this way, the norms and standards of EAP should not be presented as absolute truths, but rather should be interrogated and critiqued. Benesch (2001) wrote: "Critical EAP allows ESL teachers and students to examine externally imposed demands and negotiate their responses to them" (p. 53). The process of adopting an agentive rather than receptive position – a process that recognizes the value of students' cultures and histories and posits standards as temporally dependent rather than immutable – creates space not only for the exploration of linguistic norms in academic genres but also their "relation to EAP students' and teachers' complex and overlapping social identities: class, race, gender, ethnicity, age and so on" (Benesch, 2009, p. 81). By adopting a critical perspective, the EAP classroom is reformulated as a location for "the pluralisation of our students' future knowledge" (Pennycook, 1997, p. 264) and a vehicle for institutional and social change (Pennycook, 1997; Benesch, 2001, 2009; Morgan, 2009).

Criticality in Second Language Teacher Education Literature

The literature presented up until this point has largely focused on providing a theoretical foundation for the application of criticality in the second language classroom or examples of how praxis has been achieved in particular settings; however, criticality is also prominent in the literature related to second language teacher education. Recent trends have seen the de-skilling of teachers (Ullman, 1999) through an over-reliance on methods prescribed by experts (Lin, 1999) and the uncritical socialization of teachers into a system that promotes and maintains assymetrical relations (Barnawi, 2010). To address these concerning trends and promote an

agenda emphasizing social justice, a number of critical scholars have developed teacher education courses and programs based on critical pedagogy (e.g., Crookes & Lehner, 1998; Ullman, 1999; Lin, 2004; Sung, 2007; Morgan, 2009). Some teacher educators have focused on promoting a dialogic, democratic environment in which traditional power structures are co-investigated and altered (e.g., Crookes & Lehner, 1998; Ullman, 1999). The importance of sharing power within the classroom is rooted in the goals of critical pedagogy. Clarke (2003) wrote: "Empowerment and liberation are not serums that can be administered to others. They are not states of grace that we confer on our students. We do not empower others by declaring them to be liberated, nor can we harass them into becoming empowered. . . The best we can do is work to create the conditions under which students will begin to take the initiative" (p. 175). Thus, in order to empower students to become change agents advocating for social justice, teacher educators cannot impose their views on learners, but must provide space for them to raise their own concerns and influence the direction of educational inquiry. A key component of this process is relinquishing the 'expert' status commonly associated with the teacher position. Ullman (1999) accomplished this by assisting the teachers in her class to critique the quality of published materials, thus undermining her authority as a publisher. Crookes and Lehner (1998) also minimized their authority by relinquishing the traditional role of the teacher as autonomous planner and assessor and by limiting their role in class discussions. The process of identifying and addressing sources of inequity within the classroom is not always easy, even for well-versed critical pedagogues, as demonstrated by Lin (2004). Despite her intention to create an environment of critical inquiry, Lin (2004) found herself reproducing traditional forms of disciplinary power that she had set out to critique. This contributed to the realization that self-

reflexivity is an on-going process characterized by a constant struggle to reveal blind spots in one's practices.

Critical pedagogy has assumed various forms in the teacher education literature. For example, Ullman (1999) devised a course to use curriculum development as a means to empower teachers and promote critical perspectives. After the teachers participated in numerous seminars to build a common knowledge base, the author collaborated with them to identify an appropriate curriculum development project - the creation of a textbook. Throughout the process of developing the textbook, teachers were encouraged to problematize and debate concepts that became relevant, including the relevance of materials for students from different contexts. In a similar manner, Goldstein (2004) encouraged the use of ethnographic playwriting and performed ethnography to critically investigate linguistic and social issues. The author demonstrated how creative writing and drama could be used to engage with and develop broader understandings about critical issues. In another example, Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999) developed a graduate seminar specifically designed for non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs). The objectives of the course were to raise awareness about the status of non-native speakers in the English teaching profession and to empower non-native speakers as language educators. Using discussions and assignments that promoted critical reflection, the authors advocated that the course had a significant impact in alleviating participants' concerns as non-native speaking educators and empowering them with a sense of their own agency as professionals.

A common theme emerging in the teacher education literature was the notion of uncertainty. For example, Pennycook (2004) advocated that opportunities for the productive application of criticality need not always be planned, but can emerge out of innocuous, unintended situations. Drawing on discussions he had with student teachers, Pennycook (2004)

revealed how spontaneous critical dialogue about pedagogical occurrences could promote awareness about significant issues. He wrote: "These are small moments of critical language education, critical moments embedded in the process of discussing teaching . . . Society hasn't been transformed. Ideological obfuscation hasn't been removed. But in many ways, this is what critical education is all about. It's the quiet seeking out of potential moments, the results of which we don't always know" (Pennycook, 2004, p. 342). Thus, the transformative nature of critical pedagogy is not limited to grand societal changes, but includes intimate moments of individual revelation that are characterized by uncertainty.

While the timing of critical investigation is uncertain, so is the result of such inquiry. Regardless of the intentions of teacher educators, the outcomes of critical episodes are unpredictable. Opening space for teachers and learners to dialogically investigate issues inherently means that instructors relinquish their perceived control over instructional outcomes. As a result, Morgan (2009) advocated that a syllabus be "designed towards the creation of possibilities rather than certainties, one that attends to learning opportunities through which student-teachers might (re)conceptualize new roles and responsibilities for themselves" (p. 87). Although there are numerous factors contributing to an uncertain outcome, one prominent factor is the context in which teaching will take place. Thus, critical pedagogues warn that learners must be trained to identify opportunities for agency within the constraints posed by the local institutions in which they will work (Lin, 2004; Morgan, 2009). Furthermore, Morgan (2009) advocated that change will not necessarily be immediate, but may emerge over time as exposure combined with experience may contribute to identifying opportunities for promoting transformative pedagogy.

Although it does not focus on the promotion of critical pedagogy specifically, Kramsch (1993) also warrants inclusion when discussing criticality in second language education. Kramsch (1993) postulated that individuals do not simply operate within their native culture or the culture of the target language (audience), but in a 'third space' at the interstices between cultures. When operating within this space, learners are encouraged to name and interpret the world in alternative ways. This involves socialization into linguistic and cultural norms; however, it also involves critically questioning existing practices. Kramsch (1993) advocated that criticality could be infused into three educational discourses – instructional, transactional, and interactional – in order to foster rich, multi-layered understandings (including various world views and the assumptions embedded within them). As Kanpol (1990) eloquently stated, "Teachers at all levels of education have the power not only to help students assimilate into the mainstream culture; they can also use 'assimilation' as a social and political tool to transform consciousness" (p.247). In outlining ways that consciousness could be transformed through critical language pedagogy, Kramsch (1993) highlighted the importance of being attuned to micro and macro cultural contexts and critically listening to their own and students' assumptions and beliefs.

Scepticism in Second Language Education Literature Surrounding Criticality

Literature advocating for criticality in second language education has also been accompanied by skepticism and critique. One criticism employed against critical pedagogy is its utilization of overly abstract and inaccessible language (Guilherme, 2002). Some scholars claim that the language employed by critical pedagogues is elitist and patronizing (Bowers, 1991; Johnston, 1999), thus making it easily comprehensible for select academics, rather than the educators it is intended to address. Johnston (1999) claimed that the political hyperbole

123

employed by critical pedagogues was designed to aesthetically enhance their educational practices through "pseudorevolutionary bluster" (p. 563). As a result, he advocated that less antagonistic language be used as a means to make critical pedagogy more accessible to the average teacher: "I feel that critical pedagogy would do well to exercise moderation in its use of language. There will be no revolution . . . and I believe critical pedagogy would find a broader hearing if it did not require adherents to dress themselves up linguistically as Che Guevara" (Johnston, 1999, p. 563). Thus, the language employed by critical pedagogues was deemed to limit the potential audience for the message.

The inaccessibility of critical pedagogy for practitioners within the field has been claimed to not only be the result of the language employed by critical pedagogues but also the structure of critical pedagogy itself. Sowden (2008) claimed that English language instruction is viewed by many stakeholders as an instrumental undertaking. In other words, the English language classroom is the location for developing linguistic skills, not exploring value systems, which Sowden (2008) believed would take place autonomously outside of class. Therefore, due to the fact that critical pedagogy offers little support in the actual process of language acquisition, it was deemed to offer little utility in the language classroom (Santos, 1992; Sowden, 2008; Waters, 2009a). Furthermore, Waters (2008) claimed that critical pedagogy assumed widespread support for its agenda. This entailed not only adopting a common worldview, but also a universal understanding of language education as a political activity – something Waters (2008) deemed could not be substantiated. As a result, politicizing second language instruction was viewed not only as unnecessary, but also potentially harmful (Sowden, 2008).

The emphasis on power as a central concept in education was another criticism laid against critical pedagogy. According to Buzzelli and Johnston (2002), critical pedagogues posit

power and power relations as the central hub of educational endeavours. In other words, power is at the center of all pedagogy. However, the authors disputed this claim, arguing that power relations influence education, but morality is at the heart of teaching. Johnston (1999) wrote: "The political dimension of teaching is crucial, but it is not enough to capture the complex essence of teaching" (p. 564). On the other hand, Buzzelli and Johnston (2002) exclaimed: "Our view is that teaching in educational contexts is fundamentally concerned with moral relations, not with power. Although power relations clearly play a major part, the essence of teaching is moral in nature" (p. 56). Therefore, the authors believed that the emphasis on power within critical pedagogy was misplaced, as it distracted attention from the true essence of teaching as a moral endeavour. Similarly, Sowden (2008) argued that critical pedagogy was unnecessarily used as the justification for many pedagogical innovations. He advocated that many pedagogical activities could be rationalized under the banner of learner-centeredness or authenticity, rather than a politically-motivated emphasis on power.

The characterization of power within critical pedagogy was also deemed to be problematic. The fundamental objective of critical pedagogy is to promote a more just, equitable society. Inherent within this vision of society is the notion that power is negative and should be avoided. However, Johnston (1999) claimed that power is inevitable within any context and, therefore, cannot be outright eliminated. In contrast, he advocated that "it is more interesting and useful to work on putting this power to good use than to imagine it can be removed" (Johnston, 1999, p. 560). Moreover, Buzzelli and Johnston (2002) complained that critical pedagogy "encourages a simplistic view of power and power relations. To talk in terms of 'taking' and 'giving' power implies a view of power as a commodity or object that can be passed from hand to hand" (p. 54). Rather than viewing power as a commodity to be shared, the authors advocated

that it should be viewed in the Foucaultian sense as constantly in flux through the process of negotiation. Therefore, attempts by critical pedagogues to empower learners or minimize power differentials in the language classroom are ill-advised, as they are based on erroneous conceptions of power and its operation.

While conceptualizations of power and its emphasis within critical pedagogy were critiqued, so was the position of power attributed to criticality in second language pedagogy. According to several authors, critical pedagogy has assumed an authoritative position within second language education discourses. For example, Waters (2009a) labeled critical pedagogy as "an oppressive but largely unquestioned orthodoxy, a form of intellectual hegemony" (p. 141). Similarly, Buzzelli and Johnston (2002) claimed that "critical pedagogy has engendered its own orthodoxy and hierarchy" (p. 54) leading to the development of "new regimes of truth" (Gore, 1996 cited in Buzzelli & Johnston, 2002, p. 54). Due to its emphasis on promoting social justice, critical pedagogy has adopted a position of moral authority or self-righteousness in its ability to enlighten (Pennycook, 2001) that makes it difficult to critique. For example, Waters (2009a) claimed that opposition to critical pedagogy is "viewed as political naivety, a form of 'false consciousness'" (p. 140). As a result, any critique could be deflected due its lack of substance, and the critic labeled as politically unaware.

Furthermore, the perceived altruistic nature of critical pedagogy invalidates alternative forms of interpretation, thus establishing a hegemony of understanding (Allison, 1994; Waters, 2008). To illustrate this claim, Waters (2007b) used Holliday's (2005) analysis of a presentation at an international conference to demonstrate how alternative interpretations were silenced. Waters (2007b) demonstrated how equally viable, alternative interpretations could have been derived from the scenario; however, the interpretation adopted by Holliday (2005) was chosen

due to its emphasis on a perceived unequal distribution of power and, thus, hegemonic relationship. Similarly, Sowden (2008) accused critical pedagogues generally, and Pennycook (1994b) specifically, of imposing their political views on others. Sowden (2008) claimed that "even a well-informed and conscientious teacher can be betrayed by their own prejudices and scope of experience" (p. 286). Thus, critical pedagogy does not accomplish its goal of promoting social justice because it imposes a new form of hegemony based on its own unidentified biases. Waters (2007a) concluded: "a 'critical theory' (CT) approach – rather than bringing about true progress, simply perpetuates the status quo in a new guise, by substituting one kind of hegemony for another" (p. 281).

The moral position adopted by critical pedagogy has also been critiqued as allowing it to apply different standards of evidence. In the scientific community criteria of validity and reliability are employed to ensure information is accurate. As a result, claims to truth can only be justified when objective, tangible evidence is provided. However, such standards of evidence are not upheld within critical pedagogy (Waters, 2007a, 2007b, 2008, 2009a). In contrast, critical pedagogues apply ideological justifications (Allison, 1994; Waters, 2007a) and ad hominem arguments (Waters, 2007b) as evidence of truth. Furthermore, Waters (2007a) argued that critical pedagogy applies blanket generalizations to groups based on their positioning as either 'oppressors' or 'oppressed', rather than attending to individual differences within groups. As such, stereotypes are applied to certain groups, without empirical evidence to substantiate them, as a means to promote political control.

Contradictions in the theoretical structure of critical pedagogy have also been highlighted as a weakness. Johnston (1999) identified two aspects of the postmodern – postmodern as critique and postmodern as description. The author stated that critical pedagogues have drawn

heavily upon postmodern critique in terms of its fracturing of grand-narratives, thus opening space for counter-articulations and challenges against hegemonies. Nonetheless, Johnston (1999) argued that critical pedagogy has neglected the postmodern as description because it is closely related to notions of emancipation, critical consciousness, and empowerment – modernist concepts based on universal principles and a belief in progress. Therefore, Johnston (1999) claimed that critical pedagogues have tried to "have the modernist cake of social progress and eat it with a postmodern fork" (p. 562).

Finally, critical pedagogy has been criticized for presenting a utopian vision of society. Gore (1993) differentiated between two strands of critical pedagogy- one focused on clarifying pedagogical practices, the other focused on theoretical explanation. The author lamented that writing within critical pedagogy is often abstract and overly theoretical, providing little clarification on how the theory can be translated into practice. For example, a common assumption within critical pedagogy is that awareness is the first step towards critical, transformative action. The underlying assumption is that awareness about a false form of consciousness will provide the motivation and intellectual capacity to bring about praxis. However, the specific manifestation of critical awareness is ambiguous (Pennycook, 2001). As Kearney (1988) exclaimed: "It is certainly unlikely that any amount of 'knowledge' about the falsehood of our experience is going to help us think or act in a more effective or liberating way" (p. 386). Similarly, Sowden (2008) questioned "how altered consciousness will lead to political action or how successful this is likely to be" (p. 286). He stated that most second language learners come from the middle or upper classes, therefore, it is contentious to suggest that these individuals will readily surrender their privilege once encouraged to see the need for change to a

more just society. Thus, critics claim that critical pedagogy provides an overly optimistic and pragmatically underdeveloped vision of societal transformation.

In promoting a utopian vision of society, critical pedagogy places teachers in a difficult position. According to Janangelo (1993), discourses of critical pedagogy portray the teacher as fulfilling diverse roles in order to attain the noble goal of promoting societal change. He wrote: "These tropes portray teachers as muses who dedicate themselves selflessly to students, performers who entertain students while teaching them, prophets who dream about the future while ignoring the present, and martyrs who risk everything to fulfill their vision of the 'calling'" (Janangelo, 1993, p. 132). Sowden (2009a) would add to this list the need for teachers to be politically aware activists. However, heaping such expectations on teachers establishes standards to which they will inevitably fail. Even if second language teachers are exposed to critical theory and are politically involved in the community, critics believe meeting the expectations placed on a critical educator would be daunting. Moreover, the revolutionary, transformative expectations of critical pedagogy contradict the literature on pedagogical innovation (e.g., Markee, 1997; Waters, 2009b; Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010). Waters (2009a) noted that innovation is most likely to succeed when it builds on current practices rather than calling for a complete overhaul of instruction. Therefore, critical pedagogy is viewed as placing unrealistic demands on teachers, as it requires them to abandon familiar practices in favour of approaches that are deemed to be more transformative.

Problematic Aspects of Critiques within the Literature

Critique is an important component of criticality, therefore, criticism of critical pedagogy is important to ensure that blind spots are identified and alternative perspectives adopted. As a result, the aforementioned critiques are welcome additions to the reflexive evolution of critical

pedagogy. Nonetheless, the second language education literature often portrays critical pedagogy (not to mention criticality as a form of critical thinking) in a problematic manner. This is not to say that critical pedagogy is portrayed in an erroneous manner, as it is not a uniformly defined concept, but rather that critical pedagogy is often presented in a reified, partial manner that does not account for its true complexity. The specific cause of this rigid, incomplete portrayal is unclear; however, second language scholars have postulated various possibilities. For example, Osborn (2006) identified the tendency to 'bank' critical pedagogy. This entailed placing critical pedagogy "in little boxes that made it seem more controllable, more applicable in the daily lives of our academic demands" (Osborn, 2006, p. 152). Furthermore, Pennycook (2001) lamented that some portrayals of critical pedagogy and arguments formulated against it were based on an incomplete understanding of pertinent issues, resulting from the absence of academic rigour.

An incomplete understanding of critical pedagogy is apparent in some prominent work within the second language education literature. For example, Ellis (2003) portrayed critical pedagogy in a very limited manner as a tool for curriculum planners. He defined the concept as follows: "A critical pedagogy requires that any particular approach to language teaching be analysed in order to uncover its underlying socio-political messages" (Ellis, 2003, p. 341). As such, critical pedagogy is not something one lives or does in the language classroom, but rather an intellectual endeavour undertaken to identify hidden messages. While this is an important component of critical pedagogy, it is simply one aspect of applying criticality to the classroom. As Sung (2007) intimated, Ellis' (2003) inclusion of critical pedagogy within his book was not motivated by a desire to engage with the concept in a rigorous manner, but rather a desire to dispel critiques laid by Pennycook (1994b) against task-based language teaching. Based on Sung's (2007) anecdotes and the absence of citations related to critical pedagogy beyond

Pennycook (1994b), it is fair to assume that Ellis' (2003) vision of critical pedagogy was based on a limited understanding of the concept. This is problematic because of the status of Ellis within the field; based on his authoritative voice, many second language educators will adopt his definition as an accurate and thorough portrayal of critical pedagogy.

Another authoritative source that provides a limited view of critical pedagogy is Brown (2001). This resource is a general guide to language pedagogy that is utilized in many undergraduate second language education courses. The focus of the textbook is on providing a general understanding about the field of second language teaching, including how to teach the fours skills (i.e., reading, writing, speaking and listening). In the final chapter of the book entitled "Continuing Your Teacher Education" the author briefly touches upon critical pedagogy. Brown (2001) wrote: "Critical pedagogy brings with it the reminder that our learners must be free to be themselves, to think for themselves, to behave intellectually without coercion from a powerful elite, to cherish their beliefs and traditions and cultures without the threat of forced change" (p. 443). This description of critical pedagogy highlights the importance of student autonomy, in particular in the face of coercion from an authority figure. The importance of autonomy is further emphasized in the four principles of critical pedagogy presented: "1. Allow students to express themselves openly . . . 2. Genuinely respect students' points of view . . . 3. Encourage both/many sides of an issue . . . 4. Don't force students to think just like you" (Brown, 2001, p. 444). From a pedagogical standpoint it would be difficult to argue against any of these principles; however, it would also be difficult to use these principles to differentiate one form of pedagogy from another because they are typically embedded within most contemporary forms of education. Furthermore, the presentation of critical pedagogy in this manner over-represents the importance of autonomy in the approach. Although student voices need to be

encouraged and respected as part of the dialogic classroom, student-centeredness in and of itself does not guarantee that social justice will be addressed or interaction will move beyond "the empty babble of the communicative language class" (Pennycook, 1994, p. 311). As a result, Brown (2001) does not present an accurate portrayal of critical pedagogy.

While autonomy was over-emphasized in Brown's (2001) account of critical pedagogy, the centrality of power in critical pedagogy has also been over-represented in the second language education literature. Buzzelli and Johnston (2002) and Johnston (1999) claimed that critical pedagogy posits education as primarily about power and power relations. This interpretation is undoubtedly based on the emphasis within the critical literature on notions of empowerment, emancipation, and liberatory practice (e.g., Giroux, 1997; Freire, 1998; Giroux, 2002). Nonetheless, power is not at the core of critical pedagogy; it is simply a conceptual tool to address the objectives of critical education – to promote social justice. An understanding about the subtle mechanisms that promote and maintain unequal power relations is crucial in any critical endeavour, as it facilitates identifying restrictive structures and systems within society. Once a critical analysis has been performed, praxis can be undertaken in order to address perceived deficiencies and promote a more just, equitable system (it should be highlighted that this is not a simple, linear process, but a process characterized by constant refinement, resistance, and struggle). Although power is always present throughout this process, as it can never be eliminated from any social interaction, the true essence of teaching for social justice is compassion and caring (Kincheloe, 2008).

It must be noted that Buzzelli and Johnston (2002) also advocated for teaching as a caring endeavour; however, their conceptualization of caring was grounded in morality. The authors defined morality as "that set of a person's beliefs and understandings which are evaluative in

nature: that is, which distinguish, whether consciously or unconsciously, between what is right and wrong, good and bad" (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2002, p. 3). They believed that morality is central in any educational undertaking because teaching is founded on relationships and is inherently about changing behaviour to a prescribed end. Furthermore, Buzzelli and Johnston (2002) claimed that morality operates on two levels – personal and cultural. Thus, within the teaching as moral activity framework, caring is demonstrated through decision-making and actions that are 'good' or 'right.' There is no question that education is inherently imbued with moral considerations and implications; however, the problem with this conceptualization of caring as grounded in morality is that it ignores relations of power. The post-modern era is characterized by the fracturing of grand-narratives; therefore, conceptualizations of the moral cannot be universally derived but must be understood as emerging in variable forms from diverse sources. Moreover, post-modern conceptions of culture posit it as a site of negotiation and struggle between contradictory meanings. As a result, the problem arises as to whose morals will form the basis of educational endeavours?

To illustrate, based on neo-liberalism contemporary education has adopted utility as the primary criterion through which the moral character of instruction is determined (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000; Stromquist, 2002; Holborow, 2006). Based on this perspective, the instructional decision to focus on narrow skills that may lead to employment or rigid knowledge that may lead to success on standardized tests (Leistyna, 2007) is validated and, thus, would be considered moral. However, this denies the validity of alternative perspectives that posit such educational practices as immoral due to the absence of a more humanistic, holistic, and politically engaged form of pedagogy. Neither of these perspectives is inherently more moral than the other; however, the determination of one as right and, consequently, the other as wrong

is based on power relations. Moreover, the ascription of something as good has implications for future power relations, as subsequent determinations about what is moral will be influenced. Thus, a caring approach to education grounded in morality may actually unintentionally promote hierarchical relations and oppressive conditions, as it is predicated on the imposition of particular moral standards, a form of "education as the practice of domination" (Freire, 1998, p.75).

In contrast, a caring approach to education grounded in critical pedagogy recognizes the tenuous character of morality as influenced by power relations. As a result, critical pedagogy does not seek to impose particular standards of morality on learners, but rather attempts to identify where power is wielded in a restrictive manner in order to open opportunities for alternative perspectives to be voiced. Such an undertaking is not only beneficial for the under-represented who are given a legitimate voice, but also for the dominant groups whose access to the full scope of humanity is limited by their need to protect their position of privilege (Freire, 1993). As such, critical pedagogy invokes a genuine form of caring – not caring in a patriarchal or colonizing sense such as the "White man's burden" (Nandy, 1983) - but in a manner that respects the agency of learners and their valuable contributions to society, and attends to the welfare of humanity and the planet in a holistic manner.

An over-emphasis on power is also apparent in portrayals of the focus of critical pedagogy. Several authors have portrayed critical pedagogy as enacting a redistribution of power. For example, Crookes and Lehner (1998) viewed the exertion of authority by a teacher as undermining the principles of critical pedagogy. As a result, they sought to break down barriers to a more equitable structure within the classroom, thus causing a redistribution of power. In addition, though he viewed it as utopian, Johnston (1999) portrayed the ultimate goal of critical pedagogy as the elimination of power (unequal power relations). Thus, the objective of critical

pedagogy was portrayed as being the redistribution of power to individuals on an equal basis. Similarly, Waters (2007a) claimed critical pedagogy redistributed power, substituting one hegemony for another. In all these accounts of critical pedagogy, power is conceptualized as a tangible commodity that can be possessed and transferred. Furthermore, Waters (2007b) asserted that power is consciously wielded by individuals in a dominant position in order to maintain their authority. He contended that "those with greater amounts of power oppress those with less of it" (Waters, 2007b, p. 354). In other words, the act of oppression is undertaken by a conscious agent.

These authors attribute a very simplistic view of power and its operation to critical pedagogy. Johnston (1999), for example, claimed that critical pedagogy adopted the view of power as a commodity that is distributed, while critiquing this view using the Foucaultian notion of power. Foucault (1980) observed that power is not held by a dominant group over others, but rather is always present in all contexts. Moreover, he denied that power was deterministic and all-encompassing by explaining the perpetual potential for human agency. Foucault (1988) stated: "As soon as there is a power relation, there is a possibility of resistance. We can never be ensnared by power: we can always modify its grip in determinate conditions and according to a precise strategy" (p. 123). Thus, power relations are never static, but constantly evolving. Furthermore, he denied the autonomous agency of those in power to wield that power over others. Foucault (1988) exclaimed: "Even if we reach the point of designating exactly all those people, all those 'decision-makers,' we will still not really know why and how the decision was made, how it came to be accepted by everybody, and how it is that it hurts a particular category of person, etc." (p. 103-104). In other words, power cannot be attributed to particular individuals, but must be understood as operating beyond individual agency. For Foucault (1988) the key to

understanding power was "the strategies, the networks, the mechanisms, and all those techniques by which a decision is accepted and by which that decision could not but be taken in the way it was" (p. 104).

Based on the Foucaultian notion of power, Johnston (1999) was correct in critiquing the idea that power is a commodity wielded by some over others; however, he was not accurate in attributing such a simplistic view of power to critical pedagogy. An understanding of the subtle mechanisms Foucault referred to that maintain unequal power relations within society is at the heart of critical theory (e.g., Gramsci, 1973; Giroux, 2011). For example, critical scholars have analyzed the various ways that neo-liberalism has exerted a powerful influence over contemporary society (e.g., Barlow & Robertson, 1994; Petras, 1999; Stromquist, 2002). These analyses do not attribute power to a particular individual or group but rather demonstrate how particular discourses, norms, and systems operate to privilege particular ideas and people over others. In this way, critical work utilizes power as an important tool of analysis, but it is privilege that is central in promoting a more just and equitable society. For example, anti-racist education focuses on revealing and addressing White privilege (Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Howard, 2006; McIntosh, 2008; Lawrence & Tatum, 2008). White privilege is not something tangible that White people consciously operate, but rather consists of benefits derived from discourses that posit Whiteness as the norm from which all other racial identities are compared, thus, enabling White people and presenting them with opportunities not afforded others. The power associated with Whiteness is apparent and often tangible (e.g., in unemployment rates or membership in governing bodies); however, it is not possessed as a commodity, but rather experienced as a form of privilege. Thus, critical pedagogy clearly does not postulate power as a commodity, but rather

views it as a tool to understand how privilege is afforded to particular groups, thus fostering an unjust society.

Furthermore, the aforementioned conceptualizations of power within the second language education literature erroneously derive the concept as undesirable and something to be avoided. Waters (2007a, 2007b) contended that power is inherently utilized to promote a hegemonic relationship; therefore, the objective of critical pedagogy is to 'strip' one group of power in order to 'give' it to another that has been deemed as oppressed. Moreover, Johnston (1999) asserted that the goal of critical pedagogy is to eliminate power altogether. This posits power as an inherently negative entity with exclusively oppressive characteristics. This conceptualization of power has been utilized to advocate for pedagogical approaches that diminish the authority of teachers by empowering learners. For example, Crookes and Lehner (1998) sought to create an equitable classroom environment by democratically engaging with learners in negotiating the structure and content of the course they were teaching.

Although there is obvious pedagogical merit in promoting a democratic atmosphere in language classrooms, the conceptualization of 'power sharing' in the aforementioned literature is based on false assumptions. First, the literature posits power as something that can be measured and distributed. The assumption is that the power of one group can be reduced, leading to the acquisition of power by another group, which, if done correctly, can lead to balance or the elimination of power. In this way power is metaphorically distributed like weights on a balancing scale. However, as noted by Foucault (1980), power is omnipresent and, thus, can never be outright eliminated. Furthermore, due to the fluid nature of power, it cannot be possessed or neatly distributed between groups, but rather circulates depending on time and space.

Second, power is postulated as being controlled by an agent. For example, Crookes and Lehner (1998) believed they diminished their power as instructors in the classroom by actively involving students in the decision-making process. This belief is predicated on numerous assumptions – that institutional and cultural norms can be and are ignored; that students recognize their involvement in decision-making as genuine empowerment, rather than a concession provided by a more powerful authority; that mechanisms of power can be corrupted by autonomous actions. Although it is clear that humans do have agency in affecting power relations (Foucault, 1980), the functioning of power mechanisms is far too complex to be controlled by individual actions. Darder (2002) concurred: "The teacher's authority and power cannot be transmitted as if they were objects. Authority exists within a relational process that is manifested according to the contextual structure of power and the relational contingencies at work" (p. 111). Thus, she concluded that "teachers do not 'empower' their students, but they are in a position to support their process by creating the dialogical conditions, activities, and opportunities that nourish" (Darder, 2002, p. 110).

Third, power is conceptualized as inherently negative. The assumption is that power is restrictive and oppressive, and therefore, should be minimized or eliminated. This vision of power denies the potential for those in a position of power to exercise influence in a caring, loving manner. However, the history of humanity demonstrates such a vision to be false. For example, parents adopt an authoritative position in relation to their children, but the exercise of parental influence in a loving environment cannot be characterized as oppressive. Similarly, Darder (2002) differentiated between a positive expression of power in education (authority) and the abuse of power in pedagogical encounters (authoritarianism). She wrote: "Authority refers to the power teachers possess to influence (direct) learning, thought, and behaviour through their

138

responsibility to educate students; authoritarianism is linked to the expectation that students should and will blindly accept and submit to the concentration of power in the hands of the teacher as the exclusive knowing subject" (Darder, 2002. P.113). Therefore, power cannot be conceptualized as inherently negative, but must be understood in a more nuanced manner that considers the aims and ends to which power is utilized. Interestingly, Darder (2002) claimed that attempts by teachers to limit their authority may actually result in undermining criticality, as the absence of authority can be just as inhibiting to critical endeavours as the absence of liberty. Similarly, Pennycook (1999) was critical of superficial attempts to promote equitable relations in the classroom as subsuming a critical focus "under a rather bland notion of power sharing" (p.338).

Misrepresentations of criticality in the second language education literature have also arisen due to the inability of critics to engage with critical pedagogy on its own terms. For example, Waters (2007a, 2007b, 2008, 2009) applied a narrow, positivistic perspective to analyze critical pedagogy. According to positivism, knowledge can only be considered truthful if it is objective and can be validated through empirical evidence. Positivism posits that values and facts can be separated (thus ensuring objectivity) and that knowledge exists in a definitive, measureable form, which is determined by isolating it from contextual factors. Based on this logic, Waters asserted that critical pedagogy replaces one form of hegemony with another and imposes uniform standards of knowledge that ignore traditional standards of evidence and deny the potential for alternative interpretations. The problem with Waters' interpretation is that he is applying a theoretical lens that is based on isolation and simplification to try to understand a concept that is inherently based on dialecticism and complexity. Criticality is about seeing the world in different ways - not a uniform, standardized vision, but one characterized by the

uniqueness of context and individual experience. Moreover, criticality does not deny the validity of particular forms of knowledge (e.g., positivism), but it does deny the characterization of particular forms of knowledge as absolute. For example, a positivistic interpretation of an event would not be considered erroneous from a critical perspective; however, the positivistic claim that this interpretation is the only viable interpretation due to the absence of alternative empirical evidence (such is the case with the argument laid by Waters against critical pedagogy) would be critiqued. The application of positivism to interpret critical pedagogy prevented Waters from understanding the complexity of criticality and the nature of the concept as constantly being in flux based on the context in which it is being applied. Therefore, the application of criticality to engender new ways of perceiving and interacting in the world has been erroneously interpreted as a uniform expression to bring about a new power hierarchy. Ironically, Waters' critiques of critical pedagogy are actually more applicable to the theoretical lens he has blindly adopted than the theoretical position he has tried to critique.

The tendency to portray critical pedagogy as a static and monolithic entity can also be witnessed in the work of second language critical scholars. In contrasting the emancipatory modernist and problematizing practice paradigms of criticality, and advocating for the latter as the basis for developing a form of critical applied linguistics, Pennycook (2001) claimed to be distancing himself from mainstream critical theory. He believed this separation was necessary because "too much mainstream critical work is not critical enough: It is too normative, too unquestioning of its assumptions" (Pennycook, 2001, p. 44). As such, Pennycook portrayed critical theory as a static, unreflexive entity, unable to move beyond its Marxist origins. While Pennycook may have been accurate in portraying early critical work as monolithic in structure (e.g., Horkheimer, 1982), he neglected the more contemporary trend of critical theorists/

140

pedagogues to employ bricolage – a "French term for the work of a handyman/handywoman who uses numerous available tools to complete a task" (Kincheloe, 2008, p. 64). The critical pedagogue as bricoleur, thus, is not limited to the tools of her predecessors or the discourses employed within the tradition, but is able to adapt her critical work to the particular spatial and temporal context in question (Kincheloe, 2008; Barnawi, 2010; Crookes, 2010). Thus, critical work is not limited to the critique of positivism (Giroux, 2011) or Marxist inspired economic oppression, as Pennycook seems to intimate, but rather is a means of critiquing all forms of knowledge and social injustice.

Similarly, scholars have portrayed critical pedagogy as following modernist tendencies (e.g., Johnston, 1999; Pennycook, 2001). For example, Johnston (1999) claimed that critical pedagogues want to "have the modernist cake of social progress and eat it with a postmodern fork" (p. 562). Terms such as 'empowerment', 'emancipation', and 'democratic dialogue', which are commonly used within the critical pedagogy literature, have been associated with the modern undertaking of bringing about an idealized future. This idealized future manifests itself in a singular form based on the linear progress that is being undertaken by humanity. As such, the critical vision of emancipation and a future characterized by equity and justice is perceived as drawing upon modernist concepts. However, the characterization of progress and emancipation as being linked to a singular grand narrative is problematic, as it denies the diversity of perspective. From a post-modern perspective progress is not linear or absolute. In contrast, it is characterized by a multitude of perspectives, each containing divergent conceptions about what progress entails. Habermas contended that these divergent perspectives could be ameliorated in consensus through dialogue; however, such a position is overly-optimistic as it portrays diversity

in superficial terms (as encompassing one's perspective, but not one's essence or goals) as being something that can be overcome by rationality.

In contrast to the vision of progress as a universal principle grounded in modernism, criticality could draw upon progress as a post-modern phenomenon. In this way notions of progress, emancipation, and empowerment would not be based on universal principles or rational assuredness, but would be characterized by complexity and uncertainty. For example, the notion of emancipation has been commonly linked to the move from a false form of consciousness to critical consciousness. This characterization of emancipation is based on a universal conception of critical consciousness and certainty that one's consciousness neatly fits within this dichotomous split. As a result, one's consciousness is neatly identified as either false or critical, denying the influence of perspective in making this determination. As Pennycook (2001) wrote: "This model of liberation operates with a problematic belief in its own righteousness and its ability to help others to see the light. This sort of emancipatory modernity suggests that there really is an enlightened state" (p.40). However, enlightenment is relative. Therefore, conceptions of emancipation that are based on assuredness are problematic.

In order to address this problematic conceptualization of emancipation, a post-modern perspective grounded in hermeneutics could be adopted. According to hermeneutic philosophy, knowledge generation or understanding is the function of interpretation. In other words, we do not simply know something from having been told it, but rather interpret what was said using previous experiences, etc. to generate new understandings. As our horizons are altered or expanded through the development of new forms of knowledge, we become different people who, in turn, interpret stimuli in different ways from before. Most experiences do not engender significant alterations in our horizons; common day-to-day interactions generally do not bring

about transformative changes in the way we are and the way we think. Nonetheless, paradigmatic shifts in thinking do occur when people begin to question foundational assumptions, thus opening themselves to a new realm of understanding. This is the essence of post-modern emancipation, as it is not based on a grand liberatory narrative, but rather a form of fractured liberation experienced by each individual in a unique manner. As a series of individual emancipatory acts are undertaken, humanity also becomes emancipated, as the hegemonic discourses that restrict us begin to be questioned. As such, notions of progress, emancipation and empowerment need not be understood in an exclusively modernist manner relating to a singular vision, but can be conceptualized as occurring in multiple forms.

A post-modern conceptualization of progress would have significant implications for the practical application of critical pedagogy. Pennycook (2001) critiqued critical pedagogy as being based on arrogant, self-righteous assumptions, as a knower was postulated as liberating the unknowing. However, once the assuredness of the modernist discourse is replaced by a lack of certainty, the interaction between teachers and learners would be re-conceptualized as 'knowers' interacting with the 'unknowing' to bring about mutual liberation. This form of critical interaction would be similar to Pennycook's (2001) notion of problematizing practice, in which all forms of knowledge and injustice are constantly scrutinized in order to create a more just and equitable world.

CHAPTER FIVE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Post-Formal Thinking

The current research project is grounded in post-formal thinking (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1993; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1999). As the name denotes, post-formal thinking is a response to formal thinking, which has dominated scientific inquiry for a number of generations. Formal thinking draws its roots from the work of Rene Descartes and his famous dictum "*cogito, ergo sum*." Descartes believed in the separation of mind and body and, thus, the ability to isolate the cognitive inner world from the external physical world (Sorell, 2007). This inspired the view that humans possess the ability to objectively (unaffected by human perception or emotion) uncover the laws of various systems, both physical and social in composition. Inherent in this dualist logic is the belief that the investigator and object of investigation are autonomous entities that do not influence each other. Denying the influence of bias and the dialogic influence of any interaction on an entity, claims of truth are verified through empirical testing, or as Descartes would claim, the absence of doubt. The certainty he sought was provided by isolating phenomena from extraneous contextual features and reducing them to their component parts (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Kincheloe and Steinberg (1993) wrote: "This suspension of attention is based on the assumption that these extraneous circumstances will remain static long enough to allow the study to be validated" (p. 315). According to the formal thinking position, such an assumption is warranted as reductionism enables facts to be established that can contribute to understanding other component parts and the system as a whole. This notion was solidified by Sir Isaac Newton's tenet regarding cause and effect, namely "that the future of any aspect of a system could be predicted with absolute certainty if its condition was understood in precise detail

and the appropriate tools of measurement were employed" (Kincheloe, 2005, p. 18). As such, formal thinking values certainty and predictability in the form of objectified knowledge.

Formal thinking has provided the basis for most inquiry in the field of applied linguistics. A significant body of research has attempted to discover truths about second language teaching and learning by isolating particular characteristics of the process and applying methods to ensure objective analysis is achieved. For example, a significant body of research has attempted to provide insight into the efficacy of various forms of feedback (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Nabei & Swain, 2002; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004; Carpenter, Jeon, MacGregor, & Mackey, 2006; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006). Although various research designs were utilized, the studies generally tracked the prevalence of different feedback techniques (e.g., recasts, elicitation and clarification requests) and the frequency of desired behaviour (e.g., uptake or repair) following each application of a particular technique. By isolating the various feedback techniques, researchers could determine with certainty the efficacy of each technique in eliciting the behaviours that are believed to promote language acquisition.

In another branch of applied linguistic research, studies have focused on teacher cognition rather than specific aspects of the teaching-learning process in the second language classroom (for a review see Borg, 2006). This paradigm of research seeks to better understand how teachers generally conceptualize their work and specific aspects of the teaching-learning process, drawing on diverse concepts such as beliefs (Johnson, 1992; Johnson, 1994; Peacock, 2001; Sercu & St. John, 2007; Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010), personal practical knowledge (Golombek, 1998), pedagogical systems (Borg, 1998), maxims (Richards, 1996), and conceptions of second language education (Freeman & Richards, 1993). The intention of research within this paradigm is to gain insight into the cognitive processes that teachers undertake when planning and

implementing instruction. In doing so, it is hoped that findings can provide valuable knowledge about the cognition of experienced, effective teachers (Johnson, 2003) and factors influencing teacher decision-making that can then be applied to teacher education programs. According to Borg (2006), teacher cognition research should also be used to guide future research related to second language acquisition.

In contrast to formal thinking, postformal thinking views knowledge formation as an interpretive process. Knowledge is not postulated as an external truth that can be uncovered through the application of unbiased reason, but rather an individually constructed truth. As a result, postformal thinking denies the existence of absolute truths in the realm of epistemology and instead recognizes the tenuous nature of all forms of knowing. Kincheloe (2005) wrote: "Postformal thinking assumes that there is more to phenomena than initially seems and works to uncover the hidden forces that shape both the phenomena we encounter and the observer's frames of reference" (p.95). In making this assertion postformal thinking rejects Cartesian dualism, replacing it with the need for greater awareness about the ways that consciousness is constructed. Kincheloe and Steinberg (1993) asserted: "Never certain of the appropriateness of our ways of seeing and always concerned with the expansion of self-awareness and consciousness, post-formal thinkers engage in a running meta-dialogue, a constant conversation with self" (p. 304). As such, postformal thinking does not hide the biases inherent in knowledge production by couching understanding in objective rhetoric, but rather advocates for the continual analysis of the traditions and assumptions that tacitly ground interpretation. In this way postformal thinking seeks to reveal the ways memories and amnesia are constructed (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1999).

In addition to rejecting Cartesian dualism, postformal thinking also critiques the tendency towards reductionism in scientific inquiry. Reductionism is based on the premise that isolating phenomena will enable precise analysis. As a result, the separation of discrete items from the whole and the bracketing out of contextual influences is viewed as necessary in order to accurately understand the components of the phenomena under investigation. As Kincheloe and Steinberg (1993) noted, the social world in which we live is a complex, multi-layered system. Each of the component parts dialectically interact to create the fabric of the whole. When individual components are altered or denied an influence and/or contextual factors are ignored, the interrelationship between aspects of the system will be broken, leading to the alteration of the isolated phenomena under investigation. As such, the isolation of discrete components will not lead to a more accurate understanding, but rather a distorted view of reality. Therefore, postformal thinking recognizes the complexity of the social world and the importance of context in the process of knowledge generation.

Because postformal thinking is contextually grounded, it politicizes knowledge. Rather than viewing knowledge formation as a neutral endeavour, postformal thinking recognizes all knowledge as socially grounded, interested, and implicated in power relations. Therefore, scientific knowledge is not viewed as an objectively uncovered fact, but rather a constructed text, like a fiction, that produces its own truths (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1993). This means that inquiry, regardless of whether it labels itself as scientific or not, cannot divest itself of social relevance or ethical responsibility. The absence of explication about the motives and implications of research does not mean that the research is devoid of interest, but rather that the interests supported by the work are hidden. As postformal thinking does not portend to adhere to the criteria of objectivity, research is viewed as having a particular agenda, which in the case of

most researchers operating in the postformal paradigm is based on increasing quality of life and promoting a more equitable, sustainable world.

In applying postformal thinking to the aforementioned research related to teacher cognition, a number of weaknesses are revealed. First, the research attempts to hide the influence of the researcher in order to maintain the guise of objectivity. However, not only did the researcher decide what to investigate and how to investigate it (largely determined by the tradition of the field in which the researcher operated), but also what aspects of the data to focus on when presenting the results. Furthermore, the guise of objectivity is only possible if words are considered to have a unitary meaning, thus stripping the interpretive requirement in determining the meaning of responses provided. By denying the interpretive nature of the research, researchers have failed to reveal the interpretive frames used in conducting and analyzing the research, thus denying their audience an important resource in evaluating the interpretation provided.

Second, by denying the interpretive nature of understanding, the research erroneously portrays participant responses as objective truths. From a positivist perspective, utterances made by participants are empirically verifiable facts that demonstrate teachers' perspectives on a particular topic. The claim to truth is based on the removal of bias, as any form of interpretation on the part of the researcher would be deemed to taint or alter the purity of the data. However, what the formal perspective fails to consider is that the teachers' responses themselves are subjectively crafted, influenced by a plethora of factors including the meta-awareness of the individual, the desire to be portrayed in a positive light, the power dynamics of the interaction, etc. Thus, the self-interpretation of the respondent is privileged over the interpretation of the

investigator. This means that teacher cognition research presents one variant of truth, a variant that is ignorant to its own biases and portrays itself as the only viable option.

Third, the research generally provides a de-contextualized account that over-simplifies the phenomena under investigation. When investigating teacher cognition, researchers tend to focus on one specific aspect of instruction (e.g., grammar instruction) or one particular variable (e.g., experience). The problem with this approach is that it isolates the phenomena under investigation from contextual factors, thus, altering the phenomena itself. For example, research comparing the cognition of novice and experienced teachers isolates experience as the one variable of significance. As a result, differences detected between teachers with different levels of experience will be attributed to years of service rather than other determining factors such as the education received, context of previous experience, student composition, or dynamics operating within the specific class. This would then lead to the distortion of the effect that experience is characterized to have on teacher cognition.

Hermeneutics

Based on the deficiencies of the aforementioned research paradigm, the current inquiry will not follow the tradition of applied linguistic research, but rather will engage in a form of inquiry that is relatively unique to the field of second language education. As the focus of the current research is to investigate how second language educators understand the transformative potential of their work, the primary unit of inquiry will be understanding rather than cognition. It is recognized that framing a study around a concept, and thus theoretical tradition, that is relatively unknown poses a risk in terms of comprehensibility and recognition of the validity of the research findings. Nonetheless, the novel character of the investigation is also deemed to be a strength, as it facilitates unique insights into second language education that would not otherwise

be possible through reliance on traditional methods. Moreover, it is hoped that the unique construction of the study will provide the impetus for further studies of its kind in the field of second language education, thus breaking down the inhibitory barriers of tradition.

The structure of the study inherently involves what Giddens (1984) labeled a 'double hermeneutic.' On one level, the process of conducting research in the human sciences is itself a hermeneutic act. On another level, the topic of the investigation is hermeneutical, as it focuses on the process of how teachers make sense of their work. The significance of hermeneutics to the structure of the study means that a theory of interpretation is central to the fabric of the research. As a result, concepts from philosophical hermeneutics will provide the basis for the theoretical framework of the study.

The term 'hermeneutics' draws its roots from the Greek word *hermeneus*, meaning "interpreter" (Cresswell, 2009). The origins of the Greek word may be traced back to Hermes, the wing-footed messenger between the gods and humans who was largely credited by the Greeks for discovering the tools of understanding – language and writing (Palmer, 1969). In contrast to the characterization of understanding as unproblematic in many western cultures, the Greeks viewed the process as complex and on-going, as evidenced by the fact that Hermes was as well-known for the tendency to promote false understanding, as he was for the ability to translate the unintelligible into something meaningful.

Although hermeneutics is generally known as the art or science of interpretation, the term has taken on slightly different meanings throughout history. Early notions of the concept associated hermeneutics with principles for understanding the bible. Questions surrounding the exclusive right of church officials to interpret the bible necessitated the development of an alternative framework of interpretation during the Protestant Reformation. Luther's principle of

sola scriptura thus provided the basis for a hermeneutical theory of biblical exegesis (Grondin, 1994). Based on the work of Schleiermacher and Dilthey, hermeneutics has also been characterized as a method of interpretation. In response to the desire to ground interpretation in scientific certainty, the aforementioned scholars sought to identify universal principles that could be utilized in an objectively valid method of interpretation. More recently, hermeneutics has been transformed from a method of interpretation to a philosophical critique of the metaphysical character of methods. Hans Georg Gadamer argued that methods limit rather than reveal truth because they render apparent what was already implicit in the method. His writings have become the basis for a general theory of understanding, commonly referred to as philosophical hermeneutics. The current study is grounded in the hermeneutic tradition most closely associated with Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics.

Early forms of hermeneutics were based on the interpretation of ancient texts. Although the scope of the philosophy has been expanded, 'text' still plays a central role in hermeneutics. The term 'text' has generally been used to denote material that has been written. For Ricoeur (1981) a text is not simply a written document, but a discourse fixed by writing. In this context, discourse is being used in the Foucaultian sense, defined by Moore (2004) as "the constructed parameters within which our perception(s) of the social world and our actions within it are framed – parameters essentially produced and sustained by language and 'knowledge' and . . . controlled and patrolled by ideologies that generally serve the interests of the already powerful at the expense of the already disempowered" (p. 28). Whereas text is perceived in tangible terms as a written document in the aforementioned definitions, Prasad (2005) claimed that text might also be perceived of in a metaphorical sense. She explained that although texts are usually associated with artefacts, "it is also possible to employ text as a metaphor for the understanding of

conversation, interaction, and events" (Prasad, 2005, p.39). An understanding of text in both a real and metaphorical sense will be applied in investigating the research question.

The tradition of hermeneutics is based on several ontological and epistemological assumptions that mirror postformal thinking. Underlying the hermeneutic tradition is the assumption that reality is not a stable, external entity to be discovered, but rather a socially created construction. As a result, truth cannot be discussed as a singular concept because at any moment reality plays out in multiple, differing forms. The specific manifestation of reality at any given moment is the result of the dialogic interplay between the interpreter and the object of interpretation. As a result, the interpreter cannot be removed or bracketed from the process of interpretation. This is significant because it means that attempts to promote objectivity through methodological considerations are not only futile, but undermine the essence of the process of understanding (at least a truly open form of understanding). It also means that the optimal position for the interpreter is immersed within the subject of study.

The dialectical nature of interpretation has ontological consequences for hermeneutic encounters. Whereas positivism advocates separation between subject and object in order to minimize bias and maintain objectivity, hermeneutics maintains that the division between subject and object are not as clearly defined. In any hermeneutic encounter the interpreter and the object of interpretation act upon each other mutually promoting change. As Palmer (1969) explicated: "The object of one's experience is seen in a different light, is changed; and one is himself changed in knowing the object differently. The new object contains a truth above the old; the old 'has served its time'" (p. 195). Thus, knowledge cannot be viewed as fixed and context free, but rather constantly evolving through experience, as one also changes.

The emphasis on context within the hermeneutic tradition is based on the assumption that disembodied knowledge is meaningless. In order to understand something requires interpretation, which must take place from a particular, grounded position. Hermeneutic theory advocates that all thinking is grounded in tradition; therefore, even rational thinking is not exempt from the norms placed upon it by context. This realization is significant as it highlights the need to not only expose one's subject position, but also to critically analyze its role in knowledge formation.

A key concept to a hermeneutic theory of understanding is the notion of pre-judgement. Prior to the Enlightenment the notion of pre-judgement or prejudice was viewed without the attachment of negative meanings. However, the advent of the Enlightenment brought about a focus on rationality and methodological certainty, which cast doubt on knowledge grounded in tradition. According to Enlightenment thinking, prejudice was the result of two factors - over-hastiness or authority. The first factor was the result of applying reason without appropriate precautions to avoid bias, while the latter factor was due to the suspension of reason in unquestioning subordination to another individual of superior status. As a result, pre-judgment became viewed as a concept to be avoided through the careful application of methods and/or the denial of authority and tradition. Gadamer (1989) highlighted the weakness of this perspective by noting that the denial of prejudice was itself a prejudice. In applying this prejudice Enlightenment thinkers were not only being hypocritical, they were also making the blanket claim that all traditions inhibit the attainment of truth. Gadamer (1989) countered by explaining that pre-judgements may be false; however, they may also be grounded in truth. For him the attainment of understanding was not accomplished through a general rejection of prejudice, but rather through sensitivity to the pre-judgements that ground understanding. Gadamer (1989)

wrote: "The important thing is to be aware of one's own bias, so that the text can present itself in all its otherness and thus assert its own truth against one's own fore-meanings" (p. 269).

The notion of pre-judgement is critical to an understanding of one of the foundational concepts in philosophical hermeneutics – the fusion of horizons. According to Gadamer (1989), a horizon "is the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point" (p. 302). The horizon of each individual is limited by the finitude of human existence; every individual stands in a particular time and place from which it is impossible to escape. This means that one cannot transmute time and space in order to live the experience of the other or attain a removed position of objectivity. Rather people are always grounded within themselves by their tenuous, finite existence.

The inability of the interpreter to enter the time and space when a particular text was crafted means that an inevitable temporal and spatial gap exists. Hermeneutic philosophers claim this situation is partially addressed through the interrelatedness of the past and the present. Palmer (1969) wrote: "The present is seen and understood only through the intentions, ways of seeing, and preconceptions bequeathed from the past" (p. 176). In other words we can never escape the past because it is always tacitly operating in the present through traditions passed down from one generation to the next. Gadamer believed that language plays an essential role in communicating traditions and transcending temporal gaps, a concept he labeled 'linguisticality.' He claimed that language is not simply a tool to promote understanding, but rather an entity in and through which we experience the world. Language thus conceals the manner in which traditions are permutated from the past to the present. The transmutation of tradition through linguisticality is significant because it makes interpretation possible. When an interpreter engages in the process of understanding, her horizon comes up against an object, through which

154

a unique heritage is presented. The inherent foreignness of the interacting horizons is mitigated by the commonality established through linguisticality.

The fusion of horizons is facilitated by the dialectic interaction between the interpreter and the object of interpretation. According to Gadamer (1989), true understanding cannot be attained when the interpreter projects meaning onto that which is being interpreted. In such a scenario the object (or text) is silenced by the dominance of the subject claiming mastery over it. In contrast, understanding can be facilitated only when the text is allowed to show itself to the interpreter. Such an action can only take place when the interpreter explicitly foregrounds her presuppositions and brings the text out of isolation into the dialectic movement of question and answer. Grondin (1994) wrote: "To understand something means to have related it to ourselves in such a way that we discover in it an answer to our own questions" (p. 116). Through the process of interpretation, a text does not only answer questions, but also poses questions to the interpreter, which are to be answered in the process of interpretation. Thus, through the process of interpretation the interpreter not only gains greater understanding about the text but also about herself.

The aforementioned reliance on context to facilitate understanding marks one of the central differences between hermeneutics and phenomenology. Although the two interpretive traditions share many commonalities, they diverge in regard to the certainty that can be ascribed to elucidating experiences. Phenomenology asserts that the experiences of a researcher may be bracketed, allowing for the true essence of an experience to be revealed. Conversely, hermeneutics places "emphasis on understanding people in their lifeworld rather than attempting to extract an essence or 'truth' claim behind a particular phenomenology" (Moules, 2002, p. 13). Thus, in hermeneutics meaning is viewed as contingent and constantly open to interpretation.

Another component of understanding in hermeneutics is the interplay between text and context. According to hermeneutic theory, understanding is only possible when an object of investigation is analyzed from multiple perspectives. Understanding, thus, involves a constant movement back and forth between the specific details (the part) and the broader picture (the whole). Prasad (2005) wrote: "'the part' (i.e., the text or element of the text) can only be understood from the 'whole' (i.e., the cultural context), while 'the whole,' in turn, can only be understood from its 'parts' (p. 35). The cyclical process of moving between whole and part, known as the hermeneutic circle, thus illuminates meaning by moving beyond the explicit characteristics of a text to unravel its complexity through the tacit meanings associated with it.

Critical Theory

Although Gadamerian hermeneutics provides a strong theoretical foundation for the act of understanding, it does not adequately account for the social dimension of interpretation. The notion of linguisticality highlights how language is embedded with tradition, thus, the social meanings established by previous generations influence how their predecessors interpret the world. Moreover, the notion of the horizon includes openness to the inclusion of social influences such as culture, tradition, social affiliation, etc.; however, the composition of the horizon has not been definitively clarified, nor has the influence of power in the process of understanding. As a result, concepts from critical theory will be used to supplement hermeneutics in establishing the theoretical framework of the study.

Although there are numerous forms of critical theory, a prevalent commonality is their interest in the relationship between power and knowledge (McLaren, 2003). Kincheloe and McLaren (1994) outlined a number of common assumptions that critical researchers adhere to that draw on the connection between power and knowledge:

156

"that all thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations that are socially and historically constituted . . . that the relationship between concept and object and between signifier and signified is never stable or fixed and is often mediated by the social relations of capitalist production and consumption . . . that certain groups in any society are privileged over others . . . that oppression has many faces and that focusing on only one at the expense of others (e.g., class oppression versus racism) often elides the interconnections among them." (p. 139-140)

These assumptions are based on a few foundational concepts that have had a fundamental influence on the critical paradigm, namely power, discourse, and hegemony.

In critical theory, power is central to relationships and knowledge construction. Therefore, stripping power from any analysis would undermine its value, as it would ignore how the phenomenon was and continues to be constructed. The term 'power' is derived from the Latin word *posse* meaning 'to be able' (Cresswell, 2009). In colloquial usage, power relates to the possession of control or the ability to produce desired effects. This notion of power has also been prominent in the writings of scholars. For example, Dewey (1939) defined power as "the sum of conditions available for bringing the desirable end into existence" (p.784). Although this definition denies power as a possession to be wielded or passed on, it still implies the uni-directional application of power. In contrast, Foucault advocated that power is omnipresent regardless of the context. He articulated: "It seems to me that power *is* 'always already there', that one is never 'outside' it, that there are no 'margins' for those who break with the system to gambol in" (Foucault, 1980, p.141). According to Foucault, power is not only always present but also circulates in an indeterminate manner. As a result, Foucault (1980) claimed that "to say that one can never be 'outside' power does not mean that one is trapped and condemned to defeat no

157

matter what" (p.141-142). On the contrary, Foucault (1980) theorized that power and resistance are always coupled together, as "there are no relations of power without resistances" (p. 142). Therefore, power cannot be conceptualized in a substantive sense as emanating from a given point.

Because power cannot be ascribed to a particular location, Foucault (1988) contended that the identification of decision-makers is unfruitful in analyzing how decisions are made or how they come to be accepted. In contrast, Foucault (1988) advocated that the key to understanding power was "the strategies, the networks, the mechanisms, and all those techniques by which a decision is accepted and by which that decision could not but be taken in the way it was" (p. 104). In other words, Foucault argued that power relations are inscribed in what he termed 'discourses.' Discourses are systems of power and knowledge that create and limit possibilities. They tacitly structure how we perceive and take up issues by determining what can and cannot be said and by whom. As a result, discourses have a significant effect in shaping our horizons and influencing how we come to understand.

Another concept implicated in power relations that has a tacit influence on how people perceive the world is hegemony. Hegemony is the brainchild of Italian socialist scholar Antonio Gramsci. Gramsci (1973) asserted that dominant groups exert influence over subordinate groups in multiple ways. One common approach is to exert force, thus coercing dominated groups to capitulate. Although this approach is commonly used, it is very overt in nature and often leads to tension and forms of resistance. On the other hand, Gramsci (1971) contended that domination also often occurs by achieving the consent of those who are dominated. Consent is achieved through social structures and practices promoted by institutions such as schools and the popular media that portray the knowledge of the dominant group as common sense and natural. By

adhering to these norms and adopting them as one's own, the oppressed unknowingly participate in their own oppression (McLaren, 2003). Thus, an effective form of hegemony will result in a state of relative equilibrium and harmony (Gramsci, 1981).

The aforementioned concepts adopted from critical theory help to establish a more comprehensive epistemological framework. While hermeneutics provide insight into the mechanisms of understanding, critical theory highlights the tacit structures that frame the context in which understanding takes place. This is important because it highlights the need for interpretive analysis on multiple levels. Interpretation cannot be restricted to the individual level, as it must also incorporate the tacit contextual factors that shape individual understanding.

Limitations of Social Science Research

Hermeneutics and critical theory provide the epistemological foundation for the current study, outlining how knowledge is derived and maintained in a social setting. Adherence to epistemological relativity – the understanding that all knowledge is tenuous and fallible – should not be conflated with ontological relativity or nihilism. On the contrary, it simply highlights the limitations of research in the social sciences to the realms of description and explanation rather than prediction and control.

Bhaskar (cited in Shipway, 2011) highlighted the limitations of social science research through his explication that a stratified reality exists consisting of three domains: real, actual, and empirical. The real domain consists of the structures, mechanisms, relations, etc. that dictate the functioning of the world. This domain is impervious to direct detection, but can only be ascertained through engagement in the actual domain. The actual domain includes the events that take place in the world caused by structures, etc. in the real domain. Finally, the empirical domain comprises the manner in which humans experience events. Thus, the three domains are

interrelated in that the underlying domains influence the others, but they are not necessarily identical. For example, different individuals can empirically experience (empirical domain) the same event (actual domain) in very different ways, while the same event (actual domain) could be the result of different tacit mechanisms or structures (real domain).

Bhaskar asserted that theoretical positions such as positivism and empiricism collapse the divide between the domains, giving primacy to the empirical domain. This is an example of the epistemic fallacy, which Bhaskar (2008) contended "consists in the view that statements about being can be reduced to or analyzed in terms of statements about knowledge; i.e. that ontological questions can always be transposed into epistemological terms" (p. 36). In other words, empirical experiences are assumed to be directly correlated to an unquestioned truth embedded in reality. In a closed system where variables can be isolated and a causally efficacious relationship can be established, such as in the natural sciences, the three domains will coincide creating the impression of inseparability. However, social science research is invariably based on an open system in which the complexity of the context negates the establishment of causal relations. As a result, educational research will invariably be interpretive and explanatory in character. Moreover, based on Bhaskar's stratified reality, it is apparent that educational research will produce tenuous knowledge about tacit phenomena grounded in an ontological reality that we can attempt to grasp, but will never fully comprehend. Hence, the current study is grounded on the foundations of epistemological relativity and ontological realism.

CHAPTER SIX: DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

As previously outlined, the primary goal of this research is to investigate the transformative potential of second language education. Due to the growing importance attributed to criticality (Morgan, 1998; Pennycook, 2001, 2010; Reagan & Osborn, 2004; Kubota, 2004a) and interculturality (Byram, 1997; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2010; Ogilvie, 2013) in the second language literature, and their significance in revealing the transformative character of second language pedagogy, the research study focuses on hermeneutically investigating these pivotal concepts. Thus, the primary research questions are as follows: 1) How do second language educators understand (in a broad, multi-dimensional sense) interculturality? 2) How do language educators understand criticality? 3) What discourses influence how interculturality and criticality are taken up by second language educators?

By drawing on Gadamerian hermeneutics, post-formal thinking, and critical theory the researcher is rejecting the temptation of 'scientific maturity' that has lured many social scientists to seek legitimacy from the scientific community by adhering to the principles of positivism (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). From a positivistic perspective, methods must be carefully selected and employed in order to ensure the validity (credibility, transferability) and reliability (dependability) of the research (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Richards, 2003). Employing a method, thus, promotes the removal of bias and the discovery of unfiltered 'Truth'. For critics of scientific absolutism, such as Wilhelm Dilthey, the unique character of the subject matter in the human sciences calls for a unique approach to knowledge generation. Dilthey contended that 'explanation' is appropriate when analyzing natural phenomena within the sciences; however, the complexity of the phenomena under investigation in the human sciences renders the use of methods to isolate variables as inadequate (Gallagher, 1997). In contrast, Dilthey argued that

161

'understanding' is central to the social sciences, as we cannot separate the tool of investigation (the mind) from the object of analysis (thoughts, behaviour) (Palmer, 1969). Therefore, we cannot objectively explain phenomena within the social sciences; we can only attempt to grasp human experience and all of its complexities through understanding. By engaging in an interpretive investigation, the researcher rejects the use of procedural rules to create the guise of scientism, but rather seeks to intimately engage with the subject of investigation, drawing on insights from hermeneutics and critical theory to foster understanding.

Identification and Selection of Participants

Participants in the study were selected using purposeful, criterion sampling (Patton, 2002; Palys & Atchison, 2014). The primary criteria utilized for identifying participants were educational attainment and commitment to the profession. The ESL field is riddled with 'tourist educators' – individuals with marginal academic credentials related to education who utilize their trait as a native speaker to gain employment while traveling the world. These individuals are often only casually involved in ESL teaching on a short-term basis and, therefore, teaching could be considered as more of a hobby than a profession. As the current study seeks to investigate how educators understand concepts deemed to be embedded within the fabric of second language pedagogy, it was determined that a well-educated, committed teaching professional would be more appropriate for the research sample. Moreover, drawing data from a professional, experienced teaching population would address a gap in the literature about how experienced second language educators conceptualize and utilize culture (Young, Sachdev, & Seedhouse, 2009).

To this end, participation in the study was elicited from individuals who were teaching or had taught at two prominent second language education sites. The first site is the English

Language Program at a very large post-secondary institute in Western Canada. The program offers a range of courses to develop basic interpersonal communication skills and more advanced academic language skills needed to thrive in subject specific university courses taught in English. The instructors in the program all have at least a Master's degree, with a number possessing doctoral degrees. The second site is a community college located in Western Canada. The college does not offer high-level academic courses, but does provide a range of programs for learners with different needs. The primary mandate of the English language division of the college is to provide linguistic training for newly arrived immigrants to the country. In addition to English language training, the college also provides intercultural training, which is primarily directed towards the business community but also influences English language programs.

These institutions were selected due to their strong pedagogical reputations and large, highly qualified staffs; however, they were also selected because of the existence of a close relationship between the researcher and members of the aforementioned organizations. The researcher had been employed at the one site for over five years and had close ties with instructors at the other site as a result of his work in the second language education community. Familiarity was deemed to be a desired characteristic in the current study because the collegiality already established would enable for richer dialogue about pedagogical topics and provide additional layers of context that would assist in the interpretive process. Kvale (1996) noted that the "research interviewer uses him- herself as a research instrument, drawing upon an implicit bodily and emotional mode of knowing that allows a privileged access to the subject's lived world" (p. 125). The pre-existing relationship between the researcher and participants would thus facilitate more sophisticated, intimate access to participants' understanding of their work as an educator. Although it was acknowledged that the existence of personal relations could create

pressures to represent participants' responses in a favourable manner, this was not deemed to be relevant in the current context, as the study was grounded in hermeneutics and, hence, judgment was not attributed to the quality of instruction.

As the research involves interviews and qualitative data in the form of rich text, the number of participants who feasibly could participate is restricted. The study does not intend to establish definitive correlations or to make strong statements based on statistical significance; as a result, maintaining a minimum sample size of substance is not relevant. On the contrary, the structure of the study as a hermeneutic investigation means that deep understanding of particular phenomena is the desired outcome of the investigation. This requires concerted attention to details and repeated, ongoing engagement with the data. As a result, it is important to establish a sample size that facilitates deep engagement with all data collected rather than fleeting engagement with substantial amounts of data. To this end, ten participants were sought to participate in the research project.

Participation in the study was elicited by sending out a general e-mail through an administrator to the teaching staff and by personally inviting particular teachers to participate in the study. The general e-mail elicited one response to participate in the study, while the remainder of participants were elicited through personal communication. All participants were selected because of their well-developed professional knowledge and commitment to teaching excellence. The intricate knowledge of second language pedagogy possessed by educators and their potential to provide valuable insights into the transformative potential of second language education had been ascertained through previous interaction. Moreover, potential participants were selected based on the unique experiences they had had in order to provide a variety of perspectives. For example, participants were selected with different levels of professional

experience, educational biographies, work experience, cultural and social backgrounds, and foci within their work as second language educators. Therefore, the selection of participants was also based on critical sampling (Palys & Atchison, 2014).

Data Collection

Data was collected from participants using two means. First, participants engaged in a one-on-one interview with the researcher. The focus of the interview was in establishing an understanding about participants' pedagogical philosophy – how they view their work and rationalize pedagogical decisions – embedded in their understanding of interculturality and criticality and their function in the second language classroom. Based on the assumption that understanding is inhibited by the limitations of self-awareness and the need to express ideas through a linguistic medium, conceptual understanding was not sought through the simple explication of how concepts were understood, but rather through the creation of a rich text through which understanding about complex, multi-layered concepts would be revealed. As a result, the primary objective of the researcher entering into the interviews was to engage participants in dialogue about their experiences, approaches, and philosophies related to second language pedagogy with specific attention provided to concepts related to criticality and interculturality.

The interview was broken down into three distinct sections (see Appendix A for a list of proposed questions). The first section included general questions about respondents' educational background, teaching experience, and broad educational philosophy. The purpose of this section was to provide contextual information about participants and to gain insight into how they conceptualize their work as educators. The second section of the interview focused on elucidating how respondents understood criticality. Broad questions about how criticality was

understood were posed in addition to questions related to particular aspects of criticality including its relevance in a second language setting, the role of politics in the second language classroom, and the influence of linguistic imperialism in their teaching philosophy. The final section of the interview addressed the manner in which interculturality was understood. Drawing on the four paradigms of interculturality identified in the earlier chapter, questions were designed to draw out how participants understood culture and its function in the second language classroom, communicative competence, intercultural as an isolated term, intercultural competence, and the link between epistemology and second language education.

Although questions for the interview were scripted, they were not read verbatim, nor followed in a set sequence. In contrast, interviews were conducted in an informal, semi-structured conversational manner in order to create a relaxed environment and allow participants to influence the content and progression of the interview. Despite the fact each interview proceeded in a different manner, the interviewer made sure to touch upon all the topics outlined in the interview questions script (Appendix A). Furthermore, the interviewer exploited his knowledge about the field of second language education and the specific topics in question to encourage the expansion of the conversation. This was accomplished through the utilization of follow-up questions to extend responses, probing questions to encourage elaboration on specific points, and interpreting questions to clarify the accuracy of initial interpretations (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Interviews lasted between approximately two hours and four hours and thirty minutes. All interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. Transcribed scripts were then sent to the participants to verify the accuracy of responses and provide opportunities to clarify or expand upon responses.

In addition to participating in an interview, participants also identified curricular documents (textbooks, syllabi, institutional policy documents, etc.) that have been influential in their recent work. The documents identified were predominantly textbooks selected by the institution for use in a particular class. For the purpose of the analysis, reference books, such as dictionaries, were not included. The analysis of curricular documents was important in addressing the central research question because of the intimate relationship between policy documents and the manner in which educators' frame and carry out their work. According to Ball (1993), policy documents are heavily influenced by the prominent discourses prevailing in a given community; however, the influence is not uni-directional, as policy texts also create discourses that shape world views and have a significant impact on how pedagogy is enacted. As a result, the analysis of curricular documents would yield important insights into the discourses that shape a particular teaching community, supplementing data provided by instructors that will also reveal prominent discourses influencing pedagogical philosophies and practices.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the artefacts collected (curricular texts and transcribed conversations) was conducted through a series of ad hoc methods (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Strauss (1987) suggested that researchers have different investigatory styles and talents, so wholehearted adherence to a standardized method "would only constrain and even stifle social researchers' best efforts" (p. 7). Drawing on the advice to avoid the rigid application of methodological rules and the Gadamerian claim that method obscures rather than clarifies truth, the rigid application of rules was avoided. Nonetheless, a definitive procedure was followed in analyzing and interpreting the data.

The transcribed text outlining the interview for each participant was initially read by the researcher without applying codes or categorizing content. In this way, the researcher was able to obtain a general sense of the data, which Agar (1980) advocated is important prior to separating it into segments in order to inhibit the premature attribution of meaning. After obtaining a general sense of each text and the collective text as a whole, the researcher re-read the texts, highlighted key passages of significance, and began to apply codes. The process at this juncture entailed what Strauss (1987) labelled 'open coding,' or a very broad form of coding during which provisional organizing concepts emerge from the data. It should be noted that the codes were intended to illuminate interpretation of the text and to provide the foundation for revisiting texts to question earlier interpretations. In this way codes were not assumed to be facts from which analysis could be conducted, but rather starting points for iterative reinterpretation.

Subsequently, coded data was categorized using both *a priori* and *a posteriori* categories (Wellington, 2000). In order to allow the data to speak to the researcher, a disposition of openness to the unknown was maintained. This disposition was promoted by continually questioning the pre-judgments used in interpreting data to ensure the texts were allowed to reveal their unique character to the author. In this way, categories could emerge from the data through the process of induction (Wellington, 2000). Nonetheless, the categorization of data was also conducted using pre-established categories based on the paradigms and different delineations of the concepts outlined in the literature review. In addition to establishing preliminary categories, a detailed profile for each participant was created by separating data into a number of categories including education, teaching experience, pedagogical philosophy, criticality, interculturality, and notable points. The profiles established for respondents provided contextual information and a holistic view of each individual and his/her teaching philosophy. The categorization of data in

this manner also facilitated the next stage of coding, axial coding. According to Strauss (1987), axial coding involves "intense analysis done around one category at a time, in terms of the paradigm items" (p. 32).

Axial coding was conducted in relation to participants' understanding of criticality and interculturality. Data pertaining to each respondent's understanding of both central concepts were brought together to create a conceptual profile. The broad profile for each concept was then selectively re-coded to create a concise overview of the central characteristics defining how respondents understood each of the concepts. The creation of conceptual profiles facilitated the analysis of participant responses in isolation and the identification of commonalities and general trends in the responses of different participants, thus facilitating comparison to identify sources of overlap and potentially fruitful, alternative insights. The creation of conceptual profiles also enabled identification of prominent discourses influencing how the concepts were commonly taken up.

In addition to coding and categorizing data in multiple ways and on multiple levels, the researcher also engaged in the process of memo writing. According to Strauss (1987), memos are written by researchers in isolation from coded data to reflect insights into potential relationships between data, alternative forms of coding, and different ways of looking at data. In the present research, memoing was conducted on an on-going basis as new insights were derived by analyzing the data in different manners. The memos were regularly returned to and used to re-affirm interpretations and promote novel ways of looking at the data.

The analysis of the resources identified as influential by respondents was also conducted in a systematic manner. The first step in the process involved scanning the text to get a sense of its organization and content. Subsequently, the document was scanned to identify the presence of

terms related to criticality and interculturality in indexes, glossaries, appendices, etc. It was predicted that the specific terms 'criticality' and 'interculturality' would not be utilized, so related terms such as 'culture,' 'intercultural competence,' 'intercultural communicative competence,' 'critical,' and 'critical thinking' were utilized as targets for scanning the text. Terms located within the text were recorded along with definitions provided and contextual clues to identify how the terms were conceptualized.

The second major step in the process of identifying the inclusion of themes related to interculturality and criticality in resources was the selection of three chapters to thoroughly investigate. The selection of chapters was undertaken using information acquired during the general analysis of each resource in order to identify chapters that would most likely contain pertinent information. For example, in the one textbook a chapter entitled "Canadian Mosaic" was selected, as it was deemed likely to include information related to cross-cultural interaction and the experiences of immigrant populations that could be tied to criticality. After selecting three chapters for each resource, they were thoroughly analyzed for content and approaches that could relate to the central concepts of investigation.

The three central questions guiding this research project relate to the investigation of how criticality and interculturality are understood, and the discourses that frame how teachers approach their work. The first two questions can be engaged with directly using the data acquired through the interview texts; however, the final question can only be broached indirectly using teacher accounts. The form of 'discourse' used in this research – systems of power and knowledge that create and limit possibilities – cannot be ascertained through the linguistic analysis of texts. In traditional applied linguistic and critical forms of discourse analysis, meaning is located in the association between the linguistic form and the function, social

structure, or context of the text (Pennycook, 1994). As such, linguistic analysis can reveal embedded (and not so embedded) discourses through the manner in which language is used and the ideological associations tied to the language used. In contrast, based on the aforementioned definition of discourse, meaning is located in the discourse itself and represented through the ways people frame and engage with topics. Discourse in this sense of the word coheres with Bhaskar's (2008) notion of the real domain, as discourses are structures and mechanisms that influence events in the actual domain and the manner in which those events are experienced and interpreted in the empirical domain. Nonetheless, the data acquired by the researcher is exclusively based in the empirical domain (interview texts provide insight into educators' experience and understanding of their work, while the interpretation of resource materials is a manifestation of how they are experienced by the researcher). As a result, the identification of discourses influencing educators required the interpretation of data in the empirical domain (interview transcripts and analyses of texts) to reveal the power associated with tacit structures from the real domain.

The interpretation of the data (texts) was based on the principles of hermeneutics (as outlined in the previous sections). Gadamer (1989) wrote: "Nothing that needs interpretation can be understood at once" (p.192). Therefore, in order to truly understand the data, the researcher engaged in the hermeneutical circle by iteratively moving between the general aspects and particularities of the data. This was completed on a textual level; however, it was also achieved by moving between the text itself and the greater context in which it was embedded using the profiles established for each participant. Interpretation of data occurred on an ongoing basis, as new understandings shed light on previously analyzed data in a new and unique manner.

In addition to repeatedly moving between the text and context, the researcher also continually investigated and questioned the interpretive frame (pre-judgments) used in the analysis. Although it is recognized that meta-awareness is always restricted, the process of continually revealing and analyzing pre-judgments was believed to foster novel interpretations and the productive re-analysis of data. When the iterative process of moving between the specific and the general (the text and the context) and questioning the interpretive frame adopted no longer resulted in novel insights, the process of analysis was deemed complete.

My Horizon

As the researcher I am responsible not only for designing the structure of the research project, but also interpreting and presenting the data. As a result, I not only assume authorship of the work, but also am a part of the work. The fact that I am embedded in the interpretation of the data means that I cannot separate myself from the work – I am the dissertation and the dissertation is me. As a result, the interpretation provided is not the lone valid perspective or the one true factual interpretation, but rather one of many possible analyses. The quality of the interpretation provided is not based on its validity and reliability (objectivity), as is the case with research operating in the positivist paradigm, but rather how it resonates with the reader, inspires new ways of looking at phenomena, and provokes critical reflection on second language pedagogy. In order to more fully understand the context of the interpretation (the frame used to interpret data) it is important that I write myself into the text of the inquiry by explaining how my horizon has been formed.

I have become the person I am primarily as a result of three influences: my family, my academic and professional career, and my international experiences. Each of these influences has

been prominent at different junctures of my life and has affected my development in diverse ways.

One constant throughout my thirty-nine years has been the nurturing influence of my family. I grew up in Saskatoon, the youngest son of two wonderful parents. My father was a commerce professor and my mother worked in administration at the University of Saskatchewan. As a result, I spent a lot of time as a child at the university and was exposed to an intellectually vigorous atmosphere at a very young age. I always perceived of my parents as being open-minded and accepting of difference; I vividly remember a discussion between my father and my grandmother in which my father defended the rights of women to run for political office. This had a very profound effect on my early views of gender roles and social equality. Moreover, my parents were very logical people who encouraged critical analysis and discussion about various situations and issues. In addition to engaging in heated discussions about various topics, my father also regularly participated in strategy-based games with my brother and me.

While fostering an atmosphere of critical and creative thinking, my parents also impacted my life with their flexibility and unconditional support. Both my parents had high expectations and pre-determined ideas about what they wanted me to do. Nonetheless, they were very accepting when my personal desires didn't match their ambitions for me. Although my parents probably didn't agree with all my choices, they always provided me with the autonomy to make decisions and learn from my mistakes. Nonetheless, they did this in a way that I knew I wasn't alone and I could also rely on them to provide assistance when needed. The emotional, spiritual, mental and financial support they provided enabled me to pursue my interests and have had a direct influence on where and how I am today.

While my family had a profound effect on my early development, so did my experiences at school. In Saskatoon there is a program for academically gifted students known as "Actal." In grade four all students in the city complete a preliminary aptitude test, with those students scoring highest continuing to the next round of testing. After multiple rounds of testing the process culminated with an individual interview with an examiner. The top sixty students in the city were then selected to be a part of this special program that was administered at two different schools. I attended this program from grade five to eight and it had a profound effect on my intellectual development. In contrast to typical classrooms that rely heavily on didactic instruction or Freire's notion of the 'banking model of instruction', the Actal program was based on the principles of self-directed learning, creative and critical thinking, problem solving, and interactive learning. My peers and I were encouraged to creatively and critically analyze topics and we were taught that our voice had value. We were given a great deal of latitude to pursue topics of interest and to demonstrate our learning through a variety of means. I believe my experiences in Actal laid the foundation for future intellectual development and also inspired in me a will to exert myself to promote change.

Although I attended an academically oriented school, my identity as a young person was always grounded in athletics. Sports consumed my life and the vast majority of the people I associated with were athletes. I was comfortable with my existence and never questioned my role in the world or my identity. At the end of grade nine, however, everything changed. The majority of people I played sports with started to drink and do drugs. I had no interest in such things and refused to succumb to peer pressure. As a result, I was in effect ostracized because of my decision. No longer a part of the "jocks" I began to question the narrow definition of myself that I had prescribed to and I experienced an identity crisis. The cognitive dissonance promoted by

this situation had a lasting effect, as it initiated continual self-reflection and resulted in an inclination not to be too strongly associated with any particular group.

During the difficult years of high school, I stumbled upon an opportunity that would significantly change my life and future career aspirations – a German exchange program. Although I wasn't passionate about participating in the program, I completed the application process and was accepted. The semester I spent in Hamburg provided my first significant exposure to intercultural interaction and instilled in me a real passion for language learning. Moreover, the experience whetted my appetite for adventure and inspired me to seek out future opportunities to live and work in diverse cultures.

The next opportunity I would have to embark on a significant intercultural adventure would be after graduating with an Arts degree and moving to Ukraine to teach English for a year. From a professional standpoint, the experience was significant as it solidified my desire to become a teacher. From a personal standpoint it had a much more profound effect, as it was the first time in my life that I was exposed to a different perspective on living well. Although most Ukrainians live in poverty, they are very spiritual people who enjoy a real strength in community. I was very impressed by the capacity of Ukrainian people (and Slavic people in general) to commit selfless acts. Despite the extreme poverty in which they lived, Ukrainians were always hospitable and willing to give the little amount they had in a gesture of camaraderie. For these people, establishing meaningful relationships was far more rewarding than accumulating material goods.

In addition to being exposed to alternative priorities, I was also confronted by my own privilege when I traveled to Ukraine. Prior to living in the Slavic nation I was very naïve about my privileged existence and the struggles that many people in other parts of the world are

subjected to on a daily basis. I assumed that people had the means to acquire what they needed and enjoyed many of the privileges that I did (i.e., free time, the opportunity to pursue what they desire). These naïve notions were confronted on a daily basis by the harsh reality of life in an impoverished, corrupt society. It made me realize that my privilege protected me from having to make difficult decisions between my ethics and my survival.

After returning from Ukraine I enrolled in the B.Ed. program at the University of Saskatchewan. I found most of the Education courses to be interesting, but only one class had a profound influence on me – a class I took from Carol Schick and Verna St. Denis. The course encouraged students to critically analyze notions of meritocracy and privilege, in particular in relation to race, gender, and class. The course was met by a great deal of resistance from most students, but I found it to be very enlightening and liberating. The assignment completed at the end of the course helped me to start to unpack how privilege impacted my life and to gain a greater understanding about critical multiculturalism and issues of social justice.

The concepts that I was exposed to in the class started to come to life when I embarked on my teaching career in La Ronge. Working with Aboriginal students in northern Saskatchewan I became aware of my ethnocentric ways. Rather than considering the cultural background of my students and mediating a classroom environment that welcomed all inhabitants as equal residents, I imposed my White, middle-class values upon them during my first year of teaching. This approach inevitably resulted in resistance from the students and tensions that undermined our relationship and the success of the educational experience. Although these lessons were applied during the remainder of my tenure in the northern Saskatchewan town, other tensions arose that made me aware of issues related to Western chauvinism, racism, and tacit forms of systemic exploitation.

After teaching in La Ronge for three years, my wife and I decided to embark on volunteer work in Africa. Our motivation in going to work in Africa was based on the adventure it provided and the opportunity to truly make a difference by helping less fortunate people. Although the former motive was satisfied, the latter was not, as I became acutely aware of the less than admirable side of aid work. Upon being assigned to work in a teachers college in one of the largest cities in Ethiopia, I took on the responsibility of teaching English language and curriculum courses. In addition to my responsibilities in the classroom, I also supervised student teachers during their practicum and organized a series of workshops for local elementary school teachers.

Near the end of my first year working in the Horn of Africa I was re-assigned to a new post, conducting a mandatory professional development program for the teacher educators at the college. The program, sponsored by the World Bank, was premised on the idea that the Ethiopian education system was deficient and needed to become more modern or Western in its composition. The obviously pejorative rationale for the program resulted in many of my colleagues, who administered the program in other colleges, adopting a superiority complex and treating their Ethiopian counterparts as inept. Surprisingly, the Ethiopian educators by-and-large further propagated this view by supporting the premise of the program. This was evident based on the fact that men in their forties and fifties who had a minimum of a Master's degree and had been teaching for over ten years at the post-secondary level openly accepted me as the leader of the program, despite the fact that I only had B.A. and B.Ed. degrees and three years experience teaching in a high school. The fact that I had been educated and briefly worked in a North American system meant that my lack of experience and credentials were deemed unimportant. This was my first exposure to notions of hegemony (Gramsci, 1971) and the colonization of the

177

mind (Nandy, 1983). Furthermore, in reflecting upon the professional development program, it became apparent that the project acted as a form of cultural imperialism in that it created a hierarchy that continued the colonial trend of empowering the West.

On a personal level, my experiences in Ethiopia also had a profound effect. Although I was a visible minority - there were very few white people in the city and most residents had little exposure to people from other cities let alone other countries – my minority status was not disempowering. I encountered regular harassment by the local population when walking in public, in particular from children and individuals wanting to test their English language abilities. Nonetheless, I also gained preferential treatment because of my white skin, getting better service from taxis and in restaurants and allowances to break local norms. As a result, I became acutely aware of my white privilege and the need to consider power when assessing the application of discriminatory practices.

Upon returning to Canada I embarked on graduate studies at the University of Alberta. The concepts I was exposed to in classes helped give a vocabulary to the previous experiences I had had in my life and opened my mind to new ways of thinking about the world. The caring and supportive professors I encountered helped nourish an interest in advocating for education that would promote social justice and a sustainable future. This had a significant effect on the papers I wrote for classes and the material I chose to read. My desire to make a difference led to a Master's thesis investigating the effect of a constructivist-based curriculum course on the promotion of innovation (task based language teaching). I had been concerned with the emphasis on grammar in the language classroom and, thus, viewed task based language teaching as an important innovation that could facilitate the second language classroom becoming a site for investigating meaningful issues.

Throughout my career as a graduate student I have always felt a tension between the two academic worlds in which I have been forced to reside. On one hand, I have an education background and am completing graduate studies in an education department that focuses on qualitative inquiry. On the other hand, my area of specialization (second language pedagogy) predominantly falls under the purview of applied linguistics, which has a strong quantitative tradition. As a result, I have always felt a part of a nebulous 'no man's land', as most of the scholars I have worked with in education do not understand the nuances of second language education, while the applied linguists I have encountered have been oblivious to the traditions that dominate education (e.g., hermeneutics and critical pedagogy) and have ridiculed non-empirical work. Negotiating these two worlds has been a struggle; however, it has also presented unique opportunities to bring concepts from the different fields together. This has been instrumental in the structure of the current study.

In addition to negotiating different academic fields, I have also mediated the practical world of teaching and the theoretical world of research. Throughout my years as a graduate student I have worked as a university facilitator (supervising and assisting student teachers during their practicum), instructed numerous second language curriculum courses, and designed and implemented a graduate level English-for-academic-purposes (EAP) course. I have always sought to engage in praxis by drawing on concepts from my reading to provide the foundation and structure for my pedagogical practices, while utilizing insights from my experiences in the classroom to direct my reading and research agenda. As I endeavoured to combine the two worlds together, my reading about critical pedagogy, intercultural education, intercultural communicative competence, and contemporary issues related to politics and economics became the basis for my work as an EAP instructor. Over the five years I taught the graduate level EAP

179

class, the course evolved to become more closely associated with the intercultural as project paradigm (critical interculturality). Through my interaction (both informally and indirectly through a research project conducted) with students who took the class over the years I learned that students' linguistic abilities improved significantly as a result of the class. Students consistently scored well on standardized tests at the end of the course and also lauded the improvements experienced in preparing them for graduate studies in English. More importantly, however, students consistently advocated that the course exposed them to critical issues that define contemporary existence and helped them to view the world in a different manner. Thus, my experiences solidified that second language education could have a transformative effect and motivated me to advocate for and research the transformative potential of the second language classroom.

Throughout my career as an educator I have always believed in the importance of helping students reach their potential. I entered into the teaching profession because I wanted to make a difference in the lives of young people and this desire has remained consistent throughout my professional activities as a high school teacher, language educator, and teacher educator. In narrowly defined terms, helping students reach their potential has entailed promoting excellence in developing skills and knowledge related to the prescribed curriculum. Nonetheless, I have always believed in the importance of moving beyond narrowly prescribed curricula to encourage an inquisitive demeanour. This has meant constantly questioning the norms and assumptions embedded in the material learned and seeking alternative perspectives. As my understanding of education and its function in society has expanded throughout my academic career, my definition of what it means to help students reach their potential has also been expanded. Rather than defining well-being in individualistic terms associated with personal development, I began to

understand how individual growth is linked to social change, as societal structures pose barriers to the attainment of individual well-being. Although praxis leading to transformation is the end goal, promoting awareness and an inquisitive disposition has been the primary focus of my work. Based on the limitations of the context of my work, awareness has been viewed as an attainable, important first step before a critical mass can be established from which to bring about substantive change. In the specific machinations of my pedagogy, awareness-raising has been linked to concepts associated with intercultural education and critical theory, resulting in a personal pedagogical approach that I have labelled 'critical interculturality.'

My commitment to improving students' lives through the development of individual skills and knowledge but also awareness-raising about tacit social and societal influences has directly impacted my teaching practices, but it has also directed my research agenda. The research I have conducted throughout my scholarly career has been dedicated to promoting education as a transformative event.

The experiences outlined above have had a significant effect on my development as a human being, a teacher, and an academic. They have led to numerous intercultural experiences that have influenced my social and cultural affiliations and defined my unique cultural characteristics. Although the explication is limited by my own self-awareness, it provides an honest account of some of the most important experiences shaping who I am. This is significant because it provides insights not only into the design of the research but also the interpretive frame that was used to interpret the data and present the findings.

Ethical Considerations

The two main components of the research project involved interviewing instructors about their educational philosophy, with a focus on how interculturality and criticality are understood

and applied to the second language classroom, and analyzing ESL curricular documents. The inclusion of human subjects in the study necessitated careful consideration of ethical standards to protect the rights of participants. According to the Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans, "An ethic of research involving human subjects should include two essential components: (1) the selection and achievement of morally acceptable ends and (2) the morally acceptable means to those ends" (Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 1998, p. i4). Both components were addressed by drawing upon ethical principles outlined in the Tri-Council Policy Statement and other research-oriented resources (e.g., Creswell, 2005), and explicating how they were applied in the current research.

The achievement of morally acceptable ends is largely contingent on the question being addressed in any research project. In the current research the primary objective was to better understand how ESL educators understand interculturality and criticality, and their role within the second language classroom. The underlying premise in a study in which the main objective is deeper understanding about a particular phenomenon is that judgment of right or wrong plays less of a role. Nonetheless, discussions about interculturality will inevitably include sensitive topics such as racism, gender inequality, and the hegemony of the English language. As such, there is a potential risk that participants' responses may be viewed in a negative light. The risk of personal harm was limited by the structure of the study.

Minimizing potential harm to participants was guaranteed through provisions to promote confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher, who has been formally trained on research ethics, the researcher's faculty supervisor, and contracted transcribers were the only individuals who were granted access to the raw data collected. The transcribers only had access to raw data

during the completion of the transcription, after which point they returned all remnants of the raw data and deleted any files pertaining to the transcription. Furthermore, the transcribers signed an agreement of confidentiality, guaranteeing that information from the interviews would not be shared or released in any shape or form. The data has been stored in a secure location in the researcher's office or residence and will remain in safe keeping for a minimum period of five years, at which time it will be destroyed. Moreover, all identifying markers will be removed from data when presented in a public forum. For example, pseudonyms will be used for all individuals and institutions, and other information that may compromise the anonymity of participants will be omitted or altered depending on the situation.

Although there are potential risks to participants, there are also significant benefits that may be attained from participating in the study. Teachers are often so engrossed in their daily routine that they spend little time reflecting upon their educational philosophy or the foundations of their educational practices. The interview provided an opportunity for reflection of this nature and may have provided the impetus for further reflection subsequent to the interview. As the interview focused on concepts that have not traditionally been deemed central to second language pedagogy but are becoming more prevalent in the literature, the interview may have provided the impetus for potential professional development in the form of expanding awareness. In addition, the researcher made the analytic heuristic and references used in the study available to participants so that they could further investigate the topics raised. Discussions with several participants did take place after the collection and analysis of data in which the researcher's perspective on the topic was explicated, leading to valuable professional dialogue.

While the rights of participants were protected after the data had been collected, measures were also taken to ensure ethical protocols were followed prior to and during the study. Before

identifying participants and collecting data, the researcher completed the procedures necessary to obtain ethics approval from the Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta. After ethics had been obtained, permission was sought from the administration at institutions where the research could be potentially carried out, to use employees at their venue in the study. Although data collection took place outside of regular working hours, permission from the organizations was deemed an important step in showing respect for and honouring the institution (Creswell, 2005). Potential participants were introduced to the study through e-mail communication. The researcher had established previous relationships with some potential participants as a result of his work as an EAP instructor, graduate student, and presenter at local associations and conferences. It was anticipated that familiarity with the researcher would enhance the likelihood of participation in the study; however, previously established relationships would not be used to pressure individuals into participation. Although the researcher would be disappointed if potential participants chose not to participate in the study, it was unlikely that this would influence the professional relationship already established. Furthermore, due to the nature of the research as a hermeneutic investigation, it was not anticipated that the interview or subsequent representation of data would create tension between participants and the researcher. Potential conflict was minimized by clearly outlining the interpretive character of the research prior to collecting data, and providing participants with the analytic heuristic that was used subsequent to collecting data. In order to respect the rights of potential participants, they were introduced to the purpose, objectives, potential consequences, and likely uses of the results during the initial contact. Consent was obtained before any data was collected and participants were informed of their right to refuse participation and withdraw from the research project at any time.

Scope of the Research

All research is conducted within a particular tradition and with a specific goal in mind. The narrow focus and specific design of a study facilitates the acquisition of knowledge to enhance understanding within a field. Inevitably what facilitates understanding, also limits the possibilities afforded new knowledge to emerge. In the current study, an interpretive approach has been adopted to investigate how second language educators understand criticality and interculturality as a means to illuminate the transformative potential of second language education. The interpretive design of the study facilitates deep understanding about educators' pedagogical philosophies and the tacit discourses that influence the profession. Nonetheless, the design of the research also limits the scope of what the study can speak to.

First and foremost, the interpretive design of the study means that the results are restricted to the domain of description and explanation. The small sample size and interpretive character of the study means that the results cannot be used to predict outcomes or establish a clear correlation between phenomena. On the contrary, the rich interpretations are presented with the hope that they will resonate with practitioners and promote introspection and dialogue within the field about the function of second language education.

The interpretive character of the study presents additional restrictions in the scope of the research. According to hermeneutic theory, human experience is grounded in language, as it is through language that we are able to experience, think, and understand the world (Palmer, 1969). Unlike a tool that can be arbitrarily moulded for individual purposes though, language is not exclusively endowed with meaning by the individuals using it, but rather carries meaning already belonging to a situation. It is the common ground provided by traditions embedded in language that facilitate understanding. While language enables understanding, the selection of particular

words to express meaning is inevitably accompanied by the denial of other meanings. Moules (2002) contended: "Things should not be captured in writing, not imprisoned by it, but set free within it" (p. 31). As expressed in this quote, language should not imprison meaning; however, the inevitable need to express ideas through language has a limiting effect. Moreover, in a study based on conceptual understanding, the presentation of definitions has the potential to lead to essentialist thinking. However, it must be acknowledged here that the aim of the current hermeneutic study is not to establish definitive 'true' definitions, but rather to present definitions as a beginning point for further hermeneutic investigation.

Furthermore, it must be acknowledged that the current study does not address all factors influencing understanding. It is recognized that social identities play a significant role in how individuals experience and interpret the world. An individual's gender, ethnicity, linguistic and cultural background, etc. all play a significant role in how an individual experiences and interprets the world. In the current study, the primary focus was on how professional educators' understand their work as second language educators. Recognizing the influence of one's biography on understanding, profiles of each individual have been provided to assist the reader in interpreting the data. Nonetheless, the social identity of participants was not specifically addressed in the analysis of data, as it was viewed as beyond the scope of the current study and a potential deterrent to maintaining participant anonymity.

CHAPTER SEVEN: PARTICIPANTS

Ten educators who had experience teaching ESL or EAP at prominent higher education institutions in western Canada participated in the research project. The educators had very diverse experiences on multiple levels – professionally, personally, and academically. While most had over one decade of experience teaching, there was great divergence in the extent of their teaching careers (see Table Four) - one educator was in the beginning stage of her career, while two educators had been firmly entrenched in the teaching profession for an extensive period of time. In addition to the divergence in length of service, educators also had engaged in pedagogy in very different contexts encompassing four continents and eight countries (see Table Five). At the time of the interviews, eight of the participants worked in an academic oriented-

Table Four: Teaching Experience of Participants

Participant	Years of Teaching Experience				
	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	21 +
Robin				X	
Kelly					X
Pat				X	
Sidney			X		
Jordan			X		
Carey				X	
Mackenzie		X			
Darcy	X				
Parker					X
Taryn		X			

Table Five: Educational and Professional Experience of Participants

| Participant | Educational Experience | | Doctoral Education | International Teaching Experience | Academic Focus in Teaching |
	Pedagogical Focus	Linguistic Focus			
Robin		X		X	X
Kelly	X	X	X	X	X
Pat		X	X	X	X
Sidney		X		X	
Jordan	X	X		X	X
Carey	X	X	X	X	X
Mackenzie		X	X	X	X
Darcy		X			
Parker	X	X		X	X
Taryn		X	X	X	X

setting. This meant that the focus of instruction was on developing the academic language skills necessary to complete undergraduate or graduate studies at an English-speaking university. The other two participants worked in a program dedicated towards assisting immigrants with settlement in a new country. As a result, the focus for these educators was on developing linguistic and cultural knowledge and skills to become contributing members of society in Canada.

In addition to the varied teaching experience, the second language educators also possessed very different educational experiences (see Table Five). Half of the educators had

received a doctorate or were in the process of receiving a doctorate, while all of them possessed a minimum of two degrees with at least one being at the Master's level. A number of the educators had received their education in multiple countries, exposing them to diverse approaches and philosophies of education. Furthermore, while all of the educators had a linguistic focus in their studies, meaning literature or the study of language played a central role, four of the educators studied within programs heavily grounded within the field of education. The extensive character of their collective education was not restricted to its depth, as there was also a breadth of experience from multiple fields including curriculum studies, educational psychology, literature, cultural studies, anthropology, linguistics, history, and music.

The demographics of participants were also varied. The gender of participants was split evenly between males and females, but respondents occupied different age categories, which corresponded with their teaching experience. The diversity of the group was notable, as numerous cultural and linguistic heritages were represented by participants. Three of the educators learned English as an additional language, while the majority of them were competent in at least two languages representing different language families. The respondents as a whole were very well traveled and had enjoyed extensive experience in multiple cultural and linguistic settings. Nonetheless, the context of their experiences was very diverse, ranging across the globe.

In a hermeneutic investigation it is important to provide extensive background information about participants to clarify their interpretive frame and contextualize their responses. The need for contextual acuity must be balanced with the imperative to protect the anonymity of participants. As a result, while information about participants' experiences has been provided, specific details have been omitted, including the gender of respondents (hence androgynous names and feminine pronouns have been exclusively used), the specific countries

of origin and location of international experience, and other details deemed clear identifiers of identity.

Robin

Teaching was a career that Robin somewhat stumbled upon. After attending university, she sought to travel the world and viewed English as her ticket to travel: "*After getting my bachelor's degree, the way I got into teaching was I decided to do more traveling – a typical story. I decided to do more traveling and the only way to do more traveling was to work abroad and the most common way to work abroad was to teach English.*" Adventure was not the only motivating factor in her desire to teach English, as she was also attracted to the idea of helping disadvantaged populations. She stated: "*I wanted to see if I could get into some job where I could work with visible minorities… I didn't know what I wanted necessarily, but that was one reason - to help immigrants.*" She further elaborated on how a personal experience as a volunteer shaped her occupational choice: "*When I was volunteering, I had one student who was a refugee from a war torn country in Asia. She had lost hearing in one ear because of a bomb. She was illiterate in her own language. I am trying to teach her how to read and I was trying the phonetic approach – just getting her to recognize some words, getting her to read a few basic words. I thought this is making a difference in her life in Canada. If I can continue that with a larger group of people I could help them adapt to life more easily in Canada.*" As a result, Robin's entrance into teaching English was a combination of pragmatic opportunism and altruism.

Although Robin did not view herself as a teacher growing up, she quickly fell in love with the occupation. She proclaimed: "*Many people go abroad and do it for one or two years and have no intention of doing that for their career; they don't hate it, but they don't see it as a career. I knew that was going to be my career that first week when I had my very own classes…*

190

When I had my own class, I knew I could do this! It just felt like it was my calling. I felt right at home and it felt great to help people. I kind of surprised myself. I didn't think I was a teacher." Nonetheless, she never felt comfortable assuming the traditional role of the teacher as authoritarian. She did not want to "*dominate a room*" and instead adopted more of a facilitation role in the classroom. As a result, she implemented teaching strategies that placed less emphasis on teacher instruction. For example, she stated that from the beginning her philosophy was to make learning "*fun and engaging*" using activities such as "*creating our own English magazine, or games class, travel class, etc.*" She further elaborated on the importance of student engagement: "*I always wanted to start off a lesson with engaging the students to get their interest, to get their attention. I think that is a big part of teaching for me is that the students should be interested.*" What was deemed appropriate to foster student interest changed based on the context though. "*I used to play games a lot more. I guess EAP got to me so I have to be more serious. I have to be more serious as an EAP instructor. Still, I like to keep it a bit more lively.*" Hence, meaningful engagement played a central role in her pedagogical decision-making.

While she always tried to make her classes interesting, Robin never lost sight of the long-term objectives of her instruction. She claimed: "*I like to look at things more long-term. If I am teaching grammar, it isn't necessarily that I am looking for them to know the past tense and the present tense. I am more interested in having them be able to use certain skills and strategies long term.*" This also applied to her view of the function of language pedagogy more generally as a means to "*help the students to achieve something else. Because without trying to master that second language, they can't succeed at that other goal. I am teaching these students in the EAP to have some success in their university courses. So that is that other goal. If it was immigrants, then I'm teaching them so that they can have some measure of success in their everyday life if*

that is the type of class I am teaching. I don't look at it as learning a second language for the sake of learning a second language." In addition to the practical outcomes of language instruction, Robin also viewed her work as supporting the development of society. In commenting on cultural and linguistic divides in society, she stated: "*Second language education can hopefully make the two groups integrate or interact together better.*"

Robin demonstrated that she is a reflective practitioner who constantly strives to improve her practice. She has taught a number of classes in different contexts and engaged in research to better understand the influence of her instruction. These activities combined with constant reflection have resulted in the refinement of her teaching over the years. Although she was motivated by professional development, Robin also found it necessary to change the content and approaches utilized to maintain her own spark for teaching. She explained: "*You try to spice things up. You try to do things differently because if you do the same things again and again, it is not stimulating… You need to keep yourself stimulated.*" Despite her interest in constantly analyzing and refining her practices, Robin found it difficult to stay up-to-date within the field. "*I think one thing about teaching… is that I probably focus so much on day-to-day teaching that certain terms, and all scholars' names have all seemed to disappear since my graduate days.*" Thus, the requirements of her job undermined her ability to keep abreast of new pedagogical developments.

Kelly

Unlike Robin, Kelly's path to becoming an English instructor seemed pre-ordained. When asked why she became an ESL and EAP instructor, Kelly responded that "*it started because of my major in university.*" She explained that she had always excelled at languages in school and, therefore, decided to study applied linguistics in university. After excelling at her

studies, she believed it was a natural progression to become a teacher and started teaching at the post-secondary level. She was always interested in challenging herself and, thus, participated in several professional development activities (including graduate studies) and taught in numerous contexts with different foci in post-secondary institutes. These diverse experiences had a significant influence on her development as a language educator.

Kelly adopted a practical perspective in rationalizing her work. She stated: "*As a teacher, I think my basic goal is to meet [students'] needs, whatever they want.*" This meant catering instruction to address the goals of learners, including adapting the topics chosen for investigation. "*The contents and topics, I really wanted them to be related to the students' lives so that they can relate, they can apply… So for the materials and contents, I deliberately chose those that related to international students' experiences – like their obstacles, or learning strategies and their success – to relate to them. I think they are more interested in reading about this or the contents that relate to their future.*" Relevance also prompted her to focus on preparing students to address their immediate concerns: "*… [the] urgent need is to pass a course, you know, to pass an exam. These needs have to be met first before they can care about other secondary needs.*"

Despite her focus on achieving pragmatic goals, Kelly was acutely aware of the educational function of second language pedagogy. Although she recognized the importance of passing courses and acquiring credentials, she viewed this as just one of the benefits of second language education. "*I think second language education, as any element of education, should be able to help the learner to improve their life. I really think so. I think passing a course, or getting a degree is not enough, as the student's development is holistic, all connected.*" She further elaborated: "*I think that learning itself is never the end and should not be the ultimate goal. The*

goal is overall an enhancement of their well-being - first of all as an individual and then through them enhancing the well-being of their community. So, I always have the social consciousness while teaching not to just teach particular skills or knowledge but also to take care of the student as a person and hopefully they can have a positive influence on society." As a result, Kelly postulated second language education as preparation to become global citizens and not just the acquisition of a new linguistic code. This perspective was reflected in her explanation about the influence of learning a second language on the individual: "…*the language opens a door of a brand new world to that person. Unavoidably you are going to learn its culture, its people, history, values. You are going to feel your life has been so much enriched and colorful and more exciting. You feel like your world becomes much larger than the world of your own language.*" In this statement, Kelly advocated that culture learning is an inevitable by-product of studying a second language; however, she was not referring to a superficial level of cultural understanding, but rather a substantive change in how the world is viewed. She continued: "*Without learning a second language, we know there are other worlds out there, but they have nothing to do with us. Maybe they relate to us at a very superficial level, for example McDonalds, Hollywood movies, rock and roll. They are always distant, mysterious, a superficial level, but after learning a second language it seems like you have got the passport, you are in that world. You are one of them as if you have a secret, you are in. So you are living in that culture, it is very fascinating. Everything becomes real and vivid. It really opens a brand new, totally rich world.*" Hence, Kelly viewed second language learning as satisfying practical needs and having a transformative influence.

Kelly's pedagogical philosophy was heavily influenced by early exposure to the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach. After being exposed to the approach during

her studies, CLT assumed a prominent role in her pedagogical practices. She stated: "*It has really heavily influenced me as a teacher… So knowledge is only the foundation, not the end. The end is that you have the competence, you can use it effectively in real life. So I strongly believe in [communicative language teaching]*." Thus, knowledge about language was inadequate, as learners also required opportunities to develop their ability to apply that knowledge in a communicative act. Despite her support for communicative language teaching, Kelly did not support the notion of the native-speaker model. She articulated: "*So native-like pronunciation, being able to state all the synonyms and idioms is not a necessity. It should be adequate as long as we can communicate enough*." In this way, she supported the development of linguistic skills that could be used in a *lingua franca* context.

Pat

Whereas Kelly's background was grounded in pedagogy, Pat learned about pedagogical considerations while teaching. Pat had a very strong academic background related to the study of literature and enjoyed diverse post-secondary teaching experiences; however, her exposure to pedagogical theories, approaches, etc. was very limited. As a result, she claimed that her decisions were "*practically based out there on real situations*" rather than "*theoretically based*." Moreover, she explained that her teaching identity developed through trial and error in the classroom when she taught abroad: "*I had my formal education and then I had something which I had to learn myself basically… beyond my formal education I really learned to be a language teacher when I went away… I guess what I really learned [abroad] was my classroom manner. That's probably the main thing. So, I learned how to manage a class*." Pat's experiences abroad also impacted the career path she selected. Although she had opportunities to work in different contexts, she selected EAP instruction due to the enjoyment she gained from working with

195

international students and the congruence of the position with her skill set. She explained that her experiences teaching abroad impacted her transition to EAP instruction: "*Actually, in the classroom here it was fairly seamless after a couple of terms. So and the reason for that I would say would be primarily my understanding of our student body.*" Therefore, although her educational and early teaching experiences were not necessarily congruent, they both contributed to preparing her to become an EAP instructor.

Pat's background had a significant influence on her pedagogical philosophy. She relayed that educational considerations were not prominent in her decision-making. When asked about the function of second language education, she responded, "*You know that is an education question. One I don't think about a lot.*" Furthermore, she was hesitant to comment on the impact of education on society: "*I can't take on what we want to provide for society. I have never been able to go that large and though it is not a bad thing to have in the back of your mind, but I am always much more focused on the more direct needs.*" For Pat these direct needs related to the success of students within the program. She outlined: "*The primary objective has to be language learning, language building for us. There are all sorts of secondary objectives and some of them are quite specific to do with fulfilling those academic pieces, but at the core I have come more and more to realize that the actual language, language accuracy, language development needs to be at the core of what we do, as that is what departments on campus want and require.*" She continued: "*I mean the secondary objectives have to do with that whole academic piece.*" As such, the language and academic skills required for success in subject-specific courses at the university were the almost exclusive focus for Pat.

A pragmatic focus was evident in most aspects of Pat's work. In discussing recent changes in the program in which she works, Pat applauded the move towards greater structure

and practicality. She highlighted: "*Instructional decisions need to be practical… and they need to be clear and practical and easy to understand, and easy to apply.*" Pragmatism extended beyond instruction to the selection of topics as well. Pat highlighted how topics "*are partly predetermined… by the textbooks we have,*" however, more importantly they should be determined based on being "*something the students can relate to and grasp fairly easily.*" She further elaborated on the need to select topics that do not contain problematic assumptions and can be reasonably analyzed from at least two positions.

Sidney

Similar to Pat, Sidney also was initiated into teaching before having any formal training. After completing an undergraduate degree in an unrelated field, Sidney desired to travel and viewed English teaching as her opportunity. After working abroad for a number of years, Sidney decided to return to Canada to pursue graduate studies in the field of teaching English as a second language. When asked why this career choice was made, she responded: "*I enjoyed it and I felt like I was good at it. So, yeah, just a combination of those two things.*" Thus, her experiences abroad left a positive imprint, motivating her to upgrade her credentials and seek additional professional development opportunities.

Sidney's early teaching philosophy was based on her teaching experiences abroad. She had grown up learning French in an immersion program and had spent time living in foreign countries as a child; therefore, she had intimate knowledge of the second language learning process. Nonetheless, she felt inadequately prepared for teaching abroad and relied on the support provided by her employer. The institute by whom she was employed offered workshops on teaching strategies; these workshops greatly influenced how she initially approached teaching. "*We had a workshop on TPR [total physical response] through the company that I was hired by*

and I was a musician so it made a lot of sense to me. And so I knew very little about teaching, I just knew that I could write songs that had a repeated form in them that kids seemed to enjoy because they could get active and they seemed to be remembering the words I was teaching them." Outside of the workshops she attended, Sidney's pedagogical practices were primarily based on observation and intuition. She stated: "*It was all based on sort of just observation. So, I would play with the kids in the school yard and then come up with lesson ideas. And I would spend time with my private students having dinner or you know drinks and just through our discussions I would sort of learn what was interesting to them and then make lessons.*" Hence, Sidney relied heavily on her students to provide the inspiration for her lessons.

Sidney's early experiences developing lessons based on interactions with her students had a lasting effect on her teaching philosophy. Rather than viewing the selection of content as a form of needs assessment in which teachers draw upon their expertise, Sidney viewed the development of a curricula to address learners' goals as a cooperative, negotiated endeavour. She explained: "*I ask them what the pathway to [their goals] looks like. Because I could never even begin to understand what getting to that goal looks like for them, so I try to understand, I try to co-create a pathway to achieving that as much as I can.*" Sidney recognized her limitations in understanding and addressing students' needs and sought to create a space for mutual engagement about the direction of the course. This desire for student engagement was also applied to other aspects of her teaching. "*I'd rather have learners think about things critically or look at something without me giving too much information about sort of why a form is used a certain way grammatically for example. So, I would rather have them do the meaning making than me do it for them.*" While she encouraged learners to be actively involved in their learning, Sidney was also sensitive to the comfort of learners in following particular approaches. She

exclaimed: "*But I also know that that frustrates some learners and tolerance for ambiguity can be an issue, so I try to balance those two things. And then just things like bottom up and top down processing with reading and listening. I try to make sure I balance the two.*" As a result, sensitivity to her learners' needs and desires prompted Sidney to follow a balanced approach in her teaching.

While sensitivity to learners influenced her pedagogy, so did her view on the effect of learning a second language. In reflecting on the purpose of second language learning, Sidney commented: "*I think it expands, for me personally, it expands my world view. It affords me the opportunity to interact with people in different places in the world when I travel or if I live there. So I think engaging with others, with humans is sort of why we are here - to be able to connect and engage with others. And so language kind of affords the ability to at least begin doing that.*" For Sidney, connecting with others is fundamental to being human and this is afforded by developing linguistic knowledge. Moreover, by connecting with others, one gains greater insight into the world and oneself. Sidney commented: "*I think that essentially knowing and understanding the world and your place in it is sort of part and parcel of building connections with others. And so in a language classroom where communication is sort of the goal then that's a big part of doing that.*" She further elaborated: "*I just think that you can understand [the world] more deeply and yourself in it… I know for me like learning two other languages I learned a lot about myself and what I value and what is important to me.*" The second language classroom is not just a location for learning linguistic codes, but rather a site for making connections and communally exploring meanings. Based on this belief, Sidney always tried to promote interaction about meaningful topics in her class.

In addition to viewing the classroom as a site of meaning-making, Sidney also conceptualized it as a location for challenging the status quo. Reflecting on her experiences as a child, Sidney noted that her family always challenged her to question norms and be flexible in her perspective. "*There was a lot of that growing up, right. So it was always about culture, and it was always about sort of the notion of the other too. I remember even birthdays, on our birthday we had to buy presents for our siblings and our mom and dad. So we didn't receive gifts on our birthday, we gave.*" Although the practice of giving on one's birthday was premised on the idea of promoting sharing, it also had the effect of bringing into question commonly accepted practices in society. Sidney reflected: "*So, just all those notions of what sort of the status quo was were challenged from a very early age.*" Incorporating cultural diversity and challenging the status quo in the second language classroom was important for Sidney because of the influence it had had on her as a child. "*Because I think there is a lot of status quo imposed on second language learners, so I try my best to challenge those notions in the classroom because when I did that as a kid I felt that my life was enriched by being empowered to do so. And so, if I can do the same thing, great.*"

Jordan

Like Sidney, Jordan's career path was significantly affected by her experiences as a child. Jordan was exposed to linguistic and cultural diversity at a young age. She studied French in an immersion program and encountered further cultural diversity when she lived with her family in a foreign country. She explained: "*I had traveled and went overseas as a child… for three years and had the experience of other cultures. I always liked working in multicultural settings and when I was teaching… I wanted to teach ESL.*" Her experiences as a child instilled a passion for culture that transferred into her early teaching experiences: "*When I taught high school I had*

200

started up a Japanese club, and I always had an interest in Japanese culture and Chinese culture

having lived in Japan and China for a couple of years. So I just always found myself gravitating

towards ESL learners and trying to help them fit in and teaching cultural awareness, helping

them adjust. And also teaching main-stream high school in English 30 I got a lot of ESL students

who were trying desperately to pass that diploma exam, so I would work one-on-one with them.

That's really where my interest sort of began I suppose." Thus, her passion for teaching second

language learners was instilled at a young age and reinforced during her early teaching

experiences. This passion caused her to jump at the opportunity to transfer into EAP instruction.

As a language instructor, Jordan's primary goal was to motivate learners to use the

language. She viewed this as involving creating a comfortable environment and instilling

confidence in learners to take risks. She stated: "*When I first see them, it is a confidence issue*

and that's why usually my first activity on the first day of classes [is to] get them working

together on some kinds of group, ice breaker kind of activity. Get comfortable with each other

and sort of get them to speak out and get their opinion and let them know they have a voice and

don't be afraid and what questions do you have. A lot of times they are just afraid to ask, they're

too shy to ask." The importance of promoting comfort was heightened in Jordan's view because

of the unique character of second language learning. Unlike other subjects that could be tackled

through rote learning, Jordan believed second language learning could only occur through

meaningful engagement using the language. As a result, she always tried to provide activities for

learners that would keep them active and engaged. One of the ways she promoted this

engagement was by promoting small group discussions. She articulated: "*They love the talk-time.*

And that is something I think we neglect or we don't see the value in. I see it now more so than

ever and so I always, in that four-hour period, give them a good half-hour, put them into groups

so they are always in different groups, get them working together, get them talking and that peer engagement is really important… I think it is more important than accuracy. Just getting them to talk for me is a goal. It doesn't have to be grammatically correct, meaning is important and taking a risk, taking a chance and the confidence is huge." In addition to small group discussions, Jordan also tried to promote engagement through blogging and other uses of technology.

In addition to fostering engagement, Jordan also sought to promote greater complexity in the thinking of her students. She expressed concern about the lack of general knowledge possessed by her students, as expressed in the following excerpt: "*We were doing a unit on performance enhancing drugs and just before we started the unit...I threw the word out there - performance enhancing drugs. Most people had no idea of what I was talking about… I said okay let's build from there - Lance Armstrong. This was a hot topic; he was on Oprah right. Nothing, nobody knew the name and then I said Tour de France and still [nothing]… They're not connecting events and so of course when one approaches topics for the first time they have nothing to hang their hat on sometimes.*" According to Jordan, one of the main reasons for the inadequate knowledge base was a reluctance to read. To address this, Jordan developed a number of assignments to encourage her students to expand their reading: "*I try to convince them of the importance and relevance of reading, just to come up with ideas… So if I can get them to read the newspaper and look for controversial issues and discuss that, I think that helps to open up their minds a bit more.*"

Through expanding students' reading Jordan not only hoped to provide a stronger knowledge base, but also to assist learners in better understanding how they have come to think the way they do. She stated: "*We do a lot of current events, reading the newspaper and I want*

them to sort of have a framework and try to figure out what they believe and where that comes from." She further elaborated: "*Consider why they think the way they do. Where does that come from - your parents? Does it come from your schooling? Does it come from what you read in the newspaper, what you read on the internet? Just thinking about where their information comes from and then having an opinion on it - is it good or bad? Tell me why. And then expand on that - can you prove it? How do you know? And we talk about bias… distinguishing between fact and opinion.*" One aspect of analyzing one's perspective is comprehending the influence of culture. "*Culture, it is so in-grained, automatically ingrained in us so that we don't even really think about our background views and perspectives or where they come from.*" Therefore, Jordan sought to expose tacit cultural influences on her learners through activities in her class. In addition to encouraging learners to question the source of their own thinking, she also promoted analysis of the quality of information provided in the various sources they read. "*We sort of compare the different newspapers and I'll bring in four different newspapers and look at the same topic and so just showing them which one do you think you're going to get more information on? Which one do you think is valid? So we talk… okay so you went to the Internet right away and you watched a video on this… so how do we interpret media too and we talk about that.*" For Jordan, this was an important skill to develop, not only for success in potential post-secondary studies, but also in life in general.

Carey

Carey's induction into second language education was based on her desire to work with marginalized populations. She wanted to make a difference in the lives of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds and decided that teaching would afford this opportunity. She stated: "*I wanted to teach in inner city schools… so that was my goal. I was like I'm going to free these*

203

inner city kids." Lofty expectations were tempered by her experiences and after completing her education degree, she decided to travel abroad to teach English. She enjoyed the teaching experience and savoured the success she experienced teaching university students. The positive experience motivated her to enter into graduate studies so that she could obtain the credentials needed to continue working at the post-secondary level. Nonetheless, her desire to work with disadvantaged populations continued to influence her thinking. When asked why she entered into second language education, she responded: "*Actually, it wasn't even second language education. I think because I was interested in intercultural education that became my involvement with ESL because I was interested in that immigrant population and how even before I read Jim Cummins and stuff I was kind of interested in how these students were marginalized because they couldn't communicate and that was seen as an indication of their cognitive development… So, I think that's where it started and I guess that's always what I've been interested in.*" She continued: "*Yes I guess I have never really been focused on second languages in that sense. In terms of language acquisition it's mostly the cultural component.*" Thus, entry for Carey into second language education was based more on a passion for working with the second language learning population rather than the subject matter itself.

Her passion for working with second language learners was apparent in the effort she made to get to know her students. She believed it was important to cater instruction to the specific students in her class and, therefore, spent a considerable amount of time and effort assessing learners' abilities and identifying their interests. She articulated: "*The first week ...is getting to know their strengths and weaknesses… I try and take authentic materials and get them interacting with them to see their opinions and how they write... So I kind of try and get them interacting in that way in a more natural classroom setting rather than just giving them a test.*"

She further elaborated: "*I get to know my students. I ask them, like I am explicit about it, I do the diagnostics, but I also ask them what do you want to get out of this course? And we set some goals for the course together and then I will shift my focus to that. And when I look back at stuff, I mean there may be stuff I reuse, but at the same time I try and cater to that group.*" Although she recognized the pedagogical strength of this approach, she also realized that it required a lot of sacrifice on her part: "*So I do spend a lot of time; it's not the smartest way to do it.*" A student-centered approach was important to Carey because she believed that engagement and learning should be dialogic in character: "*I think I just try and be aware. Like when I have students from other countries I look their countries up in the paper to see if there have been any earthquakes, or you know if there's anything going on there because I want to know what's going on in their world because they're still connected to it even though they're here. And I want them to learn about here. I don't think it should be a one-way street. Like I want to understand them as much as they want to understand what's going on here.*" Hence, Carey sought to establish a collaborative environment in which all members felt appreciated.

Although she was very focused on the students in her class, Carey was still passionate about language and the intrinsic benefits of learning a second language. She lamented how pragmatism has dominated discourses pertaining to the function of learning a second language: "*What is the purpose of learning a second language? … Unfortunately, I think most of the time it's very pragmatic. It's like knowing this language will get me further… I think, like you know, as far as French and English go, people learn them not because of any cultural interest in them but because, you know, for jobs. A very pragmatic approach… So, I think people are pushing towards that more from a business aspect than just a love of languages or to increase your knowledge.*" She advocated that language provides so much more than simple employment

opportunities though. "*I would like it [second language learning] to be because you have an appreciation for another culture and you want to see a different world view, get a better understanding of things. And you should always be learning, right...I think all languages are beautiful and unique and I think [the function of learning a second language] is to appreciate that. To appreciate that it's not direct translation and I think you get a better understanding of different people when you learn a different language because you do get exposed to that different world view.*" Based on this perspective, Carey tried to instill a love for languages in her students. She did not conceptualize her classroom narrowly as an ESL class, but rather encouraged it as a location for developing an appreciation of language in general. She explained: "*I kind of try and give them a love of language and I think in my class I encourage them teaching, like I do see them teaching each other their languages and I encourage that.*" For Carey, exploring different languages opened opportunities for more sophisticated cultural and linguistic understandings and generally fostered a more productive learning environment. Furthermore, she tried to exploit the unique character of second language learning to create a positive experience for students. She exclaimed: "*I think for my students what I try and do is make it an empowering experience. Like through volunteer work or something ... some benefit for them or others to help them realize that there's something to experience that you couldn't experience if you didn't know the language.*"

Carey's holistic focus on addressing student development was apparent in her identification of the objectives of her instruction. Rather than focusing exclusively on the content of instruction, Carey believed it was important to foster the skills that would enable long-term success for students. "*Well I think in an EAP setting I want to give them learning strategies. I want to start initiating those learning strategies that will carry them through, right. And things like dealing with failure you know in the competitive environment and being autonomous*

learners. Things like that I think are very important and often overlooked. It's like you can't teach them all the vocabulary in seven weeks. What you can do is give them skills to learn." She believed it was very important for learners to consistently reflect upon their learning in order to identify areas for improvement and this applied to addressing linguistic issues as well. She stated: "*I do a lot of that; it's like error analysis where they're analyzing their own mistakes… So, it is language, but it is more language awareness rather than [just] teaching them… Teaching them about word families and why they're important and up their metacognition about their own learning.*" Thus, self-awareness was deemed more important than focusing on specific skills.

In addition to developing self-awareness and strategies for addressing various situations, Carey also sought to foster greater understanding about important topics. She stated that she would like to address topics that were directly relevant for learners and would foster more sophisticated understanding about the world: "*I would probably do something on learning. Like I do something on how we learn, why we learn. I would do something on consumption because I find at that age that's something too. Like why do you have to wear these labels? Why do you have to buy so much? So I would do stuff like that. I would probably do something on globalization and you know what that means. Have them think more critically about why they're here… Something more relevant and meaty and meaningful.*" In order for the exploration of topics to be truly meaningful, Carey believed that adequate time had to be dedicated "*so they can build their vocabulary and have a deeper understanding rather than a surface understanding of the topic.*" She also advocated the language classroom be reconceptualized as a safe space for exploration. She explained: "*So this is the safe place. Get to know yourself, get to know each other and explore these ideas because you may not have time later on.*" Thus, according to

Carey, the second language classroom was an ideal space to explore one's identity and other relevant issues that influence one's life.

Mackenzie

Whereas Carey entered second language pedagogy out of a desire to work with a particular population, Mackenzie was drawn to the profession out of a love for the English language. She adopted a passion for the language at a young age and it shaped her decisions and experiences as a student at the post-secondary level. As an undergraduate student she was faced with the option of specializing in literature or ESL and translation studies. Her decision to focus on the latter would have a significant impact on the direction of her studies and also the opportunities presented to her to teach in different international settings. This diversity of experience would impact her development as an educator.

Mackenzie was both pragmatic and philosophical in rationalizing her pedagogy. On a pragmatic level, she believed that for EAP students a *"specific objective is to actually help those prospective students to be able to function effectively in a North American educational setting*." This required more than simply developing their linguistic skills though: "*Although we do try to emphasize language skills and influencing accuracy in the first place, but I always emphasize that in addition to that we also have to focus on research skills, critical thinking skills and generally being a little open minded about different academic principles in general. So in other words it's not just about language, because students who take ESL classes always think 'oh it's about just learning the language' so they rarely think of language generally as a thinking tool*." Therefore, Mackenzie adopted a broadly pragmatic perspective in identifying what skills and knowledge students need for success.

On a more philosophical level, Mackenzie believed that the objective of language learning was to inspire global citizens. She remarked that "*in the contemporary world it's almost imperative that an educated person speaks at least one or two other languages in addition to their mother tongue.*" She argued this based on the premise that cross-cultural understanding is very important in terms of exchanging ideas and developing knowledge. She stated: "*I mean we are trying to cultivate educated citizens, so as I said, the more languages they speak, the more cultures they discover. It broadens their outlook and it allows them to communicate with people from other cultures.*" She continued: "*I think it makes them better people, more educated people, but it also improves their lives I think. They may not necessarily realize this, but it makes them better people. I think by learning another language and by learning more about another culture, you broaden your outlook and you probably become less materialistic, so your life values probably change. In other words, your focus becomes more about creation than just consumption.*" Therefore, second language education was postulated as not only providing additional opportunities, but also promoting changes in one's life values.

Although she believed that second language education could promote substantive change, Mackenzie recognized that it was highly dependent on the approach adopted by an instructor. She remarked: "*It depends on how you teach it I guess. It depends on [whether] your instructors only emphasize language and accuracy and grammar as the primary objective for learning the language… But if your instructor is a little bit more open to teaching more than just language, then [it is possible].*" Based on this understanding, Mackenzie tried to foster more than linguistic knowledge in her classroom. She sought to minimize exercises with a pre-determined correct answer and instead tried to encourage independent thinking. Furthermore, she promoted discussion about critical topics that had direct relevance for students. For example, one topic she

209

discussed with students was the commercialization of higher education. She exclaimed: "*This topic gives us a chance to discuss why it's important to study both sciences and arts, and although the latter may not necessarily lead to specific or direct financial benefits, generally this is what makes us human. And after we explored all the oil and extract everything we have in the oil sands, we want to go to the theatre, want to go to the movies, or want to enjoy life*." She further explained that the second language classroom was a productive location for discussing such topics because of the diversity of viewpoints typically found in an ESL setting. "*There is an opportunity to discuss world power or international politics generally. It's especially interesting when these students come from these countries. So then they can have a good discussion by just getting a variety of viewpoints… Because even my perspective is kind of narrow cause I look at things from the North American perspective, specifically Canadian perspective. But if somebody comes from China or Venezuela or from the gulf coast states, then it's always interesting to see how they look at it and then we can have a debate*." Mackenzie believed such interactions were productive not only because they fostered novel understandings about topics but also because they modelled civilized dialogue. She explained: "*…you can always exit and kind of leave a discussion. But then it doesn't lead to anything pretty much. So, your ability to convince or persuade other people is important, and to do so with language and in a civilized manner is very important*." The second language classroom provided a safe environment in which to foster such skills.

Darcy

In contrast to the other participants who have significant experience as second language educators, Darcy is relatively new to the field, having recently completed her Master's degree in teaching English as a second language and only having taught for three years. Darcy's attraction

to teaching language was based on her early experiences as an undergraduate student. After high school she was not sure what she wanted to do, so she decided to take a broad range of arts classes at university. She explained: "*I finished high school and came to university. I didn't know what I wanted to do so I took a couple arts classes and ended up in anthropology because I really liked it. I really liked the socio-cultural part of it, so I took you know archaeology and linguistics and all those different things. I was just fascinated by cultures and different people and different practices and stuff like that.*" An interest in culture led her to complete a bachelor's degree in anthropology; however, it also provided the impetus for pursuing a career as a second language educator. She articulated: "*It was a natural next step, but I knew I wanted to work with people, I knew I was interested in working with people from different cultures, so I volunteered to try it out because I had a friend that had done it in Japan, and I loved to travel so I thought it was a good job that would have the possibility of going overseas and started teaching. I really liked it and went from there.*" She further elaborated: "*I think a lot of ESL teachers, I'm one of them, didn't really know what to do and they tried [teaching] and loved it. So, I think I kind of fell into it. Wanting to try something new and I liked the idea of it--helping people. I love language and cultures so it seemed like a really good fit.*" Nonetheless, she was apprehensive about working with children in a public school setting claiming that "*the school system is a really hard place and it is only getting harder for teachers with class sizes and I just would not want thirty children that I would have to take care of and teach.*" As a result, teaching ESL to adults seemed like the most attractive option for her.

Darcy's interest in culture had a significant influence in the value she ascribed to her instruction. Although her primary objective as a language instructor was "*to give [her] students the confidence to be able to use English to accomplish, well, their needs, and their wants and*

their goals", she also believed that cultural instruction was extremely important in the language classroom. She stated: "*My secondary [objective] would be the settlement and integration part of it so more again like knowledge about Canadian culture and life in Canada.*" As such, Darcy framed her work in pragmatic terms, portraying the development of linguistic and cultural knowledge as the precursor to accomplishing additional goals. She elaborated: "*I think in Canada [language instruction] is giving people who come here from other countries opportunities to well maybe further their education or do the job they were doing back in their own country. Or again just being able to use English in day-to-day things that they need… It is almost like a first step that they need to do before they go on and do those other things.*" Therefore, the underlying foundation of Darcy's pedagogy was preparing learners to realize external goals.

In order to prepare learners to meet their unique goals, Darcy believed it was important to make learners feel comfortable. She recognized the influence of cultures of learning on educational success and sought to cater to different learning styles. "*Well I guess a lot of variety [in instruction] because some students want to sit there and listen to me talk right, and other students want to interact and they want to talk and ... I think it is good that they share ideas, and share opinions and present information to the class so it is not always me. So, I think just trying to allow for, trying to make the way that I teach and activities we do and the content appeal to a wide variety of people from different backgrounds and different learning styles and ways that they're used to learning, so that everyone is happy at some point.*" Moreover, she tried to make learners feel comfortable by giving them a voice in classroom decision-making. She explained: "*I try to empower my students by giving them knowledge and choices and letting them make decisions.*" She also professed to making students feel comfortable by instilling confidence in

them: "*Just giving them, hopefully, confidence and feeling like they're capable and they can do things on their own and that they're not, hopefully, that they don't feel that powerlessness that I think some people feel when they come here and they can't get a job and they can't communicate, and I think it's really hard for them.*" Empathy for the difficulties encountered by learners, thus, played a central role in her instructional decision-making.

Establishing an atmosphere in which learners felt comfortable was particularly important for Darcy because she believed that the language classroom was an ideal environment for safe risk-taking and experimentation. "*I think it's a good place to be able to practice and learn. Kind of a safe place you can make mistakes, you can try things out because they are all together from all different places, different languages, right, trying to communicate in English.*" She believed this was important because second language learners must contend with linguistic and cultural differences that can lead to misunderstandings and potentially conflict. Developing strategies and gaining practice in addressing these situations would, thus, be an invaluable tool for second language learners. She elaborated: "*Sometimes there are conflicts...I think they would be able to resolve those better, and it's a good place to practice before they go out into very diverse workplaces, or just in general.*" As a result, Darcy advocated for the language classroom as a location for developing holistic interactional skills that would enable learners to more effectively address problematic situations encountered outside of the classroom. Thus, for Darcy language pedagogy nominally focused on linguistic development.

Parker

Whereas Darcy was just beginning her career as a language educator, Parker was a veteran educator with many years of experience in diverse settings. Despite the differences, they shared a commonality in that they both stumbled upon language education after completing an

arts degree. Parker stated: "*Well, initially I kind of fell into [language teaching] ... [I] wanted to take a little bit of a break before I went to [a professional] school and some friends said oh you should go and teach English. I said well, I'm not qualified to do that. Yeah, yeah anyone can do that, and I said I don't really believe that*." After investigating her friend's claim, she became aware that further education was needed to acquire the credentials necessary to teach English abroad. As a result, she enrolled in and completed a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics and journeyed abroad to teach. After teaching for five years, Parker decided to upgrade her teaching credentials and returned to school. Subsequently, she taught a variety of subjects to learners of different ages in different countries before settling into adult second language education in Canada.

Parker came across as a very caring educator who was keenly attuned to her students' needs and desires. One of the contributing factors to her caring disposition was an experience she had during her schooling to become a language educator. She expressed that one of the prerequisites of the program was to personally study a second language and analyze her experiences. She relayed: "*One of the requirements while you were taking your program [was] you were required to take an additional language... so that you understood the processes and you could also analyze your practices and how this applied and also to understand the student experience of the frustrations or, you know, the highs and lows of that*." In acquiring a better understanding about the learner experience, Parker became more attuned to the need to create a safe environment. She stated: "*You're trying to set an environment in your classroom where it's safe, where students can ask any question... it's okay to ask you know questions about this and why does Canada accept this and ... that they could ask questions about it. That nobody was going to judge them you know, if they were curious*." Being respectful and non-judgmental was

important for Parker in establishing a safe environment: "*We are just going to be respectful and hear the other person's point of view on that. But a lot of [it is] setting that stage where it is safe and non-judgemental… [where] everybody knows the ground rules of how we are going to discuss [topics] in a safe and non-confrontational setting, manner*." Establishing rules for conduct helped to promote comfort in the classroom and contributed to enhance the learning experience.

In addition to valuing a safe learning environment, Parker also sought to establish a dynamic, engaging classroom atmosphere. She explained: "*In terms of materials, like there are set materials the program usually gives you, but I will supplement to try and keep the lesson as dynamic and interesting for the students, but also interesting for me. You know I don't want to teach something boring. They don't want to hear it*." Maintaining a dynamic learning environment also entailed creating opportunities for authentic interaction. Parker encouraged authentic interaction in the classroom but also created assignments that required learners to interact outside of the classroom as well. She clarified: "*They had to, let us say, pretend that they are going on a winter vacation a week over Christmas time that they are going to leave cold Canada. They are going to go somewhere warm and tropical. Okay, and they are going to have to go out to the travel agent… and find out all they could in terms about what it would cost to go - hotels, everything, the attractions, tourist attractions in Hawaii, the Bahamas, whatever and get themselves a good deal*." After acquiring information by actually going to travel agencies, students were required to create a brochure, give an oral presentation, write notes about others' presentations and write an argumentative essay about their preferred destination. Creating an engaging, dynamic environment was further accomplished by providing a broad range of topics with which students could engage using their linguistic resources. She proclaimed: "*I guess it is*

coming back to my own background, but trying to be diverse enough because not all of my

students may have the same interests as I did. So I try a broad range so at least one topic that we

are dealing with will be high interest for the students." Through authentic engagement with

diverse topics, Parker hoped that all her students would be motivated to actively expand their

linguistic resources.

Parker was an advocate of flexibility in teaching. She exclaimed that she did not believe

in the application of rigid methods, but rather believed in adapting instruction based on the

situation. She explained: "*I am not rigid in the sense of my planning… But that allows me the*

freedom and the flexibility to kind of judge where my students are, where their energy levels are,

where their state of mind is that I can adjust and adapt to make sure that hopefully they have the

best experience as possible or the.....heighten the learning environment as best at possible." Her

desire to adapt instruction to meet students' needs meant that she did not subscribe to fads within

the profession. In reflecting upon the evolution of second language pedagogy, she stated: "*And*

the pendulum swings...you know things needed to be very, very communicative and fluency was

the primary focus when I was going to university as opposed to accuracy. And the pendulum

shifted the other way and in terms of myself after having taught for so many years, I don't go in

either one camp … I am probably more on the communicative end because that's where I started

from, but I do believe that accuracy is important. And in certain contexts and depending on

certain students' needs and their learning styles, you may have to adapt so that their needs are

met." Therefore, Parker believed it was important to have an open disposition that allowed

circumstance to dictate instructional practices. In the context of teaching ESL in Canada, this

entailed focusing on communication, which supported her early established disposition towards

communicative language teaching. She explained: "*I want my students to be able to*

communicate with native speakers, to be able to get their ideas across … I'll get to the accuracy afterwards. But I don't want them so tongue tied that they cannot communicate and they cannot be part of the experience of living in Canada. I want them to be able to make friends. I want them to be able to get their groceries. I don't want them, you know, lost on a bus and not be able to get to where they need to go, and I want them to feel a part of the community they're living in." Hence, Parker was motivated by the desire to enhance her students' communication skills, but also their ability to function effectively in society and become members of a community.

Taryn

Unlike Parker who somewhat fell into teaching, for Taryn becoming a teacher seemed to be a natural progression in life. Not only were several members of her family teachers, but Taryn also claimed that teaching was a comfortable endeavour that she always felt passionate about. She stated: "*I love to teach. I am from a family of teachers. All my parents, my grandparents are teachers… It is just me. I knew since I was little that I wanted to teach.*" The passion for educating others was grounded in a desire to make a difference. Taryn elaborated: "*Yeah, to help others understand something, to resolve conflict between other people, I always liked to do that.*" This was also the reason she was drawn to second language education, as she believed engaging with others using an alternative linguistic code developed tolerance of and an appreciation for difference, thus facilitating greater understanding and cohesion between people. She clarified: "*Because we are becoming so much more globalized, bringing people together, I hope [second language education] plays a role in preventing conflicts, you know lowering crime rates and some things like this, because in a way many crimes are because people were never taught to communicate.*" As such, Taryn did not view language education as simply a matter of learning linguistic codes, but rather acquiring the skills to communicate effectively.

The emphasis on developing communication skills was evident in Taryn's pedagogical philosophy. "*They need to know that what they learn in class is something they can use outside of class. I always try to teach them communication skills. Grammar is secondary. You have to teach them to use the language a lot. You have to teach them to not be afraid, you know speak.*" The emphasis on communication meant that Taryn was always sensitive to creating a positive classroom environment in which students felt comfortable. For Taryn this meant reducing stress and enhancing motivation: "*The secondary objective is to teach them English. And the primary objective is to make sure everyone is comfortable and everyone is actually not stressed out, everyone is learning. I want to make sure they're moving somewhere, you know that they are not sitting still, that they are not asleep, that they are actually feeling that this is beneficial for them… Until I have the first, the secondary [objective] doesn't make any difference. I can teach them all I know, but they will not learn anything if they are stressed out, if they are uncomfortable, if they are afraid of me and things like that.*" Hence, Taryn clearly framed her teaching as revolving around the students in her class and not the content of the course. This was further demonstrated by her attitude towards the outcome of language instruction: "*The goal is progressing in your material and you are giving them more knowledge. It should not be a goal [that] they should all know these verbs, or they should all know these words. It never works like this.*" Thus, language learning was viewed as evolving in an ecological, individual manner.

Taryn believed that student motivation was intricately linked to the content of the course and the disposition of the teacher. She was opposed to instruction that focused on decontextualized drills and, rather, supported activities that were relevant for learners. She noted: "*If it's possible, the grammar should be about things that are important. It shouldn't be just enter verbs into meaningless sentences about meaningless things. It should be something they*

actually use. And it should be about such simple things as going to the store or how to buy things, how to take the bus, how to communicate your feelings, how to get a passport." Therefore, content should not be predetermined, but rather selected based on the life situation of students. She further lamented that many language educators do not enjoy their work, thus passing on the idea that second language learning is boring. Nonetheless, she advocated that the converse is also true: "*I think if you show you are passionate about it, if you show that you are open to all kinds of questions, then students work really hard because most of them want to learn.*"

As a result of her emphasis on creating an atmosphere in which students feel comfortable to communicate using the target language, Taryn believed that relationship building was very important. One aspect of relationship building entailed demonstrating that learners are cared for: "*Taking their personal culture - what I found out about them – putting it into our day-to-day work makes them feel appreciated, makes them feel that I actually care about them as people, you know.*" Part of caring for learners was recognizing them as holistic beings and not simply blank slates to be written upon. This meant incorporating activities that engaged the mind, body, and soul and provided an outlet for emotional expression. Taryn stated: "*They have no place to show their emotions, no place to actually feel anything. And if they just get stuck in the textbook, that is just going to kill them as a student, but this way [engaging them through meaningful discussion] they become engaged.*" Another aspect of relationship building was being open and transparent with learners. Taryn explained: "*Showing them that we are in this together. That we have to work together… It sometimes really helps that they see that I am open to them. 'Cause they show me how they study, I show them how I teach… So, I've gotten used to not having secrets from my students.*" Although establishing strong relationships with students was deemed

important, Taryn believed there should still be a separation between teacher and student: "*I am the teacher. I am not on the same level. We are different. I always try not to be too familiar with students. A lot of them want to be very familiar but that really breaks the structure of the class because then they forget that what you are saying is more important than what their colleague is saying because you are actually there to teach.*" Thus, Taryn sought to establish relationships that would foster a productive pedagogical environment, which meant that she always maintained a professional distance from her students.

Common Profile

Despite the diverse character of educators' personal, academic, and professional experiences, a common profile emerged from the data. The second language educators were all very well educated and had intimate knowledge of the second language acquisition process. As individuals with extensive experience learning languages and scholars who were familiar with diverse theories on language acquisition, although from markedly different perspectives, the educators brought a wealth of knowledge to the language classroom. This depth of knowledge was apparent in educators' descriptions about their classes and the rationales provided for their work. Thus, the second language educators who participated in this study possessed a high degree of expertise in their field.

Moreover, the second language educators were very passionate about their work. Although they had entered into second language education for different reasons, they universally expressed great enjoyment in working in their chosen field. All of the educators demonstrated a high level of professionalism and commitment to improving their craft, as evidenced by their participation in professional development activities. A number of the educators had participated in research projects to learn more about the effectiveness of their teaching and had disseminated

220

the results of their inquiry through conference presentations or publications. Thus, they were actively involved in shaping the development of the field of second language education. Most of them were also constantly stretching their skills by seeking out new teaching and assessment experiences. This meant that their professional skills were constantly evolving.

Finally, participants in the study demonstrated a commonality in that they were all very caring individuals. Most of the educators had experienced the challenges associated with learning a new linguistic code and navigating a new cultural landscape. As a result of this intimate knowledge, the educators were sensitive to the challenges their students were facing and were constantly looking for ways to improve their experiences. Although the desire to assist learners manifested itself in different ways, an underlying thread uniting the educators was their passion to assist their learners.

CHAPTER EIGHT: HOW DO SECOND LANGUAGE EDUCATORS UNDERSTAND 'INTERCULTURALITY'?

The focus of the current study is on investigating the transformative potential of second language education. As transformativity is an abstract concept that is difficult to directly ascertain, it has been conceptualized in this study as being related to how educators' understand two central concepts – interculturality and criticality. In other words, the manner in which interculturality and criticality are understood and embedded in one's understanding of the function of second language education will reveal the transformative potential of second language pedagogy. In this chapter, the manner in which interculturality was understood will be outlined. The hermeneutics of interculturality will not be introduced with each individual perspective in isolation, but rather by highlighting trends in how the concept was understood.

'Intercultural' is a term that has become commonplace in the second language education literature, as demonstrated by the plethora of publications addressing the topic (see Chapter Three). Despite this fact, some of the second language educators who participated in this study had had limited exposure to the term and its use within academic literature. The two educators working in a non-academic setting (Sidney and Darcy) both had familiarity with intercultural concepts as a result of extensive training they had received in accordance with their work. The training was grounded in the intercultural communication paradigm, meaning they both approached the concept from a communicative rather than pedagogical perspective. Nonetheless, the instructors in academically oriented programs had limited exposure to intercultural literature, with a few of them (most notably Carey) having been exposed to readings during their graduate studies. Despite the divergence in levels of exposure to the concept, educators surprisingly defined intercultural in relatively similar terms.

Several educators explicitly defined intercultural by breaking the term down into its component parts. For example, Jordan established a definition by breaking apart the word and defining the prefix and root. She stated: "*Inter - between. Cultural - mixing, I suppose, sharing - food sometimes, intercultural ideas, background, childhood experiences. I think that is intercultural, sharing of your culture and being open*." Robin followed a similar strategy in defining the term: "*I think the key word there might be 'inter,' the prefix. Umm, multi, more than one culture being involved and the different cultures intermingling with one another, having an effect on one another, influencing the other either in a positive or negative way*." By separating the word into its component parts both educators portrayed it as form of sharing in which individuals not only revealed their culture but also opened themselves to the culture of the other.

The dialogic character of intercultural was also emphasized by numerous other educators. Pat, who defined intercultural in pedagogical terms, defined the term in the following manner: "*As a learning process for both sides. Not as one-way for sure… So, equality comes into it, I guess. Yeah, just equality, fairness*." Equity was also a concern for Taryn in contemplating intercultural. She remarked: "*Intercultural means combining cultures in a meaningful way which doesn't make anyone feel disrespected. Working with everyone - making sure that they all feel appreciated that they are different, but they're all the same, meaning that they're all students together in this class. No one is lower, no one is higher, and no one's culture is more civilized than others… Interculturality is not that we all make everyone Canadian*." Taryn emphasized respect for all cultures, which entailed not imposing one culture on others. Rather, the meaningful combination of cultures was a process of mutual influence in which historical biases were not entertained.

In contrast to the dialogic portrayals of intercultural as the intermingling of cultures, Kelly portrayed the concept as involving cultural adaptation. She explained: "*Intercultural I think is from one culture to another culture. You can work with people from two cultures at ease, effectively.*" The ability to operate effectively in multiple cultures was not perceived as simplistic, but rather as involving intimacy with the cultures being engaged with. Kelly highlighted this fact by contrasting 'intercultural' with 'cross-cultural.' She stated: "*So, intercultural is different from cross-cultural. Intercultural requires a more intimate kind of relationship between cultures. You are working very closely and competently and effectively from one culture to another, between cultures.*"

Carey concurred with Kelly regarding the intimate nature of intercultural experiences. She claimed that most experiences people have with other cultures are not intercultural in nature because they involve engagement with another culture on a superficial level, which she labelled as an 'international experience.' She stated: "*I think, you know, there is a distinction between intercultural and international. People think that 'oh I am going to a Japanese restaurant, I am international or I am intercultural. I am having an intercultural experience.' But are you really?*" She further elaborated: "*I think that when you think about intercultural, you have to think about what is the give and take, what am I learning? ... An intercultural experience changes your perspective. It may not change your core, but it changes your understanding of the world. And I think that is what would be intercultural. Intercultural is having that fluidity, is having some flexibility and some vulnerability... and some understanding [that] what you are experiencing is a unique experience within a culture, right. It's not a check list of things.*" Carey's definition highlights the impactful nature of an intercultural experience, as it may not affect the essence of the individual, but does make a significant impact in how the individual

224

views the world. She further emphasized how intercultural experiences require 'fluidity' and 'vulnerability', emphasizing that individual attitudes and demeanours are impactful in intercultural engagement.

In contrast to the portrayal of the intercultural as dependent on one's willingness to open oneself to difference, Parker characterized intercultural engagement as a form of enculturation. She elaborated by comparing intercultural with multicultural: "*Multicultural kind of teaches the idea that you have got to accept others. You don't have to change yourself, but you have to be aware and respectful of someone, the other. Whereas interculturality is where you have to come face-to-face and you may actually have to change and adapt.*" Instead of viewing movement between cultures as a natural product of cultural engagement, Parker interpreted the movement from a negative perspective as a form of imposed change. From this perspective, cultural engagement should promote awareness, but not a change in the substance of one's worldview or culture.

Whereas culture was the central concept of change in the aforementioned definitions, communicative adaptation was the focus for some educators. For example, Sidney defined intercultural as "*just the interface between difference, so the point where meaning is made between multiple perspectives.*" According to this definition, intercultural is the location between individual viewpoints where mutual understanding is established. In elaborating how an intercultural focus affects the language classroom, Sidney stated: "*As soon as you bring intercultural into the mix then there is a lot more to it than just communication. And so there is the essence of being human and relating and engaging and meaning making on the intercultural side. Even though that is not really sort of what the constructs say in the literature. That is sort of what I see it as when I am teaching. Like when as soon as intercultural is added as a lens to*

communication then it becomes this broader thing that is more about making meaning in multiple languages too." Similarly, Mackenzie defined the concept in terms of facilitating communication: "*Well, I would say this is a way to establish connections and communicate across cultures. Well, I think [the language classroom] is kind of intercultural by default almost because most students come from different cultures so...we have a common goal of learning English but by working on that goal we almost inevitably have to share our own cultural backgrounds and try to understand and respect our differences and hopefully, find more similarities too*." Hence, for Mackenzie intercultural involves not only difference but also establishing common ground from which to build relationships.

As an isolated term, intercultural was understood by educators in a similar manner as relating to a form of movement or change. Some educators viewed the change as occurring between cultures, while others viewed it as relating to a learning process or location of meaning-making. Although most of the educators viewed the term in a positive light, Parker was skeptical about the notion of change, viewing it as an imposed rather than organic product of cultural mixing. Interestingly, no one defined it as a product of engagement between cultures.

Further insight into how educators' understand interculturality was garnered by inquiring about their perceptions of the concept when posited as a skill in the form of intercultural competence. The ability to communicate across cultural divides was postulated in broad terms by some educators. For example, Pat defined intercultural communicative competence as "*the ability to go from one culture to another... The ability to flow between cultures, which is something I have never had that much linguistically, but I think that is a good way to think of it - that word 'flow' being just a simple, easy movement so that the barriers are not stopping you and you are able to interact without a great deal of difficulty. I think that is what you are trying*

to achieve in the class." Pat believed that the ability to effectively engage in different linguistic and cultural settings was in essence the desired outcome of second language education. Thus, intercultural competence plays a central role in the outcomes of language education for her. Pat's characterization of intercultural competence as the ability to seamlessly flow between cultures generally encapsulated how most educators understood the concept. Nonetheless, whereas Pat's definition remained broad, other definitions identified a variety of skills as constituting the competence required to engage in cross-cultural communication.

Awareness of cultural difference was a characteristic of intercultural skill commonly identified. Mackenzie highlighted awareness when articulating what intercultural competence meant to her: "I *think it is basically your knowledge of other cultures and your awareness of cultural differences and similarities too, but probably also your ability to be willing to understand and to take them for what they are, and not to be stereotypically biased. Very often we like to make generalizations about entire nations or entire cultures and then we perpetuate them. But it is not a smart thing to do, I guess, because things are never black and white. So when you are making a generalization about an entire culture, it is fallacious inductive reasoning*." Thus, Mackenzie believed that the desire to open oneself to the other was an important aspect of being intercultural. She also highlighted through the definition that this could only be achieved if fallacious inductive reasoning were avoided through analyzing and questioning generalizations. An emphasis on avoiding fallacious beliefs was also articulated by Jordan: "*I think it is having an awareness and understanding that there are other cultures and viewpoints out there and not being ethnocentric, but understanding and respecting other cultures and ideas, and not having stereotypes*." For Jordan awareness was the first step in avoiding unsubstantiated beliefs about different cultures, thus facilitating productive interaction. Similar to

227

Jordan, Taryn believed that the mitigation of negative attributions was an important aspect of being interculturally competent. She defined the skill of mediating cultures as "*knowing that other people are different and not thinking that it is bad and being able to relate normally to people from other cultures.*"

While awareness is vital in intercultural engagements, Darcy also highlighted the importance of shifting perspective. She defined intercultural communicative competence in the following manner: "*So that would be the ability to interact, communicate effectively with people from different cultures and maybe shift your perspective or shift your own behaviour to try to do that more effectively.*" Thus, for Darcy effective communication was dependent on the interactants' ability to shift not only their perspective but also their behaviour to facilitate understanding. This means that intercultural interaction involves not only linguistic skill, but also cognitive and behavioural adaptation.

Part of the skill required to adapt to a new setting is the ability to acknowledge difference. According to Parker, this ability to accept difference without losing one's composure is an important characteristic of being a competent intercultural interlocutor. She explained: "*So, it would be [the ability] to function effectively in other cultures. To be able to do what you need to do… with a minimal amount of stress. If you have got that type of competence, you can function from one culture, one language to another. You may not be bilingual or bicultural but enough that you have got the skills, the adaptive skills, the tolerant skills that you can function and not be totally distressed by the differences that you are coming across.*" Adaptation to a different linguistic or cultural landscape often promotes increased stress. For Parker, developing the skill to address this stress in a productive manner while engaging in intercultural communication was an important part of intercultural competence.

A final aspect of intercultural competence that was highlighted in teachers' definitions was the importance of being humble in addressing intercultural situations. Carey highlighted this characteristic in her definition of intercultural competence as "*diplomacy and understanding the difference between international and intercultural. Not saying that you know 'I worked at the Canadian Embassy for a year so I understand you know this country I was in.' No you don't. You are still walking around with your Tim Horton's and ... watching Downton Abbey or whatever it is. You don't really understand. But to say 'this is what I learned and this is my experience and this is what I know and can contextualize it' I think is important to come out of it without stereotyping, but understanding, balancing the validity of your experience without over-generalizing.*" Carey touched on the notion of validating experience to avoid stereotyping, just as Mackenzie and Jordan had, however, she added an additional dimension with her advocacy for humility in making claims about culture. She believed that all claims to cultural knowledge must be contextualized to not only recognize the influence of perspective in making claims, but also to understand culture as a contextually-dependent, fluid concept. Therefore, the skill to mediate cultural difference, for Carey, required a humble demeanour and openness to interpret every situation as unique. This claim would seem to contradict the trend within the intercultural communicative competence literature to delineate, quantify, and assess one's competence in intercultural settings, thus portraying it as a tangible skill.

Framed as a skill, intercultural was posited in a similar fashion by respondents as the ability to effectively mediate cultural difference. Although the general sentiment about intercultural competence was comparable, educators highlighted different skills required to mediate cultural difference. A number of instructors emphasized the importance of cultural awareness and the ability to shift not only one's perspective, but also one's communication style

and behaviour to effectively engage with different interlocutors. Other educators emphasized the need to accept difference and remain humble by contextualizing knowledge.

The provision of definitions offers insight into the manner in which educators overtly understand the concepts in question. As most of the educators were not familiar with the literature on interculturality, the definitions were grounded in interpretations based on lived experiences within the classroom. This provides an alternative perspective on the meaning of interculturality and various aspects of the concept that have not been investigated in the literature. Nonetheless, 'intercultural' is a complex, multi-faceted concept; therefore, its meaning cannot be ascertained through the simple provision of a definition, but rather by investigating how it is tacitly understood and manifests itself in educators' teaching philosophy and classroom practices. As a result, gaging how interculturality is understood can only be ascertained by investigating the contours of language pedagogy that subtly reveal the intercultural nature of educators' work.

As the root of the term 'intercultural', culture is a concept that has a significant bearing on the manifestation of intercultural discourses. Culture is a complex, amorphous concept that is difficult to articulate. The fluid character of the concept was evident in the divergent definitions provided by participants. A number of the respondents adopted a view of culture that was obviously strongly influenced by their work as second language educators. These educators portrayed culture as the behaviours individuals assume in interacting with others. For example, Robin articulated: "*What is culture? Culture involves many aspects of life - the way you express yourself, the way you communicate, the way you interact...Culture could be affected by something that has been done for centuries or could be something that [is] modern. It could be an expression of what one group is like and then a different group might express things*

230

differently… Some things are misinterpreted I suppose; things that are acceptable there, but not acceptable here." In this definition, Robin highlighted how culture is not limited by time, as cultural manifestations may have a long history or may be the product of recent developments. Furthermore, Robin portrayed culture as the behaviours demonstrated by individuals in interacting with others, but also an interpretive frame in comprehending communication. Culture was portrayed in a similar manner by Jordan who stated, "*Culture is a way a certain group of people conduct themselves in given situations, how they listen and respond accordingly.*"

In addition to highlighting the influence of culture on interaction, Jordan also portrayed culture as tangible aspects of daily life. She claimed that culture "*can refer to food, language, customs.*" The common attribution of culture as tangible products of particular groups was further supported by Mackenzie. She portrayed culture as the evolutionary processes undertaken by societies and their resultant products. She explained: "*So, in a more specific sense, I think culture is everything we create as a society and that could be many different things ranging from literature to music to architecture to ideas to technology - pretty much everything. And then a more abstract way, this would probably be our achievement that could probably be placed historically as a society on the whole; like everything we've created and the way we develop, the way we're building our civilization. So, all of this could be called our cultural heritage.*" In both her specific and abstract definitions of culture, Mackenzie portrayed the concept as the tangible results of societal development. Although she acknowledged ideas as cultural artifacts, most of the examples provided constituted material achievements, leaving the impression that culture manifests itself in tangible products.

In contrast, a number of educators portrayed culture as a cognitive entity. For example, Sidney described culture in the following manner: "*Culture is a set of values and beliefs and*

attitudes that are, you know, demonstrated in the behaviours of a group of people... so, a set of shared values, beliefs and attitudes of a group of people." Similarly, Darcy defined culture as "*the shared beliefs and values and traditions of a group of people that would influence their behaviour and world view.*" In both these portrayals, culture is a mental construct that reveals itself through the actions of individuals from a particular group.

While the aforementioned definitions focused on culture as either the products of societal development or mental constructs influencing how the world is perceived, a number of respondents portrayed the concept in broader terms. Carey portrayed culture as "*shared history*" and "*a shared body of knowledge.*" This broad definition recognizes culture as including shared experiences and knowledge, which inevitably leads to a shared identity. Similarly, Kelly defined the concept in the following manner: "*Culture is everything - history, architecture, language, food, clothes, politics, law, everything that all people believe in practicing and following.*" This definition incorporates tangible aspects of culture, such as the food and clothing, but also acknowledges the influence of culture on individual's beliefs. Parker took the definition one step further to highlight that the products and beliefs of a particular culture are transmitted to future generations. She exclaimed: "*Culture is an expression of history, language, religion, political thought, all rolled together into a ball of wax that we transmute to the next generation.*" In this definition, Parker recognized the complexity of culture by identifying it as an expression of numerous factors that assumes different forms. In this way, she portrayed it as a concept that cannot be utilized in the singular form, but must be recognized as constantly evolving and revealing itself in different forms.

The amorphous character of the concept, as revealed through the divergent definitions provided for culture, led some educators to question its utility. Sidney lamented that culture is so

dependent upon other factors that it is difficult to precisely identify in daily life. She explained:

"*... when I think about it on a day-to-day level, like it is hard to say what it is because I think ....it is influenced by context, it is influenced by power relationships, it is influenced by political ideologies. It is sometimes more than just a group norm and sometimes hard to narrow down a group norm to something that simplistic. So, I don't know. Like in a lot of ways I don't even know if it really exists*.*" Sidney recognized the importance of culture in influencing how people interact and view the world; however, she struggled to engage with it as an isolated entity because of its interdependence with contextual factors. This led her to question the very existence of culture. Carey also struggled with the indeterminate, fluctuating character of culture:

"*What is culture? I don't know. Like actually, I don't know. I really, I struggle with that. Because you can change so easily and it is like well what part of me is really [American] or [Asian] or Canadian or whatever? Like, I don't know. What makes a Chinese person, Chinese? I can't say. What makes China, China? I don't know, right. It seems to me that it is very tied into the notion of race still, right. It is still very visual. It is like you look like this person, so I expect you to act like this person*.*" Although she struggled with the exact character of culture, she viewed it as being commonly associated with visual cues such as race. In establishing this relationship, Carey portrayed culture as externally imposed inhibiting norms.

Despite the divergent definitions provided and skepticism about the utility of the concept, educators unanimously recognized the importance of culture in second language education because of the close relationship between language and culture. Pat relayed: "*Obviously culture is part of language...the two are so strongly connected that you cannot do one without the other*.*" Mackenzie concurred, claiming that "*language is so deeply ingrained in culture and, probably vice versa. Culture is also inherent in language that if we're trying to teach language, it is just*

almost impossible to imagine [it] without culture." Kelly expressed the same sentiment in more metaphorical terms: "*I just think that culture is the meat or the flesh and like the language is the bone - you have to have the content to go with it… every single word is heavily loaded in culture … Because of the intimate relationship, learning a language you have to learn the culture because the culture just comes with the language and when you learn the language you need to respect the culture and follow the cultural norms and be part of it.*" For these educators, any attempt to separate language and culture would be futile because of their integrated nature.

The inseparability of language and culture was further demonstrated by Parker in her attempt to theorize how the separation could be achieved. She explicated: "*Well, in practical everyday life it is very hard to divorce them. I mean again if you, let's say you've decided as an academic endeavour that you're going to learn Latin or Ancient Acadian or Ancient Samarian, you could technically just study it as … just the language and pull it apart. But even there that's kind of hard to do because there is usually an aspect of culture that you've got to learn about the context and the history of that particular language, even though it's a dead language nobody speaks it. But, even there it's hard to divorce. I mean those are the only situations where I can think you could divorce the culture from the language and even there it would be really hard to do. Because to learn the language, to understand what's being said, you have to kind of know a little about the history of the people that actually used it when it was an actual language. So, I don't think you can divorce the two. I think they are part of the whole package.*" Hence, even with languages that are no longer used, Parker believed that cultural knowledge would be essential in accurately conveying and comprehending messages.

The significance of culture in facilitating communication was also taken up by Robin. She exclaimed: "*I think it is a strong relationship in the way and how direct you say something*

how much you elaborate on something. In some cases you want to elaborate, like in an essay ... whereas in a different culture their acceptable way of writing it is not to elaborate on it but to go in circles around it." Robin elaborated on the concept by expressing how some students she had encountered would provide very specific details in explaining their absence from class. One example she shared was the following message sent from an international student to a Canadian professor: "*Hi Professor, I have diarrhea today and I can't show up.*" Robin attributed the specificity provided as a cultural manifestation that would not be well received in a Canadian setting. As a result, she concluded that "*the nuance of the language is related to culture.*" In addition to the content of messages, educators also highlighted culture as an important factor influencing the manner in which messages were relayed. Jordan highlighted the manner in which culture influences how presentations are given. She stated: "*I have seen these presentations in China again or Japan ... and they stand and they read like this (she imitates reading from a piece of paper). So boring! I mean it is a cultural thing and I ask the students what did you think of this presentation, the one that I was falling asleep in? 'Oh I thought it was very interesting, engaging.' Really, because I want to fall asleep. And when they speak there is no intonation and stress or heart ... So, I think that is Canadian culture.*"

The relationship between culture and language was not portrayed in a uni-directional manner. Sidney highlighted that culture inevitably has an influence on language, but language also influences the development of particular cultures. She offered: "*I think culture informs language use. So I think where you grow up, the systems you grow up in, the people you interact with and make meaning with, and our own interests and whatever your own beliefs all influence how you use language. And I think all of that comes through. And so I guess culture in that way informs language use. But I know that there's a feedback loop too, between the two. Well I think*

cultures can be defined by language sometimes like sort of the valley girl speak." Therefore, Sidney recognized that contextualized culture influences the way we use language, but that language also defines groups culturally, whether established through geographical differences, generational differences, etc.

Although acknowledging the close relationship between culture and language, Taryn questioned the one-to-one association between cultures and languages. She skeptically responded to a question about the relationship between culture and language by stating: "*Sometimes overstated because a lot of languages span cultures and cultures span languages. So I would say the simplistic way many people see it as you know different culture, different language. That's not like it at all. Sometimes you have five different languages in the same head. It doesn't mean that the person has five different cultures usually. You just need to understand that language is an important part of culture, but it's not everything. It's a wonderful gateway into a lot of things that will get you into deeper culture but just knowing the language doesn't mean you know the culture. Just like the opposite, you know. Just because you know Mexican national costume doesn't mean you know anything about Mexico really. And you definitely don't know Spanish. So the relationship is very intricate.*" Taryn recognized the dialogic influence of culture and language, but questioned the close relationship often assumed to exist between the two concepts. Her understanding blends well with the post-modern character of the current world, as individuals often mediate numerous cultures using one language and use multiple languages while maintaining association with a core culture.

The unanimously recognized close association between language and culture means that culture cannot be ignored as a central concept in second language pedagogy. Therefore, although numerous participants were skeptical about the meaning and utility of culture, a sentiment shared

by numerous scholars (e.g., Wallerstein, 1999), the amorphous character of the concept must be contended with in second language education. This means that educators' understanding about the various dimensions of culture and their influence on pedagogy are even more important as determinants of pedagogical practices and must be thoroughly investigated.

One important consideration is the specific type of culture that is deemed important to be included in the language classroom. As the majority of the educators included in the research sample work in an academic setting, it was not surprising that many of them focused on developing academic culture within the classroom. Some educators explicitly focused on academic culture as the only relevant form of culture to be addressed within the language classroom. For example, Pat stated: "*We are not really directly involved with culture and learning about culture. We have a very specific program, which is building language for a specific purpose... I would argue for us most important is academic culture. [Students] are obviously picking up a lot of culture from all around them and in the classroom as well. And that is all good, but I do not think it is part of the curriculum and it is not, as I say, explicit. Ok, but academic culture is explicit within our program and needs to be and that is a specific culture, specific part of Canadian culture*." Pat acknowledged that awareness about general Canadian culture would be implicitly developed through classroom activities, but argued against its overt inclusion, as it did not directly fit into the program objectives. In contrast, she recognized the academic culture of a Canadian university as being unique from other academic settings and advocated for it as the primary focus of cultural instruction.

Other instructors did not frame the inclusion of culture in strictly academic terms, but advocated for culture to be addressed as a means to enhance the academic experience. For some instructors, this involved familiarizing students with Canadian cultural expectations. For

example, Jordan claimed: "*I think a lot of what I do here is try to imply certain Canadian cultural ideologies, for example, lateness. Like in some cultures it is thoroughly okay, the South Americans are always strolling in five, ten minutes late. And I always... try to convey the fact that it is rude, it is disruptive, it does not go over well here. You know culturally you should always arrive five minutes early, not be late. Sleeping in class is another. I think it is frowned upon in this culture, but I know in Japan it is acceptable for students to put their heads down and sleep. Yeah, so it is academic culture right, cultural expectations come into play.*" In addition to addressing expected behaviour within particular cultural settings, some instructors highlighted the importance of clarifying cultural differences in the products of academic work. Robin stressed the importance of introducing cultural content that would contribute to understanding texts used in class. In responding to a prompt about the type of culture that should be addressed, she stated: "*Those things that will help them to understand, comprehend... their reading text, listening text, the audio… looking at different ways that the essay is organized in different cultures, the circular one or whatever, the diagram I can't remember is the classic one. It could be that, that is where culture could be taught. English is more direct in writing essays.*" Different writing styles and ways of expressing ideas between cultures were viewed by Robin as a major impediment to academic success. As a result, she believed that students needed to be explicitly introduced to these cultural differences in order to facilitate their adaptation to a new way of conveying ideas. Robin further added: "*You can help them to understand their textbooks, their instructor, their classmates better. It might help them with their experiences here, their overall experience. If you are having a positive experience here and can understand the culture better, then maybe your academic results are better, your academic experience is better.*" Thus, Robin

advocated for developing general cultural familiarity as a means to indirectly foster academic success.

For other instructors, culture was included as a means to establish common bonds between learners in order to create a productive learning environment. Parker was a staunch advocate of this stating that she "*would start with the local culture because that is what they are experiencing right now… But even with the local, I try to keep the global or generational culture so that the students can interact and relate to each other so they can find some commonality to start and to build that trust in the classroom*." Thus, Parker used common cultural threads, most notably the culture of technology and pop culture, to draw learners together and identify commonalities from which a sense of security could be established, thus facilitating further learning. Similarly, Robin viewed culture as an important ingredient in the success of a language classroom. She explained: "*So the culture in the classroom, it can help in different ways. You know, make the students learn better, get the instructor to understand the students better, students can feel that the instructor understands them better... various aspects I think would be helpful because of the awareness of culture and maybe using it in some way in the classroom*." In this way, Parker and Robin tried to build a common culture within the classroom to facilitate learning.

The importance attributed to culture as a factor contributing to the efficiency of learning in the language classroom caused numerous instructors to highlight the importance of cultural sensitivity for instructors. Robin advocated: "*Yeah, [cultural sensitivity] is pretty important. It is one of the most important things to consider as an instructor or in developing a program*." Robin believed that cultural sensitivity was necessary to ensure the appropriate selection of content (i.e., content that is not offensive or laden with western bias) and respectful treatment of learners.

Parker also advocated for the importance of cultural sensitivity, emphasizing its importance among novice educators: "*So, when you are first starting teaching, I think that cultural pedagogy may need to be more explicit and actually taught. Because I have met quite a few instructors that - because either they have not traveled, they do not themselves speak a second language or again had never really thought about it – do not always have that cultural sensitivity... So if you have got instructors who have not had that background, I think it needs to be a strong part and explicitly taught - not so much for the students but for the teachers and you have got to be aware of this when you are going into the classroom*." The emphasis on cultural sensitivity for instructors, rather than students, was echoed by Pat: "*I think the important part of culture within our program is that teachers are very, very aware of all the cultural issues that they meet in the classroom. In that sense it is cultural learning for the instructor*." She further added: "*You cannot function without [cultural sensitivity]. Students can function a little bit, teachers cannot. So I would suggest it is more important for teachers, it is essential for teachers. Students can trip and make some stumbles, they can learn the process because they are younger, they are learning, they are learning lots of things, but teachers, I think it has to be there before they begin*." Thus, cultural sensitivity was deemed to be less important for students than educators, for whom it was perceived to be essential to avoid cultural mishaps in the classroom. Despite the importance attributed to cultural sensitivity, Robin lamented: "*I don't know if it is always taken into consideration by instructors in general*."

While many of the language educators advocated for including cultural content that would assist in academic endeavours, some also commented on incorporating culture to assist adaptation to Canadian society. A number of respondents touched on including "*Canadiana*" or objective aspects of culture in their teaching. For example, Darcy explained that she includes a

considerable amount of information about Canadian symbols and festivals in her instruction because it assists with adapting to a new setting. She exclaimed: "*I think it depends on the context because in the ESL setting they are coming here and so we focus a lot on Canadian culture… I think in an ideal world if you had lots of time, you would teach all that objective stuff, like you need to know the symbols and you know all the festivals and all that kind of stuff.*" She further continued: "*But I think it would be really great to spend more time on the subjective stuff, values, and why do we say it like that and really question things.*" Darcy continued to provide an example where cultural investigation would be useful: "*And language the way that Canadians use it and you know even words like 'toque' and all that kind of stuff.*" Therefore, Darcy believed it would be beneficial for learners to not only learn about factual aspects of Canadian culture, but also to explore nuances of Canadian culture and Canadian uses of language.

Focusing on Canadian culture was natural for Darcy, as she taught in a program that mandated its inclusion; however, instructors working in academic-based programs also viewed cultural adaptation as an important by-product of their work in the language classroom. Taryn believed it was important to develop the cultural knowledge of students in order to avoid awkward situations. She articulated: "*You need to be able to not just go and buy bread, but you need to be able to discuss things you know. Even having such a simple thing as knowing how to do small talk is important because otherwise people will be uncomfortable in front of you and will avoid you.*" Taryn recognized the importance of social nuance in human engagement and the significance of establishing connections in order to more thoroughly enjoy life and achieve professional success. Therefore, she believed cultural competence should be developed to facilitate engagement.

Several other educators agreed with the importance of introducing Canadian culture in the classroom; however, they favoured its introduction in coordination with other cultures represented by the students. Robin sought to draw on the cultural diversity within her class to promote learning. She exclaimed: "*The students' culture - I think it adds the diversity… It is better if you have students from different backgrounds and that can make things more stimulating. Some of the stimulating conversations we can have is 'okay what is it like in that country, and that country, in that culture and that culture?' It is nice to get that representation especially if you divide them into groups, groups of four and four different groups, sixteen students and maybe each group might have somebody from a different culture and they all give their ideas… Oh yeah, that makes it more interesting and students can learn from other cultures, be tolerant of other cultures, guide them in that direction. You bring it up, not focus just on Western culture.*" The cultural diversity apparent in most ESL classes, thus, facilitated productive dialogue that Robin sought to exploit.

Promoting a balance between introducing Canadian culture and drawing on students' culture was also advocated by Mackenzie. She proclaimed: "*I would probably strive for a more or less decent balance between Canadian - because Canadian is in the textbook. So, we read about hockey, we read about the Canadian provinces a little or Canadian history, the political system, so on and so forth - but if there is a way for me to incorporate other cultures, I would do that too. For example, when students make their presentations, they would inevitably talk about their own culture. So, for example, one thing that I like to do is a presentation about music... I give them freedom to choose what they want to do but I ask them to try and cover something that is specific to the culture they come from.*" Therefore, the decision to balance the cultures represented was influenced by the textbooks utilized in the class, but also Mackenzie's belief that

242

utilizing cultural diversity could promote a productive learning environment. This sentiment was also supported by Jordan. Similar to Mackenzie, Jordan explicitly sought to utilize the cultural diversity within ESL classrooms to enhance understanding about various cultures. She explained: "*I always try to include all the cultures – what is your experience like? In the blogs they often blog about their own cultural background experience on a given topic - that is always interesting. Definitely, it is important to incorporate their cultures so that they can see the differences and not to say that one is better than the other, but to acknowledge the differences and for a lot of them they come from a homogeneous culture, so just to be aware of some of the social innuendos and cultures of other people and how they would engage with each other*." Jordan recognized the pedagogical benefit of drawing on students' cultural background; however, she also realized that promoting cross-cultural dialogue would better prepare learners for engaging in a multicultural society, in particular learners who had not encountered cultural diversity in the past.

Whereas Jordan, Mackenzie, and Robin advocated for including students' culture as a means to foster cross-cultural awareness, other educators viewed cultural exploration as playing a more central role in the second language classroom. Sidney believed that culture should be at the center of the language classroom providing the content through which linguistic skills are developed. She articulated: "*In my view I think [culture] should be the only thing we ever really talk about. So through all the four skills you just explore culture and everything that it is and has been and could be*." Furthermore, Sidney highlighted that culture not be treated as an object of investigation, but rather as a living entity that humans mould. In rationalizing this approach, Sidney explained: "*Well I just think that through that you understand the way you make meaning in the world and I just think understanding yourself so that you can connect and relate to others,*

there is not much more to life really. Like to me that is the most nourishing experience as a human being when I can connect to someone by meaning making about something." Hence, Sidney advocated for cultural exploration in the language classroom not for pragmatic ends, but as a means to enhance human experience. The focus of the culture of investigation was indeterminate, negotiated by the individuals involved in the exploration.

Although less prominence was given to cultural exploration, other educators also viewed the second language classroom as a location for cultural consideration. These educators viewed the association between English and English native-speaking countries to be too narrow in a context where English has become a *lingua franca*. As a consequence, they did not believe that cultures associated with linguistic communities should be the exclusive focus of the language classroom, but rather that second language education provided a prime venue for general cultural investigation. One educator who adopted a particularly strong perspective on the global character of the second language classroom was Carey. In response to a question pertaining to the culture that should be taught, she stated: "*Every culture. Every culture. I do not think just because you are learning English means that you can only learn about English speaking countries. We live in a very interconnected world and I think English is a window to learn about other cultures and you should take advantage of that, right. So I do not think that it should just be one culture. I think it is a tool to learn more about others.*" Thus, Carey viewed ESL education as a means to better understand the world in general and not just countries in which the language is spoken. This sentiment was shared by Kelly: "*Because the world language is English, so basically all cultures should be included in [ESL instruction] because it does not belong to an English native-speaking country anymore. So, all cultures should be respected and equally included.*" She advocated for cultural exploration to occur in a particular manner: "*I usually start with the*

students' own culture, because for newcomers, they need to transition from their past, to their present and then to the future… So now living in a foreign country gives them an opportunity to look at their culture from a new perspective." Kelly believed it was important to begin with learners' culture as a means to promote comfort and assist in the transition process. Comparison between learners' culture and the culture of the new context was believed to further assist this transition process by aiding them in navigating the cultural divide. Nonetheless, Kelly believed it was important to move beyond the narrow scope of isolated cultures to include a more global perspective.

While the form of culture ideally addressed in class varied according to the instructor, so did the manner in which it was addressed. Several instructors philosophized that the intricate relationship between language and culture meant that culture was inherently omnipresent in the language classroom and, thus, did not need to be explicitly addressed. Taryn strongly subscribed to this perspective: "*It is basically everything. That is what you are teaching because communication is culture, so if you are teaching people how to communicate, you are teaching them, bit-by-bit you are teaching them culture. You are sharing your personal culture, you are sharing what you know about the city, sharing what you know about the country and about how people communicate here. So culture is what you are teaching. Everything that a language teacher teaches is culture.*" Parker concurred with this sentiment: "*Whether it is fun cultural activities or anything that you are doing in society is part of the culture. I mean it is more than just words, you know it is around us all the way whether we have chosen to paint this room green versus shocking pink, you know there is a cultural aspect to that too. It is so much part of the class… for me it would be how do you divorce it from the classroom?*" Thus, culture was ingrained in everything that is done in the language classroom, whether learning the language

245

itself or simply being in a setting with a distinctive culture of its own. Based on this belief, culture was not identified as content that required planned integration on the part of the teacher. In fact, Taryn had a negative view of the explicit inclusion of culture stating: "*I never teach culture. I never make it a point 'I am teaching culture.' That is horrible you know*."

Based on an alternative rationale, other educators also avoided explicitly integrating culture into the second language curriculum. For these educators, culture was only deemed relevant if it affected performance within the classroom. For example, Robin believed that culture should be addressed when it is a source of misunderstanding. As a result, culture pedagogy would consist of teachable moments that arise during the course of instruction. Robin stated: "*[Culture] certainly has a role. It just depends what is being taught. Sometimes the culture aspect just comes up naturally. There are certain readings [where] understanding the North American culture is going to help them*." The unpredictable nature of culture, in particular in a multicultural setting, also meant that the planned integration of culture was problematic. Robin continued: "*Some of it is teachable moments because quite often you do not know it is going to be related to their misunderstanding or their struggle is related to culture. Then they bring something up you did not know that it would be a problem, so it is a teachable moment*." This caused her to conclude: "*What kind of culture should be taught - incidental things that come up*."

For other educators, cultural content should be explicitly included in the curriculum. These educators postulated culture as a critical ingredient in fostering understanding. Mackenzie stated: "*I think it has to be naturally incorporated… it has to be an integral part of what you are doing because otherwise it is like you are only teaching the subject matter, but you are not teaching them 'how to fish' or how to learn*." Hence, Mackenzie equated language pedagogy

without cultural instruction as a form of providing individuals with fish, rather than teaching them how to fish. Based on this analogy, multi-cultural knowledge provides the foundation from which to extrapolate meaning in different contexts. Carey offered a similar perspective on the inclusion of culture: "*Instead of trying to educate them about Wayne Gretzky, you try to get them to understand the concept so that when they are coming across these things they can use their own [knowledge], it activates their own background knowledge.*" In this statement, Carey demonstrated that knowledge about specific, tangible aspects of culture (such as Wayne Gretzky in Canadian or hockey culture) is less important than the general cultural knowledge and skills needed to acquire conceptual clarity. From this perspective the teaching of tangible, objective aspects of culture is less important than investigating the subtle ways that culture influences perception and comprehension.

The subtle character of these less tangible aspects of culture meant that they needed to be addressed with students in an explicit manner. Kelly relayed: "*The cultural thing, that is so subtle… In my teaching I always try by all means to help them be aware of the necessity of learning soft skills… like people skills - communication skill, and intercultural communication, problem solving like talking, working with people… Everything needs to be explicitly expressed, yeah, because students they may not be aware. If you make them aware their learning becomes easier and more meaningful and applicable, more relevant.*" Kelly had experienced numerous situations where misunderstandings arose as a result of a lack of knowledge about soft skills related to culture. As a result, she perceived the explicit inclusion of soft skills as essential to promoting the success of students. Sidney concurred stating: "*There are, you know, arguments for and against [culture] being the fifth skill in a lot of the literature, that it should just be implicit in everything and I sort buy into that more. But I think it needs to be always a part of any*

sort of discussion and if it is not, then you should be wondering why?" Recognizing the debate within the literature surrounding the role of culture in the language classroom, Sidney espoused not treating culture as separate content, but rather explicitly integrating it into all aspects of language instruction.

The unique character of mediating cultural difference also caused some educators to advocate for special conditions to be developed within the classroom. One condition was the promotion of experiential learning. Taryn advocated that the special character of cross-cultural engagement meant that didactic approaches to instruction were insufficient. In contrast, she advocated for the creation of experiences that would assist learners in developing the skill to negotiate difference. She articulated: "*Just because you tell a person to be tolerant, they don't become tolerant. And just because you tell a person 'oh in Canada we have lots of different cultures' doesn't mean that the person will appreciate that. You have to come into contact.*" As a result, experiences that challenge students to mitigate cultural difference were deemed by Taryn to be of value in the language classroom.

Another condition introduced was the inclusion and exploration of emotions. Intercultural situations inherently involve emotions, as humans are emotionally attached to their cultural affiliations and intimately linked to the circumstances that have brought about the cross-cultural engagement. Nonetheless, Sidney believed that the emphasis on rational thinking in the West has undermined the value attributed to developing emotional intelligence. She explained: "*I think, you know, it is the one thing that we can do that other animals cannot - make meaning out of difference - and I do not think very many people in the [western] world are good at it because we do not value emotional intelligence...we do not make meaning of feelings.*" Nonetheless, she believed it was an essential skill to develop not only to build a conducive learning environment,

but also to facilitate negotiating cultural divides. She elaborated: "*But I mean when power is involved, feelings are there… and you know like second language learners living in Canada have feelings about why they are here and why they came and if they are not allowed to explore those, it is hard to build trust*." Hence, Sidney believed that attention should be dedicated to exploring learners' emotions and developing the ability to derive meaning from human emotion.

The importance of including multiple perspectives in the language classroom was rationalized by instructors in diverse ways. Although there was a strong pragmatic focus on the development of intercultural skills to enable adaptation within society and foster a more productive learning environment in the classroom, many viewed addressing intercultural themes as a means to achieve broader goals. For a number of educators intercultural engagement fostered greater awareness and, thus, understanding of one's own and others' cultures. For example, Taryn highlighted how intellectual growth occurred when one's meaning making system was challenged by culturally different ways of looking at the world. She stated: "*[Learning an additional language] really helps the mind, it really trains your intellect for other things because suddenly your cultural system is not sufficient to understand something else*." Intercultural engagement inherent in the second language classroom, thus, fostered cognitive growth by forcing individuals to move beyond the associations cultivated in their own culture. Kelly subscribed to a similar view, advocating that cultural clash was essential to broadening one's understanding. She relayed how she used the movie *The Pursuit of Happiness* to challenge the cultural beliefs of her Chinese students. Whereas her Chinese students believed in the importance of collective responsibility, meaning the heads of organizations feel a sense of responsibility for their employees, the movie succinctly demonstrates the individualistic character of North American institutions. As a result, she stated: "*So, I just remind them that*

don't assume that your fate has to be taken care of by others and that your well-being is others'
responsibility... So there is a little bit of cultural difference and also different perspectives of
looking at leaders or those in power." By exposing learners to different cultural perspectives, in
particular those associated with social interaction within organizations, Kelly believed her
students' intellectual resources would be expanded.

Challenging embedded cultural norms was not only viewed as a means to foster
intellectual growth, but also to challenge erroneous assumptions. Kelly believed that many
students carry with them a sense of cultural superiority based on the wealth of their nation
compared to others. She expressed the conviction that a strong sense of cultural chauvinism
exists in numerous cultures, including the Chinese culture, which she has experienced in an
intimate manner. She stated: "A*lthough China has never been totally colonized, the colonist*
mind set is still very strong, so white supremacy is pretty dominant." According to Kelly, this
mindset has contributed to a condescending view of countries that are not wealthy or politically
powerful. In response, she has attempted to bring into question the assumptions associated with
this viewpoint: "*I do mention this to promote awareness because this is against my belief; an*
individual deserves dignity and respect no matter how much they have." The most powerful way
of challenging embedded assumptions and encouraging respect according to Kelly was to create
an environment of intercultural exploration.

The importance of dispelling myths and challenging tacit assumptions was also addressed
by other educators. For example, Jordan highlighted the following characteristics of developing
interculturality: "*It is choosing your words carefully, I think, and making sure you are not biased*
towards certain cultures, dispelling myths and stereotypes about certain cultures." She believed
intercultural engagement, when properly guided by the instructor, would challenge biases and

dispel myths by confronting long-standing assumptions. Therefore, she perceived the power of first-hand engagement as being adequate to bring tacit assumptions under investigation. The power of intercultural engagement to reveal unproductive assumptions was also supported by Mackenzie. She articulated: "*We can have this discussion where we can first learn about differences and then be able to understand and to kind of get rid of some of the biases that we inevitably carry with us.*" The exchange of ideas not only challenged tacit assumptions but also included a productive dimension. Mackenzie stated: "*A cultural exchange becomes kind of prolific and productive.*" Thus, the product of intercultural engagement was deleterious and constructive at the same time.

Although interculturality was widely viewed as having a powerful, positive influence in transforming second language learning to be more than the simple acquisition of linguistic codes, some educators were sceptical about its benefits. As previously mentioned, Parker perceived intercultural engagement as a form of forced change. She was a staunch proponent of engagement between cultures, but believed that change should be dictated by each individual. Operating on the assumption that change can be avoided, Parker thus viewed intercultural engagement as a negative phenomenon involving manipulation.

Moreover, a number of educators noted that interculturality is not pervasive in the core substance of second language education. They noted that although it may be a growing trend in academic literature, its influence in the literature used by practitioners is limited. This caused Mackenzie to state: "*Well, see I think it's kind of popular but… it's more of a fad. You know what I mean? So it's like everybody keeps talking about that but then few people actually do it, or pay enough attention to it in reality. So it's kind of like you know we all like to do lip service and most people know the term and they would be inclined to use it every now and then but then do*

we actually incorporate this into what we do in the classroom? Probably not." Thus, Mackenzie equated interest in interculturality with the trend towards bandwagon jumping in the second language teaching profession (Grittner, 1990) rather than a paradigmatic shift that would see interculturality become embedded within the fabric of second language pedagogy. Perceived as a fad, Mackenzie was sceptical about the meaningfulness of interculturality, as she viewed it as an academically inspired concept rather than a concept that could shape the structure of second language classrooms.

While Mackenzie was sceptical about the influence of interculturality, Taryn viewed the concept in negative terms Similar to Mackenzie, Taryn viewed interculturality as a concept with more theoretical than practical value. She stated: "*I always find it difficult to operate with those things [intercultural competences] because I think they are more for theory.*" She explained that the obscure character of the concept meant "*most teachers will have no idea what to do with this.*" Furthermore, focusing on intercultural competence, Taryn identified numerous issues. First, she believed the literature on intercultural competence oversimplified intercultural engagement. She described the typical language classroom as an "*intercultural classroom, a difficult classroom with different ages and different genders and all of this. You will never know how many things are all mixed-up together.*" The number of variables at play in the language classroom were not perceived as important considerations by those writing within the intercultural competence paradigm. According to Taryn, this has led to intercultural competence becoming a form of stereotyping. She claimed that emphasis on particular characteristics without consideration for individual differences has led to the perspective that "*Oh, he is from Mexico, so I know everything about him. You know, he is from China, so I should be careful about this and this.*" The presentation of intercultural heterogeneity and intracultural homogeneity typical of

many intercultural dichotomies was problematic for Taryn because in reality people "*do not fit into categories*."

Second, Taryn believed the complexity of intercultural engagement meant incorporating intercultural competence as a goal in the second language classroom was futile. She confidently relayed: "*As I said, it is impossible to teach. You don't teach culture, you don't teach intercultural communication… that is really not something you can teach, but it is something that comes with time*." The ability to adapt to different situations was not perceived as something that could be productively fostered in the classroom because of the numerous variables involved, but rather as a skill to be developed through exposure and experience. Similarly, Taryn believed assessing intercultural competence was futile because the ability to adapt was contextually dependent and not inherently ingrained. She explained: "*You don't scale your students on intercultural competence or anything like this. It fluctuates a lot. Sometimes the most tolerant person can say something racist*." In making this statement, Taryn acknowledged cultural sensitivity as a dialogic process that is equally dependent on interlocutors' interpretations as it is on one's ability to adapt to different situations.

Third, Taryn believed intercultural competence created a barrier between individuals by emphasizing differences. Taryn viewed the emphasis on developing intercultural competence as admonishing cultural difference as an obstacle to be avoided. She clarified: "*We keep talking about intercultural competence as if it is this huge monster and people keep thinking 'oh, it is very difficult, it is very difficult, it is so dangerous. I do not understand these people from other countries.' Just don't think about them as people from other countries. Think about them as people and then other things add up*." She further elaborated: "*You should not tell people 'oh, you should be interculturally competent.' By this you are just stressing their differences. We*

should not stress differences. We should stress similarities." The emphasis on difference through the promotion of intercultural competence was thus viewed as de-emphasizing similarities and undermining the ability of learners to establish connections.

A final aspect that provides insight into educators' understanding about interculturality is the barriers to implementation that were identified. The most common obstacles highlighted by educators were the structure of the program in which they were working and norms within the field of second language education itself. For some educators, the incorporation of interculturality was problematic because it did not fit within the core goals of the course. In discussing the English for academic purposes program in which she worked, Pat stated: "*We are not really directly involved with culture and learning about culture. We have a very specific program, which is building language for a specific purpose*." The fact that intercultural engagement was not highlighted as an explicit goal of the program also meant that it was not included in assessment practices. Robin claimed this had an influence on her teaching practices, even if she tried to avoid teaching towards the test. She articulated: "*I think in the whole program we have freedom to focus on some things that we feel are important but there is that final exam that's facing us all the time. I don't think any of us would really say that we teach toward the final exam. Maybe some students because they are so test-oriented would want us to teach towards the final exam, controlling you in some way. So there is the reading in the final exam, there is the listening in the final exam, and there is the essay they have to write in the final exam. It is not directly related to this cultural problem*." Hence, accountability to prepare students for completing course requirements that did not include intercultural engagement undermined its inclusion.

Accountability to cover particular material was also an impediment to the incorporation of interculturality. Darcy contended the program in which she worked had strict regulations about the coverage of prescribed materials. Not only was she responsible to cover the materials provided in the textbooks assigned to the course, but also to conduct assessments that she deemed time-consuming and onerous. As a result, even though she had taken a course about developing intercultural communicative competence in the second language classroom and she had many ideas for its incorporation, she did not feel she could justify the time needed to develop these skills. In reflecting upon the influence of the course on her teaching, she lamented: "*I'm kind of a hypocrite because then I go into the classroom and I think about how much of that I actually do. You know I do the typical like what is it like in your culture and some comparisons and what do you think about that, but actually spending time, really focusing on that and kind of delving into it - I cannot say that I have. So I think about it and I want to, the motivation is there, but it just doesn't happen.*" When asked about the reasons for the absence, she responded: "*Just the time, yeah, because I don't get through the stuff I need to get through so there is no way that I can just devote you know an hour here or a half an hour there for that when I am already behind.*" Thus, the structure of the curriculum mitigated the incorporation of interculturality, even when the instructor had received training on how to implement it and was predisposed to its inclusion.

The foci in second language education also posed an impediment to the implementation of interculturality. As the name denotes, second language education has focused on the development of linguistic skills. The focus on language skill development, which is not an end in itself but rather a means to facilitate other goals, has resulted in a narrow focus amongst second language educators according to Mackenzie. In reflecting upon the integration of interculturality

in her teaching, she stated: "*Not often. Honestly, not often. Cause again this kind of drive for this impetus to do language, language, language and make sure that they don't make mistakes or that their grammar is correct, sometimes overshadows the other important objectives like these*." Even when cultural engagement is emphasized in second language pedagogy, the focus has often been on superficial elements, rather than meaningful intercultural engagement. Carey expressed: "*I really do think when they say 'intercultural' they do mean 'international' in second language education. It is not about adapting that culture or internalizing that culture, it is about gaining knowledge about what is important in that country and you remember that. That is part or your knowledge and it is supposed to add to your appreciation. But I don't know if it is really aimed at changing your world*." According to Carey, the field of second language education has emphasized knowledge about different cultures as opposed to engagement with cultures. This emphasis has become engrained in discourses surrounding the second language curricula, making it more difficult for alternative approaches to be adopted.

Summary

In summation, culture (understood most commonly as shared behaviours, values, and beliefs) was unanimously identified as an important concept in the second language classroom because of its close link to language. Educators believed culture provides context to interaction by influencing how messages are relayed and the substance of the messages themselves. As a result, culture was perceived as an inherent part of the second language experience and, therefore, had to be addressed to enhance comprehension and avoid a breakdown in communication. The relationship was perceived as bi-directional, as language was also thought to influence cultural perceptions. Despite the strong belief in the importance of culture in second

language learning, the role of culture in second language education was understood in divergent ways.

The most common role ascribed to culture was in assisting adaptation to a multicultural society. The development of knowledge and skills to mitigate cultural difference were identified as important objectives of second language education to promote smooth acclimatization to Canadian society and a more productive learning environment. For the instructors this meant developing awareness about and tolerance for cultural difference, but also an understanding of one's own biases and the ability to shift perspectives. The portrayal of culture in this manner fits well with the intercultural as product paradigm, as it renders cultural difference as something to be overcome through the development of knowledge and skill. Although this understanding of interculturality was widely adopted, its manifestation in the language classroom was very different as some instructors explicitly embedded it in their work, while others addressed it incidentally when the need arose or assumed it would be addressed implicitly through regular activities in the class.

Another position that was less commonly adopted was of culture as a proliferate influence on understanding. From this perspective cultural difference was not something to be avoided, but rather something to be embraced. Thus, the presence of multiple cultural perspectives in the ESL classroom facilitated dialogic engagement that was both deleterious (in that it countered fallacious stereotypes) and productive (in that new manifestations of knowledge occurred because of the interaction between different perspectives). The productive character of this form of intercultural engagement was dependent upon recognizing the value in all cultures; thus, emphasis was not given exclusively to Canadian culture or self-reflection on one's own

cultural identity, but rather the intermingling of various cultures. As such, interculturality was the location where meaning is created and relationships are established between people.

For some educators, the proliferate character of interculturality gave it a transformative dimension. A common notion expressed by several respondents was that intercultural involved a deeper level of engagement leading to a change in one's understanding, whereas other forms of second language education (referred to variously as multicultural or international education) attended to diversity in a less transformative manner. To facilitate this, educators envisioned language development occurring through the exploration of global cultures and topics. To ensure the productive nature of the exploration, educators also supported the adoption of a critical lens (as outlined in the next section). The perception of interculturality as productive engagement to foster novel understandings while developing linguistic skills shares parallels with both the intercultural as dialogic process and intercultural as project paradigms.

CHAPTER NINE: WHAT DOES 'CRITICALITY' MEAN TO SECOND LANGUAGE EDUCATORS?

'Critical' is a ubiquitous term in educational discourses; nonetheless, respondents were skeptical about the existence of a unified definition. Carey believed that criticality is an often sought after, but poorly understood concept. She stated: "*I think in terms of the students though it is a buzzword. They have all heard about it. They all want to be critical-thinking thinkers. It is something that they want to achieve. They do not really know how to define it. I ask them 'so you want to be a critical thinker, what does that mean?' 'Oh, smart.' They tie it to intellect, but they do not really know what that means*." Indeterminacy about the meaning of criticality was not restricted to students in Carey's opinion: "*And I really do not think a lot of teachers know what that means to be honest. I think it is the same kind of thing. I think a lot of people think it is arguing against the norm*." The elusiveness of criticality was a sentiment also expressed by Pat. In commenting on discussions she had engaged in with colleagues, Pat revealed a divergence in understanding the concept: "*The term 'critical' - okay, that is very hard again. Interestingly we did that for something, we were looking for people in our program to define the term 'critical thinking' and virtually everybody said something completely different*."

The skepticism expressed about a congruent understanding of criticality was warranted based on the divergent definitions provided by second language educators. The teachers petitioned in this study not only defined the term in paradigmatically different ways, but also identified a variety of components that comprise criticality. Despite the varied responses, certain threads of commonality were present linking the responses in subtle ways.

Criticality was generally viewed in very positive terms as a concept that should be sought after, with only a few negative portrayals offered. One educator, Taryn, associated the term with

criticism and, thus, was not a proponent. She explained: "*In terms of criticism, I am usually not critical in terms of people's work. You know I always try to make it more a feedback atmosphere, which can be called positive criticism but I do not like that term because to me it is contradictory... You never criticize people's opinions. What I sometimes do is I point out some problems - you are in Canada now, try to understand other people's point of view too, but criticizing, no… I do not like it when people criticize for the sake of criticizing you know. I think there is much more to be learned from working together.*" Thus, Taryn associated criticality with negative feedback and a form of disagreement creating barriers between people. Taryn believed it was important to provide feedback on ways to improve, but believed it should be framed in a non-critical, cooperative manner. The negative aspect of criticality was also touched upon by Parker. In responding to a question about her perceptions of criticality, she stated: "*In terms of an education sense or just a generic sense? Because you know critical could be something that is kind of negative, when you are picking something apart.*" She quickly contrasted this with a more positive view of the concept as an instrumental skill required to thrive in academic institutions and society as a whole in the West; a view more aligned with her colleagues. One educator who was adamant that criticality should not be considered in a negative light, Mackenzie, stated: "*One thing that [critical] definitely does not mean, and many students have that misconception, is that it means to criticize. So it has nothing to do with critiquing per se or finding fault with something or somebody.*"

The most common definition provided by second language educators portrayed criticality as a cognitive skill. For example, Pat defined the concept in the following manner: "*To be critical about some things has a couple of elements, a couple of simple elements. One is the ability to question and one is the ability to break things down… So if I am trying to get students*

to be critical in the broad sense, then I want those two skills to be practiced and to be worked on." For Pat, questioning was an essential skill for success at university. She believed that questioning skills are important "*because most students who do not do well at university, who are not critical, accept passively and regurgitate*." Conversely, she believed that "*students who do well and listen across a broad range of fields are ones who do not just listen passively, but learn how to … get something important out of it*." She further continued: "*To me that is the essence of being critical, or that is the importance of being critical and thinking critically that [it] allows you to continue to learn and to focus yourself and focus your questions on goals*." Due to the importance of critical thinking in academic success, Pat sought to develop questioning skills early on with students. She demonstrated how she promotes criticality by getting students to ask a simple question such as 'where did you go to high school?' and then providing follow-up questions based on the responses until arriving at an interesting revelation. She espoused the effectiveness of the activity not only in developing questioning skills, but also in gaining "*insight out of the most trivial things … [and learning] their importance only by sort of putting them under a microscope*."

The ability to question, as a form of analysis, was very prominent in the educators' definitions of criticality. For some educators, questioning involved unraveling norms, thus facilitating more accurate or novel forms of understanding. In defining criticality, Mackenzie stated: "*I think it means not to take things at face value, and not to take things for granted, but to question things and arrive at conclusions by carefully examining information available to you rather than just guessing*." As such, Mackenzie portrayed questioning as initiating a process whereby deeper understandings are established. This notion of questioning was further elaborated upon by Darcy in her definition of criticality: "*I guess it would be to examine things*

or view things in a way that you are questioning them… I guess questioning things and you know is this the right way to do it? Is this the best way to do it? Does it make sense? Are there alternatives? Do I agree with it? Do I disagree with it? What are the weaknesses? What are the strengths? So, not just accepting things at face value but kind of looking at them more in depth." Mackenzie explained how she promotes deeper investigation through strategic questioning. She relayed: "*One important way of [promoting criticality] is by asking open-ended questions. Not just the 'what, who, why, where and when' questions, but asking 'how and why' questions. So this way they do not only get a straight answer to what they are asking, but they learn about things that stand behind it.*" By focusing on the important 'how' and 'why' questions, Mackenzie fosters inquiry to understand concepts on more than just a superficial level.

Questioning was also postulated as a form of criticality related to assessing the accuracy of perceptions. Parker explained: "*Critical thinking is analyzing something, looking at something, exploring something for various and sundry perspectives, not accepting it at face value.*" She believed this was an important skill in combatting the dogmatism of norms established during developmental years. She clarified: "*When we are growing up, we just accept the dogma of any given situation… we just [accept] that is the way it is, and not realizing that there could be another way to look at this. That someone from somewhere else, whether it is culture or language, will perceive this in a different way… And face value is just basically you are seeing it just in the dogmatic way. Not even occurring to you that there might be another view of that issue, concern or otherwise.*" Thus, questioning is an important skill enabling us to move beyond the singular position developed through our upbringing by facilitating the development of multiple perspectives.

262

Another form of questioning associated with criticality was the analysis of the validity of information. Taryn advocated "*challenging opinions, challenging sources, debating with yourself even*" as forms of critical engagement. Although she was opposed to criticism, she believed "*challenging authority in positive ways*" was important in order to bring about more accurate understandings. The importance of accuracy in understanding was also touched upon by Carey. She stated: "*I force them to look at the bigger picture and be more autonomous and have an opinion and question why do you have that opinion? You know I do not say it is right or wrong, I just say... you have to understand your opinion.*" Similarly, Jordan viewed questioning as essential in verifying the accuracy of knowledge. She explained: "*Critical thinking is thinking about when you are given a topic, what do you see? What do you know about this topic? What do you have in your head already? Think about your world view, what is that based on - a frame of reference - and then look at the source in such a way - consider bias, is it a fair source of bias, consider the background of the writer.*" According to Jordan, critical thinking is a process of questioning – questioning one's perspective on topics, questioning the basis of one's own views, questioning the accuracy and source of information.

Definitions of criticality were not restricted to the process of inquisitive exploration. Robin postulated the act of being critical as a form of synthesizing information. She remarked: "*To be able to synthesize one or two or three different sources and put them together. If they can do that then that is a kind of critical thinking also because they have put these different ideas together from different sources. In terms of making some clever comment about it, that is more advanced critical thinking in my mind.*" Thus, inserting one's unique perspective in analyses was considered a more sophisticated form of critical engagement. Jordan also supported this notion of criticality: "*I think that when they meet us in EAP, it is their real first time that they are asked to*

give an opinion or that their opinion has value and it is important. When you say critical, I think

that is the important part of it and for surviving university you cannot swim under water and get

through without having to come up for air and have an opinion or thought... but you have to

back it up." This contrasted the common practice Robin had witnessed among students of trying

to demonstrate criticality by formulaically copying an example. She expressed: "*...they follow a*

certain formula and again that is not critical thinking. Why are you commenting? You are

commenting because you analysed something. You found something new in the sources, your

own perception, your own insight into that source." Hence, innovation through the application of

a unique perspective was deemed an important characteristic of critical thinking.

As a cognitive ability, criticality was often portrayed by respondents as a higher order

skill affecting other capabilities. Carey portrayed criticality as involving increased awareness

about one's limitations. In commenting on how she incorporates criticality in her class, she

stated: "*I think I do because I make them take responsibility and I make them realize their*

limitations." As such, criticality had a meta-cognitive dimension that involved comprehending

the tenuous character of knowledge construction. The influence of criticality in knowledge

formation was also highlighted by other educators. For example, Mackenzie commented on the

importance of criticality in reading: "*I think criticality is an important part of reading. So when*

they read, they need to be aware of many different things - context in the first place and the

author in the second place. Do they just trust what they are reading? Do they know who wrote it

and why they wrote it? How do they relate new information to their previous background, their

schemata, their background knowledge? All of this I think involves criticality." The relationship

between criticality and reading was not uni-directional though. Jordan commented: "*A lot of*

what we do here is just critical thinking; focusing on critical thinking that is what I want

university students to be able to do. So, the students always ask me 'how do I improve my critical thinking?' – you have got to read, gather information, gather ideas and decide where you stand on it and think about where your views come from - just creating awareness." Therefore, criticality was portrayed as being involved in the process of assessing information and also implicated in the process of acquiring information through reading.

Kelly's definition of criticality shared common aspects with aforementioned definitions. She believed criticality involved an epistemological component, claiming that the act of being critical involved analyzing the manner in which knowledge is derived. She explained: "*To be critical is not to take things for granted, not take truth as universal truth and also not to assume that everything you do is right*." However, she added a new dimension by advocating for plasticity in thinking while also maintaining confidence in one's views: "*So, try to be alert and open-minded and to be cautious. Maybe just to be reflective. Not too rigid and not too soft, not to be too defensive*." In this way, Kelly highlighted the importance of constantly questioning one's perspective without falling into a nihilistic trap that 'anything goes.'

In addition to highlighting criticality as a cognitive skill, Kelly also postulated it as having a defined social function. She remarked: "*To be critical is ... always [to] look for justice, fairness not only on your behalf but also on others' behalf*." Thus, criticality is not a skill promoted solely for individual benefit, but rather a way of being that emphasizes mutuality. This does not preclude self-benefit, but rather links personal prosperity with the prosperity of others.

The notion that criticality has a social dimension was also highlighted by Sidney. Her definition stated: "*I guess being critical is about looking at yourself and the way you make meaning with others and the systems that inform your meaning making, and how those systems influence the way you are and be and do things in the world so that you can understand their*

influence on the way you are in relationship to others. And then also like challenging those ideas and making meaning of those with other people." Sidney included an epistemological dimension, but unlike her colleagues formulated it as being dependent on other people and systemic influences. Thus, criticality involved investigating these external influences to better comprehend their functioning. According to Sidney, comprehension was just the first step, as awareness should be followed by action to bring about improvements.

An important aspect of criticality for Sidney was embodying critical principles in her daily practice. She believed it is important to promote critical investigation in the classroom, but equally important to model critical practice in her day-to-day existence. As a result, she claimed to employ criticality by "*challenging the system from within it. If I can, right. Like I am constantly asking why we do things the way we do on the team?*" In this way, Sidney attempted to model the type of praxis she expected her students to develop.

Explicitly drawing on critical theory, Carey also emphasized systemic analysis and praxis as key elements of criticality. She stated: "*Well critical from my perspective, since I am a critical theorist and I mean you know big social justice person, I guess would be looking at power dynamics and understanding what is taken-for-granted… It is kind of like questioning everything and looking at what systemic problems there are that may be blocking you from your success or you know meeting your goals or questioning your goals.*" In this definition, Carey highlighted three tacit factors influencing the achievement of one's goals – power dynamics, taken-for-granted norms, and structural factors. As a result, pedagogy focusing on the development of criticality would be grounded in investigating these factors and developing strategies to address them. Carey did not limit her definition to a singular function, as she also elaborated upon what it means for students: "*And I guess with students, having them look deeper. I think when I tell them*

critical like some people think critical is arguing, right. And I say it is not about arguing but having an educated opinion. You may research it and find out that you are right, but at least you know why you are right. You have a better understanding of it. So that to me is critical from a student's perspective." Thus, Carey acknowledged criticality as a contextually dependent concept that could assume multiple forms. She recognized that criticality could involve inquiry to foster deeper understanding, but it could also be intricately related to the promotion of freedom and social justice through unraveling tacit influences.

In addition to recognizing various forms of criticality, Carey also viewed it as involving dialogic engagement. She did not believe that teachers are purveyors of information, but rather advocated for the classroom as a site of mutual exchange and learning. She stated: "*I want to know what is going on in their world because they are still connected to it even though they are here. And I want them to learn about here. I do not think it should be a one-way street. Like I want to understand them as much as they want to understand what is going on here. So I try to affect that.*" In this way, Carey treated students as legitimate sources of information rather than blank slates on which to be scripted. Respect for student input was also integrated into the design of her course. Carey expressed: "*I get to know my students... I do the diagnostics, but I also ask them 'what do you want to get out of this course?' And we set some goals for the course together and then I will shift my focus to that. And when I look back at stuff, I mean there may be stuff I reuse, but at the same time I try and cater to that group.*" Two-way negotiation of course design was not restricted to the beginning of the year though, as Carey maintained an 'open door' policy to negotiate changes throughout the year. She explained: "*It is intense because it is not a wishy-washy course… So some of them love it and some of them just cannot take it. And if they cannot, I am like 'okay we will work on it. I will give you some step-by-step stuff' and I tell them 'you*

267

have to communicate with me. Do not just sit there and suffer in silence. And it does not hurt my feelings and I will not take it out on you'." Therefore, promoting criticality in the language classroom involved treating learners as legitimate sources of knowledge, but also maintaining open communication to ensure the establishment of an environment conducive to critical engagement.

Empowering students in the language classroom was a theme addressed by a number of other educators as well. Kelly advocated empowering students by including them in the curriculum development process. She stated: "*First of all, I give away some of my power to students and empower students. I want students to be part of the curriculum development. So I want students to participate in choosing the contents, activities, for example, group work. By group work they can choose their interest in a topic, the way they want to do it, or whom they want to work with.*" In addition to empowering learners as decision-makers, Kelly also sought to impress upon them a sense of equality with her. She elaborated: "*I try hard to remind students not to treat me as an authority because I do not want them to be afraid of any authorities or superiors. I want them to be respectful of themselves as well. So, empowerment is a very big part of my teaching belief, mainly through activities and when I talk to them I make them feel they are equal to me.*" This sentiment was also supported by Mackenzie, who stated: "*If it is about power in the sense of like the master/slave relationship between instructor and students, then I really try to stay away from this. I mean, as I said initially, I do not see myself as a guardian… So I try to make sure that it is a more equal relationship and they see me as a friend in the first place and as an assistant, a helper, an adviser rather than a policeman trying to correct them or something. And I think ultimately it is a more productive teaching environment, teaching and learning environment.*"

While Mackenzie justified equality as a means to foster a productive learning environment, Kelly advocated for equality on social grounds. She believed that all humans should be respected and treated with dignity, and this attitude should be promoted within the classroom. One way of accomplishing this was dissipating the social rank commonly associated with the teacher-student relationship. She explicated: "*I just think people with different social ranks, with different positions; these differences do not make people inferior or superior at all… I think they should have the same equality and respect as human beings*." She further elaborated: "*I think it is just because some people are lucky, they were fortunate they were in an advantageous condition so they can have something that others do not have, but this privilege does not make them [better]… I am just saying that… people in the lower working class, the lower end of the social hierarchy should not feel that they are inferior to those superiors. I think ultimately individuals no matter what they do, how much they have, every individual should have dignity and respect*." Thus, Kelly questioned the discourse of meritocracy commonly utilized to justify inequity and sought to counter it by promoting a more democratic environment in which all students were empowered to exert their voices.

For many of the educators petitioned in this study, criticality was strongly linked to culture. Western cultures were viewed as valuing criticality, causing them to be embedded within the culture, while other cultures were viewed as favouring a more hierarchical system in which skills associated with criticality were not encouraged. A number of language educators believed that non-western education systems favour rote memorization over approaches to education that encourage criticality. For example, Kelly commented: "*Yes, cultural influence and also education system…[Asian] students from the current education system are still very, very restrained in their thinking… They do not think because they have never been trained or told or*

269

encouraged to think. So they are just starting to learn to think themselves." Jordan added: "*I think, for example, in university we are asking them to write in an argumentative way and a lot of our students have no idea because they have not been asked to express their opinions or views, they have just been told 'this is what you need to learn and learn it and there is going to be a test on it'.*" Parker further elaborated: "*The critical thinking skills, there also is a cultural component to that... you know some of our students come from almost a rote system where you know it is memorization and repeat, as opposed to a Socratic system where you are learning through a series of questions and so forth. So it is a very different approach to education.*"

Conversely, a common assumption possessed by some of the educators was that students educated in the western system were encouraged to be critical from a young age. Robin commented that "*kids from a very young age are taught to question things and to write compositions at a very young age - a kind of western type of critical thinking.*" Parker added that criticality would inherently be present in western education systems. She stated: "*[Criticality] would be just kind of a natural part because this is the system that I grew up in, this is how I learned, this is how I am going to teach.*" Jordan also believed that criticality is embedded in western society, adding: "*I think maybe we take [a multiplicity of perspectives] for-granted in Canada sometimes. I do not know if I am being naive in that, but the classrooms that I have been in, my experience has been, of course we understand these different perspectives and backgrounds and we acknowledge that.*" The emphasis on criticality in western society was not limited to the early years though. Robin articulated the emphasis placed on critical thinking within higher education institutions: "*Sometimes with the EAPers it is to just get them to be able to think critically. I do not want to put too much western bias into it, but if they want to go to a*

270

western university ... they have to, in my mind anyway, [understand] what is expected in a western academic environment."

Darcy also recognized the influence of education in the development of criticality, but believed that opportunity within cultural frameworks also played a significant role. In commenting on the development of criticality, she stated: "*I think it is [culturally based] in some ways and I think it is also based on opportunities. So, for some people who have been in a refugee camp their whole life, or maybe have not been educated at all, have never gone to school... you really see the difference there and culturally as well. Not to generalize, but some women I think are not used to thinking critically. And some men too, again based on what their life experience has been and their educational level*." Thus, Darcy did not believe that criticality was associated with particular cultures, but rather depended on the experiences individuals had during their lives.

In addition to viewing culture as affording opportunities for critical development, some educators viewed criticality as being culturally defined. Robin believed that definitions of criticality were highly dependent on context. Therefore, she stated: "*I think maybe it is related to culture - what is expected or what is defined as criticality here. We are looking for students who can be able to read between the lines to be able to perhaps disagree with something that is written or perhaps say 'that is a good point but I do not understand that specifically, let us pursue that further'*." Thus, she recognized that the definition of criticality she subscribed to was not universally applicable. Parker further developed this notion through a story she relayed about an interaction she had had with a Japanese student: "*He said 'you know in Japan nobody expects me to give my opinion and I am not sure how I would do this.' And I said 'you have an opinion?' And he said 'well, yeah I do.' And I said 'but it is okay here to express within this context your*

opinion'… But here the expectation is that you give an opinion. Whereas for this Japanese, he says 'it is just not expected in the school situation. You know nobody has asked me what I thought about this. I am not even sure how - (a) I have not thought about it or (b) I had thought about it, [but] it is never really asked how do I say this? How do I let you know I do have a thought on this? I have opinions on that'… I guess in terms of what I think in terms of culture, it is not that other cultures do not have opinions, do not have critical thinking skills, it is how they are used and when they are used [that] may be different than how they are used, when they are used here." Through the interaction with the Japanese man Parker realized that culture dictates when and how critical thinking is used, but does not necessarily limit its development.

Another dimension that provides insight into how educators understand criticality is the role attributed to politics in the language classroom. Most of the second language educators acknowledged formal education as being inherently political. For example, Pat stated: "*Everything is political in nature for sure. Yeah, absolutely… [Higher education institutions] are very political systems and there are lots of political considerations for what we do. And they are tied to money, they are tied to what nations want - both ours and others - and there are all sorts of exchanges and they are always politically motivated.*" Carey concurred stating: "*I think all instruction is [political]… I do not think you can avoid it right.*" Mackenzie further articulated the point: "*I guess most of the things we do are political in nature. But even if we consciously try to stay away from politics, I think often times these are topics that just are difficult to avoid and almost any topic you want to cover will inevitably have something political about it.*" Therefore, the educators in the study were not consumed by naivety that their activities in the classroom were apolitical.

Nonetheless, there was a distinct tension surrounding the explicit inclusion of politics in the language classroom. Pat summarized the tension well when she stated: "*There is always the argument, and it is true, that universities should be places where important larger critical questions are passed and exchanged and you learn to not take a personal offence perhaps at different political perspectives. But within language situations where different cultures are present, the level of sophistication and the newness of people in the situation make people more vulnerable. So politically neutral topics, approaches have their place in a second language situation without being dull. But I think there are topics that do not do well within that situation because people are more vulnerable in their thinking*." In other words, Pat faced the dilemma of advancing the mandate of higher education to explore critical questions versus sheltering learners from politically sensitive topics that could promote discomfort. This tension was prevalent in the views expressed by educators over the explicit inclusion of politics in the classroom.

A number of educators conveyed that they avoid including politics on pedagogical grounds. Pat expressed that she attempts to avoid politics because it does not support the goals of the language program. She stated: "*I don't think it is a particularly helpful focus in the language class*." Taryn concurred with this sentiment, adding that politics can undermine linguistic development, the actual focus of the language class. She explained: "*You can get very political, but you do not want to because it is just one of the things that you do. You should not divert from actual language skills because a lot of people become very emotional about a topic, they forget grammar*." In order to maintain linguistic development in this context, attention would have to be given to developing intrapersonal and interpersonal acuity; however, Taryn believed this was beyond the purview of the second language classroom. She lamented: "*Again that is not my*

purpose. My purpose is to teach them how to communicate not to teach them how to control their emotions. That is already something else."

Avoiding discomfort was another rationale provided for attempting to exclude politics from the classroom. Second language learning involves both declarative and procedural knowledge; as a result, learners must be comfortable interacting in the language classroom. For some educators this meant excluding topics that could create tension, thus, undermining their desire to interact. Mackenzie commented: "*One thing that I try to do though, and again I have to thank my more experienced colleagues for advising me on this, is try and make sure that especially with international students that we kind of to stay away from overly controversial, overly sensitive topics that may not be perceived in the same way by students, as this may create an uncomfortable atmosphere in the classroom.*" The potential existence of multiple perspectives, thus, made the inclusion of political themes problematic. Taryn added: "*I do a lot that makes them uncomfortable as it is because I make them open up more and be active if they are shy. There is enough of that for me to introduce something that will make them uncomfortable on a new level. There is just so much breaking people's back that you can do in one day.*" For Taryn the second language classroom was already a site of discomfort, as learners were forced to operate in a linguistic and cultural sphere beyond their comfort zone. As a result, the inclusion of politics would promote additional, unnecessary discomfort that could undermine the effectiveness of the language classroom.

Some of the educators also viewed the inclusion of political themes as over-stepping their role as language educators. Taryn strongly believed that it was not her "*position as an English teacher to break [students'] moral code.*" In this way, Taryn made a distinction between an educator, whose role is to support students in holistically developing to become contributing

members of society, and a content specialist, whose role is to develop knowledge of a particular subject. As a content specialist, moral considerations were deemed irrelevant. Similarly, Jordan expressed that she shares her political framework with students when asked, however, mostly avoids politics as it is not her role as an ESL instructor. She explained: "*I try not to, no I do not want to touch [on the] political, it is not my job to get involved and tell them how to think politically.*"

The desire to avoid 'inculcating' students with particular political beliefs was also shared by other educators. Darcy relayed: "*No, I try to stay away from that because I do not want to try to influence my students in any way. I do not feel that I should. I think you have to be very careful as a teacher that you do not let your own beliefs and values enter your classroom… I think because you are in a position where you could have some influence over your students, I think you need to be careful that you are not pushing your own beliefs and values onto them.*" In an attempt not to unduly influence students, Darcy not only removed herself from the class by avoiding comments that revealed her personal politics, but also sought to minimize political themes in the classroom. Although they did not go so far as to avoid politics in the classroom, Parker and Mackenzie also sought to remain neutral in the classroom. Mackenzie rationalized: "*I know it is impossible to be absolutely objective, but you kind of try to be objective and always make sure they have a chance to express what they think, and what their culture thinks about these things because sometimes they are a little bit reluctant to accept these Western values.*" Mackenzie believed that expressing her views about a topic would inhibit the participation of students, thus she attempted to remain neutral in class discussions. Parker also shared this view stating: "*You sometimes have to be careful with current events in terms of things that are politically sensitive. They can be addressed in the class; you just have to have kind of a light*

touch on that." Having a 'light touch' meant selecting topics that were interesting and relevant to most students in the class; however, it also meant maintaining a neutral stance on issues. She expressed support for "*looking at [both] the sides of the issues, the pluses, and the minuses*" because she believed maintaining a neutral stance would assist in creating a safe, productive learning environment. She stated: "*I try to keep that neutral… Because again you are trying to set an environment in your classroom where it is safe, where students can ask any question, and that you can address the question in a neutral and factual way so that the information is given across so that there is no judgement and that you know if you are giving the politics of this particular thing… you also have to understand that there is another side to it, and the other side feels just as strongly for it*." In addition to investigating issues from multiple perspectives, Parker sought to create a safe environment by establishing clear "*ground rules of how we are going to discuss them in a safe and non-confrontational setting*."

Although many of the second language educators avoided political topics or attempted to remain neutral, Carey contended this was unfeasible and only served as a guise concealing the tacit political agenda of educators. She expressed: "*I think the other thing is people pretend they are not, but they are. They bring their conservative or liberal views into it and you cannot say it is not political… I think that other teachers bring [politics] into the classroom unknowingly because they have made decisions about the political structures of the countries that [students] are from*." According to Carey, teachers' political beliefs inevitably enter the classroom through the design of the course or perceptions of students and the societies from which they originate. By hiding under the guise of neutrality, political views are inadvertently presented as norms. This was problematic for Carey, as she stated: "*If you think something is neutral, it is taken for granted, right. It is like that is just the way it is and you do not think you can change it and you*

do not think it needs defending." Carey applied this notion of neutrality to teachers' theories of learning as well. She stated: "*There is this kind of hierarchy of language learning and we think this is the way it is. There are still lots of teachers who think the whole curriculum is based on – 'I covered it, you learned it, so you should be able to do it.' So I think that is neutrality too… But that is not a neutral judgment, but you think it is based on what you are seeing*." According to Carey, adopting a position of neutrality maintains the status quo by withdrawing concepts – whether theories of learning or tacit political messages - from scrutiny.

To counter the hegemonic influence of normativity, some of the educators advocated for transparency in the classroom. Carey commented: "*I bring [politics] in, like I said I try to be more transparent*." Sidney concurred, describing her approach in the following manner: "*Just by sort of laying my cards out on the table. I try to be as transparent as I can about those things… I focus more on sort of internal organization [and] power structures*." She further elaborated: "*I want to name it, that is my approach. Not everyone wants to name those things and surface that stuff*." By being open and surfacing power dynamics, both educators hoped to create a more productive learning environment in which all aspects of the teaching-learning process, including the structure and content of instruction, were open for scrutiny.

Part of the process of being transparent was contextualizing the subject of investigation. For some educators, this meant analyzing the privilege associated with the English language and the underlying rationale for learning English-as-a-second language. Carey articulated: "*I am honest with them. I say I do not think you are here because you love English and I recognize my position as part of that system. I do recognize my privilege that way as well and I try and explore that with them. You know like if you did not think it was going to get you a better job, would you learn English? So we talk about that and I think it is a relief for them when I say I know you are*

not here because you love English." Thus, Carey openly discussed the global system that has elevated English to a prominent position as the *lingua franca* as a means to promote comfort and enhance the learning environment. Based on a similar rationale, but with a different outcome, Sidney also contextualized English language learning with her students. She stated: "*I mean I guess I talk about English as sort of an imperialist kind of language, like sort of what does English mean in the world? What do you think it is like for people to lose their language when English is becoming so incredibly powerful and is used everywhere? And you know, do you resent me for being a native speaker and what does that look like? And lots of real anger comes out*." Sidney believed the demonstration of anger was important in releasing underlying tensions associated with the subject and also in establishing bonds within the classroom. She explained: "*I think it is essential to be able to be present with others discomfort to get to a point of connection. So a gifted facilitator once said like 'until you can be comfortable with others discomfort, you can never really facilitate'*." Therefore, the ability to navigate learners through contentious exploration was believed to promote a more productive learning environment.

In addition to contextualizing the subject of instruction through a political lens, politics were also addressed by some instructors as a means to promote tacit goals of the course. For example, Kelly believed that second language learning involved more than the acquisition of an alternative linguistic code or the ability to communicate across cultures, as she also believed that the language classroom could be a site for investigating social issues and redefining relational patterns. She explained: "*So, I think I am always aware of the political things. I always try, for myself and students, I think I am trying to advocate fairness and mutual respect… Like in the readings or writings or watching a movie, the materials I choose or the topics I choose are all*

related to social justice and equality, these kinds of democratic ideas." Therefore, the desire to promote democratic dispositions motivated Kelly to infuse political themes into her instruction.

For other educators, political themes were included to promote reflection and deeper understanding about important issues. Mackenzie believed the second language classroom was an ideal location to explore interpretations of world events because of the diverse composition of the student body and the importance of developing procedural knowledge. She explicated: "*There is an opportunity to discuss world power or international politics generally. It is especially interesting when these students come from these countries so then they can have a good discussion by just getting a variety of viewpoints*." She also believed the language classroom was an ideal location to discuss the relevance of political and economic issues directly affecting students. In discussing how she addresses the commercialization of higher education as a topic within the class, she stated: "*It is very important to explain to them that you know when we are cutting these programs, especially in the humanities, there might be financial reasons, but in this case it is dangerous when we know the price of everything, but the value of nothing. So in that respect this topic gives us the chance to discuss why it is important to study both sciences and arts, and although the latter may not necessarily lead to specific or direct financial benefits, generally this is what makes us human*." Even when topics were not inherently political, some educators adopted a political slant. For example, Carey adapted the investigation of prescribed topics to make them more politically engaging. She articulated: "*We also did 'performance enhancing drugs' and talked about different countries and stuff like that. Who it would be available to and why it would be unfair? And we looked at the political and economic issues that way as well*." Although the topic did not require the adoption of a political lens, Carey included a political dimension to foster deeper and more relevant investigation.

Political themes were also addressed by some educators because of the interest they invoke. Language educators are very sensitive to providing materials that will inspire participation. As a result, political topics are included as a motivational tool. Jordan explained: "*I have to remember it is a language course, but quite often what is motivational and engaging is global ideas, global issues. So sometimes we acknowledge the different political ideologies… sometimes the students will bring a news article about a political uprising in Egypt and we will talk about it*." Hence, politics were incorporated for the indirect benefits they provide in fostering communication.

Summary

In summation, criticality was understood by the educators in diverse ways that could be categorized as fitting into three paradigms: cognitive skill, social function, and curriculum development (refer to table six). Universally, criticality was conceptualized as a cognitive skill involving the critique and analysis of information. At the center of definitions of the concept was the notion of questioning, which educators advocated would lead to unraveling tacit norms, promoting a deeper understanding about concepts, and assessing the accuracy and validity of perspectives. In addition to being linked to the notion of questioning, criticality as a cognitive skill was also associated with synthesizing and dissecting information, formulating a novel perspective on a topic, and analyzing the formation of particular knowledge. The portrayal of criticality in this manner is closely associated with the literature on critical thinking and could be attributed to the emphasis placed on critical thinking skills within the academic oriented programs and society more generally.

Table Six: Definitions of Criticality

Cognitive Skill	
- Question - Break things into component parts - Synthesize - Support an opinion - Analyze how knowledge was derived	Questioning - Unravel norms, facilitating novel understandings - Deeper understanding - Assess accuracy of perceptions - Analyze validity of information
Social Function	
- Decision-making grounded in fairness and social justice - Investigation of tacit structural/ systemic influences - Ongoing consideration of power dynamics - Challenge taken-for-granted norms - Legitimize alternative forms of knowing	
Curriculum Development	
- Greater equality and shared decision-making - Dialogic engagement – students considered legitimate sources of knowledge - Questioning the hidden curriculum - Praxis - Transparency	

In addition to portraying criticality as a form of analysis to improve thinking, some of the educators also defined it as questioning with a social conscience. Although the underlying foundations of the two paradigms are similar in that they are grounded in analysis, this second paradigm is characterized by the desire to promote fairness and social justice. With this in mind, the process of analysis is directed towards uncovering the power dimensions associated with particular forms of knowledge, revealing the foundations of its privileged status. Hence, the form of analysis that took place is more directed than in the first paradigm, as it specifically looks at taken-for-granted norms and tacit systemic influences that legitimize particular knowledge and promote the maintenance of inequities.

The third paradigm of criticality identified by educators is an extension of the second to the area of pedagogy. For educators prescribing to this paradigm, criticality involves applying an analytic frame grounded in social justice to educational endeavours. This includes critically

questioning the structure, content, instructional strategies utilized, and tacit messages associated with the curriculum in the second language classroom. Through critical questioning educators sought to break down barriers to dialogic engagement in the classroom, creating space for students to become producers rather than mere consumers of knowledge.

The latter two paradigms share numerous similarities with critical pedagogy as outlined in the literature. Two of the second language educators (Kelly and Carey) expressed intimate familiarity with critical pedagogy through their doctoral studies; however, the other educators who defined criticality with a social justice dimension formulated their perceptions based on personal experiences and philosophical positions rather than familiarity with the theoretical tenets of critical pedagogy.

CHAPTER TEN: WHAT DISCOURSES INFLUENCE HOW INTERCULTURALITY AND CRITICALITY ARE TAKEN UP BY SECOND LANGUAGE EDUCATORS?

The manner in which criticality and interculturality were taken up in the classroom was unique to each individual based on her pedagogical philosophy and experiences as a language learner and educator. Nonetheless, there were common influences that affected how the concepts were understood. Naturally, the program in which pedagogues worked had a significant impact, as the structure and goals of the program determined instructional emphases. As a result, criticality was commonly conceived as a cognitive skill related to analysis and synthesis within the academic setting. The structure of programs was not the only common influence though, as prominent discourses that defined how some educators' framed their work and engaged in second language instruction also had an impact.

As previously outlined, discourse is defined in this study in the Foucauldian sense as relating to systems of power and knowledge that create and limit possibilities. As such, discourse is viewed as a tacit mechanism shaping social reality. This contrasts the form of discourse typically taken up in critical discourse analysis (i.e., Fairclough, 2010) in which discourses embedded in texts are thought to reflect social reality. Within this latter paradigm, the language used in texts is analyzed to reveal associated attitudes, beliefs, ideologies, etc. In the former paradigm, however, discourse is a tacit mechanism that influences how people perceive and engage in the world. As a result, it cannot be directly ascertained, but rather must be intimated through the empirical evidence available.

In analyzing the data collected for this study, I continually engaged in the hermeneutic circle, iteratively moving between the specific statements and general profile of each respondent, in addition to moving between the text (participant responses) and the context in which educators

worked. As I repeatedly engaged in the hermeneutic circle, key differences between understandings of the central concepts emerged that were not grounded in individual experiences, but rather broader social sentiments (in other words discourses). These discourses did not influence all of the educators who participated in the study, but rather each discourse influenced a select and compositionally different group of respondents, providing the impetus for different understandings of the central concepts to be espoused. Hence, exposing these discourses is important to reveal their influence not only on how interculturality and criticality were understood, but also the transformative character of second language education.

Three central discourses emerged from the analysis of the data that had a significant impact on how some of the educators understood second language pedagogy and framed their work. Each of the discourses directly influenced how criticality and interculturality were understood by some educators and, therefore, swayed the transformative character of their work. In addition to discussing how each discourse manifested itself in expositions about the two central concepts in this study, contextual influences will also be elaborated upon. It should be noted that educators are inevitably exposed to multiple and sometimes competing discourses. Navigating the different discourses can be challenging for educators, leading to the expression of seemingly contradictory claims at times (Moore, 2004). This was the case with the respondents in the current study, as discourses were reflected in complex (and even contradictory) ways through the second language educators' stated understanding about their pedagogy. Nonetheless, through iteratively engaging in the hermeneutic circle, the three discourses outlined in this section emerged as significant influences in how the central concepts were understood.

Discourse of Political Correctness

One common sentiment that influenced how a number of the second language educators conceptualized interculturality and criticality was the notion that neutrality was desirable in education. Several of the respondents expressed awareness that power is omnipresent. For example, Pat stated: "*Everything is political in nature for sure . . . politics is guiding what can be done often in terms of money that is available, yeah in terms of resources, how much flexibility you are given to do things - all sorts of things*." As a result, advocacy for neutrality was not based on the naïve belief that power was absent from the language classroom, as identified by Pennycook (1994), but rather the conviction that politics should be excluded from the language classroom. This embedded understanding revealed itself through some of the educators' rationales for particular pedagogical practices. Drawing on a professional rationale, some educators advocated that it was not their place to inculcate students or influence their moral values (refer to pages 271-273). In contrast, the role of the educator was posited as the creation of meaningful experiences connected to the development of skills and knowledge directly related to the objectives of the course. Hence, the material presented was deemed value-free, and thus apolitical, because it was included as part of the official curriculum.

The exclusion of politics was also rationalized by some of the educators on pedagogical grounds (refer to pages 270-273). Several educators expressed that the language classroom is an inherently stressful environment, as students are asked to continually stretch their linguistic and cultural resources. The inclusion of political themes would, thus, unnecessarily add superfluous stress that would only contribute to undermining the language learning experience. Taryn expressed that training sessions could be developed to assist learners in increasing their capacity to productively engage in dialogue about controversial issues; however, this would require

significant class time, something that could not be re-directed from the primary objective of the course, linguistic development. Some of the educators also expressed concern that the politicization of topics could undermine the educational experience for learners. Mackenzie, Parker, and Darcy each expressed the imperative that content needed to be addressed in a factual, neutral manner. This meant that multiple sides of an issue needed to be addressed and the teacher had to refrain from participating in order to avoid unduly influencing learners. The maintenance of neutrality was also postulated as protecting a vulnerable population from potentially sensitive issues they were not prepared to address. As a result, Pat expressed concern over the inclusion of any topics in the curriculum that could promote discomfort.

Advocacy for neutrality was based on concern for students grounded in an underlying sense of the roles and responsibilities of second language teachers as limited to assisting with the acquisition of 'official content' (in other words, pre-established linguistic and content-based goals). This framing of pedagogy was based on excluding politics for perceived student-based benefits rather than an ill-advised denial of the existence of politics in second language education. As such, it was more closely aligned with eliminating politics than feigning its non-existence. Within this framework of thinking educators recognized the influence of politics but viewed their role as minimizing its effect by avoiding politics in the classroom, in particular political issues that may upset the political sensibilities of students. The discursive framing of education in this manner limited the options available to some of the educators by restricting their role to the maintenance of political correctness. As a result, the discourse will be labelled as the discourse of political correctness.

In adopting a term that is steeped with historical meaning, it is imperative to differentiate its current usage from traditional uses. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines 'politically

correct' as "conforming to a belief that language and practices which could offend political sensibilities (as in matters of sex or race) should be eliminated." In its early usage, political correctness was grounded in feminist critiques of perceived sexism in language; however, over time it has been appropriated and is most commonly used in contemporary times as a pejorative statement to oppose linguistic and social reform (Chapman & Routledge, 2009). The discourse of political correctness does not relate to either of these meanings, but rather the pedagogical perspective that politics should be eliminated from the language classroom to avoid discomfort and potential conflict.

The discourse of political correctness influenced how some of the language educators' framed language pedagogy in several key ways. As the primary goal of political correctness is the exclusion of content that may be considered sensitive, the discourse rendered language education as apolitical. This influenced how the subject itself was perceived (English language learning was not contextualized as having political implications) and the potential functions ascribed to language learning (language education was narrowly perceived as promoting linguistic development to satisfy an external goal), thus narrowing the lens through which educators analyzed their work. This is significant because the promotion of education as a neutral endeavour authorized educators to focus on the tangible aspects of their work, an already predominant tendency within a practically oriented profession. Furthermore, the portrayal of education as a neutral endeavour promoted the notion that neutrality is not only possible but also preferable within an educational setting. Thus, the power interests and hidden agendas associated with all forms of education (i.e., the hidden curriculum) were ignored, enabling educators to not only operate under the guise of neutrality but also to perpetuate the view that the content and structure of language education are disinterested.

The discourse of political correctness influenced the content and structure of education adopted. Content was selected based on its ability to foster desired linguistic forms and functions, rather than its capacity to engage learners in meaningful exploration. In an academic context, this resulted in the selection of materials that could be approached from multiple positions, thus, facilitating the development of argumentative writing, but without promoting discomfort. As a result, 'controversial' issues that do not have a significant influence on learners' identity or the structure of contemporary society, such as the adoption of gun laws or the legalization of marijuana, were adopted to facilitate linguistic development without challenging learners' political sensitivities. The pervasiveness of the discourse was demonstrated by Mackenzie when she stated: "*I thank my more experienced colleagues for advising me on this . . . we have to stay away from overly controversial, overly sensitive topics that may not be perceived in the same way by students and this may create an uncomfortable atmosphere in the classroom.*"

The discourse of political correctness had a significant impact on the manner in which criticality and interculturality were understood. The removal of politics from the language classroom meant that criticality was limited to the exercise of cognitive skills of analysis in relation to relatively banal topics. The avoidance of political topics from which passion is often evoked would lead to the development of inquiry-based skills unencumbered by personal associations; however, it would also prevent the application of criticality grounded in social justice and a deeper sense of purpose. Furthermore, by intentionally avoiding politically sensitive topics, intercultural investigation would be significantly limited. Culture is a topic that is closely related to identity and political relations. As a result, the exploration of cultural themes would be limited to superficial aspects of culture that would not bring into question learners' cultural

identity or perspective on cultural difference. Hence, the development of interculturality would be limited to the development of skills to facilitate cross-cultural communication, but not a more nuanced form of cross-cultural understanding.

The discourse of political correctness in education could be seen as a natural extension of the broader narrative related to Canadians perception of themselves. Kymlicka (2003) outlined how Canadians take pride in the self-image as a caring, neutral people. The author contended that the historical role played by the nation as international peacekeepers and honest negotiators has been embedded into the Canadian psyche, creating the perception of themselves as honest, altruistic people and 'good citizens of the world.' The perception of Canada as a caring society has been further promoted by the existence of a social welfare system in the country. Through comparison to their neighbours to the south, "Canadians view their society as less violent, more caring for the sick or disadvantaged, less punitive, [and] more environmentally responsible" (Kymlicka, 2003, p. 364). The promulgation of the self-image as caring and neutral requires the adoption of a non-political orientation and the celebration of acceptance through a non-committal (read neutral) form of multiculturalism similar to that critiqued by Schick and St. Denis (2005). Hence, the discourse of political correctness could be viewed as a complement to the preservation of a long-standing Canadian identity.

Discourse of Narrow Instrumentality

A second discourse that was influential in shaping perceptions of second language education relates to views on the function of learning more than one language. All of the language educators viewed second language education as serving an instrumental function. Carey commented: "*I think most of the time it's very pragmatic. It's like knowing this language will get me further*." Second language education was understood as promoting tangible benefits

in other areas. For many of the language educators this meant the primary role of their work was to assist learners in achieving desired external goals. Kelly explained: "*As a teacher, I think my basic goal is to meet their needs - whatever they want*." Robin similarly concurred when responding about the function of second language education: "*Help the students to achieve something else. Because without trying to master that second language they can't succeed at that other goal*." Darcy shared a similar sentiment: "*I would like to give my students the confidence to be able to use English to accomplish, well, their needs and their wants and their goals*." As evidenced by these responses, the educators were very sensitive to learners' expressed goals and sought to assist them in achieving these goals.

Nonetheless, the language educators identified student goals primarily grounded in the overtly stated goals of the course. In elaborating upon students' needs Kelly stated: "*Instrumental. Like students what they care for [are] immediate, urgent needs - to pass a course, you know to pass an exam. These needs have to be met first*." In addition to the immediate goals of completing exams or earning course credit, educators also noted longer-term goals that were the focus of instruction. In the academic-based setting, this entailed as Mackenzie cogently articulated, "*help[ing] those prospective graduate students to be able to function effectively in a North American educational setting*." According to Mackenzie, "*grammar and usage and stuff like that prevents them [international graduate students] from being successful*," thus, an emphasis on linguistic accuracy was essential in the language classroom. Pat agreed that the focus of the language classroom should "*be language learning, language building for us*" but also added that "*there are all sorts of secondary objectives and some of them are quite specific to fulfilling those academic pieces*." Thus, the instrumental focus in the EAP courses was on developing academically oriented linguistic and cognitive skills.

In contrast, the focus in the non-academic program was assisting learners with the linguistic and cultural knowledge to thrive in society. Darcy commented: "*So the context I'm in it's more for settlement and integration and for them just being able to function in their new home.*" This meant the focus of the course was split – "*primary is the language part and secondary would be the cultural and settlement part, that day-to-day stuff.*" Darcy further elaborated: "*So we focus a lot on really functional skills and you know how do you write an email, how do you make appointments, how do you … compliment, request, apologize in a way that is socially appropriate.*"

Although social adaptation and integration were not explicitly stated goals of the academic programs, some educators believed it was essential for academic success and, thus, adopted them as secondary goals. For example, Robin believed that second language education could assist with mitigating cross-cultural differences and promoting social integration. She explained: "*If you divide society as native speakers and non-native speakers, or if you divide society in terms of immigrants or international students and those who [are] not, second language education can hopefully make the two groups integrate or interact together better.*" Similarly, Parker tied academic success to the ability to adapt to Canadian society: "*Even though they are academic, I want my students to be able to communicate with native speakers, to be able to get their ideas across… I don't want them so tongue-tied that they cannot communicate and they cannot be part of the experience of living in Canada. I want them to be able to make friends…*" Hence, although the focus of instruction went slightly beyond the purview of the program, it was still justified as a means to ultimately promote success within the program.

For some of the language educators learning an additional language served an instrumental function, but it also served a broader function not limited to the espoused goals of

the program in which they were working. For example, Sidney advocated for language learning as a means to promote personal growth through connecting with others. She articulated: *For me personally, [second language learning] expands my worldview… I think engaging with other humans is sort of why we are here – to be able to connect and engage with others – and so language kind of affords the ability to at least begin doing* that." Carey similarly espoused that language learning promoted "*an appreciation for another culture,*" "*a different worldview,*" and "*a better understanding of* things." For these educators, second language learning opened individuals to new worlds and facilitated the elaboration of one's self-concept. These sentiments were also shared by Kelly who explained how intercultural investigation fostered through language learning "*opens the door of a brand new world… You feel like your world becomes much larger… [and] your life has been enriched*." Thus, language learning was perceived as fulfilling an instrumental function complemented by broader functions not associated with the mandate of the program. This contrasted other educators who were more restricted in their view of the function of language education by the context in which they applied their trade.

The focus on goals limited to the espoused aims of the program, or what will be labeled the discourse of narrow instrumentality, limited the manner in which second language pedagogy was taken up by some of the educators. Language is a concept that is closely associated with culture and the ways that people interpret and view the world and themselves. The importance of language in identity politics and meaning construction has led to the development of aggressive linguistic policies designed to expand the interests of particular groups (Pennycook, 1994; Edge, 2003). As such, language is implicated in geo-political maneuvering. The influence of linguistic policies is not restricted to political interests, as economic benefits are also derived directly from the language learning industry (through the production of materials and diffusion of expertise to

different nations) and indirectly through the development of positive relationships and the spread of favourable discourses and ideologies embedded in the linguistic materials. Moreover, these policies have had significant implications for the maintenance of traditional cultural and linguistic practices, resulting in the extinction of languages and the promotion of language as a source of inequity (Phillipson, 1992). Despite the clear connection between language and numerous other spheres of life, the discourse of narrow instrumentality encouraged dismissing or ignoring these associations, enabling a view of language pedagogy as simply learning a new language.

By promoting the view that language education simply involves learning linguistic codes unencumbered by the social responsibility to investigate linguistic issues more deeply, the discourse of narrow instrumentality influenced how some of the educators understood criticality and interculturality. One central influence was in limiting the application of criticality. A sentiment expressed by some educators was that criticality was not strongly linked to language learning. Pat for one stated: "*I do not think criticality is that important actually. I think it is more important in other areas.*" As a result, the integration of criticality in her teaching was exclusively the result of a programmatic emphasis on the skills required for higher education and not its foundational connection with skills and knowledge developed as part of the language learning process. Postulating criticality in such narrow instrumental terms, Pat and some other instructors emphasized the development of critical thinking as a cognitive skill (see table six) and familiarity with Canadian academic norms, as they were deemed essential in completing university courses; however, less attention was directed to promoting social justice, empowering students, or critically investigating concepts that influence students' lives and define contemporary society. Similarly, the programmatic focus within the non-academic program was

on developing adaptation skills to smoothly accommodate the transition to Canadian society. Although criticality was identified as an essential skill in adapting to a new setting, it was not widely promoted within the official curriculum of the program and, therefore, was nominally addressed - predominantly in the form of questioning to ascertain the accuracy of interpretation.

In addition to limiting the application of criticality, the discourse of narrow instrumentality also limited its relevance. The application of criticality requires a venue in the form of content. Without carefully selected relevant content to analyze and investigate, the application of criticality is limited. When the context surrounding language learning is closely investigated, numerous sources of analysis relevant to learners' lives can be identified. For example, Freire (1993) utilized tacit structures that inhibited the full participation of peasants in society as the basis for the critical investigation of his Brazilian students. Similarly, Pennycook (1994b) highlighted the reasons surrounding language learning and its implications as the basis for critical exploration in the language classroom. Both of these approaches require a sophisticated understanding of language learning and its broader relationship to social, political, and economic events. Removing language education from its contextual foundations by portraying it as an isolated event to simply achieve instrumental goals would prevent the incorporation of themes that would elucidate aspects of learners' lives. Instead, learners would be encouraged to critically investigate information that is disconnected from and irrelevant to their lives, thus undermining the benefits of criticality.

Another influence of the discourse of narrow instrumentality was on the depth to which interculturality was addressed. Although the educators interviewed unanimously espoused the connection between language and culture (see pages 232-236), the manner in which culture and intercultural themes were integrated into the curriculum differed greatly between them. Those

ascribing to a narrow instrumental focus in their teaching incorporated culture to enhance the learning process. For some educators, this meant incorporating culture to break down barriers between students and establish a common bond, leading to the creation of a more productive learning community (see pages 238-239). For others, culture was integrated solely as a means to aid and improve performance in academic endeavours (see pages 236-238 and 245). Limiting the integration of culture to the achievement of instrumental goals resulted in culture being incidentally addressed by some educators when the need arose, rather than being strategically incorporated as an important part of the curriculum. For example, Robin claimed that she did not plan specific lessons to incorporate culture, but rather addressed cultural content "naturally" when "*understanding the North American culture is going to help* them." The incidental rather than strategic integration of culture inevitably led to culture being addressed in a more superficial manner, but as the quote indicated, it also contributed to an approach being adopted in which the focus was on learning target cultural content that would contribute to success in meeting programmatic goals, rather than a deeper exploration about cultural significance. As such, narrow instrumentality restricted intercultural exploration. Moreover, prescribing to a pragmatic focus resulted in narrowing the scope of cultural exploration, causing academic culture and tangible elements of Canadian culture that would assist with acclimatization to become the primary focus.

The emphasis on achieving instrumental programmatic goals has been supported by changes in the structure of higher education. Historically the university modeled itself as a social institution responsible for providing a moral compass; however, over time this manifestation of post-secondary education has been left in 'ruins' (Readings, 1996). Although remnants of the social institution remain, the mandate of higher education institutions has been altered by the

growing prominence of neo-liberalism. One of the main consequences of the neo-liberal philosophy is the application of business principles to public services. Institutions that were heavily subsidized by the government, such as universities, had their funding significantly reduced and were mandated to streamline operations. In response, universities were forced to adopt a corporate ethos to maintain revenue streams (Gumport, 2002; Stromquist, 2007). One of the corollaries of this newly adopted ethos is the positioning of students as customers and the accompanied alteration of the role of academics as service providers rather than scholars. In this system, the primary objective is customer satisfaction, which is closely linked with meeting students' instrumental goals. As a service provider, scholars need not philosophize the role of the academic or academy in society, but rather satisfy the externally mandated function ascribed to their work – a focus that limits pedagogy to the achievement of narrow instrumental goals.

Discourse of Decisive Deference

Adopting a narrow instrumental focus in teaching was complemented by a third discourse that emerged from the data - the discourse of decisive deference. Decisive deference refers to the perceived need to defer decisions to an external form of expertise. In education this means deferring pedagogical decisions to an unknown 'expert' through adherence to curriculum guidelines presented in the form of textbooks, curriculum documents, programmatic mission statements, etc. Although the language educators expressed significant freedom in determining the structure and content of their instruction, this autonomy was often not utilized, as decision-making was deferred to an external source. Pat deferred pedagogical decisions to the expressed desires of university instructors who would be working with her students upon completion of the course. Darcy deferred instructional decision-making to a pre-existing structure for the course

she was teaching. In addition, several of the educators deferred judgments related to content to the prescribed textbooks for the course.

Inevitably a degree of deference to external sources will occur in education. Teachers operate in institutions and classrooms with histories associated with the process of promoting linguistic development. These contextual traditions embed expectations for how teaching should take place in the form of materials available, course syllabi, programmatic goals, etc. The key is the degree to which teachers blindly follow or question and transform these traditions.

In the context of this study, several of the language educators demonstrated minimal desire to question the structure and content of the courses taught. Some educators expressed discomfort engaging with pedagogy on a philosophical level. For example, Pat expressed that education questions are "*one[s] I do not think about a lot,*" recognizing philosophical considerations related to education as "*blind spots to me.*" Other educators expressed that pressure associated with high stakes testing minimized their pedagogical decision-making. Robin articulated: "*There is that final exam that is facing us all the time… controlling you in some way.*" Thus, an instrumental focus was adopted based on a narrow view of language education prompted by assessment policies. In other contexts decision-making was deferred based on the structure of the course. Darcy commented that the content of the course she taught was dictated by a government agency that funded the program. As a result, there was significant external pressure to exclusively use officially sanctioned materials. She also stated that although she would like to introduce more relevant materials and engage with learners in developing intercultural communicative competence, time constraints prevented her from doing so. She stated: "*There are so many things to cover and there is such a limited time. We have a lot of administrative stuff to do.*" Part of the administrative burden was the mandated use of portfolios

to demonstrate the skills and knowledge developed in the course, a process that she characterized as "*tak[ing] up a lot of time*." Similarly, Carey contended that additional pressures brought to bear by increased class sizes and increased teaching loads inhibited professional reflection on anything but covering the material. Robin further expressed that the structure of the course she taught made it "*hard to have that romantic image of making that big difference in [students'] lives*."

The discourse of decisive deference was accommodated by disciplinary power exerted over the instructors. According to Foucault (1977), disciplinary power trains obedience by isolating individuals and creating the perception of constant monitoring. The disciplinary mechanisms identified by Foucault were based on Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon – an architectural structure designed to allow one watchperson to observe all inmates at an institution. The effectiveness of the Panopticon as a surveillance mechanism is based on the uni-directional gaze placed upon those in confinement. Whereas the prisoners are constantly exposed to the gaze of the watchperson, they cannot view the individual surveilling them and, thus, can never know exactly when they are being observed. As a result, self-monitoring becomes the basis for maintaining discipline. Bourke, Lidstone, and Ryan (2015) contend that disciplinary power is enacted in contemporary education through an emphasis on performance measures in the form of high-stakes testing, prescribed curricula, and adherence to professional standards. According to these authors, performance measures promote self-discipline resulting in adherence to imposed norms.

Disciplinary power influenced the prominence of the discourse of decisive deference; however, it was also tangibly supported by external mechanisms that discouraged autonomous decision-making. For example, Kelly relayed how taking the initiative to problem solve issues

encountered in her teaching was not well received by individuals in a position of authority. Similarly, Sidney conveyed how her desire to question the status quo resulted in lost job opportunities. She contended that she had been labelled as "*being difficult*" and was precluded from advancement because of the discomfort created by posing questions. Moreover, Carey expressed frustration about plying her trade in a workplace that rewarded mediocrity. She claimed that instructors who questioned the structure of programs were labelled as "*problematic*" and "*uppity*." She also contended that dedication to professional growth was not rewarded or encouraged: "*You get punished for having the ideas you have. And I do not want to be that person anymore because it has made me very unhappy and very stressed out*." Thus, although these three individuals sought to change the programs in which they were teaching, external influences undermined their disposition towards encouraging change.

The discourse of decisive deference had a noteworthy impact on the manner in which interculturality and criticality were understood and utilized. As the educators who prescribed to the discourse did not position themselves as decision-makers, the textbooks utilized and the programmatic focus became the default guide for their teaching. Textbooks and other documents provide guidelines for pedagogical activities within a program; however, more than simply being a document to draw upon when planning pedagogical activities, Ball (1993) contended that policy documents act as discourses, producing their own sets of truths. Ball (1993) wrote: "…we are spoken by policies, we take up the positions constructed for us within policies" (p. 14). The author further elaborated that struggles related to the interpretation and enactment of policies "are set within a moving discursive frame which articulates and constrains the possibilities and probabilities of interpretation and enactment" (Ball, 1993, pg. 15). This means that policies constructed through programmatic documents create a discursive frame within which educators

understand their work. Thus, analyzing key resources will provide insight into the manner in which they affect the hermeneutics of criticality and interculturality.

Research participants identified ten resources that played a pivotal role in their teaching practices. Due to the fact that several of the teachers work in the same context, numerous texts were identified as being influential for more than one teacher. The resources that were identified were utilized with learners at different levels who had different motivations for studying English. The level and focus of the learners could be categorized in the following manner: intermediate non-academic, intermediate-advanced academic, and advanced academic. The resources used with learners in the different categories demonstrated significant differences in their structure and content. While differences in themes and the sophistication of the language used would seem natural, the resources also were very different in how they portrayed and addressed criticality and interculturality.

<u>Intermediate Non Academic Resources</u>

Four resources were identified as influential in the intermediate non-academic category. Each of the resources was designed to promote communicative competence and to acclimatize learners to Canadian society. In fact, the terms 'Canada' or 'Canadian' appeared in the title of three of the four resources (i.e., "Canadian Snapshots", "Step Forward Canada", and "A Beginning Look at Canada") and were prominent in the unit titles of the fourth resource (e.g., "Canada", "Canadian Culture", and "Canadian Law"). Each resource contained a number of activities to engage learners in developing their linguistic abilities using the four skills (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking), although the focus was slightly different between resources.

In most of the resources, culture was addressed in an implicit manner. Although each book focused on Canadian content, the cultural aspects of the content were left for learners to implicitly decipher. Two of the resources ("LINC Classroom Activities" and "A Beginning Look at Canada") did not explicitly engage with the concept culture at all. A third resource, "Step Forward Canada", explicitly identified the development of socio-cultural competence as a major objective. Nonetheless, the stated foci within the book were often implicitly addressed. For example, in lesson two of unit two the stated socio-cultural competence focus was "the baseball culture in North America" (Rajabi & Wisniewska, 2008, p. 18). Despite the explicit focus on baseball, the sport was only mentioned as part of a dialogue and minor activity, with the significance and character of baseball culture not explicitly addressed. The assumption apparently made by the authors was that exposure to cultural content will lead to cultural understanding; therefore, explicit analysis of cultural phenomena would be unnecessary. Only the fourth resource, "Canadian Snapshots", addressed culture in an explicit manner. In the first unit entitled "Canadian Mosaic", the authors provided a detailed analysis of culture, highlighting the dynamic, contextually-based character of the concept. In addition to highlighting the various aspects of culture, including its less tangible form as beliefs and values that shape our perspective, the authors also encouraged learners to engage with the definition by critiquing it and posing questions about the meaning of the concept. By explicitly engaging with the concept 'culture' at the beginning of the book, the authors set the tone for future analysis of tacit cultural phenomena.

While culture was generally implicitly addressed in the influential resources, it was also predominantly presented in the tangible, objective form of culture, also known as big 'C' culture. The entire book written by Kaskens (2010) includes facts about Canada ranging from Canadian

geography and the composition of the Canadian population to the primary industries in Canada and the organization of the government. No mention about less tangible aspects of Canadian culture was included in the book. Similarly, Johnson and Morrison (2009) addressed culture through the identification of common markers of Canadiana and the introduction of events deemed to be particularly Canadian, such as ordering coffee at Tim Horton's and writing a thank you note. The first activity in the unit on Canadian culture invites learners to identify ten artefacts they would use to represent the culture. The pictures presented on the material encourage learners to select hockey and the maple leaf as symbols, while subsequent activities focus on additional stereotypically Canadian items such as Mounties, doughnuts, beavers, and maple syrup. These activities do not present facts about Canadian culture, but rather uncritically promote stereotypical associations with Canada and its people. Only "Canadian Snapshots" addresses the more subtle aspects of Canadian culture. For example, one activity included in the book stated: "Write a two-paragraph letter to a friend who is thinking of moving to Canada. Briefly describe Paul Chiang, the policeman, and mention two cultural challenges your friend might face in Canada" (Kingwell, Bonkowski, & Stephenson, 2005, p.6). The assignment challenges learners to move beyond superficial aspects of culture to identify cultural barriers that can influence immigrants' transition into a new society. Although the book includes numerous examples of tangible culture, more subtle aspects of culture, such as politeness and humour, are addressed throughout the book.

The focus on Canadian content in the books left little room for themes to be addressed in an intercultural manner. The presence of learners as cultural beings in the classroom was largely ignored by the developers of the texts, as learners were expected to learn about Canadian culture and traditions without any consideration given to their own cultural backgrounds. On rare

occasions learners were encouraged to identify cultural differences. For example, Kingwell, Bonkowski, and Stephenson (2005) developed a jigsaw activity to explore the influence of cultural differences on settlement. The authors prompted learners to reflect upon the three stories provided to identify differences between the individual's culture and Canadian culture and the influence these differences had on their adaptation. Furthermore, the authors encouraged learners to reflect upon the personal characteristics that helped the individuals overcome difficulties, thus demonstrating culture as a barrier that can be overcome, and to identify lessons that could be derived from the stories. In this way, cultural comparison was used to indirectly provide insights into learners' own experiences in transitioning to a new culture. Moreover, on a few occasions learners were prompted to compare cultures using their own cultural background as a reference point. For example, in a unit entitled "Family & Relationships" Johnson and Morrison (2009) stimulated reflection on cultural differences in the role of grandparents. Although cultural comparison and analysis were occasionally promoted, the curricular documents overwhelmingly fit into the intercultural as monologic process paradigm.

While culture played a central role in the content of the textbooks, criticality was largely absent. The term 'critical' only appeared in one text, "Step Forward Canada." In this text, critical thinking was identified as one of the central objectives, along with vocabulary, grammar, communicative competence, and employability skills. Nonetheless, the skills identified as part of critical thinking were very basic. For example, in unit two the tasks associated with critical thinking included: "Reflect on a favourite season; analyse scheduled events; examine routes on a map" (Rajabi & Wisniewska, 2008, p.16). Similarly, in unit ten the focus on critical thinking consisted of the following: "Differentiate between federal, provincial, and local government officials; reflect on ways to resolve community problems; identify dates and times of PTA

events" (Rajabi & Wisniewska, 2008, p.112). As such, critical thinking was portrayed as basic skills related to finding, analyzing, and reflecting upon information.

Although criticality was explicitly addressed in only one text, opportunities for critical engagement with content were present in other texts. For example, Johnson and Morrison (2009) encouraged learners to reflect upon the reasons why more divorced men remarry than divorced women and to consider strategies for avoiding divorce. In participating in discussion about these topics, learners would be able to draw upon their background knowledge and collaboratively develop new ways to think about the topic. Furthermore, Kingwell, Bonkowski, and Stephenson (2005) provided numerous opportunities for learners to critically investigate topics. At the end of each unit the authors included a culminating activity that involved gathering and presenting information. For example, at the conclusion of the unit entitled "Canadian Mosaic" learners were instructed to research and give a presentation on an immigrant serving agency. Although a critical slant was not built into the activity, learners could easily apply criticality in completing the task. Moreover, the authors included a number of readings in the book that were well-suited to adopting a critical perspective. For example, a text written by David Suzuki was included in the book in which he implored the reader to act in order to avoid an impending water crisis. Despite the critical slant of the article and the potential for fruitful discussion about water safety, human rights, and ecological sustainability, the authors did not encourage reflection upon the content of the article itself, but rather the language used by David Suzuki in trying to persuade readers. As a result, the potential exists for criticality to be infused into textbook activities; however, it is highly dependent upon the instructor and/or learners to develop a critical disposition.

<u>Intermediate-Advanced Academic Resources</u>

Four textbooks were also identified as influential for the instructors working with intermediate-advanced students with an academic focus. Two textbooks focused on listening, while the other two textbooks emphasized the development of reading skills. Although each text had a specific focus, all four skills were developed through the activities provided in each book. As the emphasis of the courses in which the books were used was on academic skill development, the textbooks focused less on content/scenarios that would be encountered in everyday life and more on academic skills and language. As a result, a considerable amount of attention was provided to note-taking skills and the organization of content, rather than content related to acclimatizing to Canada.

Perhaps due to the emphasis on academic skills, the four resources identified as influential did not include much of an emphasis on culture. The term 'culture' was only highlighted in two of the four books used. In Richmond (2009), the term appeared in the word list related to a unit on anthropology. Close investigation of the unit demonstrated that the term was not used prominently within the text though. Conversely, the term was very prominent in unit eight of Lebauer (2010b), as it provided the basis for the lecture and subsequent activities. In the lecture, learners were introduced to the work of Dr. Edward Hall, in particular his two famous dichotomies - high context and low context cultures, and monochronic and polychronic views of time. The lecture and companion activities help learners to understand the multi-faceted character of culture by introducing them to less tangible aspects of culture. They also encourage learners to interpret behaviour through a cultural lens, thus helping them to understand how potential misunderstandings may arise. Nonetheless, the lecture activities portray culture as a monolithic, static entity by classifying national cultures as fitting within a particular position on

the continuum. Without critically engaging with how these associations were derived or the contextual basis of culture, stereotypical views of specific cultures could thus be created or reinforced.

Although the concept was only specifically focused on in one chapter of one book, culture was subtly addressed in the various texts. For example, Richmond (2009) introduced the distinction between denotative meaning and connotative meaning and encouraged learners to explore the symbolic meaning of various phenomena. In a heterogeneous classroom, this would encourage exploration of different cultural meanings. Furthermore, Lebauer (2010a) promoted cultural comparison through activities presented in the book. In a pre-lecture activity, the author provided the following prompt: "In the United States, the majority of pet owners consider their pets 'members of the family.' What does this mean? Is this your attitude? Is this attitude shared by members of other cultures you are familiar with?" (Lebauer, 2010a, p. 47). In the subsequent lecture information was provided about differences in attitudes and spending habits in relation to pets in China and the United States. Later in the text, Lebauer (2010a) prompted learners to consider the influence of culture on the design of buildings: "Discuss how the culture and environment of ancient Egypt impacted the construction and design of the pyramids. . . Choose a location that you know well. Discuss how the culture and environment of that location have impacted the design and construction of its buildings" (p. 185). As such, opportunities for cultural exploration were provided, even though culture was not the over-riding focus of the units or activities.

Similar to the manner in which culture was addressed, criticality was not an explicit focus of the texts. Criticality was not highlighted as an objective in the textbooks, nor was it emphasized as a skill to be developed. Nonetheless, opportunities for the application and

development of criticality were present throughout the texts. In both Rubin (2009) and Richmond (2009) reading strategies were emphasized as a skill to be developed. The reading strategies highlighted included evaluating generalizations, analyzing criteria, and identifying multiple causes. Although these were labelled as reading strategies, they could also be considered as important skills in developing critical thinking. For example, the identification of bias was promoted as an important reading strategy in unit eight of Richmond (2009). The author introduced the different grammatical uses of the term and highlighted subtle variances in how the term is used in different fields. He also provided opportunities for readers to detect the application of bias in different settings. The detection of bias is an important reading strategy to assess the validity of information provided in a text, but it is also an important aspect in critically engaging with content in order to make justified decisions. Similarly, Lebauer (2010a) promoted critical engagement with content as part of post-lecture reading and discussion activities. She wrote: "It is important to read and listen critically. For example, this lecture reports on health benefits found to be associated with green tea. Is this information certain? Are there reasons to question this information?" (Lebauer, 2010a, p. 162). Therefore, the development of critical thinking skills was promoted through activities in the texts although it was not labelled as such.

Critical engagement with content was also promoted through various activities in the textbooks. For example, Lebauer (2010b) developed an activity in which learners were encouraged to debate different topics. Learners were encouraged to formulate arguments and counter-arguments related to the quality of Amnesty International's principles and the level of political response that is appropriate for dealing with human rights violations. Subsequently, students were to work in groups to conduct the debates, thus, developing their ability to look at the topics from multiple perspectives and formulate convincing arguments based on evidence.

Moreover, assignments were provided with each article in the reading books that offered opportunities for learners to critically engage with various subjects. Richmond (2009) included the following discussion questions in unit eight of his book: "Are governments justified in censoring the content that citizens can access on the Internet? If so, what content should governments censor?" (p.121). Similarly, Rubin (2009) stimulated student discussion and writing through the following prompt: "What are the advantages and disadvantages of having public art with an ethnic focus? Does it bring people together or divide them?" (p. 48). He further added: "Go online and find information about public art in a city not discussed in this unit. Summarize the information and present it to the class. Include your own opinions on whether it really is art and how it benefits or hurts the city" (Rubin, 2009, p. 48). Thus, students were provided with numerous opportunities to analyze and critique the information presented, and insert their voice through expressing their opinion.

The notion of ideology, commonly associated with critical theory, was also introduced in one text. Richmond (2009) introduced the notion of ideologically driven thinking in an article about the tulip economic bubble in the Netherlands in the 1630s. The article stated: "Not all observers are willing to dispose of Mackay so readily. Kim Phillips-Fein, an ideologically motivated critic of market-based economies writing at the height of the dot-com bubble, complains that 'trendy academics like to say that the tulip craze wasn't a bubble at all'" (Richmond, 2009, p. 89). The article later continued: "Without a clear, agreed-upon chronology of events that led to the stunning rise and fall of tulip prices, we may never know the causes with any certainty, and any explanation may reveal more about the researcher's ideological bias than it does about Dutch life in 1636" (Richmond, 2009, p. 90). The passages introduce how thinking

can be ideologically affected, but they also provide opportunities for discussion about how the author portrays particular views as being ideologically motivated.

The manner in which ideology was attended to in the text is symbolic of the deficiencies of the textbooks in promoting criticality. Richmond (2009) introduced the notion of ideologically driven thinking; however, he did not provide support in the form of activities or additional information to ground the concept or promote critical engagement with it. As a result, the development of criticality would be dependent on the background knowledge and initiative of the teacher. This is common throughout the textbooks, as issues that have great potential in fostering a critical perspective about tacit mechanisms and systems that promote inequality and threaten the well-being of society are addressed in a superficial manner, with a focus on the language used rather than the content of texts. Moreover, even when activities were provided to encourage critical engagement with topics (i.e., the debate in Lebauer, 2010b), the effectiveness of the investigation was undermined by the inclusion of relatively benign topics that were unlikely to challenge core assumptions in a meaningful way (e.g., Amnesty International's principles) or the provision of inadequate information from which an informed argument could be crafted. The result is the portrayal of critical engagement in the textbooks, but without real substance.

Advanced Academic Resources

Unlike the aforementioned levels where four books were identified as influential, only two books were identified as being commonly utilized with the advanced academically focused group. Both books were keenly focused on developing the academic skills needed for success in an English-speaking university, including different approaches to writing and the skills needed to analyze and evaluate information. The focus of the books was slightly different though, as

Swales and Feak (2012) exclusively focused on developing academic skills through a variety of tasks, while Henderson (2012) was split into two sections with the first section focusing on developing academic skills and the second section including a series of readings for learners to engage with.

Similar to the previously identified academically-oriented books, the two books used with advanced learners paid little attention to the concept 'culture.' The term 'culture' is absent from the indexes in both texts. Nonetheless, cultural themes are present in the texts, as the authors selected topics that would appeal to a wide range of readers from various fields. As a result, the readings included in the textbooks cover topics from the fields of political science, law, women's studies, engineering, etc., in addition to content that is related to culture. For example, Swales and Feak (2012) included information from a study looking at the decision-making patterns of American parents. The statistics provided demonstrated that decision-making is collaborative when related to certain activities and authoritative when related to others. For individuals from another culture, this would provide insight into parenting trends in the United States and highlight differences in parenting styles in different locations. Similarly, Henderson (2012) included a number of readings that fall under the category 'culture and cultural studies.' The readings introduce students to various cultural themes including the significance of the names, titles, and labels applied to different cultural groups and controversies surrounding the wearing of hijabs in certain western countries. As a result, learners would have the opportunity to explore ways that culture influences them and society.

Although cultural themes are addressed in the textbooks, they are included as a means to foster linguistic and academic development rather than as important content to be explored. As previously mentioned, Swales and Feak (2012) included a reading that explored parental

decision-making trends in the United States. Although this article could have been used to promote intercultural exploration about parenting styles in different cultures, the post-text activities focused exclusively on the effectiveness of the highlighting statements used. This exemplifies the general use of texts in the book as simply the means to practice particular skills, rather than as significant content with which learners could engage. Henderson (2012) also focused on the analysis of writing techniques and language at the conclusion of articles. For example, at the conclusion of the article entitled "Listening to the voices of *hijab*" the author included nine questions to draw learners' attention to the construction of the article. Question one asked: "What are the functions of the epigraphs (quotations) that precede the essay and many of the sections? Discuss the functions of the first epigraph (preceding paragraph 1) and one other epigraph" (Henderson, 2012, p. 306). Similarly, question eight stated: "Discuss the author's decision to use direct quotations extensively. Focusing on the two direct quotations of participants in the section, 'The *hijab*, body, and gaze' and their contexts, explain whether they add or detract from the points Ruby is making" (Henderson, 2012, p. 306). Unlike the other text, however, Henderson (2012) also included post-reading activities to engage learners with the content of the article. As an example, at the conclusion of the aforementioned article, the author included an activity that involved debating the merits of laws that ban clothing associated with a particular religion. The activity encourages dialogue about an issue that could foster cultural understanding; however, without additional guidance to support meaningful intercultural engagement, the goal of the activity seems to be communicative practice. Therefore, the inclusion of cultural themes appears to be based on promoting learner interest, rather than encouraging intercultural exploration and understanding.

In contrast to the limited focus on cultural content, the two books focused heavily on the development of critical thinking and reading skills. In fact, both texts dedicated an entire chapter to the introduction and development of critical skills. Swales and Feak (2012) included a chapter titled "Writing Critiques," which explores the role of critique in academia. The authors outlined how critique is a French word meaning 'critical assessment', including both positive and negative forms of assessment. They further elaborated how the purpose of critique is to assess understanding, develop analytical readings skills, and promote the comparison and synthesis of materials read. Although critique is applicable in all fields, the authors cautioned that individuals must adhere to the standards of judgment acceptable within particular fields. Swales and Feak (2012) elaborated: "In the humanities, attention may focus on how 'interesting' the arguments are; in the social sciences, on the methodology; and in the sciences and Engineering, on the results and what they might (or might not) imply for the real world" (p. 229). In this way, the authors portrayed criticality as a field specific skill associated with analyzing and judging information.

Criticality was portrayed by Henderson (2012) in a very similar manner in his chapter "Critical Thinking." The author defined the term in the following manner: "Critical thinking is a process of engagement. It consists of a series of logical mental processes that lead to a conclusion" (Henderson, 2012, p. 35). He also listed a number of skills associated with critical thinking including analyzing, questioning, evaluating, comparing, reconsidering, synthesizing, drawing conclusions, etc. The author contended that critical thinking is widely used in academic settings when writing summaries, reading material, participating in discussions, and assessing the reliability and validity of various sources. He further stated: "…critical skills do not apply just to reading and writing: they are used in many everyday situations … and in fieldwork projects … in

which the fieldworker observes phenomena in their surroundings and draws conclusions from these observations" (Henderson, 2012, p. 36). Hence, the author portrayed criticality as a mental skill involving evaluating information and drawing conclusions.

The two textbooks utilized with advanced academically-oriented learners included numerous activities to develop and apply critical thinking skills. For example, task three of chapter three in Swales and Feak (2012) involved reading and answering questions about a passage related to the influence of English in academia. Although a number of the follow-up questions were language related, two questions also encouraged readers to apply criticality in exploring the topic: "What is your opinion regarding the dominance of English in publication? What kinds of studies would, in your opinion, actually resolve the debate?" (Swales & Feak, 2012, p. 108). These questions are very broad and opinion-based; however, they require analysis, synthesis and evaluation, skills associated with critical thinking, to formulate an answer. Similarly, Henderson (2012) included post-reading questions that not only directed learners to linguistic elements of the text, but also required the application of critical thinking skills. For example, following Miller's article entitled "Which 'Native' history? By whom? For whom?" the following question was posed: "Discuss the significance of names, labels, and titles as they have been applied to cultural groups in the past; how could a label affect the identity of a group or individual in the group? You could consider, for example, stereotypes associated with the word 'Indian'" (Henderson, 2012, p. 249). Criticality would have to be applied in responding to this prompt in order to consider the topic from multiple perspectives and derive a novel response.

In addition to providing activities to develop critical thinking, the authors of the aforementioned texts also selected topics for inclusion that could facilitate critical understanding. Critical pedagogues advocate for the importance of questioning taken-for-granted norms and

better understanding systemic structures that maintain inequalities in society. Numerous topics have been included in the texts that could potentially foster such forms of understanding. For example, Swales and Feak (2012) included such topics as the utilization of cloud water in Chile to address water shortages, energy harvesting to generate clean power, and ethical considerations about online behaviour. These topics could promote awareness about ecological issues facing society and the need for ethical re-evaluation as new technologies change the manner in which humans interact. Moreover, Henderson (2012) addressed topics related to gender equality, corporate influence on education, and sustainable food production. Although the topics were not explicitly addressed in the textbooks in a manner to promote awareness about systemic constraints and unravel tacit norms, the nature of the content makes the development of such awareness possible. Moreover, Swales and Feak (2012) explicitly introduced a concept that provides the foundation for critique within the critical pedagogy tradition – ideology. In the context of analyzing how publishing decisions are made, the authors introduced ideological bias as an important factor. Although the concept is not well elaborated upon, its introduction could prompt discussion and further exploration not only about the influence of ideology in publishing practices, but more widely on ideological influences on decision-making.

Summary

In summary, the resources utilized at the three different levels had a very distinctive linguistic focus. Content was selected to promote linguistic development by drawing attention to particular uses of language and facilitating linguistic practice through the inclusion of interesting materials. Content was also selected to meet the objectives of the courses; for example, the non-academic courses included content to assist adaptation to living in a new culture, while the academic courses included material to develop the skills necessary for pursuing post-secondary

studies in an English speaking university. Although cultural content was prominent in the non-academic materials, culture was portrayed in superficial terms and limited opportunities were presented for intercultural engagement. Materials from the academic stream included even less emphasis on exploring intercultural themes, with content related to culture included incidentally as a means to foster language usage. Conversely, criticality was nominally addressed in the non-academic and lower academic resources, but assumed a rather prominent role in the higher academic materials. The portrayal of criticality in these texts was limited to the cognitive skill of questioning and analyzing information with minimal attention dedicated to meaningful social issues. In all cases, content was included that could promote intercultural investigation and critical exploration at multiple levels of sophistication; however, engagement with content in this manner would be dependent on the focus of the instructor, as it was not readily built in to the structure of the texts. Hence, the textbooks utilized by instructors would have a limiting effect on how criticality and interculturality were understood and engaged with in the second language classroom.

As previously mentioned, the textbooks utilized by instructors in the study addressed interculturality and criticality in a limited manner. Culture was nominally addressed in the academic-oriented texts, but was more prominent in the resources utilized in the non-academic courses. Nonetheless, the presentation of culture closely resembled the intercultural as monologic paradigm, as it was presented as monolithic facts to be digested and mimicked. Similarly, criticality was presented in a limited fashion mirroring the generic criticality tradition. Although content was included that could promote the application of criticality and interculturality on a broader basis, this was dependent on the initiative of the instructor. Influenced by the discourse of decisive deference, a number of the instructors interviewed in this

study would only utilize the material presented in the textbooks to promote the explicitly stated goals of the program. As a result, the discourse of decisive deference complemented by the discursive frame established by the resources utilized in teaching courses had a very limiting influence on how educators understood and addressed criticality and interculturality in their classes.

CHAPTER ELEVEN: WHAT IS THE TRANSFORMATIVE POTENTIAL OF SECOND LANGUAGE EDUCATION?

The transformative potential of any educational endeavour is dependent on numerous factors including the materials introduced, the manner it is introduced, the background experiences of learners, etc. Therefore, the ascription of one form of education as being more transformative in character than another is contextually dependent. Nonetheless, educators' accounts of their teaching philosophy embedded in the concepts 'interculturality' and 'criticality' provide insight into the potentially transformative character of the language learning experience within the walls of their classrooms.

The transformative character of second language pedagogy is directly linked to the manner in which the subject is conceptualized. Understood narrowly as linguistic development, language education is unlikely to have a transformative dimension. Historical models that emphasize linguistic development (for example, the grammar-translation method and audiolingualism) encourage repetition and rote memorization (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Although these processes are pedagogically sound in terms of promoting vocabulary development and encouraging language acquisition, they will not promote introspective analysis or present learners with content to stimulate cognitive dissonance. Furthermore, the cognitive benefits resulting from language exploration, a rationale commonly provided for the use of the grammar-translation method, relate more to the exercise of stimulating flexible thinking (i.e., mental gymnastics) than expanding or challenging the foundations of one's underlying thought processes or perspectives. Hence, a narrow focus on linguistic development may result in language acquisition and mental stimulation, but it is unlikely to result in a transformative experience for learners.

Similarly, language education conceptualized as the ability to communicate would have limited potential as a form of transformative pedagogy. In the second half of the twentieth century a paradigm shift took place within the field of second language education, moving the emphasis from linguistic development to communicative competence (Brown, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The emphasis on the ability to communicate effectively was attached to a form of language education commonly referred to as communicative language teaching (CLT). CLT advocates for the development of various competencies (i.e., grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence) in order to facilitate effective interaction with a native speaker. Thus, the native speaker is upheld as the norm for interaction, providing the benchmark to assess communicative competence. As the native speaker is portrayed as the model for communication, sociolinguistic norms are highlighted based on their appropriacy in meeting expectations in interaction with a native speaker. This means that cultural investigation will occur only to the extent it will contribute to communication.

Pedagogy based on communicative language teaching would have questionable capacity as a transformative agent. As the focus of CLT is effective communication, instruction would be based on developing skills necessary to efficiently relay and comprehend messages. An emphasis on communication without a broader vision of the function of language education would result in the selection of content based on its pragmatic capacity to foster particular language forms or vocabulary or promote the use of language for particular functions. This means that the content would be unlikely to challenge students' current ways of thinking or foster inquiry into topics with transformative potential. Furthermore, the fact that communicative competence posits the native speaker as the model for interaction limits opportunities for self-exploration. As the objective of communication is mimicry of native speaker norms, the linguistic and cultural

background of learners is irrelevant within the walls of the classroom. This treatment of students as *tabula rasa* would mitigate reflection on embedded norms and assumptions and prevent comparison that could lead to novel insights about both the native and target culture and language. Therefore, communicative language teaching is unlikely to foster transformative change.

The language educators who participated in this study were inducted into language pedagogy after the paradigm shift resulting in the ascension of communicative language teaching to a position of prominence within the field. This does not mean that language education was not viewed as a form of linguistic investigation, but rather that linguistic investigation continued to influence practices while the focus shifted to the development of communicative competence. As with any professional activity, the manner in which one is inducted into the profession will have a lasting influence on one's practices, but this is often supplemented by other insights developed over the course of one's career. This was the case for the language educators in the study, as they discussed being appreciably influenced by the principles of CLT early in their careers, but this influence was balanced by other influences as they developed more knowledge and experience within the field. For example, Parker noted that the emphasis on CLT during her teacher preparation was the result of paradigm shifts within the profession. She commented: "*And the pendulum swings, you know things needed to be very communicative and fluency was the primary focus when I was going to university as opposed to accuracy, and the pendulum shifted the other way.*" She articulated that the shifting paradigms have resulted in a more balanced approach being adopted, but confessed: "*I am probably more on the communicative end because that is where I started from.*" This sentiment was indicative of the perspectives advocated by other respondents. Although communicative competence played a significant role in their

pedagogy, its principles were supplemented by alternative approaches and personal insights into language education. For example, the language educators were generally reticent to advocate for native speaker norms. Even in contexts where language learning was envisaged as a process of preparation for participation in a particular society, it was not conceptualized narrowly as the adoption of native speaker norms. For example, Darcy commented on the influence of cultural investigation in her class stating: "*[It] is more knowing about Canadian culture and how their own culture influences their behaviour, and working together with a class that is also very diverse, and understanding that there are differences and there are ways to communicate that are more effective and it is a skill that you need in Canada because we are such... a multicultural society.*" Although Darcy emphasized Canadian norms in her instruction, she did so in a manner predicated on self-exploration and analysis of efficacy rather than the blind adoption of imposed norms. Hence, she sought to develop learners' communicative abilities in a dialogic manner predicated on language education as a form of inquiry.

Similar to Darcy, other educators were influenced by traditional notions of linguistic development and the promotion of communicative competence, but supplemented these influences with a broader vision of the function of language education. This is significant because it is this more nuanced understanding of second language pedagogy that defined the transformative character of their instruction.

The nuanced understanding of the function of language education espoused by the language educators could be partially attributed to the character and structure of the programs in which they taught. For example, the academically oriented instructors identified induction into academia as a central objective of the EAP program. This meant that students needed to be introduced to academic ways of using language – including adopting an academic tone,

comprehending academic language, and utilizing vocabulary appropriate to an academic setting – but it also entailed familiarizing them with particular norms for academic study. Pat clarified the focus of the program in the following statement: "*I mean the secondary objectives have to do with that whole academic piece, how to structure things, how to organize your thoughts...those are all critical important issues too...teaching critical thinking, teaching how to reference, how to research. Those are all parts and pieces of what we do and are all very important, but they all to me are secondary to language.*" The focus on developing academic skills associated with a new context would likely initiate learners to a new world of ideas and ways of looking at phenomena. Culture is implicated in pedagogical practices (Hofstede, 1986; Giroux, 2011). Every field of study is grounded in a particular epistemological foundation and is associated with a particular way of investigating and representing phenomena (Hyland, 2000). When students first enter into post-secondary institutions, they are exposed to a much deeper level of content, but also introduced to subject specific ways of approaching topics that are much more sophisticated than during their days as high school students. Although the EAP program did not specialize in a particular field of study, it initiated learners to subject-specific forms of inquiry to which students would not have been previously exposed.

Exposure to a new frame of reference would also occur because of the added layer of novelty associated with expressing ideas in a different linguistic form. Languages are not mirror reflections of each other, as the existence and meaning of words are associated with the collective history of the users of the particular language. Moreover, the manner in which languages are used to express ideas is dependent on the language itself. Kaplan (1966) famously identified how different linguistic groups express ideas using different communicative patterns. For example, users of English and Germanic languages were found to use direct, linear patterns

of communication, while users of oriental languages tended to use more indirect, circular patterns of expression. Adjusting to the communicative patterns of another group would, thus, force learners to organize and communicate ideas in a different fashion. Therefore, exposure to and use of different languages would initiate individuals to a collective way of viewing the world associated with a different group.

In addition to the focus on initiating students to western academic ways of approaching topics and communicating ideas, educators also highlighted the programmatic focus on developing critical thinking skills. Jordan stated: "*A lot of what we do here is just focussed on critical thinking. That is what I want university students to be able to do*." Parker concurred elaborating: "*We are in an academic context so... we do put an emphasis on [critical thinking] ... Your sciences require that questioning, that critical view; any of your humanities would demand those skills. Offhand, I can't think of a subject area in academia in the west that wouldn't require that*." Highlighting the importance of critical thinking in the EAP curriculum Robin observed: "*So, it is [often] not even English that you are teaching them*." The emphasis on critical thinking skills is significant in terms of the transformative character of the experience. Most of the instructors attested to their students coming from education systems in which rote memorization was heavily drawn upon. As a result, the skill of questioning and critically engaging with material was rarely honed. Developing this skill in the context of the EAP program would, thus, provide the impetus for students to develop new ways of thinking. As Paul (2004) noted: "Critical thinking is the art of thinking about thinking with a view to improving it. Critical thinkers seek to improve thinking in three interrelated phases. They analyze thinking. They assess thinking. And they up-grade thinking." Hence, the act of engaging in critical thinking would be transformative because it would lead to constantly questioning and re-evaluating one's

thinking. For individuals with little experience engaging in this type of cognitive activity, having it emphasized within a program would likely lead to a transformative experience.

Although critical thinking and western academic skills were not emphasized within the non-academic program, its structure still emphasized content that would likely be transformative in nature. Working in a program designed to assist adaptation to Canadian society, Darcy outlined how Canadian culture and ways of thinking were infused into the curriculum. She stated: "*In the ESL setting they [students] are coming here and so we focus a lot on Canadian culture, right, and language the way that Canadians use it… I like that about [the program] that the settlement and the Canadian culture is all tied together... it is an expectation right, and part of the curriculum.*" Ongoing exposure to cultural difference through the materials presented as part of the curriculum would likely lead to a culturally-based form of cognitive dissonance. Although learners could assimilate or accommodate the source of dissonance into existing schemata, the fact that they would become members of the society from which the dissonance was triggered makes it unlikely that this would be the outcome. In contrast, it is highly likely that repeated exposure to difference, that is not only experienced in the classroom but also in numerous other walks of life, would result in significant changes in the way an individual views the world.

It could be argued that the change fostered through both the academic and non-academic programs is normative in character; in other words, it is learning designed to promote assimilation into societal norms. This is a fair assumption based on the fact that the language programs were designed to prepare learners to adapt to a new setting, whether related to work, study or general living; however, the learning taking place in these contexts would not be normative in character. The individuals participating in the programs have already been

socialized into a particular set of social norms. Socialization into a new set of norms would not result in the wholesale abandonment of one set of norms for another, but rather broaden one's perspective by challenging pre-existing ways of thinking and adopting a new lens through which to view the world. In this way, the programs would foster transformative learning even if their overt goals were based on adopting local norms.

Furthermore, the educators explicated that although Canadian norms were introduced in the classroom, they were not presented in a hegemonic manner or represented as the one correct way to do things. Jordan, for example stated that she incorporates "*their cultures so that they can see the differences and not to say that one is better than the other, but to acknowledge the differences.*" Through highlighting differences she hoped that new understandings could be established. Similarly, Robin highlighted the need to celebrate the unique contributions each student could make to the classroom while pointing out "*at the same time there are certain things that you would like your students to adapt to - things that will make their life easier here.*" Pat further explicated the problems associated with imposing Canadian ways on students: "*We have to teach academic culture because students need to understand that for this particular situation. But there are so many dangers of imposing true language, and using language to impose ways of thinking on other people is so dangerous.*" She also cautioned: "*I want to make sure that it is not seen that a western value is better than another.*" Hence, the educators sought to develop knowledge of Canadian norms as part of the mission of their work, but they did so in a manner that focused on awareness-raising rather than inculcation.

In addition to being impacted by the structure of the programs in which they were working, the language educators also developed a nuanced understanding of second language pedagogy based on their biographies as language learners. Although the educators were drawn to

second language teaching as a profession for different reasons, inevitably their history included a passion for language learning and positive experiences navigating multiple cultural terrains. These experiences demonstrated the benefits of learning and communicating in multiple languages; benefits that would influence how they perceived their work as language educators and the transformative character of their pedagogy.

As previously outlined, all of the educators perceived a close link between culture and language. Because linguistic meaning was viewed as dependent on cultural associations, the language classroom was characterized as a site for linguistic and cultural exploration. At its most basic level, cultural exploration was viewed as facilitating the communicative process. As Parker articulated, "*If you do not have that cultural context, it will interfere with the communication, there will be a breakdown in communication.*" Communication was not viewed as the end result of cultural exploration, on the contrary, most instructors viewed communication, and therefore the second language classroom, as serving a broader function.

For some educators, the second language classroom was conceptualized as a site for promoting awareness and skill in attending to diversity. For example, Robin was drawn to second language teaching because of her desire to work with immigrant populations. She was very attuned to the needs of second language learners and tried to develop skills that would assist learners in adapting to Canadian culture. As a result, she supplemented academically oriented content with activities to promote cultural awareness. She believed it was important to respect students' culture and integrate it into lessons, articulating that it "*makes it more interesting and students can learn from other cultures, be tolerant of other cultures.*" While promoting tolerance was important, she also believed it was essential to foster awareness about Canadian norms that would "*make their life easier here.*" As a result, she conceptualized cultural exploration as a

dialogic process involving mutual benefit. Moreover, she believed that new arrivals were not always welcomed by Canadians, but expressed that "*second language education can hopefully make the two groups integrate or interact together better*." Thus, Robin understood second language education as a form of exploration leading to a more smooth transition into a new society.

Similar to Robin, Parker also conceptualized the second language classroom as a location for developing linguistic skills in concert with promoting awareness about cultural diversity. Although she taught in an academically oriented program, Parker believed that academic success was facilitated by easing the transition to a new culture. She stated: "*You have to live in Canada while you are studying. How do you live in this culture and be comfortable and function to be able to do your academics? How do you do that without losing your own culture? Without being isolated*?" As a result, Parker emphasized the development of adaptation skills in her classes. This involved promoting critical investigation into cultural differences so that students would have a better understanding about the foundations of alternative perspectives, but it also involved encouraging tolerance towards "*the other person's choices even though those are not the choices or practice of life that they would choose*." She believed that comfort with alternative perspectives was key to adapting to a multicultural society, thus, her classroom encouraged the inclusion of multiple perspectives on issues. Through exposure to multiple perspectives and the development of skills to cope with diversity, Parker hoped to prepare her students to acclimatize to Canadian society. As she characterized it, second language education "*is a bridge and a door to allow … people to be able to fully participate in the society because usually those who do not have strong language skills are marginalized*."

Jordan also believed in the importance of utilizing diversity within the second language classroom to broaden students' horizons; however, unlike Robin and Parker she rationalized its inclusion based on personal development, rather than assisting acclimatization. Jordan had a social studies background that influenced how she perceived her role as an educator. She expressed the desire to challenge students to develop a cognitive framework to "*try to figure out what they believe and where that comes from.*" The second language classroom provided the perfect venue for promoting investigation of this nature. As the primary focus of instruction was on linguistic development, content was required that would be relevant and interesting for students in order to promote engagement. Current events satisfied these criteria and provided opportunities for critiquing various sources of information. Jordan relayed: "[In] *the current event activity I talk about how opinions are formed and where they get the information… I'll bring in four different newspapers and look at the same topic and so just showing them which one do you think you are going to get more information from? Which one do you think is valid?*" Exploring different perspectives on a topic was further facilitated by the composition of the class. In a multicultural setting students are naturally exposed to a variety of perspectives based on cultural and experiential differences. Jordan believed this was beneficial and "*fun because now we can share a variety of perspectives and views and have our eyes opened to a number of different situations.*" The awareness promoted through investigating topics from a multitude of perspectives helped to combat unfounded biases and stereotypes and provided the foundational skills for critical decision-making. Therefore, for Jordan second language education is ideal for developing linguistic skills in combination with cognitive skills needed to foster personal growth.

Pedagogy grounded in cultural exploration to assist adaptation to a new society or promote awareness about perspectival diversity would likely be transformative in character. Exposure to alternative ways of living and looking at the world would broaden individuals' worldview. Moreover, as self-awareness is facilitated by exposure to difference, the pedagogical approaches adopted by Parker, Robin and Jordan would likely contribute to learners developing novel understandings about themselves and how they view the world. Nonetheless, the focus of instruction on promoting awareness of cultural difference would likely result in experiencing personal transformation, but not broader social transformation. In order to foster transformation at this level, a pedagogical approach would have to be adopted that promotes critical engagement grounded in social justice. This form of second language education was supported by several instructors in this study.

Carey was one educator who believed in the importance of fusing social justice into the fabric of second language pedagogy. She was drawn to second language education because of her desire to work with and advocate for minority populations. Although her career path would lead her to teach EAP courses, the importance of advocating for change always remained at the forefront of her pedagogical thinking. She believed in the importance of grounding the subject of investigation and openly critiqued the privileged status of the English language with her students. Moreover, she prominently attended to the "*cultural component*" of second language education and promoted the adoption of a critical perspective when exploring cultural practices and perspectives, which meant investigating taken-for-granted norms that had become infused into the fabric of society. Carey believed this was important to provide learners with "*a sense of empowerment*" when confronting novel experiences in a new country, but she also contended that it was necessary to engage with concepts on a deeper level. She believed that the second

language classroom was an ideal location to promote global citizenship, which she claimed involved moving from self-centeredness to empathy and mutual understanding. As a result, she encouraged the incorporation of numerous perspectives in the exploration of topics that define the global community. As she noted, the second language classroom provides unique opportunities for students to investigate issues from multiple cultural perspectives in a safe and supportive environment. She articulated: "*This is a safe place to get to know yourself, get to know each other and explore these ideas because you may not have time later on*." As such, she viewed second language education as providing a supportive space for critically investigating topics that define who we are and how we interact with each other on a global scale.

Kelly also adopted a global focus in her instruction in the second language classroom. Although she believed it was important to incorporate students' cultures and the target culture in the classroom to foster belonging and mutual understanding, she believed the status of English as a *lingua franca* necessitated broadening the focus to include global cultures. Kelly believed the incorporation of global cultural perspectives in the English classroom would facilitate broadening learners' perspectives through placing embedded cultural assumptions in conflict with new cultural understandings. As a result, she purposefully selected content that would create cultural clash in order to foster reflection. In addition to fostering reflection based on cultural difference, Kelly also sought to encourage the critical investigation of tacit structural barriers. Based on her own experiences adapting to an alternative cultural setting, Kelly believed in the importance of critical analysis as an empowering tool. She explained how critical pedagogy helped her to critique the discourse of meritocracy: "*I gradually realized there is something much bigger and more powerful than individual effort - there are structural, systematic barriers that an individual just cannot break through*." This realization prompted her

to conceptualize second language education as a venue for investigating barriers to the attainment of students' goals and the promotion of "*social justice and equality - these kinds of democratic ideas*." As such, she believed that education should not just be about individual growth but also the growth of society as a whole. She advocated: "*The overall goal is an enhancement of their well-being - first of all as an individual and then through them enhancing the well-being of their community. So, I always have social consciousness while teaching - not to just teach particular skills or knowledge, but also to take care of the student as a person and hopefully they can have a positive influence on society*."

The perception of second language education as fostering individual growth leading to societal improvement was also shared by Mackenzie. She believed the function of all forms of education was to "*cultivate educated citizens*." The second language classroom assisted in this process by promoting cross-cultural understanding through "*exchanging ideas [and] exchanging knowledge*." As Mackenzie clarified, in a second language classroom numerous perspectives will be represented leading to very fruitful discussion: "*They can have a good discussion by just getting a variety of viewpoints… if somebody comes from China or Venezuela or from the Gulf Coast states, then it is always interesting to see how they look at it*." In addition to fostering a broader understanding about topics through exploring multiple perspectives, the intercultural dialogue stimulated in the second language classroom was also believed to promote tolerance and respect for difference. Mackenzie believed this was important in developing the skills necessary to cooperate and coexist with difference in an increasingly changing world. Engaging in civilized dialogue in the multicultural classroom was thus deemed important "*because ultimately this is what allows us to build a better world and to kind of try and reduce the number of conflicts*." Hence, second language education was understood by Mackenzie as serving an

important social function in preparing individuals for negotiating difference when consensus is not possible. This function was complemented by the inclusion of a critical lens on topics introduced in the classroom that facilitate broadening learners' perspectives and appreciating different aspects of life.

Similar to other educators, Sidney also understood the value of challenging mono-cultural views and promoting greater awareness through cultural exploration. In fact, she posited cultural exploration as the focus through which linguistic skills would be developed. She explained: "*So, through all the four skills you just explore culture and everything that it is and has been and could be.*" As articulated in this quote, Sidney did not perceive cultural investigation as the learning of key facts about cultures, but rather a critical investigation of how cultural phenomena have been and could be interpreted. In approaching culture in this manner, she was positing students as culture producers rather than consumers, and encouraging the critique of the status quo. Through challenging cultural norms Sidney hoped learners would better understand the foundations of their thinking. She stated: "*Well I just think that through that you understand the way you make meaning in the world.*" She further exclaimed: "*I know for me learning two other languages I learned a lot about myself and what I value and what is important to me.*" In addition to fostering personal awareness, Sidney also believed second language education facilitated joint meaning making and relational development. She contended: "*I think it is the one thing that we can do that other animals cannot - make meaning out of difference.*" She advocated joint meaning making as "*the most nourishing experience as a human being*" and viewed the second language classroom as a prime venue for promoting dialogue as a form of meaning making. In order for this to be possible, Sidney advocated for the development of emotional

intelligence as well, to assist learners in dealing with the difficult feelings experienced during cross-cultural engagement.

The form of pedagogy advocated by Carey, Kelly, Mackenzie, and Sidney included elements of self-awareness, exploration of difference, and a critical tone in investigating issues that influence students' lives. As such, it includes components of instruction that could foster individual transformation through the expansion of awareness about diversity and one's own biases and perspectives; however, it also encourages relational development and dialogue about topics that could promote social transformation. While individual transformation can be brought about through intellectual engagement often undertaken in a social atmosphere, social transformation requires the analysis of societal structures and norms that have a bearing on students' lives, accompanied by tangible action to promote change. Giroux (2011) contended: "Educational work at its best represents a response to questions and issues posed by the tensions and contradictions of the broader society; it is an attempt to understand and intervene in specific problems that emanate from those sites that people concretely inhabit and in which they actually live out their lives and everyday existence" (p. 79). The 'educational best practices' referred to by Giroux highlight the pedagogy espoused by the educators that have a social transformative dimension in that they promote investigation and action towards relevant issues that influence students' lives. According to Gass (2014), transformational change requires permanent change in the hearts, minds and behaviour of individuals, and societal structures. Although cognitive change is the first step in producing transformational change, "practice to integrate real changes into our lives" is essential (Gass, 2014, p. 26). Due to the limitations associated with formal language education, it is unlikely that educational episodes will foster social transformation. Nonetheless, cross-cultural dialogue and the critical investigation of topics influencing learners'

lives may lead to shifts in the hearts and minds of participants, providing the impetus for social transformation when a critical mass is attained.

From the aforementioned discussion it can be concluded that all the educators understood second language education as including a transformative dimension. For some of the educators the transformative character of second language education was based on the structure and focus of the program in which they taught. For others, the close association between language and culture and the adaptive dimension of second language education made it an inherently transformative experience. Yet others understood language pedagogy as transformative due to the opportunities presented for cross-cultural exploration about topics that define society and how we communally create meaning. As outlined in the previous paragraphs, the transformative potential of pedagogy is influenced by the inclusion of content and activities to promote individual and social change. The data collected for the study also revealed several other factors influencing the transformative character of second language education.

One important factor influencing the transformative potential of second language education was the degree to which non-linguistic content was explicitly integrated into the curriculum. The explicit inclusion of some non-linguistic content occurred because of the structure of programs in which the second language educators worked. The academic oriented program emphasized academic skill development including critical thinking skills, while the non-academic courses focused on developing adaptive skills including awareness of cultural difference. Beyond the programmatic foci, non-linguistic content was explicitly included based on the motivations and interests of the instructor. For some educators non-linguistic content did not need to be explicitly integrated into the curriculum because it would be implicitly addressed. For example, Parker believed culture did not need to be explicitly addressed because it would

inherently be included through linguistic investigation. For other educators, such as Robin, the inclusion of non-linguistic material was based on the demonstrated need of students within the class. She articulated that cultural content would be included based on "*teachable moments*" or "*incidental things that come up*," but was not deliberately incorporated into her lessons. A third group of educators advocated for the explicit inclusion of non-linguistic content with the purpose of satisfying a particular aim. Sidney and Kelly fell within this category as Sidney supported the use of cultural exploration as the basis for linguistic learning, while Kelly sought to challenge learners by selecting content that would promote culture clash and help them investigate tacit norms. In both cases, the integration of non-linguistic content was purposefully designed to foster desired understandings.

The explicit inclusion of non-linguistic content would influence the transformative potential of second language pedagogy in numerous ways. First, the explicit inclusion of content that could foster transformative learning would ensure that important content was addressed. Although it is pedagogically advisable to adjust instruction based on the composition of the student population to ensure the applicability and meaningfulness of the content, incorporating material in an unplanned, incidental manner would promote heightened reliance on the student population and the ability of the instructor to recognize potential connections. Moreover, if the instructor did not view the material as warranting explicit inclusion in the curriculum, it is unlikely that it would be incorporated on an improvisational basis. Second, explicitly including material would ensure attention is directed to it as an important aspect of the educational experience. Conversely, if content were implicitly incorporated, recognition of its importance and acquisition of the desired outcome would be solely dependent upon the insights drawn by independent learners. This would inevitably lead to the content being overlooked or erroneously

understood by some learners. Third, failure to explicitly incorporate particular content would lead to the material presented in textbooks, etc. as the default non-linguistic focus of instruction. As demonstrated in the analysis of resources used by instructors in this study, the content in sanctioned textbooks was largely included to foster linguistic development. As such, transformational learning promoted by the materials would be heavily dependent upon insights provided or encouraged by the instructor, again leaving it more open to individual initiative.

A second influential factor in the promotion of second language education as a transformative endeavour was the degree of instrumentality adopted by educators. The adoption of a narrow instrumental focus had a limiting influence on the transformative potential of instruction. Pat, for one, viewed second language instruction in strictly instrumental terms. As a result, all pedagogical decisions were made based on the expressed goals of the program in which she worked. This resulted in a narrow focus on the development of linguistic and academic skills deemed necessary to thrive in post-secondary courses instructed in English. While some of the skills explicitly promoted as part of the program goals could lead to transformative outcomes, the narrow focus of the course would limit these outcomes and likely restrict them to the individual domain. Conversely, educators who did not view their work in such narrow pragmatic terms utilized instructional practices that would be more likely to encourage transformation on a more substantial level. For example, Carey worked in an EAP setting in which the goals of instruction were the development of academic language proficiency. Although the explicit goals of the program were instrumental in character, Carey adopted a wider vision of her instruction as promoting broader understanding about oneself and society, including the analysis of tacit structural influences. Through expanding the foundational goals of her work

beyond an instrumental focus, Carey promoted pedagogy with greater potential to encourage transformational learning.

A third important factor influencing the transformative potential of second language education was the manner in which criticality was applied. As previously outlined, the concept was understood in a variety of ways, but underlying all of the definitions was the notion of criticality as a form of analysis and questioning. The primary difference between the different conceptualizations of criticality was the domains in which the concept was applied. All of the educators applied criticality to the domain of information. Students in the courses taught by these instructors were encouraged to question and analyze the information they encountered in readings, lectures and discussions during the course. This included assessing the accuracy, reliability, and validity of information, which instructors accomplished by encouraging students to adopt multiple perspectives, reveal the biases inherent in different positions, analyze the credibility of sources, and evaluate the support provided for various perspectives.

While all of the educators applied criticality to the domain of information, only a few of the educators utilized the concept in the subject domain. For a number of the teachers, English language education was unquestioningly viewed as the learning of new linguistic and cultural codes to assist in accomplishing a desired goal. The potential broader function of language education and the implications of contributing to the diffusion of a dominant *lingua franca* were not considered. Thus, a critical lens was not applied to the subject of instruction. In contrast, some of the educators were acutely aware of the importance of critically grounding the foundation of their teaching – the subject. They questioned common assumptions related to the subject, including the objectification of language through the promotion of standardized forms (Reagan, 2004). They also questioned the influence of language pedagogy on language

extinction and the promotion and maintenance of social inequality (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994). Through critically engaging with the subject, educators were able to make subtle changes in the structure and content of their teaching to promote awareness about these issues and to minimize their promotion through class activities. Moreover, critical investigation of the subject, and education more generally, led them to view second language education as serving a broader function in society that went beyond the explicitly stated goals of the program in which they worked. This contributed to redefining language education as a forum for developing greater self-awareness and comfort in engaging with diversity, exploring multiple perspectives on important global issues, and investigating tacit structural influences on the way we view and interact with the world.

A third domain where criticality could be applied is the content of instruction. The content of language education is often thought of in linguistic terms. As a result, the content often is comprised of aspects of language (e.g., forms, functions, vocabulary) or samplings of language designed to promote language usage (e.g., readings and lectures that are deemed to be of interest to students). This perspective was adopted by a number of the language educators in this study who wanted to provide students with interesting materials that would not promote controversy, conflict, or discomfort. For these educators, the content of prescribed textbooks would be adequate for satisfying the goals of the course. For other educators, a critical perspective was needed in assessing and identifying content for inclusion in the class. Critical investigation of content involved contextualization to avoid social issues tangential to students' lives, thus enhancing relevance. Based on this principle, intimate knowledge of students and their lives was required to ensure the appropriate selection of content. Critically assessing content also involved maximizing the learning potential by selecting material that would promote linguistic

development concurrent with growth in other areas. This was often achieved by selecting and addressing content in a manner that would promote cognitive dissonance and challenge embedded assumptions underlying students' thinking. By questioning the applicability and value of content in fostering novel understandings, educators were able to foster a more transformative learning environment.

Although analyzing and questioning the content of instruction is important, equally so is the application of criticality to the domain of pedagogical practices. Curriculum theorists have highlighted how learning is not restricted to intended curricular content during educational episodes (Giroux & Purpel, 1983; Apple, 1990). In contrast, intentional and unintentional tacit messages are relayed through instructional practices and the structure of learning episodes. Moreover, the manner in which pedagogy is approached has a direct impact on the form of learning that takes place. For example, Freire (1993) famously outlined how a monologic form of instruction reinforces inequities by further embedding norms that privilege dominant groups, while a dialogic form of education empowers learners by facilitating critique and opening spaces for new perspectives to be heard. Thus, critically examining and questioning instructional practices would assist in revealing and avoiding unintended outcomes. The data from the study revealed that several educators applied criticality to the pedagogical practices domain, resulting in pedagogy that empowered learners through downplaying the authority of instructors, encouraging shared pedagogical decision-making, and promoting an inquisitive demeanour to content introduced.

A fifth area where some educators applied criticality was in the domain of epistemology. Epistemology is an area of utmost concern for researchers (in particular in the social sciences) because of the need to justify the foundations of understanding; however, it is a concept that is

not as commonly engaged with by educators. Although critical perspectives have started to enter into the field of applied linguistics, scientific objectivity is still very much entrenched in the field (Pennycook, 2001). As a result, the facts established through scientific inquiry are deemed to be uninfluenced by human perception or representation and, thus, are considered objective, incontrovertible forms of knowledge. Furthermore, adherence to empiricism within the scientific tradition limits epistemological consideration, as the validity of knowledge is restricted to stimuli reinforced by the senses. Hence, epistemological questions are rendered irrelevant by the certainty promoted by scientific objectivity and empiricism. In the current study, a number of educators refrained from analyzing the foundations of knowledge beyond questioning the source of information. For some of the educators epistemology was a concept they were not familiar with, while for others it was deemed irrelevant or inappropriate to be explicitly addressed. For other educators, questioning epistemological foundations was very important as a means to challenge entrenched forms of knowledge and spark new ways of thinking. Carey articulated: "*If you think something is neutral, it is taken for granted, right. It is just the way it is and you do not think you can change it and you do not think it needs defending*." As a result, she believed it was essential to engage students in epistemological analysis as a means to reveal unproductive assumptions and foster transformative thinking.

In summary, second language education was understood as a transformative endeavour by all the second language educators in the study. For some of the educators the transformative character of second language education was based on the structure and goals of the program in which they taught. For others, second language pedagogy was viewed as serving a broader function based on their experiences as language learners and educators. This broader function often related to increased awareness about cultural difference and oneself, the development of

relational skills to more productively engage with diversity, and mutual exploration of topics designed to challenge prevailing ways of thinking and foster mindfulness about issues defining global society. Educators understood second language education as having transformative potential to varying degrees. Key factors influencing the transformative potential of second language pedagogy were the level of instrumentality adopted, the degree to which topics and skills were explicitly addressed, and the domains in which criticality was applied.

Implications

As the current study is a hermeneutic investigation including a limited sample, grandiose statements designed to guide pedagogical policy cannot be made. Nonetheless, insights can be gleaned from the data to foster further understanding about the central concepts 'interculturality' and 'criticality' and the transformative potential of second language pedagogy. At the forefront of the conclusions drawn from the data is the fact that second language education is perceived as including a transformative dimension. Whether this perception is purposeful or contextually based, this finding is encouraging as it demonstrates that language pedagogy is not viewed as being restricted to linguistic development. This inevitably creates an opportunity for the transformative potential of language learning to be fostered and further elaborated upon. In order to maximize the transformative character of second language education, alterations need to be made to the structure and content of language courses. The educators in the current study revealed a number of ways that this could be accomplished.

First, the transformative character of second language education could be enhanced by putting more of a pedagogical spin on critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy has been criticized for being overly abstract, thus resembling theory more than pedagogy (Gore, 1993). The esoteric character of critical pedagogy undermines its application to educational settings and, therefore,

its utility as a guide for educators. Nonetheless, the hermeneutic investigation revealed definitional commonalities that could be exploited to enhance the application of critical pedagogy. Although criticality was understood in divergent ways, a commonality in perception existed in relation to the close association with analysis and questioning. One of the main differences between conceptualizations of criticality was the domains in which it was applied. Instructors in the study applied criticality to five main domains: information, content, the subject, pedagogical practices, and epistemology. The domains were not mutually exclusive, but rather influenced and informed each other. For example, applying a critical lens to epistemology would reveal that knowledge cannot be limited to empirical evidence, thus facilitating deeper structural analysis in other areas.

Redefining critical pedagogy as the application of criticality to various domains would help to address its obscure character by providing more guidance for educators. Rather than attempting to translate the writings of McLaren and Giroux into practice, the domains of criticality provide a tangible structure to guide educators in establishing their own version of critical pedagogy. Building off this point, the domains of criticality provide a framework that is not too prescriptive. The analysis of the various domains can be undertaken in a variety of forms, meaning they are open-ended and criticality can be applied to them in numerous ways. As such, the form of critical pedagogy adopted is unique to each context. Moreover, the concept of domains of criticality is more closely aligned with the principles of innovation. The literature on pedagogical change outlines that innovation is more likely to occur when change is perceived as being an extension of current practices rather than the adoption of a completely novel approach (Markee, 1997; Waters, 2009b). As the promotion of critical thinking is a common practice among educators (as demonstrated by the results of the current study), portraying critical

pedagogy as the extension of critical thinking to additional domains would be more likely to lead to its application than portraying critical pedagogy as a diametrically opposed undertaking. As a result, second language educators' accounts of criticality revealed commonalities that could be exploited to elaborate critical thinking into a form of critical pedagogy, thus enhancing the transformative potential of instruction.

Second, the transformative dimension of second language education could be enriched by restoring the professional autonomy of educators and encouraging their participation in programmatic decision-making. Although respondents claimed to have freedom to adapt instruction, they also highlighted numerous programmatic policies or expectations that limited their options. These restrictions included the mandated use of particular resources and assessment tools, the prescribed adoption of particular course goals, and the utilization of pre-determined products of learning (i.e., portfolios). The second language educators portrayed the programs as increasingly limiting their professional influence through restricting decision-making and imposing an amplified time commitment to cover particular material or complete particular tasks. The narrowing focus of instruction resulted in increased emphasis on achieving instrumental outcomes.

While education programs often adopt a more pragmatic focus under the rationalization of surviving in an increasingly competitive global market, the narrow focus is not consistent with the responses of second language educators in this study. Individual educators conceptualized the function of second language learning in diverse ways, including several forms of instruction that could foster transformative learning. Nonetheless, minimal outlets for sharing their vision or influencing the direction of the program were available to educators. As a result, the sophisticated insights they possessed about the function of second language pedagogy were

constantly in competition with officially stated goals and were limited to influencing their individual classes. The re-affirmation of teacher professionalism by engaging educators in collegial conversations to explore the potential broader functions of second language education would help to challenge the narrow objectives espoused by programs. Furthermore, dialogic engagement about the underlying rationale of their work could spawn productive new insights and assist in identifying transformative forms of pedagogy that would be appropriate for particular settings.

Third, while it could be beneficial for teachers to have greater input in shaping the mandate of programs, the data from the current study also demonstrated the importance of increased supports to assist educators. The inclination to promote language learning as a transformative endeavour is simply the first step in bringing the transformative potential of pedagogy to fruition; educators also require appropriate materials and pre-service/ in-service education to assist in translating intentions into practice. The analysis of materials utilized by respondents demonstrated their value in developing linguistic knowledge and skill, and additional skills deemed important (e.g., critical thinking and academic writing skills in the academic oriented program). Nonetheless, the materials were lacking in terms of their support in promoting a transformative agenda. All of the potentially transformative elements of the texts were highly dependent on teacher insight and initiative. In programs with narrow instrumental goals and increased accountability for content coverage, it is unlikely that significant time would be dedicated to developing transformative themes. Therefore, promoting a transformative agenda requires the development of supplemental materials to assist educators with exploiting the transformative opportunities in textbooks, while also identifying alternative materials that would be more appropriate in developing novel understandings.

In addition to supporting teachers through material development and identification, efforts also need to be made to assist educators through pre-service and in-service professional development. For a number of the respondents in the study, culture and intercultural themes were not broadly addressed during under-graduate or graduate education. Some of them were exposed to intercultural content during graduate studies, while others acquired knowledge about the concepts during in-service professional development programs. Nonetheless, it was apparent based on the responses of educators that intercultural content was not prominent within teacher education programs despite the extended literature on the topic. This contributed to a lack of understanding about how to infuse intercultural themes into instruction and further mitigated the implementation of potentially transformative activities even when the educator understood the value of such activities.

Moreover, the absence of substantive support to ground pedagogical practices resulted in educators adopting approaches that could foster novel understandings about themselves and cultural difference, but simultaneously support the maintenance of hegemonic discourses. In the contemporary era characterized by neoliberal philosophy, second language education has been commonly rationalized as the "development of individual competencies in service of economic growth" (Kubota, 2014, p. 13). The cooptation of second language education as a means to provide a competitive edge in the global market has contributed to greater emphasis on language learning for communicative purposes and the promotion of awareness and skills to minimize the adverse influence of diversity on efficient interaction required in the international workplace. While these could be considered positive developments, they also have the effect of obfuscating the complicitous relationship between second language education and the promotion of a neoliberal agenda. Therefore, instruction could potentially promote individual growth while

solidifying counterproductive embedded societal norms. To expand the transformative potential of instruction, professional development is required not only in the practical implementation of strategies, but also in the philosophical grounding of approaches to ensure they accomplish their transformative potential.

The current study demonstrated that the ten language educators perceived their work as including a transformative dimension. This is consistent with the structural character of second language pedagogy (mainly the dual focus on linguistic and cultural competence and the emphasis on both declarative and procedural knowledge) that makes it an ideal location for exploring transformative themes. Nonetheless, the pedagogy of the ten instructors generally fell short of the transformative potential envisioned by Goulah (2006), as it was more likely to spawn individual transformation than understandings that could foster social change. This provides a warning to those involved in shaping the future direction of second language pedagogy - if second language education is to continue to evolve from its linguistic roots to satisfy a greater social agenda, more attention needs to be given to the manner in which educators understand their work and the inhibitory factors undermining the transformative character of their work. Substantive change in the character of language education will only occur through dialogic engagement in which educators are considered important stakeholders.

REFERENCES

Agar, M. (1980). Hermeneutics in anthropology: A review essay. *Ethos, 8*, 253-272.

Aikman, S. (1997). Interculturality and intercultural education: A challenge for democracy. *International Review of Education, 43*, 463-479.

Aikman, S. (2012). Interrogating discourses of intercultural education: From indigenous Amazon community to global policy forum. *Compare, 42*, 235-257.

Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: Introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal, 62*, 276-283.

Alberta Learning. (2006). *German language and culture 10-3Y, 20-3Y,30-3Y*. Edmonton: Author.

Allison, D. (1994). Comments on Sarah Benesch's "ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism". A reader reacts. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 618-623.

Allison, D. (1996). Pragmatist discourse and English for academic purposes. *English for Specific Purposes, 15*(2), 85-103.

Allman, P. (2007). *On Marx: An introduction to the revolutionary intellect of Karl Marx*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Alptekin, C. (1993). Target-language culture in EFL materials. *ELT Journal, 47*(2), 136-143.

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal, 56*, 57-64.

Andrews, S. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the L2 teacher. *Language Awareness, 12*(2), 81-95.

Apple, M.W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum* (2nd Edition). New York: Routledge.

Aronowitz, S. (1982). Introduction. In M. Horkheimer, *Critical theory: Selected Essays* (pp. xi – xxi). New York: Continuum.

Atkinson, D. (1997). A critical approach to critical thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 71-94.

Au, W. (2012). *Critical curriculum studies: Education, consciousness, and the politics of knowing*. New York: Routledge.

Audet, R.H., & Jordan, L.K. (2005). *Integrating inquiry across the curriculum*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Auerbach, E., & Wallerstein, N. (2004). *Problem-posing at work: English for action*. Edmonton: Grass Roots Press.

Aveling, N. (2010). Unresolved contradictions: Australian multiculturalism, social justice and critical pedagogy within the liberal democratic state. In F. Salili, & R. Hoosain (Eds.), *Democracy and multicultural education* (pp. 339-363). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

Ball, S.J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 13*(2), 10-17.

Banks, J.A. (2001). Multicultural education: Goals, possibilities, and challenges. In C.F. Diaz (Ed.), *Multicultural education in the 21st century* (pp. 11-22). New York: Longman.

Banks, J.A. (2004). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. In J.A. Banks, & C.A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (5th Edition) (pp. 242-264). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Banks, J.A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education* (4th Edition). Boston: Pearson.

Barnawi, O.Z. (2010). Pedagogical tasks for fostering critical transformative EFL teachers: Pre service EFL teacher-educators. *The Journal of International Social Research, 3*(14), 107-119.

Baumgartner, L.M. (2001). An update on transformational learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 89*, 15-24.

Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 705 717.

Benesch, S. (1999). Thinking critically, thinking dialogically. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 573-580.

Benesch, S. (2009). Theorizing and practicing critical English for academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*, 81-85.

Bennett, C.I. (2007). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (6th Edition). Boston: Pearson.

Bennett, J.M., & Bennett, M.J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J.M. Bennett, & M.J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (pp. 147-165). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bennett, M.J. (1997). How not to be a fluent fool: Understanding the cultural dimension of language. In A.E. Fantini (Ed.), *New ways in culture teaching* (pp. 16-21). Alexandria: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Bergan, S., & Restoueix, J.P. (Eds.). (2009). *Intercultural dialogue on campus*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A realist theory of science* (2nd Edition). London: Routledge.

Birch, B.M. (2009). *The English language teacher in global civil society*. New York: Routledge.

Bleszynska, K.M. (2008). Constructing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 19*, 537-545.

Blommaert, J. (1987). How much culture is there in intercultural communication? In J. Blommaert, & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *The pragmatics of international and intercultural communication* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Boostrom, R. (2005). *Thinking: The foundation of critical and creative learning in classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 9-35.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.

Borrelli, M. (1991). Intercultural pedagogy: Foundations and principles. In D. Buttjes, & M. Byram (Eds.), *Mediating languages and cultures: Towards an intercultural theory of foreign language education* (pp. 275-286). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bottomore, T. (1984). *The Frankfurt school*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Bouchard, G. (2011). What is interculturalism? *McGill Law Journal, 56*, 435-468.

Bourke, T., Lidstone, J., & Ryan, M. (2015). School teachers: Professionalism or disciplinary power? *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 47*, 84-100.

Boyd, R.D. (1989). Facilitating personal transformations in small groups. *Small Group Behavior: An International Journal of Therapy, Counseling, and Training, 20*, 459-474.

Breen, M. (1987). Contemporary paradigms in syllabus design. *Language Teaching, 20*, 157
-174.

Brighouse, H. (2006). *On education: Thinking in action*. London: Routledge.

Bronner, S.E., & Kellner, D.M. (1989). Introduction. In S.E. Bronner, & D.M. Kellner (Eds.),
Critical theory and society: A reader (pp.1-21). New York: Routledge.

Brookfield, S.D. (1987). *Developing critical thinkers: Challenging adults to explore alternative
ways of thinking and acting*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (2003). Critical thinking in adulthood. In D. Fasko (Ed.), *Critical thinking and
reasoning: Current research, theory, and practice* (pp. 143-163). Cresskill: Hampton.

Brown, E.R. (2011). Freedom for some, discipline for "others": The structure of inequity in
education. In K.J. Saltman, & D.A. Gabbard (Eds.), *Education as enforcement: The
militarization and corporatization of schools* (Second Edition) (pp. 130-164). New York:
Routledge.

Brown, G.B., & Dobrin, S.I. (2004). Introduction: New writers of the cultural sage – From
postmodern theory shock to critical praxis. In S.G. Brown, & S.I. Dobrin (Eds.),
Ethnography unbound: From theory shock to critical praxis (pp. 1-10). Albany: State
University of New York Press.

Brown, G.W. (2009). *Grounding cosmopolitanism: From Kant to the idea of a cosmopolitan
constitution*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*
(2nd Edition). White Plains: Longman.

Brown, J.D., & Rodgers, T.S. (2002). *Doing second language research*. Oxford: Oxford
University Press.

Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K.K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical

praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly,*

33, 413-431.

Bryan, A. (2010). Corporate multiculturalism, diversity management, and positive

interculturalism in Irish schools and society. *Irish Educational Studies, 29*, 253-269.

Burbules, N.C., & Berk, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations,

differences, and limits. In T.S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in*

education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics (pp. 45–65). New York:

Routledge.

Butler, A. (2009). Introduction: Languages for social cohesion – The 2004-2007 programme of

the European centre for modern languages. In D. Newby, & H. Penz (Eds.), *Languages*

for social cohesion: Language education in a multilingual and multicultural Europe (pp.

11-16). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Buzzelli, C.A., & Johnston, B. (2002). *The moral dimensions of teaching: Language, power,*

and culture in classroom interaction. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Byram, K., & Kramsch, C. (2008). Why is it so difficult to teach language as culture? The

German Quarterly, 81, 20-34.

Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural studies in foreign language education*. Clevedon: Multilinguial

Matters.

Byram, M. (1995). Acquiring intercultural competence: A review of learning theories. In L.

Sercu (Ed.), *Intercultural competence: A new challenge for language teachers and*

trainers in Europe (pp. 53-69). Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (2003a). Introduction. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Intercultural competence* (pp. 5-13). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Byram, M. (2003b). On being 'bicultural' and 'intercultural'. In G. Alred, M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Intercultural experience and education* (pp. 50-66). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (2008*). From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (2009a). A model for language and culture teaching. In T. Hedges, N. Andon, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *English language teaching: Major themes in education* (Volume 4) (pp.247-258). London: Routledge.

Byram, M. (2009). Intercultural competence in foreign languages: The intercultural speaker and the pedagogy of foreign language education. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 321-332). Los Angeles: Sage.

Byram, M. (2012). Conceptualizing intercultural (communicative) competence and intercultural citizenship. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 85-97). London: Routledge.

Byram, M., & Feng, A. (2004). Culture and language learning: Teaching, research and scholarship. *Language Teaching, 37*, 149-168.

Byram, M., & Feng, A. (2005). Teaching and researching intercultural competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 911- 930). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Byram, M., Morgan, C., et al. (1994). *Teaching-and-learning language-and-culture*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1996). Defining and assessing intercultural competence: Some principles and proposals for the European context. *Language Teaching, 29*, 239-243.

Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1997). *Sociocultural competence in language learning and teaching: Studies towards a common European framework of reference for languagelearning and teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Byrnes, H. (2012). Academic perspectives from the USA. In M. Byram, & L. Parmenter (Eds.), *The common European framework of reference: The globalisation of language education policy* (pp. 169-181). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Carpenter, H., Jeon, K.S., MacGregor, D., & Mackey, A. (2006). Learners' interpretations of recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 209-236.

Chapman, S., & Routledge, C. (2009). *Key ideas in linguistics and the philosophy of language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cherryholmes, C.L. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Chiasson, M. (2012). *A clarification of terms: Canadian multiculturalism and Quebec interculturalism*. Retrieved from http://canadianicon.org/table-of-contents/the-management-of-diversity/

Chomsky, N. (2011). The function of schools: Subtler and cruder methods of control. In K.J. Saltman, & D.A. Gabbard (Eds.), *Education as enforcement: The militarization and corporatization of schools* (Second Edition) (pp. 26-35). New York: Routledge.

Ciges, A.S., & Lopez, R.G. (1998). The challenge of intercultural education in Spain. In K. Cushner (Ed.), *International perspectives on intercultural education* (pp. 146-168). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Clifford, J. (1992). Traveling cultures. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P.A. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 96-116). New York: Routledge.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 196-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cots, J.M. (2006). Teaching 'with an attitude': Critical discourse analysis in EFL teaching. *ELT Journal, 60*, 336-345.

Coulby, D. (2006). Intercultural education: Theory and practice. *Intercultural Education, 17*, 245-257.

Coulby, D. (2011). Intercultural education: The theory deficit and the world crisis. In C.A. Grant, & A. Portera (Eds.), *Intercultural and multicultural education: Enhancing global interconnectedness* (pp. 98-109). New York: Routledge.

Crawford, L.M., & McLaren, P. (2003). A critical perspective on culture in the second language classroom. In D.L. Lange & R.M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (pp. 127-157). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Cranton, P. (1994).*Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide for educators of adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cresswell, J. (2009). *The insect that stole butter?: Oxford dictionary or word origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd Edition). Upper Saddle River: Pearson.

Crookes, G. (2009). *Values, philosophies, and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crookes, G. (2010). The practicality and relevance of second language critical pedagogy. *Language Teaching, 43*, 333-348.

Crookes, G., & Lehner, A. (1998). Aspects of process in an ESL critical pedagogy teacher education course. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 319-328.

Curren, R. (2010). Education for global citizenship and survival. In Y. Raley, & G. Preyer (Eds.), *Philosophy of education in the era of globalization* (pp. 67–87). New York: Routledge.

Cushner, K. (Ed.). (1998). *International perspectives on intercultural education*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dahlen, T. (1997). *Among the interculturalists: An emergent profession and its packaging of knowledge*. Stockholm: Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology.

Daloz, L.A. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Damen, L. (1987). *Culture learning: The fifth dimension in the language classroom*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Damen, L. (2003). Closing the language and culture gap: An intercultural communication perspective. In D.L. Lange, & R.M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (pp. 71-88). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Davis, T. (2009). Perspectives from the council of Europe: Message to the ECML conference 2007. In D. Newby, & H. Penz (Eds.), *Languages for social cohesion: Language education in a multilingual and multicultural Europe* (pp. 17-18). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Deardorff, D.K. (2006a). Assessing intercultural competence in study abroad students. In M. Byram, & A. Feng (Eds.), *Living and studying abroad: Research and practice* (pp. 232-256). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Deardorff, D.K. (2006b). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*, 241-266.

Deardorff, D.K. (Ed.). (2009). *The sage handbook of intercultural competence*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Deetz, S. (1978). Conceptualizing human understanding: Gadamer's hermeneutics and American communication studies. *Communication Quarterly, 26*(2), 12-23.

Delanoy, W. (2006). Transculturality and (inter-)cultural learning in the EFL classroom. In W. Delanoy, & L. Volkmann (Eds.), *Cultural studies in the EFL classroom* (pp. 233-248). Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag.

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp.1-17). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1939). *Intelligence in the modern world: John Dewey's philosophy*. New York: The Modern Library.

Dietz, T, Rosa, E.A., & York, R. (2007). Driving the human ecological footprint. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 5*, 13-18.

Dodds, W.K. (2008). *Humanity's footprint: Momentum, impact, and our global environment*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dussel, E. (2000). Europe, modernity, and eurocentrism. In A. Moreiras, W. Mignolo, & G. Nouzeilles (Eds.), *Nepantla: Views from the south* (pp. 465-478). Durham: Duke University Press.

Earley, P.C., & Peterson, R.S. (2004). The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 3*, 100-115.

Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2007). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English language learners with diverse abilities* (3rd Edition). Boston: Pearson.

Eckermann, A. (1994). *One classroom, many cultures: Teaching strategies for culturally different children*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

Edge, J. (2003). Imperial troopers and servants of the lord: A vision of TESOL for the 21st century. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*, 701-709.

Edwards, J., & Farghaly, A. (2006). Locating culture in unexpected places. *Proceedings of the CATESOL State Conference*. Obtained March 12, 2013 from http://www.catesol.org/06Edwards.pdf.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, E., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 339-368.

Ennis, R.H. (2003). Critical thinking assessment. In D. Fasko (Ed.), *Critical thinking and reasoning: Current research, theory, and practice* (pp. 293-313). Cresskill: Hampton.

Facione, P. (2011). *Think critically*. Boston: Prentice Hall.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Harlow: Longman.

Fantini, A. E. (Ed.) (1997). *New ways in teaching culture*. Alexandria: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Fasko, D. (2003). Critical thinking: Origins, historical development, future directions. In D. Fasko (Ed.), *Critical thinking and reasoning: Current research, theory, and practice* (pp. 3-18). Cresskill: Hampton.

Feinberg, W. (1995). Liberalism and the aims of multicultural education. In Y. Tamir (Ed.), *Democratic education in a multicultural state* (pp. 45-58). Oxford: Blackwell.

Fennes, H., & Hapsgood, K. (1997). *Intercultural learning in the classroom: Crossing borders*. London: Cassell.

Fisher-Yoshida, B., Geller, K.D., & Schapiro, S.A. (2009). Introduction: New dimensions in transformative education. In B. Fisher-Yoshida, K.D. Geller, & S.A. Schapiro (Eds.),

Innovations in transformative learning: Space, culture, & the arts (pp. 1-19). New York:

Peter Lang.

Fosnot, C.T. (Ed.) (2005). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York:

Teachers College Press.

Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL*

Quarterly, 25, 605-628.

Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use

through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 323-351.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power and strategies. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected*

interviews & other writings 1972-1977 (pp. 134-145). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1988). On power. In L.D. Kritzman (Ed.), *Michel Foucault politics, philosophy,*

culture: Interviews and other writings 1977-1984 (pp. 96-109). New York: Routledge.

Fredricks, L. (2007). A rationale for critical pedagogy in EFL: The case of Tajikistan. *The*

Reading Matrix, 7(2), 22-28.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K.E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language

teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 397-417.

Freeman, D., & Richards, J.C. (1993). Conceptions of teaching and the education of

language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 193-216.

Freire, A.M.A, & Macedo, D. (Eds.) (1998). *The Paulo Freire reader*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (2002). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.

Friedlmeier, M. (2010). Intercultural education: Opportunities and limitations. Contributions

    from cross-cultural psychology. *Erwagen, Wissen, Ethik, 21*, 158-160.

Gadamer, H.G. (1989). *Truth and method* (2nd Revised Edition). New York: Crossroad.

Gadamer, H.G. (2001). *Gadamer in conversation: Reflections and commentary*. New Haven:

    Yale University Press.

Gallagher, S. (1997). Hermeneutical approaches to educational research. In H. Danner (Ed.),

    Hermeneutics and educational discourse (pp. 129-148). Johannesburg: Heinemann.

Gass, R. (2014). *What is transformation? And how it advances social change*. Retrieved from

    http://www.stproject.org/resources/publications/.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of culture: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Gerin-Lajoie, D. (2008). The issue of diversity in the Canadian educational context. In D. Gerin-

    Lajoie (Ed.), *Educators' discourses on student diversity in Canada: Context, policy, and*

    practice (pp. 9-28). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Ghosh, R. (2002). *Redefining multicultural education* (2nd Edition). Scarborough: Nelson

    Thomson Learning.

Ghosh, R. (2004). Public education and multicultural policy in Canada: The special case of

    Quebec. *International Review of Education, 50*, 543-566.

Ghosh, R., & Galczynski, M. (2014). *Redefining multicultural education: Inclusion and the*

    right to be different (3rd Edition). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Giroux, H.A., & Purpel, D.E. (Eds.) (1983). *The hidden curriculum and moral education:*

    Deception or discovery? Berkeley: McCutchan.

Giroux, H.A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*.

    Oxford: Westview Press.

Giroux, H.A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. New York: Continuum.

Glaser, E., Guilherme, M, Garcia, M.C.M., & Mughan, T. (2007). *Intercultural competence for professional mobility*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Goldstein, T. (2004). Performed ethnography for critical language teacher education. In B. Norton, & K. Toohey (Eds.), Critical pedagogies and language learning (pp. 311-326). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Golombek, P.R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 447-464.

Gore, J.M. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. New York: Routledge.

Gorski, P.C. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: The de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 17*, 163-177.

Gorski, P.C. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 19*, 515-525.

Goulah, J. (2006). Transformative second and foreign language learning for the 21st century. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 3*, 201-221.

Goulah, J. (2011). From abstraction and militarization of language education to society for language education: Lessons from Daisaku Ikeda and Tsunesaburo Makiguchi. In K.J. Saltman, & D.A. Gabbard (Eds.), *Education as enforcement: The militarization and corporatization of schools* (Second Edition) (pp. 174-180). New York: Routledge.

Graman, T. (1988). Education for humanization: Applying Paulo Freire's pedagogy to learning a second language. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 433-448.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Gramsci, A. (1973). *Letters from prison*. New York: Harper & Row.

Gramsci, A. (1981). *Antonio Gramsci*. In T. Bennett, G. Martin, C. Mercer, & J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Culture, ideology and social process: A reader* (pp. 191-218). London: The Open University Press.

Grittner, F.M. (1990). Bandwagons revisited: A perspective on movements in foreign language education. In D.W. Birckbichler (Ed.), *New perspectives and new directions in foreign language education* (pp. 9-43). Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.

Grondin, J. (1994). *Introduction to philosophical hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Grondin, J. (2002). Gadamer's basic understanding of understanding. In R.J. Dostal (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Gadamer* (pp. 36-51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Guilherme, M. (2002). *Critical citizens for an intercultural world: Foreign language education as cultural politics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gumport, P.J. (2001). Built to serve: The enduring legacy of public higher education. In   P.G. Altbach, P.J. Gumport, & D.B. Johnstone (Eds.), *In defense of American higher education* (pp. 85-109). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gundara, J.S. (2000). *Interculturalism, education and inclusion*. London: Paul Chapman.

Gundara, J.S., & Portera, A. (2008). Editorial: Theoretical reflections on intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 19*, 463-468.

Hall, E.T. (1959). *The silent language*. Garden City: Doubleday & Company.

Hall, E.T. (1989). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor Books.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd Edition). London: Arnold.

Halpern, D.F. (1997). *Critical thinking across the curriculum*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hammer, M.R., Bennett, M.J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27, 421-443.

Handler, R. (1988). *Nationalism and the politics of culture in Quebec*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, Culture & Society, 7*, 237-251.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th Edition). Harlow: Pearson Longman.

Heaney, T. (1995). *Issues in Freirean pedagogy*. Obtained October 11, 2001 from http://www.well.com/user/willard/Heaney%20%20Friere%20&%20Thresholds%20in%20Education.htm.

Henderson, E. (2012). *The active reader: Strategies for academic reading and writing* (2nd Edition). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Hinnenkamp, V. (2009). Intercultural communication. In G. Senft, J. Ostman, & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Culture and language use* (pp. 185-201). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hobson, J.M. (2004). *The eastern origins of western civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*, 301-320.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G.J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Holliday, A. (2007). Response to 'ELT and "the spirit of the times"'. *ELT Journal, 61*, 360-366.

Holliday, A., Hyde, M., & Kullman, J. (2004). *Intercultural communication: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Holliday, A., Hyde, M., & Kullman, J. (2010). Intercultural communication: An advanced resource book (2nd Edition). London: Routledge.

Hollinger, D.A. (2005). *Postethnic America: Beyond multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.

Horkheimer, M. (1976). Traditional and critical theory. In P. Connerton (Ed.), *Critical sociology: Selected readings* (pp.206-224). New York: Penguin.

Horkheimer, M. (1982). *Critical theory: Selected essays*. New York: Continuum.

Hunter, A. (2008). Transformative learning in international education. In V. Savicki (Ed.), *Developing intercultural competence and transformation* (pp. 92-107). Sterling: Stylus.

Hymes, D.H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin Education.

Jaeger, K. (1995). Teaching culture: State of the art. In L. Sercu (Ed.), *Intercultural competence: A new challenge for language teachers and trainers in Europe* (pp. 31-40) Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Jay, M. (1972). The Frankfurt school and the genesis of critical theory. In D. Howard, & K.E.

Klare (Eds.), *The unknown dimension: European Marxism since Lenin* (pp. 225-248).

New York: Basic Books.

Jay, M. (1973). *The dialectical imagination: A history of the Frankfurt school and the institute*

of social research 1923-1950. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Jensen, A.A. (1995). Defining intercultural competence: A discussion of its essential

components and prerequisites. In L. Sercu (Ed.), *Intercultural competence: A new*

challenge for language teachers and trainers in Europe (pp. 41-52). Aalborg: Aalborg

University Press.

Johnson, K., & Morrison, S. (2009). *LINC classroom activities: Language instruction for*

newcomers to Canada. Ottawa: The Print Shop.

Johnson, K. (2003). *Designing language teaching tasks*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, K. (2008). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching* (2nd Edition).

Harlow: Pearson Longman.

Johnson, K.E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy

instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*, 83-108.

Johnson, K.E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a

second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*, 439-452.

Johnson, R.H. (1992). The problem of defining critical thinking. In S.P. Norris (Ed.), *The*

generalizability of critical thinking: Multiple perspectives on an educational ideal (pp.

38-53). New York: Teacher's College Press.

Johnston, B. (1999). Putting critical pedagogy in its place: A personal account. *TESOL*

Quarterly, 33, 557-565.

Johnston, B., & Goettsch, K. (2000). In search of the knowledge base of language teaching: Explanations by experienced teachers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 56*, 437-468.

Johnston, B., Mitchell, R., Myles, F., & Ford, P. (2011). *Developing student criticality in higher education: Undergraduate learning in the arts and social sciences*. London: Continuum.

Kanpol, B. (1999). *Critical pedagogy: An introduction*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.

Kansanen, A., & Vohlonen, L. (2010). Intercultural education in international management. In M. Guilherme, E. Glaser, & M.d.C. Mendez-Garcia (Eds.), *The intercultural dynamics of multicultural working* (pp. 229-240). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kaskens, A. (2010). *A beginning look at Canada* (3rd Edition). Saint-Laurent: Pearson Longman.

Kasser, T. (2002). *The high price of materialism*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2000). Making critical thinking critical. In D. Weil, & H.K. Anderson (Eds.), *Perspectives in critical thinking: Essays by teachers in theory and practice* (pp. 23-40). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2005). *Critical constructivism primer*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2007). Critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century: Evolution for survival. In P. McLaren, & J.L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp.9-42). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J.L., & McLaren, P.L. (1994). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 138-157). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kincheloe, J.L., & Steinberg, S.R. (1993). A tentative description of post-formal thinking: The critical confrontation with cognitive theory. *Harvard Educational Review, 63*, 296-320.

Kincheloe, J.L., & Steinberg, S.R. (1999). Politics, intelligence, and the classroom: Postformal teaching. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, & L.E. Villaverde (Eds.), *Rethinking intelligence: Confronting psychological assumptions about teaching and learning* (pp.237-245).

Kingwell, G., Bonkowski, F.J., & Stephenson, L. (2005). *Canadian snapshots: Raising issues*. Saint-Laurent: Pearson Longman.

Klare, M.T. (2002). *Resource wars: The new landscape of global conflict*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Kordes, H. (1991). Intercultural learning at school: Limits and possibilities. In D. Buttjes, & M. Byram (Eds.), *Mediating languages and cultures: Towards an intercultural theory of foreign language education* (pp. 287-305). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Korhonen, K. (2010). Interculturally savvy or not? Developing and assessing intercultural competence in the context of learning for business. In A. Paran, & L. Sercu (Eds.), *Testing the untestable in language education* (pp. 35-51). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kozulin, A. (1998). *Psychological tools: A sociocultural approach to education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1998). The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 16-31). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kramsch, C., & Uryu, M. (2012). Intercultural contact, hybridity, and third space. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 211-225). London: Routledge.

Krashen, S. (1992). *Fundamentals of language education*. Torrance: Laredo Publishing.

Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 9-35.

Kubota, R. (2002). The impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block, & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 13-28). London: Routledge.

Kubota, R. (2004a). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B. Norton, & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 30-52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kubota, R. (2004b). The politics of cultural difference in second language education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 1*, 21-39.

Kubota, R. (2006). Teaching second languages for national security purposes: A case of post 9/11 USA. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(re)locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 119-138). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kubota, R. (2014). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics,* 1-22.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2002). Paying attention to *inter-* in intercultural communication. *TESOL Journal, 11*(1), 3-4.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 59-82.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2003). Being Canadian. *Government and Opposition, 38*, 357-385.

Lafayette, R.C. (2003). Culture in second language learning and teaching: Anthropology revisited. In D.L. Lange, & R.M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (pp. 53-69). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Lange, D.L., & Paige, R.M. (2003). Introduction. In D.L. Lange & R.M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (pp. ix-xvii). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Lantolf, J.P. (1999). Second culture acquisition: Cognitive considerations. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 28-46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lantolf, J.P., & Sunderman, G. (2001). The struggle for a place in the sun: Rationalizing foreign language study in the twentieth century. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*, 5-25.

Lantolf, J.P., & Thorne, S.L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lasonen, J. (2005). Reflection on interculturality in relation to education and work. *Higher Education Policy, 18*, 397-407.

Lauder, H. (1997). Education, democracy, and the economy. In A.H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A.S. Wells (Eds.), *Education: Culture, economy, and society* (pp. 382-392). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lebauer, R.S. (2010a). *Learn to listen - listen to learn 1: Academic listening and note-taking* (3rd Edition). White Plains: Pearson Longman.

Lebauer, R.S. (2010b). *Learn to listen – listen to learn 2: Academic listening and note-taking* (3rd Edition). White Plains: Pearson Longman.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (1990). Notes in the history of intercultural communication: The foreign service institute and the mandate for intercultural training. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 76*, 262-281.

Leeman, Y., & Reid, C. (2006). Multi/intercultural education in Australia and the Netherlands. *Compare, 36*, 57-72.

Legare, E.I. (1995). Canadian multiculturalism and aboriginal people: negotiating a place in the nation. *Identitites: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 1*, 347-366.

Leicester, M. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking skills*. London: Continuum.

Leistyna, P. (2007). Neo-liberal non-sense. In P. McLaren, & J.L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 97-123). New York: Peter Lang.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2002). Static and dynamic views of culture and intercultural language acquisition. *Babel, 36*(3), 5-11.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2006). A review of the literature: Professional knowledge & standards for language teaching, *40*, 7-22.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2007). The ideology of interculturality in Japanese language-in-educationpolicy. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 20.1- 20.16.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2008). Language planning and questions of national security: An overview of planning approaches. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 9*, 129-153.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2009). Communication as a culturally contexted practice: A view from intercultural communication. *Australian Journal of Linguistics, 29* (1), 115-133.

Liddicoat, A.J., & Scarino, A. (2010). Eliciting the intercultural in foreign language education at school. In A. Paran, & L. Sercu (Eds.), *Testing the untestable in language education* (pp. 52-73). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lightbown, P.M. (2000). Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 431-462.

Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lin, A.M.Y. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 393-412.

Luciak, M., & Khan-Svik, G. (2008). Intercultural education and intercultural learning in Austria – critical reflections on theory and practice. *Intercultural Education, 19*, 493 -504.

Luke, A. (2004). Two takes on the critical. In B. Norton, & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 21-29). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lukes, S. (1995). Moral diversity and relativism. In Y. Tamir (Ed.), Democratic education in a multicultural state (pp. 15-21). Oxford: Blackwell.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37-66.

Macrine, S.L. (2011). Imprisoning minds: The violence of neoliberal education or "I am not for sale!" In K.J. Saltman, & D.A. Gabbard (Eds.), *Education as enforcement: The militarization and corporatization of schools* (Second Edition) (pp. 230-238). New York: Routledge.

Markee, N. (1997). *Managing curricular innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marples, R. (2010). What is education for? In R. Bailey (Ed.), *The philosophy of education: An introduction* (pp. 35-47). London: Continuum.

Martins, I.F. (2008). Learning to live together: The contribution of intercultural education. *European Journal of Education, 43*, 197-206.

May, S. (Ed.) (1999). *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education*. London: Falmer.

May, S., & Sleeter, C.E. (2010a). Introduction. In S. May, & C.E. Sleeter (Eds.), *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.

May, S., & Sleeter, C.E. (Eds.) (2010b). *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis*. New York: Routledge.

McKay, S.L. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 1-22.

McLaren, P. (2003). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. White Plains: Longman.

McLaren, P. (Ed.) (2006). *Rage and hope: Interviews with Peter McLaren on war, imperialism, and critical pedagogy*. New York: Peter Lang.

McLaren, P., & Kincheloe, J.L. (Eds.) (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York: Peter Lang.

McNamee, S.J., & Miller R.K. (2004). *The meritocracy myth*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Meyer, M. (1991). Developing transcultural competence: Case studies of advanced foreign language learners. In D. Buttjes & M. Byram (Eds.), *Mediating languages and cultures: Towards an intercultural theory of foreign language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mezirow, J. (1990). How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In A.B. Knox (Ed.), *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning* (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miike, Y. (2003). Beyond eurocentrism in the intercultural field: Searching for an asiacentric paradigm. In W.J. Starosta, & G.M. Chen (Eds.), *Ferment in the intercultural field: Axiology/value/praxis* (pp. 243-276). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Mohan, B, & Slater, T. (2006). Examining the theory/practice relation in a high school science register: A functional linguistic perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*, 302-316.

Molnar, A. (2005). Commercial culture and the assault on children's character. In H.S. Shapiro, & D.E. Purpel (Eds.), *Critical social issues in American education: Democracy and meaning in a globalizing world* (pp. 169-178). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Moon, D.G. (1996). Concepts of "culture": Implications for intercultural communication research. Communication Quarterly, 44(1), 70-84.

Moon, J. (2008). *Critical thinking: An exploration of theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Moore, A. (2004). *The good teacher: Dominant discourses in teaching and teacher education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Moore, R.B. (1976). *Racism in the English language: A lesson plan and study essay*. New York: Racism and Sexism Resource Center for Educators.

Moosmuller, A., & Schonhuth, M. (2009). Intercultural competence in German discourse. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 209-232). Los Angeles: Sage.

Morgan, B.D. (1998). *The ESL classroom: Teaching, critical practice, and community development*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Morgan, B. (2009). Fostering transformative practitioners for critical EAP: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*, 86-99.

Morgan, B., & Ramanathan, V. (2005). Critical literacies and language education: Global and local perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 151-169.

Moules, N.J. (2002). Hermeneutic inquiry: Paying heed to history and hermes. *International Journal of Qualitative Mehods, 1*(3), 1-40.

Mullock, B. (2006). The pedagogical knowledge base of four TESOL teachers. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*, 48-66.

Musumeci, D. (1997). *Breaking tradition: An exploration of the historical relationship between theory and practice in second language teaching*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Nabei, T., & Swain, M. (2002). Learner awareness of recasts in classroom interaction: A case study of an adult EFL student's second language learning. *Language Awareness, 11*, 43 -63.

Nandy, A. (1983). *The intimate enemy: Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. New
    Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives* (2nd Edition). New
    York: Routledge.

Nilsen, A.P. (2001). Sexism in English: A 1990s update. In J. Buckley (Ed.), *The harbrace
    reader for Canadians* (pp.66-77). Toronto: Harcourt.

Nisbett, R.E. (2003). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently*.
    New York: Free Press.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Odgers, T. (2011). An instructor tool – Bennett's developmental model of intercultural
    sensitivity [DMIS]. *Share: TESL Canada's E-Magazine for ESL Teachers, 1*, 10-11.

Ogilvie, G. (2013). Promoting principled intercultural education in second language
    pedagogy: An analysis of various conceptualizations of intercultural. In S. May (Ed.),
    *LED 2011: Refereed Conference Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on
    Language, Education and Diversity* (pp. 1-30). Auckland, New Zealand: University of
    Auckland.

Ogilvie, G., & Dunn, W. (2010). Taking teacher education to task: Exploring the role of teacher
    education in promoting the utilization of task-based language teaching. *Language
    Teaching Research, 14*, 161-181.

Ogilvie, G., & Dunn, W. (2011). *Exploring the interface between critical interculturality and
    task-based language teaching*. Presentation given at the 4th Biannual Conference on
    Task-Based Language Teaching.

Olson, D.R., & Babu, N. (1992). Critical thinking as critical discourse. In S.P. Norris (Ed.), *The generalizability of critical thinking: Multiple perspectives on an educational ideal* (pp. 181-197). New York: Teacher's College Press.

Osborn, T.A. (2006). *Teaching world languages for social justice: A sourcebook of principles and practices*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

O'Sullivan, E. (1999). *Transformative learning: Educational vision for the 21st century*. New York: Zed Books.

Palmer, R.E. (1969). *Hermeneutics: Interpretation theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*, 573-595.

Papatsiba, V. (2006). Study abroad and experiences of cultural distance and proximity: French erasmus students. In M. Byram, & A. Feng (Eds.), *Living and studying abroad: Research and practice* (pp. 108-133). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Parmenter, L. (2003). Describing and defining intercultural communicative competence: International perspectives. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Intercultural competence* (pp. 119-147). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Parmenter, L., & Byram, M. (2012). Commentary on cases beyond Europe. In M. Byram, & L. Parmenter (Eds*.), The common European framework of reference: The globalisation of language education policy* (pp. 258-261). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2003). 'Language of the enemy': Foreign language education and national identity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 6*, 313-329.

Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about language learning: A longitudinal study. *System, 29*, 177-195.

Pennycook, A. (1990). Critical pedagogy and second language education. *System, 18*, 303-314.

Pennycook, A. (1994a). Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics, 15*, 115-138.

Pennycook, A. (1994b). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.

Pennycook, A. (1997). Vulgar pragmatism, critical pragmatism, and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes, 16*, 253-269.

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

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Pennycook, A. (2004). Critical moments in a TESOL praxicum. In B. Norton, & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 327-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, A. (2010). Critical and alternative directions in applied linguistics. *AustralianReview of Applied Linguistics, 33*(2), 16.1-16.16.

Petras, J. (1999). Globalization: A critical analysis. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *29*, 3-37.

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

Phipps, A. (2010). Training and intercultural education: The danger in 'good citizenship'. In M. Guilherme, E. Glaser, & M.d.C. Mendez-Garcia (Eds.), *The intercultural dynamics of multicultural working* (pp. 59-73). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Phipps, A., & Gonzalez, M. (2004). *Modern languages: Learning and teaching in an intercultural field*. London: Sage.

Pirozzi, R. (2000). *Critical reading, critical thinking: A contemporary issues approach*. New York: Longman.

Planet, M.T. (2000). The European dimension. In M. Byram, & M.T. Planet (Eds.), *Social identity and the European dimension: Intercultural competence through foreign language learning* (pp. 25-31). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Planet, M.T., & Byram, M. (2000). Methods and principles. In M. Byram, & M.T. Planet (Eds.), *Social identity and the European dimension: Intercultural competence through foreign language learning* (pp. 189-192). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Pollock, S., Bhabha, H.K., Breckenridge, C.A., & Chakrabarty, D. (2000). Cosmopolitans. *Public Culture, 12*, 577-589.

Portera, A. (2011). Intercultural and multicultural education: Epistemological and semantic aspects. In C.A. Grant, & A. Portera (Eds.), *Intercultural and multicultural education: Enhancing global interconnectedness* (pp. 12-30). New York: Routledge.

Prabhu, N.S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist traditions*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.

Pratas, M.H. (2010). Interculturality and intercultural education in Portugal: Recent developments. *Intercultural Education, 21*, 317-327.

Pratt, M.L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, *15*, 33-40.

Pring, R. (2004). *Philosophy of education: Aims, theory, common sense and research*. London: Continuum.

Pusch, M.D. (2004). Intercultural training in historical perspective. In D. Landis, J.M. Bennett, & M.J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd Edition) (pp. 13-36). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Rajabi, S., & Wisniewska, I. (2008). *Step forward Canada: Language for everyday life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rathje, S. (2007). Intercultural competence: The status and future of a controversial concept. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 7*, 254-266.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Reagan, T. (2004). Objectification, positivism and language studies: A reconstruction. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1(1), 41-60.

Reagan, T.G., & Osborn, T.A. (2002). *The foreign language educator in society: Toward a critical pedagogy*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Reich, R.B. (1997). Why the rich are getting richer and the poor, poorer. In A.H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A.S. Wells (Eds.), *Education: Culture, economy, and society* (pp. 163-171). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Renner, A., Brown, M., Stiens, G., & Burton, S. (2010). A reciprocal global education? Working towards a more humanizing pedagogy through critical literacy. *Intercultural Education, 1*, 41-54.

Richards, J.C. (1996). Teachers' maxims in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 281-296.

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R. (2002*). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd Edition). London: Longman.

Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Richmond, K. (2009). *Inside reading: The academic word list in context 4*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences: Essays on language, action and interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riley-Taylor, E. (2002). *Ecology, spirituality, and education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Risager, K. (1998). Language teaching and the process of European integration. In M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective* (pp. 242-254). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture: Global flows and local complexity*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to transnational paradigm*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Roberts, C. Byram, M., Barro, A., Jordan, S., & Street, B. (2001). *Language learners as ethnographers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rowley, C., & Cooper, H. (2009). *Cross-curricular approaches to teaching and learning*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Roy, A., & Starosta, W.J. (2001). Hans-Georg Gadamer, language, and intercultural communication. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 1*, 6-20.

Rubin, B. (2009). *Inside reading: The academic word list in context 3*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ruggiero, V.R. (1990). *Beyond feelings: A guide to critical thinking* (3rd Edition). London: Mayfield Publishing.

Ruggiero, V.R. (1999). *Becoming a critical thinker* (3rd Edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Ruggiero, V.R. (2009). *The art of thinking: A guide to critical and creative thought* (9th Edition). New York: Longman.

Ryoo, J.J., Crawford, J., Moreno, D., & McLaren, P. (2009). Critical spiritual pedagogy: Reclaiming humanity through a pedagogy of integrity, community, and love. *Power and Education, 1*, 132-146.

Ryoo, J.J., & McLaren, P. (2010). Seeking democracy in American schools: Countering epistemic violence through revolutionary critical pedagogy. In F. Salili, & R. Hoosain (Eds.), *Democracy and multicultural education* (pp. 99-127). Charlotte: Information Age.

Samuda, V. (2005). Expertise in pedagogic task design. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Expertise in second language learning and teaching* (pp.230-254). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Santos, T. (1992). Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(1), 1-15.

Schick, C., & St.Denis, V. (2005). Troubling national discourses in anti-racist curricular planning. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*, 295-317.

Schoorman, D., & Bogotch, I. (2010). Moving beyond 'diversity' to 'social justice': The challenge to re-conceptualize multicultural education. *Intercultural Education, 21*, 79 -85.

Scollon, R. (2004). Teaching language and culture as hegemonic practice. The Modern Language Journal, 88, 271-274.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10*(3), 209-231.

Sercu, L. (Ed.) (1995). *Intercultural competence: A new challenge for language teachers and trainers in Europe*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Sercu, L. (2004). Assessing intercultural competence: A framework for systematic test development in foreign language education and beyond. *Intercultural Education, 15*, 73 89.

Sercu, L. (2006). The foreign language and intercultural competence teacher: The acquisition of a new professional identity. *Intercultural Education, 17*, 55-72.

Sercu, L. (2007). Foreign language teachers and intercultural competence: What keeps teachers from doing what they believe in? In M.J. Raya & L. Sercu (Eds.), *Challenges in teacher development: Learner autonomy and intercultural competence* (pp. 65-80). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Sercu, L. (2010). Assessing intercultural competence: More questions than answers. In A. Paran, & L. Sercu (Eds.), *Testing the untestable in language education* (pp. 17-34). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Sercu, L., & St. John, O. (2007). Teacher beliefs and their impact on teaching practice: A literature review. In M.J. Raya & L. Sercu (Eds.), *Challenges in teacher development: Learner autonomy and intercultural competence* (pp. 41-64). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Shaules, J. (2007). *Deep culture: The hidden challenges of global living*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms   across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*, 263-300.

Shipway, B. (2011). *A critical realist perspective on education*. New York: Routledge.

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.

Shuter, R. (1977). A field study of nonverbal communication in Germany, Italy, and the United States. *Communication Monographs, 44*, 298-305.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sleeter, C. E., & McLaren, P.L. (1995). Introduction: Exploring connections to build a critical multiculturalism. In C.E. Sleeter, & P.L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy and the politics of difference* (pp. 5-32). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Smith, D.G. (1999). *Pedagogon: Interdisciplinary essays in the human sciences, pedagogy, and culture*. New York: Peter Lang.

Smith, S.L., Paige, R.M., & Steglitz, I. (2003). Theoretical foundations of intercultural training and applications to the teaching of culture. In D.L. Lange & R.M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (pp. 89-125). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Sorell, T. (2007). *Descartes: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sowden, C. (2008). There's more to life than politics. *ELT Journal, 62*, 284-291.

Spillane, J.P. (1999). External reform initiatives and teachers' efforts to reconstruct their practice: the mediating role of teachers' zones of enactment. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31*, 143-175.

Starkey, H. (2003). Intercultural competence and education for democratic citizenship: Implications for language teaching methodology. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Intercultural competence* (pp. 63-83). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Steele, R. (1996). Developing intercultural competence through foreign language instruction: Challenges and choices. In J.E. Alatis, C.A. Straehle, M. Ronkin, & B. Gallenberger (Eds.), *Linguistics, language acquisition, and language variation: Current trends and future prospects* (pp. 70-83). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Steger, M. (2003). *Globalization: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stromquist, N.P. (2002). Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stromquist, N.P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education, 53*, 81-105.

Sugitani, M., & Tomita, Y. (2012). Perspectives from Japan. In M. Byram, & L. Parmenter (Eds.), *The common European framework of reference: The globalisation of language education policy* (pp. 198-211). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Sung, K. (2007). Glocalizing critical pedagogy: A case of critical English language teaching in Korea. In P. McLaren, & J.L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 163-181). New York: Peter Lang.

Swales, J.M., & Feak, C.B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd Edition). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Tamir, Y. (1995). Two concepts of multiculturalism. In Y. Tamir (Ed.), *Democratic education in a multicultural state* (pp. 3-14). Oxford: Blackwell.

Thayer-Bacon, B.J. (2000). *Transforming critical thinking: Thinking constructively*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Trapnell, L.A. (2003). Some key issues in intercultural bilingual education teacher training programmes – as seen from a teacher training programme in the Peruvian Amazon basin. *Comparative Education, 39*, 165-183.

Trim, J. (1996). Modern languages in the council of Europe: Contributions to the modern languages project of the council of Europe. *Language Teaching, 29*, 81-85.

Trim, J.L.M. (2012). The common European framework of reference for languages and its background: A case study of cultural politics and educational influences. In M. Byram, & L. Parmenter (Eds.), *The common European framework of reference: The globalisation of language education policy* (pp. 14-34). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Troudi, S. (2005). Critical content and cultural knowledge for teachers of English to speakers of other languages. *Teacher Development, 9*, 115-129.

Turner, B.S. (2002). Cosmopolitan virtue, globalization and patriotism. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19*, 45-63.

Ullman, C. (1999). Between discourse and practice: Immigrant rights, curriculum development, and ESL teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 513-528.

Ur, P. (2009). *Grammar practice activities: A practical guide for teachers* (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Ek, J.A. (1986). *Objectives for foreign language learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

van Ek, J.A., & Trim, J.L.M. (1984). *Across the threshold: Readings from the modern languages project of the council of Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

van Ek, J.A., & Trim, J.L.M. (1991). *Threshold level 1990*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Vidich, A.J., Lyman, S.M. (1994). Qualitative methods: Their history in sociology and anthropology. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp.23-59). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

View, J. L. (2010). Critical teaching of history: Toward a human rights agenda for pre- and in service teacher education. In F. Salili, & R. Hoosain (Eds.), *Democracy and multicultural education* (pp. 149-172). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wallerstein, N., & Auerbach, E. (2004). *Problem-posing at work: Popular educator's guide*. Edmonton: Grass Roots Press.

Waters, A. (2005). Expertise in teacher education: Helping teachers to learn. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Expertise in second language learning and teaching* (pp.210-229). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Waters, A. (2007a). Native-speakerism in ELT: Plus ca change . . .? *System, 35*, 281-292.

Waters, A. (2007b). ELT and 'the spirit of the times'. *ELT Journal, 61*, 353-359.

Waters, A. (2008). Reviews: (Re)-locating TESOL in an age of empire. *ELT Journal, 62*, 89 92.

Waters, A. (2009a). Ideology in applied linguistics for language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 30*, 138-143.

Waters, A. (2009b). Managing innovation in English language education. *Language Teaching, 42*, 421-458.

Weaver, G.R. (1986). Understanding and coping with cross-cultural adjustment stress. In R.M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications* (pp. 111-145). Lanham: University Press of America.

Weber, S. (2003). A framework for teaching and learning 'intercultural competence'. In G. Alred, M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Intercultural experience and education* (pp. 196-212). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Weigle, S.C., & Jensen, L. (1997). Issues in assessment for content-based instruction. In M.A. Snow, & D.M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 201-212). White Plains: Longman.

Wellington, J. (2000). *Educational research: Contemporary issues and practical approaches*. Norfolk: Continuum.

Wendt, M. (2003). Context, culture and construction: Research implications of theory formation in foreign language methodology. In M. Byram, & P. Grundy (Eds.), *Context and culture in language teaching and learning* (pp. 92-105). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Wesche, M.B., & Skehan, P. (2002). Communicative, task-based, and content-based language instruction. In R.B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Westheimer, J. (2008). What kind of citizen? Democratic dialogues in education. *Education Canada, 48*(3), 6-10.

Widdowson, H.G. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson, J. (2012). The intercultural speaker and the acquisition of intercultural/ global competence. In J. Jackson (Ed.), The routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication (pp. 296-309). London: Routledge.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wink, J. (2005). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world* (3rd Edition). Boston: Pearson.

Young, T.J., Sachdev, I., & Seedhouse, P. (2009). Teaching and learning culture on English language programmes: A critical review of the recent empirical research. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 3*, 149-169.

Zamel, V. (1997). Toward a model of transculturation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 341-352.

Zarate, G. (1997). Introduction. In M. Byram, & G. Zarate (Eds.), *The sociocultural and intercultural dimension of language learning and teaching* (pp. 7-14). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Zarate, G. (2003a). Identities and plurilingualism: Preconditions for the recognition of intercultural competences. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Intercultural competence* (pp. 85-117). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Zarate, G. (2003b). The recognition of intercultural competences: From individual experience to certification. In G. Alred, M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Intercultural experience and education* (pp. 213-224). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Zoels, G., & Silbermayr, T. (2010). Intercultural relations at the workplace. In M. Guilherme, E. Glaser, & M.d.C. Mendez-Garcia (Eds.), The intercultural dynamics of multicultural working (pp. 207-215). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

APPENDIX

Interview Structure

The interviews will follow a semi-structured format to make respondents more comfortable and allow them to take the interview in any direction desired. Questions will be influenced by the responses provided during the interview.

Potential Questions

General questions:

1) Explain your educational background.

2) Elaborate on your teaching experience.

3) Why did you enter into second language education?

4) What is the purpose in learning a second language?

5) What is your primary/ secondary objective when you enter the second language classroom?

6) What is the function of second language education in education more broadly and the society as a whole?

7) How do you typically structure your class and engage in pedagogy? Why?

8) How do you make instructional decisions? What influences are most prominent (i.e., colleagues, curricula, textbooks, students, etc.)? Why?

9) How to you determine the topics/ content of your instruction?

10) How much freedom do you have to make pedagogical decisions in your teaching? What factors mitigate the choices available to you?

Questions related to criticality:

1) How would you define the term 'critical'? What does it mean to be critical?

2) Do you promote critical thinking/ pedagogy in your classroom? How? Why?

3) What role does criticality play in the second language classroom?

4) Is criticality more/ less appropriate in second language pedagogy than other subjects? Why?

5) Is your instruction political in nature? In what way do you include political themes in your teaching?

6) Are you familiar with the terms 'linguistic imperialism' and 'linguistic hegemony'? What do they mean to you? How do they influence your teaching?

Questions related to interculturality:

1) What is culture?

2) What is the relationship between language and culture?

3) What is the function/role of culture in the second language classroom?

4) What culture should be taught in the second language classroom?

5) How do you address culture in your teaching?

6) How much time/ energy should be directed towards culture pedagogy? Why?

7) What does communicative competence mean to you? How does it influence your teaching?

8) How would you define intercultural? How is your instruction intercultural?

9) What is intercultural competence? Do you promote its development? How? Why?

10) Have you encountered 'intercultural' in curricular documents, textbooks, etc.? How was it portrayed? How has it influenced your teaching?

11) How important is the promotion of cultural sensitivity in the ESL classroom?

12) What are the epistemological implications of language/ language learning?

13) Should second language education overtly address epistemology? Why/ why not?