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Abstract

This is a qualitative self-study conducted in the tradition of practitioner inquiry that examines the pedagogics of an English language development (ELD) classroom. Different from pedagogy, pedagogics is the face-to-face encounter of Sameness and Otherness in systems or institutions characterized by power imbalances, as theorized by Argentinian liberatory philosopher, Enrique Dussel. More specifically, liberatory pedagogics, as conceptualized by Dussel in the arena of education, is characterized by an analectic between teacher and student in which, from a position outside of the dominant paradigm, the dynamic of Sameness and Otherness is observed, evaluated, and reimagined so as not to reproduce sameness in the colonial tradition. To understand the liberatory pedagogics of an ELD classroom, the researcher practitioner collected two types of data: fieldnotes that included observations and reflections from her perspective as practitioner, and student work and transcripts of small group classroom discussions from the perspective of her student participants (N=4). The identification of themes led to three findings. One, in this ELD classroom, pedagogics are characterized by four forms: perception, knowing, disconnection and affirmation. Second, in this classroom, face-to-face interactions of Sameness and Otherness are not limited to teacher-student, but rather include student-student in the presence of the teacher and teacher-student in the presence of students. Finally, pedagogics could be identified as falling on a continuum between liberatory and oppressive, depending on the specific scenario, not the form of pedagogic. Implications for practice are explored.
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Chapter 1

“Let’s get a picture!” It was the last day of school and my students and I were saying good-bye, some for the summer, some for perhaps always. I am a white woman from the United States who teaches English as an additional language at a public suburban high school in the Northeast. One of the graduating seniors, a petite woman from Yemen, had stopped into class dressed in her graduation cap and gown, exuberant with the energy of having completed something that had at times seemed utterly impossible. She had moved from Yemen just some twenty months prior and enrolled in a high school in which few students wore a head scarf, a handful of students spoke Arabic and even fewer students shared her unique experience of emigrating as a young adult. Though completing coursework through the imprecise process of translation while moving through a sea of unfamiliar language and customs had undoubtedly affected Almeda, her demeanor in English Language Development (ELD) class was both buoyant and grounded despite these challenges.

For example, one day she came to ELD and explained that she was failing her cooking class. The irony didn’t escape either of us. Here, a woman who cooked daily for her family, was evaluated as incompetent in the skill when judged through the lens of a particular curriculum and teacher. With gleeful shock on her face, Almeda showed me her translated thoughts on the screen of her phone – “What does she expect? I’m learning English!” We took a moment to laugh together and then shifted focus to working out how she would complete the required assignments. She approached these challenges with the lightness of someone who knew things could be much worse.
One central criticism of English language teaching is that it has claimed to be neutral (Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycock, 1994; Phillipson, 1992). Professionals in the field are concerned with things like phonemes, vocabulary, or syntax and these structures are seemingly apolitical, value-free and pragmatic. While I understand the political nature of English language teaching, I also have taken comfort in the uncomplicated idea of English teaching being a support to immigrants acquiring a necessary skill. The opportunity to forge relationships with my students despite clear differences in life experience makes me feel good and my relationship with Almeda is a prime example.

In recent years, as I have considered my personal history and chosen path in life, I now see how the “nice” field of English language teaching has been a refuge for me to some degree because of my relationship with otherness, or more specifically race. From kindergarten to eight grades, I attended schools where I was one of a handful of white children among a majority Black student body. I generally had a pleasant and easy childhood with many good friends, but the declaration, “I hate white people,” was one I heard often, followed by, “oh, but not you, Renée” when the friend realized I was in ear shot. Despite the unease in my stomach, I believe my reaction attempted to communicate understanding, that I agreed. And I did. School, Quaker Meeting, and my parents had taught me that white people had done dreadful things – slavery, segregation, lynchings. And I was not that kind of person. And yet, I was white. It was a conundrum. My child-self wondered how people would know that I wasn’t really a white person, or at least the kind that enacts hate. I think I have lived my life trying to prove that very thing. Teaching English in the context of the United States has allowed me to demonstrate my goodness, while existing within the hegemony of whiteness as an anti-racist.
Building relationships with my students is central to my teaching philosophy. It is through knowing my students that I can best facilitate relevant, meaningful educational experiences. I ask myself though if building relationships and approaching content on the foundation of those relationships is enough. After a year of working together, Almeda and I still depended so much on translation, her English language skills still in infancy. She dreams of becoming a doctor. How did I prepare her for the structural and systemic barriers she would face? How did I help her to think critically about the life that she wants for herself and that which has been prepared for her within the limits of white supremacy, xenophobia, and sexism? Is a good relationship enough for liberation in the midst of injustice?

**Problem Statement**

As a dominant language in the global context and as the majority language in the United States, English fluency has been considered essential for access to economic and civic opportunity across the world. At the same time, the language’s hegemony comes with the violent legacy of colonial language eradication, which has taken on new forms in raciolinguicism (Alim et al., 2016; Flores & Rosa, 2019; Rosa and Flores, 2017) and neoliberal practices (Bock Thiessen, 2021; Canagarajah, 1999). English language teachers are confronted with how to best approach this tension with their students. How do English language teachers both support their students’ acquisition of English and resist its oppressive nature?

The problem is complex because the oppressive ideologies of English language teaching are inherent in the modeling of a standard, typically exemplified by the native speaker. In teaching materials and unspoken institutional understanding, the ideal native speaker has the speech patterns of a white person from the United States or England (Fránquiz & Ortiz, 2017; Lippi-Green, 2012; Malsbary, 2014; Rosa, 2016). Yet having spread widely, English has been
localized by communities, creating the category of World Englishes (Rajagopalan, 2004). ELD classrooms in the United States include students who speak World Englishes, English Creole, and African American Vernacular English, all of which are communicative, have grown out of histories of struggle, and are not standardized English as determined by governing institutions. Critical applied linguists and language teaching professionals call on practitioners and teacher educators to recognize the oppressive nature of English (Canagarajah, 1999; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Motha, 2014). Scholarship demonstrates that creating liberatory educational experiences for racialized multilingual students is challenging despite practitioners’ efforts to address the power dynamics inherent in English language teaching and learning (Ajayi, 2011; Liggett, 2009; Motha, 2014; Shin & Rubio, 2022; Taylor, 2017). My study introduces the use of Argentinian decolonial theorist Enrique Dussel’s concept of liberatory pedagogics as a lens for teacher reflection around liberatory educational practice.

**Purpose of the Study**

The study aims to determine the usefulness of Enrique Dussel’s (2019) theory of pedagogics as a heuristic for critical English language teachers to resolve moments of uncertainty as they strive to provide liberatory educational experiences within the context of the oppressive racial and cultural hierarchies of English language teaching. I will document the pedagogic or face-to-face interaction between me and my students, high school intermediate to advanced speakers of English as an additional language. Dussel (2019) theorizes that a liberatory pedagogical project is characterized by an analectic in which the teacher recognizes the alterity or otherness in the student and honors that which is new and unknown. Through practitioner research in my own classroom defined as the self-study of teaching and teacher education practices (S-STTEP), I will document my use of this heuristic and therefore respond to the
problem of how language educators can interrupt oppressive ideologies inherent in English language teaching.

**Rationale for Study**

This study will contribute to scholarship on critical English language teaching and teacher student relationship in language classrooms. Critical language scholars advocate for language teachers to resist imperialist, neoliberal, and raciolinguistic ideologies (Canagarajah, 1999; Motha, 2014; Pennycook, 2001), yet research shows that white teachers find this to be challenging (Liggett, 2009; Motha, 2014; Taylor, 2017). While researchers have considered the characteristics of humanizing teacher student relationships (García-Moya et al., 2020) and the impact of teacher student relationship on motivation to learn an additional language (Dordrecht, A. & Thorsen, 2018), this study would contribute a perspective yet to be considered – the application of Dussel’s theory of liberatory pedagogics within the English learning context. This study adds to current scholarship by approaching teacher student relationship with a decolonial lens. There are many theories or resources about humanizing pedagogies (Bartolomé, 1994; del Carmen Salazar, 2013), yet little scholarship that moves teachers from the “ways of being” to the “ways of doing” (Ladson-Billings, 2018 as cited by Peercy et al., 2022). By providing the interior perspective of a language teacher considering the nature of the pedagogic between her students and her, this study supports teachers who aspire to achieve liberatory education as theorized by Dussel.

**Research Question**

This study aims to answer the research question: What do liberatory pedagogics look like in an ELD classroom to a practitioner researcher?
Significance of Methods

I have chosen qualitative methods to explore this research question because “qualitative research is pragmatic, interpretive, and grounded in the lived experience” (Marshall et al., 2021 p. 2). Seeking to understand how I work as a teacher, I will use the qualitative method of practitioner inquiry with a teacher researcher approach (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009), or, more specifically, the self-study of teaching and teacher education practices (S-STTEP) methodology (LaBoskey, 2004; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). Practitioner inquiry provides the framework to examine my current practice and life experience of that practice. In thinking about how I aim to answer my research question, self-reflexivity is important, and I draw from the tradition of autoethnography (Marshall et al., 2021). While autoethnography tends to look back through the life of the researcher, my intention is to use reflection to consider my current teaching. S-STTEP methodology is a widely growing approach to studying teaching, rooted in reflection and characterized by a practitioner’s self-initiated and focused desire to improve, belief in the validity of their own experience, and credence dialogic practices to build understanding (LaBoskey, 2004). While at one point self-study was “used almost exclusively to refer to inquiries at the higher education level by academics involved in the practice of teacher education” (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009, p. 40), the research design is also implemented in K-12 classrooms.

Significance of Study

The lens of liberatory pedagogics is significant at the interpersonal, school, and societal levels. Considering the way in which the pedagogics between teacher and student allow for newness of the other, may help critical language educators interact in a more emancipatory way, supporting their pedagogy. This in turn, allows for students, particularly those on the periphery
of society because of linguistic or racial marginalization, to be their full selves. When students can be their full selves, schools are better able to fulfill their function and society is better for it.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations to this study. First, this practitioner inquiry is designed so that a teacher examines her own practice in the classroom, yet it takes up the conceptualization of a pedagogic, a face-to-face relationship, and that implies perspectives other than the researcher’s. While future research should consider the perspective of the student in the pedagogic with more depth and breadth, this study is limited to the perspective of the teacher and minimal student voice. Secondly, as both participant and researcher, the process of knowledge generation is vulnerable to a silo effect in which misinterpretations persist rather than be interrupted by new information. To counter this potential vulnerability, I will have intermittent conversations with a critical friend (Herr & Anderson, 2015; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009) to share my ideas, thoughts, and concerns, without forfeiting student confidentiality through the sharing of data. The generation of knowledge from this inquiry will be limited to my own classroom but, with the support of intellectual colleagues, will expand beyond the interpretations influenced by my positionality (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009). A final limitation is that of time. The implementation of this study suffered several setbacks which have translated into a shorter span of time to collect data. The classroom environment is rich with teacher student interactions, so I trust that I will have experienced many encounters of Sameness and Otherness within the data collection timeline, but it is also true that a longer time could provide for more variety in data.
**Definition of Terms**

*Analectic* - an interplay between Sameness and the Otherness in the face-to-face encounter that is characteristic of liberatory pedagogics (Dussel, 2019)

*English Language Development (ELD)* – coursework or instruction that is delivered by both English as a Second language teachers and content teachers to support the English learning of students who speak a non-English language in the home (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2017)

*Pedagogics* - “the part of philosophy (along with ethics, politics, and economics) which considers face-to-face relationships: the parent–child, teacher–student, doctor–patient, philosopher–nonphilosopher, politician–citizen, etc.” (Dussel, 2019, p. 47); an ethic born out of a philosophy of liberation that decenters the European experience and democratizes epistemology to be communal rather than imperialistic (Dussel, 2019)

*Practitioner inquiry* - an umbrella term for methods of research in which the practitioner is researcher and the professional context is the site of research, driven by the belief that those familiar with a context are well-situated to construct new knowledge (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009).

**Summary**

I aim to be a critical language educator and support colleagues in this endeavor. While I both enjoy and believe in the necessity of relationship building between teacher and student, I also question if the way that I relate to the Otherness of my students allows for their alterity to flourish. This practitioner research qualitative study with a S-STEPP methodology proposes an examination of the teacher student pedagogic in my classroom using the lens of Enrique Dussel’s theory of liberatory pedagogics and analectic. By exploring the pedagogics of my own practice,
this study serves as a model to how pedagogics may be used as a heuristic for critical language practitioners, potentially providing an additional point of access for the development of counterhegemonic pedagogic practices.
Chapter 2

The following chapter describes the literature relevant to the context and content of this self-study, a qualitative study designed in the tradition of practitioner inquiry. As a researcher practitioner, I observed and reflected on the teacher student encounters in my classroom. In addition, I collected student work and transcribed three small group classroom discussions to include student voice in my inquiry. I coded and analyzed this data to answer the research question: what does liberatory pedagogics look like in an ELD classroom to a researcher practitioner? To set the foundation of understanding, I drew from literature focused on the field of English language teaching, globally and in the United States.

I will begin this literature review with an overview of how the English language came to be spoken by so many people around the globe. I will then discuss the imperialist, colonialist, neoliberal and racist underpinnings of the spread of English and, by relation, the field of English Language Teaching. Having explained the critique of English Language Teaching from the decolonial perspective and postcolonial context, I will explain how this background relates to English teaching in the United States as a settler colonial project. Understanding that racial and cultural hierarchies were crafted and codified for the success of the U.S. settler colonial project, I will explain how this legacy inhabits contemporary English language teaching as the standard English ideal, native and nonnative biases, raciolinguistic ideologies, and racialized teacher identities. In the next section, I will explain how language teachers who are aware of this painful legacy attempt to interrupt it by employing critical pedagogies. From this point I will turn to the circumstances of English language learners in U.S. K-12 public schools – who they are and the policies and laws that govern their education. I will then discuss literature on teacher-student relationship, in education generally and specifically with linguistically and culturally diverse
students. Finally, I will discuss humanizing pedagogy, the concepts that I draw from in my practice as a teacher, reflecting my teaching philosophy. The last section of the literature review is dedicated to a discussion of my theoretical framework: liberatory pedagogy.

**English Language Teaching Globally**

The use of the English language has spread throughout the world, first through the colonial conquests of Britain and then due to the economic dominance of the United States and the United Kingdom (Bhatt, 2001; Caine, 2008; Graddol, 1997). Kachru’s (1986, 1996) Three Concentric Circles of English are often used to describe the way in which English has spread from the Inner Circle countries (i.e. United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada) where English is spoken as a first language, to the Outer Circle countries (i.e. the Philippines, Singapore, Kenya) where the use of English has been institutionalized, and finally to the Expanding Circle countries (i.e. Japan, China, Brazil) where English is commonly taught as a foreign language (Caine, 2008). By this manner of spreading, it is estimated that there are many more speakers of English as an additional language than native language speakers (Jenkins, 2006).

**Language Ideologies: Imperialist and Colonialist Legacies**

In part due to the way in which the language spread, imperialist and colonialist legacies of English permeate commonly held beliefs among English Language Teaching (ELT) professionals. Phillipson (1992) was one of the first scholars to connect the micro of ELT to a macro societal perspective (Barrantes-Montero, 2018). Calling them fallacies, Phillipson (1992) debunked five common beliefs about ELT that propagate linguicism: English is better taught monolingually; native speakers are the ideal teachers; the earlier one begins to learn, the better; the more one is exposed, the better; and the standard of English will diminish if other languages
are used much. He argued that, besides being unsubstantiated by research, these fallacies reproduce inequities, favoring the center or inner circle countries over the periphery. While Phillipson and later Pennycock (1994) were critical of the dominance of English, other critical linguists such as Canagarajah (1999) were concerned with the oppressive standards of ELT and the way in which local communities resist hegemony through localization of the language (Jenkins, 2006). These critiques continue today (Kubota, 2019, Lin & Motha, 2020).

**The Influence of Neoliberalism**

Along with hegemonic language ideologies, the influence of neoliberalism on the field of language education is a central concern of critical linguists. Governments have collaborated with private companies to commodify English, creating a neoliberal project that aims to make English the dominant language for global communication (Phillipson, 2009). In this domination, there is no room for multilingualism; subtractive English takes the space of other national languages as a “lingua frankensteinia” (Phillipson, 2009, p. 338). This neoliberal project fuels an ELT market of private language schools, curriculums, and textbooks. Universities have created ELT centers that cater to wealthy international students and bring in much-needed resources (Chun & Morgan, 2019). Bock Thiessen (2021) argues that ELT has reproduced and benefited from the utilitarian/neoliberal position that English is necessary to be successful in the global economy, while simultaneously advancing the native/nonnative binary for which “standard” English is defined in terms of whiteness. Describing this imperialist power dynamic, Rubagumya (2004) writes:

> The market has indeed replaced imperial armies, but one wonders whether the effect is any different. […] It is therefore not the case that more English will lead to African global integration; the reverse is more likely. […] Giving false hopes that everybody can
have access to “World English” is unethical. (pp. 136-139, as cited by Phillipson, 2009, p. 337)

In other words, neoliberal discourse says that those on the periphery require English to access and negotiate the center, while the standard of English to be attained is modeled in whiteness, that which those on the periphery will never be able to achieve. Adding to this critique, Flores (2013) cautions that the shift within ELT of championing plurilingual practices unwittingly supports the neoliberal agenda because the ideal subject of one parallels the other. These critical scholars call on ELT professionals to consider the unequal power dynamics created by the commodification of English, plurilingualism, and multiculturalism within the neoliberal project.

*ELT in the Settler Colonialist Context*

Critical thought around English language teaching is largely based on postcolonial contexts. Yet places with a history of settler colonialism - the ongoing structure in the United States (Glenn, 2015) - are sites worthy of examination (Motha, 2014). While the goal of classical colonialism was to extract and exploit resources, creating a circular dynamic from the home site to the foreign land and back, the aim of settler colonialism was to create a new home by occupying land, consistently moving forward in a line (Veracini, 2011). To attain this goal, settler colonialism required the extermination, removal, or assimilation of the indigenous people who had a relationship with the desired land. The replacement of indigenous languages with English was a core aspect of assimilation campaigns enacted in boarding schools. These acts of erasure were supported by beliefs of European cultural superiority. Similarly, the crafting of an argument of racial inferiority of Blacks permitted severe violence against Africans brought as slaves to support the settler colonial project through intense cultivation of the land (Glenn, 2015). Mexican children’s experience of schooling in the Southwest was also a project of cultural
assimilation (Glenn, 2015) or what Spring (2004) refers to as deculturalization – the replacement of one culture with another. Motha (2014) argues that these ideas of racial and cultural hierarchy are “part of the country’s foundation, it's ideological genealogy, the formation of its educational systems, and the ways in which all disciplines, including English, are taught and learned” (p.10). These beliefs of cultural and racial inferiority first sown with the settler colonial project of the United States continue to exist in current day ELT and what is referred to as English Language Development (ELD) in U.S. Schools.

**Race in English Language Teaching**

Issues of race are intertwined with ELT, seeing that both racial hierarchies and the demand for English have grown out of classical and settler colonialism. Scholarship in the last fifteen years has explored the ideology of an English standard, the racialized native ideal, linguistic racial hierarchies, and teacher identities (Von Esch et al, 2020). Scholars have also established a new area of raciolinguistics for which various methods of linguistic analysis are brought to bear to better understand how language, race, and power interact across contexts (Alim, 2016; Rosa & Flores, 2017). The following section reviews some of the most relevant and recent research in these areas.

**The Standard English Ideal**

In ELT, the idealized way of speaking is referred to as standard English and has been found to be directly and indirectly related to white European and white American speech patterns (Von Esch et al, 2020). Lippi-Green (2012) argues that this standard and the institutions that impose this bias maintain white hegemony. When white speakers are the standard, their way of speaking is normalized while the speakers of other languages are othered and considered deficient (Malsbary, 2014; Rosa, 2016). The acquisition of English becomes synonymous with
the acquisition of whiteness (Fránquiz & Ortiz, 2017). Flores and Rosa (2015) advocate for a shift in second language acquisition research so that the focus is on the white listener subject rather than the racialized speaker, creating a space for raciolinguistic policing to be contested by the white listener and opening more possibilities for normalizing the bilingualism of racialized groups.

Native Speakerism

The ideal speaker of English or native speaker, much like standard English, conjures an image of a white speaker from the English-speaking west (Grant & Lee, 2009). This bias for native speakers as English teachers and western teaching methodologies promotes discrimination against teachers of color and those who have acquired English outside of the inner circle countries (Holliday, 2006). Kumaravadivelu (2016) recounts their own experiences with discrimination as a nonnative speaker over years as an ELT professional and teacher educator and draws on decolonial theory to advocate for a collaborative outcome-oriented movement to change the field. The native/nonnative binary reflects a racialized linguistic hierarchy that is often evident in school practices, “positioning languages and speakers associated with whiteness as more valued and racially minoritized languages and speakers as less valued or even erased” (Von Esch et al, 2020, p. 401).

Raciolinguistic Ideologies

Research that considers combating raciolinguistic ideologies demonstrates their durability and persistence (Von Esch et al, 2020). In a two-way immersion Kindergarten classroom, Chaparro (2019) observed the ways that members of the classroom express raciolinguistic ideologies by making links between a way of speaking and a certain type of person. For instance, a young boy from a bilingual family negatively associated Spanish and Spanish-speakers,
rejecting his identification with that group because of their perceived lower socioeconomic class (Chaparro, 2019). The teacher draws a positive link between a young white child from an English-speaking family and her preliminary proficiency of Spanish but does the opposite for a young brown child from a Spanish-speaking family (Chaparro, 2019). In this instance, the white middle-class child is celebrated for using Spanish and positioned as successful, while the brown child from a lower income family is seen as having deficits in both English and Spanish (Chaparro, 2019). Beliefs about intersections of race, language, and economic class are evident even in a bilingual classroom where the pedagogical framework might be better prepared to navigate these ideologies. In English language classrooms, there is a pattern of raciolinguistic ideologies being left uninterrupted due to silence around the topic of race or the use of discussions about cultural or ethnic differences that unintentionally reinforces students as outsiders (Von Esch et al, 2020).

**Teacher Identities: Racial, Cultural, Linguistic Influences**

Within the field of language education, there has been an increase in attention placed on the influence of teacher identity on ideologies and pedagogical practice (Varghese et al., 2016). Recognizing that this work is partially built on theorizing within the field of general teacher education, in their special issue of TESOL Quarterly on the topic, Varghese and colleagues (2016) point to the seminal article by Lampert (1985) in which she argues that teacher identity is negotiated in real time as teachers consider internal and external dilemmas. Who teachers are as people and what they bring to resolve these dilemmas is consequential. Due to the historical tie of English language teaching to colonial and racial hierarchies, understanding the influence of identity on teacher behavior is important.
There is a small body of scholarship on how language teachers’ racial, ethnic, social and linguistic identities directly impact their work in the classroom (Haque & Morgan, 2009; Liggett, 2009; Ajayi, 2011; Motha, Jain, & Tecle, 2012; Motha, 2014; Vitanova, 2016; Taylor, 2017). Generally, scholarship shows that white teachers are less aware of how their racial identities influence their teaching of language (Ajayi, 2011). For instance, through conversations with six white ESL teachers, Liggett (2009) found that they distanced themselves from whiteness by describing themselves using other identities, and when they did recognize their racial identity, it was in relation to a racial or socioeconomic Other. Since race is on the periphery of their consciousness, classroom observation of the teachers also found that they misjudged student responses in class activities, which impacted instructional effectiveness (Liggett, 2009). Even when white teachers are aware of the racial differences between them and their predominately racialized students, they choose to speak about difference in terms of culture rather than race. In her qualitative study of a white ESL teacher, Taylor (2017) created the term racial touchstones to describe the interpretive tool used by the teacher participant to organize new information regarding racial understanding. Taylor (2017) theorized from observation that when navigating new understanding of race and racism, the teacher referred to her study abroad experience, opting to make connections with her students around the shared experience of cultural difference and sidelining uncomfortable discussions of difference rooted in race. Taylor (2017) concluded that a teacher’s ability to analyze their racial touchstones can lead to powerful reflection and transformation. Similarly, Motha’s (2014) ethnographic study of four first-year ESL teachers revealed the challenge of interrogating the influence of their racial, colonial, and linguistic identities on their pedagogical practice. While these teachers tried to transparently grapple with
the way in which society racialized the identities of their students, they missed other complexities, such as how their own racial identity came into play (Motha, 2014).

**Critical English Language Teaching**

Language teachers are uniquely situated to engage critical approaches due to the intersection of language, culture, and identity of their subject content (Hawkins & Norton, 2009), as well as the opportunity to interrupt the colonial and racial legacies of English teaching. Yet, there is a dearth of empirical research dedicated to critical language teaching pedagogy and practice. Scholarship has demonstrated the agency that teachers have in being classroom policy makers (Canagarajah, 1999; Cummins, 2021; Shin & Rubio, 2022). Using different methodologies in an ethnographic study of a Tamil community in Sri Lanka, Canagarajah (1999) developed grounded theory on the ways that periphery language teachers and students resisted the imperialism inherent in teaching and learning English. For instance, through observation of classrooms and informal interviews, Canagarajah (1999) noted that when periphery teachers adapted the instructional techniques of a Western curriculum so that they resonated culturally, students experienced more success. Canagarajah (1999) argued that English language students and teachers are engaged in language learning but resist the Western-centric curriculum and methodologies in multiple ways. Similarly documenting the agency of an English teacher, Shin & Rubio (2022) analyze the incremental development of his identity as a critical educator, that which culminated in the writing of a critical curriculum based on historical fiction. Yet even in this case of deep commitment to critical pedagogy, the teacher participant was met with resistance from external factors like the students’ disenchantment with school and the typical school structure of standardized goals (Shin & Rubio, 2022), that which is likely to be true in other situations, as well.
In their literature review of language teaching and race, Von Esch and colleagues (2020) write that there is promising scholarship on pedagogies that support students in grappling with race and their own racial identities (Michael-Luna, 2009; Roy, 2016), in understanding and challenging the broader contexts of linguicism and racism (Hammond, 2006; Taylor, 2006), and in developing metalinguistic awareness (McKinney, 2017). McKinney (2017) argues for centering the knowledge of racialized students to challenge anglo-normativity. She calls for transformative language and literacy pedagogies that provide spaces for racialized multilinguals to be meaning makers and therefore counter the narrative that the language classroom is only for the reproduction of the standard English (McKinney, 2017). Von Esch et al., (2020) recognize that these studies are an excellent beginning for an area that would benefit from more research.

**English Language Education for Multilinguals in the United States**

Multilingual students who receive educational support for the acquisition of English are termed English Learners (ELs) or LEPs (Limited English Proficiency) by the United States government. In the 2014-15 school year, there were 4.8 million ELs in U.S. public schools, 10 percent of the overall student population (U.S. Department of Education, 2022). Most of these students identified as Hispanic or Latino (77.8%), while the second largest group identified as Asian (10.7%), and the third as white (5.9%) (U.S. Department of Education, 2022). Other racial or ethnic categories were Black (3.6%), American Indian (.8%), two or more races (.6%), and Pacific Islander (.6%) (U.S. Department of Education, 2022). Nationally, the population of ELs grew by 28.1 percent between school year 2000-01 and school year 2016-17 (U.S. Department of Education, 2022). Forty-three states experienced EL population growth in this span of years, while seven states experienced a decrease (U.S. Department of Education, 2022). There is no demographic information about multilingual students who are not classified as LEPs.
The Law and Educational Policy for Multilingual Students

Language education policy in the U.S. public schools has been shaped at the federal level through the statutes of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2020), Title VI of this Act states:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (Title VI and race, color and national origin discrimination section, para. 1).

Based on this protection from discrimination, parents of Chinese speaking students sued the San Francisco Unified School district and won the landmark case of Lau v. Nichols (1974). In this case, the U.S. Supreme Court decided that since English language proficiency was necessary to access academic content and successfully graduate according to California statues, when the school district did not provide instruction in Chinese or to gain English proficiency, they were discriminating against Chinese speakers. Congress followed by passing the Equal Education Opportunities Act (EEOA) also in 1974, which specifically made “the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs” unlawful (Congress.gov, 2021, Title II: Unlawful practices, para. 1). Public schools were bound by law to address the needs of multilingual students but with no clear definition of how that should be done.

The Fifth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals decision in Castañeda v. Pickard in 1981 defined expectations regarding how schools must approach language barriers in public education. The court sided with Mexican American families in Texas who claimed discrimination through the hiring practices and ability grouping system of the Raymondville
Independent School District. In the decision, the court recognized that the EEOA had established the legal responsibility of a school district to appropriately address language barriers but had left little guidance regarding what was deemed “appropriate.” To deliver their decision, the justices established the 3-part standard of (1) programming based on sound theory, (2) the realistic allocation of resources to carry-out said programming, and (3) an established process for evaluation and revision (Castañeda v. Pickard, 1981). According to the U.S. Department of Education (2020, January 16), this is the framework currently used to establish the legality of the language education policy of a school district.

Language Education Policy Through a Critical Lens

The United States has crafted its educational language policy upon a foundation of deficiency. Starting with the language utilized in Lau v. Nichols (1974), multilingual students have been considered to have a deficiency that requires remediation. Though the framework that resulted from Casteñada v Pickard (1981) provided ways to measure programming for multilingual students and therefore guard against discrimination, the goal has always been to gain English language proficiency, not build on the linguistic repertoire of MLs. These steps towards equitable language policy are “regulating emancipation, rather than emancipating regulation” (Santos, 2014 as cited by Poza et al., 2021). Critics note that when language education policy reflects an inherent right to minoritized languages, it brings multilingual communities into the conversation. Circumstances of self-determination and educational dignity are created when the communities of marginalized languages craft educational language policy (Poza et al., 2021).
Teacher Student Relationships

Scholars have effectively demonstrated that positive teacher-student relationship impact students’ well-being, and more specifically, their motivation and academic achievement (Roorda et al., 2011; Suldo et al., 2009). In 2020, Garcia-Moya and colleagues published a qualitative study in which students from England and Spain described important characteristics of positive student-teacher relationships. Students portrayed what the researchers called humanizing relationships in which students (1) felt known by their teachers because of personal interactions, (2) felt that their teachers expressed empathy towards them and their perspective, and (3) felt that their teachers were approachable about both academic and nonacademic difficulties (Garcia-Moya et al., 2020). Notably, this study was multi-cultural, but the researchers found more commonalities between the responses of the two student participant groups than difference (Garcia-Moya et al., 2020). In the field of educational psychology, Henry & Thorsen (2021) conducted a study in English language classrooms in Sweden to examine the connection between teachers’ self-disclosures of certain aspects of their identity and student motivation. While they did not find that all types of self-disclosures influenced language learners’ motivation in the immediate, they theorize that self-disclosures have a relational effect over the long-term (Henry & Thorsen, 2021) Specifically, personal self-disclosures “can be understood as a micro-accrual in an ongoing process of relationship development” (Henry & Thorsen, 2021, p. 11) which, they argue, is particularly important for language learning. Flipping the coin to measure the impact of student behavior on teachers, Hagenauer and colleagues’ (2015) quantitative study found that joy was most closely correlated with positive interpersonal relationships and anxiety with negative relationships, and that teacher student relationship played an important role in teachers’ emotional experience in the classroom.
Teacher Student Relationship with Marginalized Populations

There is a growing body of scholarship specifically on the value and characteristics of teacher student relationship when considering marginalized student populations such as students of color, multilingual students, and students acquiring English as an additional language. Scholars such as Valenzuela (2017), Love (2019), Landson-Billings (1994, 1995) have called for a pedagogy of care in which “learning should be premised on relation with teachers and other school adults having as their chief concern their students’ entire well-being (Valenzuela, 2019, p. 274). When the culturally and linguistically diverse high school students in Friend & Caruthers’ (2012) study were asked about their experience of school, a salient finding was the importance of relationship and connection with their teachers, along with high expectations.

Cummins (2001, 2021) recognized the role of societal power relations as a principal factor in the patterns of underachievement in schools for culturally and linguistically diverse students and argued that teachers must challenge, both individually and collectively, the power dynamics in schools. Cummins (2021) theorized the Academic Expertise Framework, saying that “academic development will be optimized when teacher-student interactions maximize both cognitive engagement and identity investment” (Cummins, 2021, p.74). A teacher’s design of classroom instruction always “positions students in particular ways that reflect the implicit (or sometimes explicit) image of the student in the teacher’s mind. How students are positioned either expands or constricts their opportunities for identity investment and cognitive engagement” (Cummins, 2021, p.75). With the Academic Expertise Framework, Cummins (2021) pares his research focus of effective language instruction with the awareness that the school communities of marginalized students must address the sociopolitical context of English instruction in the United States to fully address underachievement. He posits that effective
language instruction and consideration of the sociopolitical context meet at the teacher student encounter (Cummins, 2021).

Diaz et al. (2016) conducted research that looked at the relationship between teacher power and student empowerment within the English learner (EL) population and the general student body. While teacher power was categorized in different varieties, referent power was defined as being cultivated through authentic relationship with students and is therefore relevant to our interests of teacher student relationship. While there was no significant different between the effect of referent power on student empowerment for the two populations, the researchers suggested that since ELs had lower self-competency levels, referent power or authentic positive relationship would be an influential motivator and provoke an increase in persistence for ELs (Diaz et al., 2016). Similarly concerned with motivation of language learners, Henry and Thorsen (2018) conducted qualitative research that considered the effects of teacher student relationship on motivation. They found that moments of positive relationship building had a more immediate impact on the motivation and engagement of students just beginning to develop relationship with the teacher, while for the students with a longer history of relationship with the teacher, the effect was less pronounced (Henry & Thorsen, 2018). Antunes (2021) also addresses his students’ level of engagement as high school ELs, many new to the United States. Reflecting on his own experience and interviews with his students, he describes his student-centered approach to curriculum as essential for positive student teacher relationship building (Antunes, 2021).

**Humanizing Pedagogy**

In the 1990’s, Lilia Bartolomé (1994) called for a shift within the field of education in the United States. Drawing from years of training teachers, she argued for a change in perspective
away from a mechanics of schooling to an analysis of in what ways, in what contexts, and for what purpose do we educate. She observed that when challenged to consider the schooling of racialized students, teachers in training generally concluded that students who didn’t experience academic success should be handled differently. The assumptive narrative was that the teachers and the systemic structure in which they worked were fine, so the problem must be the students and the methods used to teach them. In response to what she understood to be a myopic, destructive, deficit-driven methods fetish, Bartolomé (1994) advocated for a humanizing pedagogy.

In her conceptualization of a humanizing pedagogy, Bartolomé (1994) described the how and why of the teacher-student interaction, steering clear away from a list of methods that defined the what and a one-size-fits-all approach. Primarily, Bartolomé (1994) believed “that by taking a sociohistorical view of present-day conditions and concerns that inform the lived experiences of socially perceived minority students, prospective teachers are better able to comprehend the quasi-colonial nature of minority education” (p. 176). Rather than classifying certain methods as being right for certain populations, she argued that teachers need to develop political clarity within the sociocultural context to be able to discern critically the aptness of any method (Bartolomé, 1994). Bartolomé (1994) draws from the work of Paulo Freire, contemporary of Enrique Dussel, to argue for the necessity of political clarity, defining it as a continually deepening awareness of how past and present political, social, and economic policies and perspectives impact the circumstances of individuals within asymmetrical power relations. For teachers, it is essential to understand their work as political and see the connections between inequities in the larger society and schooling. Building on this concept, current teacher educators and advocates for racialized bi/multilingual students, continue to advocate for the development
of political clarity and critical consciousness in prospective teacher populations (see Alfaro, 2019; Alfaro & Hernández, 2016; Valenzuela, 2016).

Political clarity supports teachers in crafting their pedagogy so that it is humanizing rather than guided by deficit-perspective assumptions. Bartolomé (1994) posited that “politically informed teacher use of methods can create conditions that enable subordinated students to move from their usual passive position to one of active and critical engagement” (p. 177). For instance, she suggested that the power behind culturally relevant practices was that students saw teachers’ willingness to shift power dynamics in the classroom. A teacher’s willingness to acknowledge and change classroom hierarchies communicates respect for the students’ knowledge and an openness to mutual learning, both necessary characteristics of a humanizing pedagogy (Bartolomé, 1994).

Drawing from Bartolomé, Freire, Fránquiz, and others, Maria del Carmen Salazar (2013) reviewed the scholarship that grew out of Bartalomé’s call for humanizing pedagogy, synthesizing the findings into core principles and practices: (a) learner reality is essential, (b) development of critical consciousness is important for both teachers and students, (c) students’ sociocultural values must be valued, (d) coursework must be relevant and meaningful to students lives, (e) learning occurs when new knowledge is connected to prior understanding, (f) humanization occurs with the development of caring relationships, (g) it is important to be familiar with mainstream understandings and discourses, (h) students experience success through demonstrating academic, intellectual, and social abilities, (i) The use of learning strategies help empower students, and (j) transformation can grow from confronting inequities in the school system. Recently, recognizing that it can be helpful for new teachers to ground these ideas into ways of doing (Ladson-Billings, 2008), Peercy and colleagues (2022) worked with novice ELD
teachers to develop shared understanding of core practices based on these principles. Careful to not produce a static and narrow list, or essentialize the students or contexts, Peercy et al. (2022) expanded Salazar’s synthesis of principles by connecting them with core language teaching practices that demonstrate command of the content area, a line of thought similar to what Cummins (2021) has called for.

**Theoretical Framework**

I draw on one major theoretical perspective for the practitioner inquiry of the teacher-student relationship in my English Language Development (ELD) classroom. Dussel (2018; 2019) theorizes that teacher-student interactions can be generative for liberatory education. Liberatory pedagogics (Dussel, 2018; 2019) offers a way to think about language teaching that challenges deficit-thinking while acknowledging the sociopolitical context in which immigrant background students acquire English in the United States.

**Liberatory Pedagogics**

Enrique Dussel, well-known Argentinian philosopher and academic, influenced, along with others, the Philosophy of Liberation, a Latin American movement that began in the 1970’s and challenged Euro-centricism from the particular positionality of the periphery (Dussel, 2003; 2008; 2013). As part of this movement and what was described by Paulo Freire (2005) as the “banking method” of education, Dussel (2018; 2019) argued for a liberatory pedagogics within the context of schooling. Different from pedagogy, pedagogics is the philosophical consideration of the face-to-face encounter within all systems and institutions across relationships of unequal knowledge and power, such as adult-child, politician-citizen, and teacher-student (Dussel, 2019). While Euro-centric pedagogues described the role of the teacher as either filling a blank slate or having students repeat what was already known to be true, Dussel (2019) states that the role of
the teacher is to recognize the otherness of the student and support in the imagination of what has yet to become. For instance, Dussel (2019) critiques Jean-Jacques Rousse’s *Emile*, published in Paris in 1762, arguing that Rousse describes a pedagogics of domination in which, to be educated, the child must ignore all that she comes from. In contrast, liberatory pedagogics means listening to the student, “[their] *new* history, [their] *revelation*, that which each generation gives without possible repetition because it is unique” (Dussel, 2019, p. 116, italics in original). Dussel theorizes liberatory pedagogics in response to an accepted norm of education in the tradition of colonization.

While Dussel (2019) writes from Latin America in the 1970’s, his critique of the function of schooling resonates with contemporary concerns in the United States. He describes schooling as exclusionary and alienating, in part because the delivery system of education is built upon the oppressive assumption that children are deficient in knowledge and culture until they attend school. In fact, Dussel argues that the system actively works to eliminate children’s familial and communal sources of learning. Within the United States, the pronouncement of the “30-million-word gap” illustrates this discrediting of home learning in families with fewer monetary resources (Hart & Risley, 2003), building the narrative that the school system is essential and productive. Dussel (2019) critiques that schools teach children their place in society and, in response to this reality of a pedagogics of domination, theorizes liberatory pedagogics.

Simply put, Dussel (2018) writes that pedagogics of liberation gives the Other (the child, the student, the community) a “space to speak” (p. 100). Dussel (2019) describes “pedagogics’ project [as] exclusively liberatory, ethically just, humanizing, and alterative” (p.143). In contrast to the real-world context of racialized immigrant-background students, a reality in which many teachers find themselves conveying the understanding of the dominant culture (Sameness) at the
expense of the child’s culture (Otherness), Dussel (2019) advocates for teachers to create an exteriority that is apart from the system. From this vantage point of exteriority, the student is more aware of the power dynamic between Sameness and Otherness, what Dussel (2019) calls an analectic. A critical, decolonial consciousness is developed by the student and they are given the choice to claim and live into their Otherness. By living this experience with their student, the teacher “thus goes beyond the horizon of his world and liberates himself from being a functional ‘part’ of the system” (Dussel, 2019, p. 179). The face-to-face interaction of teacher and student questions the dominant system in such a way that a new system can emerge.

Yet Dussel (2019) is clear that liberatory pedagogics requires changes in the dominantly accepted relationship between teacher and student, the former as traditionally all-knowing and the later as knowledge-less. For one, the teacher must be willing to listen to the student. “Liberatory education can only begin with the revelation of the Other” (Dussel, 2019, p. 166). Mutual listening reflects pedagogical love and is the basis for a relationship of mutual learning. Therefore, secondly, the teacher must be willing to “be the disciple of the disciple” (Dussel, 2018, p. 100). The teacher must embrace the need to learn from the student because their worlds are not the same. Liberatory pedagogics requires teachers to honestly listen to their students and establish a relationship of mutual learning.

A Generative Framework for English Language Development Classrooms

For educators who enact humanizing pedagogy, liberatory pedagogics provide a generative framework for English language teaching considering the language’s hegemonic and oppressive legacy. A humanizing pedagogy provides the context in which to develop teacher-student relationships or interactions characterized by deep listening and mutual learning, as well as criticality regarding the dynamic between Sameness and Otherness. As theorized by Dussel
(2018; 2019), this shift away from the traditional understanding of the teacher-student relationship is central to liberatory pedagogics; the analectic is the teacher-student encounter in which the otherness of the student is either honored from the position of the exteriority, allowing for the creating of something new, or ignored and required to reproduce Sameness or the dominant paradigm. The relationship of these concepts is illustrated in Figure 1, which is loosely based off of Dussel’s Figure 4 in *Pedagogics of Liberation* (2019, p.144). This research engages the researcher practitioner in using a Dusselian lens to consider teacher student encounters in the ELD classroom.

**Figure 1.**
Chapter 3

This self-study has the goal of understanding if and how liberatory educational experiences are created through teacher student encounters within the context of a historically oppressive content area, English as a Second Language. In this chapter, I will first provide an overview of the opportunities and challenges of practitioner research, the overarching category under which the self-study or teacher researcher approach falls. I will then describe the design of this study, delineate the procedures involved, and describe threats to validity, the limitations of the study, and its transferability. I will conclude the chapter by describing my positionality as an insider researcher.

Methodology Overview

Practitioner research in the field of education has come to refer to insiders conducting the research rather than outside researchers (Herr & Anderson, 2015). The line between researcher and practitioner is blurred with the understanding that those within a context are most knowledgeable about the issues faced within it and all participants are “knowers, learners, and researchers” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 44). Collaboration is also a common characteristic of practitioner research, whether that be between the teacher/researcher and an outside scholar, teacher/researcher and colleagues, or teacher/researcher and students (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). There are clear systems established for reflection and documentation (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Herr & Anderson, 2015) and research findings are often made accessible to the community and/or public (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). “Teacher researchers work in inquiry communities to examine assumptions, develop local knowledge by posing questions and gathering data, and – in many versions of teacher research – work for equity for all students” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 40).
The self-study of teaching and teacher education practices (S-STTEP) methodology is a type of practitioner research defined as “the study of one’s self, one’s actions, one’s ideas…” (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 1998a, as cited by Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p.11) engaged in to examine the disconnect between who one is and who one wants to be in their practice as a teacher (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). LaBoskey (2004) describes self-study as having the following characteristics: self-initiated and focused, aimed at improvement, interactive, involves multiple methods that are generally qualitative, and relies on the authority of one’s experience for validation. Others are involved in S-STTEP methodology to provide support for the practitioner researcher’s assertions, such as via assignments and observed actions or by engaging critical friends (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). Trustworthiness is achieved by providing the reader descriptions and evidence that allow them to judge the credibility and rigor (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). According to Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) self-study methodology is unique because it is explicitly rooted in ontology and the researcher, in their pursuit of knowing, is in dialog with others.

As a relatively new and nontraditional research design, practitioner research has been criticized for knowledge-creation or rigor, ethics, political leanings and professionalism (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). The first criticism centers around the idea of who can create knowledge and conduct research. Can practitioners participate in the creation of knowledge, and do they have the expertise to conduct rigorous research? The second critique focuses on the dual role of researcher and practitioner. While some consider the dual role to be advantageous, others caution that there is an inherent conflict of interest when the researcher is also the teacher, and that participant consent can become tricky. The third criticism relates to politics – some saying that teacher researchers are not political enough, while others are too political. Finally, the last
critique has to do with the personal and the professional. Some argue that researching the self only reinforces the status quo (Anderson, 2002 as cited by Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) or is egotistical or narcissistic (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). Bullough and Pinnegar (2001) explain that the practitioner researcher involved in self-study must adequately respond to the question, so what? To do so, they must strike a balance between the role of self and the pertinence to those involved in the larger context. Bullough & Pinnegar (2001) explain that it is like studying “the space between self and the practice engaged in” (p. 15).

Research Design

For this study, I used a qualitative design in the tradition of practitioner inquiry with a teacher researcher (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) or self-study approach (Herr & Anderson, 2015; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). I conducted a self-study of my high school English Language Development classroom, considering the teacher-student encounters within an English language learning environment for adolescent multilingual learners who do not share several of my social identity characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, and age. I generated two types of data, that of my observations and reflections in the form of fieldnotes and that of the voice of my students in the form of student work and recorded, student-led discussions. To generate the first type of data, I wrote detailed descriptions of classroom happenings and my reflections daily in the hours immediately after class. To be able to collect the second type of data, I designed and implemented a unit of study about liberatory schooling (see Appendix A). During the unit, students reflected on their school experiences, learned about the history of bilingual education in the United States, explored the ways that students, families and community groups have shaped schooling in the United States, defined liberation, and presented an idea for how they would change an aspect of schooling to be more liberatory. While
teaching this unit, I collected student work that expressed their opinions about the subject matter. This included journal assignments and what I call “solid answer” responses that included their answer to a question, evidence and at least one example. I also recorded student-led small group discussions. Throughout the research process, I discussed my teaching with a critical friend four times. Without sharing the data, we discussed my thoughts and concerns regarding my classroom. In this way, I considered a different perspective and became aware of my own assumptions (Schuck & Russel, 2005; Stolle et al., 2018). I engaged in an iterative and inductive open coding process to identify themes in the data (Cresswell & Guetterman, 2019; Saldaña, 2021).

Analysis and Coding Procedures

My analysis of the data followed a recommended procedure for qualitative analysis (Saldaña, 2021). I organized the data, conducted an initial cycle of open coding, wrote analytical memos, and immersed myself in the data to continue the iterative coding process that then generated themes (Marshall et al., 2021; Saldaña, 2021). I analyzed the data as I began the collection process and continued throughout the collection period. As I collected fieldnotes on my observations of classroom teacher student encounters and my reflections, I engaged in an open coding process, asking the question: what is happening here? (Marshall et al., 2021). I coded fieldnotes, on average, every four to six weeks (See Appendix E). I also wrote analytic memos to organize and gather insights, questions, and wonderings that I returned to during the final phase of analysis (Marshall et al., 2021). Once all the data was collected, I did a second cycle of coding using the complete code book (Saldaña, 2021). In addition, I used the analytical tools included in Dedoose, a qualitative data analysis software, to identify the frequency of codes and code co-occurrence. From there, prominent themes emerged (Saldaña, 2021). Throughout
the research process, I met with a critical friend four times to discuss my thoughts about my teaching to “collaboratively make meaning” (Herr & Anderson, 2015, p. 98). We discussed my verbal descriptions of what I was observing and reflecting on in my classroom without violating student privacy through the sharing of data.

**Description of the Setting**

The setting for this study is the northeast, mid-Atlantic region of the United States in a suburban, mid-sized high school with relatively few English learners (ELs). During the school year in which the study took place, Rocco High School (pseudonym) had 19 ELs among its general population of about 900 students. The general student population has more students from marginalized populations than the state average. Most of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch. The graduation rate is a little lower than the state average.

The class that I chose to observe is an intermediate to advanced English language development class. At the time of the study, there were eight students enrolled in the class. My fieldnotes include descriptions of classroom happenings with all the students, making sure to focus on myself and to not disclose information about students who had not consented to involvement in the research. The class meets for a forty-five-minute class period every school day throughout the academic year. These students were placed in this class due to their families speaking a language other than English in their homes and their English language ability being tested at the level of intermediate or higher. In the class, six nationalities are represented.

**Participants**

The participants (N=4) in this study are some of the high school students (ages 15-18) in my intermediate to advanced English language development class at Rocco high school. While the class has a total of eight students, four agreed to participate in the research. From this group
of four students, I collected student work and recorded student-led discussions. While my fieldnotes had to at times include students outside of this sample, data for the study was limited to these participants. Three of the participants self-identify as female; one self-identifies as male. Two are in tenth grade, while the other two are in twelfth. There is a range of experiences represented in this group of participants. One was born in the United States. Two others have lived here for four or three years; the last arrived in the United States in the last six months (see Table 1). Besides being communicative in English, these students speak five other languages between them. Their motivation varies. While some express their need for better English language skills, one has expressed the desire to opt out of the class. All names used in this dissertation are pseudonyms and their home countries or languages are not referred to in order to protect students’ anonymity. In my observations of the happenings of the classroom in my fieldnotes, I refrained from using identifying descriptions of students as I wrote them. For instance, I used numbers to refer to students when writing the fieldnotes and only use pseudonyms when referring to students who gave consent to being involved in the study. I added the pseudonyms to the data in the process of incorporating the data into narrative form in the text of the dissertation. As an extra layer of anonymity, I use “they” instead of “he” or “she” when referring to students who are part of my description of a happening in the classroom, ensuring non-identifiability.

Table 1

Participant demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years enrolled in U.S. schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myriam</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamila</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditya</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jako</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of the Materials

This study took place in my classroom over whose curriculum and objectives I have full control. The English language development program has the dual goals of language development and academic skills, which can also be thought of as language development for the academic context. As a teacher, I have the additional goals of drawing from the students’ experiences in meaningful ways and engaging in issues of social justice. I plan curricular units around the idea of the language used within a particular subject area. I use the language objectives as defined by the department of education of the state in which the school is located. The language objectives are focused on the four language skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing. Considering each language objective, I plan the unit so that students build the necessary skills to meet the objectives by the end of the unit.

While the knowledge generated from this study is not dependent on the curriculum, lessons, or learning goals implemented in my classroom during the duration of the study, I designed a unit to seamlessly incorporate writing prompts, assignments, and discussion prompts that are an aspect of the methodology. These writing prompts, assignments, and small group discussion prompts were instruments used to collect data on the students’ perspectives of the study’s topic: liberatory education, teacher student interaction, and the experience of schooling for English language learners in United States public schools (See Appendix A). The implementation of this liberatory schooling instructional unit ran from January 25 to March 2. During the early phases of this research, I implemented other units of study. From November 9 to Dec 22, the students in this class and I worked on understanding identity and intersectionality, and from January 3 to 24, we studied debate (See Appendix E).
I designed the unit of study titled Liberatory Schooling to be able to “use the voice of the others in [my] practice to support [my] interpretations” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, pg. 15). Working within the limitation of only having classroom time with the participants in the study, I wanted to be able to collect their ideas and opinions on the topics of language use at school, teacher student encounters, and liberation. While the unit of study was more involved and robust than solely these tops, including linguistic development and academic skill development, the data I collected from the student focused on assignments that required students to share their thoughts and opinions.

There were three types of assignments collected as data: responses to journal prompts, solid answers to questions that required students to take a stance and support it with evidence, and recorded, student-led, small group discussions. First, for the three journal responses, participants were asked to journal freely about the following three prompts: What does physical space tell us about a school? (1/25), Is schooling and education the same thing? Why or Why not? (2/8), and How can students and teachers influence what schools are like? (2/23). Second, after having read and discussed information on a topic, students were asked to respond to a question by giving their opinion and supporting it with evidence and an example. The two questions were the following: What can the experience of the Indian boarding schools teach us about schooling? (2/22) and How do students and teachers influence what schools are like? (3/1). Finally, students were also asked to respond to discussion prompts in three student-led small group discussions, for some of which they first read a short text (Appendix B). The topics of these three prompts were one, the dynamic of learning English in school while speaking another language at home (2/21), two, student teacher encounters and learning when identity characteristics are different (2/28), and three, what liberation looks like at school (3/2). For these
discussions, students were given roles (facilitator, note-taker and timekeeper). Though I was present in the classroom during these discussions, I was circulating the classroom and only listened in, allowing the students to navigate the prompt and questions amongst themselves. Only for the students who had given consent, I began a digital audio recorder when they said that they were ready to begin the discussion. They then also notified me when they were finished and I ended the recording, transcribing the conversation later that same day, cleaning the transcription of student identifiers, and erasing the digital audio recording. The following is the text and questions given to students for the first discussion.

Read the following passage. Consider the questions below. You may choose NOT to respond if it feels upsetting to you.

_The teacher should not say to an Indian student: “You do not know how to speak. Learn how to speak Spanish [castellano].” The student, in this instance, goes home and lets her parents know the teacher is telling her she must learn to speak, because she does not know how to. Her mother says: “But we speak our language.” “Yes,” the student replies, “but my teacher says that does not count.”_  
_That is domination!_  
_But if the teacher tells the student: “You speak Quechua, Aymara, Maya, Otomi! I do not speak that language. You are bilingual, you are wiser than I am,” then the student goes back home to let her mother know the teacher thought she was wise._  

- By Enrique Dussel (2018)

- How does this passage relate to your experience learning English?
- How does it feel to not be able to speak the language of your home in school?
- Has there been a time when a teacher (without saying their name) told you that "you must learn to speak." If so, how did that happen? What did it feel like? Why do you think it felt this way?

- Has there been a time when a teacher (without saying their name) recognized that you were bi or multilingual. How did that happen? What did it feel like? Why do you think it felt this way?

Following the recommendation of Cummins (2021), this unit nests the transmission of information about language within lessons that apply a social constructivist model of teaching and learning for transformative outcomes. English learners must be equipped with information about how language works, and this is accomplished through direct instruction that follows the steps of exposure, exploration, supported practice, and independent practice. Cummins (2021) argues that while the transmission of information via direct instruction and transformational pedagogy are often discussed as opposites, teachers are always transmitting information.

This is a necessary method, especially in language classrooms, but it is not the only method. Social constructivist pedagogy builds upon the transmitted information to engage students in higher order thinking. Using the building blocks of language, students and teachers construct knowledge and new understanding. Finally, transformative pedagogy grounds the new understanding in the sociopolitical context of the student, helping the student to comprehend the power dynamics at play and act to potentially make change in their environment. Each lesson in the unit used for this study transmits information about language and supports students in developing new understanding that ultimately leads to the final project in which students propose changes to their schooling so that it could be more liberatory.
Procedures

I followed clear procedures for the collection and analysis of data (Appendix E). Beginning on November 9, during a unit of study on identity and intersectionality, I took fieldnotes of my classroom that described the happenings of the classroom with focus on my actions and reflections on my decisions, not what students were doing or saying. During this initial phase of observation, I was careful to not include information that described or identified students since I had yet to complete the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process or receive consent from the families and students. The focus of these observations and reflections were my teaching. After receiving IRB approval (See Appendix G) on December 19, on December 20, I read a recruitment statement to students and sent an Informed Consent form with them to their homes. To follow-up, I called families of students who indicated that I should with a language interpreter to orally translate the Informed Consent document and answer any questions. On December 21 and 22, I collected signed Informed Consent forms from students and asked them to sign the student asset forms, both were then kept in a locked cabinet in my home. From January 3 to 24, we studied debate and the students took the annual English language assessment, ACCESS (See Appendix E). During this period, except for the testing days, I took fieldnotes. I then began the unit of study Liberatory Schooling on Wednesday, January 25, 2023 with students responding to the journal prompt: What does physical space tell us about a school?

As a class, we worked through the seven lessons within the unit over the next several weeks. Daily, within hours of the class time, I took detailed field notes about the classroom happenings and my reflections. I collected these field notes in the same digital document, creating separate columns for the date, the description of classroom happenings, and my reflections. During this coursework, I also collected student work and recorded three student-led
small group discussions (See Appendices D & E). On February 8, I collected the second journal entry. On February 21, I recorded the first student-led, small group discussion, transcribing it that same day. The following day, February 22, I collected the first solid answer in which students responded to the question: What can the experience of the Indian boarding schools teach us about schooling? On February 23, I collected the third journal entry. On February 28, I recorded the second student-led, small group discussion and transcribed it that same day. I collected the second solid answer in which students responded to the question: How do students and teachers influence what schools are like? on March 1. I recorded and transcribed the final student-led, small group discussion on March 2.

Routinely, ever two to three weeks, I cleaned up the field notes, making sure that they were absent of any student identifiers, uploaded them to Dedoose, a qualitative data analysis software, and inductively coded them, using an initial coding process (Saldaña, 2021). Within a day or so after coding, I then wrote analytical memos to capture insights, wonderings, and initial interpretations. I coded the data in groupings of similar types. For instance, I coded the field notes that I wrote from November 9 to 22 all together on November 25 (See Appendix E). I used the same process of initial coding with both the classroom observations and reflections. Reaching a saturation point, which was defined by not seeing new insights in my data, I stopped collecting data on March 3, 2023, though we had yet to complete the unit. With all the data collected, I engaged in a second cycle of coding using the complete codebook or code list (See Appendix F) that I had developed over the course of the project. I then used analytical tools in Dedoose to consider frequency and co-occurrence of codes. Looking over the data, my analytical memos, the frequency of codes, and co-occurrence or overlap of codes, patterns emerged that helped me to
define categories (Saldaña, 2021). From these categories, themes emerged about the ways in which classroom encounters occurred (Saldaña, 2021).

As an element of my procedures for this self-study, I met with a critical friend four times over the course of the study - once in December, January, February, and April. “A critical friend, as the name suggests, is a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critique of a person’s work as a friend” (Costa & Kallick, 1993, p. 50, as cited by Schuck & Russel, 2005, p. 108). I chose an English language teaching colleague who I had worked closely with in the past to play the role of critical friend because we have observed each other teaching in the past and both value the use of a socio-political critical lens in our practice. In past experiences, I had sought out and appreciated dialogs about teaching practices with this colleague. Using Stolle and colleagues’ critical friend definition continuum (2018, p.150), I characterize my critical friend for this project as a familiar colleague and content expert, insider to the field but not the research site, who was loosely involved in the study. We defined the expectations as we went along, beginning conversations with what I was thinking about in regard to my practice and the focus of encounters of Sameness and Otherness, and following a thread of what called her attention and curiosity. Honoring the privacy of the participants, these conversations were conducted using my verbal descriptions, not data.

In our first conversation in December, I explained the project to her, my questions, and purpose. She raised pertinent issues such as the challenge of defining liberation in the short term and the importance of specifically considering teacher student encounters with adolescents. Our second conversation in January centered on the unit I had designed. She suggested beginning with the concrete activity of creating and annotating maps of students’ previous schools as a
generative activity for memory and storytelling, which proved to be effective. In our last two conversations in February and April, we discussed some of the patterns that I was beginning to articulate into findings regarding encounters in my classroom, while never showing data, I described certain vignettes in a general manner. These conversations with a critical friend helped me to question assumptions, notice blind spots, and hear perspectives different from my own.

Validity

Herr and Anderson (2015) argue that action research, defined as having “a fundamental commitment to using research to effect change” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 233) should not be deemed credible by the same criteria as positivistic or naturalistic research. They suggest quality criteria that are in dialog with more traditional research criteria, rooted in their experience of action research, and connected to the goals of action research (Herr & Anderson, 2015). Process validity is applicable to my research in that quality is ensured when the findings are an outcome of a reflective and cyclical process that seeks to question basic assumptions (Herr & Anderson, 2015). Triangulation or structural corroboration, the incorporation of several sources of evidence, guards against threats to process validity. In the case of my research, I used fieldnotes, student work, and transcribed small group discussions to structurally corroborate my findings. Dialogic validity is also pertinent to my research in that I worked with a critical friend to discuss my reflections and analysis (Herr & Anderson, 2015). As a colleague familiar with the setting of my research and the field of English language teaching, my critical friend helped me in the process of understanding my research from the perspective of an outsider and to articulate any assumptions due to my positionality as insider.

Limitations
There are several limitations to this research. First, in a self-study in which I am both researcher and practitioner, there is the chance that I might not be objective in my data collection and analysis, favoring data and findings that place me in a positive light. To guard against this, I collected two groups of data, one from my perspective and one from my students’ perspective. In the process of analysis, I aimed to structurally corroborate or triangulate my findings. As well, being both researcher and practitioner, it is possible that my analysis might suffer a silo effect in which ideas are stagnant or limited. To address this limitation, I worked with a critical friend (Herr & Anderson, 2015), engaging in dialog regarding my teaching and encounters with students. Finally, as both researcher and practitioner, it is essential that I am aware of my positionality as an insider. I address this further in a later section dedicated to my positionality. There are several limitations due to the self-study approach of my qualitative design, all of which I have tried to address.

**Reliability and Transferability**

In the context of qualitative research, reliability “postulates the qualities that make [the researcher] personally honest and credible” (Marshall, et al., 2021, p. 49). This research is honest and credible because the goals and design of the study align. For instance, I aim to add description and understanding to the body of knowledge about liberatory pedagogics. So, I ask the question of how the participants and I, as researcher practitioner, understand teacher student interaction and liberation by using the methods of observation, reflection, and participant voice represented in recorded small group discussions and student work. According to Marshall, et al. (2021), these decisions align as middle-ground approaches, therefore making the research trustworthy and reliable.
Transferability is perhaps more accurately expressed as transferability in qualitative research (Marshall, et al., 2021). While the knowledge generated by this self-study cannot be applied to other settings, as researcher practitioner, I am modeling a practice of reflexivity with a particular lens that is transferable to other practitioners in other classrooms. The research does generate implications for practitioners that are transferable, as well.

**Positionality**

As a practitioner studying my own classroom, I am positioned as an insider. Having worked at my research site for almost two years, I have tacit knowledge about the site and the students, some of whom I have worked with for all that time. While this insider knowledge helps to advance the study logistically, this tacit knowledge can also hold biases and assumptions that can be problematic epistemologically if I am not intentional about naming and examining them (Herr & Anderson, 2015). For example, there may be ways that I interact with students or choose curricula that are based on past interactions or knowledge. In the construction of new knowledge, it is meaningful to surface this background as integral to choices that I make as a practitioner, and that therefore informs the research. Also, as an insider, I have the tendency to believe in my work and may therefore be less critical of my practice (Herr & Anderson, 2015). It is important to structure the methodology to counter this tendency for personal bias, such as by incorporating methods of self-reflection and collegial reflection like a critical friend (Herr & Anderson, 2015).

In relation to my students, it is important to name aspects of my identity and the associated power dynamics because “researcher identity may influence, in unknowable ways, the data produced” (Canagarajah & Stanley, 2015, p.39). For instance, the roles of teacher and student are a hierarchical relationship. While I approach my role as a teacher with interest in diminishing the power dynamics inherent in the traditional relationship, I ultimately have control
over their grades. As well, each student understands the teacher-student relationship according to 
a variety of influences in their lives such as their educational background, their phase in life 
(adolescence), parents, and social media. It is valuable for me to recognize the hierarchical 
characteristics of the teacher-student relationship and the different ways that students and I might 
approach this relationship. In addition, I am a white, middle class, middle-aged United States 
national who speaks English as my first language. Each of these identities holds power within the 
context the society of the United States generally, and more specifically, in relation to the varied 
identities of my students. These power dynamics influence the way in which we interact and 
engage with each other. They also impact how I experience the world, my assumptions, and 
biases.

Summary

As an educator who believes that education can be liberatory and transformational, I am 
curious about the role that teacher-student interaction plays in this process. This goal of 
liberation is particularly relevant in the English language development classroom where the 
content at hand has an oppressive history and hegemonic tendencies. Critical language scholars 
have called for English language teachers to address this legacy. Enrique Dussel has theorized 
that by relating to students from a position in the exteriority – separate from dominant and 
hegemonic cultural practices - with a posture of mutual learning and criticality, teachers 
empower students to embrace their otherness and create something new, rather than perpetuate 
sameness, the dominant, Euro-centric culture and systems. With curiosity about how this 
theoretical lens supports my goal of liberatory education in the English language development 
classroom, I designed a self-study in which I am both researcher and practitioner.
This qualitative design in the tradition of practitioner inquiry with a teacher researcher (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) or self-study approach (Herr & Anderson, 2015; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009) was conducted in my high school intermediate to advanced English language development classroom. I used observation and student voice as methods for the collection of data in two groups: my observations and reflections, and my students’ thoughts in recorded small group classroom discussions and student work. To integrate the topic of my inquiry into the content of my classroom, I developed and implemented a unit of study focused on schooling and liberation (see Appendix A). During a total of 3 months of data collection, I used an iterative process of open coding and analysis, asking the question: what is happening here? Using my analysis of the coded data, categorical themes (Saldaña, 2021) emerged to answer my research question: What do liberatory and oppressive pedagogics look like in an ELD classroom?
Chapter 4

This research is a qualitative self-study of my English language development (ELD) classroom. Through his theorization of pedagogics, Enrique Dussel (2019) offers that the face-to-face interaction between teacher and student is analectic, rather than dialogic, and liberatory when the alterity or otherness of the student is recognized and allowed to create something new. This analectic is achieved not within the totality of the dominant paradigm, but from the position of exteriority where teacher and student mutually learn from each other and develop a critical consciousness about the interaction of sameness and otherness within the totality (Dussel, 2019). My research aims to answer the question: What do liberatory pedagogics look like in an ELD classroom to a researcher practitioner? To conduct this research, I collected fieldnotes, student work, and the transcripts of three student-led, small-group, classroom discussions as data to consider the face-to-face encounters in my classroom through the lens of pedagogics.

While my fieldnotes include observations of and reflections on the happenings in this high school intermediate to advanced English learner class, four of the students and their families gave consent to being recorded in the small group discussions and providing me with their student work. These students have chosen to be referred to as Jako, Myriam, Jamila, and Aditya. Jamila has been in U.S. schools since kindergarten but has at times lived for months at a time in the home country of her parents. Aditya has been in U.S. schools for less than a year, having just moved with his family. Jako is graduating this year and has been in U.S. schools for four years; she plans to attend university in her home country. Finally, Myriam has been enrolled in U.S. schools for three years, will be graduating this year, and plans to attend a U.S. university to study medicine. Two of the participants are in tenth grade, while the other two are in 12th. Their ages span from 15 years of age to 18 (see Table 1). Again, these names are pseudonyms. In my
observations of the happenings of the classroom in my fieldnotes, I refrained from using identifying descriptions of students and only use pseudonyms when referring to students who gave consent to being involved in the study. While taking fieldnotes, I referred to students by a number and added pseudonyms at the stage of incorporating the data into the narrative of the dissertation. As an extra layer of anonymity, I use “they” instead of “he” or “she” when referring to students who are part of my description of a happening in the classroom, ensuring non-identifiability.

After engaging in an iterative, open coding process, I then analyzed the frequency and co-occurrence of codes, referred to my analytical memos throughout the process, and met with the colleague who has accompanied me as a critical friend (Herr & Anderson, 2015; Saldaña, 2021). Four themes became apparent about the face-to-face encounters (Dussel, 2018) in my classroom: perception, knowing, disconnection, and affirmation. First, I perceive the way of being of my students, then decide how to interact with them. This perception of presence influences instruction, one-on-one relationship, and the imposition of my beliefs about how we should relate in the classroom. In addition, I attend to the knowing or linguistic understanding of my students through both communicative interactions that generate natural feedback and explicit one-on-one interactions to give instructive feedback. While I strive for connection with my students, differences in our identities and life experiences threaten disconnection that also must be attended to. Finally, interactions yield affirmations of self within the classroom. In the following pages, I will discuss each of these in more detail and provide examples of supportive data.
Perception

My field notes convey the extent to which I read my students’ way of being or demeanor and make pedagogical and relational decisions dependent on my perception. By way of being, I mean the body language, facial expression, tone of voice, and eye contact of students. At times, the information that I am interpreting includes oral communication or verbal expressions. Often, in just seconds, I interpret and make decisions in response to the nonverbal and verbal communication of my students. Other times, I reflect on these recollections of their presence and make decisions about actions that I take within the class period or in the following class.

While this reading of student’s body language, demeanor, and overall presentation of self in the classroom is not unique to my teaching, it seems particularly pertinent in the language learning classroom and is generative to notice when aiming to acknowledge the Otherness of students. What of their presence is validly informative? What is accepted and acceptable by me? What is questioned and admonished? Where am I steered wrong by my perception due to the way in which Sameness and Otherness interplay? The following paragraphs highlight the ways in which my perception of their state of being guides my pedagogic and relational decision making.

Instruction

I read my students’ presence and participation to inform my teaching during whole group interactions. Throughout my field notes, there are comments in which I interpret student engagement in relation to their body language, and verbal and nonverbal communication, and in turn, evaluate the learning activity at hand. For example, in response to a listening activity, I wrote, “They seemed to be engaged but did not participate. I think I need to provide them with more scaffolds to be able to understand the audio.” Or, evaluating a classroom discussion about
gender roles, I wrote, “the discussion was good in that everyone was engaged and participated.” These notes reflect the mundane thought cycle of teaching but are a meaningful data point when considering the analectic and liberatory pedagogics because packed into this simple statement are various assumptions. What does engagement look like? What is expected participation? What do these look like from the perspective of a student who does not share my cultural and linguistic background? How does my perception change when I am familiar with my students? In reference to a classroom discussion about intersectionality, I noted levels of engagement and explored reasons, writing, “the discussion was challenging. Not all the students wanted to participate. Why didn’t two students participate?”

In these examples, I interpret my students’ presence in whole group interactions in the classroom to understand the level of effectiveness of a learning activity. While a student’s way of being in the classroom provides information, it is one-sided; I do not actively confirm my interpretations, which lends itself to misconceptions.

Particularly in whole group interactions, the interpretation of a student’s way of being during an activity is unreliable. For instance, during the reading of a brief history of bilingual education in the United States, Aditya asked, “If the United States had so many languages early on, why does it really only have English now and some Spanish?” Before I could respond, another student responded in a way that I thought would be about privilege and oppression but went in a different direction.

Aditya’s question was right on point. It was exactly the kind of question that I wanted students to ask. His classmate’s response was surprising and super interesting. At first, I thought that they were going to give a critical response about power, but [they didn’t]. I could have asked [a follow up on this]… Could return to this tomorrow.
In this scenario, for me, Aditya’s presence had communicated engagement. He was sitting up at his desk and actively responding to the way in which I was guiding the class through the reading about bilingual education, though the other student’s was different. This left me with a question: To what extent is my reading of students’ presence effective and instructive for my teaching? Where do my perceptions fall short, perhaps due to differences in cultural norms? Previous research notes that teachers can misjudge students’ participation in class due to differences in social identity characteristics (Liggett, 2009) and that even when teachers are aware of differences, they miss some of the complexities (Motha, 2014).

Similar to my observations of students’ way of being, students understand their behavior to be significant to the learning environment. As part of our unit on schooling, students were asked to journal about the ways students can influence schools. Jamila wrote, “They can influence what schools are like by their education, behavior.” Myriam wrote, “student may influence by the behavior, participation.” While using the words behavior and participation rather than presence or way of being, these students seem to acknowledge that how they are in the classroom influences the school experience. Potentially, these responses reflect the messaging received by students about expected classroom behavior, expectations that I am also employing when interpreting student presence in whole group activities.

**Relationship**

My perceptions of a student’s demeanor in whole group interactions influence my one-to-one interactions and relationship with the same student. If a student’s presence communicates disengagement, such as lying their head on the desk, I tend to perceive that something is wrong and check in with that student verbally, asking them if they are feeling alright. I might also indirectly engage with the student by touching them on the back, signaling that I have noticed
their body language. I don’t generally use my authority or power to require them to adopt a
demeanor that is more in line with expected classroom behavior, such as sitting up at their desk,
maintaining eye contact, or participating actively in the lesson. I identify as an empathic person,
aiming to convey to my students that they can attend class authentically, as their true selves in
the moment, and that I will recognize them with care (Varghese et al., 2016).

My interactions with a student, about whom I will only speak in a general way to
emphasize my own approach viz. relationships and exemplify the challenges of this approach of
empathy and authenticity. After steady engagement, something changed in their demeanor.

I spoke with them first… I asked questions but they didn’t fully engage with me. I found
this to be unusual… Had I misjudged our relationship? Had something happened in the
class that I was unaware of? Or did their demeanor have nothing to do with the class or
me, but rather something larger in their life?

In my reflection on our interaction, I observed my discomfort with what seems to be an
unexplained shift in our relationship. By being empathetic to the way in which a student presents
their authentic self, am I expecting trust in return? A relationship of trust requires vulnerability
from both people. But have I offered nothing of me to them? Simultaneously, in my reflection I
consider the probability that their way of being in the classroom has nothing to do with me, the
class, or their classmates. Yet in consequent days it continues to make me uncomfortable. For
instance, I wrote, “While [the other students] completed the comprehension questions, I went to
talk with them… I said, “how this is working isn’t satisfactory, something would have to
change.” In this one-to-one interaction, I began to communicate my discomfort. The empathy
began to wane and when more absences piled up, I eventually learned that the student was
unhappy for curricular reasons. My notes first observe my feelings of hurt and defensiveness, but I also hear their words.

I will be honest in that this …hurt me… It is challenging to feel like our relationship is damaged when before I felt like we had such a good relationship. Interesting that they are saying that the problem is [curricular], and I am focused on the relationship. Perhaps I should simply shift focus and work with them directly on learning objectives.

This reflection mirrors the doubts that initiated this self-study. I value relationships with my students, but to what extent does that better their learning? Does it simply make me feel good? In these exchanges with this student, I see the way in which I perceive an issue and strive to connect, while also experiencing discomfort. It’s almost as if I expect to feel good in the relationship in return for my empathetic gestures, in return for allowing students to be themselves (Henry & Thorsen, 2021). But what if their truth questions who I am and the value of my work? Can I utilize my perceptions to refocus on the student, leaving the status of our relationship to the side?

My perception of this student guided the way I chose to interact with them, focusing more on how I felt in our relationship than my intention to accept a student’s authentic way of being. My self-observations reveal that I feel uncomfortable when the authentic self of a student disrupts my expectations of the relationship (Hagenauer et al., 2015). I expect to offer empathy and in return feel a connection with the student, feel good about establishing a relationship with the student (Garcia-Moya et al., 2020). When the student is present as their authentic self, can I engage honestly with them rather than with my perception of how things should be? Can I disengage from the pop culture myth that I am effective when I establish life-changing relationships with students?
When considering relationships between teachers and students, it is essential to acknowledge power and the inherent hierarchy of the classroom (Cummins, 2001; 2021). I have an uneasy relationship with classroom power dynamics. I counter that by giving students choice and incorporating student voice into lessons. At the same time, I interpret student behavior and use my authority to define the ways in which I believe we should interact.

There were several instances in which I observed the interaction of students and decided to use my authority to clarify my expectations for classroom interactions. For instance, at one point we were having a classroom discussion about gender roles. In the format of open discussion, we were talking about our understanding of gender roles or what each gender typically did in our cultures. A student to the class participated in the discussion in a notably tense way.

At this point, I paused the conversation and reminded everyone that we could have different opinions and that we would respect each other’s opinions by listening to each other. The conversation continued.

In this scenario, knowing that there might be differing and strong opinions, I could have begun the discussion by establishing ground rules. I could have asked students to agree to a set of expectations or we could have written a list collaboratively. Yet, I hadn’t set this foundation and then, when I perceived the potential for a problem, I used my authority to establish an expectation. How does my unpredictable use of authority affect my encounters with students?

In another instance, a student asked about the meaning of the acronym LGBTQ. I explained what each letter meant and heard some snickering from two of the students. I quickly made the decision to state that while it is possible that people with these identities are not
accepted in other parts of the students’ lives, in our classroom we would use the rule of human rights, that everyone has the right to be exactly who they are, no matter how they are treated in society.

Here I attempted to define clearly what would be allowed when relating with me and others in the classroom. I am not sure how this landed for my students, but I wanted to attempt to make a safe place in the classroom. I also did not want to enter into debate about whether any identity, particularly homosexuality, was right or wrong. I thought that using the term “human right” would circumvent those other discussions and it seemed to do so. I wonder how this posture affected our relationships.

Here my self-observations do include a wondering about how such an intervention impacts my relationship with students. At the same time, I don’t question my perception of the laughing or my use of authority to establish an expectation of acceptance.

Similarly, I intervened when I perceived that students could be friendlier when interacting peer to peer. In this scenario, a group of students were excluding other students, including Aditya, based on shared language.

I intervened in front of the whole class, asking how they feel when they’re in a group of people and everyone is speaking a language that they don’t understand. They explained their actions. I replied that it would be kind to stop having their own conversation and to include Aditya. I then realized that I might be being harsh and embarrassing them. I smiled and asked them to be friendly [and include Aditya]. They did what I asked.

In this situation, I read the interaction in seconds and decided to use my authority. I know that my reaction was emotional and related to the ways in which I felt excluded as a child. I reflect on this interaction, and I regret having intervened. For one, I actively refrain from being the
language teacher who asks students to speak in English. I don’t ever want students to associate negative feelings with their home languages. Secondly, while I would have liked the two adolescents to be more inclusive, a private conversation with them would have been a more appropriate way to handle the situation. When authority is wielded in whole group situations about personal behavior, students can be made to feel ashamed. In a private conversation, I could have explained how the situation made me feel and I could have asked them to reflect on ways to be inclusive, reducing the likelihood of triggering feelings of shame.

Finally, there was a scenario in which students hoped that I would assume a role of authority, but I declined. A student approached me after class to tell me that they had seen a classmate breaking a class rule, which had been ignored. I perceived that the student decided to talk to me about this because they wanted me to intervene. I responded by speaking to their concern rather than the other student’s actions. I told them something to the effect that I believe that when people do bad things, it is not because they are bad people, but that there must be a reason for their behavior.

I’m not sure why I responded this way. My first instinct wasn’t to commend them on addressing the issue… but rather to ask them to think of the larger issue of why one chooses certain actions. I don’t know. I could have thanked them and told them that I would deal with the issue, but my first instinct was to not encourage their behavior of supervising other students.

Here a student is calling on me to use my authority to uphold school rules and expectations. While I agree that students should follow rules and I understand how this can feel unfair to students who have followed them, I am uninterested in the role of teacher as disciplinarian. What I chose to say to this student also demonstrates my discomfort with their choice to address the
behavior of other students, yet is this not their right? Are we not a community? And would that not mean that we hold each other accountable?

There is an authoritarian element of schooling from which I actively try to distance myself. These excerpts point to my discomfort with the hierarchy of the classroom and my focus on relationships in the classroom, both peer to peer and teacher to student. I choose not to be authoritarian, but I do employ my authority to impose my beliefs when I perceive that students should be interacting differently as members of our classroom community, aligning with research that demonstrates teacher agency in defining classroom policy (Canagarajah, 1999; Cummins, 2021; Shin & Rubio, 2022).

Teachers commonly interpret and act on their perceptions of their students’ presence, yet this practice is particularly relevant when considering the ELD classroom since teachers are working with linguistically and culturally diverse populations. In my classroom, I observed three patterns of how my perceptions influenced face-to-face encounters: for the purpose of instruction, with the goal of relationship, and to impose my beliefs around community membership. While these encounters are not unique to the English language classroom, they are pertinent because my perception is influenced by my cultural lens, which is different from my students’ (Liggett, 2009; Motha, 2014; Varghese et al., 2016). In the following section, I will consider face-to-face encounters specific to the language classroom.

Knowing

In language learning, interactions can confirm (or disconfirm) linguistic understanding or knowing. The way I create spaces for feedback has relational underpinnings. In my classroom, I plan activities for feedback to be given naturally as communicators, as well as intentionally as part of instruction, and both modes are facilitated by an interpersonal knowing – teacher to
student and student to student. In my experience, there is a positive interplay between communicating well and knowing the person with whom you are communicating, therefore developing relationships in the classroom takes on an instructive role.

*Circumstantial Communicative Feedback*

With language as the academic content of the English language development classroom, all communication has the potential to be instructive. In my research, I identified three ways in which interactions provided natural linguistic feedback: in large group activities, in small-group student-led discussions, and in informal teacher-student exchanges. The following section will explore examples of each. Finding that the creation of an annotated map of their previous school was a generative activity for memories, I asked each student to tell a story from their experience in that school. Students were given some time to prepare and then we gathered in a circle to share the stories. After one student’s story, I wrote:

This student’s English is [difficult to understand]. They told their stories which I had already heard so I could pretty much follow, but I suspected that others were not understanding. I decided to let the students speak up and some did [noting certain difficulties in understanding].

After the students said that they hadn’t understood, I gave a sentence or two about each of the anecdotes that had been shared. The student spoke again and the communication seemed to be more effective, though I didn’t explicitly ask the other students if they understood. In communicative activities like this, I want students to be attentive to their audience. In a reflection about the activity, I wrote:

I haven’t shared any critical feedback with any student after they have spoken, only thanked them for sharing and led the group to applaud for them, after asking what
questions students had. The feedback comes from their listeners. Are they making sense? Are they being clear? Can their listener understand the accent they use, the volume of their voice?

This story telling activity was one example in which the goal was effective verbal communication. Some students chose to use their annotated maps and writing as supports during the activity.

Jamila began to tell her story, but then decided to look it up on her phone. She then read it. I chose to simply allow her to do this. She expresses a lot of anxiety about speaking in front of the class, even in our small group. She read her story. I perceived that it was hard to understand because reading disengages you from the audience, you speak faster and are unaware if people are following along unless you deliberately make eye contact, which she didn’t. I can’t quite remember how it happened, but Myriam either was asked or volunteered to summarize what Jamila said. She got some things wrong which prompted Jamila to clarify without reading and she told some of the story again.

In this example, I once again am observant of the extent to which a student can effectively communicate but allow space for the students to confirm or disconfirm their understanding, aiming to create an authentic communicative activity.

These interactions to achieve effective communication between students also occurred when I was absent from the group. In one of the recorded, student-led, small group discussions, students were placed in a group of four to answer questions about a poem that we had read together. One of the questions asked students to talk about when they have experienced liberation in school. In the following exchange, students correct another student’s understanding of the word liberation.
Myriam: I can describe school that make me feel like...

Jako: Liberated

Myriam: Liberation by not allowing to go outside to buy what you want to leave campus and...

Jamila: We're talking about freedom. We're not talking about...

Jako: Wait.

Myriam: It says free or liberation.

Jamila: Yeah, liberation means freedom.

Aditya: It's freedom. Yeah.

Jamila: So Free. It's like freedom. You're free. You can do whatever you want.

Myriam: I can describe school that make me feel free...maybe coming to school, see my friends.

Jamila: Ok. Keep going.

Myriam: Hanging out with my friends. Talking to new people.

In this small group setting, students gave their classmate feedback without directly telling her that she was wrong, but rather by restating the meaning of liberation. This implicit feedback guided the student to change her response, a scenario of students authentically achieving effective communication in a verbal exchange. It is unclear if the familiarity of their relationship – the level to which these students knew each other – was a factor in the effectiveness of this exchange. Being friends may have been the reason that Jamila felt comfortable correcting Myriam. Being familiar with each other may have influenced the indirect nature of their feedback or Myriam’s willingness to accept the new information.
There were also times in which the authentic interaction in a small group resulted in less effective communication. In the recorded small group discussion about the passage by Enrique Dussel, students were asked to share about their experience with learning English. In this small group of three, two students had already shared that they were not “forced’ to learn English. When it was the third student’s opportunity to respond, it seemed that she would have shared something different, but the interaction shut her down, despite her classmates’ efforts to draw out her answer.

Aditya: Jako, do you...how does this passage relate to your experience learning English?
Jako: I think I kind of related because when I focus on my something [unclear] I'm not in the never.
Jamila: I'm sorry, can you speak up?
Aditya: Can you speak a little louder, please? I can't hear you.
Jako: Honestly...I...it's hard to...speak up
Jamila: It's ok. How does it relate? What did you mean? Like how did it relate to you?
Did the teachers force you? Do they say you have to learn something by this month or...?
Aditya: Does teachers force you to learn that?
Jamila: To learn English?
Aditya: Or your parents or your friends? Someone?
Jako: No.
Aditya: No? So how does that relate to you?
Jaka: I said kind of.
Aditya: Kind of? But how?
Jako: So ...
Jamila: So how is that kind of?

Jako: I have no idea now.

Aditya: Oh my God. It's hard to listen.

Jamila: So it doesn't relate to you at all?

Aditya: Is that right? It doesn't relate to you at all.

Jako: I was never forced to.

In situations of student-to-student interaction, there is opportunity for authentic communication. It seems that Jako had an idea that may not have fit in Aditya and Jamila’s rigid understanding of the question and use of the word “forced.” When pushed to articulate her thought within their parameters of understanding, she struggled and ultimately let it drop. The level of familiarity between the students could have been a factor. These students are not good friends, while in the prior scenario Myriam is good friends with both Jako and Jamila. If the students had known each other better, they might have allowed Jako time to think or recognized her pattern of critical thinking and refrained from boxing her into their line of thinking. These communicative interactions give students feedback about their ability to communicate effectively and the extent to which they know each other may be a key factor.

There are also circumstances in my classroom in which authentic communicative feedback is given in impromptu exchanges between teacher and student. It is through the interaction that both teacher and student gain better linguistic understanding. In the following scenario, I had asked students to write their answer to the question: What can we learn from the experience of the Indian Boarding Schools?

Aditya was the first to give me his answer. He wrote that Indian boarding schools could teach us the importance of discipline and being systematic. I don’t quite remember how I
reacted at first, but he went to his seat and when he returned, he had written a whole page
supporting his original idea. I then asked him if he thought the Indian boarding schools
were good. He said, no. I said, well your writing communicates that you believe that they
were good, that they had good characteristics. He said, well the question asks what we
can learn and we can’t learn from something bad. I responded, “oh I understand your
thinking.” And then I asked Jako, “can we learn from something bad?” and she responded
that “yes, we can, so that we don’t do it again.” Aditya and I talked about it a little more
and he said that he understood and he would rewrite his answer.

In this situation, it was through the interaction that I came to understand Aditya’s thinking and
was therefore able to help him understand the phrase “learn from” in a different way. In this
scenario, I also incorporate the thoughts of another student to support our collective learning.
While in these examples, feedback was given implicitly through the practice of communicating,
the pedagogic of knowing was also apparent when I gave one-on-one instructional feedback.

Explicitly instructional feedback

In my classroom, in addition to communicative circumstantial feedback, students gain
linguistic understanding through one-on-one teacher-student interactions. I create opportunities
to work one-on-one with students to gain understanding of their knowledge or to provide direct
feedback. While being instructional, these encounters also provide the opportunity to become
more familiar with that student.

In the instance of one student, I carved out time to work one-on-one to get to know them
both as an English language speaker and as a person, a tactic I use frequently.

It is hard to decipher what they know. I am spending one-on-one time with them both to
establish rapport and to get a grasp of what they are capable of. Specifically, working
directly with them, I can see and hear what they understand. When they are a student with the whole class, they are engaged but they do not participate, nor do I ask them to participate. I only encourage them when they volunteer.

This one-on-one time was very valuable because I came to understand details of their language learning I had not known before. This one-on-one time built a rapport that carried over into whole group activities.

For instance, once they said something [quietly] and I asked them to repeat. Anytime I do this, [students] get shy and refuse to repeat what they said. I pretended to be mad, [but then made it clear I wasn’t, which I could see they appreciated].

This one-on-one interaction in the language classroom is particularly valuable to both understand a student’s linguistic abilities and to gain interpersonal familiarity, which lowers the affective filter, potentially allowing students to take more risks with the language.

With the intention of creating a classroom in which students feel free to speak, I give critical feedback to students in one-on-one situations rather than in whole group settings. This feedback is usually centered around written assignments, but I did an activity in which I pulled students one-by-one and they verbally responded to a question. Using a dictation tool, this oral response was captured in text which we then discussed.

Though recording one-on-one is time intensive, I think it is really time well spent. I can give feedback about the content of the answer and the way that they went about answering the question. I also gave students feedback on their grammar which can be carried over into their speaking and writing later.

This is just one example of creating teacher-student interactions with the purpose of giving feedback. The one-on-one characteristic of these interactions allows for a building of familiarity
between teacher and student. In a recorded small group discussion, when asked how their relationship with a teacher influences their learning, Myriam answered, “I think a good relationship with the teacher influence your learning.” Expanding on that, Jako responded:

The relationship with teacher is very important to student when they are learning because when student feel comfortable in um to feel like they are ready to study, they can study when that environment. And the environment, the teachers make that. So if you are having good relationship with teachers, you're learning will be successful. But if you are not having a good relationship with teacher, if you hate them or you can't trust them, it's going to be terrible learning.

In this last response, Jako specifically refers to the environment made by the teacher. Creating space for feedback in one-on-one interactions is my way of getting to know the student while responding to their need for linguistic feedback.

In my classroom, I provide ways for feedback to be given naturally in communicative exercises between students or between teacher and student. When feedback is given more explicitly during activities such as the editing of writing or the critique of a verbal answer to a question that is then dictated, I create one-on-one encounters with students. Building classroom relationships between and with students potentially facilitates the effectiveness of these interactions of feedback (Cummins, 2021; Diaz et al., 2016; Friend & Caruthers, 2012; Garcia-Moya et al., 2020; Landson-Billings, 1994; 1995; Valenzuela, 2017).

**Disconnection**

Difference between people often determines a certain level of disconnection in face-to-face encounters. In the teacher-student interaction, teachers generally have more power and can be attentive to the interplay of difference and dominance in these exchanges.
In a recorded small group discussion, students were asked if it is harder to learn from teachers whose social identity characteristics are different from theirs, Myriam responded:

If the teacher and you have different identity, it's hard. It's really hard. It's hard to like ...it's really hard to even learn because maybe you're in class and you are not... ok, I will say...I'm from [home country]. I'm here and my teacher and, for example, my teacher is teaching me and because I'm from [home country], he's not paying a lot of attention to me and maybe if I say something maybe she start laughing or he start laughing in the class and other students in the class, maybe they make fun of my words or something...

It's offensive because, like, I'm not from here. Like I'm trying to learn and say something, them making, like them making, like laugh, I will take it to mean thing. So, it's really hard when your social identity is different from the teacher.

Myriam describes this dynamic of dominance and difference, noting the power the teacher possesses to bridge or accentuate the dissimilarity (Von Esch et al, 2020). In the same recorded discussion, Jako says:

The teacher is giving you the confidence, like he's encouraging you to be open. So, it will be easier, even though maybe you will see yourself, ok I'm not...I'm different. But if you see yourself like you fit in the teacher's shoes, you don't see yourself like you're an outsider, but you see yourself like the teacher and you get along with the teacher and you know more about it and the teacher tries to get along with you.

Here again, Jako notes the power that the teacher holds in assisting the student in navigating the differences. The teacher can help the student connect so that they don’t feel like an outsider and part of this bridging of the differences is getting along with the teacher. In this description of
In my classroom, I observed that one-on-one interactions can increase my awareness of the assumptions that I make due to differences between my students and me. In an activity in which I paired students to talk to each other about different aspects of their prior schooling, I worked with a student because there was an odd number of students. In telling me about their prior schooling, I came to learn details about their background I had not known. I had assumed certain things about them that were not true. After this exchange, I wrote, “I was really struck by my blatant assumptions…. I think of myself as someone who is thoughtful about these things, so if I am thoughtful and doing it, then what are other teachers doing?” The next day, “I told them that I wanted to apologize, that I realized that I had made assumptions about [them] and I was sorry for that.” In this example, the teacher-student interaction provided information that allowed me to recognize my assumptions. It is possible that choosing to speak to the student about my biases helped to bridge this disconnection (Henry & Thorsen, 2021).

Teacher-student interactions can uncover ways in which students feel disconnection. In a recorded small group discussion, students were asked how it feels to not be able to speak the language of your home at school. Two of the three students in this discussion said that it felt fine to speak English at school. Jako gave a different perspective.

Aditya: What about you, Jako?
Jako: Sometimes I feel lonely because…
Jamila: What?
Jako: I feel lonely. I feel alone.
Jamila: Not speaking to someone in [home language]?
Jako: Yes, sometimes.

As far as I know, there are no other speakers of Jako’s home language at her high school. Jako admitting her feelings provides some perspective about how she experiences school. Most, if not all, of Jako’s content teachers are white and English monolingual; it could be true that most of them have not experienced what she describes. This difference has the potential to cause disconnection.

These experiences of students and my experience of learning of my own bias demonstrate how teacher-student face-to-face interaction can facilitate or ameliorate disconnection (Hagenauer, et al., 2015). In my classroom, I have more power in the teacher-student dynamic and can be explicit in attending to differences so that students don’t feel like outsiders or alone (Cummins, 2021).

**Affirmation**

Affirmation of self was apparent in classroom interactions. Some classroom activities generated culturally affirmative spaces. There were teacher-student interactions in which support a student’s being was expressed, and in a small group discussion, students spoke of linguistic affirmation that they had received from teachers. The following paragraphs discuss these examples in more detail.

To begin the unit about schooling, students were asked to draw and annotate maps of their previous schools. This was a generative activity in that it caused students to think about stories and experiences from their prior schools, some of which were in other countries. As students worked, I circulated around the classroom, noting parts of their drawings and asking questions.
I asked Myriam what the student assembly was and she began to recount gathering in the morning in lines [with many students]. Another student [expressed a similar experience]. Myriam laughed and agreed. “Ms. B, you wouldn’t believe it! Someday, I will take you to [home continent] and you won’t believe it, Ms. B!”

Memories and the space to discover that they are shared with others, both affirms the experiences and the students. I wrote, “There is a clear connection and friendly joking between these … students.” Similarly, after the storytelling activity that followed the creation of annotated maps, I reflected, “At the end of our storytelling there was a lot of what felt like camaraderie, like a deeper connection between each other had been achieved.” Even when students’ stories took place in different geographic places, the articulation of them seemed to affirm some form of a shared experience which connects with Maria del Carmen Salazar’s articulation of several aspects of humanizing pedagogy (2013).

There were moments in teacher-student interactions in my classroom in which I explicitly expressed appreciation to a student for who they are. During the storytelling activity, Aditya talked about how he used to be considered a very sincere student; he said that that had changed when he came to the United States. I noted, “At the end of class, this student and I spoke again and I commented that, while he said that he had changed in his move to the US, I would still describe him as sincere.” He seemed pleased with my comment. Similarly, there was another moment in which I reflected on speaking with Jamila. I wrote, “Today, there was something about her demeanor that prompted me to tell her that I was glad that I know her. She laughed a little and returned the words. I probably caught her off guard.” While these encounters do not seem to have instructional value, my actions are rooted in a desire to empower and appreciate my students (Diaz et al., 2016).
Students also remark on feeling affirmed by teachers regarding their bilingualism. At one point during the unit on schooling, students are asked to respond to questions about the influence of language in education. More specifically, students were asked if a teacher had ever recognized their bilingualism and how it made them feel.

Aditya: Has there been a time when a teacher has recognized that you were bilingual. How did that happen? What did it feel like? Why do you think it felt this way?

Jamila: Is bilingual two languages? I mean, of course they know because I am in ESL. Yes, because I was in ESL. It felt good.

Jako: Yes. So when teachers ask me, what languages can you speak? I answered two.

Jamila: How did it feel like?

Jako: It feel good because I'm bilingual!

Aditya: Yes, because once in my class I talked on the phone in another language other than English and a teacher knows it, heard it.

Jamila: How did it feel? And what did it feel like?

Aditya: Good because I speak more than two languages.

In this dialog, students affirm their own bilingualism and express feeling good when it is noticed by their teachers. Two of the students specifically note that it is through a face-to-face interaction that their bilingualism is noticed and affirmed.

While less evident in the data, there are moments in which affirmation of self occurs in the classroom. In my classroom, affirmation was evident during classroom activities that involved sharing about past experiences and seemed to be generated by mutual understanding between students. There were also moments when I explicitly connected with a student by affirming something about who they are. Finally, students highlighted the value of such
affirmations when discussing the positive feelings engendered by a teacher noticing their bilingualism (Antunes, 2021).

Summary

To conclude, in the data collected during this self-study, I found four themes related to face-to-face teacher-student interactions: perception, knowing, disconnection, and affirmation. I perceive my students’ way of being to make decisions regarding encounters which influence instruction, the authenticity of teacher-student relationship, and the imposition of my beliefs about how we should relate in the classroom. Knowing, as in level of linguistic understanding, is evident in both communicative and explicit feedback that is undergirded by the degree to which students and teacher know or are familiar with each other. Differences in the life experiences and social identities of teachers and students threaten disconnection and but can be explicitly attended to. Finally, there were moments of affirmation generated within the classroom and students highlight the value of being acknowledged, particularly for bilingualism by teachers. While there are evident patterns related to teacher-student interactions, to what extent do they lean towards or away from liberatory pedagogics?
Chapter 5

As a teacher who believes the purpose of education is transformation, the concept of liberation is central to my teaching philosophy. I aim to provide liberatory educational experiences for my students, meaning that, at the very least, students can be their full selves and, at the very most, together we are making incremental changes towards a more just world. In pragmatic terms, this means that I draw upon the framework of humanizing pedagogy (Bartolomé, 1994). Some of the characteristics of humanizing pedagogy as synthesized by Salazar (2013) are honoring students’ sociocultural values, taking the students’ reality into consideration, developing teacher and student critical consciousness, demonstrating student success in academic, intellectual, and social endeavors, making learning objectives relevant and meaningful to students, and developing caring relationships. While all these aspects are elements of my pedagogy to some degree, the last listed here – developing caring relationships – has seemed to take an oversized role in my practice and I began to wonder who that empowers – me or my students?

Critical language teaching scholars urge practitioners and researchers to acknowledge the hegemony inherent in the field of English language teaching. Beginning in the 16th century, the teaching of the English language grew out of the imposition of language, culture, education, and laws implicit in the colonization tactics of England in territories around the world. Then, in what came to be the United States, the practices of settler colonialism demanded the eradication or assimilation of indigenous populations which required the acquisition of English, as well as cultural and linguistic erasure. Essential to the settler colonial project was the construction of racial hierarchies, which now feed into what has been documented as hegemonic raciolinguistic (Alim, 2016; Rosa & Flores, 2017) ideologies in the English language (Von Esch et al, 2020)
and bilingual classroom (Chaparro, 2019). In addition, the field of English language teaching propagates an ideal English language standard of grammar and pronunciation, generating biases and discriminatory practices towards those who are labeled as “non-native” speakers (Grant & Lee, 2009; Holliday, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Malsbary, 2014; Von Esch et al, 2020). Considering this context of historic and current oppression, critical language scholars ask that English language teachers push past the façade of our field being a feel-good profession to consider our work more critically (Kubota, 2019, Lin & Motha, 2020). In this spirit, my research began to form around the question: does my emphasis of teacher-student relationship make me a more effective teacher or does it simply make me feel good for connecting with people who are different from me, my students?

Summary of Study

This qualitative self-study (Herr & Anderson, 2015; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009) is in the tradition of practitioner inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). My data collection included fieldnotes, student work, and recorded, student-led, classroom small group discussions. Over the course of three months, I took fieldnotes in which I noted observations and reflections about my classroom practices and encounters with students, using numbers to refer to students as to assure no identifiability. During six of those weeks, I also implemented a unit of study titled: Liberatory Schooling (see Appendix A). While engaging in this unit together, I collected student work and recorded three student-led small group classroom discussions. The unit asked students to contemplate and learn about 1) the various aspects of schooling, 2) any differences between schooling and education, 3) the history and influence of language in schooling, 4) the ways in which students and teachers influence what school looks like, 5) the concept of liberation, and 6) what is or can be liberatory about school. While the focus of this study is not the curricular
context of my classroom, I implemented the unit of study because I wanted to include student voice on the topics of schooling and liberation.

The following discussion of my findings draws from the theoretical framework of liberatory pedagogics conceptualized by Enrique Dussel (2018, 2019). Different from pedagogy, Dussel (2019) theorizes that pedagogics is the philosophical and ethical framing of the face-to-face encounters within institutions and systems of unequal power dynamics, such as parent-child, politician-citizen, and teacher-student. In the case of teacher and student, Dussel (2019) explains that the traditional Euro-centric, banking model of education (Freire, 2000) requires educators to teach what is already known (Sameness) while ignoring that which is unique in the student (Otherness). Dussel (2019) writes:

As dis-tinct, the disciple [student] has a new historical pro-ject for being human (“the Other” as real and historical). The teacher cannot simply deposit a certain amount of acquired knowledge (the “banking” conception of education, where the only question for teaching is memory: to recall), rather he must transmit what is acquired, but from the existential situation of the student (p.58).

Dussel (2019) posits that pedagogics can be liberatory when the teacher helps the student understand this interplay between Sameness and Otherness from a space apart from the dominant system, the exteriority. This liberatory pedagogic or analectic, as termed by Dussel (2019) provides an alternative to or extends the idea of dialectic, creating a space beyond totality that promises new possibilities for the formation of knowledge (Burton & Osorio, 2011). De Lissovoy and Fregoso Bailón (2019) applied Dussel’s ideas to the field of education, saying that the analectic is a way for the Other to speak for her/him/their self, as well as a way to create knowledge situated outside the dominant frame and rooted in the suffering of marginalized
populations. They specify that Dussel’s analectic counters the belief that thoughts from racialized beings are less worthy, what they call epistemological racism, and that it therefore follows that liberatory education must question its epistemological roots (De Lissovoy & Fregoso Bailón, 2019). In the following pages, with curiosity about how this Dusselian lens might support my own goals for a liberatory classroom, I apply these ideas to the data collected during this self-study.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

My research posed the question: What do liberatory pedagogics look like in an ELD classroom to a practitioner researcher? I had three central findings. First, I found several ways to characterize the pedagogics in my classroom. Second, I found that pedagogics occur between more actors than just teacher and student. Third, pedagogics are not simply defined as oppressive or liberatory, but rather can be placed along a continuum between these two poles, depending on the scenario at hand. In the following section, I use the term pedagogic to describe the face-to-face encounters in which Sameness and Otherness are at play. I reserve the term analectic for a liberatory pedagogic in which a student is able to observe and analyze the dynamic of Sameness and Otherness from the exteriority or vantage point outside of the colonizer’s curriculum. I will discuss each of these findings in depth and conclude with a reflection about implications for practice, recognizing some of the challenges of applying decolonial theory to small moments within a system of education designed in the tradition of colonization.

Forms of the Pedagogic

My first finding is that I identified four pedagogical forms in the data. Dussel states that pedagogics “is that part of philosophy which considers face-to-face relationships” within systems or institutions with actors of unequal power dynamics (Dussel, 2019, p. 32). The fact that I found
differences and themes within the pedagogies of my classroom is important because it adds definition to Dussel’s theoretical conceptualization when applied to a practical context.

The first and most prominent theme was a pedagogic of perception that guided me in instructional decisions, relationships with students, and the imposition of my personal beliefs regarding interpersonal behavior. The reading or interpretation of my students’ way of being, demeanor, presence, and verbal and nonverbal communication characterized this pedagogic and led to different types of decisions. Perceptions about student engagement during classroom activities influenced instructional decisions. For example, I evaluated an activity as successful if I perceived students as engaged and participatory. Perceptions about a students’ behavior and demeanor determined decisions I made about how to interact with a student. Such as when I perceived a student as upset or sullen, it prompted me to talk to them one-on-one about what might be bothering them. Finally, perceptions caused me to impose my beliefs about classroom relations. When I perceived students’ behavior as exclusionary, I reprimanded them and asked them to change what they were doing, for instance.

With this pedagogic, face-to-face encounters were prompted and fueled by my perceptions of students’ presence and demeanor, a finding that is structurally corroborated by students’ perspective documented in student work. Two students referenced student behavior when responding to the journal prompt: how can teachers and students influence what schools are like? Their responses, when taken into consideration in the context of my classroom, reflect the pattern that student behavior is noted by the teacher, interpreted, or perceived, and acted upon. This pedagogic of perception informs subsequent encounters, which can be problematic since my cultural lens is different from that of my students (Liggett, 2009; Motha, 2014).
Second, there was pedagogic of knowing – knowing defined as both the understanding of content (the English language) and the familiarity between members of a classroom community (relational). The example of meeting one-on-one several times with a student to get to know the student and get a better idea of their linguistic abilities in English illustrates the dual role of this pedagogic. Different from the pedagogic of perception, encounters are guided not by how I interpret a student’s way of being, but by relational familiarity and the pursuit of linguistic understanding. Whereas the pedagogic of perception is fueled by my perceptions, the pedagogic of knowing is motivated by a desire to engage with students around content in a way that engages who they are as people. This pedagogic defines my decisions around feedback, choosing to engage students in communicative activities where feedback is given naturally by their audience and provide instructional feedback privately in one-on-one encounters. The pedagogic of knowing aligns with research that highlights the influence of positive teacher-student relationships in learning (Garcia-Moya et al., 2020; Roorda et al., 2011; Suldo et al., 2009).

In a recorded, small group, student-led discussion, two students structurally corroborated this last point about the influence of relationships in the classroom. When asked how the relationship with the teacher influences their learning, both Myriam and Jako stated that it did. Jako explained that “the relationship with teacher is very important to student when they are learning because when student feel comfortable in, um, to feel like they are ready to study, they can study when [in] that environment. And the environment, the teachers make that.” Pedagogics of knowing defines my language classroom and its undergirding value of relationship in the classroom seems to be supported by the perspective of two participants.

Third, there was evidence of a pedagogic of disconnection due to differences in social identity characteristics, an interplay of Sameness and Otherness that has more potential for
negative outcomes. For example, in my classroom, by working one-on-one with a student, I
came to find out that I held erroneous assumptions. This pedagogic of disconnection is
characterized by the propensity to engage in assumptions and biases when there are differences
in social identity characteristics and life experiences, a finding that extends scholarship on how
the racial, ethnic, social and linguistic identities of language teachers directly impacts their work
in the classroom (Haque & Morgan, 2009; Liggett, 2009; Ajayi, 2011; Motha, Jain, & Tecle,

In a recorded classroom discussion, students structurally corroborated the existence of
this dynamic and highlighted the teacher’s power to either exacerbate or bridge the differences
between them and their students. Seemingly drawing from personal experience, Myriam said,
I'm here and my teacher and, for example, my teacher is teaching me and because I'm
from [home country], he's not paying a lot of attention to me and maybe if I say
something maybe she start laughing or he start laughing in the class and other students in
the class, maybe they make fun of my words or something... It's offensive because, like,
I'm not from here... So, it's really hard when your social identity is different from the
teacher.

Jako also speaks to this dynamic but emphasizes the teacher’s ability to attend to the differences
in a positive way.

The teacher is giving you the confidence, like, he's encouraging you to be open. So, it
will be easier, even though maybe you will see yourself, ok I'm not... I'm different. But if
you see yourself, like, you fit in the teacher's shoes. You don't see yourself like you're an
outsider, but you see yourself like the teacher and you get along with the teacher and you
know more about it and the teacher tries to get along with you.
In my classroom, I found that there was a pedagogic of disconnection, influenced by differences between me and my students. Student participants in the study also spoke to this pedagogic in school in general.

Finally, there was a pedagogic of affirmation, in which Otherness was recognized and honored. In teacher-student face-to-face encounters, these were moments like when I told Aditya that I believed that he was still a sincere person or when I said to Jamila that I was glad that I knew her. There were also instances when the encounters between students were affirming of their experiences, drawn out by classroom activities. In my fieldnotes, I remarked that classroom sharing of personal experiences produced a feeling of comradery and connection.

In a recorded small group discussion, three students commented that it felt good when teachers were aware of or noticed their bilingualism. The students’ sharing about a positive feeling in reference to teachers’ acknowledgement of something unique about them structurally corroborates that there can be a pedagogic of affirmation between teacher and students. At the same time, these examples seem superficial when placed in the context of scholarship on critical language teaching. For instance, McKinney (2017) argues for developing the metalinguistic awareness of students so that anglo-normativity in the language classroom is challenged. In this context, noticing the positive characteristics of students or their linguistic abilities as bi/multilinguals falls short.

Identifying various patterns of pedagogic in my practice puts a finer point on the experience of the face-to-face encounters of Sameness and Otherness in the classroom and allows for deeper analysis. For instance, Dussel (2019) states:

In pedagogics the Other’s voice signifies content revealing itself, and liberatory education can only begin with the revelation of the Other. The student reveals himself to the
teacher; the teacher reveals himself to the disciple. … But if speaking to the other is impossible, if transcending the ontic level of the expressive plane is like jumping on one’s own shadow, all pedagogics will remain ontologically situated within the praxis of a pedagogics of domination where teachers and students can only speak with one another tautologically about “the Same,” or that which the teacher is (p. 166).

By having a clearer understanding of the ways in which pedagogics play out in my classroom, I am better situated to understand the liberatory and oppressive dynamics of my classroom. As well, it is valuable to have found that all four of these pedagogics were also experienced by students in the school environment. This finding lends itself to further inquiry about how other teachers and students experience pedagogics, highlighting the value of a self-study within the larger educational context or “the space between self and the practice engaged in” (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 15).

*Multiple Faces*

While Dussel’s (2019) conception of pedagogics focused on the face-to-face encounter, the themes or forms found in my classroom demonstrate that the classroom reality lends itself to multiple ways in which Sameness and Otherness interact. Rather than consider only the literal face-to-face encounter of the teacher and student, the concept can be understood more figuratively as in the multiple ways that the faces of Sameness and Otherness engage with each other in the classroom. The data showed that, yes, pedagogics occurs between teacher and student in one-on-one scenarios, but it can also take place between students with the teacher present or between teacher and student in a whole class setting. The finding that there are multiple faces involved in pedagogics is valuable because we can look for liberatory encounters in scenarios other than one-on-one teacher-student interactions. Dussel (2018) writes,
“pedagogics is a moment of comprehension” (p. 95). When understood accordingly, it follows that the face-to-face encounter can be understood as something more than the literal one-to-one meeting of the teacher and student. The following paragraphs will give examples of these multiple faces within my data.

First, pedagogics occurs in my classroom between teacher and student. Each form of pedagogics was evident as this type of face-to-face encounter. For example, in the form of the pedagogic of perception, I initiated multiple face-to-face encounters because of my interpretation of a student’s way of being. Similarly, teacher-student encounters are evident in each of the other pedagogic forms. I met with students one-on-one to give instructional feedback when engaging in a pedagogic of knowing. The face-to-face discussion with a student that led me to recognize my assumptions formed the pedagogic of disconnection. The pedagogic of affirmation was apparent in one-on-one encounters with students in which I appreciated something about them. In my classroom, pedagogics is evident as a face-to-face encounter between the teacher and student.

Extending this understanding of Dussel’s conceptualization of the pedagogic, I also noted an interplay of Sameness and Otherness between students in my presence. In the form of a pedagogic of affirmation, two classroom activities provoked the embrace of Otherness between students in my presence. One of these examples is when students shared stories from their previous schools in a whole group activity. Though the stories came from different regions of the world, the storytelling honored a shared experience of Otherness. I wrote in my fieldnotes, “At the end of our storytelling there was a lot of what felt like camaraderie, like a deeper connection between each other had been achieved.” Similarly, in the form of a pedagogic of knowing, students navigated the dynamic of Otherness and Sameness together with me as an observer. In a
recorded small group discussion students implicitly corrected Myriam’s linguistic knowing, seemingly without making her feel uncomfortable for her misunderstanding, a sign of her Otherness. These examples demonstrate that face-to-face encounters in which there is interplay between Sameness and Otherness extend beyond the literal teacher-student to include students engaging together with me as an observer.

Pedagogics also existed between teacher and student in a whole class setting. In the form of a pedagogic of knowing, there was a negotiation of understanding between me and Aditya that took place in a whole class scenario. Aditya understood the question stem: what can we learn from...? to mean that the experience at hand must be positive to be able to acquire knowledge from it. As the “native” speaker of English, I was positioned as representing Sameness, while Aditya’s understanding of the question stem reflected his Otherness. This interplay of Sameness and Otherness occurred between us but in the presence of the whole class, demonstrating that pedagogics exists beyond Dussel’s framing of the teacher-student one-on-one encounter.

Finding that, in the reality of the classroom, the concept of pedagogics can be more broadly applied beyond teacher student encounters, refocuses practitioners to conceive of the multiple ways that Sameness and Otherness interplay in varied classroom interactions. In addition, Dussel expounds on his theory in ways that lend themselves to understanding the reference of face-to-face as figurative rather than literal. For instance, when describing pedagogics of domination, Dussel (2019) says, “What is certain is that the educator is the schoolteacher I constitutive of the pedagogical world, while the student is the orphanic thing which receives knowledge” (p. 170, italics in original), using language that invites the reader to expand on who exactly is the educator and the student. How does our understanding of liberatory pedagogics shift if the classroom as the practical site allows for encounters of Sameness and
Otherness between students? How does the role of the teacher change if alterity is being negotiated between students? This finding is generative in that it broadens the conceptualization of how and where Sameness is reproduced and/or Otherness is allowed to flourish based on the reality of the classroom.

**Continuum**

Turning to the question of liberation, I found that these pedagogical moments within the classroom fall along a continuum of liberation and oppression or domination. While Dussel (2019) writes,

> That is to say, we must now judge the morality (goodness or evil) of the educational act itself, in light of its respective projects (if it is domination, it is perverse; if it is liberation it is just, good, human, and humanizing). The Other as child, youth, or the people is the absolute criterion of meta-physics and ethics: affirming the Other and serving him is the good act; negating the Other and dominating him is the evil act. The liberatory teacher permits the creative display of the Other (p. 165).

I argue that in the day-to-day of classroom encounters, there exists more of a continuum with nuances of liberation and domination. This denotes a difference in how a theory is conceptualized in comparison to how it is applied by a teacher in practice, a theme that I will build upon in a later section. In the following paragraphs, I will support my finding with examples of scenarios from my data and how they fall along this continuum.

Within the form of a pedagogic of perception, my interpretation of the presence of the student who had curricular problems with my class, and the consequent one-on-one interactions between us, leaned towards oppressive. Dussel (2019) writes, “The authentic teacher will first listen to the contrarian, provocative, questioning, and even insolent voice of one who wants to be
Other. Only teachers that listen patiently, on the faith of his word, in a love-for-justice, are the hope for the liberation of the other as liberated” (p. 116). On the contrary, in interactions with this student, I centered myself and my discomfort, a pattern of whiteness, rooted in white supremacy culture (Motha, 2014). My challenges with the relationship also reflect my consumption of the myth fed to society by popular culture that the effective teacher is that who changes lives through relationship. In the interactions with this student, it took me several weeks to decenter myself and to listen to them; what they had to say made me feel uncomfortable (Hagenauer et al., 2015). Dussel speaks to how an expression of self in the exteriority is “a clamorous one. The important thing is to hear it, and become accustomed to hearing it. Essentially it says ‘I’m hungry! I have my own history! Let me be dis-tinct! I do not want to be the object of missions, nor civilized education, nor pedagogical methods! Let me be! I have rights!’” (Dussel, 2019, p. 177). Employing a pedagogic of perception when developing a relationship with a student can distract the teacher from listening, trusting their own perceptions and feelings over the voice of the student, which consequently produces a pedagogic that leans towards oppressive.

On the other hand, a pedagogic of perception that leads to the imposition of my beliefs could lean liberatory. Let's consider the scenario in which I heard snickers when defining the acronym LGBTQ in a whole class setting. Dominant culture in the U.S. and elsewhere has historically marginalized people who belong to the LGBTQ community. I addressed the laughter by stating to the whole class, without calling anybody out, that while there may be different feelings about LGBTQ individuals in the different spaces where the students engage, in this classroom we will treat it as a human right, that each person has the right to be exactly who they are. My imposition of this belief counters the indoctrination of oppressive societal norms that
marginalize people of the LGBTQ community. This is a complexity of Otherness, that hegemonic beliefs can be internalized and espoused by one marginalized group to oppress another (Dussel, 2013). The analectic of liberatory pedagogics recognizes the power dynamics of Sameness and Otherness (Dussel, 2019). “The teacher’s work is to create the conditions for Alterity [Otherness] to self-evaluate” (Dussel, 2019, p.120). I imposed a practice of acceptance and openness, evoking the voice of the Other that was not present to speak or could not speak. While the goal of this pedagogic lands closer to the side of liberatory, the method of getting there would be characterized as oppressive since I imposed my perspective rather than guided students in self-evaluation. In the forward to *Pedagogics of Liberation* (Dussel, 2019), Linda Martín Alcoff articulates the complexity of this difference well. She says, “Constructing an exteriority will then involve what Dussel has called ‘analectical reasoning,’ or the reasoning that reaches beyond the simple dialectics of response and reaction to a space on the far side of what is intelligible within the terms of the current thought and practice” (p. 27). For this scenario in my classroom to have been an example of liberatory pedagogics, I would have achieved “analectical reasoning” with my students to observe and evaluate their positioning regarding the LGBTQ community.

The pedagogic of perception was most common in my data, and it also seems to limit my ability to achieve my goal of liberatory education. Dussel’s (2019) conceptualization of liberatory pedagogics is born from a decolonial perspective that calls for a decentering of the European epistemology. Pedagogics of liberation “is about the pedagogical foundations of *epistemological decolonization*” (Dussel, 2019, p. 40). A pedagogic of perception is limiting because it originates from my gaze, that of a white, U.S. citizen of lost German ancestry who has interest in, but lacks familiarity with non-white, non-European epistemologies. “Dussel
reconceptualizes liberation as an analectical process beginning from the world-shattering gaze of
the Other” (De Lissovoy & Fregoso Bailón, 2019, pg.8). To be liberatory and decolonial,
pedagogics must utilize a lens that decenters whiteness and the white experience. It is unclear in
my data that I am able to employ that lens. In the examples of pedagogic of perception within
scenarios of instruction, I seem to generally evaluate the efficacy of a lesson by interpreting
demeanor through the lens of dominant expectations of engagement and participation. At the
same time, I don’t actively require students to fulfill those expectations by asking them to change
their way of being in the classroom. So, the pedagogic between me and the student who
responded to Aditya’s question about the loss of bilingualism in the U.S. leans towards
liberatory. I am applying the dominant expectations of engagement and participation to evaluate
my own work but choose not to engage with this same framework as a disciplinarian upholding
those ideals in my students’ behavior. Since the pedagogic of perception begins with my
interpretations, this pedagogic, in particular, highlights the need to be able to draw from a
decolonial epistemology, an epistemological perspective rooted in the knowledge and experience
of the Other. While I am aware of this need, I have yet to do the work to make this fully
accessible to me, and therefore engaging in a pedagogic of perception can be limiting regarding
my aim of liberatory education.

The pedagogic of knowing is central to the way I teach language and my data shows that
it tends to lean toward liberatory along the continuum. The pedagogic of knowing is the
engagement of Sameness and Otherness in classroom activities that provide implicit
communicative feedback and explicit instructive feedback. Reflective of my second finding, this
pedagogic plays out between students, between teacher and student in whole class settings, and
in one-to-one interactions between teacher and student. An underpinning of this pedagogic is
relationship or familiarity between those engaged. I posit that the pedagogic gains liberatory potential the more the actors know each other. For example, in the recorded small group discussion between Myriam, Aditya, Jamila, and Jako, Jamila and Jako were able to effectively redirect Myriam in her use of the word liberation, potentially in part because both Jamila and Jako have a strong connection with Myriam. In a different recorded small group discussion, communication faltered between Aditya, Jako, and Jamila. Despite Aditya and Jamila’s efforts to draw out and clarify Jako’s idea, Jako abandoned her thought, potentially in part because there lacks a familiarity between these students. Each of these scenarios can be placed at different points along the continuum, the first closer to liberatory and the second closer to oppressive, and the determining factor may be the extent to which the actors know each other.

I believe that the pedagogic of knowing also has liberatory qualities because these interactions create a space for mutual learning, along with listening to the voice of the Other (Dussel, 2019). For instance, in meeting with a student one-on-one, I gained understanding about their facility with the English language and learned to know them as a person by hearing directly from them. An element of this interaction is our different speech patterns. My framing of our accents in this manner (that we each have one) and choosing to engage with them one-on-one to be able to focus better on becoming familiar with their accent, is counterhegemonic in the English language classroom (Malsbary, 2014; Rosa, 2016). Similarly, in an informal communicative exchange with Aditya, by listening to his perspective, I came to comprehend our difference in understanding. These exchanges are central to my classroom and have liberatory potential.

The pedagogic of disconnection highlights the challenges inherent in face-to-face interactions characterized by actors who have different identity characteristics. While it may
seem that a pedagogic of disconnection could consistently lean towards oppressive on the continuum, my research adds to the scholarship about how awareness can support teachers in avoiding this outcome, though it is challenging (Ajayi, 2011; Liggett, 2009; Motha, 2014). In a recorded, small group, student-led discussion, Myriam and Jako spoke to how difference can create disconnection. In Jako’s example, the simple fact that she was one of the only speakers of her home language in her school caused her to feel alone. Myriam and Jako both spoke to how a teacher has the power to emphasize differences or draw connections. The example from my classroom highlighted the negative role that assumptions can play, but also the capacity that a teacher has to recognize a misstep and make it right with the student. Awareness of the pedagogic of disconnection on the part of the teacher generates potential for more liberatory outcomes; teacher awareness and agency define where it lands on the continuum.

Finally, the pedagogic of affirmation tends to be liberatory in that it acknowledges and honors students’ true selves. Considering the propensity for liberation with this pedagogic, it is valuable to notice the extent to which it occurs. For example, in relation to home language, Dussel (2018) writes, “…if the teacher tells the student: ‘You speak Quechua, Aymara, Maya, Otomi! I do not speak that language. You are bilingual, you are wiser than I am,’ then the student goes back home to let her mother know the teacher thought she was wise.” It is important to notice that my participants reflected this same sentiment when they were asked if a teacher had ever recognized them for being bilingual. All three students said that they had had the experience and that it felt good. Equally important is to observe that Jamila didn’t share a story of affirmation, but rather noted that her teachers would know that she speaks another language because she is in ESL (English as a Second Language). She also had to confirm with the group what bilingual meant. This participant has been in U.S. schools the longest – ten years.
The other students shared about one encounter each. While one cannot say definitively that they haven’t been recognized more than once for their bilingualism, I think it is valuable to notice that this may not be a common occurrence and that the students reported that this pedagogic of affirmation – a teacher revering a student’s bilingualism – impacted them positively. In my classroom, I believe that I refer to students’ bilingualism and encourage them to draw from their full language repertoire, yet this is not documented in the data. In fact, there is an instance in which I ask students to stop speaking their home language to be more inclusive to another student. It is beneficial to notice that ideologies align – those of Dussel, my students and mine – but according to my data, my actions could more fully reflect my beliefs. The pedagogic of affirmation clearly counters the traditional employment of a deficiency lens with culturally and linguistically diverse students, but it could have a more critical quality. It is valuable to notice the infrequency with which I engage in a pedagogic of affirmation, and that the data shows a superficial quality to this pedagogic in comparison to what critical researchers have documented is possible (Canagarajah, 1999; Cummins, 2021; Hawkins & Norton, 2009; McKinney, 2017).

**Implications for Practice**

In this self-study, I used Dussel’s theory on liberatory pedagogics as a heuristic in my classroom to think about how teacher-student encounters support my goal of liberatory education. Considering the oppressive legacy of English language teaching (Canagarajah, 1999; Kubota, 2019, Lin & Motha, 2020; Pennycock, 1994; Phillipson, 1992) and the scholarship that demonstrates both (1) that teacher identities impact their practice (Haque & Morgan, 2009; Ajayi, 2011; Motha, Jain, & Tecle, 2012; Vitanova, 2016; Taylor, 2017) and (2) that it is challenging for ESL teachers to fully understand and confront these challenges (Liggett, 2009;
Motha, 2014), a decolonial lens that focuses on teacher-student encounters is a constructive addition to the English language classroom. As I noted in the discussion of my findings, the Dusselian lens helped me to think about the how and who is engaged in encounters of Sameness and Otherness, providing a perspective that I had yet to consider, and adding to the call for more reflexive practices in language teaching (Molina, 2022). For language teachers who already engage in reflective practices and humanizing pedagogy, liberatory pedagogics is a valuable tool for educators invested in decolonizing language education.

With his theory of liberatory pedagogics, Dussel (2019) advocates for teachers to interrupt the political-economic colonial trajectory by positioning themselves and students outside of the dominant paradigm to observe, evaluate, and ultimately reinvent the system from the perspective of those who have been typically harmed, marginalized, or eradicated. Liberation happens when we reject that which has done harm, even though it is presented as the way things are done. Dussel conceptualized liberatory pedagogics in the 1970’s, but in a later book, *Ethics of Liberation*, Dussel (2013) described the praxis of liberation or liberation principle to be the ethical duty to act when (1) a human is made a victim in your community, (2) feasible transformation of the material negativity in the moment, microstructure or system is within your power, and (3) the outcome would be such that the victim could then live “as a full and equal participant” (p. 420). While this self-study has revealed that I have yet to engage in liberatory pedagogics with my students, my pedagogical praxis is one of liberation, as defined here by Dussel for the context of today. The juxtaposition of these concepts with the data from this research as a backdrop, highlights the complexity of decoloniality (Dei & Jaimungal, 2018; Mignolo, 2013; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Yet an implication for practitioners is that one must be
willing to wade into the messiness, and this reflexive self-study models the application of a liberatory lens.

**Limitations**

For this study, there are limitations in methodology, analysis, and transferability. Regarding methodology, the fact that I took on the roles of both researcher and practitioner lends itself to issues around subjectivity and silo effect (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Herr & Anderson, 2015). Would I be able to notice and consider negative aspects of my teaching? Would my thinking be limited due to being in both roles? Besides the fact that no researcher is completely objective, my data demonstrates that I collected observations and reflections on interactions in my classroom that I was not proud of, and these were equally, if not more, generative than my best work. To respond to the tendency of a silo effect, I met with a critical friend, an English language development colleague who approaches her work with criticality, four times over the course of the research. After sharing with her my thinking and current questions, without sharing my data, we engaged in dialog around the following questions: What calls your attention? What questions do you have? What are you curious about? These conversations served to affirm and broaden my thinking and analysis, as well as strengthen the unit that I implemented. A final limitation in the methodology was the use of recorded small group classroom discussions instead of interviews or focus groups to collect data on the thoughts and experiences of my students. While this method of data collection fulfilled the logistical criteria of using class time and allowed for student voice, students tended to simply answer the questions. In an interview or focus group scenario, I would have been able to pose follow-up questions to understand their perspective more fully (Cresswell & Guetterman, 2019). Also, there was one student participant whose disdain for the criticality of the project was thinly veiled.
In these discussions, she set a tone of expediency, trying to get through the questions as quickly as possible. Perhaps if this had not been the case, students would have taken the time to answer with more depth. In these three ways, the methodology limited this research.

The inductive open coding used to understand the data could be considered an analytical limitation. Since this is the first research, that I know of, to consider Enrique Dussel’s theory of liberatory pedagogics in the practical classroom setting, open coding seems appropriate because it allows for the researcher to ask the question: what is there to see (Marshall, et al., 2021)? At the same time, if I had chosen to apply a priori codes derived from Dussel’s theory, humanizing pedagogy, or ELD pedagogy, the analysis would have been more narrowed and potentially more relevant to these fields of interest (Marshall, et al., 2021). This type of coding would have lent itself to different analysis, but I believe that, as preliminary research considering Dussel’s theory to a real-world context, open coding was a good choice.

As a qualitative self-study, the final limitation is transferability. While the findings from this study are unique to my classroom, my students and the way in which we interact, by applying the lens of liberatory pedagogics to my classroom, I am modeling a practice of reflection that can be applied to other classrooms. The theoretical underpinnings of this research are applicable to other teachers and classrooms (Marshall et al., 2021).

**Calls for Future Research**

The findings of this study have implications for future research. First, while this study provides some insight into students’ ideas about teacher-student interactions and liberation, more research could be completed from the perspective of the student. Building upon the finding that a pedagogic takes on different forms, a qualitative study in which students are interviewed could explore how they understand these pedagogics from their experience. More research could be
conducted on how students reflect on pedagogics, how they make meaning of these interplays of Sameness and Otherness. Also, one might explore the validity of the concept of liberatory education as defined by Dussel for students in general or for students learning English in different settings.

While I found the Dusselian lens to be a helpful addition to my toolbox as a reflexive teacher, I am also left with more questions. Dussel (2018) writes, “Thus, we must give strength to the new generation, the teacher must be a disciple of the disciple, therefore putting the system of domination in question so that a new system can be organized” (pp. 100-101). While ideologically I agree with this, I am still unsure about what this looks like in a public-school classroom or, more specifically, an English development classroom. Future research could look more closely at curricular choices that create classrooms in which students are aware of mutual learning. I began this inquiry as a teacher who reflects heavily on my practice; how do language teachers in general connect with Dussel’s call? To what extent does my nature as a reflective educator play a role in the usefulness of the Dusselian lens? Dussel has an extensive list of publications; further research could employ a deeper reading of pedagogics considering his oeuvre. This research could be replicated and expanded with a group of language teachers to understand how other practitioners utilize the Dusselian lens. Finally, I found that I was not equipped to engage from a decolonial perspective that centered epistemologies other than Western or European, while I did understand how and why this is important. Further research could be conducted that examines the teacher preparation necessary so that practitioners can draw from non-European ways of knowing.
Summary

This self-study, a qualitative study of my own classroom in the tradition of practitioner inquiry, structured my curiosity about the extent to which developing relationships with my students supported my goal of liberatory education. In this dissertation, I have added to the field of education by applying Enrique Dussel’s theoretical lens of liberatory pedagogics to the practical context of my English language development classroom. I posed the research question: what does liberatory pedagogics look like in an ELD classroom to a researcher practitioner. I found that in my classroom pedagogics, the interplay of Sameness and Otherness, was apparent in four forms: perception, knowing, disconnection and affirmation. I also found that, while Dussel conceptualized pedagogics as the face-to-face interaction between teacher and student, pedagogics was evident in formations of different classroom actors and the face could be understood less literally. In my classroom, I found interplay of Sameness and Otherness between students in my presence and between teacher and student in the presence of the whole class. These two findings – the four forms of pedagogics and the more liberal interpretation of face-to-face – expand our understanding of liberatory pedagogics in the practical context of an English language development classroom.

In addition, I found that these pedagogics landed on a continuum of oppression and liberation depending on the scenario. A pedagogic of perception was not always either liberatory or oppressive, but rather each scenario deserved a closer look at the dynamic, the intentions and methods at play. A pedagogic of knowing had a clearer liberatory foundation than a pedagogic of perception since engaging from a place of familiarity was closer to understanding the Others’ reality than that of circumspect interpretation. This finding highlights the need for teachers who trained in the Eurocentric tradition to have a greater familiarity with non-white, non-Western
epistemologies, the need for teachers to access a broad range of ways of being and ways of knowing. A pedagogic of affirmation has the trappings of liberation, a true honoring of Otherness, so educators must be aware of the frequency and depth to which we engage in this pedagogic. Finally, a pedagogic of disconnection could begin as oppressive, but a teacher’s interruption of its potential could plant the seed for a liberatory pedagogic – what Dussel calls an analectic - in which both teacher and student are positioned in the exteriority, learning from each other to problematize the oppressive dynamic of this pedagogic and create a new way. While I never pinpointed in my data this analectic at work, coming to understand the continuum is an important finding because it highlights the complexities of my classroom interactions and relationships.
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Appendix A

Unit Plan - Liberatory Schooling

Queries:
- *What story does the physical space of a school tell?* (annotated map/details and dialog in narrative)
- *What do we know about schooling? Is education and schooling the same thing?* (chart/peer to peer dialog and note taking)
- *What is the history of languages in schools in the United States?* (academic article / passive voice)
- *What can the experience of Indian boarding schools teach us about schooling?* (video / cause and effect)
- *How have students, teachers and community members influenced school?* (articles and skit script / timelines)
- *What is liberation?* (abstract and concrete nouns/ song lyrics)
- *How and when is there liberation and freedom in school?* (adjectives/poem/discussion)

**Final project:** Let us imagine that society has decided that liberation is the purpose of schooling. Think about the many aspects of schooling from our chart *What we know about schools*. Each of you is asked to choose one aspect of schooling and change it so that it reflects liberatory education. Please include 1) what you would change, 2) why you believe the changes reflect liberatory education, and 3) what are the barriers and benefits of the changes. Use your imagination.

Once you have decided on the aspect that you will change, consider who has the power to make that change. This is your audience. Explain your proposal in the form of an essay, presentation, letter, annotated map (with explanatory text), or video (with script). Your teacher will help you to provide your audience with your proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>1 - Adequate</th>
<th>2 - Strong</th>
<th>3 - Strongest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>The writer uses a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity; used to provide detail and clarity.</td>
<td>The writer uses a variety of sentence lengths of different linguistic complexity; some cohesion and organization</td>
<td>The writer uses a variety of sentence lengths of different complexity in an organized paragraph or in well-organized extended text; tight cohesion and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>The writer uses specific, and some technical language related to the content area; lack of needed vocabulary may be occasionally evident.</td>
<td>The writer uses technical language related to the content area; evident facility with needed vocabulary.</td>
<td>The writer consistently uses just the right vocabulary in just the right place; precise vocabulary usage in general, specific or technical language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Control</td>
<td>There are grammar errors that are a barrier to understanding.</td>
<td>There are some grammar errors, but they are not a barrier to understanding meaning.</td>
<td>Clear control of language. There are few to no grammar errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The writer addresses the topic or question.</td>
<td>The writer addresses the topic with some reasoning, explanation or evidence.</td>
<td>The writer addresses the question or topic with clear reasoning, explanation, and evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lesson 1**

*Query: What story does the physical space of a school tell?*

*Language Objective:* SWBA to clearly communicate a story from your past schooling experiences.

*Content Objective:* SWBA to draw an annotated map of their prior school.

*Lesson Description:*

1) Ask students to “journal” about the query.
2) Show the class a map of your middle school. Describe the map.
3) Ask students to draw a map of their prior school.
4) Show the class an annotated map of your middle school. The annotations are short vignettes of where memorable events happened or descriptions of areas.
5) Ask the students to take pictures of their maps, upload them to a Word document and annotate them.
6) Story telling activity. Ask students to choose one of their annotations and to expand on by telling the class a story.
7) Share an example answer to the query that includes the three aspects of a solid answer: 1) the answer, 2) the reason for the answer, and 3) an example or evidence that supports
Lesson 2
Query: What do we know about schooling? Is education and schooling the same thing?
Language Objective: SWBA to discuss with a classmate their prior schooling experience
Content Objective: SWBA to collect and reference their collective knowledge about schooling.
Lesson Description:
1) Tell students that they have a lot of collective knowledge about schools. They have experienced school here in the United States, as well as many other countries. We will first collect some information together about school in the United States, then you will work with a partner to tell about your experience of schooling elsewhere.
2) Begin to complete the chart What we know about schools
3) Divide the class into pairs; send the document link by email
4) Students talk to a partner; one student talks, the other writes in the shared document
5) Give students some time to read over the chart; ask them to share something with the group that either interested them, surprised them, or they had questions about; share out to the group, try to not repeat what someone else has said
6) Ask students to journal their answer to the query, Is education and schooling the same thing?
7) Conduct a classroom discussion on the topic.

Lesson 3
Query: What is the history of languages in schools in the United States?
Language Objective: SWBA change passive voice to active voice; use the adverbs “for instance,” “however,” “moreover”)
Content Objective: SWBA to refer to the text to answer comprehension questions
Lesson Description:
Part 1
1) Review the key vocabulary together with Quizlet. Share the link with students: https://quizlet.com/_clsob5?x=1jqt&i=4w1e1g
2) Have students read the text to themselves, taking notes in the margins of questions or word meanings; have students circle words that they have questions about
3) Read the text out loud (choose 2 students to read, taking turns)
4) Review the meaning and part of speech for the underlined words
5) As a class, summarize the ideas in the first paragraph. Write this in the margin.
6) Ask students to work with a partner to summarize the second paragraph. Ask for two groups to read their summaries. Write these in the margins of the text on the Smartboard. Make corrections where necessary.
Part 2
1) Ask students to notice that some words are highlighted. Ask if anyone knows what part of speech these words are - verbs
2) Explain that sentences can be written in passive or active voice. Pass out the handout on passive voice. Ask students what they know about passive voice. Read over the handout.
3) Have students complete assignment 3 in pairs. Check answers as a group or as the teacher circulates.

4) As a class, go over the example of Assignment 4. Have the students do assignment 4 on their own. Circulate to check comprehension.

5) Collect the comprehension questions that students write. Create a doc that has their questions. Provide them to the students to answer. Do several as a class to demonstrate using the text to respond to comprehension questions completely.

6) Give vocab quiz; ask students to answer the question, What is the history of languages in schools in the United States?

Name: _________________________________ Date: __________________

Adapted excerpt from “A Short History of ESL/Bilingual Education” by Dr. Etienne A. Kouahou, Adjunct Faculty of English at Fordham University, Published Aug. 10, 2014

Bilingualism was common in the early days of the American colonies. On the small island of Manhattan, for example, at least 18 languages were used, and people from all walks of life were heard using non-English languages. For instance, a poster for runaway domestic workers listed the language skills of one individual who spoke some "Dutch, German, Spanish and Irish" (Crawford, 2004, p. 81). Moreover, bilingual education existed in many places and was accepted or rejected according to the dominant language in each area. For example, there were German public and parochial schools where German was the dominant language. Swedish and Italian were used in public and parochial schools until the mid-1800s, as well (Crawford, 2004, p. 85).

At the turn of the 20th Century, however, fear of immigrants and their cultures was high. A poem published in the Atlantic Monthly referred to immigrants as

"These bringing with them unknown gods and rites,

Those, tiger passions, here to stretch their claws.

In street and alley what strange tongues are loud,
Accents of menace alien to our air…” (Aldrich).

In 1918, this sentiment led to an era of Americanization efforts conducted by Ellwood P. Cubberly, dean of the Stanford school of education. Ellwood advocated for the dispersal of immigrant groups to teach them Anglo-Saxon values and culture. Eventually, Ellwood's efforts would lead to the rise of language restrictions in many states and territories, including Puerto Rico, where English would be imposed as the language of instruction in public schools. The overall trend at the time was Anglo-conformity, the forced acceptance of everything of Anglo-Saxon origin. Americanism even led to the forced removal of Indians from Eastern states (Crawford, 2004).

References


A. Find the passive voice in the article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Be</th>
<th>Past participle (P.P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: On the small island of Manhattan, for example, at least 18 languages were used</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) people from all walks of life were heard using non-English languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Moreover, bilingual education existed in many places and was accepted or rejected according to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Rewrite the passive voice sentences to be active voice.

   Example: People on the small island of Manhattan used at least 18 languages.

1) People ________________ people from all walks of life using non-English languages.

2) People ________________ or ________________ bilingual education according to the dominant language in each area.

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

Assignment 2: Comprehension

Write two questions for your classmates. The questions should require them to demonstrate their understanding of the article. They should have to refer to the text to answer the question.

Example: According to the text, __________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

1) ________________________________________________________________
Lesson 4
Query: What can the experience of Indian boarding schools teach us about schooling?

Language Objective: SWBA listen for key information

Content Objective: SWBA describe cause and effect relationships

Lesson Description:
Part 1
1) Review key vocabulary words. Share the Quizlet link:
   https://quizlet.com/_cme9k9?x=1jqt&i=4w1e1g
2) Warn the class that the video describes harm to children. There may be parts that are hard
to watch or listen to. If you feel like you can’t watch the video, please let me know.
3) As a class, watch the video and complete the watching guide, stopping intermittently to
   write the answers to the questions. Complete assignment 3.

Part 2
1) Review the concept of cause and effect
2) In pairs, have students use their notes to complete the chart by pasting in the correct
   information
3) Review the “cause and effect” phrases “Due to”, “As a result of”, “By _____ing”
4) In pairs, have students write two sentences using two of these phrases and any cause and
   effect relationship
5) Give vocab quiz; ask students to answer the question, What can the experience of Indian
   boarding schools teach us about schooling?

Part 3
1) Read over the discussion prompt as a whole class. Answer any questions to support
   comprehension of the text and questions.
2) Divide the class into small groups of 4. Give roles: (1) Reader, (2) Facilitator, (3) Note
taker, (4) Time keeper
3) Explain that the reader will read the passage out loud, the facilitator will read each
   question and open the discussion, the note taker will take notes about what was said
   without names, and the time keeper will help the group move through the questions in the
   20 minutes given.
4) Record the small group discussions
Video: How the US stole thousands of Native American children by Vox

Assignment 3: Watching Guide
As we watch the video together, we will pause the video and complete the watching guide. Before each section of the video, read the questions and be ready to listen for the answers. As you can, take short notes during the video. When we pause the video, we will take the time to write more complete and detailed answers.

The video describes harm to children. We are watching this video because I think it is important to understand the past, even when the past includes harmful acts. We do not want to ever repeat these painful acts, so we must have knowledge of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1:00</th>
<th>1:43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did the U.S. government attempt to eradicate Native Americans between 1776 and 1880?</td>
<td>Who was Richard Henry Pratt and what is he known for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the video, how did indigenous populations resist eradication?</td>
<td>What does “Kill the Indian, save the man” mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the “obstacle to total American expansion”?</td>
<td>When Indian populations continued to grow, what was the U.S. government’s new solution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:33</td>
<td>How did Indian children arrive at Indian boarding schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What happened to them at the boarding school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why were the Indian boarding schools so harmful and insidious?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>What effect did the propaganda created by the Carlisle Indian Industrial School have on this model of education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What happened between 1900 and 1925?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What happened to families who refused to send their children to these schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What effect did the schools have on the children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What effect did “striping the children of their Native American identities” have on the children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the U.S. government acknowledged and apologized for the Indian boarding schools?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened in 1928?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened in the 1960’s and 1970’s?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What effect did activism have on Indian boarding schools?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment 4: Cause and effect Use your notes from the video to complete the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td><strong>Due to</strong> his assimilation experiment with prisoners of war</td>
<td>Richard Henry Pratt was able to get the U.S. government to fund the first Indian boarding school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Print the following and cut it into pieces; one set for each pair of students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>due to his assimilation experiment with prisoners of war</td>
<td>Richard Henry Pratt was able to get the U.S. government to fund the first Indian boarding school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-2018</td>
<td>by making indigenous children dress in colonial clothing, cut their hair, stop speaking their language, and change their names</td>
<td>the U.S. government did harm to indigenous peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 - 1925</td>
<td>as a result of the propaganda created with the children at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School</td>
<td>over 350 more boarding schools were created to assimilate Native American children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-1930</td>
<td>by stripping the children of their Native American identities</td>
<td>the U.S. government was able to disconnect them from their lands and take away more tribal lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>due to a report that detailed the abuse at the boarding schools</td>
<td>many schools were closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1970</td>
<td>as a result of indigenous activism,</td>
<td>more schools were shut down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment 5: Small group discussion

Read the following passage. Consider the questions below. You may choose NOT to respond if it feels upsetting to you.

_The teacher should not say to an Indian student: “You do not know how to speak. Learn how to speak Spanish [castellano].” The student, in this instance, goes home and lets her parents know the teacher is telling her she must learn to speak, because she does not know how to. Her mother says: “But we speak our language.” “Yes,” the student replies, “but my teacher says that does not count.”_

_That is domination!_

_But if the teacher tells the student: “You speak Quechua, Aymara, Maya, Otomí! I do not speak that language. You are bilingual, you are wiser than I am,” then the student goes back home to let her mother know the teacher thought she was wise._

- By Enrique Dussel (2018)

How does this passage relate to your experience learning English?

How does it feel to not be able to speak the language of your home in school?

Has there been a time when a teacher (without saying their name) has told you that "you must learn to speak." If so, how did that happen? What did it feel like? Why do you think it felt this way?

Has there been a time when a teacher (without saying their name) has recognized that you were bilingual. How did that happen? What did it feel like? Why do you think it felt this way?

Lesson 5
Query: How have students influenced schools?
Language Objective: SWBA analyze the cause and effect relationships
Content Objective: SWBA create a timeline from the information in the text
Lesson Description:
Part 1
1) Review the key vocabulary in the Quizlet and share the Quizlet link: https://quizlet.com/_cm7n2r?x=1qqt&i=4w1e1g
2) Read the text individually or in small groups.
3) In pairs, complete the Crystal City timeline.
Part 2
1) Read over the discussion prompt as a whole class. Answer any questions to support comprehension of the text and questions.
2) Divide the class into small groups of 4. Give roles: (1) Reader, (2) Facilitator, (3) Note taker, (4) Time keeper
3) Explain that the reader will read the passage out loud, the facilitator will read each question and open the discussion, the note taker will take notes about what was said without names, and the time keeper will help the group move through the questions in the 20 minutes given.

Name: _________________________________ Date: __________________

Adapted from: The historic walkout by Chicano students in Crystal City, Texas

By Jennifer Hernandez December 13, 2022

Texas has a long history of unacknowledged struggle for equity. The walkout in Crystal City, Texas is one of the most important cases of student activism in the Southwest, but almost nobody talks about it.

In 1968, Chicano or Mexican American represented 87% of high school students in Crystal City. Nearly half of these students were children of migrant farm workers.
Local government and school officials were predominantly white. There were one or two Chicano officials who aligned with the majority views.

“Spanish was prohibited from school because education was seen as the primary means of assimilating immigrants into American society, which, in part, meant speaking English,” as reported by the Global Nonviolent Action Database (GNAD).

Mexican students were suspended or beaten with a paddle for speaking Spanish. Mexican food was also banned from the school cafeteria.

The curriculum did not provide Mexican-American experiences or Mexican history, culture, and literature. Often being called “animals” and “stupid idiots,” Chicanos were told they would not make it to college and they would have to join the military.

The rules imposed in schools did not allow Chicanos to be represented in student groups. For instance, there was a rule that those elected to represent the cheerleaders needed to have at least one parent graduate from a local high school. As immigrants, the majority of parents did not attend a local high school in the U.S., making it difficult for Chicanas to be cheerleaders.

Led by Severita Lara, students drafted a list of demands to present to the superintendent, John Billings. The Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO), founded in 1967 to empower Chicanos in Texas for social change, sent José Angel Gutiérrez, who graduated from Crystal City High, to support the growing campaign for change.

LIST OF DEMANDS:

- Educational program that treats their lives as Mexican-Americans fairly and respectfully
- Include bilingual and bicultural education
- Student elections for their popularity awards, student leaders, and cheerleaders

When presented with the demands in the Spring of 1969, the superintendent agreed to make three positions for white students and three positions for Mexican-American students on the cheerleading squad. Parents of white students protested this decision, and the school board
overturned the decision in June 1969, as reported by GNAD.

This did not deter Severita’s effort to create a new list of demands.

LIST OF NEW DEMANDS:

- More Mexican-American teachers and counselors
- More challenging courses
- Bilingual and bicultural education
- Mexican-American studies classes
- Fair treatment
- Equal opportunity
- Protection of free speech
- Chicano representation on the school board.

Over 100 Mexican-American students and their parents took their concerns to the school board on December 8, 1969. The school board did not address the concerns which resulted in a walkout.

On December 9, 1969, around 500 students walked out and began a student boycott of classes. Over a week, that number rose to 2,000 members of the Chicano community.

According to GNAD, “Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough invited student leaders Severita, Diana, and Mario to Washington D.C. to discuss discrimination in their school. While they were there from December 17 – 19, they met with Senators Edward Kennedy and George McGovern, who informed the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) of the seriousness of the situation in Texas. Gilbert Pompa, Deputy Director of the Community Relations Service at the Department of Justice, promised to send investigators to Crystal City.”

The investigation team from Washington D.C. urged the school board members to negotiate. The students had additional demands, “no reprisals against students participating in the walkout, [and] that an advisory board of Mexican Americans, chosen by Chicano citizens, be established
by the school board to advise them on needs and problems of Mexican Americans,” as reported by GNAD.

On Jan. 9, 1970, the school board granted amnesty to all boycotters, cultural holidays, peer elections for student positions and awards, bilingual education, more Mexican American teachers and counselors, and curriculum focused on Chicano history and contributions. The student walk-out had drawn attention to the situation and promoted change.

Name: _________________________________ Date: __________________

Assignment 5: Timeline

One way to understand events is to create a timeline. Refer to the article to complete the timeline below. Try to write the events in your own words. As you write, be sure that you understand what you are writing.

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>The Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO) was founded in 1967 to empower Chicanos in Texas for social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>In 1968, Chicano or Mexican American represented 87% of high school students in Crystal City. Nearly half of these students were children of migrant farm workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1969</td>
<td>When presented with the demands in the Spring of 1969, the superintendent agreed to make three positions for white students and three positions for Mexican-American students on the cheerleading squad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1969</td>
<td>Parents of white students protested this decision, and the school board overturned the decision in June 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 1969</td>
<td>Over 100 Mexican-American students and their parents took their concerns to the school board on December 8, 1969. The school board did not address the concerns which resulted in a walkout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 1969</td>
<td>On December 9, 1969, around 500 students walked out and began a student boycott of classes. Over a week, that number rose to 2,000 members of the Chicano community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17 – 19</td>
<td>Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough invited student leaders Severita, Diana, and Mario to Washington D.C. to discuss discrimination in their school. While they were there from December 17 – 19, they met with Senators Edward Kennedy and George McGovern, who informed the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) of the seriousness of the situation in Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 1970</td>
<td>On Jan. 9, 1970, the school board granted amnesty to all boycotters, cultural holidays, peer elections for student positions and awards, bilingual education, more Mexican American teachers and counselors, and curriculum focused on Chicano history and contributions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: _________________________________ Date: __________________

Assignment 5: Timeline

One way to understand events is to create a timeline. Refer to the article to complete the timeline below. Try to write the events in your own words. As you write, be sure that you understand what you are writing.

Timeline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17 – 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: _________________________________ Date: __________________

**Assignment 6: Small group discussion**

How does your relationship with a teacher influence your learning?

Is it easier to learn from a teacher who shares some of your social identity characteristics? Why or why not? Tell a story (without saying the name of the teacher) that illustrates your opinion.
When a teacher has different social identity characteristics from you, is it more difficult to learn from them? Why or why not? Tell a story (without saying the name of the teacher) that illustrates your opinion.

Tell about a teacher (without saying their name) with whom you have a strong relationship. Why do you think you have a strong relationship with this teacher?

Is it important that a teacher show that they care about you? How does a teacher show that they care about you?

Lesson 6
Query: What is liberation or freedom?
Language: SWBA to categorize nouns as either abstract or concrete nouns
Content: SWBA to use visuals and words to define liberation or freedom, abstract nouns

Description:
Part 1
1) Teacher introduces the query. Teacher introduces the idea of abstract noun in contrast with concrete nouns, giving examples.
2) Teacher hands out cards with nouns (abstract and concrete) on them; as a class, we categorize these nouns on the board in two groups; teacher asks if there are any questions
3) Teacher hands out a list of nouns; in pairs, students categorize their nouns, placing them in two categories (abstract or concrete); Teacher circulates to check and answer questions

Part 2
1) Teacher explains that it is sometimes difficult to define abstract nouns, that we have to draw from different resources to fully understand and explain abstract nouns.
2) Teacher explains that each student will use their background knowledge to define the word liberation (explain that liberation has a similar meaning to freedom, that they are synonyms). Teacher introduces the Jamboard and shows an example of a collage that uses images and words to define an abstract noun.
3) Teacher explains that, first, we will look at ways that others tried to describe liberation or freedom through song.
4) Teacher hands out lyrics, plays a song, asks students - what words stand out to them, what words seem important to the meaning of the song
5) Take time for students to collect new words and make vocab word lists

Part 3
1) Complete Assignment 7

Name: ______________________________ Date: ______________________
Abstract nouns cannot be experienced directly by any of the human senses (see, touch, taste, hear, or smell). Other examples of abstract nouns are humor, kindness, fury, wisdom, and memories. Since we don’t use our senses to understand abstract nouns, they are hard to define.

If a noun is not abstract, it is concrete. Concrete nouns are people, places, and things. We can see, touch, taste, hear, or smell concrete nouns. An example of a concrete noun is book. We can touch and see a book.

Instructions: With a partner, categorize the following list of nouns. Is it a concrete noun - something that can be experienced by any of the human senses - or is it an abstract noun - something that we can’t use our senses to understand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>truth</th>
<th>music</th>
<th>courage</th>
<th>love</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>honor</td>
<td>tennis</td>
<td>glory</td>
<td>bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egg</td>
<td>honesty</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>symbolism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>truth</td>
<td>music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courage</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honor</td>
<td>tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glory</td>
<td>bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egg</td>
<td>honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>symbolism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Redemption Song
By Bob Marley & The Wailers

[Verse 1]
Old pirates, yes, they rob I
Sold I to the merchant ships
Minutes after they took I
From the bottomless pit
But my hand was made strong
By the hand of the Almighty
We forward in this generation
Triumphantly

[Chorus]
Won't you help to sing
These songs of freedom?
'Cause all I ever have
Redemption songs
Redemption songs

[Verse 2]
Emancipate yourselves from mental slavery
None but ourselves can free our minds
Have no fear for atomic energy
'Cause none of them can stop the time
How long shall they kill our prophets
While we stand aside and look?
Ooh, some say it's just a part of it
We've got to fulfill the book

[Chorus]
Won't you help to sing
These songs of freedom?

[Acoustic Break]

[Verse 3]
Emancipate yourselves from mental slavery
None but ourselves can free our minds
Whoa! Have no fear for atomic energy
'Cause none of them can stop the time
How long shall they kill our prophets
While we stand aside and look?
Yes, some say it's just a part of it
We've got to fulfill the book

[Chorus]
Won't you help to sing
These songs of freedom?

[Outro]
All I ever have
Redemption songs
These songs of freedom
Songs of freedom
I Am Free by Equanimous

I am free
I am free
I am free
I am free
I am free

I am radiantly, healthy, happy and wealthy
I am grateful for life and life is grateful for me
I am accepting and loving
Energy is abundant
And I’m thriving while I’m giving to community
I am free
I am free
I am free
With energy flowing
I am free

I am living on this planet fully in love
I am connected in unity from the stars and above
I am enjoying the moment, feeling playful and potent
I am energy with magic and beauty, it’s like a dream
I am free

I am free
I am free
I am free
Energy flowing
I am free

I am expanding the field of joy spaciously
I am alive and I express myself creatively
I am whole and at peace and know how to release
I am living out my _____ _____ inside of me

I am free
I am free
With energy flowing
I am free
I am free
I am free
With energy flowing
I am free
Cause I am free
Yeah
I am free
With energy flowing
I am free
Liberation by BUZZ

[Verse]
We were dancing
Upon a fallen tree
Just two kids
With nowhere better to be
I remember lying
Lying through my teeth
Loneliest September
All the fall leaves
It's a reckoning
Only what they want
Inside my heart is a fire
It's burning like a thousand suns

[Chorus]
I'm running
I'm burning
I'm crashing
I'm living
I'm trying
I'm lying

[Post-Chorus]
I'm living
For myself

[Outro]
Oh, oh
Oh, oh, oh

Assignment 7: What is liberation?

What does liberation mean? It is a similar word to freedom. They are synonyms. They are also abstract nouns. **Abstract nouns** cannot be experienced directly by any of the human senses (see, touch, taste, hear, or smell). Other examples of abstract nouns are humor, kindness, fury, wisdom, and memories. Since we don’t use our senses to understand abstract nouns, they are hard to define.

If a noun is not abstract, it is concrete. **Concrete nouns** are people, places, and things. We can see, touch, taste, hear, or smell concrete nouns. An example of a concrete noun is book. We can touch and see a book.

On the **Google Jamboard titled “Definition of liberation or freedom,”** create a collage of images and words to define the word liberation. What does this word mean to you? At least 3 images and at least 5 words. Express with words and images the meaning of liberation for you.
Lesson 7

Query: How and when is there liberation and freedom in school? (poem/discussion)

Language Objective: SWBA to identify adjectives

Content Objective: SWBA to relate the poem to their own experience

Description

Part 1

1) Lead the students through Assignment 8
2) Read over the discussion prompt as a whole class. Answer any questions to support comprehension of the text and questions.
3) Divide the class into small groups of 4. Give roles: (1) Reader, (2) Facilitator, (3) Note taker, (4) Time keeper
4) Explain that the reader will read the passage out loud, the facilitator will read each question and open the discussion, the note taker will take notes about what was said without names, and the time keeper will help the group move through the questions in the 20 minutes given.
5) Record the small group discussions

Name: _________________________________ Date: __________________

Assignment 8:

Whole group

1) Read the following poem, first to yourself, then with the class, and then with a partner.
2) Highlight any new words. Understand their meaning in the context of the poem by translating them, looking up their definitions, or asking a classmate or teacher.
3) What are the words or phrases that are meaningful to you? Share these with a partner and explain why.

Small group discussion

Consider the questions below. Question by question, one group member at a time, discuss your answers to the questions. You may choose to not respond if it feels upsetting to you.

Purple by Alexis Rotella

In first grade Mrs. Lohr
Said my purple teepee
Wasn’t realistic enough,
That purple was no color
For a tent,
That purple was a color
For people who died,
That my drawing wasn’t
Good enough
To hang with the others.
I walked back to my seat
Counting the swish swish swishes

Of my baggy corduroy trousers.
With a black crayon
Nightfall came
To my purple tent
In the middle of an afternoon.
In second grade Mr. Barta
Said draw anything;
He didn’t care what.
I left my paper blank
And when he came around
To my desk
My heart beat like a tom tom. How clean
He touched my head And white
With his big hand And beautiful.
And in a soft voice said
The snowfall

How does this poem relate to education that is freeing or liberating?
How would you describe education that makes you feel free or liberated?
When has school or education felt like freedom?
When does it feel oppressive?
Appendix B

Small Group Discussion Prompts

Small group discussion 1:

Read the following passage. Consider the questions below. You may choose NOT to respond if it feels upsetting to you.

_The teacher should not say to an Indian student: “You do not know how to speak. Learn how to speak Spanish [castellano].” The student, in this instance, goes home and lets her parents know the teacher is telling her she must learn to speak, because she does not know how to. Her mother says: “But we speak our language.” “Yes,” the student replies, “but my teacher says that does not count.”_ That is domination!

_If the teacher tells the student: “You speak Quechua, Aymara, Maya, Otomí! I do not speak that language. You are bilingual, you are wiser than I am,” then the student goes back home to let her mother know the teacher thought she was wise._

- By Enrique Dussel (2018)

How does this passage relate to your experience learning English?

How does it feel to not be able to speak the language of your home in school?

Has there been a time when a teacher (without saying their name) has told you that "you must learn to speak". If so, how did that happen? What did it feel like?

Has there been a time when a teacher (without saying their name) has recognized that you were bilingual. How did that happen? What did it feel like?

Small group discussion 2:

How does your relationship with a teacher influence your learning?

Is it easier to learn from a teacher who shares some of your social identity characteristics? Why or why not?

Tell a story (without saying the name of the teacher) that illustrates your opinion.

When a teacher has different social identity characteristics from you, is it more difficult to learn from them? Why or why not?

Tell a story (without saying the name of the teacher) that illustrates your opinion.

Tell about a teacher (without saying their name) with whom you have a strong relationship. Why do you think you have a strong relationship with this teacher?
Is it important that a teacher show that they care about you?
How does a teacher show that they care about you?

Small group discussion 3:

Read the following poem. Consider the questions below. You may choose NOT to respond if it feels upsetting to you.

Purple by Alexis Rotella

In first grade Mrs. Lohr
Said my purple teepee
Wasn’t realistic enough,
That purple was no color
For a tent,
That purple was a color
For people who died,
That my drawing wasn’t
Good enough
To hang with the others.
I walked back to my seat
Counting the swish swish swishes
Of my baggy corduroy trousers.
With a black crayon
Nightfall came
To my purple tent
In the middle of an afternoon.

In second grade Mr. Barta
Said draw anything;
He didn’t care what.
I left my paper blank
And when he came around
To my desk
My heart beat like a tom tom.
He touched my head
With his big hand
And in a soft voice said
The snowfall
How clean
And white
And beautiful.

How does this poem relate to education that is freeing or liberating?
How would you describe education that makes you feel free or liberated?
When has school or education felt like freedom?
When does it feel oppressive?
Talk about language and freedom. How does language relate to education that feels like freedom?
## Appendix C

### What We Know About Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th><strong>Structure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Teacher-student relationship</strong></th>
<th><strong>Language</strong></th>
<th><strong>Teaching and Learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Culture</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>How much do you go to school? How do you travel to and from school? Do you eat at school? Who do you have class with?</td>
<td>What is expected of the teacher? What is expected of the student? How do teachers and students interact?</td>
<td>Is there a home-school language mix match? Do you use more than one language at school? Do you acquire new languages at school? How?</td>
<td>How are students taught? How are they expected to show their understanding? How are they evaluated?</td>
<td>What are the rituals and routines? How do students interact? What happens when there are conflicts between students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 days, for 7 hours/day. School buses, walking, cars. Eat in the cafeteria. Go to with cousins, friends, classmates.</td>
<td>The teacher needs to teach the students and give homework out. Students should be in class on time and do their work.</td>
<td>Yes there is home school. Yes. yes</td>
<td>Computer, paper work. It depends on how the teacher is teaching. By grading the test or worksheet.</td>
<td>They go to the auditorium before going to class. They fight, they talk normally. They fight in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6 days a week for 7:30 hours/day. School van, school buses and personal vehicles and walking. We bring food from home and we can also buy food there too. With teachers and students. Has to wake up early; teach students good; maintain student behavior; talk about students’ grades with parents; Students wake up early, do homework and classwork on time; communicate well; respect everyone. Yes there are some homeschools too. They speak gujarati. Yes more than 2. Yes we do learn more languages in the school by compulsory language period every day like gujarati, hindi, sanskrit. Mostly on the paper. raise hands when the teacher asks questions to the students. Revision every single night and do homework everyday. They take tests every month and within a week they call us and our parents and show our grades. Go to school everyday and start praying for 10 minutes every day at the start of the school day everyday to our god. Mostly students communicate with everyone and are friendly with everyone. First call home. And they suspend us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>5 times a week, It takes 7 hours. It took 15 mins to get to school from my home. The school didn’t provide breakfast but the lunch was great. The classmates were random. Teaching skills and coaching for university. Students respect each other and study hard. Teachers have authority but not bossy. It was only korean We should study English as a second language. There is homeschooling but not usual. actually we don't ask much. We don't take tests as much as here but when we take 2 tests, it is like a final test. they give a grade by student's result of test. It contains 8 periods a day. We study together in class. There is a 10 min-break between periods. We go to the bathroom and talk to other friends at that time. if you are in the trouble, you can talk with teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>It depends on the time of hours we take in school but we all go to school 5 days a week. We go to school by bus, car, bike, and walk. Yes we eat at school. With different teachers but one form master.</td>
<td>Come to school early and leave late, be in class on time, finish their syllabus before the end of the year, make sure the student is prepared before university, and follow the school rules. student must be respectful to the teachers, do the school, come to school on time, follow the rules, must pass your exam, be obedient</td>
<td>No homeschooling. But saturday class Yes It a chose</td>
<td>by black boards, books, pafilet. participation in class, class works, reshears, home work, test, exam. By performance, test, exam, particles. We have 12 subjects.</td>
<td>Dress in school uniform, Assemble in the morning praying and raise the flag before going to class. Group studies, teams.clubs, works, and groups. They go outside the school and fight outside the school or compete in a subject or something.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed and in Dedoose</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Topic explored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>What story does the physical space of a school tell?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Journal 2</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Is education and schooling the same thing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Solid answer 1</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>What can the experience of Indian boarding schools teach us about schooling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Recorded discussion 1</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Language at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Journal 3</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>How have students influenced schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Solid answer 2</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>How have students influenced schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Recorded discussion 2</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Recorded discussion 3</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>How and when is there liberation and freedom in school?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E

### Timetable for Data Collection and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit / Date</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Other Activities</th>
<th>Coding &amp; Analytical Memos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/09</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial coding fieldnotes 11/09-11/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrote Analytical memo re: fieldnotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced Research to Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collected Informed Consent Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collected Informed Consent Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial coding fieldnotes 12/01-12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrote Analytical memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed Teaching with Critical Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9-1/17</td>
<td>ACCESS Testing – No class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22</td>
<td>Discussed Unit Plan with Critical Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21</td>
<td>Revised Unit Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class; Student work: Journal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/27</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class; Student work: Journal 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>Initial coding of Journals 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>Wrote analytical memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>Initial coding of Journals 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>Transcribed small group discussion #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22</td>
<td>Discussed Teaching with Critical Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class; Student Work: Journal 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26</td>
<td>Initial coding of fieldnotes 2/13-2/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27</td>
<td>Fieldnotes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28</td>
<td>Student Work: Solid answer (How do students and teachers influence what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schools are like?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/29</td>
<td>Wrote analytical memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>Transcribed small group discussion #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>Transcribed small group discussion #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Initial coding of small group discussions #2 and #3; Initial coding of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>Second cycle coding fieldnotes 2/13-2/27, Journals, Student Work,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7-4/13</td>
<td>Wrote analytical memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>Discussed patterns and findings with critical friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F

### Final Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Subcodes</th>
<th>Code descriptions</th>
<th>Data samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>activism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentioning or referencing of activism</td>
<td>“we should write letters to the principal to tell him that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority / hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is when I exert my authority or the teacher/student hierarchy is apparent</td>
<td>I told her that she hadn’t come to class. I wasn’t going to write her a note to the nurse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>When the word behavior is used by teacher or students</td>
<td>Journal excerpt (image)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bias</td>
<td></td>
<td>When students or teacher express bias or become aware of bias</td>
<td>possible that people with these identities are not accepted in other parts of the students’ lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connection</td>
<td></td>
<td>When there is a connection or lack of connection between teacher and student</td>
<td>At the end of class, this student and I spoke again and I commented that, while he said that he had changed in his move to the US, I would still describe him as sincere. / I will be honest in that this comment offended and hurt me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demeanor</td>
<td></td>
<td>When the demeanor or way a student is acting is noted or responded to by the teacher or students - demeanor communicates</td>
<td>I guess there is something about his demeanor and way of being in the classroom that projects that he feels like he is better than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For this activity, he asked if his answer was right and I clarified that a journal is just his thoughts on a topic; there was no right and wrong answer – the conditioning of school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“So, they never told me, like you gotta ... They helped out.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td>When the language is observed or noted</td>
<td>... to clarify without reading and she told some of the story again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differentiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>When the differentiation of language instruction is noted - can be positive or negative</td>
<td>I thought it would be better for her to talk about her answers than to type them into the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback</td>
<td>Teacher giving student feedback about language; linguistic feedback being given by anyone</td>
<td>The feedback comes from their listeners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowing</td>
<td>Teacher or student recognizing student knowing about language; this can also be negative, that the teacher ignores or interrupts the knowing of the student</td>
<td>...next time I could also collect some of the words that students choose to use and share them out to be incorporated in others’ vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listening subject</td>
<td>A noticing about the listening subject rather than the speaking subject</td>
<td>Her speech is also very differently accented than mine, which I need to get used to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
<td>When teacher or student models a linguistic skill</td>
<td>We then wrote a solid answer together as a class for the earlier question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning together</td>
<td>Examples of where both teacher and student are learning</td>
<td>Perhaps this is a question that I need to ask the students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback to teacher</td>
<td>When student gives feedback to teacher or teacher asks for feedback from students</td>
<td>...but he asked that each individual just answer and I changed gears.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberatory</td>
<td>Noticing about liberation</td>
<td>I think creating a space for students to tell stories from their lives is liberatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognitively challenging</td>
<td>Points in instruction or encounters that highlight the degree to which an exercise is intellectually challenging or not</td>
<td>While working with each of these students it became clear to me the complexity of the ideas that I was asking them to grapple with.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criticality</td>
<td>Moment in which a student demonstrates criticality – critical thinking about the power dynamics of society or institutions</td>
<td>“Kill the Indian, save the man.” …answers very clearly that this means that he wanted to change them so that they were no longer who they were, so that they no longer had the same identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dignity</td>
<td>An encounter or a comment that evokes a sense of dignity</td>
<td>“So, when teacher respect you, you can feel freedom.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppression</td>
<td>An encounter that expresses oppression</td>
<td>“…to me it’s offensive because like I’m not from here. Like I’m trying to learn and say something them making, like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>race</strong></td>
<td>The mentioning of race</td>
<td>After some more thought, he looks at me and says quietly that he will put that he is white.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The mentioning of the intersection between race and language</td>
<td>I then asked what language did they want the immigrant groups to speak? Someone answered, “English.” What culture did they want the immigrant groups to have? A student called out from the back of the room - white.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>raciolinguistics</strong></td>
<td>When the word respect is used</td>
<td>“feel free in the school when I choose my path and I can control myself and respect”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noticeings about student understanding (or lack there of)</td>
<td>“We don’t use English because it is easier than others. It is because they have the power, they have money, they have power...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>respect</strong></td>
<td>Moment in which there is a student-to-student encounter</td>
<td>...while they were taking the quiz, one student was using his phone. Another student told him to stop using his phone and the first student told him to mind his business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students share aspects of their reality</td>
<td>Other students had questions about this and were doubtful that it was actual school. For instance, a student asked if they wore their uniforms and S2 replied that they did.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>student reality</strong></td>
<td>Students share their opinion / thoughts</td>
<td>S6 shared that one could be educated out of school to make a dress, build a house, or some other skill, but you needed to go to school to be able to learn to read and write.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Caste as a dominant international language in the global context and as the majority language in the United States, English fluency has been considered essential for access to economic and civic opportunity across the world. At the same time, the language’s hegemony comes with the violent legacy of colonial language eradication, which has taken on new forms in raciolinguicism (Alim et al., 2016; Flores & Rosa, 2019; Rosa and Flores, 2017) and neoliberal practices (Bock Thiessen, 2021; Canagarajah, 1999). English language teachers are confronted with how to best approach this tension with their students. How do English language teachers both support their students’ acquisition of English and resist its oppressive nature?

In the 1970’s, Enrique Dussel, a Latin American decolonial philosopher, conceptualized pedagogics as an analectic (interplay) between sameness and otherness in face-to-face relationships, such as teacher and student (Dussel, 2019). He theorized that a liberatory pedagogic project allows the otherness of a student to flourish and influence the next iterations of society, rather than education being a mechanism of assimilation into a system of domination (Dussel, 2019). In a lecture on this theory, Dussel specifically cited language education as a paradigm example of what this domination can look like. Considering the historical role of language education in the process of assimilation and colonial domination, Dussel’s framework of the liberatory analectic can clarify the ethics of the relationship between teacher and student in English language classrooms.

This critical practitioner inquiry aims to examine the pedagogics of the relationship between myself, a white teacher, and my multilingual students in an English language development (ELD) classroom. While researchers have considered evidence of humanizing teacher-student relationships (García-Moya et al., 2020) and the impact of teacher-student relationship on motivation to learn an additional language (Dordrecht, A. & Thorsen, 2018), this study would broach a perspective yet to be considered – the application of Dussel’s theory of the teacher student analectic within the English learning context.
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Research Design
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Qualitative practitioner inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Saraco, 2018)) with a teacher research approach (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009), using the methods of fieldnotes, researcher memoing, the recording and transcription of 1-3 lessons, and student work as artifacts for data collection.

*required

Research Question(s) and/or Hypotheses

Provide the research question guiding this research project as well as any hypotheses (if applicable).

I. What do liberatory and oppressive pedagogics look like in an ELD classroom?
A. What is my analectic relationship with my multilingual students, particularly regarding our race, gender, and culture—and how do I understand my students’ analectic relationship with me?

*required

Source of Participants

The primary participant of this practitioner inquiry is me, the researcher. The class that I will use for this research is an intermediate to advanced English Language Development (ELD) class at Chichester High School, a local suburban school district.

*required

Inclusion Criteria

List and describe the inclusion criteria.

Age - 15 to 20
Enrolled in English Language Development English language ability - intermediate to advanced

*required

Exclusion Criteria

List and describe the exclusion criteria.

I have not chosen to focus on the other ELD classes that I teach because the age of the students (middle school) and the language ability (beginner).

While all students in the chosen ELD class will be invited to participate in the study, if a student or their parent/guardian declines, I will not include observations of this student in my fieldnotes or collect their artifacts as data. A student who declines participation will continue to participate in the class; their learning will not be interrupted or effected.

*required

Describe your recruitment procedures and any compensation given for participation.

I am an English Language Development (ELD) teacher for the Delaware County Intermediate Unit who is contracted to provide instruction to Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students in Chichester Middle and High Schools. I am the ELD teacher for the high school students who will be invited to participate in the
study. I will explain the research to this class of students. I will ask these students if they would be willing to participate in the study. If so, I will give a letter of parental consent to be taken home and signed. I will call the homes of each student to offer (1) verbal interpretation of the consent form by a professional interpreter and (2) answer any questions that they might have. Once parental consent has been returned, I will ask students to affirm their willingness to participate and sign assent.

No compensation will be given to participants. Student recruitment script:

I am a doctoral student. As a doctoral student, I must conduct research. I want to invite you to be a participant in my research. The topic of my research is the educational experience for English language students and teacher-student interaction. Our classroom is the site of my research. If you participate in my research, I will use your assignments as data. I will record 3 small group discussions. I will take notes about my observations of our class. If you choose to not participate, the class will be no different for you. The class will be the same for those who participate and those who do not. Your grade will not change or be affected by your decision to participate or not. Again, your choice to participate will not affect your grade. Do you have any questions, so far?

There are minor risks to participating in the research. One, there is a chance that some class time is lost because of the study. I will do my best for this not to happen. Two, there is the chance that you will feel emotional distress because of the topics discussed. You will always have the choice to not answer a question if you don’t want to. Three, there is the chance that someone might know that you are a participant in the study. This is called a breech in confidentiality or privacy. I will do my best to keep your participation private. For instance, none of my notes and data will include your name or the name of the school. Do you have any questions?

This research has been approved by WCU IRB #2023-139. I will give you each a consent form that needs to be signed by a parent or guardian. (Hand out consent form) Please show the form to your parent or guardian. If you agree to be a participant, please bring the form back to class signed. If your parent or guardian has questions, please let me know and I will call your home with an interpreter, if necessary, to answer their questions.

Thank you. I hope that this research will make me a better teacher. I hope that you feel willing to participate.

Do you have any questions?

Script to use with interpreter:

Hello. My name is Renee Burgos and I am _____________ English language development teacher. This week in class, I discussed with students that I am a doctoral student doing research. I am inviting your student to be a participant in the research. I sent a consent form home with ____________ on ______________.

Were you able to discuss the consent form with your student? (yes/no)
Would you like for me to explain the consent form?
(yes)
The topic of my research is the educational experience for English language students and teacher-student interaction. Your student’s English language development classroom is the site of my research. If your student participates in my research, I will use your student’s assignments as data. I will also record 3 small group discussions during our ELD class. These discussions will take 45-60 minutes in all.

If you choose to not allow your student to participate in the research, the class will be no different for them. The class will be the same for those who participate and those who do not. Your student’s grade will not change or be affected by your decision to have them participate or not. Again, your choice to allow your student to participate will not affect their grade. Do you have any questions, so far?

There are minor risks to participating in the research. One, there is a chance that some class time is lost because of the study. I will do my best for this not to happen. Two, your student might feel some emotional distress. Your student will always have the choice to not answer a question if it makes them feel uncomfortable. Three, there is the chance that someone might know that your student is a participant in the study. I will do my best to keep your student’s participation private. For instance, none of my notes and data will include student names or the name of the school.

This research has been approved by WCU IRB #2023-139. Do you have any questions?

Would you like the interpreter to translate the consent form?

(Yes) I will read the consent form line by line and the interpreter will translate.

Please return the consent form with your signature if you consent for your child to participate in my research. Thank you for considering.

Study Documents

If applicable, this includes flyers used for recruitment as well as letters of acknowledgement (ex. external group letter of acknowledgement, coach's letter, etc.). Burgos Support Letter.docx

Script to use with interpreter.docx Student recruitment script.docx

*required

Describe all study procedures.

Provide a step-by-step description of each procedure.

Permissions

My direct supervisor for the Delaware County Intermediate Unit was contacted on November 7, 2022 to provide a letter of acknowledgment for research from my employment, the contracting agency for the school district where I work.

IRB Consent
On November 21, I submitted the IRB proposal to the Institutional Review Board of West Chester University.

Participant Recruitment and Consent and Student Assent

Once the IRB process is complete, the parents/guardians of the students in this class will be informed regarding the study. Consent forms will be provided to parents in English with the option of receiving interpretation of the document by a professional interpreter via phone (see form attached). Students will also be provided a form to confirm their assent to participating in the study and will have the opportunity to ask any questions about the study at the outset. With the parents’ consent and the students’ assent, I will begin the research.

Instruments, Interventions, and Data Collection

The data collection methods for this study will be (1) field notes taken before and after class that document the plans and implementation of the lesson, (2) memoing that describes my interpretations, curiosities, and questions about the different interactions with students, (3) audio recordings and transcriptions of 3 lessons on the themes of the dissertation, and (4) artifacts such as student work, lesson plans and rubrics. There will be no instruments used for this study. Nor will there be interventions implemented for this study.

For the audio recordings of the 3 lessons will be organized as small group discussions. I will group the students according to consent/assent and only use the data from the recordings of those students with consent/assent. The participation in these discussions will take 45-60 minutes of class time.

*required

Describe the duration of study participation, the time commitment for study participants, and the timetable for study completion.

The duration of the study will be from January 2022 to May 2023. The data collection phase will take place from January 1, 2022 to February 28, 2023. Within the designated class time, participants will participate in 3 small group discussions that will take 45-60 minutes in all. Given the nature of school, there will be interruptions such as changes in schedule, testing and weather. I have left a wide window for data collection in consideration of these interruptions, as well as the unpredictable nature of documenting critical moments.

*required

Describe the information to be gathered and the means for collecting, recording, and analysis of data.

I will observe my interactions with students and take fieldnotes of critical moments as soon as possible, noting my interpretations and reflections in memoing within a 24-hour period. These notes will be collected digitally in a Word document and kept on a password-protected computer. I will audio record 3 small group discussions that pertain to language learning & schooling, liberatory education, and teacher student relationship. These discussions will take 45-60 minutes of class time in all. I will group the
students by consent/assent and only use the data from the students with consent/assent. I will borrow recording devices from the university. I will transcribe these audio recordings. To analyze the data, I will engage in an open coding process to first make sense of the data and then identify apparent themes within the data.

Data Collection Forms

Attach any data collection forms that you might be using in the study.

Small group discussion prompts.docx

*required

Survey, Questionnaire, or Interview

Will the study utilize surveys, questionnaires, or interviews?

Yes ✔ No

*required

Genetic Testing

Will this study involve genetic testing?

Yes ✔ No

*required

Drugs, Devices, Biologics

Will the study involve administering any of the following? Check all that apply.

Drug Biologic Device

✔ None of the above

*required

Participant Data, Specimens, and Records

Does this project involve the collection or use of materials (data, video or specimens) recorded in a manner that could identify the individuals who provided the materials, either directly or through identifiers linked to these individuals?
Do you anticipate study participants will be subject to minimal or greater than minimal risk?

Minimal Risk to participants means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical and psychological examinations or tests and that confidentiality is adequately protected.

Greater than Minimal Risk to participants means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research risks are more than minimal risk, but not significantly greater. Studies that fall under this category will range in their probability of a moderate-severity event occurring as a result of study participation (and the level of safety monitoring will depend on that probability) but there are adequate surveillance and protections in place to identify adverse events promptly and to minimize harm.

*Minimal
Greater than Minimal

What are the Potential Risks related to your research?

All research poses potential risk to participants or others. In many cases, these risks are clearly identifiable. But even in relatively simple data collection there may be less obvious risks. Please check all that apply

*Privacy Risks

Describe any and all privacy risks:

Provide detail regarding the frequency, severity, and duration of each risk.

There is the potential risk of a breach in confidentiality.

How will you minimize these risks?

*required

To mitigate any potential loss of confidentiality, I will take field notes using a system of Student 1, Student 2, etc.
Risks to Third Parties (institutions, community, researchers, or non-consented individuals)

- Privacy Risks
- Social or Psychological Risks
- Physical Risks
- Risks to third parties (institutions, community, researchers, or non-consented individuals)
  - ✔ Other: *required

Describe:

There is the risk that there will be a loss of instructional time. In addition, there is the risk that students will feel that their grade will be impacted by their participation or lack of participation in the study. The purpose of the study is to understand teacher-student interactions in and around instruction. Therefore, it is in my interest, as the researcher, to mitigate any loss of instructional time due to the implementation of this study. I will plan to take fieldnotes outside of instructional time or while students are occupied with an appropriate task. To mitigate any feelings from students that their grade will be impacted by their participation in the study, I will state clearly and repetitively that no student grades will be influenced by the research. There is also the risk of emotional distress due to the discussion topics. I will allow students to choose not to answer questions and provide a school counselor's phone number on the consent form in the case that they do feel distress.

Expected Benefits

Describe the anticipated benefits to participants (if any). If there are none, please state that there is no direct benefit to the participant. Also, please state the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result from this research study.

Taking this practitioner inquiry approach, I hope to benefit from a focused examination of my teaching. I believe I will be able to improve my teaching through this approach of structured observation, reflection, and writing. This research is valuable to the field of English language teaching in that it explores how teacher-student interaction can influence liberatory versus assimilatory or oppressive outcomes, a topic of current interest in the field.

*required

Are you seeking a waiver of informed consent?

A Waiver of Documentation of Consent is used when:

- You are providing an Informed Consent Document to participants, but will not be obtaining their written signatures.
- Reading an Informed Consent script verbally, or over the phone, to participants when conducting a screening conversation and sharing study information requesting verbal consent.

✔ No Yes
Select one of the following and then provide a rationale explaining why this Waiver of Documentation of Consent will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of participants.

The only record linking the participant and the research would be the informed consent form and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each participant will be asked whether the participant wants documentation linking the participant with the research, and the participant's wishes will govern.

The research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to participants and involves no procedures, for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

If the participants or legally authorized representatives are members of a distinct cultural group or community in which signing forms is not the norm, the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to participants, and provided there is an appropriate alternative mechanism for documenting that informed consent was obtained.

*required

Informed Consent

Describe the procedures for obtaining informed consent.

The consent process will begin with me explaining the research to the students in my class. Those who are willing to participate in the research will take parent consent forms to their homes. I will inform the students that I will call their parents/guardians that afternoon/evening to offer (1) verbal interpretation of the consent form via a professional interpreter and/or (2) the opportunity to ask any questions. To communicate with the parents/guardians, I will use the phone number that I have on record. Upon return of the signed consent form, the student will be asked to assent to their participation by signing an assent form. The assent form is written at a level of English that students will be able to understand without translation. I will save all the signed assent and consent forms in a locked box in my home office.

*required

Informed Consent Form

The attachment must be in a .doc or .pdf - links will not be accepted.
If you would like to use our informed consent generator to create a document that is fully editable, please click here: https://www.wcupa.edu/_admin/research/forms/confidentiality/

Please note - that if having a parent/guardian consenting - the consent form language will need to be modified to include "MY CHILD" instead of " I "
InformedConsentForm 12172022.docx

Child Assent Form(s) if applicable

For examples of assent forms - please see the ASSENT SAMPLES documents/examples on our IRB website.
Will your research involve any of the following?

Check all that apply.

Deception
Investigation Drugs or Dietary Supplements Investigational Devices Retaining Data or Biological Samples for Future Research

✔ None of the Above

*required

What technological and physical safeguards will you use to protect data from inappropriate use or disclosure?

Check all that apply.

- ✔ De-identifying data at point of collection (e.g., using Qualtrics to anonymize data)
- ✔ Locked room or cabinet
  Behind a double lock (e.g. locked cabinet in a locked room)
- ✔ Restricted access to authorized research team members
- ✔ Password-protected computer or device
  Password-protected folder or storage
  Destruction of source data immediately after processing
- ✔ Destruction of audio or visual data immediately after transcription
  Modification of audio or visual data to eliminate identifiers

Other:

What will you do with data or specimens at the conclusion of the study?

Check all that apply:
I am not collecting any identifiers. I will retain data for the required retention period (3 years, or longer as required by other agencies) and then destroy it.

I will deidentify data or specimen logs and erase or destroy any related codes. I will retain data
✔ for the required retention period (3 years, or longer as required by other agencies) and then destroy it.
I will keep identifiable data for the required retention period (3 years, or longer as required by other agencies) and then destroy it.
I will destroy any leftover specimens.
I will retain data and specimens for future use. Other:

Safeguarding Participants’ Identity

*required

How will data confidentiality be maintained?

I will store all research documents either in a locked box in my home office or in my password-protected laptop computer. The names of the participants will be protected by using the labels Student 1, Student 2, etc. These steps will safeguard the participants’ identity. I, Renée Burgos, Dr. David Backer, and the IRB committee will be the only people with access to these documents. All data collected for this research will be destroyed three years after the completion of the study.

*required

Provide exact location (e.g., Building & Office Number) of where informed consent forms and/or study data will be stored (physical or electronic).

=738 B Putnam Blvd., Wallingford, PA 19086.

*required

Provide the names and titles of individuals having access to the consent documents and data.

Renée Burgos
– English Language Development Teacher - Doctoral Student – rb939807@wcupa.edu

David Backer
– Professor – West Chester University –dbacker@wcupa.edu

West Chester University IRB

*required
Specify the date for destruction of data (surveys, disks, etc.; must be a minimum of 3 years)

05-31-2026

The documents/attachments listed here have been previously uploaded throughout the application. No new uploads should be required here. Please double check that all appropriate files have been uploaded.

Outside IRB of Record

This is required when engaging in multi-institutional research.

Study Protocol

Attach the protocol for this study that was reviewed by the Outside IRB.

Outside IRB Approval

Attach the IRB Approval from the Outside IRB.

Outside IRB Review Meeting Minutes

Attach the minutes from the outside IRB meeting(s) for the review of this study.

Outside IRB Correspondence

Attach all correspondence concerning the review of this study by the Outside IRB.

Study Procedures

Study Documents

If applicable, this includes flyers used for recruitment.

Burgos Support Letter .docx Script to use with interpreter.docx Student recruitment script.docx

Study Instruments

Attach all instruments (i.e. personality scales, questionnaires, evaluation blanks, etc) to be used in the study.

Small group discussion prompts.docx
FDA Letter

Participant Protection

Informed Consent Form

InformedConsentForm 12172022.docx

Child Assent Form(s)

Assent for Minors.docx