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ABSTRACT

The discourses of English as and for development (Appleby et al., 2002; Seargeant & Erling, 2011; Romaine, 2015a, 2015b) are used in the educational policy and planning decisions of low-income countries because of the language’s continued positioning as a necessary skill for socioeconomic participation and success, despite little to no evidence that supports this correlation in areas of extreme hardship (Coleman, 2011; Erling & Seargeant, 2013; May, 2014; Ricento, 2015a). Navigating between institutional policies and the students who learn English are teachers, who often work with limited resources and knowledge of English, as well as lack access to opportunities for second language teacher education (SLTE) (Awasthi, 2009; Davies, Glendinning, & McLean, 1984; Herrera & Rubio, 2018; Hussain, 2009, Kerr, 1994). Few researchers of global English design studies with an approach that actively engages with teachers to problematize global English discourses and conceptualize English language teaching (ELT) in alternative ways that work for their lived realities of constant change and hardship without depreciating participants’ goals and imagined futures with English, nor devaluing their right to access English or any knowledge that they feel will improve their lives (but see Bui, 2018; Phyak & Bui, 2014).

Because of the inherently political nature of language and language teaching, this study is informed by critical theories of discourse, power, and subjectivity (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986; Bourdieu, 1977, 1984, 1991; Foucault 1978, 1982, 1991; Gramsci, 1971; Habermas, 1985, 1987). Viewing discourse as activity that is social and culturally constructed, as well as historically constituted (Shi-xu, 2015), I position myself as full participant in the construction of this engaged, ethnographic case study (Dyson & Genishi, 2005; Glesne, 2011) on English language policy, planning, and teacher praxis in a remote, northern Nicaraguan town, taking the dual role of volunteer English specialist and researcher over a six-month period. Within this approach, influenced by engaged language policy and practices (ELP) (Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017), I provide curriculum-planning collaboration, teacher-education workshops, and co-teaching partnerships with three teachers of varying English language ability – two for a small, unaccredited, private university and one for an after-school program for secondary school students. Participants of secondary focus are two administrators of the university and a Peace Corps volunteer in the area. Tertiary participants are the secondary-school students of one of the teachers as they interact with the teacher in the classroom, as well as participate in a questionnaire. University students also filled out a questionnaire.

Specifically, I ask what discourses of global English and ELT participants drew on to explain their beliefs and enact their professional selves, as well as how they responded to the alternative, critically engaged discourses of global English and ELT that I presented through curriculum planning meetings, teacher development workshops, and co-teaching. I then ask how the confluence of these discourses shaped teachers’ emerging subjectivities as both teachers and learners of English. The goal of these questions was to engage teachers in praxis – or reflection and action upon their teaching-learning situations in order to conceptualize them in alternative ways for their lived realities. A secondary goal of these questions was to see if this emerging praxis would lead to teachers’ coming to an intellectual understanding of themselves outside of dominant discourses (e.g., deficit associations with nonnative speaker identities (Canagarajah, 2005; Holliday, 2006; Medgyes, 1994; Tang, 1997)). However, because discourses of global English are powerful and deeply entrenched in teaching beliefs worldwide, another underlying goal of this research was not necessarily to evoke lasting changes in identity formation and
praxis. Instead, it contributes to a methodology, including descriptions, analyses, and conclusions, in order to inform future research and praxis at the ELP-SLTE interface, as this area receives little attention in peripheral contexts, and theoretical and practical work has largely remained at the propositional level. This is where this study finds its most important significance. I employed the data-collection methods of video-taped participant observation, field notes, semi-structured interviews with teachers, and student questionnaires. For textual analysis of policy documents and educational materials, as well as the interactional data emerging from participant-observation and interviews, I conducted discourse analysis based in thematic analysis (Gibbs, 2007) on semiotic patterns through the use of open-coding and, upon second analysis, selective coding (Strauss, 1987). I then applied my theoretical framework of discourse, power, and subjectivity to the themes because these themes evolve from a researcher’s and participants’ narratives and experiences as part of the ongoing story of global English, saturated with theory from a variety of sociological, postcolonial, and political economic perspectives. I use a process of narrative knowledging (Barkhuizen, 2011, 2015) to work through and display findings.

The study resulted in a dynamic synthesis of discourses – some elements of our activities led to critical awareness of issues regarding English, including the design of a critically engaged English curriculum, while others were resisted by participants, which challenged my understanding of English in low-income countries as I reevaluated what it means to be a “critically engaged” educator and researcher. I found that Global-North-Global-South partnerships must conceptualize English in both alternative, localized ways and conventional, global ways (Canagarajah, 1999), and that this work requires a constant, iterative commitment to praxis. As critical ELP-SLTE research like this continues to emerge in the Global South, it has rarely provided descriptive accounts of the critical pedagogy developed (Crookes, 2013). As well, it has yet to be critiqued in a variety of contexts, intersections, and situations that problematize Global-South/Global-North partnerships. My findings address both these areas. Implications point toward the improvement of research methodology at the interface of ELP-SLTE in the Global South, as well as ethical, reflective praxis in Global-North English teachers and teacher-educators volunteering in low-income countries.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

It is nothing new to argue that English is not a key to socioeconomic success for all who dream of acquiring it, and that the desire for English – and the ways we think it should be taught and learned – contributes to worldwide inequality. Canagarajah (2005), Hall and Eggington (2000), Kumaravadivelu (2006a, 2006b, 2016), Makoni and Pennycook (2007), Norton and Toohey (2004), Pennycook (1998), Tollefson (1991, 1995, 2000), Ricento (2015a) and many other scholars in language policy and planning (LPP) and second language teacher education (SLTE) have set the foundation for thinking and acting differently about English teaching around the world, most importantly in low-income countries. What is more recent, and imperative, in this line of research at the LPP-SLTE interface, is that researchers of Global English are just beginning to be active participants in their studies in an effort to think and act with participants, seeing such activity not as secondary to research, but as a deeply intellectual process that can lead to honest and realistic – not utopian and idealistic – change for millions of English teachers and learners around the world (e.g., Phyak, 2016; Phyak & Bui, 2014). In this chapter, I introduce my dissertation research, for which I took the dual role as researcher and volunteer English teacher educator for two separate but related educational sites in a remote, northern Nicaraguan town. I discuss its significance and intellectual merit to the field of applied linguistics. Lastly, I briefly introduce and describe the dissertation chapters that follow this introduction.

1.1. Statement of the problem

Problems associated with English language policy and planning (LPP) and second language teacher education (SLTE) have been well documented in countries on the “periphery,” a spatial concept that Canagarajah (1999) defines as “…such communities where English is of post-colonial currency…. Also included under this label are the many communities which formerly belonged to other imperial powers…but have now come under the neo-imperialist thrusts of English-speaking center communities” (p. 4). At the macro-level of LPP, the discourses of English as and for development (Appleby, Copley,
Sithirajvongsa & Pennycook, 2002), along with the overlapping discourse of English for socioeconomic development (Erling & Seargeant, 2013; Seargeant & Erling, 2011) are conflated and used to justify English as a Foreign Language (EFL) coursework or English as the medium of instruction for all subjects in peripheral countries. Despite these justifications, research shows that access to English does little to alleviate hardship in areas of extreme poverty (Coleman, 2011; May, 2014; Melitz, 2008; Ricento, 2015a; Romaine, 2015a, 2015b).

While LPP affects administrators, teachers, students, parents, and even larger communities, my research focuses on teachers. Local English teachers may have few resources and limited English language skills to confidently and effectively teach the required English mandates (Awasthi, 2009; Davies et al., 1984; Herrera & Rubio, 2018; Hussain, 2009; Kerr, 1994). Who teachers are, how others position them, what policy constraints – implicit and explicit – under which they teach, and what they believe about language affect how they teach, which has consequences for learners’ language acquisition. Furthermore, this context attracts English-teaching volunteers from the Global North who respond to the call to teach English for developmental purposes, often for very short periods of a few weeks to a few months, and often with little to no teaching experience or language skills of the host country (Biehn, 2014; Linse, 1989; Jakubiak, 2012a, 2012b, Pantea, 2012; Romero, 2012). Thus, as Piller (2016) states, “…appealing as the notion of a global lingua franca and ‘English for everyone’ may be, in reality, discourses and practices related to the global spread of English have become a key mechanism to entrench global inequalities” (p. 165). Global North volunteers return with an experience that they can use to facilitate educational and occupational futures, but Global South teachers remain without realistic, or even empowering and fulfilling, SLTE opportunities that help them navigate teaching English in difficult social, cultural, economic, and political conditions.
Despite a wealth of literature that defines, explains, and describes these issues in low-income countries (discussed in depth in Chapter 2), it is hard to find research on Global North\textsuperscript{1} researchers-practitioners working with Global South teachers to re-shape existing English language policies and teaching practices. Very little research has been conducted on critical and reflective SLTE partnerships between Global North and Global South teachers and teacher-educators, which serve as a base to begin the difficult, tense, and uncomfortable process of questioning conventional discourses and associated methods of English language teaching (ELT) (Crookes, 2013), working together to think differently about English with the goal of opening the goal of acting differently as English teachers (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, 2006b, 2016). While researchers from the Global North are now beginning to move past the first step of thinking differently about English in peripheral communities and towards acting differently about their own participation in SLTE in these areas (Menard-Warwick, Bybee, Degollado, Jin, Kehoe, & Masters, 2019), this dissertation research was constructed with the goal of beginning long-term engagement studies between Global-North and Global-South researcher-practitioners.

1.2. The study, its significance and intellectual merit

It is not one English policy, one teaching practice, nor one educational site that sets the paradox of English as a language that brings both opportunity and inequality (Tollefson, 2000), and to learn about the connections between macro-level policy and micro-level teacher practice researchers must “…find conversations on the more macro aspects of English language teaching, which include such political, cultural, and social issues as language policies and their implications for schooling practices, and the role of the teacher in (re)creating such policies and practices” (Hall & Eggington, 2000, p. 1). In this spirit, this multi-sited (D. C. Johnson, 2013) instrumental case study (Stake, 2000) is situated at the LPP-SLTE interface in the context of two English programs functioning in the remote, northern Nicaraguan town of

\textsuperscript{1} Dados and Connell (2012) state that the terms “Global North” and “Global South” bring about a change of focus away from “development and cultural difference and toward an emphasis on geopolitical relations of power” (p. 12). I follow them in using these terms instead of “developed” and “developing.” I discuss at length this and other issues with “development” in Chapter 2.
Tepetl\textsuperscript{2}. Approached for assistance with developing an English program for a small, private university, and later responding to an email advertisement to volunteer for an existing program for secondary school students run by the U.S. Embassy, I constructed a short-term, located (Johnson, 2009) and engaged\textsuperscript{3} (Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017) language planning and teacher education effort with the university and secondary-school program in order to place conventional discourses of English and teaching English in dialogue with critical and alternative discourses. The goal of the university partnership was to create a curriculum and teacher praxis different from more than 30 years of the same patterns of SLTE and ELT in Nicaragua (see Chapter 2), and learn how the administrators and teachers worked with and responded to this different discursive construction of the field.

Because of the inherently political nature of language and language teaching, this study is informed by critical theories of discourse, power, and subjectivity (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986; Bourdieu, 1977, 1984, 1991; Foucault 1978, 1982, 1991; Gramsci, 1971; Habermas, 1985, 1987). I conducted the study within the larger ethnographic approach of engaged language policy and practices (Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017). As a volunteer language teacher educator, I designed a Freirean-based (1970/1993, 1992, 1998) teacher professional development effort that uses concepts of conscientization and problem-posing education to inform curriculum design meetings, professional development workshops with university teachers, and co-teaching activities with a secondary-school teacher. My research questions are primarily discursive, and I align with Shi-xu’s (2015) definition of discourse from cultural discourse studies as “...a situated communicative event or a class thereof called activity in which people accomplish social (inter)action through linguistic and other symbolic means, in particular historical and cultural relations” (p. 290, emphasis in italics in the original). In this conception, discourse is a dialectic between “text” and “context,” and is configured in the interplaying relations of communicators, intents/forms/relationships,

\textsuperscript{2} Tepetl (from Nahuatl, meaning “forest”) is a pseudonym used to protect the confidentiality of participants.

\textsuperscript{3} The terms located and engaged, as well as other key terms and concepts of this study are defined and explained later in this chapter or in Chapter 2.
mediums of communication, purposes/consequences, historical relations, and (inter)cultural relations (Shi-xu, 2015).

I specifically ask the following research questions:

- What discourses on global English and English language teaching (ELT) do participants use to argue for the importance of knowing English, and how it should be taught and learned? How do these discourses manifest in talk and activity?

- How and why do participants welcome or resist the differing4 and critical discourses on global English and ELT that I introduce in the SLTE activities of curriculum design meetings, workshops, tutoring, and co-teaching?

- What social, cultural, historical, political, and systemic identifications as Nicaraguans and, specifically, as English teachers in Tepetl affect participants’ sense-making of their emerging English teacher subjectivities as they interact together among intertwined conventional and critical discourses?

- How do the social, historical, political, and systemic identifications that I enact, appropriate, and resist as researcher-volunteer affect my own sense-making and emerging teacher-educator subjectivity?

The aims of these questions are outlined in Chapter 3: Methodology. These questions require that I design structured mediational spaces (i.e., workshops, tutoring, and co-teaching) (Johnson & Golombek, 4

4 I use the terms “differing” and “alternative” discourses interchangeably to connote discourses that I enact with teachers that are not necessarily critical (See Chapter 2, Sections 2.2. and 2.3. for this definition), but that are also not dominant views in second language acquisition (SLA) or expected practices in second-language teaching. For example, from the field of SLA, providing corrective feedback to learners when they make a mistake is accepted practice (Ammar & Spada, 2006); however, researchers do not agree on which types of corrective feedback (e.g., explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition) help learners more than others. Patterns have emerged that seem to show that several forms of corrective feedback are more effective than recasts, i.e., immediately correcting a student’s error as he or she speaks (Lyster & Saito, 2010; Ammar, 2008; Ellis, 2007); yet, many language teachers use recast prominently (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), which may not help learners who cannot notice and remember the correction (Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013). Thus, presenting to a teacher a “differing” or “alternative” discourse would entail discussion about the research that shows immediate recast may be unhelpful to learners with attention or memory obstacles, like children in many parts of the rural north of Nicaragua who suffer from severe malnutrition (World Food Program USA, 2018).
in which I present information and allow space for teachers to engage with ways of thinking about teaching, about English, and about their own subjectivities from differing and sometimes critical discourses in which they may not have been allowed to engage with in the past. That is, the workshops or other spaces in themselves do not become mediational spaces unless what happens in those spaces between me and the teachers induces mediational activity (Johnson & Golombek, 2016). Evidence of their welcoming, appropriating, negotiating, or resisting these new discourses emerge in how they respond in talk and activity. The confluence of discourses brings about cognitive/emotional dissonance as teachers reason via their own backgrounds and histories as English learners, as well as their own experiences with teaching.

The aim of these questions is not to construct an interventionist agenda, but instead form awareness of the complicated situations in which English is taught by exploring a different conceptualization of global English and ELT. This research, then, is exploratory in nature. Instead of imposing beliefs on English language policy, planning, and teaching, the aim is to both teach and to listen, to incorporate ideas and perspectives from participants as I introduce my perspective and knowledge in order to synthesize what we do together into improved teacher-researcher praxis. All are invited to question, challenge, be challenged, and change the way English is conceptualized, and to design a curriculum and pedagogy with the potential to bring forth honest opportunities for English language acquisition, but also other important knowledge for improved life circumstances. The significance of this study lies not necessarily in changing participants’ and researcher’s thinking, as Hawkins and Legler (2004) indicate is the most common outcome of teacher-researcher collaborative research, but – as Hawkins and Legler advocate – its significance lies in how the study’s design and findings contribute to disciplinary theory and practice in the areas of critical SLTE and LPP.

5 In Vygotskian sociocultural theory, mediation conveys the entire structure and process of an activity in which, through higher forms of human behavior, an individual actively modifies a situation as he or she responds to it (Vygotsky, 1978).
The findings of this research are also significant to rethinking Global North-based, EFL volunteerism – often conducted by well-meaning but untrained “native” English speakers. As a well-meaning, “trained” and experienced English language educator who endeavors in EFL volunteering in the Global South, I have come across difficult issues involving relationships and ethics, including in this research study; thus, even those who possess training, experience, and cultural and linguistic competency to function appropriately and professionally in an EFL volunteering experience have much to learn about the effects of their partnerships – and even impositions – on the lives of their participants. Rethinking the way researchers, teachers, and volunteers associated with global English engage with Global South communities has the potential to create more thoughtful, ethical, effective relationships with educators in low-income countries. Though the findings of this research are not generalizable, they can provide a case for other researchers to consider for their own research design and context.

1.3. Chapter descriptions

Chapter 2 provides the conceptual and theoretical framework of this study, beginning with a discussion on globalization and global English, including English for socioeconomic development in low income countries. The chapter then moves to theorizing discourse, power, and subjectivity in light of these political concerns, including reviewing literature at the interface of critical language policy (CLP) and critical second language teacher education (CSLTE), highlighting the contextual and methodological strengths of these studies, as well as demonstrating areas that have not been well attended to in the literature, including limited engaged research and praxis in Global-North-Global-South SLTE partnerships, as well as limited descriptions of what this work actually entails. Chapter 3 details the engaged, ethnographic case study methodology that I use. It also includes a description of the sites, participants, methods of data analysis, and my positionality as a now ten-year volunteer teacher-educator in Nicaragua, including a statement on the ethics of being a full participant in this project. Chapters 4-6 answer the research questions that I pose by first providing analyses of the discursive forms of data that take the shape of activity, materiality (objectivity), and subjectivity. Chapter 4 focuses on answering the
first of my three research questions, Chapter 5 answers the second research question, and Chapter 6 answers the final two research questions. Chapter 7 concludes this study with a summary of the findings and implications for conducting LPP-SLTE research and praxis in the global South.
Chapter 2

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

I conceptualize my research within globalization and the global spread of English, including what “global English” means in association with other terminology for English(es) around the world. This discussion also explores the terms *Global North* and *Global South* in relation to sociopolitical issues, as opposed to purely economic measurements. I then focus on the primary discourses of global English to which Global South countries often ascribe as reasons to implement English language policies in educational institutions: English *as* and *for* socioeconomic development. I explain the critical and postmodern theoretical underpinnings of discourse, power, subjectivity, and learning that guide my analyses and which provide explanatory power for their findings. Lastly, I review the literature in the fields of language planning and policy (LPP), critical discourse studies (CDS), and critical second language teacher education (CSLTE) that have researched how the discourses of English as and for development have affected policy decisions, teacher education, and language pedagogy in low-income countries, and what my study offers to this line of research.

2.1. Globalization

Following Blommaert (2005), I found my micro-level exploration of the discourse of English for socioeconomic development in the macro-context of globalization. As Niño-Murcia (2003) indicates in her analysis of English functioning as linguistic currency in Peru, “English is seen as a requirement imposed by globalization and a global market” within an “imagined global citizenship” (p. 121), but exactly what globalization refers to needs to be clarified. Steger (2005) refers to the “sloppy” nature in which globalization has been defined as a process, a condition, or an ideology, and this conflation affects its explanatory power (p. 13). In Steger’s opinion,

…the term *globalization* should be confined to a set of complex, sometimes contradictory, *social processes* that are changing our current social condition based on the modern system of independent nation-states….At its core, then, globalization is about the unprecedented
compression of time and space as a result of political, economic, and cultural change, as well as powerful technological innovations. (2005, p. 13, emphasis in italics in the original)

Thinking about and being in the world changes as our awareness of it expands (Robertson, 1992), and Appadurai (1990) describes five “scapes” that capture the flows of this expansion: ethnoscapes of people, technoscapes of technology, financescapes of money, mediascapes of information, and ideoscapes of ideas (p. 296-300), which provide justification to perhaps pluralize globalization to globalizations, as Niño-Murcia (2003) suggests. Waters (1995) argues that these processes occur in three strata of social life: the economy, the polity, and culture, each of which respectively has three different types of “exchange”: material, political, and symbolic. Within a process of “transcultural flows” (Appadurai, 1996), international involvement at different levels is imperative for economics and production; people, goods, and ideas flow across permeable national borders; and these processes occur through migration, travel, the Internet, other media, and communications.

Pennycook (2007) expands on Mignolo’s (2000) three phases of globalization – beginning with the “discovery” of America; second, replacing the hegemonic Christian mission with an equally hegemonic civilizing mission; and third, development and modernization after World War II – to include two more phases, or “overlapping processes” (p. 26):

this [modernization in the European image] merged into the capitalizing/universalizing design, when international capital and a concept of human universality governed human relations in the latter part of the twentieth century; and finally corporatizing/globalizing, when globalization takes over from universal and international concepts of the world, and it is the corporatization of many levels of society – from business to institutions that had formally been seen as part of the state (education, health, transport) – that predominates within a new neoliberal politics for the world. (Pennycook, 2007, p. 26)

Pennycook’s processual descriptions of globalization demonstrate that globalization is not strictly economic, that there is significant co-existence among these processes, and that these co-existing
processes come with their own discourses: “civilizing, conceptualizing, capitalizing and corporatizing designs” (Pennycook, 2007, p. 27). The final, “corporatizing/globalizing” phase which Pennycook describes is the process of neoliberalism. Harvey (2005) defines neoliberalism as both political and economic processes that apparently work for the advancement of human wellbeing because individuals’ entrepreneurial spirits and capabilities are liberated through engagement with an institutional system that supports robust private property rights, free markets and free trade. As an ideology founded in politics and economics, neoliberalism promotes a separation of the state and privately-managed market, which has resulted in the privatization and commodification of former state-controlled public services like education, health, and social welfare programs. As pertaining to the global spread of English, neoliberal ideology manifests symbolically in the forms of English language teacher education programs, research-based best practices and methods, textbooks and accompanying teacher resources, and high-stakes English testing like TOEFL and IELTS, all of which are circulated through discourses and imbued ideologically with naturalized, normalized policy, planning, and pedagogical practices.

Flowerdew (2002) states, “In other words, it [the symbolic manifestation of globalization] is concerned with discourse” (p. 246, emphasis in italics added). Fairclough (2006) states that globalization as a discourse attracts other discourses which are associated with it, a clustering of discourses that he calls interdiscursivity (Fairclough, 1992), or “the use of elements in one discourse and social practice which carry institutional and social meanings from other discourses and social practices” (Candlin & Maley, 1997, p. 212). Within and across discourses, a process of dialogism (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986), or intertextuality (Kristeva, 1980) occurs: that is, there is an interrelationship across textual practices (oral and written), as similar ways of thinking, writing, and speaking are lifted from one particular context and find their way into similarly produced texts. They become “recontextualized” as the same types of texts,

---

6 The Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) is owned by Educational Testing Service (ETS). The International English Language Testing System (IELTS), is jointly owned by the British Council, IDP: IELTS Australia, and Cambridge Assessment English.
messages, styles, and choices repeatedly occur in a discourse. By connecting to other discourses, these discourses spread globally through people physically or through technology:

We [researchers of communicative events] have to conceive of communication events as ultimately influenced by the structure of the world system. In an era of globalisation, the threshold of contextualization in discourse analysis or sociolinguistics can no longer be a single society (or even less a single event) but needs to include the relationships between different societies and the effect of these relationships on repertoires of language users and their potential to construct voice. The world system is characterized by structural inequality, and this also counts for linguistic resources. (Blommaert, 2005, p. 15)

With the addition of cultural and semiotic processes as part of globalization and global markets comes the term *knowledge-based economy (KBE)* (Fairclough, 2006), which refers to the new turn in capitalism that emphasizes that “[k]nowledge [instead of manual labor] is now recognised as the driver of productivity and economic growth, leading to a new focus on the role of information, technology and learning in economic performance” (Organization for Economic Co-operation, 1996). This knowledge is often called *human capital*, and it is treated both as an educational, innovative product and service, as well as an asset of productivity:

[P]roduction and services based on knowledge-intensive activities that contribute to an accelerated pace of technical and scientific advance, as well as rapid obsolescence. The key component of a knowledge economy is a greater reliance on intellectual capabilities than on physical inputs or natural resources. (Powell & Snellman, 2004, p. 201)

This discourse revolves around strategies to elevate “knowledge” to that of other forms of production, or even greater than industrial forms (Fairclough, 2006). Wodak and Meyer (2009) argue that KBE “…has permeated most domains of our Western societies and is also colonizing other parts of the world….” (p. 12). For its role, the global spread of English has attracted discourses around which drive the competitive production of language policies, schools, textbooks, teacher-training programs,
curriculum design, testing, and more, much of it occurring online and with new technologies, including language-learning software and online classes (Flubacher & Del Percio, 2017; Holborrow, 2015; Park & Wee, 2015). English is the most common language taught around the world today as “…the prime mediator of the economic, political, cultural, and social relations and flows that constitute globalization” (Block, 2013, p. 287-288).

2.1.1. The Global North and Global South

Globalization processes have expanded linguistic and cultural contact through international companies and organizations, technology, and the media, but they also have a role in creating new obstacles to global economic equality, education, human health and well-being (Spring, 2006), culminating in a dichotomy of “developed” and “developing” countries. The phrase “developing country” stems from deeply hegemonic historical and economic processes. Once it is decided that a country is developed or underdeveloped, certain norms are enacted as to what constitutes development. The notion of development itself is problematic because it implies that there is one direction that societies need to follow in order to be “developed,” and this path has been predestined by those who already are “developed.” Esteva (1992) discusses the term’s foundations in colonial psychology, where individual “primitive” thinking had an ideal endpoint of “the rationality and individualism lauded in Euro-American thought” (Watkins & Shulman, 2008, p. 33). Tollefson (1991) states that these ideas emerge from modernization theory, where “underdeveloped” countries must make structural institutional shifts towards those of “developed” nations, including a shift away from socialism and towards capitalism. Connecting development specifically to capitalism, Kenny and Savage (1997) cite Leftwich’s (1994) defining features of current western aid and overseas development policy, including to ensure that economies be promoted as open, competitive, and welcoming of the market, and to encourage human rights and democracy. They further quote Griffin (1991) that while the “political and ideological rivalry” (p. 647) of the Cold War advanced foreign aid interventions, these policies have always had the economic intention of creating “a strong, expanding, global capitalist economy” (Griffin, 1991, p. 647)
It is because of the deeply problematic history of the term “development” that I do not use terms like “First World” and “Third World” or “developed” and “developing” countries. Instead, I use the terms “Global North” and “Global South,” as well as “center” and “periphery” (Giddens, 1984). The Global South refers to Latin America, East Asia, Africa, and Oceana (Dados & Connell, 2012), areas to which terms like the Third World traditionally refer, as these regions have a high density of low-income countries and people who are marginalized politically and culturally. However, “The use of the phrase ‘Global South’ marks a shift from a focus on development or cultural difference toward an emphasis on geopolitical power relations” (Dados & Connell, 2012, p. 12). The differential of the Global North and Global South emerged from development economics in the 1950s and 1960s, when Argentine economist Raúl Prebisch used the terms “core” and “periphery” to distinguish between the countries in “development” whose interests and views challenged those of the capitalist and communist Cold War powers that used entire regions like Latin America to play out their war. “Global South,” then, carries with it a discourse of resistance found in movements in Latin America and Africa, and within new intellectual movements like subaltern studies and the acknowledgment of the South “as a region of distinctive intellectual production” (Dados & Connell, 2012, p. 13, italics in the original). Therefore, “Global South functions as more than a metaphor for underdevelopment. It references an entire history of colonialism, neo-imperialism, and differential economic and social change through which large inequalities in living standards, life expectancy, and access to resources are maintained” (Dados & Connell, 2012, p. 13).

2.1.2. Global English

Beginning with “the dark side of Western modernity” (Mignolo, 2000), the phrase Mignolo uses for the violence of the colonial enterprise that begun in the 1500s and which continues presently in disparate forms of neo-imperialism, English has remained a postcolonial marker to the present day in the form of global Englishes. Later gaining status as the lingua franca for science, business, and academia (Ricento, 2015a; Sonntag, 2003), the English language continues to be a coveted skill for many around
the world, but has created obstacles for low-income countries trying to acquire it. It was not until the “critical turn” in the late 1980s and 1990s that the global spread of English began to be more broadly criticized in the field of applied linguistics (Cooke, 1988; Pennycook, 1994, 1998; Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999, 2000; Tollefson, 1991). Seen as an imperialistic, hegemonic, and a neoliberal enterprise, these scholars implicated English in the death of other languages and the abuse of linguistic and other human rights. In response to these discourses, others have emerged from the lens of political theory that see English as a human right and a cosmopolitan choice (Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Crystal, 1997). Most recently, scholars have noted how communities around the world have localized and taken ownership of English, transgressing rules and creating innovative ways of communication that express multiple subjectivities (Canagarajah, 2013; Pennycook, 2007). Therefore, Sonntag states, “The politics of global English are the politics of globalization, both economic and cultural” (Sonntag, 2003, p. 1).

The global spread of English was systematized by Kachru’s (1986) concentric circles of World Englishes (WE), which has become the most often cited paradigm of WE. The inner circle is the “norm-providing” circle, where countries like the United States, Great Britain, and Australia, for example, speak English as a native language. In the second circle, the outer “norm-developing” circle, English is spoken as a second language (ESL) by peoples colonized by the British Empire, like India, Kenya, and British Guiana, who give English the status of a national language. The third circle is the expanding circle, which is “norm-dependent,” as the countries that belong to it learn English as a foreign language (EFL). This circle includes countries like Germany, Japan, Russia, and countries within the continents of Latin America and Africa that were colonized by non-English-speaking, western European nations. Kachru’s paradigm, though helpful in its time for demonstrating the heterogeneity of Englishes and the emerging norms developed by non-inner-circle users’ adaptation of the language for their contexts, has come under critique for its rigidity (e.g., not including creole Englishes in the model, nor acknowledging inner circle Englishes like African American Vernacular English), as well as its hierarchical placement of English as a native language, ESL, and EFL (Bruthiaux, 2003; Holborrow, 1999; Mufwene, 1994).
World Englishes aside, other related terms present themselves in the literature on the global use of English. English as an International Language (EIL) is an umbrella term that accommodates all varieties of English into the same non-hierarchical plane. It is an attempt at an egalitarian model based on the fact that the number of people who speak English as an additional language far exceeds those who use it as a first language (Canagarajah, 2007). Unlike in the WE model, power does not flow one way outwards, from the inner circle to the outer circles. Under EIL come other models. Traditionally, Lingua Franca English (LFE) has focused on pragmatics rather than grammatical norms, and emerges from contexts of use, including combining with local language varieties, in order to form a communicative practice where meaning emerges from interaction (Canagarajah, 2007). On the other hand, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) has tended towards an understanding of a pre-given English that is then used by different speakers. However, Seidlhofer (2011) defines ELF slightly differently, as a globalized version of EIL (different from locally diverse forms of EIL, which perhaps would fall into Canagarajah’s definition of LFE), which signifies “...any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option” (p. 7, emphasis in italics in the original). Her definition places those in Kachru’s inner circle as the minority, as many more millions of people are communicating through English as a “contact language” – a language that is neither interlocutor’s first language (Firth, 1996). ELF is shaped just as much as, if not more so than, native speakers of English, its linguacultural norms are negotiated among its users within processes of accommodation and adaptation (Seidlhofer, 2011), and users acquire just as much ELF through technologies like the internet and smart phones as they do a formal education (Brumfit, 2002).

Pennycook (2007) uses the term Global Englishes, which he founds in critical theories of globalization and language in order to conceptualize the political complexities of the global spread of English: “a language of threat, desire, destruction and opportunity” (p. 5). Global Englishes connects English to power, but also views its users as capable of resistance and change, and new and ever-fluid identities (Pennycook, 2007). However, in many peripheral areas accessing English, the desire for the
singly dominant standardized English outweighs the imagining of creative, fluid uses and identities, and this is why I am drawn to using the singular global English. Like global Englishes, Sonntag (2003) states, “We can define global English as part of globalization. It is part of the cause, the process, and the product of globalization” (Sonntag, 2003, p. xii). Her book focuses more on issues regarding standardized English than Englishes (though there certainly are elements of Englishes represented) in its liberating and hegemonic aspects, through analysis of political-economic case studies on the United States, France, South Africa, India, and Nepal. Global English as used in my research draws on the imaginary of what English is to learners in peripheral areas aiming to acquire it as a separate, standard system for purposes tied to economic, technological, cultural, and social processes of globalization.

Global English cannot escape ideals of economic and social mobility (Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Crystal, 1997, Niño-Murcia, 2003; Van Parijs, 2000), as well as discourses of imperialism (Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999, 2000), hegemony (Dua, 1994), and neoliberalism (Holborrow, 2015; Menard-Warwick, 2008; Phillipson, 1992). It is connected to currency metaphors like “English is like the dollar” (Niño-Murcia, 2003), connective metaphors like “English is a bridge” (Krashen, 2000), and access metaphors like “English opens doors” (Sayer, 2018) and “English is a key” (Rios-González & De Benedictis Serrano, 2018). It is also connected to metaphors expressing conflict or negativity, like English as a “gatekeeper” (Pennycook, 1995) or “barrier” (Krashen, 2000), as well as metaphors of inevitability like, “English is a necessary evil” (Niño-Murcia, 2003), or of destruction like, “English is a killer language” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Two scholars who have remained proponents of ELF in order to develop a global demos and increase socioeconomic equality are Brutt-Griffler (2002) and Van Parijs (2000). Brutt-Griffler puts forth a strong position against the linguistic human rights discourse and linguistic imperialism to which Phillipson (1992) and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999) adhere. Whereas Phillipson has defined linguistic imperialism of English as “the dominance of English… asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages” (p. 15), and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999, 2000) argues that this
imperialism stifles parts of one’s dignity and identity as a speaker of a language, Brutt-Griffler (2005) counters that this way of thinking neglects to acknowledge the positive role English has played in the world. She cites the case of South Africa, where access to English is a very strong determinant of economic status, and Lesotho, where people are still suffering severe inequality because of the denial of an English education.

Others see access to English as a choice and even a right. Phillipson (1992) and others who claim that English is hegemonic have been criticized for neglecting to acknowledge people’s agency as they are affected by the spread of global English, as these scholars perceive people as “passive consumers of hegemonic cultural forms” (Pennycook, 1995, p. 48). Van Parijs (2000) claims that English as a lingua franca promotes global economic justice, reducing outmigration of peoples from developing countries. Consequently, English, as well as other lingua francas, becomes an economic commodity (Heller, 2010).

The conceptualization of English as “cosmopolitanism” opens a view where “…the agency of the individual is emphasized, indeed celebrated, in transnational, cross-cultural interactions. Individuals are considered ‘free to choose [their] cultural experiences’…” (Sonntag, 2009, p. 15). To be cosmopolitan means not only that opportunities come to people – it means that people can go seek opportunity, as well.

However, “…learning a second or third additional language is not always a realistic option, and it certainly is not easy or without costs” (Ricento, 2015b, p. 34). That people are “free” to participate in the linguistic and social experiences of their choosing neglects the fact that a great number of people worldwide do not have quality access to basic education, let alone resources for the learning of English or other languages. To counter the arguments put forth by Brutt-Griffler and Van Parijs, May (2014) poignantly points out that “…despite English being an official or co-official language in as many as 15 postcolonial African states, the actual percentage of English speakers in each of these states never exceeds 20 percent” (May, 2014, p. 183). He points to other countries in Africa that have English as an official language, yet are the poorest countries in the world, and countries in parts of Asia that have some of the strongest economies in the world but have chosen a local official language (although he admits often in
conjunction with English) (May, 2014). Several other social, political, and economic factors play a much larger role in determining if knowledge of English will bring socioeconomic opportunity (Ricento, 2015b). For example, one problem is the equation of supply and demand in finding employment. Ricento (2015c) states,

While proficiency in English, whether as a first, second, or third language, may provide an advantage for careers and employment in certain sectors of the global economy, the number of available jobs and the number of jobs being created that require significant knowledge of English is very small compared to the numbers of workers seeking jobs worldwide. (p. 37).

Romaine (2015b) furthers that jobs in low-income countries are predominantly very low-wage work, requiring no English language competence; thus, “…few will realize the economic benefits and opportunities creating a path out of poverty that English appears to promise” (Romaine, 2015b, p. 266).

Because global English is tied to such contrasting discourses, Sonntag (2003) argues that in order to study linguistic globalization, one needs “…to focus on the local politics of global English” (p. 1), or case studies of specific situations in specific contexts. In Sonntag’s (2003) culmination of case studies on global English in the United States, France, India, South Africa and Nepal, she argues that each case is a complex political interweaving of local actors demonstrating support and opposition to English, their conceptualization of language in the process of globalization, and how power plays a role in this phenomenon. She states, “Hegemony and resistance, elites and subalterns, liberalization and democratization—these are political concepts that have been applied to the study of globalization” (Sonntag, 2003, p. 2), and, therefore, to global English. The global use of English is also connected to producing new forms of localization and global identification (Pennycook, 2007), a process that is a part of a larger notion of glocalization, defined by Robertson (1995) with the following understanding:

I have tried to transcend the tendency to cast the idea of globalization as inevitably in tension with the idea of localization. I have instead maintained that globalization ... has involved and increasingly involves the creation and the incorporation of locality,
processes which themselves largely shape, in turn, the compression of the world as a whole. Even though we are, for various reasons, likely to continue to use the concept of globalization, it might well be preferable to replace it for certain purposes with the concept of glocalization. (Robertson, 1995, p. 40)

This transcultural process produces new and unexpected economic, political, and sociocultural relations to the point that traditional social-science models of globalization, like dichotomous center-periphery understandings, do not hold in a post-colonial world context (Appadurai, 1996).

2.1.3. English as and for development

In the process of “developing” the countries of the Global South, the English language has become one of the most important developmental tools (Sargeant & Erling, 2011; Tollefson, 1991; Wedell, 2011). Jakubiak (2012a, 2012b) notes that English for development (where increased language ability apparently assists people to participate in development projects) is often confused with English as development (where English language learning itself is the developmental goal), and that this confusion is problematic. First, people study and promote English whether or not it is relevant and applicable to their daily lives and potential futures. Research demonstrates that unless one has high social status in one’s community, that English for development that is disconnected from career training that employs English (e.g., tourism) rarely helps learners socioeconomically (Coleman, 2011; May, 2014; Niño-Murcia, 2003; Romaine, 2015b). As Appleby et al. (2002) indicate, English for development “...is problematic ...because it fails to draw any real connections between language and social, cultural, and economic change” (p. 338). Despite this, English-medium educational institutions and English as a foreign language requirements continue to proliferate in the Global South. Governments, non-government organizations (NGOs), researchers and others associated with the teaching and learning of English in low-income countries, therefore, need to connect why they are promoting and teaching English to the local realities of teachers and learners, provide reasons for doing so, and establish a foundation for programs that allows for long-term realization of their goals and sustainability of their programs (Wedell, 2011). In Chapters 4,
5, and 6 of this dissertation, English as and for development are the central discourses around which I ground other discourses that come to be attached to it.

As English for development pertains to English program planning and teaching specifically, Burns & Richards (2009) argue,

[T]he English language skills of a good proportion of its citizenry are seen as vital if a country is to participate actively in the global economy and to have access to the information and knowledge that provide the basis for both social and economic development. Central to this enterprise are English teaching and English language teachers. There is consequently increasing demand worldwide for competent English teachers and for more effective approaches to their preparation and professional development. (p. 1)

They continue that the increased demand for English internationally has created new language teaching policies, teacher accountability, and teaching standards (Burns & Richards, 2009). Appleby et al. (2002) address the continued reliance of Global South nations on Global North financial support to improve ELT, since their own government spending is constrained, and that this dependence changes countries’ sociocultural, economic, and political structure. Specific to curriculum planning and teacher development, they argue that the discourses of English for development and English teaching exclude local participation, rendering them voiceless:

Although development programs sometimes give lip service to encouraging local participation in the development process and promoting contextually appropriate curricula, all too often in the language-in-development context local participants – teacher educators, teachers, curriculum designers, and students – are not viewed as, or are not able to claim the space as, legitimate or authoritative speakers” (Appleby et al., 2002, p. 342-343).

Global North “experts,” some who have never taught English and only speak it natively, often arrive in the form of volunteer teachers. Because they often rely on international aid for language for development programs, educational institutions in low-income countries depend heavily on untrained
local teachers and untrained international volunteers to teach English, remaining largely unaccountable for who teaches English and how they teach English. Although this issue is explored some in the literature on global English (e.g., Biehn, 2014), micro-level analyses remain relatively underexplored (but see Jakubiak, 2012a, 2012b; Menard-Warwick et al., 2019; Smolcic, 2011). Specifically, EFL volunteerism has received little attention, as well as the relationships between local teachers and their volunteer counterparts. A small number of insightful theses and dissertations at the micro-level provide critical takes on EFL volunteerism (Linse, 1989; Romero, 2012).

2.2. Toward criticality, reflection, and change: Critical Theory

Pennycook (2001) separates three approaches to critical research: critical thinking, emancipatory modernism, and postmodern problematizing practice. In the critical thinking approach, one develops a critical distance for employing rigorous analysis through problem-solving or textual understanding, particularly using critical reading and objective methods, rather than politically-motivated approaches. In the modernist-emancipatory approach, associated with neo-Marxist Critical Theory, there is an acceptance of critical distance and objectivity, but one also engages with political and social problems, arguing that one can still do so in an objective, “rational” manner. In the postmodern-problematizing approach, associated with poststructuralism, one also engages with issues of power and inequality, but rejects the idea that one can remain objective and critically distant (Pennycook, 2001). Because of their political nature, the emancipatory and poststructural approaches are relevant to the research that I conduct. There are no clear lines that separate the metaphors of critical, postmodern, and poststructural thought, and I am not interested in policing those lines. Gannon and Davies (2012) provide the reminder that many postmodern and poststructural scholars started out as critical theorists and maintain elements of these positions in their writing. It is a “basket” of concepts that interweave these areas in which I am interested in order to conceptualize the sociohistorical and political context in which I carry out my research. As Oksala (2011) acknowledges, the poststructuralist Foucault, whose views on power, discourse, and subjectivity influence my work, never intended for his concepts to be used within a unified
theory, but instead he understood his views as a toolbox – “a flexible and varied methodological approach” (p. 86). Taylor (2011) agrees:

While Foucault may offer us some “tools”, we must figure out the use to which we will put those tools. We must critically analyse our present, identify oppressive norms and practices and figure out how we may counter those norms and practices: simply telling us what to think and do would undermine the emancipatory aspects of Foucault’s work. (p. 8)

This section explores the nature of Critical Theory as the foundation of conceptual change in global English and English teaching that I look to explore in this dissertation. The following section extends the concepts of discourse, power, and subjectivity initiated by Critical Theory into postmodern and poststructural thought.

As a formal description of research and analysis, the school of Critical Theory has emancipatory goals of social transformation: “It is an account of the social forces of domination that takes its theoretical activity to be practically connected to the object of its study” (Rush, 2004, p. 9). In this way, Critical Theory is “critical” because of its attempt to answer Marx’s eleventh Theses on Feuerbach: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it” (Marx, 1845/1977, p. 158), and this is done through the activity of labor (Wertsch, 1985), theorized as including the use of symbolic tools, the most powerful being language (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986).

Traditional Critical Theory emerged with the leadership of Horkheimer and Marcuse to attempt an interdisciplinary social science that merged economic analysis with cultural and ideological analysis (Agger, 1991; Delanty & Strydom, 2003). Inspired by the Hegelian-Marxist tradition, neo-Kantianism, and Freud’s social psychology, they argued that twentieth-century capitalism had been able to develop strategies (e.g., positivism as an effective form of capitalist ideology) to avoid the socialist revolution that Marx predicted, including deepening a sense of “false consciousness” among the working class that social hierarchies are “inevitable and rational” (Agger, 1991, p. 108). Because of the ideological dominance of positivism, individuals accept things as they are, so do little about it and perpetuate this domination.
Individuals internalize values of obedience and discipline that keep them from understanding or imagining that another reality is possible and from desiring to be liberated from their circumstances (Agger, 1991). The Italian Marxist Gramsci saw ideology on a cultural and ideational plane, extending through entire communities and societies, disseminating physically and virtually across borders, resulting in “…normalized, naturalized patterns of thought and behavior” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 159). Gramsci’s theorization of hegemony as part of this power of discourse, connotes power by consent; unlike forced imperialism, hegemony is disguised and coercive, working over the control of culture and ideas, where people feel that the changes imposed on them are inevitable (Gramsci, Hoare, & Smith, 1971).

The second wave of Critical Theory, primarily associated with Habermas when applied to educational contexts (Murphy, 2013), moves beyond positivist critique and the establishment of an interdisciplinary science. Unlike his Frankfurt School mentors, Habermas engaged with a wide array of theoretical and political traditions, and argued that the school did not go far enough in breaking from positivist approaches. Specifically, Habermas, a student of Adorno and Horkheimer, argued that Marx did not clearly set apart types of knowledge acquisition: that derived from causal analysis and that derived from self-reflection and engagement with others, or praxis. While Habermas (1971) acknowledges one of three types of knowledge as “empirical-analytical” – or observable and measurable, so-called rational knowing – he argues that humans also come to know through understanding meanings that emerge from engagement and dialogue with others, which he calls “historical hermeneutic” or “communicative knowledge.” The third type of knowing, “critical” or “self-reflective” knowing, emerges from individuals’ desires to be free agents and ultimately derives from knowing oneself, the end result of this knowing being praxis (Lovat, 2013, p. 71-72). Theorizing the different ways that individuals acquire knowledge, Habermas (1985) reconstructs a view of historical materialism to “shift critical social theory, like all western philosophy, from …the paradigm of consciousness to the paradigm of communication, thus enabling workable strategies of ideology-critique, community building, and social-movement formation to be developed” (Agger, 1991, p. 110). Habermas’s (1985) theory of communicative action
explains that as individuals develop a communicative capacity through self-reflective knowing, which involves understanding how one’s lifeworld intersects with various other lifeworlds, they can then commit to action for social justice. Self-reflexivity, then, stems “…from one who knows who they are, values the integrity of being authentic and commits oneself to establishing the kinds of caring and trusting relationships that bear the best fruits of human interactivity” (Lovat, 2013, p. 73). This merging of compassion and logic is completed through “… a universal speech situation governed by norms of dialogical equality and reciprocity wherein the goal of consensus formation guides many dehierarchizing social practices” (Agger, 1991, p. 120). However, like his mentors before him, Habermas’ theory is rooted in the fundamental status of social class over other markers of identity, like race, sex, and gender that play a prominent role in pre-existing power relationships for communication, and his theory is critiqued for assuming an Anglo-hetero-normative view of rational communication between two interlocutors who agree on the fundamental rules for communication and who are able to see themselves as equals (Agger, 1991).

I include this short summary of Critical Theory because the approach that guides my interactive engagement with participants, Engaged Language Policy and Practices (ELP) (Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017; see Chapter 3), is rooted in critical pedagogy based in part on the Critical Theoretical principles of Freire (1970/1993). However, my analysis of the discourses that emerge from these interactions is based in theories of discourse, power, and subjectivity that move beyond Critical Theory.

2.3. Extending understandings of discourse, power, and subjectivity

Pennycook (2001) argues that, while critical applied linguists should conduct work at least partly informed by Marxist-influenced Critical Theory, it critiques the dominating and hegemonic narratives of...
modernism only to provide a rational and emancipatory “alternative truth” in place of these narratives (p. 7). That is, in critiquing ideology, they still search for a universal truth on the other side of it, constructed outside of individuals’ subjectivities and the discourses that constitute them. Poststructuralism, like Critical Theory, is fascinated by power dynamics that work through institutions, language, texts, culture, and subjectivity (Murphy, 2013), meaning that structures play a significant role in the contingencies that occur in human activity. Poststructuralism, a North American term used to describe a disparate and often unrelated number of twentieth-century French sociologists and philosophers, begins at and then moves beyond the structuralism of linguist Ferdinand de Saussure and anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss.

Postmodernism, like poststructuralism, is also a North American term, which originally was inclusive of poststructuralism in the 1990s, both terms signaling a “crisis of confidence in western conceptual systems” (Gannon & Davies, 2012, p. 78). Postmodernism moved past the binary thinking of much of Critical Theory (e.g., oppressed-oppressor, truth-ideology, criticism-transformation), taking a largely deconstructive strategy to critiquing emancipatory discourse and claims to truth, arguing that individuals can never stand outside of the discourses that construct them. Thus, while individuals possess agency, agency is always “radically conditioned by positions made available to the acting, agentic subject, and subjectivity is always also subjection to the available ways of doing” (Gannon & Davies, 2012, p. 78). Postmodern and poststructural thought, then, marks a skepticism of modern thinking stemming from the Enlightenment, including the emancipatory thought of liberal humanism and Marxism on which much of Critical Theory is founded:

It is the task of resituating the human subject not as the central heroic and active agent who shapes her own destiny but as the subject who is constituted through particular discourses in particular historical moments that is central to the postmodern approach to research. (Gannon & Davies, 2012, p. 80).

Gannon and Davies (2012) argue that poststructuralism has become a more common term than postmodernism, which signals a specific “linguistic turn” in postmodernism, particularly in recognizing
the power and historical contingency of language and discourse in constituting what society deems as truth by analyzing how individuals articulate their thoughts and engage in practice. Like postmodernism, poststructuralism views power relations, including subjectivity, as “…established and maintained through discourse and through positions taken up and made possible within parts of discourses” (Gannon & Davies, 2012, p. 73, emphasis in italics in the original). Therefore, poststructuralism “turns to discourse as the primary site for analysis” (Gannon & Davies, 2012, p. 81). Analyzing discourse, researchers can understand how subjects and objects are discursively produced. In order to understand how I use the terms discourse, ideology, power, agency, and subjectivity in this research, I define and discuss my orientations to these concepts below.

**Discourse and ideology.** Discourse originally took on definitions of meaning-making above the sentence, or *parole* (Saussure, 1960), as opposed to *langue*, or the stable, linguistic system as prior to language use and unproblematically assumed as accessible to all members of a linguistic community. *Parole*, what actually becomes spoken or written, is variable among individuals and socially influenced (Saussure, 1960). Patterns of language are contextually bound by linguistic, situational, social, and cultural elements, which affect meaning, and these interconnected links between language – discourse – and society have been studied in various ways by scholars in semiotics and pragmatics (e.g., Austin, 1962; Brown & Levinson, 1978; Grice, 1989; Jakobson, 1960; Levinson, 1983; Searle, 1969; Schegloff, 1991; Whorf, 1956).

However, critical, including postmodern and poststructural, thinkers like Bakhtin (1981, 1986), Bourdieu (1977, 1984, 1991), Butler (1990), Foucault (1975, 1978, 1991) and Vološinov (1973) saw any act involving these semiotic units as imbued with rules, rituals, assumptions, and principles of exclusion or inclusion: discourse is both a socially constituted and a constitutive semiotic practice (Wodak, 2018), and discourse is inescapably tied to knowledge, power, and inequality. While the non-count noun *discourse* refers to general language use, within Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) it takes on the form of a count noun “…to refer to a specific set of meanings expressed through particular forms and uses which
give expression to particular institutions or social groups” (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2018, p. 2).

Discourses, then, take form as “neoliberal discourse, racist discourse, fascist discourse, sexist discourse, anti-immigration discourse, etc.” (p. 2), and they express larger ideologies: “sets of beliefs and values belonging to particular social groups” (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2018, p. 3). These ideologies develop in social interaction occurring within a certain group and time period (Vološinov, 1973).

Foucault’s understanding of power as a set of force relations at the micro-level of individuals is helpful to understand how processes – “micro-technologies” – transform and overturn powerful forms of knowledge, and new knowledges come to constitute new interplays of force relations, what Foucault calls the “micro-physics of power” (1991, p. 26). Thus, individuals can and do resist powerful discourses that constrain their lives through activity. Unlike ideology, discourse connotes a strong essence of activity. Määttä (2014) gives an important account of the history of the term “discourse,” or descorre/discorre in Old French, whose 12th century meaning, from the Latin discursis, was “to run around” (p. 64), and later in Medieval Latin to mean an argument. Therefore, discursive formations are embodied and are

...ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them. Discourses are more than ways of thinking and producing meaning. They constitute the 'nature' of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life of the subjects they seek to govern. (Weedon, 1997, p. 108)

These formations are controlled, managed, and constricted by institutions of power like the church, science, education, or government, what Foucault (1980) calls “regimes of truth” (p. 112), through activities like giving confession in church or being sent to detention in school. Blommaert (2005) states, “Discourse is language-in-action, and investigating it requires attention both to language and to action” (p. 2). For Blommaert (2005) discourse-in-action encompasses the following:

...all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use. Discourse is one of the possible names we can give
to it, and I follow Michel Foucault in doing so. What is traditionally understood by language is but one manifestation of it; all kinds of semiotic ‘flagging’ performed by means of objects, attributes, or activities can and should also be included for they usually constitute the ‘action’ part of language-in-action. (p. 3)

Blommaert states that the field of linguistics is but one field that defines discourse and uses it as a unit of analysis. In fields connected to linguistics, “discourse” is not necessarily purely linguistic, but can take form as visual, spatial, or material object. Providing an example from Foucault, Carling (n.d.) explains, “…in his analysis of the development of the modern penal system Foucault cites the medical and juridical discourse about the necessity of rehabilitating criminals–but he also cites the actual structure of prisons, designed to maximize surveillance, as contributing to the discourse of this conceptualization of criminality.” In their theorization of “figured worlds,” or “…our participation, especially our agency, in socially produced, culturally constructed activities” (p. 40-41), Holland, Lachicotte, Jr., Skinner, and Cain (1998) draw on cultural historical activity theory (Leont’ev, 1978, Vygotsky, 1978, 1986) and Foucault’s discourse theory (1965, 1975, 1978) to demonstrate that humans rely heavily on artifacts “as mediators in human action” (p. 60), or “psychological tools” that “…are the means by which figured worlds are evoked, collectively developed, individually learned, and made socially and personally powerful” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 61). Cultural artifacts can be a tangible “tool/artifact/mediator” (Holland & Cole, 1995), like a hammer, that “connect[s] two or more objects by driving a nail (or its equivalent) through them” (p. 61), or conceptual, like a psychiatric diagnosis of a person (p. 62), which then shapes how people view and treat a person, and has a number of social and economic consequences for that person. Whether tangible or conceptual, these artifacts mediate human identity, agency, and intentionality (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986). Foucault sees discourse as a cultural artifact: as a material, psychological tool that is not a part of the superstructure of ideology (as in Marxist conceptions), but as part of the material (one of many materializations being economic) base of modern humanity that has material functions and consequences. Holland et al. (1998) state the following:
Categories carry an association to those who use them and are subject to them—an association with power—as artifacts do an association with tasks and those who perform them. In fact, for a Vygotskian like Cole, categories of expression and more tangible artifacts like hammers are the same. They ‘afford’ ways of doing not only things but also people. (p. 62)

Discourse, like other psychological tools, is socially and culturally constructed, as well as historically constituted, and works through the forms of text (written or spoken), activity, concept, or object. The discourse of additive bilingualism, for example, in which a person acquires another language after acquiring his or her first language (e.g., Cummins 1978a, 1978b), mediates when and how schools decide to teach language, as well as what disciplinary measures, like assessment, to conduct. Additive bilingualism also can construct a view in educators that languages are separate entities that should always be kept separate. For example, when a colleague and I provided teacher education workshops in northern Nicaragua in 2015, she and I met a well-meaning volunteer English teacher from the U.S. with no prior experience teaching English, who would punish children and label them as “cheaters” if they used their L1 Spanish in her classroom. The consequences are quite material, including the plausibility of physical trauma of a malnutritioned child (roughly half of children in this area of Nicaragua suffer from some form of malnutrition) who relies on her L1 to help her memory and learning of the L2, who builds a fear or resentment of the English classroom or teacher, causing her to physically miss class and stay home from school (a high rate of truancy also occurs in this area of Nicaragua). Being disciplined and shamed for using the L1 has the material consequence of remaining home from school, which furthers social and economic consequences for the child.

To clarify the definition of discourse that I subscribe to and use as a unit of analysis for this dissertation, I restate Shi-xu’s (2015) definition of discourse from Cultural Discourse Studies that I provide in Chapter 1 to situate my discursively-based research questions. Discourse is “…a situated communicative event or a class thereof called activity in which people accomplish social (inter)action through linguistic and other symbolic means, in particular historical and cultural relations” (p. 290,
emphasis in italics in the original). Discourse, then, is conceived as a dialectic between text and context, and is configured in the interplaying relations of human subjects, material objects, and activity, along with historical and cultural relations (Shi-xu, 2015).

**Subjectivity.** A postmodern and poststructural understanding of identity sees an individual not as possessing a fixed set of traits, but as a fluid and contradictory individual subjected to changes across time and space, constituted by the discourses in which a subject ascribes (Morgan, 2004; Morgan & Clarke, 2011). Foucault’s historical work demonstrates that subjectivity is a “social, cultural and historical form rather than a pre-given substance that is outside of and therefore distinct from sociocultural norms and values” (Taylor, 2011, p. 6). That is, like other social constructivists, he believes there is no Kantian rational, individual being that reflects and acts upon the objective world. Subjectivity in this sense is the real basis of the self as both agent and object, not just active agent. This understanding of identity, as well as the activity of self-conscious reflection on oneself, differentiates the term *subjectivity* from *identity* (Hall, 2004), and is why I tend toward using the term subjectivity in this research. I follow Morgan and Clarke (2011), however, in using identity and subjectivity interchangeably, seeing how the term “identity” has also been used in self-reflective research.

Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of *habitus* connotes the less fluid subjective dispositions that individuals acquire by participating extensively in the social groups that are a part of their daily practices. By participating in the practices of certain social and cultural groups, humans form deeply ingrained habits, skills, and dispositions (Rawolle & Lingard, 2013). From this perspective, individuals see themselves – their identities – as inseparable from their relationships with others, and they react accordingly with appropriate linguistic, attitudinal and behavioral responses. This practice/habitus couplet plays out in social *fields*, or competitive spaces within capitalist society in which (unequal) access to capital is sought (Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of *symbolic power*, the practice of mediated interaction between habitus and social structure, is helpful to connect domination to both social agents and institutions. The field of TESOL, for example, has constructed multiple highly competitive links,
from the level of the textbook industry to appropriate methods, from SLTE programs to student assessment, all of which are unequally accessed and provide unequal access to various forms of capital. By participating in an MA TESOL program and practicum, an individual acquires a teaching self through participation with faculty, mentors, peers, and students. Influenced by this social network, the individual comes to appreciate certain theory and practice over others, as well as ways of presenting oneself as an English teacher and TESOL student. Norton’s (2000) research on subjectivity from a feminist poststructural perspective has been highly influential on research in second language education, demonstrating how the interconnected elements of a teacher’s identity, from his or her race, class, gender, culture, and other areas, “both shape and are shaped by the processes of instruction and interaction” (Morgan, 2004, p. 173). This process brings “semiotic potential” to the concept of identity (Blommaert, 2005), which agrees with Vygotskian sociocultural and activity theories that focus on mediation and representational tools of social categories that construct the self (e.g., K. E. Johnson, 2009; Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

For Bourdieu, cultural capital (e.g., knowledge, skills, education, language or linguistic capital) interacts with economic capital (e.g., money) and symbolic capital (e.g., prestige) in order to make certain practices and perceptions that emerge from habitus more desirable than others, and those individuals ultimately prevail in controlling capital resources. Bourdieu’s notion of cultural capital is embedded in our subjectivities and agencies, which interweave with structure over time, and he uses case studies (e.g., his work in Algeria) to study the reproduction and change that occur in societies. Bourdieu’s (1984) market metaphor of cultural capital, under which linguistic capital falls, is used by critical researchers to explain how learners develop within this social construction, and Bourdieu is more helpful to educational researchers than Foucault in this regard because his concepts directly link to social class in education and the culture of education being founded in the worldview of the dominant class (Grenfell, 2011). For Bourdieu, who experienced schooling as a working-class youth, schooling was a “democratic façade” that
partook in the process of ranking students, providing access for some, and advocating exclusion of others
in order to portray success as “a natural and individual phenomenon” (Grenfell, 2011, p. 37).

Agency. Discourse is not something owned by the powerful, and individuals are not powerless
against the social structures by which they live their lives. From a poststructural perspective, “discourse is
a precondition for agency or resistance” (Morgan, 2004, p. 173). Foucault (1978) states, “Discourses are
not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are…. [D]is course
can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of
resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy” (p. 100-101). Foucault concerns himself with
showing how individuals’ current conditions are the product of historical development, not natural
conditions, and promotes change – what he calls “the work of freedom” (1984, p. 46) to counter
domination and oppression (Taylor, 2011).

Foucault’s (1978) orders of discourse conceptualizes how discourses not only get taken up, but
also limit the actions that people can take because they constrain the ways people are able to think about
an issue. Orders of discourse “are the discursive equivalent of the social order, and, therefore, just as the
social order is a context of inequitable social relations, so orders of discourse are a context of the
individuals shape and control the order of discourse and the social order. Power relations essentially
position subjects within a discourse: “Subjects’ actions take place in discourse, and subjects themselves
are produced through discourse” (Kendall & Wickham, 1999, p. 53). Despite possessing agency, people
“…are not all that free and operate within boundaries of the sayable and hearable” (Blommaert, 2005, p.
104), but no one power or location is responsible for the “grand narratives” within which people live and
think. Power is a process or movement, not an object, and is not owned by individuals: it moves through
them. Hegemony is not always a top-down process, but is enforced even on the periphery, far beyond the
reach of powerful governments and institutions. Foucault (1978) uses the concept of governmentality to
imply that disciplinary power works bottom-up, from the periphery, within small, local governments, churches, educational institutions, and individuals, all maintaining the orders of discourse.

Discourse becomes historically constituted as it is re-used and disseminated by agents. Below the level of discourse to the textual level, Kristeva (1980) uses Bakhtin’s (1986) notion of *dialogism* towards a semiotic theory of *intertextuality*: “By introducing the *status of a word* as a minimal structural unit, Bakhtin situates the text within history and society, which are then seen as texts ready by the writer, and into which he inserts himself by rewriting them” (p. 65, italics in the original). She explains that texts – including subjectivity as textual – absorb, quote, reconstruct, and transform other texts. Intertextuality, then, comes to explain how texts interweave and change through time and different practices. Blommaert (2005, 2010) argues that this all occurs in an ordered linguistic/semiotic structuring, and he draws on Foucault’s *orders of discourse* to create the notion of “orders of indexicality” (2005, p. 69). Blommaert begins with Silverstein’s (2003) *indexical* order (see also Agha 2003, 2007), in which indexical meanings are patterns that provide similarity and stability through time and thus become predictable markers of social categories. Blommaert then places indexical order within another kind of higher order of social structuring, orders of indexicality:

…ordered indexicalities operate within large stratified complexes in which some forms of semiosis are systemically perceived as valuable, others as less valuable and some are not taken into account at all, while all are subject to rules of access and regulations as to circulation…. [Thus]…orders of indexicality index important aspects of power and inequality in the field of semiosis. (Blommaert, 2010, p. 38)

Therefore, Foucault (1978) insists that knowledge, instead of lying objectively “out there” in the world, “must be traced to different *discourse/practices* that frame the knowledge formulated within them” (Agger, 1991, p. 116), and he empirically studies, for example, the discourse/practices of prisons (1991), mental illness (1965, 1975), and sexuality (1978), accounting for how knowledge and practice becomes
historically constituted in and through discourses in order to make the prisoner, the mentally ill, and the homosexual problematic individuals in society (Agger, 1991).

Discourse is not just practice, as detailed above, but practice that works as power and knowledge production. Foucault argues that it is in discourse/practice that power and knowledge are tied together. Power/knowledge, in French *pouvoir/savoir*, is not directly translatable in English. *Pouvoir* (power) has a dual meaning: as force (*puissance*) and as the verb “to be able to,” or potentiality. *Savoir* (knowledge) is an implicit, historical, common sense knowledge. It “is not the knowledge that is decreed by some authoritative body ‘from on high,’ but is more precisely described in the passive voice: it is a kind of knowledge that is ‘recognized as true,’ ‘known to be the case.’” These arrangements of power have no clear origin, no person or body who can be said to ‘have it’” (Feder, 2011, p. 56). Examples of this knowledge are felt within statements like, “boys will be boys” (i.e., boys are given a “pass” to behave in harmful ways), or in the case of language teaching, the ideal of the “native speaker” as more authoritative and authentic than the “nonnative speaker” (Phillipson, 1992). Thus, if *pouvoir* means a potentiality or capacity, and if *savoir* means implicit, common-sense knowledge, an understanding of social life and customs, then *pouvoir/savoir* (power knowledge) is poignantly summarized by Spivak (1992) in the following:

You might come up with something like this: if the lines of making sense of something are laid down in a certain way, then you are able to do only those things with that something that are possible within and by the arrangement of those lines. *Pouvoir/savoir* – being able to do something only as you are able to make sense of it. (p. 151)

Therefore, in a Foucauldian understanding of agency, “…identity positions are materializations of discursively structured power relations” through which individuals frame their “capacity to act or imagine otherwise—to have agency—since, following Foucault, discourses also create the conditions for their transgression” (Morgan & Clarke, 2011, p. 819).
Because of the power of the institution, poststructural thinkers like Foucault acknowledge but also question the “‘sovereign subject’ as the originary cause and governing intentionality of any action” (Felluga, 2015, p. 13). Intentional action, while carried out by independent actors, is always carried out within pre-existing understandings of action. In the words of Foucault, “Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power” (1978, p. 95-96). Foucault’s definition of subjectivity (assujettissement) means making a subject, making subject to, and in his later works, while he is still concerned with disciplinary practices (e.g., regulating schools, prisons, sexuality), instead of focusing on how they promote normalization, he concerns himself with how they are used in resisting normalization: “he turns to the subjects’ relationship to her self, her own subjectivity” (Feder, 2011, p. 67). McGushin (2011) states, “In the activity of seeking and discovering my self, my attention is entirely directed toward the self as the object being sought, as that substance or essence that I discover and come to know” (p. 128). He continues:

…it is the activity through which the individual takes on this dynamic relationship to herself that establishes who she truly is. When we lose sight of this we start to accept a static, fixed idea of who and what we are, and then we are inclined to neglect the development of the active relationship, which is the real life and heart of subjectivity. (p. 129, emphasis in italics in the original)

Therefore, subjectivity is discursively constituted in power relations, the subject himself or herself being one of those relations of power.

Agency, then, becomes possible – and inevitable – within the contradictions and movements of discourse, which are performed through a subjectivity that is contradictory, constituted, and reconstituted within discourse (Weedon, 1997). Similarly, Holland et al. (1998) state, “the self is treated as always embedded in (social) practice, and is itself a kind of practice” (p. 28). They draw on Bakhtin’s (1981) theory of the authoring self to demonstrate what they call the “self-in-practice” (p. 32), which is mediated at the interface of social lives and embodied sources. Self-authoring theory also follows this
interdependent and dialogic activity of identity development, which affects individual agency and what individuals come to see themselves as doing through discourse. Self-authoring “occurs as ‘one’s own discourse is gradually and slowly wrought out of others’ words’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 345), that is, as individuals author their own identities through adopting discursive resources and practices” (Menard-Warwick et al., 2019, p. 112, emphasis in the original). Thus, agency (and subjectivity) is always constricted by, partly informed by, and must work with the agencies and subjectivities of others.

2.4. Critical theories in language studies and learning

Scholars of language studies and language education who research issues on globalization, language ideology, and language teaching discussed at the beginning of this chapter have been conducting critical research for over 30 years, mainly working from Critical Theory and postmodern constructionism discussed above (Kubota & Miller, 2017). The theoretical foundations of this language research works to understand power, examine the relation between theory and society, and construct social identities as multiple, fluid and dynamic. At the heart of the politics surrounding language education is how education reproduces and reflects social relations, but also resists, complicates, and responds to them (Bourdieu, 1977; Canagarajah, 1993, 1999; Giddens, 1984; Heath, 1983). The language classroom in particular is a site of struggle in which students and teachers appropriate, legitimize, and resist conventional social, cultural, and linguistic understandings that result in the marginalization of teachers and learners’ subjectivities. Critical theories of language and learning are most often found in the areas of critical discourse studies (CDS) / critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 1992; Foucault, 1971; Mills, 1997), critical pedagogy and critical literacy (Freire, 1970/1993; Luke, 1988), and theories of learning from critical psychology (Schraube, 2000) and critical Vygotskian sociocultural theory (Teemant, 2018; Teemant, Cen, & Wilson, 2015; Smagorinsky, 2018). Critical theorists and teacher-researchers extend first into functional conceptions of language – how we get things done with language (Austin, 1962) – and argue that both structural and functional theories of language are not neutral; instead, language has a
social history that constructs and is constructed by an array of inequitable power relationships at the intersection of social class, race, gender and sexuality (Norton, 1997). Crookes (2013) argues,

[Language can be seen as doing things (directly or indirectly) to society in general, and to learners (and their identities) in particular….as a tool, or indeed a weapon, sometimes used for social changes, and sometimes used against the weak. The integration of language with social matters is sometimes referred to as discourse processes, or sometimes just “discourse.”] (p. 87)

Therefore, critical theories as directed toward language and learning provide understandings of how language “helps or hinders a person from understanding (and acting on) the world” (Crookes, 2013, p. 87). In the rest of this chapter, I situate discourse, power, and subjectivity specifically within the fields of language planning and policy (LPP) and second language teacher education (SLTE), where this study is situated. I provide a literature review that surveys the scholarship on how the discourse of English for socioeconomic development in the Global South has specifically affected policy and planning decisions, language teacher education, and language pedagogy in low-income countries. I first synthesize the findings from critical and engaged language policy and planning (CLP, ELP), and then from the literature on critical second language teacher education (CSLTE). Since both these areas possess long histories of research, the review focuses specifically on the English language in CLP/ELP and CSLTE, largely in low-income countries. These reviews highlight trends, as well as issues and gaps in the research, and how my research addresses problems within both fields that have been little addressed, specifically limited descriptions of methodology and curriculum for CSTLE contexts in the Global South, and the lack of research on Global-North-Global-South partnerships in ELT and specifically CSLTE.

Critical second-language (L2) research covers a broad area and uses a vast range of methods, but all explicitly focus on discourse and ideology (Tollefson, 2011). I situate my research within the overlapping areas of CLP/ELP and CSLTE. CLP research attempts to build equitable and dialogic relations with those affected by policy, but does not necessarily focus on how teacher education interacts with policy, though this is the focus of some CLP researchers who work within ELP, and these works will
be discussed in Section 2.4.1.3. ELP is “engaged” CLP work on the part of the researcher who commits himself or herself as participant in the classroom and connected spaces, but the work in this area is recent and limited in scope. The field of CSLTE, on the other hand, has addressed problems presented by Critical Theory and critical pedagogy, and many of these problems emerge from curriculum, policy, and practice (Burns & Richards, 2009). As Savignon states, “Language teaching is inextricably tied to language policy. Viewed from a multicultural intranational as well as international perspective, diverse sociopolitical contexts mandate not only a diverse set of language learning goals, but a diverse set of teaching strategies” (Savignon, 1991, p. 265). Thus, while CLP research does not necessarily address CSLTE (though it can), CSLTE is inextricably connected to it. Because of these overlaps, it is difficult to separate the relevant literature to this research dissertation into two separate categories. Figure 2-1 below conceptualizes the overlap and summarizes research priorities in each area, based on Tollefson’s (2006) discussion of critical theory in language policy and Hawkins and Norton’s (2009) discussion of critical language teacher education.

**Figure 2-1: Overlap in CLP/ELP and CSLTE Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLP/ELP</th>
<th>CSLTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Uses critical/poststructural theories of power and discourse</td>
<td>- Uses tools from critical pedagogy (praxis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shows how implicit/explicit LPP maintains inequality</td>
<td>- Promotes teacher-learners’ critical awareness of and responsiveness to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aims at equitable LPP, especially minority language maintenance</td>
<td>- Advocates self-reflection of teacher-learners’ practices, identities and positioning in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not necessarily oriented to micro-level educational research</td>
<td>- Builds equitable, dialogic pedagogical relations between teacher-educator and teacher-learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Builds equitable, dialogic relations with those directly impacted by policy decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My aim for this review is to define both of these fields within their sociohistorical contexts, establish the dominant trends at the interface of these lines of research with a focus on English in low-income countries, demonstrate how they inform my research, and explain how my research extends work at the CLP-CSLTE interface.

2.4.1. Literature review: Critical and Engaged Language Policy

Critical Theory and poststructural thought have influenced LPP research since the 1970s and more prominently through the 1990s during the broader “critical turn” in applied linguistics, starting with the emergence of Critical Language Policy (CLP). Tollefson (2006) defines CLP as an approach to LPP that sees policies as maintaining social inequality and as following the interests of dominant groups. CLP aims for the creation of democratic policies, especially policies promoting minority language maintenance. Drawing on the work of Bourdieu (1984, 1991), Foucault (1978, 1982, 1991), Gramsci (1971, 1988), Habermas (1985, 1987), as well as other postmodern, postcolonial, and feminist scholars, CLP research opposes positivist approaches that distance researchers from the so-called “subjects” of their research and claim objectivity in analysis (Tollefson, 2006, p. 43), and it advocates that the people most affected by language policy should have a large role in making policy decisions, including teachers and students (D. C. Johnson, 2013). As quoted from Tollefson (2006), key ideas used from Critical Theory include the following:

- a focus on power in policy-making as a process between social structure and individual agency, including how hegemony and ideology work to marginalize certain individuals
- a Marxist conceptualization of different socioeconomic classes, ethnolinguistic groups, and genders as having “fundamentally incompatible interests,” while the dominant class controls its own interests through policy that affects everyone else (Tollefson, 2006, p. 46)
- an alignment with Habermas’ (1975) legitimation crisis, which sees a process of colonization developing as individuals’ familial and cultural identities “are increasingly encroached on by capitalism,” for example, the global spread of English and its connected language policies as imposing economic order (Phillipson, 1992). (Tollefson, 2006, pp. 46-48)

These concerns of CLP emerge from the socio-historical roots of LPP, rooted in colonial and post-colonial efforts to regulate language use in accordance with nationhood, beginning from when the
emerging nations of Africa gained independence from Western European control and had to confront the problem of regulating languages for the state, government, and education (Errington, 2001; Kamwangamalu, 2013; Makoni, 2013; Ricento, 2012). Western linguists using descriptive methods began to study and assist in decisions on official language policies, which often caused the status of local languages to continue to be marginalized in relation to the colonizers’ languages (Abdelhay, Makoni, & Makoni, 2016; Makoni, 2013). D. C. Johnson (2013) synthesizes language policy definitions from Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), McCarty (2011), Schiffman (1996), Spolsky (2004), and Tollefson (1991) to define it as “a policy mechanism that impacts the structure, function, use, or acquisition of language” (D. C. Johnson, 2013, p. 9), and that guides institutions, work environments, and education. LPP takes many forms, including official written documentation; unofficial understandings settled in language beliefs and practices “that determine and direct language use and interaction” (D. C. Johnson, 2013, p. 9); and macro- and micro-level processes, regardless of documents or practices, through which individuals move, especially concerning the holistic event of designing, interpreting, adopting, administering, and even resisting policy (D. C. Johnson, 2013). Language policies can be top-down (developed by government or authoritative body) or bottom-up (generated for and by people directly affected by it); have overt or covert goals; be de jure (explicit, official, legally-binding documentation) or de facto (implicit policies or people practicing without an official policy text) (D. C. Johnson, 2013). Planning also can serve different functions: corpus planning (related to the form and structure of languages and literacies), status planning (related to functions of languages and literacies in a speech community), and acquisition planning (related to improving opportunities to learn language and literacy), or some combination of the three (Hornberger, 2006).

Tollefson (2006) acknowledges the work of CLP researchers such as Moore (2002) and Pennycook (2002), who apply the notion of governmentality (Foucault, 1991) to move away from macro-level analyses of “…domination and exploitation by the state and capitalist market to the indirect acts of governing that shape individual and group language behavior” (p. 42). They examine the micro-level
techniques, practices, rationales, and strategies of agents like politicians, state and local government administrators, school administrators, and educators. Pennycook (2002), for example, questions why mother-tongue preservation and maintenance is the anchor for most language policies (traditional and critical), as promotion of the mother-tongue was frequently a strategy of colonial language policy in order to maintain power and the obedience of colonized peoples. He argues that the critical policy analyses of scholars like Phillipson (1992) and Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) to maintain the mother-tongue in the face of the global spread of English in fact argue for the same language maintenance as former racist governors and school masters of colonized states, many of whom kept English education out of schools for fear of not being able to control the populations. Thus, “On the one hand, very similar sounding arguments in favor of mother-tongue education have been made from radically different political orientations; and on the other, quite different arguments about mother-tongue education may be made to support quite similar political orientations” (Pennycook, 2002, p. 24). He draws on Foucault’s work on governmentality to demonstrate that it was not always national- or state-based policy, but instead “an array of technologies of government” (Rose, 1996, p. 42), like local schools and municipalities, that promoted mother-tongue maintenance in colonial and post-colonial contexts. This protectionism of the mother tongue, he argues, allowed colonial powers to enact an “exoticizing gaze” on the “Oriental” and “indigenous” Other (p. 20), echoing Spivak’s (2010) argument regarding “museumizing” cultures (p. 2125) – preserving culture and identity in order to preserve subalternity and division. Ultimately, Pennycook argues that it is imperative to understand the complexity of the different contexts in which English and other languages are supported, and that if there is any way forward beyond this contradictory dichotomy of English-or-mother-tongue, it is to “disinvent” the construct of languages as separate systems (see Makoni, 1998; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007), which have only served to divide. However, despite over 30 years of critical research in LPP, “monolingual and assimilationist ideologies continue to inform policy and practice” (Kubota & Miller, 2017).
2.4.1.1. Ethnography in CLP

While governmentality is promising for moving past macro-level, national and state policy decisions toward valuing micro-level contexts and discourses, this work tends to remain at the genealogical level of interpretation, conducting historical discourse analyses on past policy documents and other texts that highlight the construction of myths and assumptions that assist in government control. This research remains largely outside of present-day institutional interactions, like classrooms, professional development workshops, and second language teacher education (SLTE) programs. Davis (1999) argues that critical approaches like those described above do not capture the language planning processes in which individuals take part, from creation, interpretation, and appropriation or resistance. She argues that an ethnographic approach provides a thick description of these processes in schools and communities. Therefore, a combined methodological approach to CLP using ethnographic fieldwork provides a way to connect to the daily social activities and subjectivities that develop within a particular policy process. While there are many ethnographic studies within CLP (see Canagarajah, 2006, for an extensive summary), there is little applied study on policy processes researched specifically in light of second language teachers’ practices or in SLTE programs in the Global South. The literature review below that does work at the CLP-CSLTE interface uses ethnographic or critical discourse analytic approaches.

Early researchers in CLP conducted ethnographic research in schools around the world to document ground-up change, like Canagarajah (1995, 1999, Sri Lanka), Davis (1994, Luxembourg); Hornberger (1988, Peru); McCarty (2004, Southwestern United States); Smith (1999, New Zealand); and Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1995; Solomon Islands). However, D. C. Johnson (2013) distinguishes between research that provides policy implications and research that focuses explicitly on policy processes. He states, “…there is a difference between research on multilingualism, multilingual education, and interactional norms that proffers language policy implications and research that focuses squarely on language policy processes, emerges from the LPP literature, asks language policy research
questions, incorporates policy text and discourse as units of analysis, and presents findings about language policy, specifically” (D. C. Johnson, 2013, p. 43-44).

To provide one example of a study that derives implications for LPP, Canagarajah’s (1995) research on teachers’ codeswitching in Sri Lankan ESL classrooms addresses the implicit “hidden curriculum” (p. 175) that guides many teachers and students’ negative views of using the first language (L1) in the second-language (L2) classroom. This implicit policy stemmed from training that dictated a no-tolerance understanding of classroom code-switching, contradicting the social life experienced in the larger multilingual context of Sri Lanka, formerly under British colonial rule until 1948 and, at the time of publication, under the rule of the militant group Liberation Tigers, who promoted nationwide Tamil-only policy. Therefore, in the larger community “[t]he linguistic, psychological, and social conflicts of the community are reconciled through codeswitching activity, since it enables them to subtly use English (and claim the values and identities it symbolizes) in a largely Tamil matrix or base (which assures vernacular solidarity)” (p. 176). At the time of the study, English language policy in schools had changed from the colonial English-medium education to a separate ESL subject beginning in the third grade and ending in eleventh grade, taught in the vernacular and inconsistently implemented.

Canagarajah found that teachers used many different types of codeswitching while teaching and were largely unaware of doing so until hearing recordings of themselves. Teachers preferred an English-only classroom environment and many were apologetic for using Tamil in the classroom, despite that their classroom usage reflected the macro-functions of codeswitching that occurred widely in Sri Lanka. “Pure” English was only used in formal classroom procedures, so students did not acquire the English needed to communicate outside of these tasks. Therefore, classroom codeswitching aligned with communicative pedagogues’ beliefs that language teaching should take into account the specific contexts of the communities in which students live, including the language policies that guide those communities. Canagarajah ends with implications about questioning the privileging of separate languages (as opposed to codeswitching and other mixing) in applied linguistics, as well as the importance of developing
culturally relevant methodologies for the English classroom, including confronting the hesitance of using the L1 in the language classroom.

An ethnography that explicitly focuses on in-service teachers as agents in the policy-making process is Skilton-Sylvester (2003), who – like Canagarajah – argue that teachers can use students’ L1 as a learning resource for L2 acquisition, even when language policies are quite prohibitory. Skilton-Sylvester’s research on English-only ESL instruction for speakers of Khmer in Philadelphia demonstrates that teachers can still integrate Khmer language and culture as a classroom resource despite legal policies that guide the program which do not support bilingualism and biliteracy. At the same time, however, ethnographies have shown how the macro-structures of policy and the sociopolitics of larger society restrict in-service teachers’ agency. Palmer and Lynch (2008), for example, demonstrate how bilingual elementary teachers in Texas are so restricted by the testing requirements of No Child Left Behind policy that they must forgo bilingual, Spanish-English instruction in order to prepare students for the language they will be exposed to when students take the tests, either completely in Spanish or English.

2.4.1.2. Ethnography of Language Policy and CDA

Since the studies described above, CLP researchers have systematically linked critical analysis of micro-level educational practices with macro-level language policies and ideology. Hornberger and Johnson (2007) developed the ethnography of language policy and planning (ELPP) as “a method and theory for examining the agents, contexts, and processes across the multiple layers of language policy creation, interpretation, and appropriation” (D. C. Johnson, 2013, p. 44). Partly inspired by the ethnographic research traditions of Hymes’ (1974) ethnography of communication and Fishman’s (1964, 1991) research on language revitalization, ELPP is well suited for classroom-based (and teacher-workshop-based) research that aims to understand the teacher’s role in interpreting, enacting, and resisting implicit and explicit language policy (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). ELPP theorizes power and discourse from a critical theoretical lens, acknowledging the agency of participants in shaping and
enacting policy decisions. ELPP can “open up ideological spaces that allow for egalitarian dialogue and discourses that promote social justice and sound educational practice” (D. C. Johnson, 2013, p. 44).

D. C. Johnson (2007, 2009) provides one of the first studies using ELPP, focusing on Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act within bilingual education in the School District of Philadelphia 2. His study ran from 2002–2006, and he collected ethnographic data – including participant-observation, field notes, and interviews with teachers, administrators and federal policy makers in Pennsylvania – on “a series of action-oriented research projects on language policy and bilingual education program development with teachers and administrators” (2009, p. 143) who were part of a Spanish–English dual language program. Johnson then compared his ethnographic data with critical discourse analyses (CDA) of federal, state, and local language policy and discourse.

D. C. Johnson (2009) proposes a methodological heuristic similar to Activity Theory (Engeström, 1987) to guide his ELPP project: “one must consider the (1) agents, (2) goals, (3) processes, and (4) discourses which engender and perpetuate the policy, and (5) the dynamic social and historical contexts in which the policy exists, keeping in mind that these categories are neither static nor mutually exclusive” (p. 144). For his 2009 article, D.C. Johnson focuses on two administrators as agents who were involved in interpretation and appropriation of the top–down policy of No Child Left Behind and the creation of local language policies. Despite the English-centered wording of Title III, and the required changing of the name of her office from the Office of Bilingual Education to the Office of English Language Acquisition, one of the two administrators demonstrated high levels of interpretation of the policy and agency to promote bilingual education within the policy. Not caring what they called her office, she cared much more that she still was able to access funds for bilingual education, paying attention to what the policy omitted in order to continue her agenda for bilingual education in her school district. Because of his analysis using CDA, Johnson was able to demonstrate how this one policy was “appropriated in contradictory ways, leading to the problematic result that a singular de jure policy is actually multiple de facto language policies” (D.C. Johnson, 2009, p. 154). By using a combination of ethnographic methods
and CDA, Johnson moves beyond conventional CLP approaches that “obfuscate agency and perpetuate
the reification of policy as necessarily monolithic, intentional, and fascistic” (p. 155), and that miss the
local micro-level practices that allow for alternative discourses to emerge and the potential for social
change to occur. Because one aim of ELPP is to analyze how the discursive contexts of language-policy
decision-making processes influence local interpretation, appropriation, or resistance, ELPP provides
CLP with empirical data to support or refute its historical-structural claims. Johnson argues,

Because a lot of language policy analysis is, essentially, discourse analysis, it behooves the field
to establish more disciplined forms of language policy discourse analysis…[I]n order to make
claims about macro policy goals, and establish links between language policy and language
education practice, disciplined discourse analysis is essential. (D. C. Johnson, 2009, p. 151)

Policy discourse includes both spoken interaction (meetings, workshops, interviews) and the
material text of the language policy. He proposes CDA as an important addition to ethnographic policy
research, and the review of his work in Philadelphia schools above exemplifies the necessary linkages
CDA makes between macro-level policy discourse and micro-level policy-making practice, a process that
Fairclough (1989) refers to as orders of discourse.

Outside of D. C. Johnson’s research, however, CDA coupled with ethnography in language
policy has been a rare methodological approach⁸. CDA and ethnographic approaches have much in
common, and in CLP both sides illuminate issues about policy processes that neither can do alone. He
continues that ELPP “…should include both critical analyses of local, state, and national policy texts and
discourses as well as data collection on how such policy texts and discourses are interpreted and
appropriated by agents in a local context” (D. C. Johnson, 2009, p. 142).

---

⁸ But see Koyama and Chang (2019) on teaching English to refugees in Arizona in light of national immigration and
state education policies; see also Rogers (2011) for a longitudinal study in general (but not language) education
combining CDA and ethnography to analyze educational-tracking documents of an African-American high-schooler
labeled as a special education student.
2.4.1.3. Engaged Language Policy

Arguing from the field of anthropology during the larger “critical turn” of the 1990s, Rappaport (1993) laments the solely descriptive ethnographic work that demonstrates disinterest in “the application of anthropology to the solution of real world problems” (p. 295). Lamphere (2004) echoes this lamentation, but states that anthropologists have been moving from the conventional practice of being an outside expert studying “others” to collaborator with those whom they research, “…giving much attention to how community members can shape a research agenda and become equal participants and how anthropologists can help build the skills and capacities of local populations through their participation in the research process” (p. 431). Rappaport calls for an engaged anthropology that “…is not confined to research but also necessarily includes planning, advocacy, and information dissemination….” (1993, p. 302), and Lamphere calls attention to increased partnerships, expanded public outreach, and attempts to influence policy as ways in which engagement is enacted. Based in Rappaport and Lamphere’s concerns, Davis (2014) and Davis and Phyak (2017) have since developed the approach Engaged Language Policy and Practices (ELP) to research how “participants and researchers collectively engage in transforming complex discriminatory language ideologies and practices, especially in peripheral communities of marginalized populations” (Davis & Phyak, 2017, p. 39). They highlight the role of the researcher as part of the research in order to provide participants “engaged space for achieving agency through resistance to global and local hegemonic ideologies” (p. 39). They enter this transformational cycle at the level of discourse, arguing for the imperative that researchers and practitioners examine local and global discourses on their lived experience:

While public sphere ideologies are constructed through ‘authoritative discourses’ such as state policies, counter-public sphere ideologies represent ‘internationally persuasive discourses’ toward countering harmful dominant discourses (Bakhtin, 1981). The authoritative discourses support standard language and monolingual ideologies that are unquestionable taken for granted and provide no room for alternative discourses. On the
other hand, internally persuasive discourses embrace grassroots language practices and ideologies. (p. 15-16)

ELP embraces the Freirean (1970/1993) notion of praxis to be developed in partnership with teachers to reflect on policy circumstances and take ownership of their pedagogy. Praxis, an inseparable unit of reflection-action (see Section 2.5.1.), is the process through which people come to know: “The act of knowing involves a dialectical movement which goes from action to reflection and from reflection upon action to a new action” (Freire, 1970/1993, p. 13). This knowledge is always incomplete because as soon as people move through the process of reflection-action, they create a new position or footing, which, in turn, must be known through perceiving, reflecting, and acting (Crawford-Lange, 1981).

Davis’ work (Davis, Cho, Ishida, Soria, & Bazzi, 2005; Davis, 2009) with students in Hawai’i models “engaged” policy work that begins with relationship-building between researcher and participants, builds partnerships to challenge policy, and ends with policy change. She draws on Fine’s (2006) ethnographic democratic engagement approach, placing participants “at the center of explorations and liberating transformation” (Davis & Phyak, 2017, p. 60). Davis draws on postmodern and multilingual theories, as well as critical and participatory research methods, to design a program at a high school attended by Filipino, Samoan, and Hawaiian students. Obtaining a grant through U.S. Department of Education (DOE) funding from 2001-2006, Davis and colleagues created an elective program for students called Studies of Heritage and Academic Languages and Literacies (SHALL), which provided interactive courses in students’ home or heritage languages, Pidgin and Hawai’ian English Creole; academic language studies in English, Samoan, and Ilokano; and technology literacy. Students reflected on their multiple home, community, and school identities; conducted language analyses to develop metalinguistic skills; and produced a number of research projects, like interviewing community members, in order to develop academic English abilities. The result of this engagement was substantial: “Compared to the national public average of high school graduate rate of slightly more than 50 percent for marginalized
student populations … all SHALL student participants graduated from high school, and nearly 90 percent went on to community colleges and universities” (Davis & Phyak, 2017, p. 73).

Only a handful of studies have emerged in recent years that bring ELP to the periphery of low-income countries impacted by English policies. These studies tend to be conducted by in-group researchers who are from the area and who identify ethnolinguistically with their participants. They also tend to work with not just English and the majority language of the country, but also minority language maintenance. Phyak (2016) and colleagues have been the most recent figures in ELP in low-income, peripheral countries to take up the call to work with teachers and do so in a theoretically and methodologically sound attempt at praxis. Bui (2018), Phyak (2016), Phyak and Bui (2014), and Sharma and Phyak (2017), as native scholars and educators of their home countries of Nepal (Phyak and Sharma) and Vietnam (Bui), possess an insider status that allows them to build trust and relationships bound in the same ethnolinguistic identities and histories. Bui (2018) highlights the importance of critical researchers to have strong ties to the places and peoples that constitute their research: “Engaged research is considered an always ‘in-motion’ approach wherein the researchers have strong ties with the land, people, and the socio-political and educational issues (Davis, Phyak, & Bui, 2012) of their research settings taking a research activist role to collectively work with participants” (p. 280). Their work can assist critically engaged scholars from the Global North in finding the emotional-intellectual, conceptual and practical tools necessary to engage in critical, productive ELT partnerships in the Global South.

Phyak and Bui (2014) and Bui (2018) look at the context of EFL policies in their respective countries of Nepal and Vietnam, where minority youth speak an indigenous L1, Nepali or Vietnamese as an L2, and now learn English as an L3 starting from the first grade in Nepal and the third grade in Vietnam. While English is taught in Vietnamese in Vietnam, there is an increasing push to use English as the medium of instruction in Nepal. Minority students face challenges learning English because they say that it is difficult, very different from their L1 and L2, and impractical; therefore, the English language policies in both countries affect minority student motivation and create anxiety and ambivalence.
Insufficient teacher education and teacher resources also play a role in driving inequality. In their research, they argue for the repositioning of youth as “creative and responsible agents in language and education research” who take a central role in resisting and changing language policy. Bui’s (2018) engaged ethnography with minority students led to teachers’ departing from the official curriculum to meet the needs of youth, thus impacting the classroom layer of LPP. For Phyak (Phyak & Bui, 2014), not only did the engaged ethnography lead to increased awareness among students and teachers, but also among parents and politicians. Phyak was invited to give a talk at the Limbu Students’ Forum (LSF) at Tribhuvan University and while there, learned that Limbu language classes would be initiated for local students.

The very little work conducted by out-group members of the community also works with in-service teachers and not pre-service teachers. Coelho and Henze (2014) and Henze and Coelho (2013) engage with secondary teachers in rural Nicaragua who must teach English under a long-standing foreign language policy requiring five years of English at the secondary school level. The Nicaraguan teachers in their publications know little English and work with limited resources, as is the case throughout many countries in the Global South. Both the 2013 chapter and the 2014 article are not research, as the authors state they did not receive IRB approval and saw their work as practice and not research. While the two manuscripts do not report research, they provide descriptive, reflective accounts of a partnership between a Nicaraguan NGO that administers secondary education in rural areas and a small group of faculty and students affiliated with San José State University (SJSU). The NGO sought this partnership because it needed to implement the teaching of English into the already-established content curriculum for rural secondary teachers. I was a member of this SJSU group and spent substantial time working with teachers in Nicaragua both before and after the publications of my colleagues.

Henze and Coelho (2013) provide a thoughtful description of our partnerships with rural teachers. They draw on Critical Theory, but aside from a brief reference to critical pedagogy with two Freirean-based (1970/1993) concepts of problem-posing and conscientization, they do not detail the theory and
praxis behind the activities, dialogues, and reflections they promoted in teacher education workshops with teachers. When they do provide descriptions, many of the activities are not so much critical as they are pre-conceived activities brought to – not developed with – the teachers, many to which I contributed. With that mentioned, there were brief periods in our visits that made a space for local teachers to participate in the development of our workshops. For example, on one occasion, we invited a couple of the teacher leaders to our hotel one night to plan activities for the following days’ workshops, taking into consideration their expertise, ideas, opinions, and needs. Discussed in Section 2.2.2. below regarding critical pedagogy and critical SLTE, the lack of documentation of the processes of critical dialogue and practice is an area that needs to be addressed (Crookes, 2013). My colleagues provide helpful descriptions from fieldnotes and some quotes from teachers, but the detail related to praxis – how they and the teachers demonstrate a reflexivity and action in their work together regarding the sociopolitical issues of English that they problematize – is not present in their discussion, nor is it clear how their partnership with teachers really engaged with and possibly even resisted the secondary school English policy behind why these rural teachers had to teach English in the first place. As Nicaraguan researcher and educator Chávez (2006) notes in Section 2.5.2.1. below, because there is such little authoritative control over what teachers actually do in Nicaragua, especially in more remote areas, teachers are actually quite free to interpret policy in the way that they want, teach what and how they want, relatively unimpeded by school authorities.

In their second publication, Coelho and Henze (2014) thoroughly describe many teacher education activities that we conducted with teachers, including a macro-level comparative analysis that teachers did to draw attention to similar situations facing English teachers in other low-income countries. Coelho and Henze then conducted micro-level analyses of English usage with the Nicaraguan teachers with whom they worked in teacher education workshops. Coelho and Henze draw on field notes, our participation in workshop activities with teachers, and teacher responses to a questionnaire, activities which they call an “engaged form of language inquiry and dialogic process” (p. 146). Stemming from
their questioning of the importance and relevance of English for rural Nicaraguans’ lives, they state that they remain “unconvinced” that rural areas need English (p. 150); however, as I discuss in the introduction chapter to this dissertation, it is not our right to be convinced of what marginalized individuals need for their education, fulfillment, and integrity. As our heritage as Global-North-based English scholars and educators is saturated by domination, disrespect, and inequality towards the Global South, if we claim to be critical educators, we need to respect our Nicaraguan colleagues’ dreams, imaginings, and rights to access English, while at the same time offering our knowledge and partnership in order to critique its relevance in their lives. It is not about either party convincing the other; it is about a synthesis of ideas and experiences that can move us toward change and greater social justice.

Furthermore, Coelho and Henze (2014) claim,

> By participating in active spaces for problem posing, dialogue, action, and reflection, rural teachers are beginning to question the realities and myths surrounding the global uses of English and to take a more critical and practical stance toward the English education policy. (p. 146)

An important detail left out of the descriptions of our partnership in these articles is that our visits as a team were extremely short (7-10 days on average) and actual workshop times with teachers – often the only time spent with them – even shorter (1-3 days). Substantial time – even years – passed between each of the total of just four visits. While critical consciousness-raising activities about global English and teaching English certainly occurred, and the teachers seemed to appreciate these activities, teachers had little time to process them and we had little time to dialogue with them. After our quick, transitory, connection to their lives (some teachers had to travel hours by bus to these workshops and, although later reimbursed by the NGO, had to front the funds for their own travel and lodging, a tremendously difficult expectation for the average Nicaraguan teacher to meet), teachers had to return to difficult teaching and learning situations where much, if not all, of what we did with teachers likely was soon forgotten or just hard to implement, especially with no continued emotional-intellectual support to do so. As many critically-engaged scholars rightly note, critical engagement is difficult, long-term work (Appleby et al,
that Coelho and Henze espouse (our continued return to the same area of Nicaragua and with some of the same teachers over the years) is one element of Coelho and Henze’s work that too many research and practice-based partnerships in the Global South lack. That we committed to continuing to visit teachers and trying to build our work together through years is a practice that I have not found in the review of other relevant literature. My critique of their (and my) work is not to downplay the important, meaningful work of my colleagues that certainly empowered and motivated local teachers in different ways. Coelho and Henze are ethically-minded, experienced, globally-aware scholars whose work points to a number of issues regarding LPP and SLTE on the periphery, and I have learned and grown as a critical scholar because of them. In the spirit of criticality, I reflect on our work and learn from it to better inform my research study.

2.4.1.4. Concluding the CLP/ELP review

The studies described above work at empowering students and in-service teachers. Looking into this line of research, I found little-to-no research on pre-service teacher education. However, few teacher education programs exist in periphery countries (though this is changing), so it makes sense that there is such little research on them. While CLP (and ELP) has opened much-needed critique of LPP practices and actively made steps toward equal and democratic policy processes, it also has been critiqued for some of its shortcomings, including “being too deterministic and underestimating the power of human agency…and not capturing the processes of language planning” (D. C. Johnson, 2013, p. 42). D. C. Johnson furthers that while CLP research, especially work that focuses on governmentality of the classroom, importantly has begun to address the micro-level aspects of teacher and student interactions and discourses, it still places little value on the agency of teachers and learners to affect language policy and planning processes. Furthermore, the use of CDA in CLP is not without criticism. CDA has many critics (e.g., Blommaert, 2005; Schegloff, 1997; Widdowson, 1995, 1998), and I align with many of the
concerns that they express. Many critics argue that the goal of CDA to make social change is “its most damaging feature” (Hammersly, 1997, p. 244). Hammersly continues:

It aims to achieve a very great deal more than other kinds of discourse analysis. Not only does it claim to offer an understanding of discursive processes, but also of society as a whole, and what is wrong with it, and of how it can and should be changed. As a result, it faces all the methodological problems with which more conventional kinds of research have to deal, plus many others as well…. (Hammersly, 1997, p. 244-245)

This is where, I argue, research on critical pedagogy and critical second language teacher education connects to policy concerns in observable ways that can be documented and not assumed. This work often draws on ethnographic methods. Within that literature, as reviewed in Section 2.4.2. below, teacher identity and agency play important roles in resisting and shaping planning and policy decisions.

2.4.2. Literature review: Critical second language teacher education

SLTE in itself was not an active area of research until the 1990s, starting with Richards and Nunan’s (1990) edited volume on areas that included classroom issues, program and curriculum design, practicum models, and reflective teaching as research-based practices for SLTE programs. This was a significant change from the short-term, skills-based and atheoretical positions on L2 teaching, moving SLTE toward a teacher education model that was cognition-based (Borg, 2006; Tsui, 2011) and influenced by Vygotskian and other sociocultural theories (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; K. E. Johnson, 1999; Lantolf, 2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991). This contributed to more explicit calls for rethinking the knowledge base of SLTE away from students as language learners to teachers as learners of language teaching (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). The scope of SLTE evolved, then to include the following:

(a) the nature of the teacher-learner; (b) the nature of schools and schooling; and (c) the nature of language teaching, in which we include pedagogical thinking and activity, the subject matter and the content, and language learning. Taken together, these domains outline a systemic view of the knowledge-base that emphasizes their constant and critical interdependence…. This view stands
in contrast to the binary distinction between subject matter and learners on which most discussions of language teaching and language teacher education have been based…. a basically transmission view of language teaching and learning. (Freeman & Johnson, 1998, p. 405-406)

Since the 1990s, research into SLTE has concerned itself with not only what teachers need to know to teach language, but also with the teacher as a “whole person in action, acting with the setting of that activity [of teaching]” (Lave, 1988, p. 17). Tsui (2011) summarizes the four major strands of SLTE research that emerged from this period: teacher cognition, teacher knowledge, teacher learning and professional development, and teacher identity. Especially important to this research study are the areas of teacher learning and professional development, as well as teacher identity.

Teacher learning and professional development has looked at pre- and in-service teachers as reflective practitioners, researchers, and experts (Tsui, 2011). Understanding teachers’ trajectories is the central component of SLTE (K. E. Johnson, 2009), as teachers – like all professionals – continue learning throughout their profession as teacher-learners (Freeman, 2009). As regards teachers as reflective practitioners, Tsui (2011) cites Dewey (1933) as the first to propose reflective action as part of the teacher profession to argue that teachers do not just passively carry out curriculum mandates, but also have the potential to change curriculum. Schön (1983) continued this understanding by arguing that instead of “technical experts,” the architects and other professionals that he studied are “reflective practitioners” that come to new understandings of themselves, their practices, and their apprentices or students through the process of reflective practice (p. 332). In SLTE programs, reflective journaling, among other assignments, is now common and encompasses past experiences with language learning and teaching (Bailey et al., 1996), as well as reflections on team-teaching or other practicum assignments (Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Knezevic & Scholl, 1996).

Another strand of research in SLTE, teachers as experts, emerged in the 1980s and 1990s from “…the need to understand the special forms of knowledge that are as complex and sophisticated as those possessed by experts in other professions” (Tsui, 2011, p. 31). Such studies demonstrated that, as do
experts in other professions, expert teachers are much more skilled in several areas than are novice teachers, including possession of “a complex but integrated and coherently structured knowledge base,” the ability to quickly recognize and interpret meanings, the ability to improvise and “handle complex tasks with apparent automaticity and effortlessness, principled justification for what they do in the classroom, and the possession of better self-monitoring and meta-cognitive skills (Tsui, 2011, p. 31). Studies in this area take a sociocultural perspective and also conceive expertise as a process (Bullough & Baughman, 1995, 1997; K. E. Johnson, 2009; Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Tsui, 2003), instead of a static understanding of expertise as “effortless, efficient, and automatic” (Tsui, 2011, p. 32). A sociocultural understanding shows that expertise is a constant process of becoming, a striving for more knowledge and understanding, and a space of struggle as teachers work “at the edge of their competence” (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993, p. 34).

Teacher identity has become an imperative line of research in SLTE, as it is central to teacher learning and development (Burns & Richards, 2009; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Golombek & Johnson, 2011; K. E. Johnson, 2006, 2009; Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Tsui, 2007, 2011). The identities of teacher-learners encompass the various social and cultural roles that are performed with their professors, their peers, and the students with whom they interact in practicum settings (Burns & Richards, 2009). In this line of research, “…identity is not just relational (i.e., how one talks or thinks about oneself, or how others talk or think about one), it is also experiential (i.e., it is formed from one’s lived experience)” (Tsui, 2011, p. 33), and thus begins to form long before a teacher’s pre- and in-service work (Zhang, 2016). Identity is also discursively constructed and highly dependent on social, cultural, and political contexts (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Morgan, 2004; Singh & Richards, 2006).

One important area of research on teacher identity in the context of SLTE is the native-speaker (NS) and non-native-speaker (NNS) dichotomy that has been discursively constructed within the process of English language teaching worldwide. Although non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) make up the majority of English teachers worldwide (Canagarajah, 2005), Burns and Richards (2009)
poignantly point out that “…untrained native speakers teaching EFL overseas [e.g., international volunteers] are sometimes credited with an identity they are not really entitled to (the ‘native speaker as expert syndrome’), finding that they have a status and credibility that they would not normally achieve in their own country” (p. 5). At the same time, NNESTs worldwide are positioned unequally to native English-speaking teachers (NESTs), and these issues emerge in pre-service courses (Kamhi-Stein, 2009), as well as in-service teaching work (Reis, 2011), including focusing on student attitudes (Moussu & Braine, 2006) and language proficiency and self-perception (Medgyes, 1994; Tang, 1997). This area of research transitions SLTE into the critical realm of conflict, struggle and resistance regarding teacher identity. Reis (2011) draws on Davies and Harré’s (1990) notion of positioning as a helpful conceptual tool to understand these conflicts:

Because discourse is always embedded in relations of power, individuals at times choose to willingly take on certain subject positions and freely reject others but, conversely, are sometimes ascribed certain subject positions which they do not value, claim, or desire. For NNESTs, to say that identities are negotiated within power relations means that NNESTs’ professional legitimacy is eroded to the extent that disempowering discourses (such as the NS myth) that position them as illegitimate professionals remain unchallenged. Thus, in many contexts, qualified NNESTs are positioned as less able professionals than native English-speaking teachers (NESTs). (p. 33)

Nonnative English-speaking teachers’ professional identity has been researched in a variety of contexts, and Zhang (2016) has provided a thorough literature review on this area, though most of it concerns identity in SLTE programs in center-country contexts. Providing a critical orientation to NNESTs in the U.S. pre-service-teaching context, Reis (2011) provides a case study based in Vygotskian sociocultural theory that confronts the deficit view of non-native English-speaking teachers NNESTs. However, in the context of pre- and in-service teacher education in peripheral areas of low-income countries, the research on NNESTs taking part in CSLTE programs is less robust, and Zhang’s review is indicative of this, prominently citing research on TESOL students in programs and practicums in the
United States (e.g., Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Park, 2012; Pasternak & Bailey, 2004). Since such professional programs – be it short-term training or long-term degrees – are uncommon in low-income countries (see this chapter, Section 2.4.2.2.), this is understandable. The research found in this area is primarily conducted by scholars who represent the ethno-linguistic population that they study (e.g., see Bui, 2018; Canagarajah, 1993, 1999; Phyak, 2016; Phyak & Bui, 2014), and their dedication and knowledge have invaluably enriched this small but growing sub-area of research, and can help Global-North outsider scholars create and maintain better partnerships with Global-South colleagues.

2.4.2.1. Critical Pedagogy for CSLTE

Critical SLTE (CSLTE), according to Hawkins and Norton (2009), functions from certain approaches and practices that are guided by the Frankfurt school of Critical Theory, especially the work of Habermas (1985, 1987) and critical pedagogy (CP), notably the work of Freire (1970/1993, 1992, 1998). CSLTE research explores the workings of power in discourse as it affects subjectivity, positionality, and agency of teachers and students in navigating and resisting implicit and explicit pedagogy, planning, and policy decisions (Canagarajah, 1999; Cook, 1999, 2001; Crookes & Lehner, 1998; Davis, 1999; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Hawkins, 2004; Hornberger, 1988; Johnson, 1999; Morgan, 1998; Norton & Toohey, 2004; Pennycook, 1994, 2001, 2002; Rajagopalan, 1999; Ramanathan, 1999; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996; Tollefson, 1991, 1995; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1995). These researchers examine the relation between theory and society, specifically language classrooms, and construct teacher and learner identities as multiple, fluid and dynamic as they respond to explicit and implicit policies. In order to confront, resist, and change the systemic policies that influence their teaching, teachers must learn to take a critical educator stance. A language educator who is critical is committed to social justice and equity (Kubota & Miller, 2017). He or she does not teach language as a neutral system for meaning-making, but instead reflects and acts on the ideologies that emerge in the classroom and larger connected contexts in order to empower themselves and their learners with the linguistic and cultural knowledge and capabilities to succeed in society (Burns & Richards, 2009).
Confronting conventional and neutral practices of language teaching, Critical ELT (CELT) is an important element and goal of CSLTE. CELT emerged from a concern about research in second language acquisition (SLA) that teaching does not improve second language learning for all learners because L2 learning resources (human and otherwise) are not equally distributed and do not respond to a number of students’ needs (Crookes, 2013; Hawkins & Norton, 2009). CELT is informed by the praxis of critical theory and critical pedagogy (Burns & Richards, 2009; Hawkins & Norton, 2009). The critical pedagogue Ira Shor (1992) defines critical pedagogy (CP) to encompass

Habits of thought, reading, writing, and speaking which go beneath surface meaning, first impressions, dominant myths, official pronouncements, traditional clichés, received wisdom, and mere opinions, to understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences of any action, event, object, process, organization, experience, text, subject matter, policy, mass media, or discourse. (p. 129)

CP is associated with educators like Freire (1970/1993), Gadotti (1980, 1983, 1996), and Giroux (1983, 1990). Opposed to what he called the “banking model” of education, where students are passive learners of transmitted information from teachers, which is then stored in their minds (like depositing money in a bank), Freire promoted an existential/humanist pedagogy which expressed the dual nature of person and life situation, views evolving from influences from existentialism, phenomenology, Marxism, and Christianity. This dual nature of person and life situation means that the student is involved in his or her learning environment, locates problems within that environment, and engages in dialogue with the teacher and other students in order to change the situation. The foundation of Freire’s thought began at the idea of human vocation: “to act on perceived reality in order to change it for the improvement of life conditions” (Crawford-Lange, 1981, p. 258). Human vocation is realized through consciousness (and by extension conscientization) emerging in problem-posing education, praxis (or the dialectic of reflection-action/theory-practice), and dialogue.
**Problem-posing education.** The purpose of education according to Freire’s philosophy “… is to develop critical thinking by presenting the people’s situation to them as a problem so that they can perceive, reflect, and act on it” (Crawford-Lange, 1981, p. 259). This problem-posing allows teachers-as-learners and learners-as-teachers to confront taken-for-granted situations in their lives by deconstructing the social, cultural, political, and economic reasons for these situations (Shor, 1992). The conscientization (Freire 1970/1993) that occurs as an effect of education motivates students to change their world. In regards to discussing global English as content, for example, this would entail posing issues like access, practicality, and ideology as problems. Freire remarks more broadly about the dialectic behavior of education, but the same holds true for the spread of English:

Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. (Freire, 1970/1993, p. 47)

Freire maintained that there are levels of consciousness by which people perceive reality, and the highest of these levels is *critical consciousness*. Critical consciousness develops as one becomes increasingly aware of the world and the interaction of phenomena within it. People who are critically conscious realize that reality is transformable. The responsibility for that transformation belongs to the people directly involved in a situation as they begin to perceive the dehumanizing contradictions of their situation: “When awareness of those contradictions results in a decision to act on those contradictions, people enter into *conscientization*” (Crawford-Lange, 1981, p. 258). Conscientization is the process which develops critical consciousness; it is the process of learning to perceive contradictions and to take transforming action against oppressive elements of reality. Conscientization does not occur automatically. It is not a byproduct of social change. It is a conscious, educational choice. The ultimate goal of problem-posing education is to develop critical thinking through dialogue and praxis.
Dialogue. Knowing takes place through dialogue, “a horizontal relationship between equals where the participants perform praxis focused on the transformation and humanization of the world” (Crawford-Lange, 1981, p. 259). Dialogue, and therefore knowing, is necessarily social. Crawford-Lange’s principle of dialogue reads, “Dialogue forms the context of the educational situation” and she speaks to the importance of dialogue within education that “[t]he organization of curriculum recognizes the class as a social entity and resource” (p. 263). In the context of CSLTE, Hawkins and Norton (2009) state that dialogue is collaborative and includes the process of mediation between teacher-educators and teacher-learners in constructing meaning. Dialogue is also the means by which reflection occurs. Reflexivity in CSLTE requires teachers to not only be able to dialogue about goals and pedagogy, but also demonstrate “deep reflectivity on their own practices,” including how they might do certain teaching activities differently in the future (Hawkins & Norton, 2009, p. 16).

Praxis. Praxis is the dialectical method of critical reflection plus creative action by which people come to know (Freire, 1970/1993). The “act of knowing” is different from the acquisition of knowledge: “The act of knowing involves a dialectical movement which goes from action to reflection and from reflection upon action to a new action” (Crawford-Lange, 1981, p. 258). Since people can never know completely, as soon as they act on a situation and therefore come to know it, the situation changes and thus requires continued reflection and action in order (Crawford-Lange, 1981). This process of praxis is meant to confront and change the status quo towards a more democratic and just society (Abednia, 2009). Praxis in CSLTE has promoted the following three areas: critical awareness, critical self-reflection, and critical pedagogical relations (Hawkins & Norton, 2009). Since the 1980s these areas have been explored under the headings of critical pedagogy, critical language awareness, and critical language teacher education, lightly in the area of second language studies in foreign language teaching and more prevalently in ESL for immigrants coming to the United States and the United Kingdom (Crookes, 2013).

Hawkins and Norton (2009) state that while there is a growing body of critical literature within TESOL, applied linguistics, and SLA, much rarer are accounts of actual CELT practices (but they cite
Morgan, 1998; *TESOL Quarterly* special issue, 1999), and even rarer is literature on CSLTE practices in pre-service programs, as opposed to teachers already practicing. However, Crookes (2013) states that although language teachers have undergone apprenticeships of observations – the 12 or more years spent as a student watching teachers in action (Lortie, 1975) – “almost none of us has a period of apprenticeship in which to observe critical language pedagogy” (p. 1). Abednia (2009) points out that despite critical pedagogy and ELT’s almost three-decade-long relationship, it has yet to form an important space within SLTE. Seidlhofer (2011) also remarks:

…most classroom language teaching per se has changed remarkably little considering how much the discourse about it has. This is to say that for teachers of English across the globe, the main knowledge-base and point of reference has not moved with the tide of applied linguistics research: the language as used by Inner Circle speakers and codified in grammars, dictionaries, and textbooks remains, by and large, unquestioned as the only legitimate object of study and target of learning, certainly in regions where English is taught as a foreign language (i.e., in Kachru’s Expanding Circle). This state of affairs has resulted in an incongruity in the discourse of ELT which, although it is giving rise to some misgivings and unease, is hardly addressed directly and proactively. (p. 9, emphasis italics in the original)

Demonstrating similar concern, K. E. Johnson (2009) comments that although the goal of L2 teacher education has stayed constant over the years in preparing teachers for the profession:

…our understanding of that work—of who teaches English, who learns English and why—of the sociopolitical and socioeconomic contexts in which English is taught, and of the varieties of English that are taught and used around the world, has changed dramatically in the last half century. (p. 113)

K. E. Johnson draws attention to what she calls a “located” teacher education stance, which implies that because English language teaching occurs in various places around the world where social, cultural, political, and economic factors differ dramatically, then teaching and teacher education should
not be uniform. Instead, “both the content and activities of L2 teacher education must take into account the social, political, economic, and cultural histories that are ‘located’ in the contexts where L2 teachers learn and teach” (p. 114). She continues that context extends past geographic place and into the realms of sociopolitical, sociohistorical, and socioeconomic spaces connected to both local and global movement:

Studies from around the globe find L2 teachers enacting their practices in styles that suit the normative ways of teaching and learning that are historically embedded in their local contexts (Canagarajah, 1999, 2005; Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996; Li, 1998; Probyn, 2001; Simon-Maeda, 2004). More specifically, despite the fact that questions about the exportability of “western methods” have been raised for some time (Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Li, 1998; Scovel, 1986; Ting, 1987), ministries of education, national educational policy makers, and other legislative bodies continue to set educational politics that impose western methods without taking into account the local constraints that will ultimately affect the extent to which L2 teachers are willing and/or able to implement curricular innovations. (K. E. Johnson, 2009, p. 114)

A number of attitudes and assumptions have contributed to the strength of discourses on language pedagogy and teacher education that have marginalized millions of language educators worldwide. As Seidlhofer (2011) argues, there are “deep-seated assumptions that the language remains, and indeed should remain, essentially the same as it has always been: the property and preserve of its native speakers, irrespective of who uses it and in what contexts” (p. 28). Some of the most common assumptions that have permeated SLTE and language pedagogy are the native-speaker fallacy (Phillipson, 1992), and standard English ideology (Cameron, 1995), or the misconception that teaching and learning standard varieties of English is the only proper policy, despite their irrelevance to local contexts. Appleby et al. (2002), however, state: “… this focus on relating classroom life to the local world outside the classroom often avoids addressing the larger ideological and political problems (Canagarajah, 1999) that can have a significant impact on students' lives and teachers' roles” (p. 334). In development contexts in particular, “The problems are, then, inherent in the discourses of development: They influence relationships between
donor and recipient at all levels from the global to the classroom and create expectations and tensions around questions of ownership, control, and expertise within language and development programs” (Appleby et al., 2002, p. 334). I argue, then, that Global-North teacher educators working in the Global South have an ethical obligation to align current critical theory and practice with the teaching contexts and local teaching knowledge and perspectives in which their teacher-learners teach, both at the local policy level of the school and community and the more global level of the ideologies and politics that shape how they are teaching and learning English.

Proposals and principles for critical language pedagogy for English teaching abound, but very little research takes an active approach to initiating partnerships with educators or teacher-learners and describing those processes for CSLTE. Crookes (2013) cites Apple (1988) about 25 years prior to his own argument, indicating that this gap still exists:

[T]here is a highly developed body of metatheory in the area of critical pedagogy, but a seriously underdeveloped tradition of applied, middle-range work. To the extent that critical work in education remains at such an abstract level, we risk cutting ourselves off from the largest part of the educational community. (Apple, 1988, p. 200, cited in Crookes, 2013, p. 43, endnote)

Echoing this, Crookes quotes Canagarajah (2005), whose statement also currently holds almost fifteen years later:

Though we have a well-established critical tradition on orienting to sentence-level rules from the time of critical linguistics (see Fowler & Kress, 1979) and stretching up to more recent forms of critical discourse analysis (see Fairclough, 2000; Gee, 2000), there are very few research projects using this approach in classroom learning. Although exemplary articles on how critical linguistics can help classroom language learning are available (see Fairclough, 2000), they haven’t inspired active research. (Canagarajah, 2005, p. 933)

Crawford (1978) (see also Crawford-Lange, 1981) is the first language specialist to establish a framework for foreign language teaching using the critical pedagogy of Paulo Freire (Crookes, 2013).
Creating the framework for the U.S., ESL-based context, she outlines 20 principles that guide her systematization of nine elements of a curriculum, but sparse research seems to have continued this thorough and systematic attempt to develop a critical pedagogical framework for EFL contexts—though of course, from a critical pedagogical perspective, each context is different and would require ground-up approaches and adjustments to pre-established principles from other contexts (Crookes, 2013). While hers is the first descriptive proposal for which other researchers and educators can use and adapt for their own contexts, it still functions as a proposal with no empirical research to support its strengths and reflect on its shortcomings.

Abednia (2009), working in the Iranian TEFL context, addresses teacher education in the area of global English, but even this work, like Crawford’s for second language curricula, stops after providing a proposal for transformative second language teacher development (TLTD)–he does not provide a study of action resulting in research and praxis. Abednia argues that L2 teachers cannot initiate problem-posing without developing critical thinking about their career trajectory (past and present), and what they do and believe; in so doing, they can become transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1990) that not only adapt to but change reality. He constructs a proposal for TLTD programs using Crawford’s (1981) 20 principles for teacher education that cover the areas of approach, content, process, teacher educators’ roles, and student teachers’ roles. Through constructing his proposal for TLTD programs, Abednia argues that critical pedagogy is not just “theoretically visionary,” but also “very practicable” (p. 277); however, his article does not provide practical examples; instead, it concludes with an important and needed reflection on the caveats about the difficulties of employing TLTD programs.

Similarly, Singh and Richards (2006) provide a proposal for the university SLTE classroom based in Vygotskian sociocultural theory, viewing the classroom as a socially situated community of practice that serves as a site for identity construction where teacher learners exercise their agency as they form teacher identities (Norton & Toohey, 2004). The authors propose reimagining SLTE programs that too often only focus on teaching content and provide a brief exploratory practicum, as these programs are
largely ineffectual in changing teachers’ practice (Tomlinson, 1990; Lamb, 1995; J. Roberts, 1998). Citing the work of Johnson and Golombek (2003) and Hawkins (2004) as researchers and teacher educators who construct a socially constructive SLTE classroom, Singh and Richards connect SCT with larger systems of power, specifically teacher identity construction as they appropriate and resist aspects of the language teacher education classroom. Their notion of this proposal as a “critical” sociocultural perspective is nothing new: SCT can already be critical in the way defined in this research, but as Crookes (2013) argues, SCT is critiqued by critical language theorists and pedagogues for not going far enough in addressing issues of social class, race, gender, and sexuality in the student-teacher classroom, and how inequitable resources (human and nonhuman) and learning contexts arise through the intersectionalities of these markers of identity, impacting teacher educators, student teachers, and student teachers’ future students.

2.4.2.2. CSLTE in the Global South

CSLTE research is rarely conducted in global English contexts. This sparse research is primarily conducted with pre-service, U.S.-based teachers in SLTE programs (Smolcic, 2011), in-service teachers receiving professional development opportunities (Coelho & Henze, 2014; Henze & Coelho, 2013), and both new and experienced in-service teachers who are in the process of teaching courses on their own (Bui, 2018; Canagarajah, 1993, 1999; Sharma & Phyak, 2017). This research, reviewed below, focuses not only on the act of teaching, but on pedagogy, or “…the discourse which attends the act of teaching….Teaching is a practical and observable act. Pedagogy encompasses that act together with the purposes, values, ideas, assumptions, theories and beliefs which inform, shape and seek to justify it” (Alexander, 2002, p. 2). From my search of the literature, I was unable to find any Global South CSLTE efforts specifically conducted with pre-service teachers. However, in peripheral contexts, teacher education programs often do not exist, and many teacher education efforts often occur in formal and informal workshops or dialogues with communities of practice of in-service teachers. Another issue that arises is reliance on Global North ELT “expertise” and center-based methods of ELT (as well as
assumptions about methods) that are uncritically transported to peripheral contexts. The literature surveyed on local English teachers in low-income countries indicates that they usually possess limited teacher training and varying levels of English proficiency (Awasthi, 2009; Hussain, 2009; Kerr, 1994; Niño-Murcia, 2003). This literature is often written by local scholars and teachers, and I summarize main problems and implications from a globally-representative sample, then attune to Nicaragua, specifically, and the literature’s relevance to my research.

Below I highlight main themes in the existing but limited engaged, empirical research in CSLTE in these areas, beginning with researchers who use ethnographic methods. First I look at those who are ethnolinguistic insiders to the communities in which they partner, then move to researchers who are Global-North outsiders to communities. I then review the one research study that I found that uses CDA to study CSLTE. Though this study, conducted by Cahnmann, Rymes, and Souto-Manning (2005), focuses on bilingual pre-service teachers in the U.S. context and not the Global South, the study is helpful for understanding identity negotiation and the importance of using CDA to analyze how minority teachers construct themselves under policy and other mandates.

Problems of English language teacher education remain the most significant concern of local researchers and teachers in the Global South. Hussain (2009), in arguing for transforming English teacher professional development in Pakistan, states that “no institutionalized arrangement for providing regular training” exists in the country (p. 110). In his research on ELT in Nepal, Awasthi (2009) first gives a history of the profession in the country, stating that until 1971 English teachers were not trained and “those who are trained also need retraining” (p. 200). Since then, teachers first must take an undergraduate program in English education, but “there is still a dire need of trained and efficient English teachers in Nepal” (p. 199). Kerr (1994), in her survey of 300 English teachers in Nepal, found that with a few exceptions, they had limited English proficiency, which agrees with Davies et al. (1984) earlier work in Nepal that indicated similar proficiencies.
Local English teachers and scholars of Nicaragua have conducted thesis and dissertation research, as well as a limited number of publications on English teacher education in Nicaragua. While the Nicaraguan Ministry of Education (MINED) has given much attention to creating English language policies in the last twenty years, it has given scant attention to English language teacher education since the 1980s, according to Nicaraguan researchers (Chávez, 2006; Bodden & Trejos, 2011; Herrera & Rubio, 2018). According to these researchers, secundaria (secondary-level) school teachers face the following issues:

- Lack of consistent national curriculum
- Little to no teacher education and lack of appropriate qualifications
- Unhelpful and demoralizing teacher supervision and assessment by administrators not proficient in English or trained in English teaching
- Limited didactic materials, equipment (e.g., photocopier, projector), and libraries
- Large classes
- Poor teacher motivation and pay
- Limited knowledge of English and content knowledge of English, resulting in low self-confidence and significant use of Spanish in the classroom
- Use of teacher-centered, difficult, and laborious approaches to teaching, including long and unclear grammar explanations and considerable time spent writing on the board

Regarding their views on methods of teaching English, Chávez (2006), Bodden and Trejos (2011), and Herrera and Rubio (2018) display an aversion to the methods common in Nicaraguan English classrooms, including using the L1 in the L2 classroom and the Grammar Translation Method, but demonstrate a positive orientation towards Communicative Language Teaching. These authors place responsibility for poor teaching on the few teacher education programs provided to teachers, and generally align with dominant approaches to language teacher education.

Chávez (2006), however, is the only Nicaraguan scholar and educator in the reviewed literature who advocates a post-method understanding of TESOL (Kumaravadivelu, 2006b), which places importance on criticality and context for the Nicaraguan classroom:

Teachers’ theoretical knowledge of EFL methods should be addressed with a critical perspective; not to prescribe any particular method as the best way to teach, or as something that should be
used blindly and exclusively. Rather, they should be led to realize that the principles and techniques of particular methods might be useful for some teaching situation, but not for others. Ultimately, through this analytical perspective teachers will be able to construct their own language teaching theory. That is to say, they will be able to make well-informed decisions to integrate, combine, adopt or adapt optional teaching approaches autonomously. (p. 34)

Teacher education programs that promote this way of teaching, she argues, will be more successful than those that solely teach conventional methods, especially since, she argues, Nicaraguan teachers’ decision-making in their classrooms is relatively unimpeded by school authorities.

2.4.2.3. Ethnography in CSLTE in the Global South

Researchers as ethnolinguistic insiders. Canagarajah’s (1999) critical ethnographic study of English teachers in Sri Lanka is the seminal work that initiated critical ethnography and critical pedagogy for English teaching in peripheral contexts. In his study on English teachers’ resisting linguistic imperialism, Canagarajah (1999) uses a center-periphery framework (Giddens, 1984) to place the voices and actions of participants in their context at the forefront, reflexively narrating classroom experiences that he observed over a period of four years in the early 1990s. Among other concerns, Canagarajah is interested in discourses and teaching methods that local students and teachers confront in the teaching materials they use, which are produced by Global North companies, as well as the effects of such discourses on language acquisition. He is further interested in how students deal with the tensions between their own agendas and those in the textbook, as well as how teachers’ overcome the challenges of implementing methods that do not relate to the traditions of their community.

Although Canagarajah’s (1999) research covers a broad area of concerns for this peripheral community, for the purpose of this review I acknowledge one analysis of ideological tensions that emerge in the ESL classroom due to the textbook and its hidden curriculum. Local teachers used old textbooks donated to Sri Lankan universities by the Asia Foundation. These books use a situational language teaching approach (Richards & Rodgers, 2014) and focus on the acquisition of form by providing
meaningful situations in which to present grammar and lexical items. Assumptions that the book possesses include behaviorist understandings of language learning as a drill and habit-forming practice, and “[l]ittle consideration is given to how the students’ own linguistic and cultural backgrounds might affect or enhance their language acquisition” (p. 86). Canagarajah continues, “The fact that ‘correct’ English is taken to be Standard American English, rather than the Englishes’ students bring with them, means that the students are further isolated from their social context” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 86).

The pre-packaged textbooks and curriculums were resisted by students and teachers because of the Western-influenced values in the curriculum. Students, for example, wrote and drew in their textbooks symbols of popular Tamil resistance, Tamil culture, and at times manipulating the content of the textbook so that it is “reframed, reinterpreted, and ‘rewritten’ by students’ counter-discourses” (p. 91). These actions demonstrated a resistance to and lack of interest in the course. Teachers demonstrated both appropriation and opposition to materials and methods. Canagarajah uses narrative of his observations to demonstrate how teachers’ experiences unfolded as they attempted (sometimes successfully, other times not) methods that they as a group deemed appropriate, in this case, task-based teaching. He found that “pedagogies are not received in their own terms, but appropriated to different degrees in terms of the needs and values of the local communities. Multifarious contextual factors—institutional, material, cultural—play a part in shaping the realization of the imported methods” (p. 121-122). He continues, “In the midst of the conflicting influences from the center and the periphery, local teachers have to adopt creative and critical instructional practices in order to develop pedagogies suitable for their communities” (p. 122).

Canagarajah ultimately argues for the importance of helping teachers and students on the periphery develop the “instinctive, untutored, and untheorized modes of appropriation” for their own teaching contexts (p. 185). That is, there is a case for appropriating discourses, not to be seen as some hegemonic center-to-periphery export, but as resistance through the creative and alternative decisions that teachers and students make through appropriating them. In “safe houses” of communities of practice, the
teachers come together to “interpret instructional material and curricula according to their community and home-based knowledge” (p. 186). They and their students shuffle between codes and conventions, and engage with – instead of ignore – the “multiple discourses that clamor for attention” in the materials, methods, and realities of their classrooms (p. 186). Thus, resistance is not about reinvention. Citing Kramsch (1993), Canagarajah argues that it is about negotiation of the apparent borders of language and culture: “Therefore, rather than finding methods that are culturally comfortable to the local students and teachers, it is important to develop strategies that encourage them to explore intercultural differences” (Kramsch, 1993, p. 188), which play out in materials, methods, and classroom interactions. This ethnography is one example of research that provides insight into a resistance pedagogy that may empower local teachers and students to shape their own meanings of English teaching and learning, especially in areas that do not provide teacher training; however, since Canagarajah’s (1999) study, few scholars have continued this line of research on the periphery.

Sharma and Phyak (2017) use critical literacy (CL) as a socially situated practice to work with local teachers in their respective home country of Nepal. They argue that the erasure of critical approaches to teacher education in SLTE professional development not only neglects the voices of teachers who identify themselves within a critical pedagogy, but also deems the sociopolitical aspect of ELT on the periphery irrelevant. They demonstrate that scholars have paid little attention to how English teachers are “…inducted and trained in critical approaches to teaching in contexts where a banking model (Freire, 1970/1993) dominates teacher development practices and where the ability to use local sociopolitical issues is not yet considered a legitimate part of teachers’ professional development” (p. 211-212). Sharma and Phyak (2017) define critical pedagogy specifically for language teacher education to mean the following:

…an approach that allows teachers to engage in a critical analysis of the existing ideologies of second-language teaching and teacher development and in building alternative consciousness that considers language teaching as a critical sociocultural process….This consciousness also includes
teachers’ awareness of the fact that inclusion of critical sociopolitical topics in second-language teaching helps students develop both linguistic and critical thinking abilities. (p. 211)

Founding their conceptual framework in Bakhtin’s (1981) notion of ideological becoming, they detail a case study methodology in which they discuss the process of critical materials development, a professional development workshop, and follow-up dialogue with in-service teachers to demonstrate how critical awareness emerges from engaging teachers in understanding ideological tensions between dominant and alternative discourses of teachers’ professional development. Their case study research is one of very few that thoroughly detail each of these activities and demonstrate teacher and student responses. For example, in the transformative teacher development workshop, Sharma and Phyak used critical literacy materials on Nepali social issues to assist in forming “alternative teaching ideologies and practices incorporating CP” (p. 220). This one-day workshop was held for 16 in-service, secondary English teachers, some of whom were also teacher trainers. They first provided a PowerPoint presentation on critical pedagogy, but were also careful in representing it in a way that was not too radical and foreign. They presented questions for easy talking points, like, “Is it possible to teach a text that is not in the prescribed textbook? Have you ever taught such a lesson?”; “What social issue would you teach if you want to teach a lesson that is not in the textbook?”; and, “How do the activities/texts/methods you use in your class encourage students to engage in dialogues?” (p. 221). Teachers responded with concerns about push-back from the administration if they did not teach with the text, as well as the importance of using the text to prepare students for national examinations, seeing criticality as incorporating “extra content” that is “counterproductive to student learning” (p. 222).

However, as dialogue continued, the teachers began to reflect on how they could incorporate Nepali social issues, such as the caste system, while learning certain poetry in English, and they “became critical of the existing professional development program for ignoring criticality as an important aspect of professional development” (p. 222). By the end of the workshop, all teachers were in agreement that students should be made aware of social justice issues, but cautioned care while teaching these issues due
to some students’ “hatred” of other groups (p. 222). The results demonstrated that critical-consciousness-raising took place among teachers: “This elicitation not only helped us extract social problems in a teaching-learning context, but also provided prompts for initiating and stimulating the process of critical dialogue among the participants. Although most teachers were largely aware of these issues, they said that they had hardly ever contemplated on how these issues had impacted their students’ lives” (p. 222-223).

By using the ideological conflicts and tensions in teachers’ knowledge, teaching philosophies, and practices as a starting point for transformative teacher development, Sharma and Phyak argue that critical pedagogy should be a core part of SLTE efforts.

Admitting that teachers did not change as much as she had hoped, Kubanyiova (2012) provides an ethnographic research project about “teacher change” (p. 9) within EFL teachers in Slovakia, her home country. Theorizing language teacher cognition primarily from social cognitive perspectives (Bandura, 2002), but also drawing on literature from Vygotskian sociocultural perspectives (Golombek & Johnson, 2004; K. E. Johnson, 2009) and complexity theory (Dörnyei & Ushiota, 2009; Larson-Freeman, 2006; Larson-Freeman & Cameron, 2008), Kubanyiova integrates yearlong ethnographic findings on eight in-service Slovakian English language teachers into a model of Language Teacher Conceptual Change (LTCC). The teachers volunteered for this extra professional development aimed at engaging language teachers with the latest research on second language motivation in order to provide them ways to “encourage, support and sustain students’ learning engagement in the English language classroom” (p. 66). The 20-hour course was on how social psychological processes shape individual learners’ motivation and included the following topics:

- human motivation in social contexts
- creating and maintaining motivational conditions in the classroom
- building cohesive and productive class groups
- nurturing group responsibility and strategies for rounding off group experience in a motivating manner. (Kubanyiova, 2012, p. 78)

However, Kubanyiova found that by and large, after eight months of providing a teacher development course, giving teacher interviews, and conducting classroom observations, teachers did not experience
conceptual change. She found “…teachers whose visions were quite different from the central philosophy of the teacher development course and who, therefore, saw no need to systematically engage with its content (‘nice-but-not-for-me’)” (p. 161). One teacher did embrace the philosophy of the teacher development course, but felt that her teaching practices already aligned with what she was learning, although – based on Kubanyiova’s observations – they did not, and thus also did not experience conceptual change. What is most remarkable about her work is that Kubanyiova largely failed in reaching her research goals. She begins the introduction to her book, “This book documents the impact of a language teacher development programme that had a grand mission to transform language classrooms – and failed” (p. 1). Demonstrating that failure is a tremendously important part of critical and active research agendas, and that through failure, researchers and educators develop and improve their praxis, Kubanyiova provides an honest and unapologetic account of a fruitful study from which other critical researchers and educators can learn.

Researchers and educators as outsiders. The studies above are conducted by ethnolinguistic insiders to the communities that they research, and they work with in-service teacher development. It was much rarer to encounter research in this area on pre-service teachers. Addressing the growing disparity between culturally and linguistically diverse students in the U.S. and their mostly white, monolingual teachers, Smolcic (2011) is one of a small group of faculty members at a prominent U.S. university that leads a group of pre-service K-12 students to Ecuador each summer for a teaching practicum with Ecuadorian children. She argues that teacher education programs should help student teachers investigate assumptions about learning and learners. She defines “culturally responsive” teaching practices as including “…a teacher’s developing awareness of her own cultural identity, of her students’ cultures as well as the cultures of the schools, of cultural variation in ways of learning, and of instructional practices rooted in non-dominant cultural ways of being” (p. 15). Smolcic uses cultural-historical Activity Theory (Engeström, 1987) to draw attention to the complex factors involved in the teacher-identity formation of one U.S. student’s immersion experience in the Ecuador program. Citing critical pedagogues like
Cochran-Smith (2004a, 2004b) and Giroux (1990), Smolcic demonstrates that becoming aware of one’s own cultural identity is an important part of developing critical consciousness of the classroom, including the ability to understand how macro-level ideological issues affect micro-level classroom practice, like teachers’ assumptions leading to viewing minority students’ performance from a conventional deficit model. Smolcic’s chapter focuses on the experiences of Global-North pre-service teachers, however, and not Global-South pre-service teachers. While her work demonstrates important critical components for pre-service North Americans who take part in such cultural exchange programs, a need still exists to improve equality in access to CSLTE opportunities for the Global-South partners with which many of these programs work.

In Nicaragua, specifically, teacher education projects since the 1980s have relied heavily on international direction from the Unites States and the United Kingdom (Brantmeier, 1997; Luxon & Luxon, 1995; Steinmueller, 1990). Within the context of a massive popular education and literacy campaign launched by the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in 1980 to determine all school subject matter by the social and political realities facing Nicaraguans, Steinmueller (1990) was an important actor in one of the first partnerships to overhaul foreign language education in Nicaragua, begun in 1987 with the Ministry of Education (MINED), Nicaraguan teachers, and international educators from the U.S. and U.K. Since MINED’s teacher workshops and curricular design at that time did not fit the realities of classrooms and communities (the people designed to develop the English program were actually speakers of French who were learning English), local teachers proposed restructuring of the units to be taught: “Never before had teachers influenced curriculum, but the idea was quickly accepted by the Ministry. This was to become a new model of participatory curriculum development” (Steinmueller, 1990, p. 6). Teachers, who had varying teaching experience and English competencies used Spanish to create their proposals, and MINED consolidated some of this work into a final proposal, resulting in a final unit plan and methodological guidelines, exercises, and examples of how to teach the units in Spanish: “It turned out to be a healthy blend of Nicaraguans who had developed the program and English-
speaking consultants who made suggestions to assure that the grammar and usage were correct” (p. 6). Steinmueller was an integral part of the workshops provided to almost 800 Nicaraguan teachers, 47 of them English teachers, working in and respecting the Creole and Coast English spoken on the East Coast of Nicaragua, U.S. English, and U.K. English that were used in their work together. These workshops were divided into two approaches: (1) second language teacher education, where teachers learned ideas for the classroom, and (2) teachers as learners of English, where they were provided space to improve their own acquisition and knowledge of English. Steinmueller continues that many teachers had little competency in the English language themselves, as well as limited formal training. Tension also arose between the Ministry of Education (MINED) and teachers because the materials that needed to be sent to teachers often did not arrive on time for classes to begin. Printers broke down before the workshops, and power went out during the workshops. Tapes with “native speaker” voices recorded on them were useless because of limited or sporadic access to electricity. Though Steinmueller’s (1990) writing is a reflective account, not research, she – like Coelho and Henze (2014) and Henze and Coelho (2013) in the ELP literature – provides a helpful description from which researchers can learn and adapt.

In 1993, Luxon and Luxon (1998) carried out a language teacher education program in Nicaragua with 47 schools and over 60 teachers. Their project, a partnership between the British Government, two of Nicaragua’s largest universities, and the Asociación Nicaraguense de Profesores de Inglés (Nicaraguan association for English Teachers, ANPI), researched how English teaching was being conducted in secondary schools throughout Nicaragua and aimed to transform practices with practical and relevant solutions for the Nicaraguan context. Observing classrooms, conducting interviews, and disseminating questionnaires, Luxon and Luxon (1998) found that only 27% percent of teachers were licensed, but that this fact made no difference in terms of the language proficiency of teachers or their teaching capabilities. Like Steinmueller (1990), they also noted lack of resources and materials, along with the required use of a constraining textbook disconnected to the Nicaraguan context with not enough copies for each student and teacher. Ultimately, the partnership reached about 400 teachers around the country, who learned ways
to teach within the limitations of their environments and who then would carry the responsibility of training other teachers in their regions (Luxon & Luxon, 1998).

Almost 30 years have passed since the end of the Contra War, yet the power outages, water outages, lack of basic materials and technology for schools, and other issues that Steinmueller (1990) and Luxon and Luxon (1998) describe still occur in many parts of Nicaragua, including the northern town in which this study is situated. The current teaching and learning obstacles that Nicaraguan researchers and educators Chávez (2006), Bodden and Trejos (2011), and Herrera and Rubio, (2018) describe in Section 2.4.2.2. are seemingly too similar to the issues of Nicaraguan English teachers 30 years ago. This is an ethical matter that calls into question the role of English teaching in areas of severe hardship, including the processes of national and international SLTE partnerships.

2.4.2.4. CDA in CSLTE

Critical discourse analyses of language policies, implicit or explicit, are not often connected to the activity of second language teacher education (SLTE) research. A recent, encompassing review of the literature on CDA in education from 2004 to 2012 found that about 9% of CDA research in 257 peer-reviewed articles across 142 journals focused specifically on teacher education (Rogers et al., 2016); though the authors do not break down teacher education into the sub-area of second language teacher education, it can be assumed that the percentage of CDA studies looking at SLTE is smaller, and even more minimal for SLTE outside of the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia, as Rogers et al. (2016) count just four CDA studies taking place in all of Latin America in the ten-year period (their review does not indicate if any of those four studies focused on language education or SLTE). Finally, 64% of CDA studies used written data (e.g., policy documents) as the data source, with 22% using interaction and 14% using interview data. Therefore, studies that analyze textual, oral, and interactional data in the area of SLTE, especially in periphery countries, would be rare.

One outlying study in this area is the work of Cahnmann et al. (2005). Though it is situated in the Southeast state of Georgia in the U.S., its theoretical and methodological design demonstrates how CDA
can be used with group interactional data to learn how pre-service bilingual teachers change through various processes of identity formation. They present the recent problem that Southeast and Midwest states are facing with new, primarily Spanish-speaking immigrant communities moving to the areas, and the lack of bilingual teachers to serve these newcomer communities. Obtaining grant funding from the Department of Education (DOE) to create a teacher recruitment program, Teachers for English Language Learners (TELL), at their university, Cahnmann et al. (2005) worked toward the goal of enrolling 55 bilingual pre-service teachers – at the time of the study, they had 33 enrolled. The goal of TELL is twofold: to ensure the program’s success and to ensure that bilingualism is viewed as a resource for all students. Directed toward the goal of the DOE grant, it aims to support and develop critical language awareness among all TELL scholars. The researchers’ own goal was to provide “intellectual and rhetorical resources to combat widespread deficit orientations that discriminate against bilingual populations” (p. 196).

One of the activities that the researchers/teacher-educators did with student-teachers is support them through focus group sessions in which these students – who come from 16 different countries, including the United States (31 of 33 speaking Spanish as a first, second, or additional language) – engaged in conversational narratives about how and why they wanted to become bilingual educators, and their impressions and needs from TELL. Analyzing fieldnotes and audio-recorded data from the first year of the program, Cahnmann et al. (2005) situated their analysis and findings within Foucauldian (1978) social theory of the discursive pervasiveness of power for its usefulness in understanding “the proliferation of discourses that surround bilinguals in the contemporary United States context” (p. 198). They then used CDA to analyze the processes of bilingual identification and changes in identification that occur in face-to-face interaction, using Fairclough’s (2003) three levels of identification: (1) as prepositioned (individuals’ backgrounds and experiences), (2) as individual agency (individual will in choosing how individuals identify themselves), and (3) as contingent on interaction (co-constructed identity formation). The researchers found the complexly intertwined nature of these levels – the
corporate construction of “bilingual” that makes teacher-educators feel inadequate via testing, the agency demonstrated in re-defining terms that they feel (mis)represent them, and co-constructed identification as the group actively negotiates, resists, or otherwise changes individuals’ identification by drawing on systemic and other discourses of bilingualism. Lastly, they ended with a discussion of the Freirean-based model of “theater of the oppressed” (Boal, 1974) as a tool for empowering bilingual pre-service teachers to progress from the problem-posing that emerges through dialogue into affecting social action and change. Their findings demonstrate individual resistance and the complexly intertwined nature of “corporatized macro-level definitions, self-definitions asserted through an act of individual will, and the contribution of interactional contingency” (p. 207), which all create tension in the student-teachers’ identification as bilingual. While the article draws on focus group data, it would be interesting to see how these teachers interacted with these identifications in their practicum teaching or other types of workshops, and how those may have differed from what they said together in group interaction.

2.5. Concluding the Chapter

Critical and poststructural theories of discourse, power, and subjectivity provide me with conceptual and analytical tools, as well as explanatory power to address the concerns of critical language policy (CLP) and critical second language teacher education (CSLTE) in my research. My research aims to develop communicative capacity in participants and myself, and through this knowing, promote the capacity for communicative action with the goal of transforming how two Global-North-Global-South partnerships conceived of English program planning and teacher education. In understanding the English classroom in remote areas of severe hardship, teachers and learners can use the classroom as a site for transformational learning – not transmission of knowledge through ineffective or disempowering means. The attention of critical and poststructural theories to reflection as a process that counteracts positivistic impulses of research, including the view that method is objective and value-free, allows me to validate the voices and subjectivities of my participants as rightful owners of knowledge and experience, and place their knowledge into dialogue with my own. Critical Theory provides me a space to conduct research that
does not merely reproduce the status quo of thinking of English as socioeconomic development within globalization, as well as English teaching as a set of methods imported from the Global North, but also question the status quo through engagement and reflexivity with the aim of thinking differently about ELT on the periphery.

The methodological implications of some poststructural thought are equally beneficial to my research, as Agger (1991) states:

Postmodern and poststructural ethnographers (e.g. Marcus & Fischer 1986) are highly self-conscious about the ways in which their own narrative practices impose distorting interpretive frames on people’s experience. Although this has been a perennial concern of positivist ethnographers as well, the postmodern and poststructural attention to issues of discursive politics has significantly advanced the ways in which ethnography is composed (e.g. Richardson 1988, 1990a, b, c, Denzin 1990), especially among those who link discourse theory with larger sociopolitical questions of colonialism and imperialism (e.g. Said 1979). (p. 121)

Combined with critical pedagogy, the critical theories of discourse, power, and subjectivity detailed in this chapter allow for the development of a methodology that attunes to how subjects move through discourse-as-activity towards the goal of conceiving of global English and ELT differently.

The literature reviewed in this chapter combines elements of macro- and micro-level analysis in order to better understand how power and discourse intertwine with subjectivity in the formation of language teachers. While each review is useful to help situate my own focus, goals, theorization, and methodology, none really come together in a way that my research attempts. As this literature review demonstrates, there is either very little research or a complete gap in research in CLP-CSLTE literature in three areas: (1) CLP-CSLTE processes documented and engaged with in the Global South, (2) Global-South and Global-North CSLTE partnerships, and (3) detailed documentation of the praxis that occurred with teachers, and the reflexive implications of this work for challenging the very theory and praxis that it uses. The methodology provided in Chapter 3 describes how such critical work was attempted in my
research context, while the literature reviewed here guides me in my concern for ethical issues surrounding the discourses of English: the ideologies behind the global spread of English, the discourses that guide how it is taught and learned, and what real opportunity there is for people in rural areas of poor countries investing in the language.
Chapter 3

Methodology

“No one lives in the world in general. Everybody, even the exiled, the drifting, the diasporic, or the perpetually moving, lives in some confined and limited stretch of it—‘the world around here’” (Geertz, 1996, p. 262).

At the same time that we live in “the world around here” (Geertz, 1996, p. 262), which requires an individual to possess local knowledge to be a functioning member of the culture, that local knowledge is increasingly permeated by globalized understandings of “the world out there,” like acquiring English for purposes of global mobility or participation in the global economy. Barakos (2016) states, “Some of the most pressing concerns of recent language policy research (and neighbouring disciplines such as applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, and critical discourse studies [CDS]) have been how to analyse and understand the links between ‘macro’ and ‘micro’ as well as ‘structural’ and ‘agentive’ phenomena of texts, discourses, and social life” (p. 23). This means that researchers need to change their perspective on policy from “thing” to “things people do” (Mortimer, 2013, p. 69), that is, policy as practice (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012). The methodological design that follows allows me to learn how participants enacted, negotiated, or resisted certain macro understandings of English and teaching English in the micro, day-to-day, interactive, teacher-education activities conducted during fieldwork. This design was approved by the Pennsylvania State Office for Research Protections, STUDY00006735.

I begin this chapter by first providing a description of the historical and political context of the study. I then restate my research questions and detail the research design, constructed as an engaged, ethnographic case study. Within this engagement, I designed a Freirean-based (1970/1993) curriculum planning and teacher education effort that uses concepts of mediation and conscientization to inform curriculum design, professional development workshops, and co-teaching activities with teachers. This approach was developed under the guidance of Engaged Language Policy and Practices (ELP) (Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017; see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.1.3.). I follow the description of the approach with a description of the town of Tepetl and the two educational sites in which I worked, including the
participants of each site. I outline the methods of data collection, the four research stages of my project, and procedures for data analysis. Because my dual role of researcher and volunteer teacher development specialist is a crucial element to my research design, and because I am an object of my own analysis, I conclude the chapter with an explanation of these roles and the ethical issues with which I was confronted. In the concluding chapter of this dissertation, I revisit these issues.

### 3.1. Research questions

To begin, I restate the research questions, which are designed to provide findings on participants’ orientation to discourses of global English and English language teaching (ELT), as well as their emerging English teacher subjectivities as expressed and contested through these discourses. For my theorization and definition of discourse, see Chapter 2, Section 2.3. I ask the following:

- What discourses on global English and English language teaching (ELT) do participants use to argue for the importance of knowing English, and how it should be taught and learned? How do these discourses manifest in talk and activity?
- How and why do participants welcome or resist the differing and critical discourses on global English and ELT that I introduce in the SLTE activities of curriculum design meetings, workshops, tutoring, and co-teaching?
- What social, cultural, historical, political, and systemic identifications as Nicaraguans and, specifically, as English teachers in Tepetl affect participants’ sense-making of their emerging English teacher subjectivities as they interact together among intertwined conventional and critical discourses?
- How do the social, historical, political, and systemic identifications that I enact, appropriate, and resist as researcher-volunteer affect my own sense-making and emerging teacher-educator subjectivity?

Question 1 presents the thesis of the dialectic crisis of global English, whereby my engagement with participants in the activities involved in Question 2 responds with the antithesis to these discourses,
challenging participants’ understandings that emerged from Question 1. These discourses are sometimes critical, but also sometimes what I call “differing” or “alternative,” as they are not popularly taken up within global English teaching practices (e.g., Task-Based Language Teaching). Question 3 allows for a socio-historico-political understanding of English in Tepetl and a space from where participants interdiscursively pull as they come to understand themselves as learners and teachers of English within the discursive possibilities that Question 1 and 2 reveal. Question 4 confronts my own changing subjectivity as a teach educator as I am actively shaping and being shaped by these discursive possibilities in interactions with teachers. These questions address the potential for synthesis of conventional, critical, and alternative discourses drawn on and enacted by participants and researcher, with the ultimate goal of contributing knowledge to how Global North and Global South educators can partner together to create critically-aware and practical English programs in low-income, peripheral areas in the Global South. Answers to these questions also contribute to disciplinary theory and classroom pedagogy in relation to the critical paradigms of LPP and SLTE.

### 3.2. Historical and political context of the study

The Central American country of Nicaragua is located south of Honduras and El Salvador, and north of Costa Rica. Its west coast meets the Pacific Ocean and its east coast meets the Caribbean Sea (see Figure 3-1). When this study took place in 2017, Nicaragua was the poorest country per GDP in Central and Latin America, and the second poorest country in the western hemisphere behind Haiti (CIA World Factbook, 2019; Tellez, 2014). Roughly 42% of the country’s population lives in poverty and 15% in extreme poverty (Fabretto Annual Report, 2015). Education is required only up to sixth grade and over 50% of Nicaraguan youth age 13-19 are not enrolled in secondary education (grades 7-11) (MINED, 2015). Catter’s (2011) review of education in Nicaragua finds that 36 out of every 100 children in Nicaragua do not finish primary school, mostly due to economic reasons, and that 15% of children between 5 and 14 work. She continues that 29% of schools function without water, 68% without electricity, and 75% without basic resources such as textbooks or school furniture. Chávez (2006)
summarizes that education in Nicaragua has constantly changed since the nine-year Contra War (1981-1990) due to changes in and styles of government leadership, their priorities, and the poverty and corruption resulting from war, natural disasters, and governing processes. Thus, education, including English language education, has been a system of constant change and interruption.

Figure 3-1: Map of Nicaragua (CIA World Factbook, 2019)

Nicaragua is an ethnically and linguistically diverse country, despite its small size. Today, the official language of Nicaragua is Spanish, though regional languages are also recognized: English, Miskito, Rama, Sumo, Garifuna, Miskito Coastal Creole, and Rama Cay Creole. Roughly 3% of the Nicaraguan population still speaks an indigenous language (the Misquitos, Sumos, and Ramas). Ethnic groups form the following representations: 70% Mestizo (mixed race of Spanish and indigenous groups), 17% White, 9% Black, and 5% Indigenous. Nicaragua is thus a vibrant “contact zone” (Pratt, 1992) because of six original indigenous languages, Spanish, English, and English Creole, but within this plurality is also a long history of domination of groups and language hierarchies that are beyond the scope of this current study (see Freeland, 2013).
3.2.1. British and North American violence and transgressions in Nicaragua

Nicaraguans have long suffered under Spanish, British, and American influence, violence, and manipulation, as well as under the dictatorships that resulted from such transgressions. Tellez (2014) states, “The history of Nicaragua is about political instability, oppression, civil war, poverty, foreign interventions, corruption, and natural disasters” (p. 6). He continues:

Personal and foreign special interests have generally prevailed over the national interests. Foreign intervention in Nicaraguan political and economic affairs, particularly by Great Britain and the United States, has led to various forms of populist and nationalist governments, including dictatorships. This legacy of intervention is seen today in people’s attitude toward foreign influence. Although some Nicaraguans tend to be supportive of United States policies, other Nicaraguans are highly suspicious of the cultural and political intentions of the United States. (Tellez, 2014, p. 6)

Before Nicaraguan independence from Spain, the British conducted a series of violent attacks in the western side of Nicaragua. While the British claimed the east coast of Nicaragua as a protectorate until 1850, British occupation diminished after Nicaragua gained independence from Spain in 1823 and became an independent republic in 1838. With diminishing British influence, however, came North American influence and imperialistic intentions in the region. Fruto Chamorro Perez became the first president of the Republic of Nicaragua in 1854, but American mercenary and filibuster William Walker, who undertook illegal expeditions to Central America with the intention of building slave colonies there, was recruited by Nicaraguan liberals to take over the conservative presidency begun by Chamorro (Tellez, 2014). He succeeded, and Walker briefly became the second President of Nicaragua from June 1856 to 1857: “He confiscated the landholdings of his conservative enemies for release to U.S. citizens, declared English as the official language, and legalized slavery” (Staten, 2010, p. 28). Central American nations, with the help of the British and of American Cornelius Vanderbilt (who had his own imperialist
intentions in the region), eventually expelled him, but Walker attempted to return to Nicaragua twice before he was captured and executed in Honduras in 1860 (Staten, 2010; Tellez, 2014).

Walker’s imperialist agenda was the first of many legal and illegal U.S. interventions in Nicaragua. By the early 1900s, “Increasing U.S. intervention and dominance of both the economic and political systems of the country became a constant … [and] awakened a deep and growing sense of nationalism and resistance to foreign occupation” (Staten, 2010, p. 27). General Augusto C. Sandino led a guerilla force against U.S. Marines in 1927 and by 1933 the Marines had completely withdrawn from the region (Tellez, 2014). This withdrawal allowed for General Anastasio Somoza García to become president in 1937, beginning a long and oppressive dictatorship lasting until 1979, when the political group *Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional* (FSLN) [Sandinista National Liberation Front], formed in the 1950s, named after their anti-American, anti-imperialist hero Augusto Sandino, and overthrew his regime.

Tellez (2014) remarks, however, that “…the predominance of the FSLN led to a different kind of authoritarian government in the [19]80s” (p. 8). After the FSLN overthrew the Somoza dictatorship in 1979, the U.S. illegally supported the Contras (anti-communist), who fought the socialist FSLN for the next nine years “to protect U.S. interests in the country (neocolonialism)” (Tellez, 2014, p. 8). The U.S. Congress had banned the U.S. from supporting the Contras, but former President Ronald Reagan and the CIA secretly and illegally continued to aid the Contras, starting a “US-led counter-revolutionary war” (Freeland, 2013, p. 94). The FSLN eventually won the war in 1990, but not before roughly 50,000 people were killed and hundreds of thousands displaced (Staten, 2010; Tellez, 2014). The FSLN is still highly active today as the sole leading political party of Nicaragua, whose leader in the 1980s – José Daniel Ortega Saavedra, popularly known as Daniel Ortega – is the current president, though his recent actions, including rewriting the constitution in order to establish unlimited presidential terms, have created dictatorship-like control, allowing Ortega to continue to run for presidency (Tellez, 2014). The transgressions and violence at the hands of the British and Americans have left, understandably, feelings
of suspicion and animosity towards these foreign superpowers, their citizens, and their language. With that said, the teaching of English has a long history in its secondary and postsecondary education systems.

3.2.2. Former English language policy

That Nicaragua’s dominant FSLN party is named after a Nicaraguan who fought and killed U.S. Marines, eventually leading to their withdrawal from Nicaragua, demonstrates Nicaraguan’s animosity towards and resistance against U.S. imperialism (Bandes-Becerra Weingarden, 2016; Gilbert, 1988). The leader of the FSLN in the 1980s and current president of Nicaragua as of this writing, Daniel Ortega, is known for his anti-American rhetoric (Azpuru & Boniface, 2015). Within this resistance to U.S. imperialism before 1979 was also an aversion to the English language (Stern & Jacobs, 1988), though teaching English as a foreign language has a long history in the country, and students – though accepting of Nicaraguan nationalism – historically have been open to international exchange and the importance of English as an international language (Stern & Jacobs, 1988). In fact, for some Nicaraguans, English was a language of resistance: because the east coast of Nicaragua did not speak Spanish as a first language (they spoke creole Englishes and indigenous languages), the Spanish government banned English as a language of instruction (Stern & Jacobs, 1988), forcing Spanish on the population and fueling the costeños’ continued calls for autonomy. When the costeños won autonomy in the 1980s, they began offering elementary education in English and Miskitu, and Spanish as a second language (Stern & Jacobs, 1988).

However, because of U.S. and British transgressions in the country, for other Nicaraguans, English is a sign of “subjugation and domination” (Brantmeier, 1997, p. 35) and is not welcome in some communities. Brantmeier (1997) recalls receiving threats over the phone when developing an English program in the northern city of Estelí in 1993. She states,

I received an anonymous telephone call telling me, ‘No hay que dar clases de inglés!’ (Do not teach English!). The caller also stated, ‘Algo horrible te va a pasar si siguen con los planes del instituto de inglés. Aquí en Nicaragua, no necesitamos el inglés’ (Something horrible will happen
to you if you continue the plans for the English institute. Here in Nicaragua we do not need English). (p. 35)

More recently and discussed later in this dissertation, Peace Corps TEFL is not invited to work in some areas of the country, including the town in which my research takes place (anonymous Peace Corps TEFL representative, personal communication, 2017).

During the Somoza dictatorship until 1979 when the Sandinista revolution overthrew it, public and private educational institutions taught English and French, and by the 1980s English became a requirement for students in grades 7-11 (Steinmueller, 1990; Stern & Jacobs, 1988). As far back as the mid-1980s, the reasons for learning English were the same as they are today: development. Steinmueller (1990) and Brantmeier (1997) list the need for medical, agricultural and other technicians to access information published in English to improve their practice, study abroad opportunities, and participation in the increasingly interconnected world as reasons for Nicaraguans learning English 20-30 years ago. Stern and Jacobs (1988) list similar reasons but also mention that “[n]one said they were studying English to prepare for moving to the U.S.” (p. 19).

### 3.2.3. Current English policy, teacher education, and practice

Recently, an increase in tourism in Nicaragua over the past decade and a desire to be more competitive globally has influenced the Nicaraguan Ministry of Education (MINED) to revise its secondary-school English language policy to include a (slightly) more structured curriculum (“Instalan comisiones nacionales,” 2015). MINED’s National Educational Plan (2002-2015) asked for funding and participation from world organizations to begin to overhaul their curriculum, including developing a new EFL program, which was piloted in 2004 and had over 70 schools using it by 2006 (Chávez, 2006). The program, founded in attention towards communicative competence and a constructivist educational philosophy, required no textbook and instead focused on pedagogical support of teachers (Chávez, 2006). Exemplifying the deep disruptions that occur when different entities gain power in Nicaragua, Chávez laments, “…because of changes of national educational authorities in 2006, the policies changed as well,
and the process [of strengthening ELT] stopped. Currently, little is known of the new current policies for EFL language instruction (Chávez, 2006, p. 30). Despite the lack of direction for the EFL program in Nicaragua, MINED has recently required English classes at all education levels, beginning in the first grade (“Avanza con éxito,” 2018; Castillo Bermúdez, 2018; “Nicaragua promoverá,” 2017). Starting in 2018, the teaching of English now begins in the first grade. A review of relevant articles on MINED’s website does not find reasons for beginning English language learning in first grade; however, teacher training at all levels has been given more attention, but the quality and relevance of the training for the Nicaraguan classroom remains inadequate (Chávez, 2006; Bodden & Trejos, 2011; Herrera & Rubio, 2018).

Formal language policy documents and materials by governments, educational institutions, and foreign aid organizations provide the discourse of national and international development as reasoning to support learning English at secondary levels, and this discourse is found in documents by the Nicaraguan Ministry of Education (Canelo & Acevedo, 2009), the Peace Corps’ “Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) Certificate Program” (2019), and the U.S. Embassy in Nicaragua (2018). A 2008 Nicaraguan Ministry of Education (MINED) national curriculum contains the most recent edition of the decades-long-enforced requirement of five years of foreign language education at the secondary school level, from grades 7-11 (Canelo & Acevedo, 2009); however, the program of study, along with articles on MINED’s website, use “lengua extranjera” [foreign language] as a metonym for “English,” as the program of study outlines its curriculum in only Spanish, while the very brief pages dedicated specifically to foreign language curriculum are in English, with some Spanish (Canelo & Acevedo, 2009). No other foreign languages are mentioned.

As for the goals of English language education, a recent article on MINED’s website demonstrates a strong orientation toward English as a tool for socioeconomic development and opportunity:
En cuanto a la creación de la Comisión Nacional de Lengua Extranjera, el Ing. Arturo Collado, Secretario Técnico del Concejo Nacional de Universidades, destacó que es una preocupación nacional fortalecer la enseñanza del inglés como segunda lengua en todos los niveles educativos y en la población nicaragüense, debido a las grandes perspectivas que tiene nuestro país con los proyectos de la construcción del Gran Canal, así como el crecimiento del sector turístico nicaragüense. [As for the creation of the National Commission of Foreign Language, Mr. Arturo Collado, Technical Secretary of the National Council of Universities, emphasized that it is a national concern to strengthen the teaching of English as a second language at all educational levels and in the Nicaraguan population because of the great prospects that our country has with the construction projects of the Grand Canal, and the growth of the Nicaraguan tourism sector].

(“Instalan comisiones nacionales,” 2015)

The Grand Canal mentioned in the quote refers to the current fifty-billion-dollar canal project supposedly funded by Chinese billionaire Wang Jing and his Hong Kong Nicaragua Development (HKND) Group (“Nicaraguan canal project,” 2015). The proposed canal would cut through Nicaragua and join the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans via a route through two lakes, including Lake Nicaragua, the country’s largest freshwater lake. Thus, MINED draws on the discourse of English for development (Appleby et al., 2002), one of many discourses associated with Global English, to justify English language coursework in its educational policy. No other foreign languages are referred to in any of MINED’s policy documents or on their website.

### 3.2.4. International influences on ELT and SLTE

International presences, primarily from the United States, have also supported English language acquisition in Nicaragua in recent times, as they did in the revolutionary 1980s (See Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2.3.). Peace Corps volunteers (PCVs) have been serving in Nicaragua since 1968 (“Peace Corps
Nicaragua Volunteers,” 2018), and TEFL PCVs have been operating in Nicaragua since 2014\(^9\) (Overseas Programming and Training Support, 2016). The Peace Corps TEFL program currently functions in 11 countries; its Nicaraguan program is currently suspended due to political instability in the region. At the time of the study in 2017, the program was running throughout the country, but not in the town and surrounding areas in which this study takes place. It offers a TEFL certificate that is validated by the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington D.C. after completion of 120 hours of training followed by two years of supervised teaching (“Teaching English as a Foreign Language,” 2019). Training includes pre-service work in the form of online learning and practice teaching, two years of supervised volunteer teaching at the volunteer’s post (including teacher observations), and several training events during their in-service teaching.

Peace Corps TEFL functions with conventional orientations towards methods. According to retired Nicaraguan PCV Richards (2017), she states, “This knowledge [of conventional methods] would later be critical to my success in the Peace Corps, as the organization officially charged me with changing Nicaraguan EFL teachers’ practice from primarily the Grammar Translation Method to primarily the Communicative Language Teaching Method” (p. 7). With that noted, some Peace Corps Nicaragua volunteer-teachers also have developed a critical sense of how their presence and beliefs affect their Nicaraguan teaching partners. Recently reflecting on their presence and activity as co-teachers in English classrooms, Nicaraguan TEFL PCVs asked:

How do we feel about playing a part in promoting English as a global language? Is what we’re doing here actually making a difference? But we have tried our hardest to remain open minded and curious. Starting from a place of humility and a genuine hunger to learn has made a world of difference. Our counterparts are as excited to teach us as we are to teach them. They want to learn English, they want to help us learn about Nicaragua, and they want us to help them be better

\(^9\) As of this writing, all PCVs have been evacuated from Nicaragua due to violence that began in April, 2018 when President Daniel Ortega announced pension cuts, which led to nation-wide protests and police and military violence (“Peace Corps Nicaragua Volunteers,” 2018; Confidencial, 2018).
This reflexivity on the part of international English volunteer teachers is an important step toward taking action on changing how they work with administrators, English teachers and learners. The PCV English teachers’ critical reflections echo Brantmeier’s (1997) concern when she was training English teachers in the early 1990s:

As an educator, I continue to struggle with the full effects of this project. Was this English language center in Estelí really a development project, or did it serve to engender power relations in the community? Is English an agent of change, progress and modernization, or is English a tool used to help constitute strategies of domination? My critical reflection on these issues reveals conflicting agendas within the sociopolitical arena, and in viewing the English language center from this perspective, I contend that this project sustained the social hierarchy and advantaged elites in the society. (Brantmeier, 1997, p. 40)

This critical reflection is not yet evident in other programs, such as the U.S. Embassy’s English Access Microscholarship Program (Access). Access has been offered throughout the world in low-income countries since 2004. Over 115,000 students in more than 85 countries have participated in Access, “…a global scholarship program supported by the U.S. Department of State that provides a foundation of English language skills to bright, economically disadvantaged students, primarily aged 13- to 20-year olds through After-School classes and Intensive Sessions” (U.S. Department of State, 2017, p. 7). The scholarship pays for fees to take part in the program and materials like the course textbook and compact-disc (CD). The Access Program Handbook for Providers is an 86-page document that outlines how providers (government ministries of education, non-government organizations, or others) can implement the program in their country. In Nicaragua, a U.S.- and Spanish-based NGO is the provider through which the Access Program runs at its schools in several towns and cities. At the time of the research, seven Access programs were running in Nicaragua.
3.3. Research design: Engaged, ethnographic case study

3.3.1. Case study

My research questions are best answered through a case study approach that accounts for “…an interest in the local particulars of some abstract social phenomenon” (Dyson & Genishi, 2005, p. 2-3); in this case, I study local English teachers’ understandings and practices – discourses – within the global spread of English. I construct a combination of units – two educational sites engaging with the teaching and learning of English, one of which is building an English curriculum and in need of SLTE, and the other which already has an English curriculum and an experienced English teacher. Dyson and Genishi (2005) argue that “…cases are constructed, not found, as researchers make decisions about how to angle their vision on places overflowing with potential stories of human experience” (p. 1-2). Specific to the field of the education of language teachers, “case study methods of research have produced some important discoveries about…how language teachers draw on perspectives and assumptions to inform their practices…” (Faltis, 1997, p. 145). Because I explore how learning and teaching English on the periphery brings about its own pluralities and truths, then case study allows me to engage in the provision of “transformative possibilities” that may “…generate new hypotheses, models, and understandings about the nature of language learning or other processes…” and contribute to “…challenging current beliefs” (Duff, 2008, p. 43) about global English and ELT.

Since three teachers are the focus of this research, with other participants informing this focus, I construct an instrumental case design (Stake, 2000) within the context of English teaching-learning in Tepetl. Stake defines two types of case studies, intrinsic and instrumental. In an intrinsic case study, the sole purpose is to come to a better understanding of a specific case because that case itself is of interest for very particular reasons to the researcher. No connection to macro-level issues or to theory is made. Stake calls a case study instrumental “if a particular case is examined mainly to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization. The case … plays a supporting role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else. The case is still looked at in depth, its contexts scrutinized, and its
ordinary activities detailed, but all because this helps us pursue the external interest” (Stake, 2000, p. 445). Stake continues that cases are instrumental in leading to improved understanding and theorizing and can result in countering certain generalizations made in other studies, and this is why I call this case study instrumental.

While case study allows for openness to a change in research goals, it does not mean that researchers do not engage with theory. Blommaert and Jie (2010) acknowledge that case methodology is “an inductive science, that is: it works from empirical evidence towards theory, not the other way around….you follow the data, and the data suggest particular theoretical issues” (p. 12, italics in the original). The data then evolve into cases that can be generalized as they fit into larger categories, and the researcher does this through the application of theoretical models. However, Blommaert and Jie (2010) also importantly point out that theorizing does not just take place after data analysis; it is still imperative to theorize beforehand; otherwise, researchers are left to rely on their own assumptions and opinions to guide their methodological design and research questions:

You have explored theoretical frameworks prior to starting your fieldwork….You usually know beforehand whether you will use a Marxist or a cognitive-psychological framework for your work, and these choices have influenced the design of your fieldwork and, of course, the particular kinds of data you have collected. The important point here is, however, methodological: generalisation is perfectly possible, because your data instantiate a case, and such a case belongs to a larger category of cases. The unique and situated events you have witnessed can and do indeed reveal a lot about the very big things in society. (p. 13)

Constructing an instrumental case study informed by critical and poststructural theories of discourse, power, and subjectivity, I demonstrate that generalizations posited by the macro-discourses of English as and for socioeconomic development must be critiqued with an understanding of particular local contexts, which have the power to destabilize patterns of knowledge and enact processes of thinking and acting differently about global relationships with English. Internal validity, that is, knowing if a case
that has been constructed is truly the reality of participants of the case study, brings forth another apparent problem with case study methods (Faltis, 1997). Thus, it is important to use methods of triangulation and long-term observation in order to avoid assumptions and generalizations. I detail these in Section 3.5.

3.3.2. Critical ethnography in case study

I have not conducted an ethnography, though I use the methods traditionally founded in ethnography, including long-term engagement with the site, video-taped participant-observation, interviews, and collection of relevant documents (Watson-Gegeo, 1988), which provides me with the descriptor of ethnographic case study. Duff (2008) states that “…one main difference between case study and ethnography is that, whereas the former focuses on the behaviors or attributes of individual learners or other individuals/entities, the latter aims to understand and interpret the behaviors, values, and structures of collectivities or social groups with particular reference to the cultural basis for those behaviors and values” (p. 34). While I place under investigation the normalized practices that the cultures of the fields of LPP and SLTE as a whole have produced, I am more interested in how the three teachers in this study – in connection with institutional actors and resources – justify, enact, or resist elements of these normalized assumptions and practices. I align with critical ethnography in that it is not merely descriptive, but it constructs ideological critique into cultural description, and it acknowledges that the researcher cannot objectively stand away from participants to observe them (Canagarajah, 1999).

Traditional ethnography requires long-term engagement in a specific site. However, in language policy research, “…there is no one ‘site’ in which a language policy is created nor one ‘community’ in which a language policy is penned. Therefore, ELPP [ethnography of language policy and planning] is preferably multi-sited …” (Johnson, 2013, p. 145). For example, Duff’s (1995) ethnographic case study on bilingual education in Hungary looked at three schools and focused on several teachers and speech events as the units of analysis (Duff, 2008). In my research, I link findings from Site 1, a university, with findings from Site 2, a secondary school, both operating in a remote town and both affected by several conflicting opinions, attitudes, and ideologies of English and English teaching, demonstrated in the policy
and planning choices that are made within these institutions and in the speech events and activities of the participants.

3.3.3. Combining policy and praxis: Engaged ethnography

My study is an *engaged* ethnographic case study, in which I am a full participant observer (Glesne, 2011). Glesne discusses her critical ethnographic positionality in Costa Rica as a “*volunteer researcher*” (p. 16, emphasis in italics in the original) because not only did she conduct research, but also she acknowledged that the organization with whom she was working needed her knowledge and abilities. Low and Merry (2010) define six ways that researchers practice engagement in fieldwork: “(1) sharing and support, (2) teaching and public education, (3) social critique, (4) collaboration, (5) advocacy, and (6) activism” (p. S204). For my work, engaging with local participants is a practice that seeks to document what is happening through local practices and learn if partnering with participants, providing different perspectives, and developing novel practices provides potential for small but noticeable adjustments in teachers’ discourses about English and ELT. More importantly, however, I am not trying to make grand change in the lives of my participants – I am learning from them in order to inform theoretical and methodological changes to research and praxis on ELP-CSLTE.

Engaged Language Policy and Practices (Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017) has potential as a starting point for inviting teachers into the language planning stages, while also providing a space for professional development that begins from their voices and concerns. Davis (2014) and Davis and Phyak (2017) constructed ELP to research how “participants and researchers collectively engage in transforming complex discriminatory language ideologies and practices, especially in peripheral communities of marginalized populations” (Davis & Phyak, 2017, p. 39). They highlight the role of the researcher as part of the research in order to provide participants “engaged space for achieving agency through resistance to global and local hegemonic ideologies” (Davis & Phyak, 2017, p. 39). As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.1.3., this approach embraces the Freirean (1970/1993) notion of praxis to be developed in partnership with teachers to reflect on policy circumstances and take ownership of their pedagogy. This knowledge is
always incomplete because as soon as people move through the process of reflection-action (praxis), they create a new position or footing, which, in turn, must be known through perceiving, reflecting, and acting again (Crawford-Lange, 1981).

While I draw on elements of ELP, at the same time I question the role of the Global-North researcher in bringing emancipatory dialogue to Global South agents. Kumaravadivelu (2016) writes, although both the center and periphery communities have to work together to disrupt the hegemonic forces, the latter bears a greater share of responsibility, because, as Holliday (2006) observes, “it cannot be denied that ‘Centre’ researchers trying to empower ‘Periphery’ communities to which they do not belong may in the end only strengthen the discourses of the ‘Centre’” (p. ix). I believe that in order to assume a greater and meaningful responsibility, the periphery communities must seriously engage in critical self-reflection, asking a probing question that Jacques Derrida (1994) asked in a different context and for a different purpose: “What now must be thought and thought otherwise?” (p. 59)

Kumaravadivelu makes a critical point about Global-North researchers bringing emancipatory agendas to the Global South, and like him I am critical of Global North academics’ unreflective promotion of “conscientizacion” (Freire, 1970/1993), a concept ironically coming from the Global South, re-theorized in the Global North, and then given back to the Global South by Global North researchers, to marginalized groups.

An engaged orientation is not necessarily participatory action research (PAR), though it shares some of its qualities. While engaged research and PAR promote partnership, advocacy, and activism, PAR “has at its essence the intent to change something, to solve some sort of problem, to take action” (Glesne, 2011, p. 15), placing a high expectation on the agency and capability of participants to enact social change. Action research that results in social change can take years of engaged participation. Although the partnership in this study lasted far too briefly for such goals (roughly six months), I argue that it is still possible to initiate engaged, meaningful work in short-term partnerships, but I do not believe
that significant changes resulting in social justice can be realized in short periods. The power of this study is not that I dramatically change participants’ thinking and activity, but that I expose readers to what their worlds are really like and the enormity of what they deal with – and just how powerful, yet subtle, the dominant discourses of global English and ELT are.

3.4. Description of the research setting: Tepetl and the two research sites

The two educational sites that form the nucleus of this study are located about two miles from each other in the northern town of Tepetl, a pseudonym, just minutes from the Honduran border and over four hours’ drive north from the capital of Managua. Tepetl is located in a mountainous region of the northernmost department of Nicaragua. Much of the population of 30,000 residents lives in the surrounding rural, mountain region, so the town itself feels quite small. The downtown area is roughly seven by eleven blocks and includes a central park, a colonial-era Catholic church, restaurants, markets, and cafes. The area is known for its coffee and lumber, and has a rich indigenous history still kept alive in the names of mountains, rivers, towns, and folklore, though speakers of indigenous languages are not prevalent in the area.

The town is situated in an area of severe hardship due to its remoteness and climate. It is located in one of the two driest departments, which also have the highest rates of poverty and malnutrition in Nicaragua (World Food Program USA, 2018). Power outages occur frequently in the town, sometimes several times a week, lasting between several hours to the entire day and into the evening. Because the climate is so dry, the municipality turns off water to households every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday in a conservation effort. Outside of town, which is situated in a valley surrounded by mountains, is a rural landscape, which makes Tepetl a difficult town to get to and leave. The area is not well known to tourists and aside from missionaries from the Mormon Church and volunteers from the Peace Corps, locals do not see many international travelers. Tepetl and the surrounding regions are conservative areas where tradition, religion, and social hierarchies remain staunchly in place.
This northern area is not known for its friendliness to North American presence. In 1926, when the United States occupied many areas of Nicaragua, the department of Nueva Segovia and surrounding departments in the north were the center of a guerrilla effort led by Augusto César Sandino, whose armies successfully fought and pushed out the United States Marines, who in 1927 bombed the area to support its ground troops (Tellez, 2014). This region is also home of the dominant Frente Sandinista Nacional Liberación (FSLN) political party, which named itself after Sandino and which fought and won the U.S.-backed Contras during the Contra War, which lasted from 1981-1990. Tepetl is a place that welcomes international presence with contradiction: for example, the local ministry of education will not allow the Peace Corps TEFL program to function within its territory, according to a representative from Peace Corps TEFL Nicaragua whom I interviewed, but many locals – especially the youth – want access to English and are open to being more globally connected. The U.S. Embassy has twice succeeded in the last six years in running its two-year English program out of an NGO-funded school in Tepetl.

The first of the sites at which I carried out my research was a small, unaccredited private university that I call Universidad de la Zona Norte (UZN), a pseudonym. Roughly one month into formal data collection, I began a volunteering endeavor in a two-year intensive English program for secondary school students funded by the U.S. Embassy, called the English Access Microscholarship Program (informally referred to as Access). This before-school program functioned out of an NGO-funded primary school campus that I call Colegio San Bernardino (CSB), also a pseudonym.

3.4.1. Site 1: Universidad de la Zona Norte (UZN)

UZN opened in 2016, one year before this study took place. UZN does not have its own campus, but instead functions out of a primary school campus on Saturday mornings for three hours. One mile northeast of the primary school is the university’s main office, a colonial-era home at the edge of town that the university rents and that serves as a place to enroll in study, collect tuition payments, and meet with students regarding academic matters. UZN does not have a website nor is there any other textual indication that the university exists. At the time of the study, UZN enrolled 296 students from the local
surrounding areas, including southern Honduras. In rural, northern areas such as the small, mountainous town just south of the Honduran border in which my research is conducted, most young adults only have access to this type of university. In order to legally function as a university, UZN had to partner with an accredited university, which was legally authorized to provide certificates to UZN’s students.

 UZN is considered by locals and Nicaraguan higher education officials to be a “universidad de garaje” [garage university] (Castillo Bermúdez, 2009; Cermeño, 2011; Navarrete, 2015). Such universities have spread quickly throughout Nicaragua over the last several years and now number around 56, according to Castillo Bermúdez (2009). Unaccredited and looked down on by official and legal institutions, they provide cheap, low quality education to students. They are perceived as fraudulent (Castillo Bermúdez, 2009), “caramanchels” [little shops] running under “condiciones tan deplorables” [deplorable conditions] (Cermeño, 2011). While universidades de garajes are contested, they provide Nicaraguans who otherwise would not be able to study because of location, finances, and other hardship an opportunity to receive some education and hope for a better future, and in some communities they are very well received because of the impact they have had on youth (Cermeño, 2011). In 2015, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua–Managua, the most reputable public university system that has campuses throughout the country, accepted only 8.76% high school graduates, leaving thousands of youth with no opportunity to enter public education (Navarrete, 2015).

3.4.1.1. Negotiating entrance to UZN

For my work with UZN, I refer to my role as an “invited” volunteer English language specialist whose expertise was sought for the development of an English program. The dean of UZN, Paulo, wanted to start an English program. Paulo was a friend of a colleague of mine whom I knew from the NGO for which I volunteered in the past. In the summer of 2016, my colleague sent an email, copying Paulo, asking for support of a new university in northern Nicaragua that was creating an English program. I expressed interest, and we set up our first of many Skype meetings to further discuss the partnership. Around this time, I also asked another Nicaraguan friend and colleague of mine to visit the site and meet
Paulo to establish that UZN and Paulo were legitimate and trustworthy entities. My friend, a university professor of English in a city south of Tepetl, visited and felt comfortable recommending the project.

In August 2016, Paulo and I held a Skype meeting to discuss his goals and how he foresaw working with me as a volunteer English specialist. The month leading up to the meeting, I sent him several questions about his university and his goals for an English program (see Appendix B). In late August 2016, I obtained from him an official plan and expectations for our partnership (see Appendix C). The plan was ambitious, with no clear parameters or end goals. For example, although he headed a university, Paulo looked to teach English to university students, children, and members of the community. When we spoke during the Skype meeting, I admitted to him that I could not assist him in accomplishing all of his goals, there were strands with which I certainly could assist him. He agreed with me and we negotiated the plan until we were both comfortable. His plan and our Skype meetings about the plan indicated that he had five English teachers, one of whom was a North American working with the Peace Corps. I would work on developing an English curriculum and educating English language teachers.

### 3.4.1.2. Participants of UZN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education/Experience</th>
<th>English Proficiency</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paulo</td>
<td>Male, 34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Licenciado in agronomy</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Cousin of Enrique (teacher at Site 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Female, 32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Licenciado in agronomy</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Former Access student of Enrique’s (teacher at second site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar</td>
<td>Male, 45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Maestria in agronomy</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Training to teach English for UZN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reyna</td>
<td>Female, 20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Working on licenciado in English Teaching</td>
<td>Low-intermediate English proficiency</td>
<td>Training to teach English for UZN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Female, 26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Peace Corps Volunteer with the Ministry of Health</td>
<td>- BA, feminist, gender and sexuality studies and Hispanic studies</td>
<td>Knew Paulo and Linda as personal acquaintances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-1: Participants at UZN

---

10 The licenciado, is a four- or five-year course of study similar to a Bachelor’s degree in the United States. The maestria is a two-year post-graduate degree similar to the Master’s degree in the United States.

11 I use participants’ self-described levels of English proficiency.
Table 3-1 above provides demographic and brief contextual details of the five UZN participants. The 296 students of UZN are not represented. Although I consider them peripheral participants for filling out a questionnaire (see Section 3.5.5.), they otherwise did not interact with me or the teachers during research activities.

**Paulo.** At the time of the study, Paulo was 34 years old and the dean of UZN. He has a PhD from a private Nicaraguan institution and at the time of the study had one year of teaching experience. He did not speak English aside from a few words and phrases. He said that he received his PhD in agronomy from a private university in a city about one hour’s drive south of Tepetl. Paulo was also teaching an agronomy class at a university in a city three hours southeast of Tepetl, while at the same time managing his responsibilities as dean of UZN.

**Linda.** Paulo’s wife, Linda, was 32 at the time of the study. She has a maestría from the same private Nicaraguan institution that Paulo attended, and at the time of the study also had one year of teaching experience as a sociology professor at UZN. She also did not know English aside from a few words and phrases. She expressed the desire to continue her education toward a PhD in the near future. Together with Paulo, she has two children, who were ages six and eleven during the time of the study. While Paulo left the family and UZN for much of each week to teach at another university, Linda managed and administered the daily obligations associated with UZN.

**Cesar.** At the beginning of the study, Cesar was the only teacher who would be working for Paulo and Linda, despite Paulo indicating in Skype meetings and in his planning document that he had five teachers. At the time of the study, Cesar was 45 years old and was currently working on a maestría in English Teaching, a degree for which he successfully acquired after the study ended, in February 2018, culminating in a thesis on the importance of English language teacher education in Nicaragua. Although he had never taught English, at the time of the study, he had been teaching computer technology for a primary school for the last ten years. Cesar was married with two children, both boys, aged 16 and 7. At the time of the study, he said that he had a strong intermediate level of proficiency in English. About two
months into the study, Cesar started taking a night English class provided for free. The class met once a week and I accompanied Cesar to his class twice during fieldwork. Later in my fieldwork, when I began work at the second site of Colegio San Bernardino (CSB), I learned that the English teacher there, Enrique, was a cousin of Cesar.

**Reyna.** Reyna was the second teacher who would be working for Paulo and Linda at UZN. In the first couple of weeks of my arrival, during which I was surprised to find that Paulo did not have the English teacher that he said he did, Cesar had put out a job advertisement for another English teacher for UZN, to which Reyna responded, increasing the number of English teachers to two. At the time of the study, Reyna was 20 years old. She was not enrolled in a *licensura* program at the start of the study, but became motivated through our work together to begin one in English Teaching, about three months into our project. The university that she attended during the study is the only accredited university in Tepetl. She had no teaching experience at the time that she became an English teacher for UZN, and she identified herself as a low-intermediate level English speaker. When she was in secundaria, three years prior to this study, she participated in the Access Program, taught by Enrique, the teacher-participant at CSB. Reyna had never had an official job prior to this opportunity with UZN, though she did significant labor as a child helping prepare and sell food for her family. She became pregnant at 18 and at the beginning of the study, her daughter was 16 months old. She had lived with her grandmother her entire life, including during the study.

**Amelia.** At the time of the study, one Peace Corps Volunteer (PCV) was stationed in Tepetl. When I arrived in January 2017, Amelia had been in Tepetl for six months of her two-year assignment, assigned to work with the Ministry of Health. Amelia was 26 years old and took a B.A. from a private liberal arts university in the Pacific Northwest in feminist, gender, and sexuality studies and Hispanic studies. She had studied abroad in Spain and in Venezuela and identified as advanced in Spanish. In Tepetl, Amelia’s official counterpart was with the Ministry of Health, and she involved herself with other health and education projects in the community. Amelia first met Paulo when she was on a quick “site
visit” to Tepetl before officially beginning her two-year PCV commitment. He contacted her soon after she returned to Tepetl to begin her two-year commitment. She said that Paulo took it upon himself to show her around every day for about two weeks. Shortly thereafter she met his family: his wife, Linda, and their children. Although Amelia did not have much time to assist with the new English program, after meeting me, and through months developing a relationship with me and the teachers, Amelia began to attend a small number of meetings and teacher workshops, where she provided her thoughts on curriculum and supported Cesar and Reyna in their learning.

### 3.4.2. Site 2: Colegio San Bernardino (CSB)

The U.S. Embassy Microscholarship Access Program (Access) has been offered throughout the world in low-income countries since 2004. Over 115,000 students in more than 85 countries have participated in Access, “…a global scholarship program supported by the U.S. Department of State that provides a foundation of English language skills to bright, economically disadvantaged students, primarily aged 13- to 20-year olds through After-School classes and Intensive Sessions” (p. 7). The scholarship pays for fees to take part in the program and materials like the course textbook and its accompanying compact-disc (CD). The Access Program Handbook for Providers is an 86-page document that outlines how providers (government ministries of education, non-government organizations, or others) can implement the program in their country. In Nicaragua, a U.S.- and Spanish-based NGO is the provider through which the Access Program runs through its schools in several locations. At the time of the research, seven Access programs were running in Nicaragua, including one in Tepetl, at the primary school campus of Colegio San Bernardino (CSB).

CSB is a primary school located about two miles north of UZN. It is one of the newest education centers run by the NGO for which I have volunteered over the last decade. Small in size, it serves over 1,500 primary school children with education and nutrition. The school is located just off of a busy and dangerous highway. It is tucked into the side of a mountainous region, and children play in the school yard surrounded by greenery. A small number of parents take a taxi with their children to drop them off at
school, but the majority of students walk or bike to school, many – even very young children – by themselves. Although it is a primary school, CSB served as the location for the Access Program. The Nicaraguan school day for primary and secondary school children is a half day, and secondary school begins in the afternoon. Therefore, Access students at this location would walk the miles to CSB in the morning to attend the Access program, then walk the miles back to their secondary school locations for their normal school day. The English classroom was at the end of an outdoor hall (see Appendix E). The classes before it were filled with primary schools students and their teachers, and across the hall was the school’s library.

3.4.2.1. Negotiating entrance to CSB

For my work with CSB, I refer to my role as a combination of “invited” and “uninvited” volunteer English language specialist, someone whose presence (but not expertise) was explicitly invited at the macro level by the U.S. Embassy, but not at the micro level by CSB and the Access teacher, Enrique. My relationship with CSB did not begin until I was already a few weeks into my fieldwork with UZN. During fieldwork, I responded to an email advertisement that I received from the U.S. Embassy to volunteer for Access. For American Citizens traveling in Nicaragua, the U.S. Embassy advises signing up for their travel alert emails. I received many of these during my fieldwork, and of particular interest was an email received on May 7, 2017 from the U.S. Consulate in Managua, which contained an emergency alert for the upcoming hurricane and typhoon season, as well as an “Invitation for Native English Speakers” to volunteer to help in an Access English class. The title alone – an invitation only for native English speakers – aligns with the ideology of native-speakerism: It does not matter if one does not have English teaching experience; if one speaks English as a first language, one is an asset in the English classroom. The email reads as follows:

Are you looking for an opportunity to volunteer in the community? How about practicing English with Nicaraguan youth? The English Access Micro Scholarship Program (Access) is a great way to get involved in community outreach and person-to-person diplomacy. Implemented
by [a local NGO\textsuperscript{12}] on behalf of the U.S. Embassy in partnership with Nicaraguan host institutions, Access provides intensive English language instruction to outstanding high school students (ages 13 -16) from economically disadvantaged families. Students attend two hours of English lessons daily from Monday through Friday. Since 2010, 2,020 Nicaraguan students have participated in the program. If you would like to volunteer for a talk, seminar, round table, game or workshop in English with these students, please contact the U.S. Embassy’s Public Affairs Section at ManaguaRC@state.gov and put “Access Program Volunteer” in the subject line. Please let us know if you have any questions. Thank you in advance for volunteering. It will be a lot of fun and is a great chance to learn about Nicaragua! (email, May 7, 2017)

In late May 2017, I emailed the U.S. Embassy and was put in contact with the NGO that runs the program, the same NGO with which I have a now ten-year relationship as volunteer. Its coordinator was enthusiastic about my interest in volunteering. She stated that there was currently an Access program running at their school in Tepetl. It was in its fourth month of its two-year commitment, and she stated that she would reach out to the teacher to see if he would be interested in working with me. The next day, I received an email from the teacher of Access, Enrique (a pseudonym), welcoming me into his classroom as an observer and resource for the students.

I was apprehensive about meeting Enrique because although he seemed excited in email to involve me in the class, I was concerned that the NGO might have not given him a choice in the matter. I met him and his class the following day, and that fear was immediately put to rest when I saw an energetic, positive, excited, English teacher who gathered his students to welcome me with a motivational chant (that I would soon learn they did daily), ending in the youth yelling as loud as they could, “Awesome!” Despite the warm welcome and immediate kindness of Enrique and his students, when we met after the first class to discuss how I might be an asset for him and his students, I told him that I understood that an outside presence can make a teacher feel uncomfortable, or not able to do what he or she normally does with students, and that while I was excited to work with him, I wanted to make sure that he felt the same. From my researcher-volunteer viewpoint, Enrique was sincere in his response that I was welcome in his class. Like the participants at UZN, he had never worked with a North American

\textsuperscript{12} The name of the NGO has been replaced by the bracketed phrase to protect the identity of the school site and participants.
English educator before, and he reasoned that my presence would expose students to a new culture, and that my native-English-speaking status would help students improve their English.

3.4.2.2. Participants of CSB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrique</th>
<th>Enrique’s students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male, 42</td>
<td>- 24 students aged 13-18, female and male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenciado, English</td>
<td>- In their fourth month of the two-year intensive English Access Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has taught English for over 20 years and Spanish to tourists and visitors for many years</td>
<td>- Actively worked with Enrique and me through lessons, including conventional and critically-based tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process of his second time teaching the two-year Access program</td>
<td>- Served as interlocutors with Enrique for me to learn what discourses of English and English teaching he actively used in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced English proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin of Cesar (teacher at UZN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former teacher of Reyna (teacher at UZN) three years prior when she took the first Access program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2: Participants at CSB

**Enrique.** At the time of the study, Enrique was 42 years old. He was curious about English from a young age, and learned much of it on his own without formal teaching. In his secondary school English classes as a youth, he was more advanced than the teacher and called upon to run the class when the teacher was away. He was the first English lecturer at the only accredited university in town (the one in which Reyna was attending during Stage 3 of the study), stating that he helped found the program. He has taught English since he was 21 years old, from small towns in the mountains near Tepetl to Managua, the capital of Nicaragua. He also had taught Spanish to North American and European tourists in Managua for many years. Cesar sees himself as an advanced English speaker, though he laments not getting many opportunities to speak to other English speakers because of the remote location of Tepetl. Working with me was refreshing for him, he said, because I exposed him to new language. Enrique is connected to both of the UZN teachers. He is Cesar’s cousin and Reyna’s former English teacher when she took Access three years prior to the study. Enrique was in his fourth month of his second time taking a group of secondary students through the program.

**The students.** The 24 students of Access program were, based on the requirements for eligibility for the program, some of the most impoverished youth in Tepetl. With just slightly more girls than boys, the students would walk or bicycle to CSB Monday through Friday. Classes began at 8 a.m. and ended at
11 a.m. After these students attended their before-school Access Program, they would then return home for a quick lunch before heading to their usual secondary schools for their normal school day, which runs for half a day, or 3-4 hours, in Nicaragua. Access is a competitive program and, despite their home circumstances, the students had to have good scores and demonstrate high motivation to be accepted.

Because this study focuses on the discourses at the LPP-SLTE interface and how teachers navigate conventional and alternative discourses during our discussions and activities together, I was less interested in the students as learners of English, and more interested in the strategies – emerging through activity – on which Enrique drew to teach, and what those said about the discourses of English and English teaching to which he ascribed. The students served as interlocutors through tasks presented both by Enrique and by me, so that I could learn from Enrique his views on such tasks and what they meant to his understandings as a teacher. Aside from completing a questionnaire, like the students of UZN, the students did not have any other responsibility to me for the research but to continue interacting with Enrique in their classroom as they normally would.

3.5. Methods of data collection

3.5.1. Participant observation

As full participant (Glesne, 2011), I used a Freirean-based critical approach inspired by the work of Davis (2014), Davis and Phyak (2017), and Crawford-Lange (1981) to guide curriculum planning and SLTE activities involving participants, as described above. While ELP (Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017) gave me the conceptual tools for engagement with teachers during curriculum development meetings, planning activities, workshops, and tutoring, Crawford-Lange’s (1981) framework described in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2.1. provided me with ideas for a loose method through which to carry out engagement. I worked with participants as “teachers as learners of teaching” (K. E. Johnson, 2009), teachers as learners of teaching English, and teachers who are also learners of English. I used fieldnotes, audio-video, and photography in order to document observations of my participation and the participation of others.
3.5.2. Field notes

I took extensive field notes by hand because of frequent power outages. I kept descriptive and analytic field notes, as well as research diary notes. Descriptive notes entailed mental notes (Lofland & Lofland, 1995) of discussions and observations to write down later when pulling out a notebook is inappropriate. I expanded on these notes later, in the early mornings and late evenings, the very few minutes to myself that I could grasp in the highly social and connected Nicaraguan culture. Analytic notes entailed the connections that began occurring to me (Glesne, 2011), including problems that arose and how I would work through them, clarifications of earlier impressions, and step-by-step notes on how to structure upcoming workshops and meetings. Diary notes included my feelings on the positive and frustrating elements of fieldwork, which later allowed me to reflect on some of the difficulties that I experienced with more distance and, thus, clarification. I described settings and appearances, acts, events, processes, talk, documents, and artefacts (Glesne, 2011).

3.5.3. Visual data: Photographs and audio-video

Photographs and audio-video recordings of workshop, meeting, tutoring, and co-teaching interactions in the two sites accompanied my field notes. Videotaping was invaluable to data collection, as it allowed me to replay and analyze data frame by frame (Glesne, 2011). I also undertook social, spatial, and temporal mapping of the sites (Watson-Gegeo, 1988). Social mapping involved recording demographic information and participants’ relationships with one another. Spatial mapping involved documenting the placement of participants in relations to one another, as well as the placement of technological devices (e.g., a compact-disc player) and teaching resources (e.g., the white board). Temporal mapping documented the daily rhythm of the activities conducted in each site. This mapping was supported by photography, which helped me “…with qualifying and contextual relationships that are usually missing from codified written notes” (Collier & Collier, 1986, p. 10). I also diagrammed the sites in my field notes, drawing the rooms, walls, windows, doors, and other architectural elements, which also assisted in qualifying and contextualizing field notes (see Appendices E and F).
3.5.4. Interviews

I conducted nonstandardized, nonscheduled, semi-structured interviews with all three teachers and the Peace Corps volunteer: Cesar, Reyna, Enrique, and Amelia. This approach to interviews gave the interviewees more choice to take my questions in different directions and supported their personal experience. I also intended to interview Paulo and Linda, the dean of the UZN and his wife, a professor. They agreed to an interview, but upon arriving at the scheduled time, I would find that Linda or Paulo would not be present or would be engaged in other obligations. This absence from a scheduled interview occurred three times, and to ensure that I was respectful of and sensitive to their possible discomfort at being interviewed, despite their consent to participate in one and their seeming excitement and interest, I stopped asking them. They could have been uncomfortable because of UZN’s status as an unaccredited university, or uncomfortable with some elements of my research, as “la hora nica” [the Nica hour], a term used endearingly among Nicaraguans to joke about never being punctual, has been taken up within the gaze of the imperialist outsider as an annoyance “…que nos declara incapaces de ser puntuales, y en consecuencia, gentes irresponsables” [that declares us [Nicaraguans] incapable of being punctual, and consequently, irresponsible people], but that in reality has a more empowering implementation: “No hay que descartar que llegar tarde sea una forma de resistencia. Quizá decidimos hacernos esperar, cansados de hacerlo ante dones, patrones, capataces, jefes, jueces, curas, guardias, timbucos, calandracas, yankis, caudillos y dictadores” [Do not rule out that being late is a form of resistance. Maybe we decided to make ourselves wait, tired of doing it before sirs, masters, foremen, bosses, judges, priests, guards, timbucos, calandracas13, yankees, leaders and dictators] (Arellano, 2008).

My goal in conducting interviews with the teachers was to gain an understanding of the participants’ personal histories, experiences with English language and U.S. cultural learning, and beliefs about English in the area, English teaching, and learning. I conducted the interviews after teachers had

---

13 Timbucos and calandracas are Nicaraguan vernacular terms used to negatively describe the bourgeoisie and oligarchs of the 19th century (timbucos) and a social class of men who were not owners but who also were not owned by employers (calandracas), both groups causing war and trouble for the peasants that had to fight under them (“Timbucos y Calandracas,” 2011).
taken part in several workshops and meetings with me, having already exposed them to the critical and alternative discourses of English to which I subscribed. I wanted to learn if engagement with those discourses emerged from their responses, if they indexed conventional discourses so commonly connected to English, or if they presented an intricate combination of both discourses. I was also interested in understanding how their alignment to certain discourses allowed them to present to me particular subjectivities as teachers and learners of English, and how these subjectivities connected to the larger social, cultural, political, and historical climate of Nicaragua and its relationship to English and the United States. Participants each received similar questions, but if an answer opened up a space for inquiry, I would ask a question that I did not initially schedule. Questions were classified into the following six categories: background, history of learning English, history of teaching English, opinions on the global spread of English and its relevance to Nicaragua, definition and opinions on the terms “critical” and “critical thinking,” and if there was a space for their use in English classes, their opinions on North American volunteers coming to teach English, and advice for me and other volunteers (see Appendix G).

My goal in conducting an interview with Amelia, the Peace Corps volunteer, was to learn about her experience as an outsider to Nicaragua and Tepetl, but also as someone who had been in the area long enough to speak knowledgably and reflectively about her linguistic and cultural experiences regarding English, as well as her relationships with the participants associated with UZN and CSB. Questions asked about her background, how she saw English functioning for Nicaraguans and, in particular, citizens of Tepetl, her opinions on English in Nicaragua and Tepetl, and her experience teaching and tutoring English in Tepetl. Her answers served to support or correct my analyses of my experiences and observations regarding English, English teaching, and English learning (see Appendix H). I also interviewed a representative from the Peace Corps TEFL program, which allowed me to better understand how English – and the Peace Corps’ role in its teaching – was historically, politically, and socioculturally situated in Nicaragua and Tepetl, in particular. Questions regarded the goals of the TEFL program, how it
was structured, how PCVs worked with local teachers, the teaching methods that the program supported or did not support, and the political and historical relationships that the program had with MINED in Tepetl and Nicaragua. Interviews lasted about one hour, and participants were told that they were free to answer or not answer any question.

3.5.5. Questionnaires

I generated open-ended questions (Mackey & Gass, 2005) for the 296 students of UZN and the 24 students of CSB because I wanted to understand what young people in Tepetl understood about English in their lives, their opinions about the importance of English, and how they saw English in their futures. As well, I hoped to obtain unexpected answers that disrupted my understandings of English for youth in Tepetl. These questionnaires helped establish a pattern of certain discourses to which many people used, and helped me ascertain if there seemed to be any resistance or negative feelings toward English. Questions pertained to demographics of age and sex, what they wanted to do as a career, why they wanted to learn English, their history of learning English, resources they had and wanted to have to learn English, what they thought were positive and negative aspects of English in Nicaragua, and other questions related to their English experience and opinions (see Appendix I). The questionnaires led me to better understand students’ cultural interpretations of English – that is, what they believed were the norms about English in their lives. A questionnaire instead of a survey allowed students to use their own language to describe their situations and opinions, thus providing me more emic data for analysis. Questionnaires were written in Spanish, so students – most of whom had limited to beginning levels of English competence – could use their full voice in responding.

3.5.6. Document collection

I collected text-based documents (Glesne, 2011) that were important to the daily activity of English teaching at both sites. For UZN, I collected Paulo’s official planning document for the English Program, as well as the Peace Corps TEFL Manual of Activities, Grammar, Teaching Strategies, and Vocabulary for the Nicaraguan Classroom (Abbot, Morris, & TEFL Peace Corps Volunteers in
Nicaragua, 2012) that the UZN teachers and I used to guide our curriculum meetings and teacher education workshops. The curriculum that we developed for the UZN English program also became a document for analysis. For CSB, I collected the *English Access Microscholarship 2016-2017 Handbook for Providers* (U.S. Department of State, 2017) that CSB and Enrique were required to follow. I also collected the textbook and teacher guidebook that the NGO, as a provider of Access, chose for teachers and students to use. The students used *Go Beyond 2: Student’s Book Pack* (Campbell, Metcalf, & Benne, 2015). The 10-unit book totals 149 pages and is the second of a series of five books, each of which has a cover photo of Western-looking youth riding on a roller coaster. Enrique also used *Go Beyond 2: Teacher’s Edition Pack Premium* (Cole & Terry, 2015). The teacher’s pack is 210 pages and comes with three audio CDs. I also collected a series of web-based articles from the Nicaragua MINED and newspapers that provided me with the information needed to give sociocultural and historical context to my study (Glesne, 2011). These documents provided understandings into the reasoning behind teaching English in Nicaragua, English teacher education, and historical relationships with English, North Americans, and Great Britain.

3.6. Research Stages

Table 3-3 on the following page provides a summary of the four stages of the case study. The stages, along with methods of formal data collection, are detailed below the table. Each stage emerged from the prior stage, and my choices on how construct them and what to include were dictated by past experiences and observations with the sites and participants. These stages are the following: Stage 1: “Casing the joint”; Stage 2: Policy analysis and initiation of curriculum design; Stage 3: Fieldwork; and Stage 4: Follow-up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/15/17-03/03/17: “Casing the joint”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site 1: UZN**
- Initiated a six-week site visit to build relationships of mutual trust, create a work plan with UZN, and adjust IRB to the realities of the site.
- Conducted initial workshops and meetings to establish potential participants’ trust in me as an experienced and knowledgeable partner.
- Introduced Freirean-inspired plan for curriculum development and SLTE workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/03/17-04/28/17: Policy analysis; initiation of curriculum design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site 1: UZN**
- Began design of English curriculum and teacher education workshops based on meetings, discussions, and experiences during Stage 1.
- Collected and designed learning and teaching materials to facilitate fieldwork.

**Site 2: CSB**
- Start: 04/28/17
- Co-planned and co-taught with the teacher for the U.S. Embassy English program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/28/17-08/11/17: Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site 1: UZN**
- Continued to design English curriculum and co-teach with participants.
- Administered questionnaires to UZN students to learn about prevailing discourses and needs associated with English.

**Site 2: CSB**
- Start: 06/07/17
- Interviewed the Access English teacher.
- Interviewed the two English teachers of UZN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/15/17-12/31/17: Follow-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Maintained contact with participants until the end of 2017 to learn about their English learning and teaching opportunities.
- Reached out to English teachers at other Nicaraguan universities to triangulate fieldwork with information and others’ experiences about English in Nicaragua.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return to U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3-3: Summary of Design and Data Collection**

3.6.1. Stage 1: “Casing the joint”: Universidad de la Zona Norte

To build this multi-staged, multi-sited study, I spent a period of six weeks (01/15/17 – 03/03/17) visiting the site to learn more about it, the people who were affiliated with it, the larger community, and other sites that could potentially inform my work. Dyson and Genishi (2007) call this “casing the joint” (p. 19), a process whereby “…case study researchers precede formal data collection with amassing basic information about space, time, and people in some site or sites. Some of this information can come from varied kinds of documents…. Still, the bulk of the work of casing the joint happens in early visits to the sites themselves” (p. 21). The visit allowed potential participants and me to begin building relationships...
and mutual trust, as well as a work plan for the upcoming several months. This relationship-building work was a long and complicated process of building trust. It included giving initial teacher development workshops to show my capabilities as an educator and my genuine interest in Paulo’s ideas and the teachers’ development as English learners and teachers.

The early site visit allowed me to propose to Cesar my idea for a critically engaged, Freirean-based curriculum and workshop plan for the coming months. I did not want to offer a type of partnership that he did not support. The early site visit also assisted me in adjusting the IRB to reflect the reality of the project, which I could not fully understand and describe without having visited. Within the first several days of casing the joint, for example, I found much of what Paulo told me about the site and its associated participants to be different from our Skype and email exchanges, including that there was no designated university campus, that UZN was unaccredited, and that he did not have five English teachers working with his program, as his written plan and our Skype meetings indicated. Thus, it is important to conduct this preliminary work, especially in sites with which one is unfamiliar, because it assists the researcher in building initial relationships, understanding how social life is configured, learning what exactly the site(s) can teach the researcher about the phenomenon that he or she is researching, and learning how to (re)structure the study (Dyson & Genishi, 2007).

3.6.2. Stage 2: Preparing for fieldwork

Stage 2 occurred over seven weeks, from 03/03/17-04/28/17, in which I returned to the United States. During Stage 2, I engaged reflectively with the dissonance that I experienced during the site visit, readjusting my understanding of the site from Paulo’s descriptions in his original plan (see Appendix C) and in Skype meetings and towards what I experienced during the first stage. In Stage 2, I began to collect and design resources that I needed for engaged fieldwork in Stage 3: workshops, curriculum meetings, tutoring, and co-teaching. I used Stage 2 to begin the design of the Freirean-based curriculum and workshops for Stage 3. My intention was to start a draft that I could present to the group, then continue together with the group to reshape the draft with their knowledge, experience, and reflexivity. I drew on
Crawford’s (1978) second-language curriculum design principles that she derived from Freire’s philosophy (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.3.). I structured a draft curriculum and teacher workshops with these principles in mind.

Stage 2 encompassed not only resource design, but also resource collection. I collected English exercise books, notebooks, and English-Spanish dictionaries to aid our work together. I also collected a variety of online websites that provided resources for learning and teaching English that would generate dialogue and ideas with the teachers. To provide an example of this resource gathering, I knew that the UZN English program needed content to teach, so I began searching for resources that would be inexpensive and accessible for the program. In his work on critical perspectives on language materials, Gray (2013) argues that materials “…are cultural artefacts from which meanings emerge about the language being taught, associating it with particular ways of being, particular varieties of language and ways of using language, and particular sets of values” (p. 3). He continues that they are ideological and that they promote existing power relations. Aligning with his argument, I wanted to resist course books completely (Thornbury, 2013), especially since students who attend UZN are studying there because they cannot afford to study at an accredited institution.

I reached out to Nicaraguan teachers and professors, and one professor emailed me a manual created by Peace Corps TEFL volunteers in Nicaragua. Now in its third edition, the full title is *Teaching English as a foreign language, 7th-11th Grade: Manual of activities, grammar, teaching strategies and vocabulary for the Nicaraguan classroom* (Abbot et al., 2012). The manual, which followed the Nicaragua MINED’s secondary school foreign language policy, is available for free online as of this writing, and the teacher who emailed it to me said that many Nicaraguan teachers, even those who have not worked with PCVs, use the manual. I was drawn to the manual as a resource for several reasons. First, the Peace Corps TEFL program is validated by the Center for Applied Linguistics (TEFL Certificate Program, 2019), whose founder, Charles A. Ferguson, and his wife, Shirley Brice Heath, were committed to engagement with marginalized language populations through their respective fields of sociolinguistics.
and linguistic anthropology. Also, it was freely accessible online for teachers and it incorporated aspects of the Nicaraguan context, both areas of which aligned with my critical stance to the partnership. I emailed the Peace Corps in Nicaragua to introduce myself and my research, and I asked permission to use the manual in connection with the curriculum that I was drafting. They were glad to know that their manual was being used in different contexts and gave me permission, though they told me that I did not need to ask permission. They also asked if I would share my curriculum with them to help them continue to shape their work, to which I agreed and sent them after completion of fieldwork. This highlights another element of engaged work: connecting with others from the Global North who are teaching English in the Global South, sharing resources, and learning and reflecting together on our work.

3.6.3. Stage 3: Fieldwork

During the four-month-long Stage 3, from 04/28/17 to 08/11/17, I began fieldwork by engaging again with the director and teachers at the university, this time in the form of professional development workshops, curriculum meetings, tutoring, and co-teaching. I obtained formal written permission in person from Paulo, Linda, Cesar, Reyna, and Amelia. For CSB, I obtained written permission from the NGO which hosted the Access program, as well as oral and written permission from Enrique, the students and their parents, during my first week volunteering in the classroom. Enrique assisted me in setting up individual meetings with all 24 students and at least one parent or legal guardian per child, to discuss my research and obtain consent from guardians and assent from students, who ranged in age from 13-18. In total, I conducted eight teacher education workshops with Reyna and Cesar (Amelia attended the final two of these); three curriculum development meetings primarily with Reyna and Cesar, but sometimes also with Paulo, Linda, and Amelia; twelve tutoring sessions with Reyna; and twenty-two co-teaching partnerships with Enrique, including post-teaching meetings.

Workshops. The teacher education workshops provided to Reyna and Cesar covered the topics summarized in Table 3-4 below. Workshops ran roughly three hours long with a 20-minute break halfway through, three occurring at the beginning of Stage 3 and three occurring about one month later, just before
teachers were to begin teaching. Based on our discussions and my own intentions as a researcher-educator, I came up with the workshop topics for Stage 3. Workshops entailed an exploration of the world of TESOL, language, and learning through both conventional and critical lenses, as well as a focus on the teacher and his or her identity as important to informing her or her teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop 1 05/01/17</th>
<th>Workshop 2 05/02/17</th>
<th>Workshop 3 05/03/17</th>
<th>Workshop 4 5/30/17</th>
<th>Workshop 5 5/31/17</th>
<th>Workshop 6 06/01/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freirean-based problem-posing activity and dialogue about English in their world and in the world</td>
<td>The history of methods in TESOL</td>
<td>Task-based language teaching</td>
<td>Curriculum and materials exploration, critique, discussion</td>
<td>Developing lesson plans for creativity and criticality in connection with the Peace Corps TEF manual for the Nicaraguan classroom</td>
<td>Practice Teaching Lesson Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce intentions to create critically-informed workshops/curriculum; dialogue about what that means; negotiate intentions with teachers</td>
<td>Problematizing the concept of “method”</td>
<td>Using (and problematizing) technology for planning and implementing lessons</td>
<td>Critiquing the Peace Corps manual</td>
<td>Developing lesson plans for creativity and criticality in connection with the Peace Corps TEF manual for the Nicaraguan classroom</td>
<td>Dialogue on the nature of teachers as lifelong learners, teacher beliefs, and forming teacher support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion on theories of learning and theories of language</td>
<td>Familiarization with Peace Corps TEF Manual for the Nicaraguan classroom</td>
<td>Developing lesson plans for creativity and criticality in connection with the Peace Corps TEF manual for the Nicaraguan classroom</td>
<td>Practice teaching lesson plans</td>
<td>Final curriculum discussion and negotiation before teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning within the historical, cultural, and socioeconomic backdrop of Nicaragua</td>
<td>International Phonetic Alphabet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group feedback on lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-4: Brief Description of Workshops for UZN English Teachers During Stage 3

**Curriculum meetings.** Curriculum meetings were held four times on Sunday, 04/30/17, Monday, 05/22/17, Monday, 05/29/17, and Saturday, 06/17/17. The first meeting was attended by Paulo, Cesar, Reyna, and Amelia. The second meeting was solely with Cesar. The third meeting was with Paulo, Linda, Amelia, Reyna, and Cesar (though he missed a substantial portion), and the final meeting was attended by Cesar and Reyna. These meetings entailed a number of planning discussions about whom the teachers were teaching (e.g., age group), where they would be teaching, how many students they would likely have, and what resources they would have access to. They also entailed negotiation of the Freirean-based curriculum that I had begun based on the work of Crawford-Lange (1981) and in dialogue with the Peace Corps TEF manual as a base for content. The meetings were intended to provide administrators and
teachers a voice in the decisions about what to teach, and based on our dialogue, change areas of the curriculum and syllabus. I also intended the meetings to be a place in which all involved would actively plan and write the curriculum with me.

**Tutoring Reyna.** In early May, 2017, Reyna approached me about the possibility of tutoring her in English, as it had been a couple of years since she had taken classes and actively used the language. She came at least twice a week for a couple of hours each session. We usually split the session into learning English for the first hour, then learning about teaching English for the second hour, though it did not always end up this way. These flexible sessions were mostly dictated by what Reyna was curious about, though I lightly structured them in light of preparing her for teaching for UZN. Sessions also became a space for her to explore technology. She had never used a computer before, so often times, tutoring focused on using my laptop to find information about English and English teaching, learning to type, and engaging in other technological literacy.

**Co-teaching with Enrique at CSB.** While co-teaching was planned with Cesar and Reyna, it occurred only once with Reyna and never with Cesar due to planning obstacles encountered at UZN (see Chapter 7). Co-teaching and planning with Enrique, the Access teacher at CSB, was a space in which Enrique fit me into his class with great openness and flexibility. Sometimes I would teach a small activity, sometimes I would teach most of the class, and sometimes I played the role of an aid or tutor, working with students during group activities. When I taught, I often worked in critical elements about English and the materials with which students used, intending to build critical awareness among the students and Enrique in a non-face-threatening manner. As a guest in his classroom, I always introduced my ideas to Enrique before teaching them, and he always met them with enthusiasm. After-class planning sessions with Enrique involved planning content delivery and deciding who would teach what. More than that, they were a space for Enrique to voice his concerns, frustrations, and worries about students, about the Access program, and about the school.
3.6.4. Stage 4: Follow-up

During Stage 4, which I mark as a period from when I ended fieldwork on 08/11/17 to the end of the year on 12/31/17, I maintained contact with participants to continue to support their learning and teaching, and to learn about their opportunities for English learning and teaching. This period entailed email communication, as well as text and audio conversations through the mobile application WhatsApp. While I maintained communication with them, I also maintained support (which I continue to do as of this writing) in the form of writing letters of recommendation for jobs or learning opportunities, assisting with feedback on assignments for degree coursework, and listening to frustrations with not being able to find work opportunities. This period again demonstrates commitment required of engaged fieldwork – that the researcher’s relationships with and support of participants does not end when data collection ends.

3.7. Data analysis

I reviewed and transcribed all interviews, and I reviewed and selectively transcribed all audio-video recordings using broad transcription. After initial analysis, I further reviewed and transcribed other audio-video recordings that became important to potential findings. I initially broadly transcribed audio-video data using NVIVO12, transcription and coding software that assisted in documenting, tracking, and making connections between codes. Transcription conventions are based off of Richards (2003), which are slightly less detailed conventions than from a Conversation Analysis perspective because I am not interested in line-by-line analysis, nor do I take the turn as the unit of analysis (see Appendix A for transcription conventions). My unit of analysis is “organism-in-context” (Edge, 2011). For audio-video data that entails description of interactions with nonverbal movements and other interactional elements of the context, which are essential to my definition of discourse as activity, I adapt techniques for transcript representation from Lapadat (2000) and Swinglehurst, Roberts and Greenhalgh (2011), which assisted my transcription of what Lapadat calls “context” by placing paralinguistic and nonverbal descriptions to the right of the talk. I used the process of triangulation (Fielding & Fielding, 1986) through data analysis,
which acts to check each method and analysis for its strengths and limitations in supporting findings and conclusions.

I reviewed and selectively typed up the originally written field notes from observations. I created memos to collect my preliminary interpretations on the discourses that participants drew on to explain their beliefs and enact their emerging teacher subjectivities (Yin, 2013). While I wrote memos during data collection, I extended these during later stages of analysis. I also utilized fieldnotes, interviews, and the collection of textual documents to create a “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) of participants’ beliefs and practices related to curriculum design, teacher education, and their own language learning. I reviewed transcripts and fieldnotes several times to become thoroughly acquainted with the data, allowing me to continue to determine themes as they emerged (Yin, 2013).

For textual analysis of policy and materials documents, I conducted thematic analysis (Gibbs, 2007) of discourses of global English and ELT. Discourse analysis allows me to pinpoint discourses in implicit and explicit policy texts, as well as classroom materials (e.g., textbooks), to learn how they are intertextualized and recontextualized (Bakhtin, 1981; Kristeva, 1980) among administrators, students, and pre- and in-service teachers in interaction, as well as how discourses that they use relate to the situations, institutions and social structures that frame them (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Krzyżanowski, 2018). I also conducted thematic analysis on the interactional data (participant-observations and interviews), coding for semiotic representations of discursive patterns. Semiotic analysis includes and extends textual analysis of documents and includes artefacts and signs, and as these signs become grouped into a system, they form a social code: “Semiotics, therefore, is concerned not only with what a sign denotes or represents, but also with what the sign connotes or ‘means’ in particular cultural contexts” (Glesne, 2011, p. 187). In the context of an English classroom in remote, Tepetl, what it means to teachers to engage with a Western-based textbook and CD may mean something different from teachers of English in the United States and the meaning to which they assign the same materials. These signs – and the meanings associated with them – sediment into common sense knowledge of how the world should be and how
subjects should act within it (Geertz, 1973). I first open-coded and then selectively coded (Strauss, 1987) and extracted themes from analyzing audio-video interactions, interviews, questionnaires, and textual documents. Selective coding took the form of sociologically-constructed coding (Strauss, 1987), whereby constructs that form out of the researcher’s knowledge of the context and scholarly knowledge guide the groupings of individual and textual statements in order to connect local meanings to social scientific issues. Selective coding allowed me to see how these variables connected to all forms of data (Strauss, 1987), exploring “…how categorizations or thematic ideas represented by the codes vary from case to case, from setting to setting or from incident to incident” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 48).

I then applied my theoretical framework on discourse, power, and subjectivity to the themes, which allowed me to identify areas of dissonance or tension between the subjectivities and agencies of the teacher and researcher and the discursive structures of the institutions and policies. As I applied my theoretical framework, I utilized the processes described in Stage 4 of my fieldwork to receive updates from participants and other informants knowledgeable of the English teaching context in Nicaragua. I presented them transcripts and early drafts, asking for their commentary and feedback. This allowed for “analysis as ethical and political conversation (Heller, Pietikäinen, & Pujolar, 2018, p. 120) whereby “ethical commitment in data analysis means not only consideration for fair and accurate use of the data, e.g., within the limits of the informed consent, but also discussion of it in ways that take into account what the analysis you are undertaking means to the other participants in the conversation….” (Heller et al., 2018, p. 121). This process allowed me to take into consideration my social position, interests, and assumptions through a process of reflexivity with participants and other informants.

In terms of writing up my analysis and findings for this study, I worked through the process of narrative knowledging (Barkhuizen, 2011, 2015). According to Barkhuizen (2011, 2015), narrative knowledging is “…the meaning-making, learning, and knowledge construction that takes place at all stages of a narrative research project, from the conception of the research project to the consumption of the research report” (2015, p. 97). Although my research is a discursive research project, narrative
emerges in my field notes and interviews, but also in how I describe, analyze, and make sense of the data. From the first stage of curriculum design to the final stage of teaching in the classroom, the process through which the teachers and I move creates a story of those left behind in the global desire for English occurring in periphery countries worldwide. Thinking of my research as an unfolding story allows me to be a participant within it, as researcher, educator, volunteer, and advocate for these teachers.

3.8. Researcher positionality and ethics

Within this project, situate myself within the volunteer work to which I have been committed for the last ten years in Nicaragua, which has been focused on SLTE partnerships with local, Nicaraguan English teachers in cities and rural areas. My first trip to Nicaragua was in the summer of 2009 between my first and second year of my Master’s degree coursework in applied linguistics at the University of California, Davis. Connected to a Nicaraguan-based non-government organization (NGO) in 2009 by a former professor from my undergraduate institution, I joined an initial group of five other educators from this same institution, forming a total of three faculty members and three graduate students. The NGO sought assistance with the professional development of Nicaraguan English teachers. While English has been a requirement in secondary schools since before the Nicaraguan revolution of 1979, the NGO and teachers faced some challenges after recent changes were implemented by the Ministry of Education, and they were looking to improve their program.

My colleagues and I focused on SLTE of local teachers, primarily in the rural north. After the team traveled to Nicaragua for one week in March 2009 to tour some school sites (I was not a part of the group at this time), I was the first of the group to travel alone to Nicaragua to actually work with teachers for an extended period of time. I visited teachers for six weeks in August and September 2009 to conduct a thorough needs analysis, provide professional development workshops for teachers, and push for professional development opportunities, like local teachers’ attendance at two conferences in Managua, Nicaragua: a Pearson Education conference and the annual NicaTESOL conference. These opportunities, which the teachers had been trying to access but had previously been denied prior to my advocacy on
their behalves, allowed the teachers to begin to feel like a cohesive teaching unit of professionals, and to make connections with other educators in Nicaragua to ideally form a community of practice\textsuperscript{14} (Lave & Wenger, 1991, Rogoff & Lave, 1984; Wenger, 1998). During this time, I stayed with a local family, paying rent and contributing to house chores and groceries. I worked in English classes every weekday with two primary-school English teachers, and I provided teacher development workshops to four teachers in total. The trip was personally and professionally meaningful for me as a young teacher-scholar. I developed sincere relationships with my host family and teachers that continue to this day. I felt that, although the trip was only about two months, I was able to contribute to a growing sense of groupness that the teachers were developing. My own working class background, which occluded me from opportunities of studying and volunteering abroad in the past, also helped me forge long-lasting relationships with my host family and the teachers, something that I later would see as separating me from other Global North colleagues and volunteers working in Nicaragua and other peripheral countries. As well, I was of the same age as many of the teachers and had around the same years’ teaching experience as they did, so we were able to forge a bond that was more equitable, though I was still positioned as a native English speaker (NES).

Two colleagues and I still had interest in maintaining our partnership with Nicaraguan teachers (see Coelho & Henze, 2014; Henze & Coelho, 2013). We returned to Nicaragua for one week in 2012 and ten days in 2013 to continue professional development workshops with SAT tutors. These visits were short but practical: continue partnering with the director of programs and the teachers to provide them with professional development opportunities that tried to meet their needs. We worked with the NGO to observe and assess SAT tutors in their classrooms, as well as provide professional development

\textsuperscript{14} Another social theory of learning important to language teacher education is work on communities of practice (CoP). CoP have three core elements: a shared domain of interest (e.g., teaching English language learners); a community in which members share a commitment to helping each other, interact, and learn together; and a practice in which members have more than an interest but are actual practitioners of their craft (Lave & Wenger, 1991, Wenger, 1998). Thus, any group that works together in the same domain is not necessarily a CoP, and I do not use this as a social theory in my research because some participants, as will be shown, undergo painful experiences due the actions of other participants that exclude them from feeling like a true member of a CoP.
workshops to a small group of rural teachers. This trip was much different from the endeavors of 2012 and 2013, which pulled teachers out of their classrooms and communities and had them travel to us at one location to participate in workshops, a tremendously difficult journey financially for these teachers, who had to come up with the money for bus and hotel and were reimbursed by the NGO only later. This was one of many instances that I witnessed that allowed me to begin to critique my colleagues’ and my presence and interruptions in the teachers’ lives. During this 2015 trip, we travelled to the teachers, even in incredibly remote areas, and observed their classrooms, alleviating the burden of taking them out of their rural communities. I am not sure that our presence was that helpful to teachers; in fact, I got the sense that they felt that we were evaluating them. Some, but certainly not all, seemed stressed and uncomfortable by our presence, which made sense: unlike my nearly two months of daily work with teachers in and out of classrooms in 2009, where we could build trust together and learn from each other, these short, one-day interruptions in which my colleague and I took part were well-meaning, but certainly not engaged. These visits provided no time for the teachers and us to really get to know and trust each other. Two white, female professors from the Global North were showing up in their classes, sitting in the back, observing and writing on notebooks. Unlike my engaged travel in 2009, I was disappointed by the disconnectedness that I felt with the process. As an individual traveler, I accomplished much with teachers, both personally and professionally, and I lived with Nicaraguan families, not separated from them. When I traveled with my North American colleagues, we stayed in a hotel, for short periods of time (1-2 weeks), limiting relationship-building opportunities.

Over the years, I began to see past the positive and encouraging parts of our work (which I argue were many) to see some problematic, disengaged elements. My critique of our past work by no means is meant to belittle the significant amount of time, effort, care, and selfless service that my colleagues and I had given to this project, which ended in 2015. Each member of this team was dedicated, critical, and careful about how we approached our partnership. This critique is meant in the spirit of Freire to challenge all of us who work in areas of extreme hardship to embrace honestly the ideal of praxis in hopes
that we understand our work in new ways and adjust our orientations. As of this writing, I am currently the only member left of the original group who continues to return to Nicaragua and assist with the development of English programs and teachers. Not one week passes in which I am not in communication with a Nicaraguan. This long-term volunteer experience and the critical, reflexive process that it spurred in me led me to re-think how English language volunteers and researchers could better collaborate with people around the world trying to access English, for I saw flaws in both uncritical and critical endeavors. This experience is behind the drive of this dissertation.

This issue is important to me because of the genuine care and concern that I have developed about humans and the world through my years as an ESL instructor in the United States and as a volunteer teacher educator in Nicaragua. Growing up as a part of a large working-class family, with a father who was a plumber and a mother who worked in an apple orchard, I did not have opportunities to volunteer abroad because these endeavors are expensive. Thus, when I did finally have an opportunity to volunteer abroad, I was and still am sensitive to issues of social class – of the researcher and the researched – and how class plays a role in access. That some volunteers whom I have come across have taken lightly their footprint on the lives of others without acknowledging the self-serving benefits of their volunteering has deeply affected me, just as much as some volunteers whom I have met have inspired me with their awareness, concern, kindness, respect, and integrity. Pennycook (1994) wrote a similar sentiment twenty-five years ago:

As someone who watches the shifts and changes in the world with interest and as someone who is often deeply disturbed and angered by what I see around me … I find questions around local and global inequalities and injustices constantly return. And, over the years, I have become increasingly sure that these are connected, that it is essential for me, politically and morally, to work out the relationships between my work as an English teacher and what I see around me in the world. (p. 3)
As the politics of global English continues to connect with the politics of globalization (Sonntag, 2003), I am often in reflection about my role as an English teacher and English teacher educator, caught between local and global forces and wondering if the choices I make regarding teaching English in a low-income country are the right choices. In essence, then, this dissertation is not only an effort to better understand the processes of English policy, planning, and teaching under circumstances of great hardship, but also an ethical work in an effort to continue responsibly and compassionately moving forward with English policy, planning, and teaching in countries on the periphery.

3.9. Concluding the chapter

In this chapter, I provided the historical and political context of Nicaragua, and I restated the four research questions that guided my inquiry on the tension of conventional and critical discourses of English and English teaching as presented in teachers and other peripheral participants’ talk and interaction. These questions intend to better understand how these discourses become synthesized into a way of thinking about and teaching English that makes sense for the local context, as well as a new way of understanding their own subjectivities as English teachers in this context. After introducing a description of the local context of the study, including the research sites and participants, I then detailed the methodology that allows me to answer these questions in light of my critical and engaged theoretical orientation. In Chapter 4, I first answer the initial research question about what discourses on English and English teaching are presented in the participants’ environment and own talk and activity. In Chapter 5, I then introduce my critical agenda and how these ideological discourses were taken up, resisted, or otherwise interacted with by the participants. In Chapter 6, I explore the complex subjectivities of the teachers as they negotiate these discourses for their own identification processes, especially as they interact with other individuals and objects (e.g., teaching materials) in their environment. I also address my own subjectivity as it interacts with the participants.
Chapter 4

Disciplinary and Institutional Discourses

Canagarajah’s (2002) article problematizing Geertz’s definition of “local knowledge” (1983) begins with a quote from Stuart Hall that reads, “It is when a discourse forgets that it is placed that it tries to speak for everybody else” (Hall, 1997, p. 36). The quote encapsulates the nature of human agency behind individuals’ ability to place discourse, and at the same time ascertains how discourses become so naturalized over time that individuals forget about their potential to change these placed discourses. They forget that even the most widely accepted discourses are still “local” – often from a local, western European standpoint, then presenting itself as “valid for everyone” (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 246) as they are adopted in other localities around the world. In English language teaching (ELT) worldwide, while there can be potential for either fully resisting, or welcoming but altering, conventional discourses on ELT in innovative ways for their specific teaching contexts (see, e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Sharma & Phyak, 2017), there also is a tendency towards “copying” center discourses and “becoming methodological” (Edge, 2011, p. 49) when implementing English language policy and teaching methods, especially in programs and with teachers who seek more experience with program development or teaching.

Copying is an important step in becoming a teacher subject, and the “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) that takes place when students navigate through the education system plays a powerful role in what and how teachers teach. It is through the experience of teaching that teachers realize the potential to move past the technician role and toward theorizing practice, later reflecting on practice, and assuming a more intellectual role. Through reflection, teachers can find the potential for acting on their world and changing it, thus becoming pragmatic and, eventually, critical and reflexive (Edge, 2011). Center discourses come as imports and manifest in policy and planning documents, assigned textbooks, or in the histories, experiences, and assumptions of U.S. international aid workers or Global-North English
teacher-volunteers. They emerge, also, in the discourses of teachers themselves as they talk through their own understandings of English teaching and enact certain positions through teaching-related activities.

This chapter is dedicated to answering my first research question: “What discourses on global English and English language teaching (ELT) do participants use to argue for the importance of knowing English, and how it should be taught and learned?” The reason for beginning with this question allows me to establish a foundation of discourses – conventional or critical, center or peripheral, or a blend – that are a part of the participants’ English learning and teaching worlds before I introduce critical and alternative discourses in workshops, meetings, and co-teaching activities. The data represented in this chapter come from initial planning and policy documents, general student questionnaires, and early workshops, interviews, and co-teaching experiences with the primary participants. Although I divide my research questions into three chapters, I do not take the stance that conventional and critical discourses, or center and peripheral discourses, occur separately – on the contrary, the data demonstrate that they are intricately intertwined, sometimes even in one utterance. For the sake of structuring analysis and findings, I separate the chapters.

### 4.1. Policy and planning documents guiding UZN and CSB

Sections 4.1.1. and 4.1.2. below detail the analysis of the policy and planning documents that guide English curriculum development and English language teaching at the two sites of UZN and CSB. Table 4-1 below summarizes the discourses from these analyses. Both documents are different genres. I view the UZN document as a planning document and schedule, and I view the CSB handbook as a set of policies and guidelines. While both are different genres, serve different purposes, and have different audiences, they do not always distinctly differ in their content, implementation, and goals.
Table 4-1: Summary of Discourses Represented in the UZN and CSB Documents

4.1.1. UZN’s English Language Teaching Learning Pedagogical Project

The development of an English program and teacher education effort at UZN was guided by a short, open, and flexible two-page document that Paulo provided me upon my request during initial Skype and email communications before my visit. Before committing to a partnership, I asked Paulo to define the goals and objectives of his intended curriculum, age and level of students, rules or guidelines that he would like the program to follow (e.g., teaching approaches and methods), didactic materials and other objects that he possessed or hoped to possess, and specific ideas for how he saw my role in assisting with curriculum development and teacher education. In late August 2016, I obtained from him a plan and expectations for our partnership (see Appendix C). I did not receive clear answers to my questions in his planning document, which was not necessarily cause for alarm – Paulo did not speak English and had never administered an English program or trained English teachers. I had hoped that he might have some
clear direction that he had wanted to take, which would allow me to better position myself as a partner and not an expert telling him what to do, but as I continued to talk with him, I found that he was unsure of how to begin and what he needed to begin. I negotiated this planning document with him during Skype meetings and through email from August to December 2016, before I visited the site in January 2017.

Paulo entitled the document “Proyecto pedagógico enseñanza aprendizaje del idioma inglés en el municipio de Tepetl” [English language teaching learning pedagogical project in the municipality of Tepetl]. I was the intended audience of this document as the volunteer teacher educator and curriculum developer who, according to Paulo, would be working with five teachers, including a North American conducting research in the area, Amelia. The plan was divided into two subsections: activities and objectives. Under activities, Paulo numbered five areas which he wanted to develop. Under objectives, he provided a bullet-point list of seven goals for the program. Reading the document, I found that Paulo had two overarching outcomes. The first was an English language program that required the design of a curriculum and training of five teachers who would teach English for the UZN program. The second outcome, with the support of Amelia (whom he stated was conducting research there), would entail those five UZN teachers to then later train 20 English teachers in the municipality, reaching 100 students of various ages and 20 adult community members. Thus, those who were trained by Amelia and me would then go out to communities to train others to teach English. This manner of education is indicative of the teaching-learning work of Nicaragua’s recent past that was conducted with rural adult learners during the highly successful Nicaraguan literacy campaign of the early 1980s that was inspired by Freire (1970/1993), who visited Nicaragua to assist with the campaign. The campaign encouraged educated Nicaraguan youth to volunteer to teach and learn with rural communities to attain basic literacy in Spanish. These rural students would then become teachers and continue to teach others in their communities (Miller, 1985). Using Freirean concepts of dialogue, political conscientization, generative themes, and community-action research, the campaign quickly “…was able to reduce the illiteracy rate
from 50.2 percent (N = 722,616) of the population 10 years of age and older to approximately 23 percent in 5 months, and to 15 percent in 9 months” (Arnove, 1981, p. 244).

Paulo would have been a small child during the time of the campaign, and his working-class family from the rural north likely benefitted from the project. This sort of socialist and revolutionary thinking has a recent history and proud following to this day, especially in northern Nicaragua. However, while Paulo’s first goal of training five English teachers seemed attainable for my six-month partnership with UZN, the second goal seemed too extensive and without clear boundaries: Paulo hoped for long-term collaboration between UZN and Penn State for this goal, including linguistic and cultural exchange with Penn State students and teachers. This second goal was unattainable for our partnership and something beyond my capacity as a sole volunteer not representing Penn State for institutional partnership. After negotiating the plan with me, Paulo ultimately was satisfied with keeping the first goal for curriculum and teacher development, while setting aside the second goal for volunteer-student partnerships for another time. Paulo’s plan demonstrated themes that indexed certain discursive orientations to global English and English language teaching, and I discuss the most relevant to these themes below: (1) English as a beneficial partnership, (2) Partnership as action, (3) English as and for socioeconomic development, (4) teacher education as creative and innovative, and (5) Potential for developing a critical agenda. The code entitled “potential for developing a critical agenda” refers to indications in the document that Paulo could be open to a curriculum design and teacher education informed by CLP and CSLTE, ideas that I would later propose to him after beginning work with him and the teachers.

**Global English as partnership.** Pennycook (1994) argues that the discourse of English as an International Language (EIL) “…is considered to be natural, neutral, and beneficial,” noting that it is seen as beneficial because this “…rather optimistic view of international communication assumes that this occurs on a cooperative and equitable footing” (p. 9). Paulo’s program plan orients towards English education as partnership, not a one-way flow from a more experienced actor to the less experienced. In just two pages of text, there are 17 words or phrases that index partnership, the most common word being
intercambio [exchange] occurring six times in phrases like exchange of experiences, sociocultural exchanges, participate in exchange. Exchange is a word important to the economic theory of value (Park & Wee, 2015), in which the metaphor of the market becomes important for global English because one form of capital can be exchanged for another form. Bourdieu (1986), then, sees the “linguistic market” as a process of exchange between economic capital (material wealth) and the cultural capital (acquisition of cultural practices), social capital (belonging), and symbolic capital (legitimacy or prestige) in the values placed on standard variety over vernaculars, or certain accents over others. UZN students’ receiving an exchange with Penn State students provides them exposure to a “native” speaker and the symbolism of associating with North American students at a prestigious university.

The words alianza [alliance/partnership] and colaboración [collaboration] both occur three times. Words and phrases like apoyo [support], relaciones interinstitucionales [inter-institutional relations], sostenible/sostenibilidad [sustainable/sustainability] (in relation to collaboration), and comunicación/communicación efectiva [communication, effective communication] each occurred twice in the document. The phrase lazos de fraternidad [fraternal bonds], which was used to describe Paulo’s intention for a lasting partnership between UZN and Penn State, occurred once. Paulo states that he had already established “alianzas” [alliances] with local institutions that would provide scholarships for UZN students to take English classes. This information provided me with an understanding of Paulo’s ethos as a connected community member and a dean with established connections to other institutions and awareness of students’ socioeconomic hardship. Paulo demonstrates awareness of the financial burden that such programs can have on students, as Ricento states, learning English “is not easy or without costs” (Ricento, 2015b, p. 34). In the written plan, Paulo also indicated that he had the support of a North American colleague from California, Amelia. From the written plan and subsequent Skype meetings, my understanding was that Amelia was a researcher “realizando una investigación por acá” [carrying out research here] – possibly a PhD candidate like me, or possibly a Fulbright or other grant-supported fellow.
– and that she had already been working with the supposed five teachers and Paulo. Paulo was connecting local and international actors into the partnership in order to provide low-cost access to English.

Paulo’s choice to regularly index partnership between UZN and local and international actors by using the words and phrases listed above indicates that he held a stance that valued partnership wherein his ideas, those of the teachers, and my own could be mutually respected and synthesized as the project developed. Jaffe (2009) defines stance as “a person's expression of their relationship to their talk (their epistemic stance—e.g., how certain they are about their assertions), and a person’s expression of their relationship to their interlocutors (their interpersonal stance—e.g., friendly or dominating)” (p. 3). With substantial value being placed on partnership, the document takes the illocutionary force (Austin, 1962), or the intention, of an invitation for collaboration. By rooting his stance in partnership, he indexed an identity of democratic values and potential for agency in program planning and development.

**Partnership as action.** Blommaert (2005) follows Foucault’s understanding of discourse as “all forms of meaningful semiotic activity,” which includes the performing of activities as discourses functioning as activity (p. 3). Connected to the activity of partnership is a noticeable intent for action in the planning document. For subjects, Paulo avoided using terms like *profesores* or *docentes* [teachers] or *estudiantes* [students], instead opting to use *facilitadores* [facilitators] three times, *actores* [actors] three times, and *agentes* [agents] once to mark subjects as “doers” of teaching, learning, and planning activities. Teachers that will teach for UZN are called “facilitators” and “actors,” whereas “agents” seem to be those that are part of developing the project. Paulo also uses “actors” to refer to the financial institutions, like banks, that Paulo claimed would provide scholarships. The word *acciones* [actions] is used twice in direct connection to bringing about students’ cultural and social development. In the objectives section, each objective begins with a verb: *fortalecer* [strengthen], *ampliar* [expand], *incorporar* [incorporate], *mejorar* [improve], *consolidar* [consolidate], and *desarrollar* [develop]. The two actions described in the second of five activities, the development of a coordinated curricular program, are specifically intended for my part in the project, in which I would provide “*Formulación de propuesta de programa*” [Formulation of
program proposal] and “Desarrollo e Implementación metodológica para fortalecer la formación de 100 actores” [Development and methodological implementation to strengthen training of 110 actors]. These nominal subjective and objective referents index Paulo’s orientation toward action and the agency of actors for the purpose of effectuating social and cultural development of all actors involved. Promoting action throughout the two-page plan, Paulo creates a subject position of himself as an active dean whose thinking pushes acting together towards goals of socioeconomic development.

Global English for socioeconomic development. In the document, Paulo aligns with the discourse of English for socioeconomic development. He demonstrates the intent to alleviate the financial hardship of students in Tepetl. The fourth of five activities that he lists pertains to finding scholarships for students with limited resources who wish to study English. Paulo claims that “Hemos…encontramos una serie de actors que a su momento serán base firme de gestiones para becas” [We have…found a series of actors that at the moment will be the firm basis for the management of scholarships]. These alliances with local institutions and banking agencies would provide “becas y otras colaboraciones sociales para jóvenes de escasos recursos con deseos de estudiar” [scholarships and other social contributions for young people with limited resources with desire to study]. Placing this goal in the plan indexes social awareness of students who are otherwise unable to access English due to financial hardship. Paulo also uses the present perfect “hemos enontramos” [we have found] that indicates he has already completed these negotiations, as well as the auxiliary verb “serán” [will be] in “serán base firme” [will be the firm basis] in order to demonstrate certainty and again support that this partnership has already been agreed upon. This language indexes a professional identity that embodied attention to issues of social justice. Indexicality in discourse involves not only deictic time and space reference, but also meanings tied to abstract concepts of personal and social identity (Ochs, 1990; Strauss & Feiz, 2014). Although Paulo’s written plan was just two pages in length, the patterned and context-dependent interconnections within it serve to construct Paulo as a dean who sees global English as an active exchange through partnership, as well as a “skill” that is expensive to attain and in need of support.
Paulo extended his plan not only to benefit his university students, but also primary school children, as well as 20 adults from the community who “quieren accede a clases de inglés [y] son personas que viajan a Estados Unidos y desean aprender lo esencial” [want access to English classes [and] are people traveling to the United States and want to learn the basics]. Although this part of the plan was part of the second main goal with which I said I could not assist him due to constraints of time and resources, Paulo’s inclusion of this goal demonstrates an understanding of his university as intrinsically connected to the community, not set apart from it. The community is part of the university and the university is part of the community – there is no gap. By connecting his vision of an English program to his perceived needs of the community, Paulo sees development in English as part of a larger project “con vision de crecimiento nacional” [with vision of national growth]. Later in the document, when he sets goals for creativity and innovation in regards to the teaching and learning of English, he does so within a larger clause that indicates the importance of “el idioma inglés como una base primordial de comunicación en el mundo” [the English language as a fundamental base of communication in the world]. The statements connect to the assumed socioeconomic imperative of English, as well as its role in contributing to a global demos (Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Van Parijs, 2000). Paulo writes under the fifth and final “activity” that guides the document, which has the goal of exchange experiences between English students in Tepetl and young volunteers from the United States, that some of these students from Tepetl are “20 adultos comunicándose con familiares en el extranjero y compartiendo con familiares la expectativa del idioma. (Los adultos que quieren acceder a clases de inglés son personas que viajan a Estados Unidos y desean aprender lo esencial)” [20 adults communicating with relatives abroad and sharing with family members the expectation of the language. (Adults who want access to English classes are people who travel to the United States and want to learn the basics)]. This statement about opportunity through migration provides one reason for the importance of English to this community, according to Paulo. Thus, English is a skill for socioeconomic development not only for national growth, but also for individual global mobility for socioeconomic opportunities away from Nicaragua. His statement also
portrays an “imagined community” (Anderson, 1983; Calhoun, 1991) of how he or adult learners in his community assume English as used by migrants to the United States: that they would need English to communicate not with employers or larger society, who likely would speak English, but with relatives who probably share their first language of Spanish.

**English teacher education.** Paulo listed very few goals for language teacher education, including the following: teachers’ “mayor dominio del inglés” [greater mastery of English], “mejor servicio en sus diferentes centros educativos” [better service in their (the teachers’) different schools], and an increase in “calidad educativa” [educational quality] of teachers and their abilities. For example, one of the objectives is to “mejorar la creatividad e innovación” [enhance creativity and innovation] in classrooms. Discourses of global English tied to neoliberal marketization are present in phrases like “better service,” an “increase” in “quality,” and “innovation” (Holborrow, 2015). At the same time, Paulo also draws a connection between the need for the improvement of teachers’ English-speaking ability to their ability to teach it, and seeks to help teachers leave behind traditional methods of teaching so often found in Nicaraguan English classes, which rely heavily on grammar-translation, often because teachers cannot speak English sufficiently or at all (Bodden & Trejos, 2011; Herrera & Rubio, 2018). Although these goals align with neoliberal discourses connected to global English that do not always benefit individuals like Paulo’s students (Ricento 2015a, Romaine, 2015b), the goal of improving the quality of teaching also tied to the improvement of learning through more realistic and practical methods, goals with which I was trained to work and which addressed what I observed and experienced during my years working with other Nicaraguan teachers (e.g., exclusive use of grammar-translation and choral-repetition of words and phrases in English classrooms in remote areas). Thus, while Paulo indexes a global English discourse with neoliberal implications, he at the same time indexes an ELT discourse of communicative, innovative, and creative implications, one that continues to invite (and see as unproblematic) the transference of western-based CLT to the Global South. If Paulo’s goals were to strengthen English teachers’ language and language teaching competencies in order for students to access opportunities for socioeconomic
development, students would need to actually use English in more authentic ways through activities that generated creativity and increased interest. CLT proposes interaction “as the means” and ultimate goal of learning language (Richards, 2014, p. 174), and typically demonstrates communication through interaction in the target language, introduction to authentic texts, learners’ personal experiences as contributions to learning, and linking the classroom to the outside environment (Block, 2013; Holliday, 1994). However, CLT is critiqued for subscribing to what Tollefson (1991) calls modernization theory, where “Western ‘experts’ … are viewed as repositories of knowledge and skills who pass them on to elites who will run ‘modernized’ institutions” (p. 97) Holliday (1994) states that ELT programs in expanding circle countries “reflect the Self-Other discourse” where Global North teachers disseminate CLT knowledge to the Other; furthermore, conforming to CLT can take a sense of ownership away from teachers and students of the Global South, where local knowledge, as well as local resources for learning, do not always relate well with CLT practices (Block, 2013).

**Potential for developing a critical agenda.** The document’s title, “Proyecto pedagógico enseñanza aprendizaje del idioma inglés en el municipio de Tepetl” [English language teaching learning pedagogical project in the municipality of Tepetl], contains the phrase enseñanza aprendizaje [teaching learning] without a dash (i.e., teaching-learning) or without inserting “y” [and] between them (i.e., teaching and learning). Paulo could simply mean the process of both English teaching and learning that occurs through program initiation. He could also mean the process of learning how to be teachers, as in “student teachers,” which is one of two goals of the UZN English program project (building a curriculum the other). Paulo also could have had some sense of a Freirean notion of teaching-learning/learning-teaching (1970/1993), which has at its essence a social justice-oriented calling for the teacher to learn from the student as the student learns from the teacher through dialogue. Freire spent nine days in Nicaragua in the early 1980s assisting in the Freirean-inspired popular education movement to bring literacy to the mostly-illiterate Nicaraguan people. Thus, rural Nicaraguans who received education in the 1980s, as Paulo did, would likely have experienced this popular education movement. The Freirean
concept of teacher-learner does not devalue the education and experience of the teacher as facilitator and manager of the classroom – after all, nothing would get accomplished without a more knowledgeable actor mediating the social situation and learners, and Freire (1970/1993) is adamant about this requisite of mediation. In the written plan, Paulo, the dean, uses the term enseñanza aprendizaje once more within the document, under the fifth of seven objectives, for which he writes, “Mejorar la creatividad e innovación respecto al proceso enseñanza aprendizaje del idioma inglés como una base primordial de comunicación en el mundo” [Improve creativity and innovation regarding the teaching learning process of the English language as a fundamental basis of communication in the world]. Here, with a broader connection to the context of English as a lingua franca, it seems that Paulo does not intend the Freirean sense of teaching-learning, but a process of both teaching and learning English as part of developing global communication opportunities.

Paulo also uses the term praxis [praxis] in his final objective, which ends the document: “Desarrollar foros, seminarios de studio, intercambios, análisis y otros escenarios que permitan una praxis efectiva del idioma y lose espacios de comunicación y divulgación del proyecto” [Develop forums, study seminars, exchanges, analyses and other scenarios that allow for an effective praxis of the language and the spaces for communication and dissemination of the project]. Praxis, another term essential to critical pedagogy, is theory in action, or reflection and action upon the world in order to transform the conditions in which people live (Freire, 1970/1993). The activities of “seminars, exchanges, analyses, and other scenarios” that Paulo proposes provide the space for dialogue, reflection, and conscientization towards the goal of project dissemination (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2.1.). However, in Spanish (as well as English), praxis is also used as synonymous with práctica [practice], or the opposite of theory – the exercise of an ability or skill. Therefore, like his use of enseñanza aprendizaje, his use of praxis also cannot be unquestionably associated with a critical orientation to education. Paulo likely orients to conventional understandings of “teacher learning” as pre-service teachers learning their craft and “praxis” as practice; however, the document as a whole provides promise for me to approach Paulo about
developing his English program from a Freirean-based, critically-informed foundation because of its attunement to partnership and concern for the socioeconomic hardship of students.

**Conclusion on UZN Policy and Planning Document.** In conclusion to the document description and analysis, Paulo provides a number of insights into his affiliations to global English, though not as much to ELT. He understands English as important for the social and cultural development of his community, and connects its acquisition to local and national development and international opportunities for Nicaraguans. He aligns with the discourse that English opens doors to socioeconomic mobility, and this vision “es una acción en cada momento de proyecto” [is an action in each project moment], demonstrating the strong value that he places on this discourse. As for English language teaching, Paulo sees improved teacher education as serving students’ needs for English language acquisition, and providing opportunities for teachers’ development in English is part of the teacher education that he hopes to initiate. He sees education in English and English teaching as evolving from partnership, and – in writing, at least – frames activities as democratic, collaborative, active, and socially-conscious. Paulo also demonstrates a communal vision of education of which the English program potentially serves not just students, but also the community.

Paulo’s plan is an example of how a local actor interprets English teaching and learning for his local university and community context, a ground-up effort as opposed to a top-down implementation by government or corporate powers. Although Paulo is the dean of UZN, I still frame the plan as ground-up for several reasons. Because he runs an unaccredited *universidad de garaje* [garage university], as locals call it, he is not formally accepted into the field (Bourdieu, 1993) of tertiary education in Nicaragua and, therefore, is willing to work differently towards planning and implementation. He extends his potential reach past his university and into his community, moving outward with the intention of helping adult learners and children develop English skills, as well as reaching out for local and international collaborations in order to provide accessible, quality learning opportunities. Though I limited my partnership with him to solely address his first goal of starting an English program for UZN, I could see
how a sustainable program could eventually train teachers for his secondary goal of community outreach, if he had the resources, trained teachers, and commitment to do so. Paulo’s ground-up partnership and plan also leaves much unspecified about his views on ELT, which demonstrates not only possible uncertainty or little knowledge about language teaching (which is why he sought collaboration in the first place), but also potential signs of openness toward approaching curriculum design and SLTE through the critically-informed curriculum development and teacher education that I intended to propose to him. With no pre-established policy or teaching-learning resources, the project would be ground-up, developed by and for the teacher participants and their future students. Paulo’s plan indicates that he values exchange, fraternity, innovativeness, and creativity. Because of the remoteness of Tepetl, the status of UZN as unaccredited, and the socioeconomic status of UZN students, an English program (and the teachers who taught for it) would have to be open-minded, innovative, collaborative, flexible and pragmatic about working in a learning environment that Global North educators might view as unstable and unsustainable, but which is likely more representative of how many young adults around the world access tertiary education, since about 80% of humanity lives on less than ten dollars a day (Ravallion, Chen & Sangraula, 2008).

4.1.2. From planning and policy to activity: Paulo’s actions regarding English

Paulo and Linda agreed to an interview with me on various occasions, but each time we scheduled one, something seemed to come up. For example, on a number of occasions I would schedule a time and date with Paulo only to find that he did not come to the office that day. Paulo worked as an adjunct professor for another university several hours from Tepetl, and he would be gone from the office a few times a week. He never told me that he taught at another university; for the first few weeks of our work together, I was lost as to why we were not collaborating together as our planning and Skype meetings alluded. I eventually stopped asking for an interview, as I considered it rude and inappropriate to continue asking. Whether Paulo and Linda simply forgot, obligations arose, or they were uncomfortable with being interviewed (it is important to remain aware of the colonialism and imperialism of European
and U.S. transgressions in Nicaragua, Paulo did fill out a questionnaire for me (the same questionnaire that I gave UZN students, see Appendix I), which helped me better understand his views on global English and English language teaching.

In his questionnaire responses, Paulo uses a common metaphor of English as a bridge: “El inglés es una puente de oportunidad” [English is a bridge of opportunity] for managing projects or scholarships for study. He does not know English, but is highly motivated to learn it because “hay exigen saber inglés en empresas de prestigio” [there is demand to know English in prestigious companies]. The metaphor of a bridge to opportunity helps Paulo construct the discourse of English for development. When asked the positive reasons for learning English in Nicaragua, he writes that Nicaragua is growing in production and needs to speak English to open markets. People who speak both Spanish and English, he argues, have better opportunities for employment. He also notes the connection of English to academic information and research, occluded knowledge for academics like Paulo who live in remote areas of countries of hardship. Not having access to this knowledge excludes him from growing as a professional and helping improve his country. When asked if there are negative consequences of learning English in Nicaragua, he responds, “Ninguna, el aprendizaje de un idioma trae aspectos positivos” [None, learning a language brings positive aspects]. I follow this question with one documented problem in Nicaragua, that of indigenous languages declining because of English (Freeland, 2003, 2004, 2013). When I ask if English in Nicaragua threatens the survival of these indigenous languages and English creoles, Paulo responds, “No, todo es cultural y la familia debe seguir enseñando las lenguas nacionales o criollas” [No, everything is cultural and the family should continue teaching the national and creole languages]. Not only does English not threaten indigenous Nicaraguan cultures and languages, but also it is the individual responsibility of each family to maintain these languages, which are protected as national languages in Nicaragua. This individualistic discourse of success and failure is demonstrated in another question regarding English and whether it can help alleviate poverty and difficult life circumstances. Paulo responds that yes, English does so, but also that “La pobreza es mental” [Poverty is mental], a position
echoed by a small number of UZN students in their questionnaires. The individual motivation and hard work of people who want to study English is what will allow them to succeed with its acquisition and obtain better employment. If one does not succeed, it is because they did not have a strong enough mentality to do so.

Beyond the answers given in the questionnaire about the importance of English for developmental purposes, Paulo also demonstrated alignment with English as social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977). Paulo called me out of my office space in late January 2017, three weeks after I arrived in Tepetl, to show me a poster-paper advertisement that he had taped on the outside of the UZN office (see Figure 4-1 below). In English, it reads, “Opening of interactive English courses supported by methodology from Penn State University. Begins: 14 February 2017. Schedule: Tuesday and Thursday, 9 a.m. – 11 a.m. and 3 p.m. – 5 p.m.; Saturdays and Sundays 9 a.m. – 11 a.m. Open enrollment. ‘Education key to success.’”

![Figure 4-1: Advertisement for English Courses Posted Outside the UZN Office](image)

The advertisement proposes the beginning of English classes well before we are ready to provide them: February 14, 2017. The initial program plan emailed to me and negotiated between us clearly states that the months leading up to April will be dedicated to constructing a curriculum for the university and
training teachers: “Desarrollo de un Programa Curricular Coordinado (Enero-Marzo 2017)”

[Development of a Coordinated Curricular Program (January-March 2017)] (see Appendix C). Only after March would we pilot the curriculum, something we had discussed many times prior to my visit. Also complicating his desire to begin English classes so early is that at this early point of partnership, UZN only had one teacher, Cesar, not the five that his initial plan stated that he had. After my arrival, Paulo placed an advertisement in the paper and received one response from Reyna, increasing his teachers to two. Amelia – whom he indicated as a researcher conducting research at UZN – was actually a Peace Corps volunteer stationed in Tepetl, whose situation is discussed below in Section 4.1.3. Lastly, Paulo and Linda often changed decisions about class start dates, times, and age of students throughout my fieldwork (see Chapter 7), complicating the teachers’ and my preparation process. The advertisement provides the first materialization of a discursive movement from Paulo’s written intentions for English for developmental and culturally collaborative purposes towards more active intentions for English for the advancement of his own social, cultural, and economic capital. By advertising a so-called methodology from Penn State University – using the actual name of a prominent North American university – Paulo constructs the credibility that he needs to attract students to UZN. I came to understand that Paulo could be considering me – not just the name of Penn State – as a material indicator of UZN’s ethos, or credibility, because of my identity as an Anglo-American, native-English-speaking academic assisting his university.

Beyond this poster display, Paulo spent every day of my first two weeks in Tepetl introducing me to the local Ministry of Education (MINED), other MINEDs in surrounding towns, and various other educators and administrators in the area. While these were positive and productive experiences for me, as I got to know many individuals and feel connected in Tepetl, it was quite clear that introducing me to so many of his colleagues was benefitting Paulo, as well. My fieldnotes are heavy with subjective descriptions of how I felt like I was being placed on display as Paulo often interrupted meetings and showed up unannounced to demand attention in introducing me as someone who already has her PhD and
is a university professor, despite my correcting him that I was a PhD student. Indicators of behavior and
gaze of those we met allowed me to infer that our presence was unexpected. By introducing me to so
many actors and creating his poster, Paulo could advertise our partnership for the purposes of student
recruitment to a “legitimate” English program created by a North American English teacher. Therefore,
the discourse of global English that emerged from Paulo in this first week represented a surface-level
image of English as a profit-making opportunity, but also as a status-increasing opportunity for this dean
of a small, unaccredited university. The potential for profit increases as the program appears more
legitimate through material actors and resources. These “‘discourses’ and the other forms of cultural
artifacts used in everyday practices construct subjects and subject positions” (Holland et al., 1998, p.
133); thus, the discourse constructing the Anglo-normative, native-English-speaking subject as evidence
of a legitimate English program over other programs in the area allows Paulo market UZN as competitive
with other universities in the surrounding area, despite not being accredited, and compete for the limited
number of students in these rural areas. This social positionality is “inextricably tied to power, status, and
rank,” and it “has to do with entitlement to social and material resources and so to the higher deference,
respect, and legitimacy accorded to those genders, races, ethnic groups, castes, and sexualities privileged
by society” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 271). Because Paulo directs the “universidad de garaje” [garage
university] in Tepetl, then it helps him to position me as an expert and allow my status as a North
American native-English-speaker to present itself in front of potential funders (e.g., MINED, banking
institutions) and consumers (e.g., students).

Despite the initial basic, open-ended plan emphasizing partnership and multiple alliances, Paulo
began to form a different “imagined community” (Anderson, 1983; Caughey, 1984), a “figured” world
that is a “socially and culturally constructed realm of interpretation in which particular characters and
actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over
others” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 52). Holland et al. (1998) cite Vygotsky’s (1978) work on how humans
“manipulate their worlds and themselves by means of symbols” (p. 49), particularly tangible objects (e.g.,
a poster, a North American volunteer), and this allows a “pivot or shift into the frame of a different world” (p. 50).

4.1.3. Meeting Amelia: Surprise, confusion, and resistance to ELT

The longer I worked with Paulo at the UZN office, the more I sought an outside perspective about the confusion and discrepancies that I was experiencing between Paulo’s planning document and his initial comments and activities upon project initiation. I place this section here within the UZN planning analysis because it demonstrates how, from the beginning of the project, misinformation and misunderstanding posed a possible set-back for a Freirean-informed project based in relationships. I asked Paulo to connect me with Amelia, the woman he mentioned in his written plan who was supposedly conducting research in the area and supporting the teachers with me. Amelia and I met at a café a couple of blocks from the UZN office. When I began the conversation that I was excited to work with her on the English program, Amelia was surprised. I learned that she was not conducting research in Tepetl, as Cesar had stated in the plan, but was actually a Peace Corps Volunteer (PCV) in the area assisting in the health sector. Upon talking more, we found that Paulo had placed Amelia’s name in the written program plan as one of the English educators without having told Amelia. He informed her after he had sent the plan to me, at which point she told him that as a full-time PCV for the health sector, along with the many other projects with which she was already involved, she would not have time to teach English or support teachers at UZN. Paulo also had misinformed Amelia about me, telling her that I was a Fulbright scholar.

As Amelia spoke in an interview months later, she narrated how she first met Paulo when she was on a quick site visit to Tepetl before officially beginning her two-year PCV commitment. According to Amelia, she was giving a talk on bacterial diseases at the primary school that Paulo’s children attended: “He happened to be there um and kind of made a beeline for me (2.0) and started chatting me up” (interview, 6/25/17). He asked her what she did and she explained that she would be in the area for almost two years starting the following month. She gave him her contact information and thought nothing of it. She says that a month later, “I got here and within like two days he called me and I didn’t remember who
he was….but I agreed to meet with him because I was free at that moment.” She thought that Paulo would be a potential collaborator while she was there, as “…part of the Peace Corps requirement that they give us in the first three months of our service … is interviewing (0.5) um key community leaders…. it’s basically an excuse for us to kind of get to know people, put ourselves out there, have an excuse to let people know what we’re doing here, understand, like, orient ourselves basically.” She continues, “I ended up telling him that that was one of the assignments that I had been given and he took it upon himself to introduce me to @EVERYone he knew. And probably people that he didn’t know, um, looking back, @ha….that’s funny cuz I reflect on that and see that that’s like a dynamic that very much served him, like showing me around” (interview, 6/25/17). Amelia’s initiation to Tepetl by the helping hand of Paulo was quite similar to the experience that I had with not only being shown around to different MINED sites, but also, in my subjective understanding, “shown off” as one of his international colleagues, something that “very much served him,” as Amelia reflected on her own situation.

Paulo may have displayed two very different agendas through textual (planning document) versus active discourse due to the local community’s strong desire for English, and Paulo’s desire to meet that need. In our first interview (6/25/17), Amelia narrates her resistance to the conventional discourse that because she is a native-English speaker (NES) then she can teach it. When I asked her if she is often approached to help with English, she responded:

AME: ALL THE TIME
KAT: all the time?=
AME: =ALL the time
KAT: by whom-
AME: [all the time] by EVERYONE
KAT: wow
(3,0)
AME: by everyone=by renters in this house, “oh, you speak English you’ve got to teach me”
KAT: hm (.) in[teresting]
AME: [um::] (. ) by the director of the health center=one of the first things she said to me was, “oh:: you need to teach me English” and it’s never like a request. It’s like a “you need to teach me English, you speak English and you need to teach me”(.) um by:: people on the street, random people on the street, everyone. (1.5) Almost everyone
KAT: uh how comfortable or uncomfortable is that and how do you negotiate that or say whether you agree to help or not
AME: mmm hh. (2.5) my, yeah=it’s not super uncomfortable for me just because it’s happened so many times. I think initially it was a little uncomfortable. It also depends on who it’s coming from um and
the force with which it’s said um and the actual- because now- after being here for a while I kind of realize that that’s just, like, just kind of something that people say, that if I actually held like an English class very, very few people to no people would actually arrive um, and so I don’t feel like an obligation or a responsibility or a duty to that- also because- and this is what I say to try and explain um: why it is if people are asking me why I don’t have an English class because, um because that’s not what I’m here to do, um that’s not really the work that I’m here to do: and I’m not really a trained teacher at all, um although I have done a little bit of tutoring and a little bit of support for English classes, but I’m not trained in it and sometimes I even will say (1.5) sometimes I’ll even kind of try and flip it if people, if there’s like a little pushback, and although there’s usually not, but I think- I HAVE said before, you know, just be like “You trying to teach me Spanish, um and you can speak it perfectly no problem=you don’t think about it twice, but to teach it to someone who doesn’t- who doesn’t speak, it is more complicated and you might not be able to explain to me all the reasons why you say the things the way you say them” and things like that. And then it kind of- usually it kind of clicks there. (interview, 06/25/17)

Amelia placed significant stress on the phrase “ALL THE TIME,” repeating it three times. This, and the stress that she places on the word “everyone” twice reveals exasperation that this ability to teach has been placed on her. Her comfortability changed, however, when she realized that they might not be serious about learning, keeping their intentions at the ideological level. Rajagopalan’s (2000) call to free English educators around the world from the “guilt complex” they have for spreading an imperialistic agenda of English and the discourses of capitalism and neoliberalism with which it is associated is particularly important here, as Amelia highlighted how inescapable it is for volunteers who know English to get away with not teaching it (she admits to doing light tutoring and classroom help for a neighbor’s child). Amelia learned to distinguish between the majority of requests that reveal Nicaraguans’ desire for English and the minority of requests that demonstrated a particular individual’s actual motivation to try to learn English. She demonstrated that English for many Nicaraguans remains an unattainable wish that they voice, sometimes forcefully, she claims, but that if she put in the effort to actually provide classes, that “few people to no people would actually arrive.” Amelia juxtaposed a desire for English with the reality that individuals would not take classes.

Amelia also demonstrated an aversion to the global ELT discourse that as long as one is a NES, then one can teach English. She thought that being educated to teach English is important, voicing that she is not trained, and it is an area in which she had no experience or even desire to enter. She developed a strategy to help individuals who ask her for English lessons understand how difficult their request
would be for her to fulfill: flipping the situation to them, she hoped they would understand that just because they speak Spanish does not mean that they know how to teach it. This strategy allowed her the agency to resist being placed in an ELT role. Amelia also valued sustainability and is unwilling to take part in projects that do not seem to be stable and beneficial. Therefore, Amelia demonstrates resistance to the conventional discourses of English teaching abroad that promote native-speakerism and claim that short-term, unsustainable teaching can be helpful (see Beinh, 2014; Jakubiak, 2012a, 2012b).

Connecting my meeting and interviews with Amelia to the initial MINED meetings in the remote mountain towns to which I accompanied Paulo, I put my subjective understandings of Cesar’s discursive orientations to English into dialogue with the subjective experiences of Amelia. Here, I question if it really is English for the personal and socioeconomic development of his students and the community that Paulo desired, or if it is English as ideologically connected to different types of capital – and one more beneficial to Paulo himself – to which he aligned. During the early weeks of Stage 3 fieldwork, Paulo asked to talk to Amelia after we finished a meeting, and the two sat at a desk outside my office talking for about 30 minutes. Amelia later told me that Paulo had asked her if she would be willing to tutor him in English, to which she declined. The act seemed to highlight Paulo’s desire for English for himself, not only for UZN. Secondly, whereas Paulo draws his plan from the discourses of English as and for development that hold promise for self- and social wellbeing, Amelia provided a different account of Tepetl as an area that does not benefit from English language skills.

4.2. CSB policy document: English Access Microscholarship Program Handbook

In contrast to the ground-up, emergent, planning document that guided curriculum development and teacher education for UZN, the Access Program that functioned at CSB is under policy guidelines of the U.S. Department of State. The English Access Microscholarship 2016-2017 Program Handbook for Providers (U.S. Department of State, 2017), from here on referred to as the Access Handbook, is a 108-page document that outlines specific requirements about how providers (e.g., government-run schools, non-government organizations) will implement the program. The first 34 pages detail a program
overview, including how to plan a program, recruit teachers, design a curriculum and obtain textbooks and materials; how to implement the program, recruit and select students, monitor and assess student performance, and budget rules for partnering with the U.S. Embassy; and how to successfully complete the Access Program. The bulk of the document, the final 73 pages, is a vast appendix section with standards checklists, responsibilities, qualifications, sample lesson plan templates, sample budget proposal, and other administrative rules and expectations for program implementation. While Paulo’s UZN document falls under the genre of “plan,” the Access Handbook – though called a “handbook” – really falls under the genre of “rulebook.” In Nicaragua, a U.S.- and Spanish-based NGO is the provider through which the Access Program runs. Potential providers of the Access Program are asked to apply if they meet a number of criteria, including “Recognizing a strong need in your community for Access” (p. 7). A “strong need” for Access equates to a strong need for English, as that is the primary education that Access provides. It is unclear what the signs are for determining whether a community demonstrates “a strong need” for English.

The goal of Access is to provide English language instruction to students between the ages of 13-16 who come from economically disadvantaged families. Only 24 students per class are selected on a competitive basis, and only eight sites throughout Nicaragua provided classes during the time of this study. Teachers who apply also must meet competitive requirements, like advanced English proficiency and at least three years of English-teaching experience. Access has the secondary goal of promoting U.S. culture to students in disadvantaged circumstances. For teachers, Access “will give teachers the opportunity to be part of a committed and professional team” with the incentive to “participate successfully in their community’s socioeconomic development and also apply for future U.S. educational and exchange programs” (U.S. Embassy in Nicaragua, 2018). Teachers must have an English teaching degree or degree in a “related field,” at least three years of experience teaching English as a foreign or second language, and advanced proficiency in English in order to apply. Whereas the UZN program did not have access to English learning materials, CSB received funding from the U.S. Embassy for
textbooks, teacher books, and educational activities that CSB outlines in its curriculum and budget. Therefore, the goals, rules, and tools associated with Access were pre-given, and the subjects of the activities of Access – the teachers and students – underwent competitive screening to be considered for the classroom. The following discursive themes of global English and English language teaching emerged from the Access handbook for analysis: (1) promotion of U.S. culture and values, (2) English as individual development and English for socioeconomic development (local and international), (3) native speakers and nonnative speakers (NS, NNS) of English, (4) communicative curriculum and methods development, and (5) potential for critically-informed teaching.

Promotion of U.S. culture and values. The Access Handbook is quite explicit about the purpose of Access to represent the U.S. positively by promoting and disseminating U.S. culture and values. The phrase “U.S. culture and values” is used 13 times in the handbook. The first use of the phrase, found at the beginning of the document under “Program Overview,” states as one of the goals of Access: “Access students also gain an appreciation for U.S. culture and democratic values through enhancement activities” (U.S. Department of State, 2017, p. 7). One of the requirements placed on teachers is that “Enhancement activities related to U.S. culture and values must occur regularly throughout the program” (p. 13). Specifically defining what U.S. culture and values are, the handbook reads:

At least three of the following course topics must be covered during an Access Program’s After School and/or Intensive Session Instruction: U.S. Holidays, U.S. History, U.S. Popular Culture, U.S. Education, Gender Issues, the Environment, Ethnic Tolerance, Democracy, and Civil Society. Examples of enhancement activities related to U.S. culture and values are:

- Celebrations of U.S. holidays such as hosting a Thanksgiving dinner or a Fourth of July picnic
- Writing and producing skits about key events in U.S. History
- Talent shows in which Access students perform songs by U.S. musicians
- Science-themed activities relating to environmental issues
- Inviting guest speakers to discuss aspects of life in the U.S. such as ethnic diversity and tolerance. (U.S. Department of State, 2017, p. 16)

The Access Handbook, then, makes a clear connection between learning English and learning U.S. history, promoting science and environment, and valuing diversity and knowledge which the U.S. Department of State associates with U.S. values; therefore, unlike many users of global English(es),
standardized English is promoted by the U.S. Department of State not as a neutral lingua franca, which is the discourse disseminated by the LFE community (Seidlhofer, 2011), despite the likelihood of LFE being the norm that Access students will use, if they ever use English to any communicative capacity at all. English for the U.S. Department of State is a way to expose and influence students toward a positive orientation to the U.S. and its apparent democratic culture and values of science, history, and social justice. In Pennycook’s (1994) evaluation, “What emerges …is a complex set of relationships between English and what types of culture and knowledge are given international credibility” (p. 21). Foucault’s (1975) concept of power/knowledge (See Chapter 2, Section 2.3) conceptualizes this social practice of language use (e.g., using language within the social practice of learning about and valuing the “culture” of the United States) as an activity that is never disconnected from some discourse (e.g., nationalistic discourse of one language equating to one nation and one way of being).

**English as individual and for socioeconomic development.** Individual or personal development through English is another theme which appears throughout the document, mostly through the use of the term “skills,” which appears 28 times in the document, most prominently coming after the phrases “English language,” occurring eight times, “language” occurring two times, and “communication” and “writing” occurring once each, for a total of twelve phrases tied to the concept of language acquisition as skill. English as individual development ties English language learning to “improved self-confidence due to stronger critical thinking skills” (Access Handbook, p. 7), as well as to individual success through employment and educational opportunities:

Various components of the Access Program seek to foster personal development by working towards building balanced intellectual and emotional capabilities with students to better prepare them for future academic and professional endeavors. Students are introduced to topics including career development resources, available opportunities to pursue higher education, and additional U.S. government-sponsored exchange programs. (p. 16)
The Access Program, then, claims to not only balance adolescents’ intellectual and emotional wellbeing and increases their language, critical thinking, and life skills, but also opens a door to exchange programs to the U.S. not normally given to disadvantaged Nicaraguan youth. English develops the student inwardly and outwardly, all in one skill. Access ties the development of the student in the English program to family and community involvement. Their recommendations to providers outline working with families and the community: “Students are more successful when their entire community is behind their education. We recommend involving parents and relatives in your planning. Those in the students’ homes and neighborhoods can help make their participation in the Access Program a true success” (p. 25). Parents and families, it continues, should know how demanding the Access Program is and that not only the student, but also the parents or guardians, must be dedicated to the process. Thus, development of the individual is a social process that benefits the development of the community. The term “development” is used 17 times throughout the document, a prominent 11 of which are qualified with the adjective “personal.” After “personal development,” the phrase “career development” appears twice, followed by one each of the qualifiers “socio-economic,” “4-H youth,” and with the post-prepositional phrase “of friendly relations with other peoples.” Thus, Access explicitly and prominently situates opportunities for English acquisition in the discourse of English as development – for individual wellbeing and success – while at the same time situating English opportunities for development, for example, with the United States 4-H program, which provides opportunities for Access youth to visit the United States and learn agricultural and horticultural methods (Fabretto, 2018). As is demonstrated by Paulo in the UZN document, the reasons for learning English in the Access Handbook also blend into different, overlapping developmental spaces.

Disconnecting English as development from English for development is complex because the Access Handbook intermeshes the two: “By seeking to join the Access family, you are demonstrating your commitment to strengthen your local community by increasing the English language skills of local youth and contributing to their improved self-confidence due to stronger critical thinking skills,
increasing their exposure to new career and educational opportunities to study abroad or obtain better jobs” (p. 7). The first independent clause is focused on strengthening the local community, presumably socioeconomically, thus promoting English for development. However, the second verb phrase within the first independent clause promotes the individual development of confidence as attributed to increased ability to critically think, thus promoting English as development, as it strengthens self-confidence and critical thinking skills. This then allows for individual success in education and employment, as is argued by the final verb phrase, which should then benefit the community, again returning the argument to English for socioeconomic development. English acquisition equates to self-confidence and critical thinking, which creates opportunities for employment and better jobs: self-improvement is for socioeconomic improvement.

**NES and NNES.** While U.S. culture and values are heavily promoted, the Access handbook equally promotes student interaction with both native (NES) and nonnative (NNES) English speakers. Aside from rules regulating that all parts of the selection process and consent forms must be in the students’ and parents or guardians’ native language, all references to “native” languages are equally accompanied by “nonnative” in the noun phrase, “native and non-native speakers of American English,” which appears three times in the handbook to encourage student interaction with all speakers. Reference to solely native speakers of English appears twice more, in sections encouraging providers to connect students to actors at the U.S. Embassy, Fulbright fellows, the Peace Corps, and other North American entities working in Nicaragua. Activities called “Intensive Sessions” provide students with opportunities outside of normal class time to participate in English-speaking events: “Intensive Sessions should combine English language instruction with enhancement activities. As much as possible, enhancement activities should incorporate U.S. Embassy/Consulate exchange alumni, U.S. exchange program participants, U.S. Embassy/Consulate personnel, and other native and non-native English-speaking partners” (p. 14). Guest visits are also encouraged: “Regular visits from the community and from the U.S. Embassy/Consulate are a great chance for your students to practice their language skills with native
speakers and to learn more about U.S. life and culture” (p. 27). Native-speakerness thus acts as a vector for information on U.S. culture and values – it is not necessarily the nativity of the speaking that is of primary value, as the Access Handbook usually promotes nonnative speaker interactions alongside native speakers; it is the U.S. background and experience about which native, as well as non-native, speakers can provide information.

**Communicative curriculum and methods development.** The Access Handbook states that providers must follow the curriculum plan provided during their application process to become Access providers. Over the two-year program, Access students must receive a required 360 face-to-face hours of instruction, no fewer than 180 hours per academic year. As for textbook and materials, it states, “Your organization must identify … the textbook and supplementary materials in the Access Program proposal. American publishers and American English materials are preferred but not required” (p. 11). The promotion of U.S.-based materials from U.S.-based publishers aligns with Access’s promotion of U.S. culture and values, but it also demonstrates a preference for Standard American English as opposed to the English or Englishes, as well as the cultural contexts, to which Nicaraguan students will likely be exposed, like the two local varieties of Creole English spoken on the East Coast of Nicaragua and the English emerging from Nicaraguans learning it on their own without exposure to U.S. speakers. The NGO that provided the Access Program in Nicaragua used MacMillan Education’s six-level Go Beyond textbook packs, beginning with the Go Beyond 2 level (Campbell, Metcalf, & Benne, 2015). A Level 2 teacher’s edition pack is also used, which comes with three audio CDs for course activities (Cole & Terry, 2015).

In terms of approaches and methods for teaching English, the Access handbook states, “Lessons should focus on the four language skills: reading, writing, speaking and listening. Focus the classroom time on communicative teaching methods. Access classes should include time for accuracy (grammar) as well as fluency (freely speaking)” (p. 12). The handbook aligns with communicative language teaching (CLT) approaches, listing the skills as separate foci and promoting a balance between accuracy and
fluency. It also values creativity and innovation in materials use, encouraging teachers “…to enrich the classes with supplementary materials, games, and projects” (p. 12). CLT is the most recent movement and paradigm shift in the language teaching profession, responding to the assumptions and activities of situational language teaching (SLT) of the 1960s, which promoted the practice of basic language structures in meaningful situation-based activities (Richards & Rodgers, 2015). CLT, on the other hand, shifted focus from the mastery of language structure to communicative potential. Deriving from Hymes’ (1972) functional theory of language as communicative and Halliday’s (1975) functional account of language use, its goals are “to (a) make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and (b) develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication” (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 85).

The Access handbook promotes teacher agency and creativity in using “varied methods of teaching” (p. 12), and the program values slowing down to learn material over speeding through material in order to maintain the curriculum schedule: “Teachers should use this opportunity to grow as an English language professional and think outside of the textbook” (p. 12). The handbook values part of teacher development as the ability to pace activities to work with learners’ needs, as teachers must address those needs in new and varied ways, drawing them away from methods on which they typically rely and encouraging them to try something new. In its Appendix 5: Lesson Plan Example (p. 41-42), the handbook promotes the agency and expertise of teachers to deviate from the example structure provided: “Note: This is only an example. Teachers are encouraged to develop lesson plans that show their individual training and expertise. Lessons should be communicative and interactive. Do not focus on rote memorization” (p. 41). The handbook continues to discourage traditional and classical approaches to language learning and promote the more recent and globally adopted communicative teaching approaches, and by providing examples and not dictating directions, teachers are free to work out what “communicative” and “interactive” means to them based on their own training.
Potential for critically-informed teaching. At CSB, the Access Handbook, despite its top-down authorship by one of the most powerful governmental institutions in the world (the U.S. Department of State), provides for teacher freedom and creativity as described above, and also requires service activities that couple learning English with learning local social and environmental issues. These provisions allowed for the potential for critically-informed moments in teacher and student learning. For example, one of the requirements of Access is to involve students in Community Service Activities “…to increase their awareness of issues facing their respective communities while also gaining an understanding of the ways they can positively contribute to civil society” (p. 16). To be accountable for these activities, teachers must send the U.S. Embassy/Consulate a summary of the activities and achievements of the service activity within two weeks of completing it. Activities like this have the potential to get students and teachers thinking together about their community with English, but also beyond English, developing other skills that enhance their wellbeing, connection to community, and chances for a healthier future. While this at least demonstrates connecting English development to other forms of development, it does not promote critical awareness, though it leaves open the possibility for visitors to introduce it, since it does not explicitly dictate a curriculum and pedagogy. Because the U.S. Embassy is relatively uninvolved in the daily implementation of Access, and because it is supportive of teacher development through creativity and problem-solving, teachers also have the potential to create critically-informed lessons for in-class activities, not just out-of-class service. As Enrique, the English teacher at CSB, describes in Section 4.3. later in this chapter, Access is open to listening to teachers’ ideas and, unless requirements are not met and check-ins go uncompleted, remains supportive of the teaching-learning process.

Conclusion on CSB policy document. The Access Handbook that guides CSB’s English program represents discourses promoted by the U.S. Department of State, an organized unit of disciplinarity that receives substantial attention from Nicaraguans, who use it as a resource for visas, passports, and local and international job and educational opportunities. This top-down, institutional policy, however, has some flexibility and encourages teacher professional development, creativity, and
innovation. English as a “skill” that enhances self-confidence and personal development reflects attention to the individual, whereas English as important for study abroad and better job opportunities reflects attention to national and international socioeconomic development. While the very explicit promotion of American culture and values is promoted via the learning and teaching of global English, the policy also allows for the use of any learning materials, although it does explicitly promote and prefer U.S.-based resources, and it also values student interaction with both native and non-native speakers of English.

There also seems to be a hands-off approach from the U.S. Department of State: although curriculum, budget, and assessment must be well documented and implemented, teachers are encouraged to not rely on the textbook, to be creative, and to develop professionally through trying new approaches and methods to teaching. In fact, both UZN and CSB are guided by fairly vague and freeing guidelines for ELT: as long as teachers are creative and provide some sort of communicative approach towards teaching, then teachers are relatively free to teach how they want to. Thus, there is potential to also introduce some critical discourses on ELT and global English in not just the UZN English classroom, but also the Access classroom. Built-in requirements of the Access program, like community service activities, demonstrate that Access connects the learning and teaching of English to projects that require developing an understanding of critical issues that affect Nicaragua and the world.

4.3. Discourses of Global English represented by students

In order to establish a prevalence of discourses on global English that would provide potential reasons for administrators and teachers’ thinking about global English in light of their students’ futures and opportunities, I collected student responses to questionnaires, which required them to respond open-endedly to a series of questions about their age, major, motivation to learn English, opinions on English, and resources for learning English (See Appendix I). I collected responses from 109 UZN students and 21 CSB students. Questions and responses were written in Spanish. Five questions in particular asked students to provide their opinions on global English:
• ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre el inglés como una lengua mundial? ¿Siente que todo el mundo debería aprender el idioma inglés? ¿Por qué o por qué no? [What is your opinion about English as a world language? Do you feel that the whole world should learn it?]
• En su opinión, ¿cuáles son algunas razones positivas para aprender inglés en Nicaragua? ¿Cuál podría ser un beneficio al aprender el idioma inglés? [In your opinion, what are some positive reasons for learning English in Nicaragua? What would be a benefit of learning English?]
• En su opinión, ¿hay consecuencias negativas al aprender inglés en Nicaragua? ¿En caso afirmativo, ¿cuáles algunas preocupaciones que tiene con el idioma inglés? [In your opinion, are there negative consequences of learning English in Nicaragua? If so, what are some worries that you have with English?]
• ¿Cree usted que el aprendizaje del inglés en Nicaragua amenaza la supervivencia de las lenguas indígenas o criolla que se hablan en el país? ¿Por qué o por qué no? [Do you believe that the learning of English in Nicaragua threatens the survival of indigenous languages or creoles that are spoken in the country? Why or why not?]
• Muchas veces, la gente dice que el inglés puede ayudar a la gente a superar la pobreza y otras circunstancias de la vida. ¿Cree usted que esto es verdad? ¿Por qué o por qué no? [Many times, people say that English can help people overcome poverty and other life circumstances. Do you believe this is true? Why or why not?]

Most students provided short, one-to-two sentence responses, though some wrote a little more and some left answers blank. The purpose of asking students their opinions on English as a threat to other languages and as a key to alleviate poverty was to prompt more insight into my questions about the positive and negative aspects of English in Nicaragua. That is, if they responded that there are no negative consequences to learning English in Nicaragua, the question about English threatening local languages gave them an opportunity to think about and provide their views on one possible situation in which English might have consequences.

Table 4-2 below provides a summary of students’ responses to these five questions that directly related to global English discourse. Since the first question about their opinion on global English is actually two – their opinion, as well as reasons why they think that way, I broke the table into two separate categories: (1) positive, negative, or neutral opinions about global English and (2) reasons provided for global English, in which I limited reasons to the top four. I did the same for the next two questions, providing the top reasons given for positive effects and negative consequences to learning English in Nicaragua. Responses to the final two questions – whether English threatens indigenous
languages and whether English alleviates poverty – are simplified into yes, no, possibly/unsure, and blank or illegible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion on global English and if everyone should learn it</th>
<th>Top 4 Reasons provided for global English</th>
<th>Top 4 Positive Effects of English in Nicaragua</th>
<th>Negative consequences of English in Nicaragua</th>
<th>English as a threat to indigenous languages</th>
<th>English as an alleviator of poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UZN Student Responses (n=109)</strong> (Age range: 15-41)</td>
<td>Positive 87%</td>
<td>It’s universal / fundamental (25%)</td>
<td>Communicate with tourists / foreigners (37%)</td>
<td>We can lose our traditional language and culture (1%)</td>
<td>Yes (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative 2%</td>
<td>Communicate with foreigners (18%)</td>
<td>Better jobs/pay (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No (75%)</td>
<td>No (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral 4%</td>
<td>Necessary for economy (10%)</td>
<td>Travel / leave country permanently (19%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly (0%)</td>
<td>Possibly, unsure (3%, 1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank 8%</td>
<td>Travel / leave permanently (9%)</td>
<td>Professional development (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blank, illegible (8%, 1%)</td>
<td>Blank (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSB Student Responses (n=21)</strong> (Age range: 13-15)</td>
<td>Positive 95%</td>
<td>It’s universal / fundamental (10%)</td>
<td>Better jobs/pay (52%)</td>
<td>Many consequences but English is vital (5%)</td>
<td>Yes (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative 0%</td>
<td>Necessary for economy (10%)</td>
<td>Personal development; overcome hardship (38%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No (67%)</td>
<td>No (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral 0%</td>
<td>Have new friends (10%)</td>
<td>Scholarships / studies (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly (10%)</td>
<td>Possibly (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank 5%</td>
<td>Travel; communicate with visitors; eliminates discrimination (each at 5%)</td>
<td>Develop the country’s economy (29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blank (10%)</td>
<td>Blank (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4-2: Summary of Student Opinions on Global English**

In many ways, the students’ responses align with the reasoning for English provided by the institutional documents: the UZN English program plan and the Access handbook, which both attune to
English as development and for development, advocating for personal and national development through the learning and teaching of English. There is an overwhelmingly positive and uncritical orientation to global English and its value in Nicaragua to open up job opportunities, especially in the sectors of tourism and translation. While 95% and 87% of students at CSB and UZN respectively had positive views of global English, 48% and 46% respectively explicitly state that everyone in the world should learn it. While CSB students, slightly younger than their UZN counterparts, did not provide one negative orientation to global English (though one student left this question blank), three different reasons were given by UZN students. While 2% (n=2) of these UZN students had negative views of global English, 4% (n=4) were neutral in their responses. Three stated that there are other important languages of the world that they are curious about, three acknowledged that English is not necessary in poor countries around the word and stated that these countries do not like English, and one student argued that it is a personal decision whether or not to learn English.

When specifically asked about one possible negative consequence of global English, however, a larger percentage of students saw English as a possible problem, with 10% (n=2) of CSB students and 16% (n=17) of UZN students agreeing. One CSB student responded, “Sí, la amenaza, porque las lenguas antiguas la gente no le va a tomar mucho interés, como el interés que se le toma al inglés” [Yes, a threat, because people will not take as much interest in the ancient languages, as interest in English is taken]. Eight of the twelve UZN students who responded affirmatively to English threatening indigenous languages stated that the languages, the culture, or both could be forgotten.

While the students were not specifically asked about ELT, their opinions on global English provide an understanding of the discourses of global English that circulate across the town of Tepetl in different places, and at different ages and stages in life. These students in Tepetl provide discourses of global English as a largely positive skill or tool that they can use for individual and societal development, mobility in the work force and, to a lesser extent, mobility internationally. English was seen far more as a tool that would allow them opportunities in Nicaragua than one that would allow them to travel abroad for
leisure or permanently for work. Just one of 21 CSB students (5%) and nine of 109 UZN (8%) students who responded mentioned the benefits of English for study or work abroad, while both Paulo’s planning document and the Access Handbook heavily promote English for opportunities abroad. Thus, students’ reasons for learning English will help them domestically, whereas at the authoritative level, it will help them both domestically and abroad.

4.4. Discourses of Global English and ELT represented by teachers

Pennycook (1994) states that the discourse of English “as natural, neutral and beneficial also seems to hold sway for many people more directly involved in English language teaching” (p. 11). He argues that the framing of global English “between a conservative view on standards and a more liberal pluralist concept of variety,” as well as an acute focus on only intelligibility and description, sets up a situation in which “…most people in English language teaching have been poorly served by academic work which fails to address a far more diverse range of questions that might encourage a reassessment of our role as teachers of English in the world” (p. 11). Cesar, Reyna, and Enrique expressed a dynamic range of discourses tied to their views on global English and English language teaching. The discourses represented here occurred either before I explicitly or intentionally introduced critical or alternative discourses, or after introducing them but in dialogue that occurred in ways that were likely not influenced by my critical dialogues, e.g., narratives given in interviews about their youth or discussions about current socioeconomic issues of Nicaragua. Data directly connected to participants’ interacting with and responding to my critically-based discourses are analyzed and discussed in Chapter 5. The discourses analyzed below consolidate around the themes of English as and for development, which emerge in discussions about learning English for the delight of it, teaching English for national project development, knowing English to accommodate foreigners, viewing English and U.S. culture as models for development, and narrating rare stories of success of students or friends who have learned English, representing how the rare success of one student out of several learning English comes to justify how English brings opportunity for all who seek it.
4.4.1. Learning English as development but teaching English for development

From the interview data, Cesar, Reyna, and Enrique demonstrated that their reasons for learning English differed from their reasons why present-day Nicaraguan youth must learn English. They learned English, they say, because they were curious about it and liked the way it sounded, and they all mastered some level of it because they were motivated to do so, despite their various hardships. However, when asked why they teach or want to teach English, the motivation, curiosity, and delight that they got from learning is not visible in their answers for why their students and their own children should learn it.

Cesar: From curiosity to project development. Cesar began hearing English as a child when he went to the movies. He explains in his interview with me, after I ask when and where he began to learn English:

La verdad es que desde pequeño me gustaba el inglés. Yo me acuerdo cuando estaba chiquito ((@haha)) iba al cine y las películas eran en inglés y yo salía hablando jargon ((@haha)) supuestamente hablando inglés. (2.0) Siempre me ha gustado de verdad, pero para- para ser más claro (.) antes del acceso al inglés anteriormente era muy, muy, muy difícil. <The truth is that since I was little I liked English. I remember when I was little @haha I went to the movies and the movies were in English and I used to speak jargon @haha supposedly speaking English. (2.0) I've always really liked it, but for- to be clearer (.) before, accessing English before was very, very, very difficult> (interview, 05/20/17)

When Cesar references “before,” he is placing a boundary that separates his childhood in the 1970s and 1980s from how things are now. Although, as the literature review indicates, Cesar would have had to take mandatory English classes when he was an adolescent in the 1980s, those mandatory classes were likely quite introductory and his schooling was also interrupted by the civil war – a part of his background that is analyzed in Chapter 6: Being Made into English Teacher Subjects. Cesar says that he actually stopped going to school at age 11 to work, but returned later to finish. On the other side of this boundary, present-day Nicaragua, students have more access to English because of stronger relations to the United States, technology, more government investment in ELT, and assistance from international aid, including Peace Corps TEFL and the U.S. Embassy’s Access Program. Cesar continued, when I pressed him about why he learned English:

Uhm (1.5) en definitiva de inicio simplemente por (.) ¿cómo le dijera? (1.0) por- (.) porque me gustaba ¿no? porque- si le explicara porqué sería difícil. Ah, si hubiese sido en este momento ((makes high pitched
For Cesar, learning English was simply for the sake of learning it, what Appleby et al. (2002) define as English as development: English for its cognitive benefits, for the delight of learning, for decoding. However, he does not grant young Nicaraguans today the same pleasure – for them, English is “una necesidad” [a necessity] and he explains why later in the interview, when telling me about his youngest son, who was seven years old at the time of this study:

Este- (1.0) y yo le digo a él que tiene que aprender el inglés porque es más que necesario hoy en día. Es más que necesario. Los libros, los tratados, las noticias, todos esos usan como puente de enlace el inglés. Yo le pongo de ejemplo los chinos. Los chinos que vienen al canal no usan el chino aquí, utilizan el inglés….Sí, utilizan el inglés para comunicarse. ¿Por qué? (1.0) porque como aquí en Nicaragua no hay muchos que hablen chino, ((xx)) entonces es más fácil utilizar como mecanismo de comunicación la – del chino al inglés y del inglés al español y a la viceversa. Entonces ellos utilizan el inglés muchísimo, utilizan el inglés. <This- (1.0) and I tell him he has to learn English because it is more than necessary today. It is more than necessary. Books, business dealings, the news, all these use English as a bridge. I give the Chinese example. The Chinese who come to the canal do not use Chinese here, they use English….Yeah, they use English to communicate. Why? (1.0) because as here in Nicaragua there aren’t many who speak Chinese, ((xx)) so it’s easier to use as a communication mechanism the - from Chinese to English and from English to Spanish and vice versa. So they use English very much, they use English> (interview, 05/20/17)

Cesar connects necessity of English to the metaphor of a bridge, across which resources like books, partnerships, and media flow. He follows this commonly-used metaphor for English with a concrete example of the Nicaraguan Canal, the now-defunct\textsuperscript{15}, fifty-billion-dollar project supposedly funded by Chinese billionaire Wang Jing and the Hong Kong Nicaragua Development (HKND) Group that he owns (“Nicaraguan canal project,” 2015; see Chapter 3). This example materializes the metaphor of a bridge into humans with different L1s communicating via the bridge of English for the purposes of development projects, or English for development. Later in the interview he highlights another developmental project commonly given as a reason for learning English: tourism:

\textit{Todo país que educa a su población fortaleciéndole sus habilidades comunicativas en inglés, está abriendose las puertas, abre las puertas para que los extranjeros vengan. Ayer estuve viendo las noticias sobre el Cañon de Somoto, muchos, muchos internacionalistas franceses, estadounidenses, canadienses

\textsuperscript{15} As of this writing, the Nicaraguan canal, voted on by the people in 2007, has not been successfully realized, though work has controversially begun on it and HKND’s promises of funding for the canal have not been met.
(1.5) y en las entrevistas los franceses no ocuparon el francés para hablar, ocuparon el inglés. El canadiense pues, el canadiense habla francés pero también habla inglés, pues habla inglés básico. El canadiense habla francés y habla inglés. O sea, todos utilizaron el inglés para dar el reporte a la entrevista porque el que los estaba entrevistando les preguntaba en inglés, entonces ellos respondieron en inglés. Eso significa que es siempre como un medio de comunicación para cualquier área de la cotidianidad. <Every country that educates its population by strengthening its communicative skills in English, is opening the doors, opens doors for foreigners to come. Yesterday I was watching the news about Somoto Canyon, many, many French, American, Canadian internationals. (1.5) and in the interviews the French did not employ French to speak, they employed English. The Canadian, then, the Canadian speaks French but also speaks English, well he speaks basic English. The Canadian speaks French and speaks English. That is, everyone used English to give the report to the interviewer because the interviewer was asking them in English, so they answered in English. That means that always as a means of communication for any area of everyday life> (interview, 05/20/17)

Cesar invoked the discourse of English as a universal language, arguing that every country is taking part in education through English. He explicitly stated that “English opens doors,” interestingly not for Nicaraguans to venture out of Nicaragua, but for “foreigners to come” to Nicaragua. Questionnaire responses from UZN and CSB students also echo this response, many more reasoning that learning English will allow them to help foreigners in Nicaragua or to obtain a job in Nicaragua, with fewer reasoning that English will allow them to live, attain a job, or study abroad, 29% of students (n=6) at CSB and 29% of students at UZN (n=32). Paulo’s planning document and the Access Handbook used by CSB both indicate importance for learning English to study and work abroad, but students and teachers seem to focus on remaining in and developing Nicaragua. Cesar referenced the tourism industry, which until recently16, had been bourgeoning in parts of Nicaragua, as evidence of Nicaraguans’ need for English. Cesar provided the example of Somoto Canyon, a large canyon formation through which the Rio Coco (Coco River) runs, which has become a thriving tourist hotspot for foreign hikers and swimmers. I visited Somoto Canyon in 2015 when on assignment with the NGO with which I am associated, assisting with the training of English teachers in rural areas outside the town of Somoto. One of the students of the English program run by the NGO, Sistema de Aprendizaje Tutorial [Tutorial Learning System (SAT)],

16 On April 20, 2018, just seven months after I completed fieldwork, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega and the Nicaraguan military began violent assaults on citizens protesting his decision to impose social welfare cuts to citizens. The violence has resulted in the deaths of about 450 Nicaraguans, and the disappearance or jailing of many others. As of this writing, the situation is still ongoing, and although the violence has calmed, journalists are still intimidated and the people are silenced. Until this situation began, Nicaragua had been benefiting from an increase in tourism, becoming known to U.S. and Western European tourists as a safe country not as impacted by tourist crowds as its neighbor to the south, Costa Rica (Valenzuela, 2019).
was the tour guide for my North American colleague and me. However, upon return from our hike and swim down the canyon, my colleague conversed with an older local man from Somoto, who said that the tourism that the canyon has generated is leading to drug and alcohol abuse by the young, male tour guides (we did not see any female guides on our trip), that the money coming in from tourism was not supporting the local economy or helping these youth’s families, but instead serving the wants of these young tour guides and increasing abuse in relationships. The man also claimed that English use was hurting Spanish and other local languages. Although we could not verify the truth to the man’s claims, the man’s feelings and concerns were quite real, and he demonstrated that “development” is not an unproblematic process – it has consequences for individuals and communities.

**Reyna: From curiosity to helping foreigners.** Like Cesar, Reyna was curious about English as a youth, which propelled her to study it. However, she also has similar views as Cesar about students learning it now for the purpose of helping foreigners in Nicaragua:

> *Desde pequeñita me llamaba la atención. No sabía pero me llamaba la atención escuchar música en inglés, me gustaba, y también porque es un – es otro idioma que lo estamos adoptando. Sí, para mí es mi segundo idioma, de verdad. Sí, me gusta. Porque también sé que puedo ayudar a otras personas que quizás vengan acá a Nicaragua y no puedan hablar español y necesitan ayuda, y “wow,” que digan, “wow, en Nicaragua hay personas que sí pueden hablar inglés.”* <Since I was little it called my attention. I did not know but it caught my attention to listen to music in English, I liked it, and also because it is a - it is another language that we are adopting. Yes, for me it’s my second language, in truth. Yes, I like it. Because also I know that I can help other people who maybe come here to Nicaragua and can’t speak Spanish and need help, and “wow,” that they say, “wow, in Nicaragua there are people who can speak English”>

(interview, 05/17/17)

Like Cesar, she was attracted to English as a small child. She simply liked it. Reyna attended to social class and social judgment, not only in this excerpt, but also in many other data samples. In the excerpt above, she imagines the respect of foreigners who unexpectedly find that there are Nicaraguans like her who know English. In other talk with Reyna during and outside of her interview, she often lamented Nicaraguans’ not wanting to study language, especially English, and Nicaraguans’ making fun of those who want to speak English. She showed conscientiousness of and sensitivity to a national identity that foreigners would respect, if only Nicaraguans would learn English. When I asked Reyna if she wanted her daughter to learn English, she told me the following:
Sí, porque el inglés es muy importante. Es muy importante para hablarlo, para poder ayudar a las personas que no puedan hablar quizás español, sean personas americanas y ella pueda traducirles, ayudarles. No precisamente esperando dinero sino que ayudar nada más. Sí, yo quiero...quiero que aprenda inglés. Sí, quiero que sea muy inteligente. <Yes, because English is very important. It is very important to speak it, to be able to help people who cannot speak maybe Spanish, be it American people and she can translate for them, help them. Not exactly hoping for money but to help, nothing more. Yes, I want (.) I want that she learns English. Yes, I want that she be very intelligent>. (interview, 05/17/17)

Reyna indexed the discourse of English as development for her child, something that would allow her to benefit cognitively and socially – to be intelligent and also, importantly, to have the respect and dignity of helping others and not being looked down on. Like Cesar reasoned, as well as the CSB and UZN students, English is to serve foreigners who come to Nicaragua, not Nicaraguans who go to foreign lands. Like Niño-Murcia’s (2003) assessment of English knowledge in Peru, it is not just about economic currency, but a valued “linguistic currency” (p. 121) that functions as cultural capital for its users, a sign of prestige and “distinction” (Bourdieu, 1984, 1991). Reyna’s severe poverty, discussed in depth in Chapter 6, is a significant motivator in making sure that she and her child are legitimized as intelligent. She was also hyper-aware of Nicaragua’s status in the world and demonstrates a desire for Nicaraguans to be educated and have knowledge of English. However, she was able to disconnect learning English from monetary gains, unlike Cesar, arguing that it is less important to earn money for English as a skill and more important to help others with this skill, valuing relationships over money. On the other hand, like Cesar, Reyna felt similar positive orientations toward English as a global language:

REY: Bueno, es beneficioso en la parte de que ya otro idioma más que nosotros manejamos, aparte de que uno puede trabajar como traductor, nos pueden dar la oportunidad, porque no a mucha les gusta estudiar este idioma. Por lo general por ningún idioma la gente se preocupa, solo por otras cosas. Sí, no les gusta estudiar casi ningún idioma entonces, pero aquí necesitan muchas veces porque en Nicaragua hay muchos lugares turísticos. Está San Juan, está el Cañón de Somoto. Hay muchos lugares turísticos. <Well, it is beneficial in the part of that already another language that we handle, apart from that one can work as a translator, they can give us the opportunity, because not many like to study this language. In general, people aren’t concerned about language, just other things. Yes, they do not like to study almost any language then, but here they need many times because in Nicaragua there are many tourist places. There is San Juan, there is the Somoto Canyon. There are many tourist places>. KAT: Hay Aguas Calientes. <There is Hot Waters (A volcanic spring near Tepetl)>. REY: También. Sí, hay muchos lugares turísticos, y entonces muchas veces necesitan traductores, también maestros. Entonces en ese aspecto yo digo que tengo – puedo tener la oportunidad. Me es muy beneficioso estar estudiando está carrera. Felizmente que me llamaron aquí @haha para participar y es muy bonito, me siento muy agradecido con Dios y con ustedes, sí. <Also. Yes, there are many tourist places, and so many times they need translators, also teachers. So in that aspect I say that I have - I can have the opportunity. It is very beneficial for me to be studying this career. Happily,
they [Paulo and Linda] called me here @haha to participate and it's very nice, I feel very grateful to God and to you, yes>. (interview, 05/17/17)

The discourse of English for local development, especially in the area of tourism, was clear in Reyna’s reasoning during her interview. She twice references translator as a job, as well as teacher, two opportunities that open for her if she knows English. She discusses tourist locations, which are almost two hours and five hours away, respectively, which would take her far from her family to work. I mention a tourist destination a lot closer (a 15-minute drive), though tourists are rarely seen this far north. However, later in the interview when I ask her about how and when she uses English, Reyna stated that she had never met a tourist:

KAT: ¿Cuántas veces al mes y de qué manera está expuesta al inglés? (5.5) Por ejemplo, puedes decir que escuchas música en inglés unas diez veces al mes o que hablas con turistas en inglés una vez al mes. <How many times a month and in what way are you exposed to English? (5.5) For example, you can say that you listen to music in English about ten times a month or that you talk to tourists in English once a month>.

REY: Bueno (1.0) con turistas nunca me he topado. Como le dije a usted (.) es la primera persona americana con la que he tenido la oportunidad de hablar, de comunicarme, sí. <Well (1.0) I have never met with tourists. As I told you (.) you are the first American person with whom I had the opportunity to speak, to communicate, yes>. (interview, 05/17/17)

I gave Reyna two example responses after receiving a 5.5-second pause after I ask the question. She then oriented her response to my example of talking to a tourist, stating that she had never met a tourist. I, in fact, am the first North American to whom she has ever spoken. Tourists in Nicaragua rarely explore the dry, remote, mountainous regions, which have high malnutrition rates, water and food vulnerability, and electricity outages. West coast destinations near the beach or great lakes, like the colonial cities of León and Granada, the surfing destination of San Juan del Sur, or perhaps some of the northern cities like Estelí will find international interest; however, the more remote one visits, the less secure, and tourism is an industry that needs to provide travelers with a sense of security. During my fieldwork, aside from Amelia, the only time I saw another North American was when I briefly spoke to two North American youth in Tepetl whom I met while passing them on the street, fulfilling their mission trip with the Mormon Church. For Reyna, she imagines helping tourists, and English is the key to helping them. English gives her a sense of pride and integrity, as tourists will feel welcomed and awed by
Nicaraguans’ English-speaking ability. However, if Reyna had an opportunity to work in the tourism industry, she would likely need to move away from her grandmother’s home in Tepetl. Her parents left her when she was a baby to work in Managua (see Chapter 6); Reyna would likely perpetuate this cycle if granted an opportunity to work in tourism, and have to leave her baby in Tepetl with her grandmother.

**Enrique: From curiosity to opportunity for his students.** Enrique began to learn English on his own when he was quite young. He stated that when he was just five or six, he would sit on the floor of his home watching TV and movies from the 1980s. He says,

I remember one day was playing a trailer about *Missing in Action*. I remember it was with this guy. The guy who star in that movie was Chuck Norris! @ha Chuck Norris, *Missing in Action*, I remember. But I didn’t know what he was saying, uh (1.0) I just liked the sound of his voice. And: he’s like- but I didn’t know at the time, you know, I just discovered that, though, over the years. So (.) and he said, “It’s time to die!” He just throw up like raining, boof! It was in the blast and then a bunch of guys, you know, Vietnamese? They were all BOOF! And then I remember (.) I said, “It’s time to die.” I want to talk like that guy. (interview, 06/26/17)

Like Cesar and Reyna, Enrique first began learning English out of curiosity and interest, not for job attainment and global interconnectivity that Cesar and Reyna reason is important for students. Like Cesar’s description of going to the movies and talking a nonsensical English, Enrique, too, was drawn toward the sounds and repeated phrases before understanding their meaning. He continued in his interview that English was “appealing” to him “because of the sounds.” He continued to demonstrate curiosity for English throughout his childhood, taking his brother’s Hulk comic books and figuring out what certain words meant:

I remember a special word and it says, I read, I read, the word ‘a-guy-n’? (1.0) ‘A-guy-n?’ which is ‘again.’ I didn’t know what that word meant, so but I discovered that when I read or looked it up in a diction- an old dictionary that I still got at home, I mean, in PIECes. It’s like an anTIQUE! It should be in a museum! @HAHA (.) For real=a museum of what? (1.0) Languages. (interview, 06/26/17).

Enrique was incredibly self-motivated to learn English, and this is further discussed to demonstrate how this comes to form a foundational aspect of his teacher identity in Chapter 6: Being made into English teacher subjects. For the purpose of this chapter, I lightly highlight his curiosity here and how it aligns with but also differs from the reasons he feels his students need to learn English.

Enrique’s view of English in Nicaragua is that it is really important, not only for the neoliberal
discourses that Cesar uses to justify English in Nicaragua, but also for individual development of the whole person, like Reyna discussed when wanting her daughter to know English. Enrique interwove English as and for development in a much more integrated way than the UZN teachers, in a similar way to how the Access Handbook that he follows integrates the two:

KAT: What about like (. ) your own thoughts about English in Nicaragua and English in the world=do you think it’s um: (. ) it’s a positive thing=do you think it’s a negative thing that English is this world language and that a lot of people now have to- FEEL like they have to learn it in order to gain opportunities=do you want to talk a little bit about how you feel about that?

ENR: It’s totally important. (1.0) It’s totally important (1.5) Because uh: I remember that I was (. ) (coming here) and the coordinator said a really interesting phrase and he says, “English (. ) brings hope” (2.0) a hope for a better future. Uh: (. ) to give you better opportunities. To put better food on the table.

KAT: And- and you feel that this is (. ) [this is true?] ENR: [yes::] (1.0) because when Access happened (. ) I mean, it might happen (. ) to (Arnold) [a former student] like (. ) and (xxx) ones, I mean it’s like an addiction (that) a person they have, they crea- create about uh: how important (2.0) or what’s important of the words. Some say that words are powerful=you can make big changes (. ) with them right?=if you believe in that I mean you can change your:: attitude, your life, the way you’ve- you- the way you speak, the way you TREAT people, the way you see people. (interview 06/26/17)

Enrique repeated twice that English is “totally important,” tying English to a discourse of “hope.” At the same time that Enrique saw English as an avenue for emotional and intellectual development, treating people and themselves better and living a better life, he also invoked the neoliberal discourses of choice and individual determination in overcoming hardship, as if it is an individual’s own responsibility to overcome systemic oppression, despite relentless oppressive social, economic, and political forces.

KAT: well what about, like (. ) okay, so you transform the mindset of the student and you have, like, a really amazing student, like (Maria17) or gosh you have so many lights in your class that- so they’re transformed, but then they (. ) are in th- the world of Nicaragua where social and structural things make it really difficult to find work or to: g- get to university. It doesn’t- (. ) maybe they know English but, you know, that university still costs that amount of money or uh: just all sorts of issues that Nicaraguans face, social, economic, governmental, political. Like, do you feel (. ) do you feel that someone who knows English has a better chance than someone who doesn’t know English to: (2.0) I guess to: confront those problems that Nicaragua has?

ENR: I think that a- a- a person who knows English has better opportunities

KAT: uhuh

ENR: But (. ) many times you see Tepetl is (. ) has a very limited department. There are not like (. ) oh (xx) like lots of opportunities (or chances) to achieve your goals, but (. ) some of them have to move to other cities. But as the experience we’ve had with this case, for example, with Access we have uh: taught some students who used to polish, shine shoes or make tortillas. They have to choose their lives. (interview 06/26/17)

17 Pseudonym
Enrique acknowledged that opportunities for Access students to attain jobs in Tepetl where they can use their knowledge of English do not exist. As Enrique stated, they must “move to other cities.” He admitted a structural limitation, but then still placed significant responsibility on individuals to “choose their lives,” as with the global English discourse of English as cosmopolitan (Sonntag, 2003), where individuals are free to choose to change what they learn and do for their futures. In a culture that heavily depends on a family unit that lives and often works together, even when children are well into adulthood, English separates those who acquire it from their families by providing opportunities far removed from their communities. This structural issue limits some from accessing English or jobs with English, and provides opportunities for others at the cost of affecting their familial structure. The Access Program is only offered every few years and only in a small number of areas. It is a highly competitive program that will only take up to 25 students. Thus, a motivated student in poverty who shines shoes for a living, as Enrique alluded to in his example, is competing for a limited number of spots; it does not matter how good of a student or how motivated he or she is. There were only seven Access classes running throughout the entirety of Nicaragua when this study took place. Students who do not live in one of these towns or cities do not have access to Access and will still find themselves shining shoes or doing the metaphorical equivalent in another form of work. It is not just choice and individual hard work, but also luck: If one is the right age, in the right town, and able to secure one of the limited spots, then one might have an opportunity to work in a city or travel to the U.S. because of English. On the other hand, Reyna, Enrique’s former student three years prior to the start of this study, was able to access Access, but was not able to find opportunities for work after completion. After her two years of Access courses, she had no opportunities for work or further education. She was still a member of one of the most impoverished social classes in Tepetl, raising a baby that she had as a teenager, and living in a very difficult neighborhood with her grandmother. Reyna’s first ever job opportunity, let alone job opportunity involving English, arose because I so happened to be conducting research in her town and she so happened to apply to a teaching position at UZN that Paulo advertised after my arrival.
Later in the interview, Enrique discusses one student who “made it,” or who successfully emerged from hardship because of his devotion to learning English. The success of just one student tends to be remembered over the more common hardships of most students, like Reyna, yet remembering these very limited success stories provides justification for the importance of global English. Below, Enrique discussed his first group of Access students, the group of which Reyna was a part when she studied three years prior:

I remember this student who used to live near here, across from town. It’s uh: his name is uh: Lloyd maybe. I remember uh: a few things he said, like uh, “I’m really tired of being poor. I don’t want to be poor,” he said. He moved to Managua, he got a scholarship, to ONE college, you could say that, an expensive (university), one (xx) that’s expensive. I don’t know how he got a scholarship but he made it. He made it and I witnessed that that his uh: oh (xx) passion his, his (feelings) just GREW by those days. I SAW that in my every day class, every single class. It’s incredible I mean (. . .) wow. And I was part of that=I mean (x) um: I feel great because (xx) I can say now I can say (. . .) that I have to learn from THEM @he I have to learn from them=oh=wow=gosh=I say (3.0) he made that. (interview, 06/26/17)

Talking not only to Enrique, but also to many others while I was in Tepetl, I came to find that there was always what I call “that one student,” or that one story of someone who improved his or her life circumstance because of English. Many know someone who escaped poverty and their situation and that English played a role in that. Many also tend to believe that those who are not successful have no one to blame but themselves. They do not try hard enough, or they do not want it badly enough, and Reyna also draws on this discourse as Chapters 5 and 6 reveal. Even if this student did do it all on his own, wanted it badly enough, worked really hard and “made it,” if he made it after college is never discussed. Did he graduate? Has English helped him get a good job or improve his life circumstances and future potential? These stories perpetuate the larger discourse of neoliberalism by promoting individual motivation and perseverance towards success. Enrique also touched on his role in being a mediator in this student’s transformation. This is what Enrique loves about his work, and he invoked a little bit of Freirean inspiration when he said, “I have to learn from them” – he is a teacher-learner that mediates students (at least the motivated ones, according to this) and in so doing comes to learn from students. When a student like Lloyd succeeds, Enrique is rewarded.
Enrique said that he sees no negative consequences of English learning and teaching in Nicaragua, but he continued to narrate stories of his life as learner and teacher of English that construct a hidden discourse of the hegemony of global English. While the excerpts above demonstrate that Enrique saw English as bringing hope and students as needing to choose their lives, our meetings and interview together demonstrated that Enrique himself often socially and economically struggled because of his knowledge of English. Enrique often told me about how he has been taken advantage of since he was a teenager for knowing English well, much of this discussed in Chapter 6: Being Made into English Teacher Subjects, as these experiences play a significant role in shaping Enrique’s professional identity. For Enrique (like for many teachers), knowing English – and well – made him a highly desired rarity, and he began to be taken advantage of by schools, universities, and other institutions, which paid little or nothing at all, lied to him about positions and incentives, and let him down in other ways. A theme that emerged from participants and nonparticipants in conversation was that social hierarchies and even petty jealousy from bosses, those of a higher social class, and those higher in the institution could keep English teachers having to secure multiple different jobs for little or no pay, receiving late paychecks or paychecks with earnings lower than they should be, and being given a tremendous workload beyond the responsibilities of English teaching. At the time of the study, Enrique taught at three different schools, including for an after-school program for troubled youth. His boss at the after-school program made Enrique do his administrative duties, like gradebook records for the entire student population that had to be sent to Managua. Enrique saw me as a confidant to whom he could voice his frustrations about being overworked and underpaid. He confided that both in the past and during the time of this study his paychecks would often come late or that earnings would be taken out of the monthly wage. Enrique was constantly working and was very well-respected socially in Tepetl, but he struggled economically in similar ways to those in Tepetl who did not speak English. Being an English teacher seemed to have no more economic benefits than being a teacher of any other subject, or being a laborer.
4.4.2. International communication

As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1., the term “developing country” has roots in colonial domination and spreading local epistemologies and ideologies from the West as globally relevant models for advancement. How English, specifically, is relevant to this advancement is less clear (Appleby et al., 2002). A discourse that prevailed within teachers’ interviews and students’ questionnaires was that English would assist them in communicating with foreigners in Nicaragua in two industries in particular: tourism and translation. As a former Access student, Reyna was exposed to the deep connection between English and U.S. culture and values that the Access Program promotes, as demonstrated in the Access handbook. When I asked Reyna about negative consequences to learning English, she indicated none, returning to the discourse of English for development:

Bueno, consecuencias que se diga no porque es muy positivo, más bien ayuda al país, porque como usted sabe en Nicaragua somos un país muy pobre y necesitamos desenvolvernos, aprender, tener la necesidad de aprender otro idioma, porque sino ahí nos vamos a quedar, en el suelo, y nunca vamos a avanzar, no nos vamos a desarrollar como país, como personas. Entonces yo digo que no traen consecuencias, más bien: (1.5) muy ¿cómo le digo? (.) muy bueno porque- porque hay muchos que buscan, no solo aquí en Nicaragua, en los países vecinos buscan traductores. Igual, Nicaragua tiene personas que saben inglés, quizás algún día podemos desarrollarnos, sí. <Well, consequences I say no because it is very positive, it helps the country, because as you know in Nicaragua we are a very poor country and we need to develop, to learn, to have the need to learn another language, because if not we will stay there, on the ground, and we will never move forward, we will not develop as a country, as people. So I say it does not bring consequences, rather: (1.5) very, how do I tell it? (.) very good because- because there are many who seek, not only here in Nicaragua, in neighboring countries they look for translators. Equally, Nicaragua has people who know English, maybe one day we can develop, yes>. (interview, 05/17/17)

Reyna continued to highlight the poverty of Nicaragua and the need for the country to develop. While she argued that the country needs to learn and develop, it is English that will propel this development. As one UZN student stated in her questionnaire, “English is like a trampoline” (student #65), a metaphor of a quick, springing-upward motion. For Reyna, English language development is narrowly defined as job opportunities, specifically opportunities which serve internationals, though becoming an English teacher is one rare job that is mentioned outside of the discourse of foreign assistance. Teachers, in turn, train students for tourism, translation, or teaching. English language development is much less connected to other knowledge development, like scientific and technical information, which is largely written in English (Hasman, 2004), relationship and knowledge sharing, and
acknowledgment of the stringent social, cultural, and political hierarchies that keep individuals from forming sustainable development projects. In student questionnaires 38% of UZN students (n=41) and 14% of CSB students (n=3) listed job opportunities of tourism or translation as reasons for the importance of English in Nicaragua, whereas only 7% of UZN students (n=8) and 5% of CSB students (n=1) connected English learning to developing other forms of knowledge (e.g., accessing research written in English). Reyna’s final statement, “quizás algún día podemos desarrollarnos” [maybe one day we can develop] shows a hope in overcoming poverty, but English and only English is seen as a way to overcome. As for Reyna’s own desires to be an English teacher, she connected it to the fact that there is no other professional work in Nicaragua, aligning with Enrique’s observations that Tepetl has very little opportunities for any work, let alone work requiring knowledge of English, as well as Romaine’s (2015b) argument that the majority of vocations available in low-income countries are low-wage, manual work.

When I asked Reyna why she wants to teach English and what she sees as positive about it, she responded,

_Bueno, me gusta porque uhm (.) por una parte, porque el inglés, la mayoría de las personas no lo escogen como carrera, y entonces eligen otras carreras. (1.0) Pero acá en Nicaragua por ejemplo, el Ministerio de Educación necesita docentes, entonces es más fácil para encontrar trabajo porque aquí en Nicaragua es difícil encontrar trabajo. Por ejemplo, de ingeniero, es difícil encontrar trabajo en ingeniería, quizás como enfermera. Tengo una prima que es enfermera y no trabaja porque no tuvo la oportunidad en ningún hospital. Entonces por una parte escogí el inglés porque muchas veces hay oportunidades para – para maestros que aprenden otro idioma ....._<Well, I like it because uhm (.) on the one hand, because English, most people do not choose it as a profession, and so they choose other professions. (1.0) But here in Nicaragua for example, the Ministry of Education needs teachers, so it's easier to find work because here in Nicaragua it is difficult to find work. For example, as an engineer, it is difficult to find work in engineering, perhaps as a nurse. I have a cousin who is a nurse and does not work because she did not have the opportunity in any hospital. So on the one hand I chose English because there are often opportunities for - for teachers who learn another language ....._>

(interview, 05/17/17)

Because of MINED’s recent investment in the English language, there is a need for qualified English teachers, and Reyna’s answer demonstrates an awareness of this. It may be easier to find a job, at least in teaching, if one knows English. She provided her cousin’s situation as a nurse as an example that materializes this reasoning into real issues and experiences that Nicaraguans face. Threads of neoliberal discourses underpin their reasoning: competition (businesses hiring an English speaker over a non-English speaker), business and trade, and scholarship and study abroad opportunities are invoked to argue
why youth need to master the language. English, then, both opens and limits professional pathways for Nicaraguans. There are few jobs in the north – English-related or otherwise – but because of MINED’s recent investment in English, there are at least English-teaching jobs, according to Reyna. Aside from this seemingly sole job opportunity to become an English teacher if one knows English, Cesar and Reyna reference the tourism industry as another avenue, though northern Nicaragua is not an area to which tourists normally venture. Thus, teaching seems to be the only realistic option, and being in the tourism industry (e.g., hotel management, tour guide) an imagined opportunity.

4.4.3. Linguistic hegemony

In Gramsci’s (1971) analysis of linguistic hegemony, disciplinary powers such as the government or educational institutions use “rational-bureacratic norms” (Chatterjee, 1994, p 83) to construct what become worldviews, common-sense understandings of so-called naturally-occurring phenomena that remain unquestioned because individuals feel there is nothing that they can do about it. English can be a gatekeeper not only for those who live in remote areas of Nicaragua, but also for many Nicaraguans trying to access professional careers in which English is not even necessary to perform the duties of the job. Cesar discussed the need to learn English for job attainment, even though the job does not entail the use of English:

Por ejemplo, viene alguien del extranjero a establecer una empresa y busca personal, busca diez personas, le llegan 20 currículos y entre los 20 currículos diez saben hablar inglés y español, y diez solo español. Lo más probable es que los diez que tengan inglés y español tengan más ventajas sobre los otros. (1.5) Ya después de medir las otras cualidades que se necesitan pues, estamos hablando de diez personas con las mismas capacidades, diez en español e inglés, y las diez solo en español. La lógica lo dice, lo más seguro es que si tienen las mismas capacidades pero al que sabe inglés, vamos a dejar al que sabe inglés también porque ese es el idioma de todo (xx). Entonces para muchos propósitos. Saber inglés no solamente es como para jactarse de tener esa habilidad, sino que es para sacarle provecho. <For example, someone comes from abroad to establish a company and looks for staff, looking for ten people, 20 CVs arrive and among the 20 CVs ten can speak English and Spanish, and ten only Spanish. Most likely, the ten who have English and Spanish have more advantage over the others. (1.5) Already after measuring the other qualities that are needed then, we are talking about ten people with the same capabilities, ten in Spanish and English, and ten only in Spanish. Logic says the safest thing is that if they have the same abilities, but to the one who knows English, we are going to let the one who knows English also because that is the language of everything (xx). Then for many purposes. Knowing English is not only for boasting of having that ability, but for taking advantage of it>. (interview, 05/20/17)
English acts as a gatekeeping device, or a way to eliminate the pool of potential job seekers. To a much more competitive extent, Park (2011) and Cho (2017) describe how South Korea’s “English fever” has come to construct the TOIEC exam as a gatekeeper not only for individuals trying to obtain a competitive job, but also if individuals want to qualify for promotions within their companies. First, Cesar did not think that the business owner has a responsibility to learn Spanish, coming to a Spanish-speaking country to conduct business. It is the responsibility of Nicaraguans to be ready to serve the needs of the international company. Second, even if English is not a needed skill for the company (maybe employees stamp bags of coffee or roll cigars, for example), he argued that those who know English will get hired before those who know only Spanish for a job that requires no English to perform.

For Cesar, English is a branding device that is not just for “jactarse” [boasting], as Cesar says (social capital) but also “sacarle provecho” [taking advantage] – or having advantage over others for scarce jobs offered by foreign direct investment (economic capital). However, the advantage does not redistribute wealth in Nicaragua or activate economic growth; on the contrary, English-speaking workers are exploited to do low-wage work in which they may not even use their English skills, continuing to strengthen the elite’s control of class power and capital (Harvey, 2005). The hidden discourse, then, that emerges in Cesar’s opinions about English in Nicaragua and in the world is that it is not that it is purely a positive, beneficial force due to its status as the language of business, government, and economic development, but that this positive, beneficial force only benefits disciplinary and institutional systems.

When I asked Cesar if there are any negative consequences to learning English in Nicaragua, he said, “No, lo contrario, todo es positivo, porque incluso el mismo gobierno utiliza gente que habla inglés” [No, on the contrary, everything is positive, because even the government itself uses people who speak English] (interview, 05/20/17).

When I asked Amelia for her opinion about English as a skill for socioeconomic mobility, her observations and experiences supported political economic research that indicates a complicated and unequal correlation. She states:
There are very few situations where knowing English alone (3.0) furthers, you know, your career or whatever project you’re trying to do. It’s knowing how to do a certain skill set IN English as well, right? Um: (3.0) I don’t know, there- I’m thinking of like (4.0) so the jobs that I’ve heard here (2.0) that you can get in English are like working at the airport you need to be bilingual, um:: call centers (2.0) you need to be bilingual. But again both of those are in Managua only. It doesn’t really apply here in the north. Um, what was the third one. I know someone who works for a bank, um, like a national bank? And he said that he has worked with international clients before. (He used to) be able to speak English (.) but (2.0) yeah, he sees that as a necessity but I- and something that helped his ability to speak English pretty fluently, like pretty well um, he says that it’s helped him get to the position that he’s at. And I absolutely of course believe him but at the same time uh: question the emphasis PUT on being able to speak English in that position because I think a lot of it is just like going to- I think that the clients that they do have to interact with in English are very few and far between. And I think that it’s like pretty minimal, basic English that one could even put into Google translate kind of thing (. ) copy and paste that into an email or a correspondence with their English-speaking client….So: um:: .hh (.) and obviously he didn’t get to that position just through speaking English. He got through like taking really intensive courses in accounting and managing and administration and so forth. AND concurrently taking English courses. But yeah, I think that a lot of people do think that by learning English, it will open a lot of doors for them and unfortunately just knowing English in and of itself from my perspective isn’t going to radically change anyone’s world here. (interview, 6/25/17)

From listening to her friend’s experiences and thinking about her own experiences and observations in Nicaragua, Amelia saw English as a skill that people in rural areas use to migrate to Managua for jobs, where there are call centers and other types of employment. Amelia also believed that other skills – not just English – are important for helping Nicaraguans in the north obtain good positions, as she told the story that her friend has narrated to her about his banking career, a position for which, she assumes, he likely uses very little English, but because he knows English, the simple status that the “skill” provides him allows him access to the banking opportunity, regardless if he uses it or still knows it. Cho (2017) and Park (2011) among others demonstrate how linguistic capital for the new neoliberal workforce in South Korea values TOIEC18 scores, increasingly raising the bar on what counts as sufficiently proficient, over actually having competence in English. Thus, a score on a test is the ticket to the job opportunity, not actually knowing English. Amelia’s narrative of her friend tells a similar story: knowing English, at least on paper, may give a competitive advantage over others for a job that requires limited or no English. She also demonstrates awareness of the socioeconomic situation in northern Nicaragua that there are very few employment opportunities regardless of knowledge of English.

18 The Test of English for International Communication, by Educational Testing Service (ETS).
Drawing conclusions from the primary participants’ thoughts on global English, as well those from students’ responses to the questionnaires, provides the following patterns: global English is overwhelmingly viewed as a positive phenomenon by teachers and students. It provides access to personal development skills like curiosity, self-confidence, critical thinking, and new knowledge, while at the same time opening potential for a socioeconomically stronger nation, primarily through development of the tourism industry and other areas in need of translation services. Everything about learning English leads to some sort of development and progress, but how it does so remains vague in participants’ responses. However, Amelia’s observations and experiences as a foreign volunteer provide a different discursive orientation to global English. As an outsider in a privileged position, coming from the U.S. as a NES, she has the potential to support the same discourses of English as and for development to which Cesar and Reyna orient.

4.4.4. Perspectives on ELT

Section 4.4.2. above analyzes the discourses of global English that circulated within the participants’ lifeworlds as I entered that world and began asking them questions about it and observing it. This section transitions to discourses on ELT – how participants feel about how English should be taught and learned, and how these discourses emerge through what they say and what they do outside of interviews during workshops and teaching. This section is not as robust as the previous because most of the participants do not express or display much of their opinions on ELT until after I begin introducing alternative and critically-based perspectives on ELT in workshops or co-teaching. Interactive data on ELT is analyzed in Chapter 5, when participants reach areas of dissonance between what I teach and what they have been taught or have experienced in the past. Represented below are opinions that emerged in interview, early workshop, and early co-teaching data that provided a base for me to begin thinking about how I could construct future workshops that addressed these views. It is important to restate here that Paulo does not speak English, Reyna has never been a teacher nor ever had a job, Cesar has taught computation for about ten years to primary school students but has never taught English, and Enrique has
over 20 years of experience teaching English. Reyna has a basic command of English, Cesar has an intermediate level, and Enrique is an advanced speaker, according to their own self-reported understandings. These experiences and abilities play a role in shaping their perspectives and actions about the teaching of English, and in particular the following themes appeared multiple times in our work together: the superiority of the native-English-speaker, the L1 as unhelpful for the L2 classroom, teaching as structured activity (e.g., strictly following lesson plans, certain approaches or methods), and critical and alternative discourses said and enacted by teachers.

Native and nonnative English-speaking teachers. Paulo, Cesar, Reyna, and Enrique placed high social capital on individuals from the United States and the English that they speak as, looking to them as models for development. Paulo, the dean of UZN, continued to place high value on NESs throughout our planning together. On many occasions, Paulo would try to convince me that he would rather that volunteers like me and Amelia teach English than assist Cesar and Reyna in their teaching development. The following fieldnote summarizes a lunch conversation that we had on the topic:

At lunch, for a second time Paulo tried to convince me that Amelia and native speakers are better to have than local teachers. I told him that for one, it is not sustainable: Amelia and I would be leaving soon. Secondly, I told him that most of the world learns English from and speaks English to non-native speakers. I reminded him of the Freirean-based plan that I proposed to him and to which he so excitedly agreed. He agreed again with the plan, but repeated that native speakers are better for the classroom and gave an interesting example. He told me that native speakers are “más suave” [smoother], saying that local teachers say loudly and harshly, “FOR EXAMPLE!” while nonnative-English-speaking teachers reply softly, “For example.” I took from this curious example that he meant to capture a harshness or unrefinedness to the English of nonnative speakers of English in Nicaragua, and that was a quality that he did not want his teachers to have. (field note 04/29/17)

Paulo continued to voice conventional discourses like that of NES superiority in ELT, which has become an everyday, taken-for-granted, institutional discourse/practice, one which Fairclough (1989) argues is an unconscious agreement with the “power to project one’s practices as universal and ‘common sense’” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 33). If Amelia and I acquiesced to Paulo’s desire for us to teach for his English program, according to Freire, we would be serving to perpetuate this social relation instead of challenging it. As Auerbach (1995) summarizes,
Freire (1970, 1981, 1985) argues that it is only when the education of subordinated peoples directly addresses issues of power and the learners’ role in the social order that it can cease to be domesticating. In this view, serving the interests of the learners cannot be separated from challenging their marginalization through both the content and processes of education. (p. 12)

Paulo is not the only participant to elevate the NES above the NNES. Cesar also expressed the discourse of NES superiority in his interviews and in workshops. Cesar placed the blame on teachers when expressing his concern about the poor quality of SLTE programs in Nicaragua:

Por ejemplo, un maestro de inglés enseñando inglés, enseñando listening- hablando con acento o comete errores gramaticales, no es conveniente. ¿Por qué? Porque el estudiante aprende los errores que yo pueda cometer al hablar, pero si el gobierno me dijera a mí, “aquí tiene usted como maestro de inglés, aquí tiene este paquete de audios, cada audio viene conectado con el currículo y lo va a utilizar en cada lección, y aquí está una grabadora para usted como maestro de inglés para que la utilice.” Y fiscalizarlo que lo está utilizando, no que lo irá a vender. Entonces el estudiante aprende a escuchar un idioma correcto. Pongamos de que sea de nativos. <For example, an English teacher teaching English, teaching listening- speaking with an accent or making grammatical mistakes, it isn’t convenient. Why? Because the student learns the mistakes I can make when speaking, but if the government told me, “Here is your English teacher, here is this audio package, each audio is connected to the curriculum and you will use it in each lesson, and here is a tape recorder for you as an English teacher to use.” And check that you are using it, you won’t sell it, then the student learns to listen to a correct language. Let's say it's from natives>

(interview, 05/20/17)

Here, Cesar demonstrated his view that “expertise” is in the audio package and that a student “learns to listen to the correct language. By indicating that such audio packages are “de nativos” [from natives (NESs)], Cesar positioned NNES teachers as secondary experts to the packaged audio materials, and demonstrates a discursive understanding of English usage as a performance that should be standardized and have no mistakes. These mistakes are apparently detrimental to learners, who will learn incorrect usage, indicating that Standard English is the only goal of English learning. Cesar also did not factor in the societal obstacle of recurrent power outages that occur very often, as well as the high cost of such audio packages that schools, teachers, and learners have to absorb. Instead, he placed value on the government as the authority that supplies the packaged resources and dictates how they use them in each lesson. He blamed teachers who, according to him, are at risk of selling the audio materials instead of using them for teaching, opening another unspoken concern that teachers are not compensated sufficiently
and must resort to such actions. At the end of his interview, I asked Cesar if he had anything else that he would like to discuss about the learning or teaching of English.

Uhm: (1.5), bueno (1.5) la verdad que yo estoy ansioso. Yo estoy ansioso por empezar a trabajar, empezar a trabajar con usted, con Amelia, con cualquier otro voluntario que venga. Porque yo creo que nadie mejor, nadie mejor que alguien de- del norte, alguien de Estados Unidos, nos diga cómo enseñar y cómo aprender el idioma. <Uhm (1.5) well (1.5) the truth is that I am anxious. I am anxious to begin working, begin working with you, with Amelia, with whoever other volunteer comes. Because I believe that nobody better, nobody better than someone fr- from the north, someone from the United States, should tell us how to teach and how to learn the language>. (interview, 05/20/17)

Cesar was anxious not necessarily due to starting a new job teaching English for the first time, but that he would be doing so with the support of me and Amelia, individuals from “del norte” [the north] who should be telling him what to do, what he is doing wrong and what he is doing right. He is anxious about being judged, possibly, as he sets up a center-periphery distinction that, Phillipson (1992) argues, represents the discourse of linguistic imperialism, which draws from dependency theory (Chirot & Hall, 1982) in which “…the ‘First World’ center imposes a set of economic, political and military structural relations on ‘Third World’ nations in the periphery which makes them ‘dependent’ on the core or center nations for economic and political survival in the global capitalist system” (Sonntag, 2009, p. 8).

Therefore, there is “nadie mejor” [nobody better], a phrase he repeats twice, than North Americans to “nos diga cómo enseñar” [tell us show to teach] the language. Foucault’s (1978) metaphor of the panopticon, or the disciplinary, all-knowing power of surveillance, provides, in Pennycook’s (1995) evaluation, an understanding of the global system as that of the knowers and those needing to know (or being overshadowed by what the knowers know):

Thus, we can see how the Third World is subjected to a form of surveillance – a “normalizing gaze” that “compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes” (1979: 183) – by the “powerful and knowing” central tower, the Western intellectual and political institutions that construct discourses on the Third World, and which, by the nature of their surveillance, lead the objects of that surveillance to become the “principle of [their] own subjection” (p. 203). And, just as Rahim (1986) suggests that English became the language of the panopticon in colonial India,
so I would like to suggest that English today is the language of the global panopticon.

(Pennycook, 1995, p. 49)

That Cesar subjects himself to anxiety because of what Amelia or I will think of his teaching, despite our support and open-mindedness, shows that our gaze on him is extremely powerful, despite our best of intentions. We, too, cannot escape the gaze placed on us as “powerful and knowing” NESs. While Cesar saw the native English speaker as the better teacher and the better model for English pronunciation, he viewed local Nicaraguan English teachers more negatively. He tended to hold individuals responsible for their own failure and neglected to acknowledge the responsibility of larger social and political systems for the inability to successfully access tools that support their personal well-being and economic success. This is not to deny that individuals do not play a role in their final success, but that systemic conditions constrain individuals’ choices. This sense of individual responsibility for one’s success and failure manifests in Paulo, Cesar, Reyna, and, at times, Enrique. For Cesar, he continues to blame teachers as professionals and voices a negative view of most English teachers in Nicaragua:

La población en Nicaragua tenemos un programa de educación en inglés muy bueno porque el compendio curricular es muy bueno, pero los maestros no contribuyen. (1.5) Los maestros no ayudan. Los maestros siempre se quedan en lo mismo, enseñando casi lo mismo y le ponen las cosas en la pizarra a uno, no lo profundizan, no se interesa que si el estudiante lo captó. Yo estuve viendo todo el programa, y digo yo, si los maestros se empoderaran de este programa los chavalos de quinto año saldrían hablando comunicación básica, ya por lo menos empezando el beginner, el intermedio. <The population in Nicaragua has a very good education program in English because the curricular compendium is very good, but the teachers do not contribute. (1.5) The teachers don’t help. Teachers always stay with the same, teaching almost the same and put things on the blackboard, don’t deepen it, don’t care if the student caught it. I was viewing the whole program, and I say, if the teachers would be empowered from this program, the fifth year boys would talk basic communication, at least beginning the beginner, the intermediate>. (interview, 05/20/17)

Instead of placing the fault of what Cesar views as poor teaching practices on the limited access to professional development opportunities and resources, Cesar believes it is the teacher’s own fault that they are not empowered by the teacher education program, which provides a “muy bueno” [very good] curriculum to which the teachers “no contribuyan” [do not contribute]. He goes so far as to lament that they “no se interesa” [do not care] about students’ learning, naturalizing this behavior as if it is a larger
part of the culture of language teaching in Nicaragua. Teachers move through a rote, routinized method of teaching with no motivation to help students acquire the language.

Reyna had fewer and less opinionated thoughts on ELT than did Cesar because Cesar was enrolled in a graduate program for teaching English at the time of the study and had developed not only an apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) from his own learning experiences, but also a bit of methodological grounding from his current coursework as a student in a maestria program for English teaching. Reyna did place value on knowing a North American, however, and how her relationship with me became a source of empowerment for her as a teacher. After her participation in the Access program when she was a teenager, she confides in her interview that she did not continue studying English or studying at all because of health complications due to a teenage pregnancy in which she gave birth to a girl. She stated: “Nunca había tenido la oportunidad de convivir mucho tiempo con una persona americana. Es mi primera vez. ¡Wow! Si solo quizás, ’hi, bye’” <I had never had the opportunity to live with an American person for a long time. It is my first time. Wow! If only maybe, “hi, bye”> (interview, 06/27/17).

For Enrique, like Reyna, native- and non-native-speakerness in teaching is not necessarily a hierarchical, but is an exciting and different point-of-view for local teachers and students. Because I was the first North American volunteer with which all three teachers had ever worked, I asked them at the end of our fieldwork if they had any feedback for me about how I and other volunteers could better support local teachers. Enrique responded:

I think that (. ) everything for me is pretty (happy) (. ) for real (2.0) at least (. ) one single thing (. ) that is necessary (. ) you know just (. ) like you: (xx) in front of the class (. ) reading something (. ) trying to engage them or (something like) reading a question (. ) that’s really great because I mean they have a chance to uh: use English (. ) you know (. ) to use English with uh: with a NATive speaker (. ) okay having the chance to communicate with (. ) (xx) (. ) maybe they (xx) accent sounds like uh: is it a clear message they have for this person? Am I communicating (. ) EFFECTively? (playing?) yeh? Something like this is create that environment. It’s really good. Yeah and I think that ANY activity you have=any activity (xx) great. (interview, 06/26/17)

Enrique saw my participation in his class as creating a new environment that students have never experienced: talking to a native speaker and receiving a type of verification that their accent can be
understood by a NES and that they can understand my accent. On the day of the interview (06/26/17), I had presented a lesson in class for the upcoming Fourth of July, assisting Enrique in providing a cultural lesson that the Access Handbook requires of teachers. Enrique had asked me if I would lead the class on the cultural topic and I agreed. He and I had bought food the day prior to serve the students hot dogs on the holiday. While he was preparing the food in the school’s kitchen, I led a history game on why the Fourth of July is celebrated, and then I taught them the Pledge of Allegiance – they were to read it, help one another make meaning from it, and then surprise Enrique when he came back with the food by reciting it to him. Referring to this activity, Enrique continued:

ENR: and the class like the uh: cultural lesson (.)(that we) had today?
KAT: ((yeah))
ENR: the- the pledge of uh:
KAT: the pledge of allegiance?
ENR: allegiance (1.0) and (.)(xx) because I remember that I- I just uh: have seen that movie for example (an old) movie I like watching=I love that movie. This guy uh: is uh: kindergarten cop?
KAT: yeah ((with Arnold Schwarzenegger))
ENR: ((with Arnold Schwarzenegger))=@HA, yeah ((it’s pretty)) funny=I love that movie
KAT: @haha yeah
ENR: and the kids like “yeah yeh”=pretending to be (xxx). That’s really great I love that movie and it’s great that you brought (.)(you) (actually) created that opportunity that environment that atmosphere in class=that’s really great because this is something new (.)(now) they have a different point of view (with) something they have to like uh: make it work or- or value (in places) we have another culture (x) of culture

To Enrique, it is not necessarily just my native-speaker status, nor my accent, that enhances his students’ learning. It is that I bring “something new” (line 13) to which the students have never been exposed, and “a different point of view” (line 14) of the history of the United States and the cultural nationalism with which most students in the United States begin each school day. It is the nativity of who I am that enriches his classroom, not necessarily the fact that I am a NES, because I come from a different place, have a different history and experiences, and can share that to students to open their mind to new lifeworlds.

**Separation of L1 and L2.** Throughout our work together, Cesar often demonstrated an aversion to using Spanish in the English classroom, or Spanish with English at all. Reyna had less opinion on this, but did seem to support Cesar in his opinions, as will be shown in Excerpt 4.1 below, which comes from
our second workshop together on 5/02/17. In this part of the workshop, I provided a brief overview of some of the approaches and methods that historically have been used to teach language, beginning from the classical approach, moving through the audiolingual method and others, and ending at approaches within communicative language teaching. I explained the oral approach and Situational Language Teaching (SLT) and how it was important in these approaches to sometimes use the first language for second language negotiation (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). I introduced them to the oral approach, saying that with this perspective, it is sometimes important for students to hear their first language as rules of grammar are taught. In these workshops, I used a combination of English and Spanish because both Reyna and Cesar are learners of English, and Reyna’s knowledge of English was not as strong as Cesar’s. Thus, I accommodated for this while at the same time providing sufficient opportunities to listen to and speak in English. While Reyna almost entirely used Spanish to communicate, Cesar practiced English until he could not express the meanings he needed; then he would switch to Spanish. Thus, as I explained an approach that allows for the use of the L1 for directions, clarification, and other purposes, I used a similar approach to dialogue with them, though my own ideology for doing so differed. If I solely used English, Cesar and Reyna would not understand a significant portion of what I say. If I solely used English, Cesar and Reyna would not be provided the opportunities for English language use that they both needed and desired. In the excerpt below, Cesar stops me just after I finish a point about the importance of the L1 in the SLT and oral approach, demonstrating a resistance to this differing or alternative approach to some of the more dominant views on L1-use in the L2 classroom that see it as a detriment to the learning of the L2.

Excerpt 4.1 – “That doesn’t work” (Workshop 2, 05/02/17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 CES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 KAT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CES:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 que escribe las en el leguaje inglés
<i>si think that it would be appropriate for the student to first be given the diction that i put on the board, so (xx) and after write (xx) on the board. Say it first, give the directions, and then write them in the English language>.

10 KAT: yeah (.) so that's good (.) then=right? (.)
11 (instructions) first and then-
12 CES: -(sí)
<i><yes>
13 KAT:(and then)-
14 CES: (sí, porque sí) que lo que tenemos allí es primero lenguaje antes de verlo (.) la manera de ver el lenguaje es escribirlo (.) entonces, por- por ejemplo decirles Bueno "hoy vamos estudiar: (.) acerca de" (1.0)
15 <yes, because yes that what we have there is first the language before seeing it (.) the way to see language is to write it (.) so, for example, tell them well “today we are going to study: (.) about” (1.0) “today we are going to study- (1.0) today we are going to study about (.) eh (.) ‘to be’ verb”>
16 KAT: great. and (.) todo en inglés?
<i>and (.) all in English>
17 CES: y todo de eso incluso- todo en ingles (.) por eso escribe en inglés también en la pizarra (.) “today we are going to study about ‘to be’ verb” (.) entonces el que al principio no escuchó, después lo leyó y se reforzar.
<i>and all of that even- everything in english (.) that’s why you also write in english on the board (.) “today we are going to study the “to be” verb (.) so, he who at first didn’t hear, reads it and reinforces it>
18 KAT: okay
19 CES: reforzar a la pronunciación (.) “we are going- today we are going to study about ‘to be’ verb”
<i>reinforce the pronunciation>
20 KAT: (again in LH claw)
21 CES: también pueden hacer <that could be too>
22 KAT: que bueno (.) bueno idea <nice (.) good idea>
23 CES: sí, porque (xxxx) reforzar (.) reforzando
24 ((CES uses RH in circular motion to emphasize his use of “reforzar”)
In lines 4-9, Cesar expressed his opinion on verbal and written reinforcement of directions to students: say it to students first in English, then write it on the board in English, representing a theory of learning tied to behaviorism, where stimuli are provided that trigger a response in the students, which is then reinforced. He then became more explicit in his views: that seeing language will help students grasp what they heard, repeating the phrase “reforzar” [reinforce] in lines 27, 29, and 36. I encouraged Cesar’s opinion and participation in the workshop by showing that I appreciated his idea, and in line 40 I looked...
to Reyna and asked her what she thought, since she was quieter and less sure in initial workshops. Cesar interrupted this attempt at transferring focus to Reyna to continue his point. After I initially invited her in, however, Reyna became comfortable talking, supporting Cesar’s opinion by providing a personal experience of her own English education in the past when teachers were always like that. She tended to avoid providing her opinion on ELT unless Cesar begins sharing his own, or perhaps does not know she has one until his experience helps her remember her own. Then she can support that with the experience that she has had, beginning to feel comfortable participating by sharing her everyday knowledge to help Cesar counter the academic knowledge espoused by the SLT approach. Cesar wants English to be taught in English. He believed that too much Spanish, especially when classes meet so little each week, is a detriment to the acquisition of English. He reasons that writing English and speaking Spanish – and in later workshops, any use of Spanish, even when providing directions to an activity – “doesn’t work” (line 57). Interestingly, Cesar needs to rely on Spanish himself to successfully communicate with me, as he begins Line 1 in English, but then transitioned to English. Although he learned much and used much English in my workshops, he did not possess sufficient competence to function solely in English within the topic of teaching English. Despite relying on Spanish to express his opinion, he still was of the opinion that Spanish did not have a place in the English classroom.

Enrique, on the other hand, a veteran English teacher in the rural Nicaraguan context, uses Spanish in the Access classroom and does so for matters of clarification, comprehension, and even humor. Unlike Cesar and Reyna, who are in the process of imagining their teacher identities, providing opinions on how they would manage their classroom and what values they would uphold, Enrique has over 20 years of knowing what works and does not work for him and his students because he has a strong understanding of himself as an English teacher, the purpose of his lessons or activities, and the culture in which he is practicing as an English teacher (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992). The classes, even many instructions, were mostly conducted in English, but there were times when he used Spanish or encouraged students to use Spanish. In Excerpt 4.2 below, students worked in groups of four-to-five on a page in their
workbook. Enrique passed around sticky notes to each group, asking them to identify a new word or phrase on the page, write it on the sticky note, and stick it on the whiteboard in front of the class. He then directed students to create a dialogue with the new word or phrase, which they would present. He gave these directions in English and was now in the process of going to the student groups to clarify the directions.

*Excerpt 4.2: Enrique’s use of Spanish for directions and clarification (co-teaching, 06/19/17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENR: you have to create a conversation= presentation=would you like to express: to your classmates? (1.0)</th>
<th>(E walks from group in front right corner to group in back left corner. E leans over group, looks at each student while giving directions, touches RH index finger to LH little finger, then opens both hands out toward classmates))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENR: huh? (2.0)</td>
<td>((Ss look at E and then each other))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1: we were-</td>
<td>(ST2 holds up sticky note paper; students seem confused))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2: -y también?-</td>
<td>((E scrunches face, leans down to look at notes in front of ST3. Ss look at the same note. E moves RH down to touch paper and point to note))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENR: What are you talking (about)?</td>
<td>((E now understands their confusion and stands up to present information to entire group))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3: (xx)</td>
<td>((ST1 demonstrates understanding; all Ss look up at E))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENR: okay tam:bien puede ser any pla:ce= &lt;al:so it can be&gt;</td>
<td>(ST3 demonstrates understanding))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1: =[ah::]</td>
<td>((holds up sticky paper towards E to ask a question but E is looking away from her at another student))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENR: [tam:bi en any pla:ce]= <a href="">al:so</a></td>
<td>((E points to S2; after saying “it could be” stops to look up, think))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3: =[ah:::]</td>
<td>(S2 tries to interrupt E))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENR: [okay=any=place]=any=word=something new on the paper?=</td>
<td>((points with LH index finger toward S2, shakes index finger to tell her to wait until he is done explaining))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3: (1.5) a birthday party?</td>
<td>((E begins voicing an example sentence, acting bored or tired, placing LH on heart))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENR: =any word=puede ser (1.5) it can be&gt;</td>
<td>(E is cut off by loud exclamations of background Ss))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3: =[ah:::]</td>
<td>((E begins example again, stands behind group, puts LH on L hip, shakes head back and forth))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENR: Sí- sí, siempre un- &lt;yes- yes, always a&gt;</td>
<td>((E looks at and points to S3 on “if we ask”, looks up to think of an example))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2: -eh-</td>
<td>(E suddenly has idea for an example, bends knees and enacts looking out the window, uses LH, open palm up))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENR: -(xx) luego (1.0) luego (x) &lt;later&gt; &lt;later&gt;</td>
<td>((Ss seem to understand and begin shuffling through notes and working on their dialogue, E walks away))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3: =[ah:::]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Excerpt 4.2, Enrique’s students used Spanish to ask him questions. He did not reprimand them for using Spanish. He also used some Spanish, in particular small phrases like “puede ser [it can be]” (lines 12, 18), clauses that repeat the English example in Spanish (line 26), or phrases to set up the example sentences he creates in English, like “ahora si (xx), si preguntamos” [Now if (xx), if we ask]” (line 28). Quickly moving from group to group to provide clarification, such intermittent use of Spanish allows Enrique to speed up the process of information dissemination, so students can quickly get on task and he has time to address each confused student group. The above excerpt attempts to show not only the codeswitching practices of Enrique and his students, but also the interactive gestures that Enrique uses while engaging students, demonstrating that he understands language use as not just words, but a complete embodiment of the individual. The quickness to which he bounces from group to group, his engagement and excitement, and his face full of expression and attention shows that for Enrique, English teaching requires a physical, not just mental, presence. His in-the-moment activities demonstrate discourses of ELT that align with Communicative Language Teaching, Total Physical Response, and student-centered approaches to problem-solving and presenting information.

Further demonstrating that he welcomes some Spanish and, in particular, integration of both Spanish and English in activities, on 06/14/17, Enrique assigned homework because he felt that students were not giving the English program sufficient time and respect. The students had been more unfocused and hyper than usual that day, and he told them that they would need to write a compromiso [commitment]. Entitling the assignment “My personal commitment,” he told them that he wanted to renew motivation in them to enjoy their time in the class but to also take it seriously to improve their futures. He encouraged them to write their commitments in English, Spanish, or even a mix of languages. This activity came out of the moment as Enrique realized it was needed, demonstrating a stark contrast to the structured nature of activities and lessons that Cesar and, to a lesser extent, Reyna seemed to want as soon-to-be teachers.
**Structure as a scaffold.** The three teachers displayed different discourses when it came to orienting toward structuring lesson plans and the larger curriculum, as well as orienting to specific approaches as correct over other approaches. Reyna was so new to working as a teacher and, more specifically, an English teacher that she was at a point in her professional development of taking it all in, learning not only from me, but also from Cesar. Because of Cesar’s teaching experience at the primaria level, as well as his current studies for his *maestria* in English teaching, he was more aware of planning lessons, and he relied on planning, methods, and approaches that he was learning in his program. Because much of these structural activities demonstrate the process through which the teachers become English-teacher subjects, I analyze their reliance on structured modes of activity and lesson planning in Chapter 6: Being Made into English Teacher Subjects.

Moving to the Access Program at CSB, Enrique spoke little about his opinions on how he structures his lessons and how he teaches structures like grammar. He did not easily open up about his expertise gained in over 20 years of experience teaching English; however, he would make known to me his opinions on teaching the Access program, like that he strongly did not like the textbook. At one point I told him that I noticed that he tends to create meaning and context through which his students are learning, and that he does not necessarily hold the curriculum or textbook as the only models. I asked him if that fluidity is something he believes in:

I used to teach with (.) structure. I used to- it’s okay because that depends on the students in the class you manage. You try to (.) to work with uh, when you introduce grammar I think it’s necessary. But uhm: in other times I think (.?) I mean= not uh stick to=to be a stick to that point you know, to follow the grammar structure. It’s important. It’s really important because I mean for a student who doesn’t know nothing about it=sometimes it’s necessary, right? (interview, 06/26/17)

Here, Enrique equated grammar with structure and gave the belief that the way one teaches depends on the learner: it is important to not “stick to” grammar, but at the same time, it is important – and even necessary, in his opinion – to teach grammar, especially when students are unaware of grammar. K. E. Johnson (1999), like Cesar did in this excerpt, also uses the phrase, “it depends” to underscore the value of reasoning teaching, “the cognitive activity that undergirds teachers’ practices: the reasoning that
determines the doing of the teaching” (p. 1). Enrique expressed that language teaching goes beyond just grammar and vocabulary, and his opinions demonstrated that his classroom priorities included meaning-making over correct usage:

> English uh: doesn’t have to be: like taught (. ) only words=I mean just vocabulary, right? But MEANingful things (1.0). How language can transcend (. ) with those words you’re using (2.0). For example, in my class, how can you transform the environment eh: mindset of the students. (interview, 06/26/17)

Enrique linked accent to the potential of language to be more meaningful than just words. By attuning his students to these other parts of language he can transform the “environment” and the “mindset” of his students. A Vygotskian perspective on language sees thought and language as so intimately connected that language shapes thought as it is expressed, starting as inter-psychological before becoming intra-psychological (1962, 1978). To a similar tune, the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis demonstrates how language structures thinking (Whorf, 1956). Bourdieu takes these cognitive understandings further by situating them within the specific social contexts of individuals, and linking subjective thought (habitus) with objective surroundings (field) which emerge from the social organization of the context (Grenfell, 2011). And for Freire, such transcendence leads to conscientization. For Enrique, he established a context within his classroom that allowed them to not just repeat words and memorize vocabulary. He explicitly and dialectically linked the transformation of the environment to the mindset of his students, and his students’ meaning-making activity to the transformation of the environment.

**Alternative and critical discourses said and enacted by teachers.** While all three teachers of the two different sites expressed and enacted more conventional understandings of ELT, Enrique was the only teacher who also initially demonstrated or oriented to alternative or critical discourses of ELT. Enrique incorporated aspects of a critical or alternative pedagogy through a number of lessons, activities, and relationships with students. For example, he took them on an outing to plant trees, coupling English learning with critical awareness of environmental issues. After the activity, the students worked with Enrique to create a final report, writing and including photos about their experience.
In the report, the students describe their action of planting 100 trees, citing the contribution to the planet and the local problem of river depletion in the dry region of Tepetl. Alluding to the comradery that the students have, they talk about the two groups that always competed against each other during classroom activities, which they named the Elephants and the Choco Pandas (a Latin American chocolate drink). Through partnership towards a meaningful goal that included students’ connecting with community members in order to successfully realize the project, Enrique provided both an alternative activity from the classroom routine and a critical activity that had students think about and act on their world. In this way, the activity resembled Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in which “...students are given functional tasks that invite them to focus primarily on meaning exchange and to use language for real-world, non-linguistic purposes” (Van den Branden, 2006, p. 3). Focusing on tasks as units of language learning, TBLT is informed by the field of second language acquisition (SLA): “In SLA research, tasks have been widely used as vehicles to elicit language production, interaction, negotiation of meaning, processing of input and focus on form, all of which are believed to foster second language acquisition” (Van den Branden, 2006, p. 3).

Enrique often took students outside of the classroom to learn, even simply going to the school’s gym to get students actively moving their bodies as they learned English. He would break the students’ routine and was acutely aware of the emotional ups and downs of his teenage students: “Related to classroom management is the subject of learners’ emotions, and their expression” (Crookes, 2013, p. 51), and on several occasions, Enrique would talk to a student before or after class for a long period of time, never to scold or punish, but to connect with the student and help the student re-focus and leave home issues or other hardships behind for the time being. He managed not just an English classroom, but also students’ emotional and intellectual wellbeing, and for this reason, he was able to incorporate some criticality in his teaching, as well as allow me to do so when I taught. Crookes (2013) argues that if critical language pedagogy intends to be introduced successfully, that “…a teacher must have a good command of classroom management techniques. A class embarking on inherently interactive, possibly
unfamiliar classroom activities needs to be one that is already comfortable with a set of routines that will permit these initiatives (established mainly by the teacher, through use of classroom management techniques)” (p. 49-50).

4.5. Concluding the chapter

The discourses that emerged from document, interview and questionnaire analysis in this chapter may draw seemingly obvious findings already established in the literature that English is a highly sought language worldwide, even in rural Nicaragua, for purposes that range from individual enjoyment to individual development, to attainment of local work to ability to travel globally. It is nonetheless imperative to establish these discourses before creating a curriculum and teacher education project that introduces alternative and critical discourses for dialogue and, ideally, change, as these initial viewpoints provide a basis to which my workshops can respond, and allow me to focus on specific conventional discourses that seem to be particularly sedimented. Conventional discourses emerged as strongly embedded in participants’ construction of global English and ELT, and demonstrate the clear interdiscursivity (Blommaert, 2005, 2011) among language planners, students, and teachers, often found in intertextual metaphors (e.g., English as a bridge) or reasoning processes (e.g., placing individual blame on learners or teachers for failure). Policymakers, teachers and students found English to be an overwhelmingly positive skill for both personal development and the socioeconomic development of Nicaragua, providing students with critical thinking skills and different points of view to read their world. Global English also was an activity, not just a language, which involved NES and NNES actors coming together in partnership and exchange of ideas and information, although the NES did emerge as a more privileged subject in the discursive constructions regarding ELT, specifically.

The following discourses of ELT emerged as prominent: NES superiority over NNES, maintaining separate usage of English and Spanish in the classroom, and the importance of planning and structure in teaching. While Enrique, in particular, and in some cases a small number of UZN and CSB students peripherally, demonstrated an understanding of and concern for critical or alternative discourses
of global English or ELT, both sites and all teachers held primarily conventional views on English. With this firmer understanding of how participants understand English and ELT, it is worth exploring with participants and learning from them about the opportunities that do exist and can exist for English in their lives, and working with participants toward not only critiquing English in their lives, but also coupling English with other knowledge and skills that provide more options for their futures as Appleby et al. (2002), Pennycook (2002), and others argue.

In his later genealogies, Foucault “…uncovered how knowledge and power were interlinked and constructed individuals as objects of knowledge and as subjects who were controlled, even – and perhaps especially – by themselves” (Allen, 2013, p. 24). Apart from the two institutional documents, the town of Tepetl is populated by teachers and students learning or wanting to learn English and expressing their own viewpoints of global English, which tend to display the same “truth”: that English will improve their lives personally and professionally. They hear these discourses everywhere. Television commercials participate in the dissemination of these truths, selling online English and English course packets (e.g., Rosetta Stone) multiple times a day. My fieldnotes detail these layers of discourses on English that permeate the daily lives of any resident with a TV in Tepetl. Open English, which boasts being the most popular online English school in Latin America (“About Open English,” 2019), is known for its humorous commercials that represent second-language users of English embarrassing themselves over misunderstanding what they hear or mispronouncing what they say. In one commercial that was regularly advertised during my fieldwork, a woman and man are exchanging vows when the man, staring lovingly into the eyes of his bride, repeats after the priest, “In sickness and in health.” The bride suddenly appears shocked and angry. She screams, “Estuviste con Raquel?” [You were with Raquel?], humorously misunderstanding the phrase “in sickness and in health” and thinking that he has been cheating on her with a woman named Raquel. The woman is then seen throwing dishes, flipping tables and ruining the wedding cake in a rage. The discourse that one will misunderstand or be misunderstood with poor English, and therefore embarrass oneself, if one does not know English well enough, including accent (the
topic of many Open English commercials) indexes the unsuccessful attempts at individuals hoping to be globally connected: “you must use this accent if you want to become the person you intend to be” (Blommaert, 2011, p. 56), or in the case of the female actor on the Open English commercial, she ought to have had perfect English in order to understand the wedding vows (as if the cultural ritual of weddings were not semiotically rich enough with cues on what her love was actually saying).

Discourses are placed in Tepetl by the media, by international government and aid organizations like the U.S. Embassy and Peace Corps, by private volunteer organizations, by the Nicaraguan MINED, and by local teachers and students. While I was able to establish that, indeed, many conventional discourses emerged as prominent in the opinions and activities of participants, it was also the case that alternative and, at times, critical discourses showed presented themselves, demonstrating that they exist in contradiction at the same time, and it is about taking advantage of them as they emerge in order to harness their potential for changing discourses toward more healthier and more enriching relationships with English, English speakers (native and non-native), and our realities and imaginations. These discourses do not always support one another in a web of clarity and co-operation. Discourses are messy and occur at multiple, layered scales; they represent that there is no fixedness of places and people. The following chapter, Chapter 5: Resistance Discourses (and Resistance to Resistance Discourses), builds off of these initial findings on discourse as I introduce alternative and critical discourses in meetings, workshops and co-teaching interactions.
Chapter 5

Resistance Discourses (and Resisting Resistance Discourses)

“Conscientisation is concerned with expanding the range of discourses within which people might actively (and reflectively) participate. This is not merely a shift in “sign systems”, but a change in the concrete practices of everyday life. There is thus a material as well as ‘intellectual’ basis to conscientisation” (P. Roberts, 1996, p. 193)

This chapter is about “expanding the range of discourses” that the participants expressed and enacted in Chapter 4 in order to bring about participation and reflection towards conscientisation of global English and ELT. In this chapter, I move to explore the antithesis of my first research question explored in Chapter 4 by analyzing data in relation to my second research question: How and why do participants welcome or resist the differing and sometimes critical discourses on global English and ELT that I introduce in the SLTE activities of curriculum design meetings, workshops, tutoring, and co-teaching?”

As a teacher educator working in Nicaragua for the last ten years, I was reflexive about my actions as “a moral enterprise” during this stage of the project, understanding that, as Crookes points out, “We can help, or harm, our students (and society)” (2013, p. 177), not only by pushing conventional views on English and approaches to ELT, but also by promoting critical views, including social and political activism, which can have negative and even dangerous consequences for participants and researchers. Therefore, I approached my introduction to critical understandings of English and ELT with compromise. Crookes (2013) defines compromise as “action within a longitudinal context of a life” (p. 184). By compromising – temporarily making decisions to go along with a theory, approach, or method that one does not advocate – the researcher “preserves one’s capacities and capability for action in the long run” (p. 184). Crookes supports this stance with the philosophical work on compromise by Benjamin (1990) and MacIntyre (1981), with MacIntyre defining agency as co-constructed, and thus, partly dependent on the agency of others:

What the agent is able to do and say intelligibly as an actor is deeply affected by the fact that we are never more (and sometimes less) than the co-authors of our own narratives….We enter upon a
stage which we did not design and find ourselves part of an action that was not of our making.

(1981, p. 199)

The critical pedagogical basis of my workshops and co-teaching, then, emerges from my participants and me working together on understanding a global phenomenon for a local context. The data presented below will not only demonstrate an expansion of the discourses analyzed in Chapter 4 through critical and alternative means, but also how elements of compromise, resistance, and even advocacy during a point of concern over teaching materials complicate the notions of dialogue and partnership on which these critical and alternative discourses are founded. In the interest of space, the data are but a few samples of extensive documentation of discursive themes that emerged from coding. I attempt to provide at least one discursive event per represented theme for analysis. I begin by analyzing critical and alternative discourses of global English introduced in workshops and meetings at UZN and in co-teaching experiences at CSB. I then analyze critical and alternative discourses of ELT that I introduced in workshops, meetings, and tutoring at UZN, followed by an analysis of a co-teaching activity at CSB. Lastly, I analyze a representative example of a cluster of events that demonstrates resistance to a perspective from critical ELT that avoids using problematic, decontextualized materials for teaching English. These events involve the materialization of the discourse of technology-use, in this case compact-disc (CD) audio, as imperative for learning English.

5.1. Critical and differing discourses of global English

Based on the initial discourses represented in Chapter 4, I designed dialogues and activities with participants to see if we could challenge the following prominent discourses in their reasoning and actions: (1) deferring to the “expertise” of the researcher/teacher-educator (as opposed to dialogue and partnership); (2) viewing the NES as the “owner” of English (as opposed to a view of languages as owned by no one); and (3) viewing the way of life represented in textbooks as natural and normal.
5.1.1. Resisting Global North expertise: A Freirean-inspired curriculum for UZN

Before beginning a critical curriculum for UZN, I first introduced my idea to Paulo and Linda after many weeks spent learning about and assessing the context. If they agreed, I would base my work with them and the teachers within a Freirean-inspired approach to curriculum design and teacher education, in which they as administrators, as well as the English teachers, would have a significant role in shaping it through our dialogues together. Paulo and Linda both were excited to hear Freire’s name, saying that they knew of him well. As discussed in Chapter 2, Freire spent time in Nicaragua in the early 1980s during the successful, FSLN-initiated and Freirean-inspired literacy campaign, and these resistance and revolutionary ideas still hold a prominent ideological state within the minds of many Nicaraguans. I established my definition and examples of the elements of critical pedagogy that I intended to use in my work with UZN (see Chapter 2, Sections 2.4.2.1. for these definitions). I told Paulo and Linda that I intended to approach curriculum meetings and SLTE workshops that addressed obstacles in the teachers and students’ daily lives, how these obstacles related to (or did not relate to) the teaching and learning of English, and how we could incorporate these challenges into our work together and later into the English classroom.

I wanted to distinguish my ideology – a commitment to questioning “truths” of English knowledge and English teaching – from that of other development projects in or near the area, like the Access Program and the Peace Corps TESOL Program of which they were likely aware, though I also wanted to demonstrate support for these organizations by drawing on their work to inform my own. I introduced participatory curriculum development (Crookes, 2013), where the administrators and teachers would provide substantial input on the content of the course. Owing to Paulo’s open and liberal written planning document analyzed in Chapter 4, as well as his initial tendency to speak of English at the broader discursive level of its global importance and not of specifics for his program, I felt comfortable that I had little to no restrictions on the type of curriculum and SLTE development that I could initiate. Paulo also did not provide me with any prefabricated strategies or materials, nor suggest any during our
many communications during Stage 1 of the research project. Thus, on paper, we were in a relatively flexible and supportive situation to begin our work. Paulo and Linda were supportive of my proposal and agreed to move forward with a Freirean-inspired program in which they would regularly participate.

The next step was to propose the critically-based curriculum and SLTE to the teachers, Reyna and Cesar. To continue an ethos of equal say in this project, I needed to make sure that all participants understood and felt comfortable with the approach I intended to take with our teaching-learning. I proposed this type of curriculum during our first teacher-education workshop on 05/01/17, after beginning the workshop with an exploration of generative themes about English in the world and teaching English in Nicaragua, detailed in Section 5.1.2. below. These generative themes allowed us to bring up and discuss some of the issues concerning teaching English, especially in their local context, which then provided me a space to transition into proposing a curriculum based in critical-pedagogical principles with the goal of confronting some of the problems that the themes generated within the curriculum. With Enrique at CSB, our agreed-upon partnership was different from the UZN partnership. Because Enrique was four months into teaching for a program with an already-established policy and already-designed syllabus, I took on a supportive, co-teaching role. Meeting with me in early June 2017, he invited me to co-teach, lead activities, aid students, and meet with him after each class to plan with him. He gave me the freedom to create what I wanted to create that went along with the syllabus, so I used my roles to inject critical activities and dialogue where they seemed to fit, trying not to disrupt the flow of Enrique’s course. My critically-based work with Enrique was much more emergent than the planned work I constructed for UZN workshops.

5.1.2. Generative themes: Confronting NES superiority and ownership of English

The goals of the curriculum and teacher-training efforts were to realize a basic English language program for a successful start to English language acquisition, while at the same time remaining critically conscious of issues regarding English in Nicaragua in order to find creative and challenging ways to realize an empowering education. In order to provide the participants with some organization toward this
goal, I designed a porous curriculum using Crawford-Lange’s (1979, 1981) second-language curriculum design principles that she derived from Freire’s philosophy (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2.1.). The first of Crawford-Lange’s principles regards purpose. She states, “The purpose of education is to develop critical thinking by presenting the people’s situation to them as a problem so that they can perceive, reflect, and act on it” (1981, p. 259, italics in the original). The purpose of English language education, then, is to acquire English through critically thinking about the life situations of the learners and teacher, which present the content through which English is used and learned. Teachers and students learn English, but also critically reflect and act on situations that affect them. The first workshop, held on 05/01/17, began with a dialogue activity in which the teachers and I responded to open-ended clauses written on five different posters (see Table 5-1 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poster 1: English can provide socioeconomic mobility (that is, English opens doors), but..</th>
<th>Cesar</th>
<th>Reyna</th>
<th>Katie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenemos poca confianza y somos poco atrevidos en las oportunidades. We lack of confidence and are shy in from of opportunities.</td>
<td>Algunas veces no nos interesamos. Sometime [sic] we don’t have interest.</td>
<td>Other skills and abilities are also important to build a future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poster 2: English is spoken all around the world, but..</th>
<th>Poster 3: I know English (or have a friend/family member who knows English), but..</th>
<th>Cesar</th>
<th>Reyna</th>
<th>Katie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuestro país carece de un sólido programa de enseñanza que nos ayude a aprenderlo bien. Our country doesn’t have a solid program that help us to learn very well.</td>
<td>No puedo desarrollar mis habilidades por no tener con quién practicar. I can’t develop my skills because I haven’t who practice with my.</td>
<td>I can not [sic] convey my English with them because they don’t like it.</td>
<td>Other languages are important, too.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people does [sic] not have the opportunity to study, maybe because they are poor or they do not have support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poster 4: Local Nicaraguan teachers teach English, but….</th>
<th>Poster 5: International volunteers teach English, but..</th>
<th>Cesar</th>
<th>Reyna</th>
<th>Katie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tienen muchos debilidades en el dominio del idioma. They have many weaknesses due to English knowledgements.</td>
<td>No tenemos acceso a sus programas. We don’t have access to their programs.</td>
<td>It is for a short time.</td>
<td>Regresan a su país. They return to their country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They don’t have materials for work.</td>
<td>They may feel uncomfortable or shy about their abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-1: UZN Teachers’ Answers to Generative Sentences Activity
I taped five posters around the small room in UZN’s main office, which served as our workshop and meeting space. I wrote the five clauses in English at the top and in Spanish at the bottom, one on each poster, and the teachers and I provided answers by finishing the subordinating clause. Cesar gave a Spanish and English translation to his answers, while Reyna gave answers in English, except once, when she gave both Spanish and English. I waited to write my answers on the posters until Cesar and Reyna had written theirs, so my answers would not influence theirs. Holistically, Cesar and Reyna’s answers pointed to individual, social, economic, and institutional obstacles that, according to them, English teachers in Nicaragua face. After we each provided an answer to each poster, I walked to each poster, read aloud our responses, and then initiated dialogue about those responses. Posters 1 and 2 pertained more to global English discourse, whereas Posters 3, 4, and 5 pertained to the actual learning and teaching of English.

On Poster 1, I wrote, “English can provide socioeconomic mobility (that is, English opens doors), but…,” and at the bottom, “El inglés puede proporcionar movilidad socioeconómica (es decir, el inglés abre puertas), pero ….” Both Reyna and Cesar provided responses that center on the concerns of individuals as learners. Cesar demonstrated a concern for lacking confidence in English and, because of that, shying away from opportunities when they arise. This self-prescribed deficiency places NNES as not proficient or capable enough to realize opportunities. Cesar expressed this nervousness in his interview, as well (see Chapter 4, section 4.4.4.), when he said he felt anxious about beginning teaching with Amelia and me (two NESs), and when he argued that “nobody better” than North Americans should “tell us [NNES teachers] what to do.” This discourse can be traced back in colonial history to the construction of Self and Other, and the field of TESOL has central ideologies implicit in even its name, as Pennycook (1998) suggests: “The colonial construction of Self and the Other, ‘TE’ and ‘SOL’ of TESOL remain in many domains” (p. 22). In order to resist this notion of NES superiority, I waited to respond to Cesar’s comment after dialoging with them about Poster 2. In Excerpt 5.1, provided in the coming pages, during a
dialogue about how NNES speakers of English far outnumber NES speakers of English, I returned to Cesar’s concerns in Poster 1 to demonstrate that Nicaraguans can find confidence in their English use.

Reyna, on the other hand, pointed to another discourse that she saw within her community: that some people do not have interest in the language. The discourse of individual motivation – where one realizes opportunity through demonstrating interest and hard work – underlies the idea that those who do not have many opportunities are in that situation because they did not care about the knowledge that could have led them out of that situation. This subdiscourse is linked to the larger discourse of neoliberalism, where – as discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.1., economic processes (e.g., investment in English for economic development) work for the advancement of individuals’ wellbeing as they are liberated through engagement with an institutional system (e.g., English coursework in schools or universities). If one opts out of participating in this process, one is positioned as individually lazy, careless, and unmotivated, regardless of social, economic, historical, and political circumstance. In an interview four months later (5/20/17), Reyna recounted her history of investment in English (Darvin & Norton, 2015). Throughout her narratives in her interviews, as well as how she conducted herself in workshops, tutoring, and meetings, Reyna constructed an identity of overcoming obstacles through ambition. She was the only participant who defied “la hora Nica” and would show up “on time” according to my North American cultural understanding of time, and she always came with a gift of fruit or a prepared drink that she made from the fruit trees on her grandma’s property. Reyna demonstrated several times in her interview how her own individual motivation to learn differed from many of her peers in Nicaragua, even by bringing mocking voices into her narrative (Bakhtin, 1981):

_Pero hay unos que muchas veces lo desaniman a uno [...] “Ay, esta se cree gringa ahora.” Muchas personas cuando uno sabe inglés por ejemplo, le dicen gringo. ¿Cómo es que le dicen? Gringo del monte o de montaña, algo así._ [...But there are some that often discourage you [...] “Oh, this one thinks gringa now.” Many people when you know English for example, they say gringo. What do they say? Gringo of the hill or mountain, something like that].

Gringo is a mildly pejorative term for my North American identity, an identity for which both Reyna and Cesar have emphasized their appreciation. In my field notes of the interview, I see this local hostility to
English as rooted in the political history of Nicaragua, especially in the history of the north of the country, where Tepetl is located. The notions of not caring, as indicated in her response on Poster 1, or having feelings of animosity or jealousy, as depicted in her voicing others in her interview, allow Reyna to position herself apart from others who think this way – she is motivated, hardworking, and has a positive orientation to my identity as a North American, unlike some Nicaraguans.

I returned to these issues raised in Poster 1 after reading Poster 2 with the teachers. At the top of Poster 2, I wrote, “English is spoken all around the world but…” and at the bottom, “*El inglés es hablado en todo el mundo, pero….”* Reyna wrote, “Some people does not have the opportunity to study, maybe because they are poor or they don’t have support.” Cesar wrote, “*Nuestro país carece de un sólido programa de enseñanza que nos ayude a aprenderlo bien*” and then the same in English: “Our country doesn’t have a solid [teaching] program that help us to learn very well.” Lastly, I wrote, “Other languages are important, too.” Reyna’s response regards access, and how it is restricted by economic and social conditions. It is not just that English classes are expensive; it is also that family and friends may not support their decision to further their education (Murphy-Graham, 2012), including English coursework, or that students and teachers are not provided the support needed (including resources) to succeed. Unlike her response to Poster 1 that gives attention to individual characteristics (e.g., not caring) that keep some from taking advantage of English, she demonstrates awareness that social issues and relationships construct and maintain inequitable access to such opportunities, as well. After reading Reyna’s response aloud, I asked how much English classes cost, to which Reyna responded thirty dollars a month. This generated a short discussion that, since many Nicaraguans live on fewer than two dollars a day (World Food Program USA, 2018), it would take an entire month’s salary to pay for one month of English.

Cesar’s response provided a teacher’s point-of-view on the lack of support from the country’s educational infrastructure, which does not provide teachers with a sufficient teacher education. This response also transitions from a focus on the self in his Poster 1 answer to a focus on social and structural limitations in his Poster 2 answer. Access and support, then, were important issues to the two teachers,
and they were aware of both individual and social elements of their complex experience as English language learners and teachers. Taking a different perspective from the teachers and thinking it could be a good way to start a dialogue on ownership of English as a global language – which addresses some of the insecurities that the teachers wrote about on both Posters 1 and 2 – I wrote, “Other languages are important, too.” I wanted to initiate dialogue about the importance of all languages and, ultimately, to express that English – and any language – belongs to everyone, not just those who speak it natively, demonstrating my resistance to the one-nation/one-language myth (Higgins, 2003; Singh, 1998) that contributes to why Cesar and Reyna feel insecure about their English-language use.

Standing next to the poster with Cesar standing to my left and Reyna standing across from me, I began by acknowledging the importance of English for many people in many areas of the world. This led me to transition to another point: that English is but one of several world lingua francas. I asked the teachers what language (as one’s first or “native” language) is most spoken in the world. Cesar guessed Spanish, and I wrote a numbered list on the poster, placing Spanish in the second spot. Cesar then guessed English, saying, “because English and Spanish are the:: most spoken in the world” (workshop 1, 05/01/17). Reyna voiced agreement, adding, “yeah.” I smiled and turned to the board to write English in the third spot. Cesar laughed and said, “uh-oh.” Nine seconds passed in silence as I waited for another guess. Cesar tried again, “maybe: French?” I responded, “not French,” as Reyna laughed. I then hinted, “think (3.5) east (5.0) piensa en el este.” Another six seconds passed and Cesar guessed, “Chinese?” and Reyna immediately added, “oh, yeah!” I wrote the number of Chinese speakers in the first spot on the poster: 1,917,000,000. After joking that we all will soon be speaking Chinese because of their power and presence worldwide (including in Nicaragua), we returned to the task, filling in the number of 415,000,000 speakers next to Spanish and 350,000,000 speakers next to English. I followed by adding a fourth: Arabic and Hindi tied at around 300,000,000 speakers. After some discussion about these most-spoken languages, I then wrote the number for speakers of English as a second language compared to speakers as a first, saying, “mil quinientos millones” [one billion five hundred million]. This large
number, sitting below the much smaller number of first-language speakers (350,000,000), allowed me to begin a dialogue about ownership of English, addressing the discourses that emerged from Cesar and Paulo in Chapter 4 on the importance of learning from only native English speakers the standard and “correct” way to speak English, and the discourse presented by Cesar in Poster 4 above in Table 5-1 that Nicaraguan English teachers “…have many weaknesses due to English knowledgments.” In Excerpt 5.1 below, I made my central point that English does not belong to native speakers (McKay, 2002).

Excerpt 5.1 – No one owns English (workshop, 05/01/17)

| 1 KAT: so hay más hablantes de inglés as a second language que | ((KAT begins sentence, points to board when saying “que” <than>)) |
| 2 <so there are more speakers of english as a second language than-> | |
| 3 CES: como una lengua materna <as a first language> | ((CES ends sentence)) |
| 4 KAT: exacto () so what does this mean <right> | ((KAT stands at entrance to kitchen, RH up high and resting on entrance opening)) |
| 5 (3.5) | |
| 6 KAT: qué significa esto <what does this mean> | ((KAT points to both numbers of NS and NNS on poster)) |
| 7 CES: that means that many student are [sic] learning english a lot | ((CES has arms crossed; REY still presses down on desk; both stand and face KAT; KAT nods three times)) |
| 8 | ((KAT looks back and forth to REY and CES)) |
| 9 KAT: yeah=many students are learning english a lot (2.5) | ((REY quickly looks toward CES and then to KAT, smiling)) |
| 10 (2.5) | ((KAT waits to see if they generate other ideas, looks down at paper in her hands and then at poster)) |
| 11 KAT: what else (1.0) que mas <what more> | ((After “tienen inglés” <have English>, CES and REY nod in agreement)) |
| 12 CES: uh english is the (1.0) uh (1.5) business () uh | ((At “para () nosotros” <for () us>, KAT takes RH index finger and draws imaginary circle in air to include REY and CES; loud music from slow-passing advertisement car plays, distracting CES as he looks out window)) |
| 13 REY: yeah | ((At “tener confianza” <have confidence>, KAT points to Poster 1 where CES has written “tenemos poca confianza” <we have little confidence> and are shy to speak the language; KAT then steps back to return to Poster 2)) |
| 14 KAT: yeah () business language | ((REY smiles as she repeats KAT’s final words, nods and looks down at desk)) |
| 15 (12.0) | |
| 16 KAT: y también nadie es propietario del inglés <and also no one is the owner of english> | |
| 17 (4.5) | |
| 18 KAT: toda la gente en el mundo tienen inglés. No es mío. No es de los estados unidos. No es de inglaterra. Es () para () nosotros (2.0) puede (2.5) podemos tener confianza en inglés porque es (2.0) es nuestro, es uh: nuestro propio <all the people in the world have english. It isn’t mine. It isn’t of the united states. It isn’t of england. It’s () for () us (2.0) one can (2.5) we can have confidence in english because it’s (2.0) it’s ours, it’s uh: our own> | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 REY: propio <own> | |
In line 1, I initiated a comparative clause, which Cesar finished in line 3, showing that he understood this large difference in the number of NES and NNES worldwide. As is the case for most workshops, Cesar took a more dominant role in answering and participating than did Reyna, and he again provided ideas for why there are so many NNES in lines 7 and 12. Reyna often would defer to Cesar, then support his answers as she did above, as well as in Chapter 4, Excerpt 4.1. This demonstrates the difficulty of generating authentic dialogue in a group situation that, despite mutually positive and healthy relationships that have developed, at this point in time, after over four months, still function under unequal power relationships. Cesar’s age, status as a male, and ten years’ experience as a teacher strengthen his capacity to participate. Reyna’s age, status as a female, residence in the poorest neighborhood in Tepetl, and lack of work – including teaching – experience played a role in limiting her comfortability, deferring to Cesar and taking a supportive role to his comments. Demonstrated in Chapter 4, Excerpt 4.1, I attempted to balance this by, for example, specifically asking Reyna what she thought, but Cesar – as demonstrated in that excerpt – continued his own opinion without giving Reyna a chance to take up the floor that I offered her.

In line 15, I again waited – this time for 12 seconds – to see if anyone generated other ideas before I provided my own. When I argued that no one owns English, and that everyone in the world has the capacity to access and use English to their liking, wants, and needs, Cesar nodded, indicating potential agreement. In line 21, I connected a response that Cesar wrote on Poster 1 about not having the confidence to speak English to the point I was currently making about no one owning English, and I walked to Poster 1 to physically point to what he wrote to make this connection. I implicitly promoted a discourse of translingualism, advocating for individuals to fluidly maneuver communication with others when speakers’ proficiency and legitimacy fluctuates (Canagarajah, 2013), that we should not be timid about errors, inconsistencies, and nonstandard deviations – my own good but marked Spanish use combined with the teachers’ limited English proficiency as an example of the incredible amount of meaning-making and activity that we accomplished together.
In line 23, Reyna demonstrated a similar form of internalization and engagement as she did when supporting Cesar’s contributions. When I posed the unconventional idea that English is “nuestro propio” [our own] (line 22), Reyna repeated “propio” [own], smiled and nodded her head. In this moment she imagined a different subjectivity through this resistance discourse to the unquestioned power of the NES, allowing her to construct a new part of her teacher subjectivity with us (Darvin & Norton, 2015). Since identities require recognition (Blommaert, 2005), the fact that I – as a NES – demonstrated that I supported a NNES subjectivity that owns English just as much as I do, I could position her and Cesar outside of the conventional, historically-constructed discourse of NES superiority. Thus, identity development is a dialogic process which occurs as “one’s own discourse is gradually and slowly wrought out of others’ words” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 345); this process of authoring ourselves (Bakhtin, 1981) is socially constructed and needs the support of interlocutors to not position the subject differently or negatively while she or he undertakes this transforming process.

Returning, then, to the beginning of this section about Crawford-Lange’s (1981) principle of purpose, the answers on the five posters, represented in Table 5-1 above, served to generate the themes, or problems, that our curriculum could pose for teachers and students to work through as they learned and taught English. For Freire, “theme” meant “…a concrete representation of an idea, concept, hope, doubt, value, challenge, or obstacle in interaction with its opposite and implying a task to be performed” (Crawford-Lange, 1981, p. 262). Therefore, a theme should also include its opposite. Crawford provides an example for second-language education: communication/noncommunication. The above posters generated some small but encouraging dialogue from teachers that later shaped the following structure for the UZN curriculum, represented in Table 5-2. The main theme of the English language program became “open doors/closed doors.” From there, the curriculum then explored four contrastive themes within six units:
The UZN curriculum themes above are for one year of English, as the intention was to pilot the curriculum, make adjustments, evaluate its success, and – if all progressed as we had hoped – design a second year’s curriculum. The theme and subthemes were generated directly from the teachers’ commentary on the posters and the dialogue about that commentary. Therefore, the subtheme of confidence/uncertainty emerged from their comments about lacking confidence and being uncomfortable, quality/inequality stemmed from comments about quality of teacher education programs and not having access to English classes, and local/global stemmed from issues brought about by international volunteer teachers, as well as conversations like that in Excerpt 5.1 about ownership of English. Understanding that the teachers and the dean had expectations of me as an “expert,” based on the discourses that emerged from our interactions analyzed in Chapter 4, I also compromised with a conventional unit structure that provided my UZN colleagues with a holistic understanding of the content that we could cover in a one-year introductory English course. Appendix J provides the full syllabus that we created together, using content from the Peace Corps TEFL manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Theme: “Open doors/closed doors”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1: Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: confidence/uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: My family and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: communication/noncommunication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3: My community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: communication/noncommunication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4: My country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: quality/inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5: My region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: quality/inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 6: My world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme: local/global</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5-2: UZN Curriculum Themes Generated from Poster Activity**

The UZN curriculum themes above are for one year of English, as the intention was to pilot the curriculum, make adjustments, evaluate its success, and – if all progressed as we had hoped – design a second year’s curriculum. The theme and subthemes were generated directly from the teachers’ commentary on the posters and the dialogue about that commentary. Therefore, the subtheme of confidence/uncertainty emerged from their comments about lacking confidence and being uncomfortable, quality/inequality stemmed from comments about quality of teacher education programs and not having access to English classes, and local/global stemmed from issues brought about by international volunteer teachers, as well as conversations like that in Excerpt 5.1 about ownership of English. Understanding that the teachers and the dean had expectations of me as an “expert,” based on the discourses that emerged from our interactions analyzed in Chapter 4, I also compromised with a conventional unit structure that provided my UZN colleagues with a holistic understanding of the content that we could cover in a one-year introductory English course. Appendix J provides the full syllabus that we created together, using content from the Peace Corps TEFL manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect</th>
<th>Creative Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PCM p. 194-206)</td>
<td><em>Environment and Natural Disasters in my country</em></td>
<td><em>- Vocabulary about nature words (dirt, leaf/leaves, mountains)</em></td>
<td><em>Quality/inequality</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>- Past tense verbs</em></td>
<td><em>- Animals (bird, frog, horse)</em></td>
<td><em>The recent canal project through Nicaragua can bring new opportunities to Nicaragua. It also can negatively impact the environment and people’s lives. How do you see the construction of the canal affecting Nicaragua’s future?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>- Introduce 5 new irregular verbs (and past tense) from verb list</em></td>
<td><em>- Vocabulary about natural disasters</em></td>
<td><em>Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that has a creative or interactive element.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5-3: Daily Plan for Unit 4: My Country, Under the Subtheme of Quality/Inequality**
Table 5-3 above is a sample of the syllabus provided in Appendix J to be covered for one day, under Unit 4: My country (subtheme: quality/inequality). The theme, “My Country,” guides the unit, and students have ample opportunities to describe, explain, and form opinions on social, historical, economic, and political concerns about their country, especially as they pertain to the subtheme of “quality/inequality.” In the syllabus, footnotes give teachers more information on the boxes entitled “Critical Aspect” and “Creative Aspect.” They read:

Paulo Freire wanted students to think critically about their life situations, what they were learning and why. Not every class must be critical, but regarding English, it is important to have honest conversations with our students. These conversations can be had in English or Spanish. The first language is a great resource for learning a second language.

Both the critical aspect and creative aspect are just ideas to help guide you. You do not have to do these activities or have these discussions; you might have better ideas that you would like to do. An appendix is provided with sample activities of some of these ideas. Also refer to the Peace Corps Manual for activities, especially the final pages of the manual, the “Multi-purpose activities Index,” on pp. 252-274, which you can creatively or critically adapt.

We also left many critical and creative blocks empty of ideas, replaced instead with an encouraging note starting with “your turn,” inviting teachers to develop their own critical or creative activities that differ from what they see presented in the Peace Corps TEFL manual. When we finished our curriculum and syllabus, we shared them with the Peace Corps in Nicaragua in hopes of inspiring them with new ideas, just as their work had influenced us.

5.1.3. Resisting one-language/one-culture subjectivities represented in the CSB textbook

I transition from my work at UZN with Cesar and Reyna to my work at CSB with Enrique and his students in order to demonstrate how I introduced critical or alternative discourses of global English within an in-progress English classroom with an already-implemented policy and an already-designed syllabus. The activity described below is but one of many critical activities that I designed and implemented in Enrique’s classroom. For the interest of space, I allow it to be representative of these other activities.

I presented an activity on 06/20/17 based in Critical Literacy that enabled students to question elements of their English-learning experience. Critical Literacy (CL) “…isn’t simply about reading or
functional literacy. It never has been” (Luke, 2012, p. 4). Like other critical traditions like Critical Language Awareness and Critical Discourse Analysis, CL is concerned with inviting learners to develop the capacity to see “…the ways in which language has position, interests, power, and can act to disadvantage those on the lower rungs of a hierarchical society” (Crookes, 2013, p. 28). The discourse that I invited students to confront in this activity is the naturalization of English as connected to U.S. culture and values, isolating students from their own context (Canagarajah, 1999). For example, the understanding of language as a fixed unit implies that vocabulary represented in the textbook is important and relevant to all learners to memorize, regardless of where they live and how their lives, activities, and resources differ. This one-language/one-culture lamination emerged from the nationalist movements in Europe in the nineteenth century, which saw ethnic identity and language as imperative to differentiating one’s nationality from other countries, and to achieve a homogenous group (Wright, 2004). García (2012) defines ethnicity from an anthropological perspective as “a cluster of features or practices that are attributed in some way to a collectivity or aggregation of people, and that is often the basis for social-cultural organization” (p. 80). Language, as one symbol of ethnic identity, “becomes the prime ethnic identity feature or practice in and of itself” (p. 81). Therefore, ethnolinguistic identity involves “language planning activities [that] emerge and are made possible precisely because of the situational and contextual nature of ethnic identity and the ways in which language features and practices both symbolize and enact ethnic identity” (p. 81). Planning a course to use a particular textbook is but one way that ethnolinguistic identity emerges as a fixed unit of inclusion or exclusion, and learners absorb this through textual and visual clues.

Enrique and the students used Go Beyond 2: Student’s Book Pack (Campbell et al., 2015). The 10-unit book totals 149 pages and is the second of a series of five books, each of which has a cover photo of Western-looking youth riding on a roller coaster. Enrique also used Go Beyond 2: Teacher’s Edition Pack Premium (Cole & Terry, 2015). The center structuralist discourse of the textbook, what Giroux (1983) calls instrumental ideology, leaves little room for the teacher or student to question the so-called
“truth” of the textbook’s presentation of U.S. culture, including individualism and the robust ownership of commodities. Because of this, the language that students are expected to master produces the communicative norms and social and cultural values of U.S. communities. The English represented in the textbook is Standard American English, and the approach to teaching that it implicitly emphasizes is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), seeing language as functional, with a focus on language as a means of communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The book’s activity structure works separately on the skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking for practical meaning-making, seeing learning as skill-development through both cognitive and behavioral aspects (Littlewood, 1984).

For the activity, I asked students to work in pairs to critically analyze two pages in the textbook that they had been working on for several weeks. Figure 5-1 below is a photo from pages 20-21 of the textbook. The pages represent the beginning of Unit 2: Home and Away, and students are introduced to new vocabulary to talk about homes and household chores. In the picture, three different apartments are represented, stacked one on top of the other. The visual representation differs from the living environment of most Nicaraguans. Homes in Nicaragua are typically small, cement structures, with much of the home open to a small yard or court. In each of the three apartment complexes, pale-skinned families are doing work or relaxing. The apartments possess modern appliances like dishwashers, clothes washing machines, flat-screen TVs, fish tanks, computers, vacuums, and ovens. While some Nicaraguan homes that I have been to have a clothes washer, even fewer homes have the other commodities represented in the picture.

Similar to what Appleby et al. (2002) describe in a language-in-development program in East Timor, “The textbooks supplied for the course or brought by teachers, in common with most globally marketed textbooks, presented a materialistic, middle-class lifestyle belonging to the English-speaking world (Brown, 1990), which contrasted markedly with the cultural and economic reality of East Timor” (p. 333). Attempting a similar critical exploration of the socioeconomic and political issues in the Nicaraguan students’ lives, I constructed the following activity.
I called my activity with students, “Think outside the Box,” and I wrote that phrase on the whiteboard. My goal was to get students to think about their textbook as a box, constricting English to a limited set of vocabulary and grammar. I first asked students what “think outside the box” meant in Spanish in order to establish a comprehension check. One student raised his hand and answered, “piense fuera de la caja” [think outside the box]. Without taking an explicitly critical argument, I attempted to build students’ awareness of the vocabulary and grammar that the textbook covers. I asked students to work in pairs on the following directions: (1) Find three vocabulary items that Nicaraguans do not have or do not use; (2) Find two drawings of items that Nicaraguans do not have or do not use; and (3) write three chores that Nicaraguans typically do, but that are not in the textbook. I wrote these questions on the whiteboard in front of the class, and I picked students to write their answers on the board after working together. Figure 5-2 below shows the small whiteboard that sat unsecured on two classroom chairs in

---

19 Permission to use the illustration was granted by Peter Cornwell, Illustration, The Long and the Short of It, and MacMillan Education Rights and Permissions Department. The edition, Go Beyond 2: Student's Book Pack (Campbell, Metcalf, & Benne, 2015) is hereby acknowledged in this dissertation.
front of the classroom, a material reality of many Nicaraguan classrooms that juxtaposed with the materiality represented in the textbook.

![Image of a whiteboard with a critical literacy activity]

Figure 5-2: Critical Literacy Activity with Enrique’s Students

This turned out to be a challenging task for the students because, like students in the United States and elsewhere, they were not used to thinking about what is not in the textbook and what is implied by what is included in and excluded from the textbook. The activity allowed for extensive use of the required vocabulary and images in the textbook as students compared them to their own experiences, generating new vocabulary. Thus, it did not take away from their required syllabus. For example, for the first task of finding vocabulary items that Nicaraguans do not have or do not use, a student walked to the board and wrote, “doing the laundry” (a textbook vocabulary item). I asked the class if Nicaraguans do the laundry, and they agreed that they did. I asked how the chore in the textbook differed from their experience, which allowed them to learn new phrases not in their textbook: “by hand” and “washboard.” Even Enrique’s vocabulary was challenged by the unit’s representations. The day prior to my activity, a student asked him what the box of water with a fish in it, an image in the middle apartment complex, was called: “how do you say uh=pe pecera?” Enrique responded, “uh: that’s=uh:: fish uh (2.5) what is it (1.0) fish case (. ) gu-show case (. ) show case uh anyways,” and walked away from the group to address the class (co-
teaching, 06/19/17). The term “fish tank” is so far removed from even advanced English speakers’ use in rural Nicaragua, and his struggle to find the correct word exemplified the importance of disconnecting English from cultural representations and meaning-making far removed from most Nicaraguans.

In Excerpt 5.2 below, I led the students through the final of the three directions: to provide three chores that Nicaraguans do that are not represented in the picture or vocabulary in the textbook. A particularly powerful sequence of answers followed.

Excerpt 5.2 – Pictures of Items that Nicaraguans do not Have or do not Use

1 KAT: what about you guys (.) back here
2 (5.5)
3 KAT: what’s one picture you saw (3.0) that
4 nicaraguans do not have or do not use
5 (12.0)
6 KAT: okay
7 (10.0)

8 KAT: mopping the floor
9 (12.0)

10 KAT: mopping the floor (1.5) do Nicaraguans mop
11 the floor?
12 (1.5)
13 they do (.) so the question is find drawings of
14 items that Nicaraguans do not have (.) or do not
15 use (.) they do mop the floor=right?
16 but it was good try (.) a good try
17 (4.0)
18 how: about (4.0) this group
19 (2.0)
20 do you have an idea=a drawing? (2.0) for
21 number two? (.) [do not have or do not use]
22 ST1: [do not have bookcase] (1.0)
23 do- do not have bookcase
24 KAT: bookcase (.) okay (.) yeah (1.5) keep that in
25 mind for af- when he’s done (.) we’ll put that
26 on the board
27 (10.0)
28 ENR: i use my tiny table as my bookshelf [@hahaha]
29 KAT: [nice]
30 (1.5)
31 29 KAT: multipurpose @haha
32 ENR: @hahahaha yes (.) I use my tables for that=all
33 my books on my tables [@hahaha]
34 KAT: [@nice]
35 (ST2 finishes writing on board, looks at KAT and walks
34 KAT: [@haha]
35 KAT: setting the table (.) okay=good=I like that one (6.0)
36 KAT: raise your hand if you: or your family sets the table (1.0) one (.) two?
37 ENR  eh (.) eh (.) what is that (.) eh @haha
38 KAT  but not very common, right not very typical (2.0)
39 (.0) eat=right some families (7.0) some families (2.0) usually we just we're hungry we go and
40 the plates out (2.0) all th- the silverware (1.0)
41 do you know that word yet=silverware? (.)
42 forks (.) spoons (.) knives=set those out (1.5)
43 cups (1.0) and they set it out first and then the family comes and sits (.) and eats (1.5) but only
44 some families (.) not everyone (.) that- that’s a good one (1.0)
45 ST1:  don’t have bookcase
46 KAT: bookcase=yeah how many (.) of you own (.) a bookcase or your family owns a (.) bookcase=raise your hand (2.0) one?
47 it’s- it’s a little (.) maybe uncommon (.) yeah (4.0)
48 KAT: and (.) you mentioned a good one (.) you want to say it again?
49 ST1:  shower
50 KAT: you guys want to put another one up?
51 ST1: don’t have shower
52 KAT: a shower (.) you don’t have a shower (.) yeah (.) do you have a bath, instead? (.) a bucket (.)
53 a bucket (.) tsh:: (.) tsh:: yeah (.) very good
54 back to desk)
55 ((KAT reads ST2’s answer on the board and initiates clapping; ENR and classmates clap))
56 ((one student raises her hand, then the student to the L of her raises her hand; they both quickly drop their hands and look at each other; ENR teases the Ss by quickly raising his RH then dropping it three times whe he says “eh”))
57 ((KAT mimics placing dishes out on imaginary table, then silverware))
58 ((KAT mimics hand shape holding cups and places on imaginary table, then draws imaginary circle on “the family comes”))
59 ((KAT points to board where student has written “setting the table”))
60 ((KAT points to ST1 who said “bookcase” earlier, nods at her, walks two steps toward her))
61 ((KAT turns back to front of room, then faces students, raises LH when she says “raise your hand”))
62 ((one of about twenty students raises her hand))
63 ((KAT writes on the board))
64 ((ENR mimics reaching under the bed to take a book, then using it as a pillow; he laughs and many students laugh))
65 ((KAT walks toward a group in back left of room))
66 ((ST1 raises hand when KAT does not hear her answer))
67 ((KAT motions to give marker to group when she hears ST1 and turns to her))
68 ((A student takes the marker as KAT responds to ST1; KAT nods her head many times, then makes gestures for a bath and for washing her arms by pouring water from a bucket, making a “tsh” sound as she does this; ST1 smiles and laughs))

I begin this excerpt first with a ST1 misunderstanding the directions to the activity in order to show how she learned from that misunderstanding to participate again, twice, with particularly powerful answers later in lines 22 and 63. Before moving on to another student, I had learned from the learning culture of Enrique’s classroom that after each student response – correct or incorrect – everybody clapped and encouraged one another, so I initiated clapping after ST1’s incorrect response, which may have motivated her to try again, twice, moments later. As ST2 prepared to go to the board to write his answer,
ST1 offered a new idea: “don’t have bookcase.” While we waited for ST2 to finish writing, Enrique admitted that he did not have a bookcase, demonstrating that this commodity is not used even by educators. Linda and Paulo did not have a bookcase in their house, either. I spent many days and nights in their home, and they had to stack their books on top of one another in the corner of their stairwell. Paulo, the dean of a small university did not own one, and in my years of experience in Nicaragua, I rarely encountered a home that had a bookcase, let alone books, besides the Bible, to place in one.

I returned to ST2’s response: “setting the table.” Like the commodity of a bookcase, the act of setting the table also is not common in many Nicaraguan households. However, I was very clear with students that setting the table is also not something that all North Americans do. Textbooks can give a cultural stereotypes, so in line 42, I say, “some families,” twice, and again in line 49: “some families (.) not everyone” to indicate that this chore does not represent all Americans. In line 50, I encouraged ST1 to give her answer about the bookcase again, which she repeated, and then I asked the students how many of them owned a bookcase, after which one student of roughly 20 raised her hand. This was a particularly powerful moment for me as an educator, learning just how rare something seemingly so common could be to many people. Reading implies luxury, a search for purpose and meaning, fulfillment, and self-actualization. Reading is a privilege and an indulgence. These students’ parents were tasked with the job of survival – many working long days and possibly evenings for little pay – and many of these students joined their parents to work before or after school. ST1 continued with another powerful suggestion in line 63, when she said, “shower.” Bathroom chores and items are not represented in the vocabulary or pictures on pages 20-21 of the textbook; however, ST1 made a link from the activity to the basic human right of water and cleanliness by stating this answer. While some homes in Nicaragua have showers, others have basins or baths, and others have nothing but a water spigot. During fieldwork, when I stayed with Paulo and Linda, I would have access to a shower. When I stayed with a woman from whom I rented a room, I had access to a spigot and a bucket. In Tepetl, in order to conserve in this very dry area of Nicaragua, water was shut off to homes on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and sometimes on other
days, for example, when torrential rains caused issues. Therefore, there were many days that I did not have access to water, regardless of where I stayed. ST1 moved from initially misunderstanding the directions to the activity to providing two powerful responses that showed differing levels of awareness, first responding to an item on the textbook page, a bookshelf, then to an item not represented on the page, a shower. Closing the activity, I was more explicit with my intentions, linked the activity to their lives.

Excerpt 5.3 – Getting Students to Think About Their Lives with English

1 KAT: okay (.) that was good=that was 2 difficult=right? (. ) that was difficult (. ) that was 3 hard because i asked you to do something=i 4 asked you to think outside the box (1.5) and 5 think outside the textbook 6 (1.0)
7 KAT: this guy here (. ) can i borrow it? (. ) thank you 8 (. ) this has some vocabulary=right (2.5) it’s a 9 good start but YOU (1.0) you want to always 10 think outside the box what else (1.0) can (. ) i 11 learn 12 (2.0)
13 because (. ) as a Nicaraguan (. ) as a Nicaraguan 14 this is not (. ) our lives (. ) right? (. ) this is not 15 our lives 16 (2.0)
17 this is different 18 ST1: an apartment 19 KAT an apartment? (2.0) yeah: we don’t live in 20 apartments 21 ST1: no 22 KAT: we don’t (. ) have dishwashers (1.5) we don’t 23 vacuum (1.0) so how can we use English to 24 describe our lives=not the lives of people we 25 don’t know what about me and my life and 26 how English can be a tool (. ) herramienta a 27 tool (. ) for me and my life and to describe 28 what’s around me=so when you do these 29 activities at ho:me=i hope=tarea=for 30 homework, go beyond= think outside the 31 box=don’t just do the exercises 32 (2.5)
33 KAT: do the exercises and then think (. ) think “okay, 34 what about my life (. ) eh what are other words 35 i can look up in my dictionary (. ) take my 36 dictionary and look up new words that go 37 beyond just this (. ) okay? 38 (1.5)
39 do you understand?
40 Sts: YEAH
I began by acknowledging the difficulty of what the students just did together. I changed my tone during the activity’s end to a more authoritative one, using an imperative in line 9: “you want to always think outside the box.” I then positioned myself as Nicaraguan in lines 13-15, and am not sure why I did not use the second-person possessive pronoun “your” – perhaps this was an attempt at solidarity after having lived in their town for months. ST1 – the same student from Excerpt 5.3 – demonstrated again that she understood what I was intending to convey, saying in line 18, “apartment.” I responded immediately to her participation by bringing that into my next comment that “we” Nicaraguans do not live in apartments, to which she responded, “no” (line 21). I then explicitly asked, “how can we use English to describe our lives=not the lives of people we don’t know.” While it is impossible to find evidence that this Critical Literacy activity helped students or Enrique begin to question hidden discourses in the textbook, Enrique immediately continued with the theme after I ended the activity, instead of moving on to the work that he originally was going to do that day, by asking students to describe their own lives and what they do that is different from Americans’ lives. He provided the example of preparing types of foods, which spurred student participation further. When we talked about the activity after class, Enrique was adamant that he really liked it; however, his only concern was that he had to test students on the vocabulary in the textbook, that they are already behind in the syllabus, and that it is hard to implement extra material like those I used. Crookes (2013) argues that critical foreign language policy “is not always advisable or practical, purely for pragmatic reasons” (p. 139), and I acknowledged Enrique’s concern; however, I also reminded him that the students had to use the textbook vocabulary in order to learn the new vocabulary. Thus, they were still on target for their next language assessment.

5.2. Critical and differing discourses of ELT

Based on the initial ELT discourses represented by participants in Chapter 4, I continued dialogue through activities that challenge the following dominant ELT discourses: (1) teaching English as separate from other forms of social and political knowledge (see, e.g., Auerbach, 2000; Crawford-Lange, 1981), (2) maintaining Standard English and the separation of the L1 and L2 (see, e.g., Lippi-Green, 1997;
Phillipson (1992) summarizes five discourses of ELT that are particularly sedimented in practices worldwide: English should be taught in English, the NES is the ideal teacher, English should begin to be taught at a young age, the English curriculum should focus as much as possible on English (not other related knowledge) to increase learning, and that using other languages in the English classroom negatively impacts English language acquisition.

5.2.1. “Toma bastante tiempo”: Resisting a critical, project-based English lesson

Crawford-Lange states two principles for instructional objectives of a curriculum program. First, she writes, “The primary intended outcome of an educational experience is creative action on the part of learners” (1981, p. 261). Second, she writes, “The acquisition of information and skills is a secondary objective of education, and the content of such acquisition is subject to creative action” (p. 261, emphasis in the original). The core of learning within the UZN English curriculum, then, is to act in creative ways on the world, because the acquisition of English alone will not change students’ life circumstances. Creative action inside and outside of the classroom while trying to incorporate English in different ways allows for the potentiality of learners to change their world in ways that do and do not involve English. Learners may develop an awareness of how other factors, not just English, affect one’s educational and professional trajectory. Developing English acquisition is secondary to the process of creation and problem-solving of an issue; however, acquiring English is still an important goal of an English curriculum; after all, it is an English program. However, bringing other knowledge into the English curriculum is not detrimental to acquiring English; it can provide students ample opportunities to use English by dialoguing about issues most critical to them.

To provide an example of how these instructional objectives can be built into a lesson, I introduced Cesar and Reyna to a lesson on recycling that a Nicaraguan teacher and colleague of mine, whom I call Johan, created. Cesar actually knew Johan from taking an English class from him several years prior. For a project that he undertook for his Master’s degree in Pedagogical Resources, Johan –
born and raised in a northern city two hours south of Tepetl – created a book out of purely recycled materials. Asking himself, “What can I learn from my own process of constructing a multimodal story book?” and, “How can teachers use this illustrated book as a pedagogical resource for teaching English as a foreign language?”, he created this pedagogical resource to help “those who start learning English as a second language in a non-English speaking country” (p. 1). Johan started with Dewey’s philosophy that “We do not learn from experience ….. we learn from reflecting on experience” (Dewey, 1933), and so began with mapping his process, experience, and reflection developing an educational resource.

Acknowledging that his country of Nicaragua has limited teaching resources and that teachers and students could create their own resources, he argues, “teachers teach English by following the language program created by the ministry of education, but not with practical material according to students’ needs” (p. 4).

Johan coupled the problem of educational resources with a serious environmental problem that Nicaragua faces: “In Nicaragua garbage is a very serious issue. Instead of reusing material such as plastic bottle, paper, cardboard, and so on, people throw them everywhere contributing more to the contamination of their environment. This educational resource can encourage the students to use their imagination and personal experience to create it” (p. 5). Johan’s report then details his experience creating a recycled book for an English lesson. His report shows pictures of him collecting old bottles and trash, creating book covers out of metals and other materials, and recycling and re-making his own paper to go inside the book. Johan thoroughly documents the materials used and the step-by-step process he did to create the book, and demonstrates how it can be used as an English resource, where students can write in English and draw pictures to create their own story inside. His goal is that students not only learn English, but also that they engage creatively in learning about and changing a problem in their community.

I used Johan’s project as an example of how to tie English to instructional objectives that are critical because Johan is a teacher from Nicaragua. This was not a project that was created by an academic or a teacher from the Global North (though arguably the idea of recycling is an imported
concept from the Global North), but from the experience of a teacher who knows Nicaragua, its strengths and its obstacles, intimately. I hoped that by engaging with a Nicaraguan’s project (and not one of my own or one that I imported from the U.S.) that Cesar and Reyna might see that Global South educators are creating and leading stimulating learning opportunities without the influence of Global North individuals.

During workshop 2 (05/02/17), and with Johan’s permission, I introduced Johan’s project to the teachers. It took about ten minutes to thoroughly describe what Johan did, showing the teachers on my laptop Johan’s process, pictures, and reasoning behind his project. I then asked the teachers their thoughts on the project, at which point Cesar, per what became the norm, gave his opinion while Reyna quietly observed and lightly supported his answers.

Excerpt 5.4 – Cesar’s Opinion of Johan’s Critical Lesson (workshop 2, 05/02/17)

1 CES: *bueno, es una, es una, es una idea muy* (2.5)
   *muy interesante* (.) *porque: en realidad, para* 
   *aplicarla con los muchachos, es educarlos dos* 
   *veces.*
   <well, it's a, it's a, it's a very (2.5) very interesting idea (.) because: really, to apply it with kids is to educate them twice>

5 KAT: *sí* <yes>

6 CES: *en la educación (2.0) manual- ah pienso que* 
   *tres (.) en manual (.) en el ecológico, y en su* 
   *aprendizaje de xx (una meta)*
   <in hands-on (2.0) education ah I think three (.) in hands-on (.) in ecological, and in his/her learning of xx (a goal)>

9 REY: *(meta)* <goal>

10 CES: *porque se le puede solicitar al chavalito, ¿no?*,
   *donde da una descripción de lo que hizo (2.0)*
   *cómo lo hizo=entonces, el chavalo* 
   *no puede hacer (. porque yo estoy claro de* 
   *que aprender inglés, incluso para uno, para uno* 
   *es: very, very hard (1.5) pero es, es muy difícil* 
   *para uno aprender inglés* 
   <because you can ask the kid, right? where he/she gives a description of what he/she made (.) how did she/he- how did she/he make it=so, the kid can’t do it (.) because I am clear that learning English, even for one, for one is: very, very hard (1.5) but it is, it is very difficult for one to learn English>

17 (3.0)
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| 18 CES: | por::que nosotros no tenemos:: un: (3.5) un campo para practicar () las aulas ahora, por ejemplo, normalmente un curso de dos (1.5) dos horas diarias, tres horas diarias, y se pasan estudiando dieciséis horas, significa que trece horas pasan hablando español y tres horas pasan hablando inglés en el aula de clase<be:cause we don’t have: a: (3.5) a field to practice () classes now, for example, normally a course of two (1.5) two hours a day, three hours a day, and they spend sixteen hours studying a week, it means that they spend thirteen hours speaking Spanish and they spend three hours speaking English in the classroom> |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 REY: | ensayando @haha |
| 26 CES: | entonces, prácticamente (1.0) cuando vuelven a (1.0) a la clase (1.0) (xxxxx) <so, practically (1.0) when they come back to (1.0) to class> (xxxxx) |
| 27 |  |
| 28 REY: | (ya se le olvidó () ya se le olvidó todo @haha) <(the already fogot () they already forgot everything @haha)> |
| 29 KAT: | @ahHAH |
| 30 CES: | exactamente ¿ya? <exactly yeah?> |
| 31 KAT: | oh, sí, entiendo <oh, yes, I understand> |
| 32 CES: | entoneses (xxx) pero pero (2.0) con una actividad como ésta se vuelve algo crítico <then (xxx) but with an activity like this it becomes something critical> |
| 33 |  |
| 34 KAT: | mm-hm |
| 35 CES: | porque va a construir la idea, y, y el mejor aprendizaje del ser humano es lo que se construye en la cabeza, y no lo que otro va construyendo en la cabeza (1.5) ya porque ya, ya con- si alguien me está desarrollando una idea, me la desarrolla para que yo la aprenda, es algo perdido por lo tanto se queda en () en un espacio de la memoria=pero si yo lo desarrollro, estoy generando otra información. <because she/he is going to build the idea, and, and the best learning of being human is what is built in the head, and not what another goes building in the head (1.5) yeah because yeah, yeah with- if someone is developing an idea for me, he develops it for me to learn, it is something lost therefore it stays in () in a memory space=but if I develop it, I am generating other information> |
| 36 |  |
| 37 |  |
| 38 |  |
| 39 |  |
| 40 |  |
| 41 |  |
| 42 |  |
| 43 |  |
| 44 REY: | (mm-hm) |
| 45CES: | (y ese) aprendizaje es efectivo <and this learning is effective> |

((CES looks in front of him in thought, then looks at KAT at “un campo” <a field> and expands LH and RH outward to the sides of his body; KAT and REY look at CES as he talks))

((At “se pasan” <have passed> CES takes LH palm up as if flipping an imaginary page from the L to R, looking at REY))

((KAT nods at “pasan hablando español”))

((REY looks from CES down toward table laughing, then smiles))

((At “practicamente” <practically> CES shakes head quickly; at “vuelven” <return> extends LH away from body then circles it back toward him))

((CES becomes inaudible as REY interjects her comment; REY looks at KAT as she speaks, then laughs))

((KAT looks away from CES and down toward table))

((CES rests elbows on table, places both palms and all fingers together))

((CES extends index and middle fingers of both hands and on “construir” <build> points them from in front of body back towards his head))

((At “construyendo” <building> CES points four times with index and middle fingers at his temples))

((CES repeatedly gestures LH in front of head and back to gesturing to his head in back-and-forth motions))

((REY nods, resting L elbow on table with L hand and fingers toward her temple))
Excerpt 5.4 displays three separate aversions that Cesar had to his fellow Nicaraguan English teacher’s project. In line 1, Cesar paused for 2.5 seconds before providing the descriptor “interesante” [interesting], which allowed Cesar to begin with fairly neutral commentary in his evaluation of Johan’s work. Cesar connected the multiple layers of learning that the recycling project enables; however, Cesar did not indicate how English use and acquisition can be one of the goals of the critical project, as Johan intended the project to do. Instead, Cesar viewed the critical project as separate from an English-learning project, not incorporating much English practice at all. For his first concern, he stated that when a teacher asks a student to describe how he or she made the book, “el chavalo no lo puede hacer” [the kid can’t do it] (lines 12-13) because learning English is, as Cesar switches to English to say, “very, very hard” (line...
15). For Cesar, as is also demonstrated in interview data in Section 5.4. below, criticality involves a high level of language acquisition that beginner students will not have. An English class should be taught in only English, as he argued several times over the months and is captured in Chapter 4, Excerpt 4.1, as well as in interview data.

Cesar then switched to a second, related problem: that of practice. Reminding me that a school day of classes is really only two to three hours in Nicaragua (as discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.2., primary and secondary school is only a half-day), students rarely meet for English classes, spending only a handful of hours in English classes each week. Reyna found her voice to support Cesar, explaining that students use those three hours in English in class for copying and rehearsing, not authentic use of the language. When Cesar began a subordinate clause in lines 26-27 about when students finally return to the English class, Reyna found her voice again to participate, interrupting Cesar to complete the sentence that students will already have forgotten what they learned, indicating that practice only occurs in the classroom (and how much is questionable), not at home. Homework is not something that is regularly assigned and if it is, students rarely do it (according to my own observations from being in Nicaraguan classrooms since 2009, including observations of Enrique’s students for this research).

Cesar thought that Johan’s project indeed demonstrated a critical aspect that is good for actively learning and thus remembering lessons. He called this type of critical learning “efectivo” (line 45), but again, kept this effective learning separate from learning English. I intended to argue in line 46 that it “toma tiempo” [takes time] to construct a critical lesson plan that effectively tackles a relevant issue as well as provides authentic attempts to use the language, but Cesar interrupted to provide his final concern, perhaps mistaking my start as a critique of the time required of Johan’s lesson, as Cesar said that creating a book is time-consuming, taking several days to process the material (e.g., collect it, dry it). To Cesar, a lesson is a unit of time that should be finished in a short amount of time; however, a lesson can be extended through many days, especially through project-based learning (DeCapua & Marshall, 2014). Seeing lessons and smaller, embedded activities as short-term, Cesar offered an uncritical activity idea in
place of Johan’s lesson idea: making greeting cards. While such an activity allows students to work
individually or together toward a goal by moving through an authentic task – greeting cards are a
common way of showing affection – the activity does not address a critical theme to which learners can
attach their creativity, and, as language teachers around the world can attest, students likely would make
those cards with groups in class, speaking to each other in their L1s, which is the concern that Cesar had
about critical language teaching.

Some critical aspects of my work with Reyna and Cesar were not being received well. Not
expecting my example to get such resistance, in line 60, I retracted a bit towards compromise. I softened
my opinion of Johan’s project, stating, “podemos adaptarla” [we can adapt it] (line 60) and “es sólo un
ejemplo (3.0) de de criticalidad” [it’s only an example (3.0) of of criticality]. My research intention was
to learn how the teachers incorporated or resisted discourses of criticality, not to force any way of
thinking or doing on them as they configure their worlds as soon-to-be English teachers. This was a space
for exploration of different discourses in hopes of thinking and doing differently, but certainly not cause
for despair if it did not occur, as these areas of resistance shown by teachers provide important spaces for
the critique of critical theory and critical pedagogy from practical problems raised by teachers:

Nicaraguan students barely go to school let alone English class. In Nicaragua, 36% of children and youth
drop out of school to work (Fabretto Annual Report, 2015), and that percentage increases in rural areas
like Tepetl. If they speak so little English outside (and possibly inside) the classroom as it is, why
complicate potential acquisition with a project that – as Cesar saw it – had so little to do with English? As

Cesar remarks in an interview about his own English learning experiences in Nicaragua:

CES: Cinco años he pasado en la universidad, pero la universidad ofrece pocos espacios para el idioma.
Yo con Johan aprendí muchísimo. Aprendí muchísimo con Johan, pero desafortunadamente Johan
tuvo que irse. Tuvo que irse porque él también necesita ese apoyo profesional, eh – y yo sé que los
espacios que a Johan le daban eran muy poquitos, porque nosotros recibíamos solamente dos horas
y media a la semana de inglés. Y en dos horas y media a la semana de inglés – < I have spent
five years at university, but the university offers few spaces for the language. With Johan I learned
so much. I learned so much with Johan, but unfortunately Johan had to leave. He had to leave
because he also needs that professional support, eh - and I know that the spaces that Johan gave him
were very few, because we only received two and a half hours a week of English. And in two and a
half hours a week in English->
KAT: -No es suficiente. <-It isn’t enough>

CES: Ya después las otras clases eran en español. Ya hasta después ya en tercero o cuarto año que ya empezábamos a ver un poco más, pero las otras clases ya en inglés, pero siempre los profesores se apoyaban del español para que pudiéramos entender, y eso no contribuía, pues. Y de hecho pues hasta cierto punto ellos quizás tengan razón porque si hablaban solo en inglés podríamos quedar un montón sin entender y sus objetivos no se iban a cumplir. Entonces yo soy de los que para hablar en inglés es utilizar el mayor porcentaje del inglés en la enseñanza, y dejar un porcentaje para las explicaciones en español. <-Then the other classes were in Spanish. It wasn’t until later in the third or fourth year we were starting to see a little more, but the other classes were already in English, but the teachers always supported themselves from Spanish so that we could understand, and that did not contribute, then. And in fact because to some extent they may be right because if they spoke only in English there would be a lot we would not understand and their goals were not going to be met. So I am of the thought that to speak in English is to use the highest percentage of English in teaching, and leave a percentage for explanations in Spanish>

Cesar has invested considerable time and money into his English language education over the years, and here he laments about his university experience, having spent five years with few spaces to actually use and thus acquire the language. Cesar provides insight into an issue that has crucially shaped his own identity as an English-teacher-to-be: his first English classes were given only in Spanish. Only later did he begin to hear more English, but teachers still used mostly Spanish. This experience profoundly affected Cesar’s learning, forming his strong opinion that “el mayor porcentaje” [the greater percentage] of a course should be taught in English, with some “explicaciones en español” [explanations in Spanish]. This final line contradicts his opinion about giving directions to students in Chapter 4, Excerpt 4.1, when he explains that writing directions on the board in English, then giving those directions orally in Spanish “does not work.” Cesar is in a process of working out what he thinks based on his apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) in English classrooms in Nicaragua, and he will soon get a chance to teach English for the first time, allowing the activity to continue to shape his views on a topic that – based on how many times it comes up in interview and workshop data – is deeply important to him as an English-teaching professional.

### 5.2.2. “Both?” Promoting L1 Use in the L2 Classroom

While Cesar is correct that it is frustrating that English classes in Nicaragua tend to be taught too much in Spanish, and this overreliance has convinced him of the harm of L1 for the L2 classroom, on the other hand, as he admits, if his teachers did not use Spanish in the classroom, then he and the other
students would not understand what to do. In the English-teaching context of Nicaragua, Cesar will need to experiment with the right amount of time in languages based on the learning context, and find what that balance will be. Incorporating critical elements into teaching beginning and intermediate English means that many discussions will take place in Spanish, as students will not yet have the vocabulary to discuss complex issues. Using our workshops as an example of how the teachers and I could use both Spanish and English together, realize many of our goals together because of this, and still use and learn a lot of English, I hoped that the workshops would be a model for how they could approach English and Spanish in their own classrooms. I consciously and unconsciously made communicative choices, like acknowledging their answer in Spanish but providing an answer in English when I felt they would understand the English, acknowledging their English but then providing an answer in Spanish when I sensed that answering in English might not be understood, and meeting them in whatever language they used with me. There were also times when my ability to communicate in Spanish failed me – when I did not recall a vocabulary item or when I began to talk about an issue requiring language I had never used before in my L2. Thus, I as a lifelong learner of Spanish also served as a model for them that negotiation of meaning through translingual practice is natural and normal.

In Excerpt 5.5 below, I explicitly introduce the discourse that I promote: using the L1 in the L2 classroom to reduce teacher anxiety, support students, and talk about critical issues in their education beyond English. Excerpt 5.5 comes from workshop 2, given on 05/02/17. We had spent the first hour-and-a-half of the three-hour workshop dialoging about the history, value, and problems of various approaches and methods in language teaching, including the Structural Approach, Grammar Translation Method, Audiolingualism, the Oral Approach, and Communicative Language Teaching. We discussed these methods and approaches in light of psychological, social, physical, and situational aspects of language acquisition that may make certain approaches and methods difficult and even inappropriate for the northern Nicaraguan context. For example, we dialogued about the high rates of malnutrition in children in the area, and that perhaps approaches that required extensive use of memorization (e.g., those
guided by the learning theory of behaviorism) or that disallowed the use of the L1 as support for learning the L2 (e.g., the Direct Method), would place a high cognitive load on children whose minds and bodies are being affected by nutritional issues. In essence, I attempted to get Cesar and Reyna to “confront context” at UZN (Appleby et al., 2002, p. 333), and develop a post-method understanding to their teaching (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, 2006a, 2006b). With this understanding, Cesar and Reyna would engage in the activity of using, adapting, and developing their own approaches and methods through a flexible process of analyzing the local context and students’ needs and reflecting on and changing their teaching as they continue to gain experience (Jin & Cortazzi, 2011). I began with expansion activities, then later worked with them to build entire lessons, not just one activity, from ideas from the manual, from other resources, or from their own imaginations.

Excerpt 5.5 – Using both the L1 and L2 when teaching (workshop 2, 05/02/17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KAT: so this way (.) th- the students talk (.) the students are speaking English (.) the students are presenting (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>and HERE in this (.) with el cuerpo de paz it’s the peace corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>it’s GOOD=it’s a good start (.) like (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>podemos usarlas para iniciar una lección (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pero los estudiantes (3.0) los- las olvidan las palabras (.) si? &lt;we can use them to begin a lesson (2.0) but the students (3.0) forget the words (.) yeah?&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>um: but (1.0) with (1.5) an interactive lesson (.) where they make a poster (1.0) they present it up here (2.0) they speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IN Spanish and English (.) (they can)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>REY: use Spanish (.) both, yeah (2.0) it’s hard using only English (.) it’s hard, especially with children or (.) even adults with basic (.) skills (1.0) so with Spanish and English they can present (.) and in that way, they are using the language, and they are working together to: (.) to build it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>((KAT stands and leans over table while pointing with LH at paper she holds in RH; paper faces CES and both CES and REY sit at table, looking at paper; KAT points to mouth on “talk”; KAT moves LH open palm towards white board on “presenting”))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>((KAT points to board, then to paper, places paper on table and walks to white board, where Peace Corps activity has been drawn))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>((KAT pauses, clears throat, places LH open palm up towards whiteboard in front of her, looking at whiteboard; KAT makes circular motion with both hands on “iniciar”))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>((REY nods head; CES and REY watch KAT at board))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>((KAT walks back to table on “but”, points to the lesson in REY’s hands on “interactive lesson”; KAT mimics drawing a poster with LH on “they make”; KAT walks to whiteboard and mimics presenting a poster on “up here”; KAT moves LH and RH back and forth on “they speak”))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>((REY lifts RH in fist with index and middle fingers pointed on “both?”))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>((KAT nods on “both, yeah”; CES nods once and REY nods twice on “it’s hard”))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>((KAT walks two steps toward table, both hands up, palms open and toward her body); brings hands together on “together”))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the excerpt, I had just finished introducing Cesar and Reyna a sample activity that I created that is more interactive than a small activity that we read in the Peace Corps manual in order to demonstrate how we can extend ideas in the manual. In the activity, “Map My Community,” students work in groups to find meaningful language together, create posters, and give directions to a tourist on how to get from one location to another location. The students also tell the tourist interesting facts about the location. I was advocating a student-centered approach to the activity; however, moving to a student-centered approach in the town of Tepetl likely means allowing for some Spanish use as students work together to “build” (line 22), or make meaning with, the human and other learning resources they have. In line 15, Reyna overlapped my utterance when I advocated for both languages to be used, asking, “both?” and holding up two fingers together. I reasoned why I believe in the use of both languages because of the difficulty of using just one when students have “basic (. ) skills” (line 18) – not just English skills – Reyna nodded and I nodded, and Cesar nodded once. Using the term “skills” here fits the conventional discourse that sees language as a skill to attain, and not a process of meaning-making, and in retrospect I could have explored a different reasoning process as an advocate of critical ELT.

While using the L1 and L2 when teaching is not necessarily a critical discourse (though it can be depending on the dialogue and circumstances that arise when engaging with the discourse), it is certainly alternative to conventional approaches and methods to teaching a second language which view use of the L1 as detrimental in the L2 classroom, like the Audiolingual Method, which argues that the teacher should minimize the L1 during the learning of the L2 (Richards & Rodgers, 2014), or Communicative Language Teaching, which, Holliday (1994) argues, reflects native-speaker superiority in that it was developed for Western universities and institutions for learners with strong cultural and economic capital who understand classroom learning from culturally-bound assumptions from Britain, Australia, and North America (BANA). ELT practices are cultural practices, not neutral practices (Pennycook, 1994). The conventional ELT discourse argues, among other methodological tenets, for “the demand to use only English in the classroom, the priority given to oral interaction over written communication, and the
presentation of certain culturally dependent games and activities, particularly pre-structured, textbook-based information-gap activities” (Appleby et al., 2002, p. 333). Viewing ELT practices as cultural practices, then, complements the definition of discourse that guides my research: “…a situated communicative event or a class thereof called activity in which people accomplish social (inter)action through linguistic and other symbolic means, in particular historical and cultural relations” (Shi-xu, 2015, p. 290, emphasis in italics in the original). In Nicaragua, where language classes are often teacher-centered, as all of the teachers in this study attested and as I have observed in my past work, moving to a student-centered approach where students engage in tasks that are socially, culturally, and politically meaningful for their education and future may mean relaxing the expectation that students—especially beginners and students who may be suffering from hunger, malnutrition, or other physical and mental stress—speak only in English.

5.2.3. Digital technology for teaching: Assuming meanings and values on CDs

The analysis presented below is illustrative of how imagined understandings of what ELT should resemble come into dissonance with alternative discourses that attempt to work with the lifeworlds of students and teachers, but that may not be as desirable as convention. I begin my analysis with an event. One of Foucault’s principles of discourse analysis is to analyze discourse as event rather than discourse as merely textual (what is said or written) (Hook, 2001, 2005). Hook remarks,

…one should approach discourse not so much as a language, or as textuality, but as an active ‘occurring’, as something that implements power and action, and that also is power and action. Rather than a mere vocabulary or language, a set of instruments that we animate, discourse is the thing that is done, “the violence”, as he puts it, “which we do things” (1981a, p. 67). In a similar vein Said adds that the predominant goal of discourse is “to maintain itself and, more important, to manufacture its material continually.” (Hook, 2001, p. 20)

Placing this event in light of other events that occurred before and after it and which involve similar texts, materials, and activities, I show through this analysis how difficult it is to resist powerful,
conventional discourses because of their naturalization as the way things are and should be (Gramsci et al., 1971). Focusing on audio compact-disc (CD) technology used for listening to English, I explore the meaning that CD technology might have to discourses of expertise and authenticity of the English educators who use them. After describing and analyzing an event with the administrator of UZN, Linda, regarding her concern for CD technology for the English program, I analyze three events in particular: (1) an interview excerpt in which Reyna expresses her inability to access CD technology, (2) an audio-video excerpt of Enrique using a CD in class when the power goes out, a common occurrence in Tepetl, and (3) two audio-video excerpts of teacher workshops in which Cesar circumvents discussions of CDs and promotes phone applications that he uses to learn English. Authority is given to the CD (and CD player) as it comes to symbolize (in)competency or (in)expertise of the educator who uses it (or chooses not to use it). CD technology, out of all forms of audio technology, has come to be used as the main technology for various English programs in present-day Nicaragua, including the Access Program and Peace Corps TEFL, but the analyses that follow come together in overlapping ways to critique this practice.

Digital technology use by educational institutions in the Global South is a tool framed for both the learning of English as and for development (David et al., 2017; Passey et al., 2016; Willems & Bossu, 2010). Digital technologies have the potential to enhance English as development because they provide oral and written language models for learners that differ from those provided by the teacher, but they can also contribute to the “native-speaker fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992), an assumption that positions the phonological and grammatical knowledge of the native speaker as superior to non-native speaking educators. Digital technology can increase digital literacy skills and critical thinking and can also enhance English for development, as learners can access a variety of texts and connect to a number of potential relationships digitally through English that can assist them, for example, in the development of a local project, like reading articles published in English on how to improve horticultural techniques for increased crop yield. Whether it is used as development or for development, digital technology for English language acquisition in the Global South meets realities of hardship that traditional classrooms in
the United States and other Global North countries do not have to consider. David et al. (2017), who appraise information and communication technologies (ICTs) as language teaching tools in Nigeria, list a number of benefits of ICTs – PowerPoint, e-conferencing, compact disks (CDs, VCDs and DVDs), technology-aided distance learning, and other technologies – for the learning of language as and for development, but also acknowledge several obstacles with which teachers must confront, including the following:

First, lack of infrastructure which includes poor power supply, lack of modern computer hardware and software facilities and technologies, unavailability of internet services, dilapidated and poorly built classrooms, lack of modern teaching aids and furniture are, among other things, major encumbrances to effective utilisation and maximisation of ICT tools in language teaching and learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions today. Until the issues are addressed, academics/learners may not be able to maximise ICT tools for their language classes. (David et al., 2017, p. 200)

Thorne’s (2003, 2016) concept of cultures-of-use regarding digital communication tools demonstrates issues of laminating digital technologies onto contexts of learning without considering how the local culture of learning conceptualizes such tools. The framework argues that “technologies, as forms and processes comprising human culture, mediate and assume variable meanings, values and conventionalized functions for different communities” (Thorne, 2003). His initial research in the mid-1990s and early-2000s on cultures-of-use taught him that his digital design of U.S.-France email exchanges to enhance his college-level French courses was socially and culturally inadequate for his students. Some interactions tended “to sputter along,” while others did not occur at all because many students perceived email as “inappropriate for age-peer relationship building” (p. 187) – that kind of communication, students said, was used for professors and employers, among other cross-generational communications. Thorne takes a sociocultural theoretical orientation to linguistic, interactional, and cognitive practices, arguing that “…these practices emerge within distinctive cultures-of-use – that is, in
the articulation between the immediate contextual aspects of the communicative event at hand and the historically sedimented associations, purposes, and values that accrue to a digital communication tool from its everyday use (Thorne, 2003). Thorne continues that digital communication tools are not neutral – humans move through socialization processes as they participate in different speech communities. Through social participation in communities, they build associations, preferred and dis-preferred uses, and expectations for digital communication tools (Thorne, 2003). These associations and preferences can be facilitated or limited by structural and societal elements: if access to internet, for example, is expensive, then users will prefer technologies that do not require internet, like many phone applications (apps), which only initially require internet connection to download.

5.2.3.1. Linda’s concern: Why does the UZN curriculum not have CDs?

I begin with a summary of a field note (06/06/17) that I took of an event that I experienced four months into my six-month fieldwork. Aware of the unavoidable subjectivity of my field note, I corroborated my experience with the teacher, Reyna, who witnessed the event and provided me her rendition of what happened and why she thought it happened, which aligned with my experience. The event occurred on a Sunday morning after Reyna finished teaching her first ever English class. Reyna and I had spent months working together on her English proficiency and her development as an English teacher. Though the director, Paulo, and his wife had said there were a total of eight students signed up for the class, only one student came. Because of this, after class, Reyna asked me how much the English classes were because she had family members who were interested in taking the class. This would increase student numbers and make it more enjoyable for the child who came to class. I was under the impression that classes were free as we piloted the program, which is what Paulo had told me at an earlier time, but I said we should clarify with Linda. Together we walked to the adjoining room to ask Linda. Paulo was not present, though he was there briefly earlier in the morning, which was particularly disappointing that morning, since Reyna’s class marked the commencement of the English program for UZN, after months of working together to get the program running for his university.
I asked Linda how much the English courses were, as Reyna’s nieces might be interested in the class. She told me $20 US, but increasingly became agitated, asking me if the UZN English curriculum had CDs. I told her no – CD technology is expensive and hard to find in Tepetl; in fact, Linda accompanied me one day when I tried to find a CD player in town for workshop use and, later, teaching. From a position of privilege and authority (though I tried to minimize that positionality), I was unaware at the time of my assumption that CD technology would be appropriate for learning language in Tepetl. The search took us several hours, and we entered several stores asking about CD players. We finally found one store that had one small CD player, which cost just over $70 U.S. The obsolete device would have cost roughly $35 in the U.S., according to research I did later, but in this rural, remote Nicaraguan town, a CD player is a rare commodity. After I reminded Linda of this difficult search for the CD player, she told Reyna and me that the tuition money would go to one CD for each student. I responded that I was not sure that students would be able to play the CD, since very few have access to such technology, and that a CD would likely have different content from the curriculum that we had just designed together for UZN, which could be confusing to students. Linda felt frustrated with me – here was a Global North “expert” of ELT who was not providing CD technology – or textbooks, or other symbols of a traditional foreign language course – to students and teachers, possibly placing UZN students at a disadvantage compared to other English programs that use the technology, like the Access class that Enrique taught, for which Linda’s secondary-school-aged daughter did not qualify because they were not economically disadvantaged.

From a conventional discursive analytic perspective, we could analyze this field note pragmatically to illustrate how Linda and I were aligning to two different discourses, her to a packaged English curriculum indicative to Global North “expertise” and authenticity, and me to the engaged language planning (Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017) that guided my work with the university. This misalignment led to misunderstanding, despite my best efforts to include Linda and Paulo, and explain and remind them of my curricular and pedagogical intentions, as well as their continued interest in and
support of the critical perspectives that I often discussed with them. I responded to Linda’s question about my curriculum having CDs with a process of entailment: CDs are difficult to find and expensive; therefore, my curriculum did not require CDs. By immediately responding to this with a statement about students’ tuition going to CDs, she made a presupposition that my curriculum should have CDs, though she did not provide a reason. Because of this missing link in her statement, I repeated the entailment that I began with, questioning that since CDs are not a part of most students’ lifeworlds, how would they be able to use them? Linda possibly took this question as a Face-threatening Act (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as she did not provide an answer to it and instead showed signs of frustration. However, by exploring the wider contexts of discourse, “in which text…is given meaning by discourses…which in turn derive from a multiplicity of non-discursive practices…” (Pennycook, 1994), I ask of this discourse of authentic ELT how CD technology comes to symbolize (in)competency or (in)expertise of the educator or institution.

5.2.3.2. Reyna draws on individualism to circumvent CD use

About two weeks prior to the event with Linda just described, I interviewed Reyna about her life, background with English and goals related to English. In the portion of the interview presented below, she discusses her opinions on individual hard work and success in spite of hardship using an example regarding her lack of access to CD and other technology for her English classes.

REY: Aquí. Si uno quiere, uno puede, no importa qué tan pobre sea. Porque imaginése, por ejemplo, yo no tenía la oportunidad de pagar una carrera pero tuve la oportunidad de estar en Access Program, que era gratis, no teníamos que pagar ningún dinero. Teníamos acceso a libros, a diccionarios, audio, pero para serle sincera nunca escuché un audio porque nunca tuve la computadora. Tengo – en mi casa tengo CDs. En inglés, de los libros de Access, pero nunca pude escuchar uno. El profesor decía, “tienen que escuchar en sus casas, tienen que – pero yo no lo tenía, no tenía en qué escuchar, no tenía grabadora, no tenía equipo, no tenía una computadora ni nada para escuchar eso. Eso fue – <Here. If you want it, you can, no matter how poor you are. Because imagine, for example, I did not have the opportunity to pay for a career [undergraduate study] but I had the opportunity to be in the Access Program. It was free, we did not have to pay any money. We had access to books, dictionaries, audio, but to be honest I never heard an audio because I never had the computer. I have – in my house I have CDs. In English, from the Access books, but I could never listen to one. The teacher said, ”You have to listen at home, you have to – but I did not have it, I did not have anything to listen to, I did not have a tape recorder, I did not have a computer, I did not have a computer or anything to listen to that. That was – >

KAT: Qué difícil <How difficult>.
REY: Sí. Otros sí tenían computadoras y todo eso, y equipos. En mi casa solo había un televisor nada más sí. Pero yo digo que si uno quiere aprender uno puede como sea, no importa que no tenga los medios, pero muchas veces la pobreza está en la mente, no solo en lo económico. Ah, yo miro que
Reyna positions herself and others in relation to poverty by using CDs as the object in her narrative that disallows her access to a large part of her learning, but that does not limit her potential for learning. She uses a protective reasoning process that allows her to combat forces in her environment that keep many people in poverty from success. She indexes a discourse of individuality by stating, “Si uno quiere, uno puede, no importa qué tan pobre sea” [If you want it, you can, no matter how poor you are]. She then provides an example to support this reasoning: social and economic conditions disallowed her to go to college, but the U.S. government provided Access to poor students for free. This example brings up a contradiction and irony: the U.S. Embassy program, named, “Access,” freely gave English CDs that accompanied the textbook, which she could not use because she did not have “access” to a device on which to play them. To overcome this contradiction, she again indexes an individualistic psychology that places responsibility for success on the person – “la pobreza está en la mente, no solo en lo económico” [poverty is in the mind, not only economic] – unable to see the oppressive social conditions behind why the majority of poor people are poor. Drawing on a discourse of individuality allows Reyna to overcome the teacher’s authority (Enrique was her teacher three years prior) and the authoritative power of the CD player, because as long as she has the focus and motivation, she will persevere.

For Reyna, subscribing to this truth that people can overcome severe poverty through hard work and being in the right mind allows her to demonstrate the uselessness of the CD in light of her success without it. This counters the unquestioned “regime of truth” (Foucault, 1980) of what resources an English program needs to qualify as legitimate, to which Linda, the director’s wife, abides in when she insisted that tuition money would fund CDs for students. As discussed in Chapter 2, Foucault defines
“regimes of truth” as the historically specific mechanisms which produce discourses which function as true in particular times and places (1980). Regimes of truth regulate how people understand and validate social attitudes and practices, and they work through processes of disciplinary power which make us into subjects, normalizing certain ways of being and knowing, while stigmatizing others. While Linda sees CDs as an object of authenticity in English programs (English for development), and Reyna’s former teacher stresses the importance of listening to CDs for language acquisition (English as development), Reyna effectively resists the CD through her reasoning, though she subscribes to another “regime of truth,” that of individual responsibility founded in neoliberalism. As Foucault argues, ideology seems to connote some sort of truth on the other side; however, as Reyna demonstrates, there is never a “truth” on the other side. Resistance to one ideology means subscribing to another ideology through new discursive formations of text, events, and activities. One has the agency to move in different directions, but “subjectivity is always also subjection to the available ways of doing” (Gannon & Davies, 2012, p. 78). Reyna cannot escape the available discourses, and neither can I as the researcher of these discourses.

5.2.3.3. Power outage during Enrique’s class

The next analysis comes three weeks after the discussion with Linda about CDs, during one of Enrique’s Access classes (co-teaching, 06/19/17). In Excerpt 5.6, the course was about four months into its two-year cycle. Enrique was taking the students through a CD-based activity when the electricity suddenly went out, something that is an almost-daily occurrence in town.

*Excerpt 5.6 – “I don’t know what to do”*

| 1 Recorded Female Voice: Unit two (. ) page twenty (. ) | ((ENR pushes button on CD player; Sts orient to paper in front of them)) |
| 2 exercise two (. ) one (. ) dee | ((CD player stops working)) |
| 3 Recorded Male Voice: Ethan is making his bed | ((ENR makes open-palmed gesture with left hand, lets hand fall to side and smack his jeans)) |
| 4 | ((ST1 looks at ENR)) |
| 5 ENR: oops (. ) beep | ((ST2 looks at ENR)) |
| 6 STU1: se fue [la luz] | ((STU1 looks to student in group, puts hands to mouth)) |
| <the power went out> | ((STU3 places right hand to forehead)) |
| 7 STU2: [se fue] la luz | |
| <the power went out> | |
| 8 ENR: yeah::: | |
| 9 STU1: no::: | |
This CD-based activity demonstrated that the almost-daily reality of power outages makes the use of the CD player impractical on many days. But more than this, the CD player – an object – seems to possess authority over Enrique. He conceded to the technology as his hands fell to the side of his jeans, splapping against them. The power outage signaled the end of the activity. The students displayed frustration that the power went out, but none of them were perturbed about the English activity ending. Instead, the students represented in the transcript, a group of girls, worried that they had not completed their ironing chores (a common daily chore for most girls in this part of the world). Enrique, the authoritative figure in the class, an advanced English speaker, and a dynamic and creative educator, positioned himself as helpless, as secondary to the expertise of the disembodied “native”-English speaking voice on the CD, as he repeated, “I don’t know what to do” twice (lines 17-18), offering an apology to the students, followed by another gesture indexing frustration: throwing his hands in the air and then letting them fall and slap against his jeans. Enrique could have easily continued the activity, since the textbook has the same information written on page 20, and since I often saw him conduct spontaneous, engaging activities with students. However, he did not make this choice. After the electricity went out and CD stopped, Enrique moved on to a new activity with students.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Foucault’s understanding of discourse is of power and knowledge inseparably working together to form truth. Power/knowledge, is “a kind of knowledge that is ‘recognized
as true,’ ‘known to be the case’” (Feder, 2011, p. 56). Cesar’s experience of getting stuck in the moment, of not knowing what to do during an unexpected event, comes out of a condition of historical development, wherein technology is given authority over the educator and the educator is dependent on it. For Enrique, at least in this moment, he was only able to make sense of the “doing” of the activity through the CD player, a machine that makes English completely disembodied, but gives that recorded native-speaker voice authenticity and expertise over that of the non-native-English-speaking teacher. The CD player placed lines around what Enrique felt he could and could not do. Like Linda, whose concern over UZN not having CDs reflected on the authority of UZN, Enrique seemed to associate the technology with some sort of authority, rendering him powerless on what to do next.

5.2.3.4. Cesar demonstrates free cell phone apps for language learning

I return to a date four weeks before Linda’s concern over CDs, on the second day of a three-day workshop with Cesar and Reyna (workshop 2, 05/02/17). In Excerpt 5.7, Cesar presented a phone application (app) to Reyna and me that he uses to learn phonetic and phonemic rules, called, “Phonemic Chart.” This was not the first time – and would not be the last – that Cesar stopped the workshops in order to demonstrate his free and accessible learning technologies. At the time of the study, Cesar was a teacher of technology at a primary school and he often positioned himself as a technology expert in the workshops. In Excerpt 5.7, I had just finished introducing the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) as a tool for teachers if they do not know how a word is pronounced and they do not have access to internet or other technology due to circumstances like power outages that Excerpt 5.6 exemplified. I brought English-Spanish dictionaries that use the IPA for the teachers to practice pronouncing words. After my activity, Cesar showed me a phone app for learning phonetic and phonemic rules in English.

**Excerpt 5.7 – Cesar demonstrates free, accessible cell phone applications**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CES: i study with this: (. ) ay pee pee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KAT: great app (. ) that’s perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

((KAT and CES sit across from each other at table; CES holds his cell phone across table with both hands to show KAT; KAT sees screen, nods head and smiles))

((CES holds phone with LH, screen toward KAT, and presses screen with RH index finger; sounds emit from phone))
4 KAT: is this an app?=
5 CES: =yeah
6 App voice: eel (. ) bead (. ) eve
7 KAT: a cuál es el nombre de-
   <what is the name of>
8 CES: -este tiene =cómo se llama=se llama:: (. )
   <this has=what’s it called=it’s called:: (. )>
10 phonemic chart
11 KAT: wow
12 (2.0)
13 KAT: bueno
   <nice>
14 CES: pho- phonemic chart
15 CES: este es bueno (xx) descargar
   <this is a good (xx) to download>
16 App Voice: eeya (. ) deeya (. ) seeya (. ) meeya
17 CES: para- para- para- para phonetica (. ) uh
   <for- for- for- for phonetic>
18 KAT: se llama phonemic [chart]
   <it’s called>
19 CES: [phonemic] chart
20 (48.0)
21 CES: y el unico que es offline
   <and the only one that is offline>
22 KAT: okay
23 CES: no se necesita internet
   <internet isn’t needed>

((KAT looks at CES, smiling, then down at phone))
((CES looks at phone))
((CES looks up at KAT))
((KAT picks up pen on table))
((CES turns phone toward him, looks at screen))
((CES looks from phone to KAT))
((KAT writes name of app in notebook))
((REY returns to sit at table after taking phone call outside the room))
((CES shows his phone to REY as she sits))
((CES pushes screen of phone; KAT and REY look down at phone))
((CES looks at REY after app voice stops; REY shifts through papers in front of her))

Through this excerpt, as well as several other promotions of cell phone app technology during this and other workshops, Cesar demonstrated the unnecessary and obsolete nature of the CD player. Unlike CD players, many adults and youth in Nicaragua and other low-income countries have cellphones, which are an inexpensive commodity compared to the United States because they do not come attached to expensive contracts and data plans. As Traxler (2016) summarizes, “…we have seen mobile technology change from expensive, difficult, scarce and fragile to cheap, universal, robust, pervasive and ubiquitous” (p. 10). Although not everyone can afford internet, many phone apps do not require wi-fi, as Cesar noted about his app in line 23. For apps that do require internet to use, a recent government initiative in Nicaragua installed free wi-fi at every plaza central. These small, central parks are located in many cities and towns, even in remote towns like the one in which this study was conducted. Therefore, more rural Nicaraguans have opportunities to routinely access internet.
During the third workshop, which took place on 05/03/17, the day after the second workshop from which Excerpt 5.7 comes, I told Cesar and Reyna that they could borrow the CD player – the one for which I searched all over town with Linda – any time they needed it for teaching. Without allowing one second to pass after my offer, Cesar picked up his cell phone and raised it with one hand, raising the other hand at the same time and explaining, “sí porque también uno puede utilizar el cell phone con speaker” [yes because you can also use cell phone with speaker] (workshop 3, 05/03/17). He held his phone up and made a gesture of attaching a wire to it. He shrugged after he said this, indicating that it was not consequential for him. I acknowledged his idea, agreeing that it was “más fácil” [easier] than the CD player I had offered him.

Cesar strengthened an alternative discourse to this apparent “way of doing” language work by CD in English classes, promoted by Linda, resisted by Reyna, and submitted to by Enrique, by demonstrating a counter-knowledge that institutions may not be thinking about, at least in Nicaragua. A Foucauldian view of power sees power as a process that is reversible through ceaseless struggles and confrontations (Feder, 2011). It is not always the institution that dictates how things are – it is micro-level relations that, over time, come to disrupt old and cement new technologies, which then are taken up by the institution. Power is not just top-down; it “is not an institution [or] a structure,” nor an individual capacity, but rather a complex arrangement of forces in society” (Foucault, 1978, p. 93). Most of the lines in Excerpt 5.7 were dedicated to Cesar teaching me and Reyna about the app, an English learning tool that I did not know existed. I was unaware of any of the many free, digital learning resources that Cesar showed me during six months of working together. As the “expert” language specialist that the participants positioned me as, despite my attempts at resisting, I demonstrated lack of expertise when it came to the practical digital resources to which Nicaraguans could access for language learning. As Foucault argues, power is a set of force relations at the micro-level of individuals; therefore, the processes that individuals undertake – “micro-technologies” – transform and overturn powerful forms of knowledge, and new knowledges come to constitute new interplays of force relations, what Foucault calls the “micro-physics of power” (1991, p.
26). If more local administrators and teachers like Cesar, as well as Global North educators like me and international organizations like the U.S. Embassy, begin to see the potentiality of these apps as learning tools for their classrooms, they can change this impractical and expensive practice of using CD technology for English language learning.

Not until after returning from my fieldwork did I realize that I, too, aligned to the same discourse as Linda and Enrique – a few weeks into my fieldwork, as I have indicated earlier in this chapter, I spent hours looking for a CD player in town, assuming that it would be a helpful learning and teaching resource for my workshops, but ultimately only found and bought one overpriced model that we ended up never using in workshops. The so-called “critical” and “engaged” scholar was completely unaware of her complicity in perpetuating an English-learning practice that excludes those who live in poverty. Instead, in almost every workshop, Cesar showed us a free app or other digital resource that we could use; however, in an earlier interview with me, Cesar did not see himself as a legitimate English language educator because of his national identity. As already discussed in Chapter 4, he said in the interview:

*Porque yo creo que nadie mejor, nadie mejor que alguien de – del norte, alguien de Estados Unidos, nos diga cómo enseñar y cómo aprender el idioma.* [Because I believe that nobody better, nobody better than someone from the north, someone from the United States, should tell us how to teach and how to learn the language] (interview, 5/17/17)

If more local teachers acknowledged themselves as the experts of their own teaching and learning situations, not the foreign volunteers who are often unaware of the practicality and accessibility of certain resources, then local teachers can become empowered to see themselves as legitimate English language authorities.

**5.2.3.5. CD technology and authentic ELT**

The experiences of Reyna, Cesar, and Enrique demonstrate three issues surrounding the concept of CD technology in the context of rural, northern Nicaragua: (1) it is inaccessible to many people because it is difficult to find and expensive; (2) it is disconnected to classroom realities like almost-daily power outages, and (3) it is an impractical and obsolete way to access audio, especially when other digital technologies are less expensive and more mobile. Returning to Linda’s concern about the UZN
curriculum not having CDs, I argue that the CD and CD player invoke an ELT discourse of expertise and quality in English programs. I was not providing that for UZN; therefore, my expertise and credibility as an English-teaching professional from the Global North was subject to scrutiny. Linda was making a statement about other materials, knowledges, and activities that she expected I would bring with me or develop. She imagined me – the researcher and “expert” – as a particular object of English teaching (an Anglo-American, native-English-speaker), as using certain material to be an expert (e.g., digital technology), and as acting in certain ways that display that expertise (e.g., using conventional Global-North-based practices to language teaching instead of a Freirean-based approach to partnership that positions me as equal to teachers). “Expert” is a combination of textual, material, and active behaviors, and if one does not actualize and materialize in those expected ways, frustrations and misunderstandings arise. The conceptualization of packaged materials like CDs, but also textbooks and other resources, as displaying some sort of expertise or authenticity is an example of how institutions, from local universities to international agencies like the U.S. Embassy’s Access Program, control this “regime of truth” of what English teaching and learning should look like, and how out of touch it is with the knowledge and realities of local teachers.

Foucault’s intention with his definition of discourse is not to empower some counter-discourse to mainstream discourses (e.g., English does not open doors); instead, “It is more a question of increasing the combative power of potentially subversive forms of knowledge than of simply attempting to amplify their ‘truth-value’; more a tactics of sabotage and disruption than a straightforward head-to-head measuring up of ‘supposed truth’ with a ‘truer’ counter-example” (Hook, 2001, p. 26). Reyna explicitly resisted and Cesar implicitly circumvented using CD technology, yet still had been largely successful in learning English and becoming English teachers. If Cesar joined with other Nicaraguan English teachers to promote cell phone apps, they could disrupt and change the uncritical dissemination of CD technology for language learning. Henze and Coelho (2013) argue for organizations and institutions to gain similar
awareness to cell phones over CD and other obsolete or impractical technologies in their work with rural
Nicaraguan teachers (in which I took part and disseminated speakers to teachers for their cell phones).

5.3. Criticality in ELT? Cesar, Reyna, and Enrique’s definitions and opinions

After spending weeks together in workshops, meetings, tutoring, co-teaching, and other activities, I wanted to learn what the terms “critical” and “critical thinking” meant to Cesar, Reyna, and Enrique, and if “criticality” had any place, in their opinion, in the English classroom. They had months to explore critical and differing discourses with me through our work together, and I was curious to see if this work changed some of their thinking on criticality or reinforced their initial opinions on teaching English.

Cesar. For Cesar, he remained insistent for most of our time together that there is no space for criticality in English language teaching, at least when learners have very little English skills. In Cesar’s view, being critical requires advanced discussions, which Cesar only sees as occurring in the L1 – a language that he feels should stay out of the L2 classroom. Cesar’s definition of critical differs from that which I gave and demonstrated in our workshops together:

KAT: Okay. ¿Y cuando digo la palabra “crítico” o la frase “pensamiento crítico,” sobre qué opina, o sobre qué piensa? <And when I say the word “critical” or the phrase “critical thinking” what do you think, or what you think about?>

CES: El pensamiento crítico va más allá de la coyuntura. Decir, va un poco más adentro de lo personal. Para mí la palabra “pensamiento crítico” es cuando llevamos el pensamiento al punto más alto de lo que yo pienso, de lo que yo creo, de lo que estoy convencido, y el cómo puedo plantear la situación, es decir, con más razonamiento, con más este, no quiero redundar, con más énfasis en la realidad, ¿ya? Decir, más aterrizado. Para mí el pensamiento crítico es muy (.) muy profundo, muy profundo. <Critical thinking goes beyond the conjuncture. That is to say, it goes a little deeper than personal. For me the word “critical thinking” is when we take the thought to the highest point of what I think, what I believe, what I am convinced of, and how I can pose the situation, that is, with more reasoning, with more this, I do not want to react, with more emphasis on reality, right? Say, more grounded. For me critical thinking is very (.) very deep, very deep.>

KAT: ¿Y qué piensa de incorporar un aspecto crítico en el currículo de inglés? <And what do you think about incorporating a critical aspect into the English curriculum?>

CES: Me suena muy – muy interesante, pero al mismo tiempo implica un gran desafío. <It sounds very, very interesting to me, but at the same time it implies a great challenge.>

KAT: Uh-huh.

CES: ¿En qué sentido? El pensamiento crítico requiere de expresiones propias y sinceras, de expresiones sin (1.0) sin acomodo. Es decir, esto me salió, esto me salió, esto pienso, esto pienso. Pero yo voy, incorporar el pensamiento crítico al inglés puede significar inducir al estudiante a que tenga un domino bastante amplio del vocabulario. <In what sense? Critical thinking requires proper and sincere expressions, expressions without (1.0) without accommodation. That is to say, this came out of me, this came out of me, this I think, this I think. But I go, incorporating critical thinking into English can mean inducing the student to have a fairly broad command of the vocabulary.>

KAT: Uh-huh. ¿Lo cree usted que uh – pueden hablar en español sobre [sic] un poco? Uh-huh. Do you
think that uh - they speak in Spanish about ((the topic)) a little?

CES: Lo podemos hacer en español, lo podemos hacer en español. Y sí, perfectamente, podría ser a lo mejor el uso de lo que no entiendan en español, lo que puedan decir en inglés, en inglés. Se puede perfectamente bien. Pero no sé, tal vez es una idea y yo no estoy todavía este (.) no la tengo bien afinada. No la tengo muy bien afinada, así de (.) pero nos- nos pondría en una situación difícil con los estudiantes si lo llevamos de primera. Lo podemos llevar, digo yo, después de algunos- par de meses de haber introducido llevar el pensamiento crítico. Después de- después de los primeros meses ya trabajando, ya por lo menos saben, saben decir algunas frases, algunas frases, pero digo yo meter el pensamiento crítico en la primera clase o en la segunda clase no sería como muy- <We can do it in Spanish, what we can do in Spanish. And yes, perfectly, it could be the best, the use of what they do not understand in Spanish, what they can say in English. It can perfectly well. But I don’t know, maybe it’s an idea I’m not yet this (.) I do not have it very well tuned. I don’t have it very well tuned, so (.) but we- we would put ourselves in a difficult situation with the students if we lead with it first. We can take it, I say, after a few- couple of months of having introduced critical thinking. After - after the first months already working, at least they know, they know how to say some phrases, some phrases, but I say I put critical thinking in the first class or in the second class it would not be like very- >

KAT: Sí, sí, en tiempo, necesitan más- <Yes, yes, in time, they need more->

CES: Por lo menos, imagínese que el vocabulario (.) el abecedario, en la segunda clase el abecedario apenas con el abecedario en la segunda clase y de pronto yo le digo a él, qué opina acerca de la religión como parte de la coyuntura actual, algo más crítico. <At least, imagine that the vocabulary (.) the alphabet, in the second class the alphabet only with the alphabet in the second class and suddenly I say to him, what he thinks about religion as part of the current conjuncture, something more critical.>

KAT: Okay

CES: Sí, el chavalo me lo va a decir en español, me lo va a decir en español, y el chavalo puede pensar en algún momento de que yo le estoy enseñando español. Va a pensar en eso también. Yo sé- yo sé que la única manera de hablar inglés es hablando inglés aunque pensando en español, pero hablando inglés. Porque al pensar en inglés se aprende con- con despaciosidad, con más calma a pensar en inglés, porque pensar en inglés y hablar en inglés es jodido. <Yes, the kid is going to tell me in Spanish, he’s going to tell me in Spanish, and the kid can think at some point that I’m teaching him Spanish. He’s going to think about that, too. I know- I know that the only way to speak English is by speaking English although thinking in Spanish, but speaking English. Because when you think in English you learn with- with slowness, with more calmness to think in English, because to think in English and to speak in English is fucked up.>

KAT: Ah.

CES: Sí, es jodido. <yes, it’s fucked up>

KAT: Sí @haha <yes>

CES: Entonces es que me gusta la idea del pensamiento crítico, me gusta. Pero estoy tratando de adecuarla. O de imaginármela en el aula de clases con beginners. <So I like the idea of critical thinking, I like it. But I’m trying to adapt it. Or imagine it in a classroom of classes with beginners>

(interview, 05/20/17)

Cesar did not define “critical,” but went straight to “critical thinking” – and in reflection, I should have asked him for “critical” first before stating “critical thinking.” His understanding of critical thinking is founded in early emancipatory modernism associated with Critical Theory (Pennycook, 2001), in which thinking critically can be done so rationally and objectively. When asked if he thinks critical thinking has a place in English classrooms, he prefaced his response in the same way he did when he critiqued Johan’s
critical lesson plan – “muy interesante [very interesting]” (line 11), which indexes that he was going to view the critical element as problematic. As is his concern with Johan’s lesson, Cesar continued that thinking critically required vocabulary in English that students do not yet have. When I asked him if he thinks students could use some Spanish, Cesar conceded to the idea, but said he is not “bien afinada” [well tuned] (lines 20-21) to the idea – not adjusted to this way of teaching. He argued that leading with Spanish first puts teachers in a difficult situation and that only later, with more command of English, might it be appropriate. Demonstrating that he did not connect criticality to English in the ways that we had done together over several workshops, he provided a hypothetical teaching example in which he is teaching Spanish to students and suddenly asks them about religion. Confused, the student will think that Cesar is teaching him Spanish in an English class, not English. Cesar’s reasoning process indicates that he was still not ready to understand what I meant by critical ELT – that the point was to build awareness of English as not always a positive “skill” that alleviates poverty, and to connect English with the lifeworlds of students in ways that help them engage with this problematic. The critical work that I was attempting to enact and promote with him and Reyna had nothing to do with religion, or other deep concepts requiring critical thinking skills in the emancipatory-modernist sense. Cesar was not ready to link the criticality I espoused to the curriculum that we designed together and his future teaching.

Reyna. Reyna had a very different response from Cesar to what the terms “critical” and “critical thinking” meant to her, and whether engagement with these concepts belong in an English language classroom. While Reyna had no teaching experience (including English-teaching experience) and a lesser command of English, she seemed to notice elements of our work together that Cesar did not. After talking about an issue that frustrated Reyna – that students with money can afford English classes, but that students with no money actually take English classes seriously but cannot afford them – I asked her in her interview what she thought about bringing these issues into the English classroom:

**REY:** No es justo. Deberíamos de tener el dinero los que nos interesamos @haha. <It’s not fair. We who are interested should have the money @haha>.

**KAT:** ¿Cree usted que estos temas deben ser discutidos como parte de- oh, lo siento (1.0) oh, sí, problemas en Nicaragua, en otros países, cree usted que estos problemas deben ser discutidos
como parte de un currículo en inglés? <Do you think these issues should be discussed as part of –
Oh (.) I'm sorry (1.0) oh, yes, problems in Nicaragua, in other countries, do you think these
problems should be discussed as part of a curriculum in English?>

REY: Mire, yo digo que sí porque quizás viendo, concientizando. Vamos a decir, hombre, ¿qué estamos
haciendo? Tenemos un país muy pobre, debemos de tratar de salir adelante, de progresar, porque
nosotros somos los que vivimos en el país. Sí. Yo pienso que sí, que sería muy importante para que
recapacitemos. Look, I say yes because maybe seeing, raising awareness. We’re saying, man,
what are we doing? We have a very poor country, we must try to get ahead, to progress, because
we are the ones who live in the country. Yes. I think so, that it would be very important for us to
reconsider.>

KAT: ¿Y cuando digo la palabra “crítico” sobre qué cosas opina, o sobre qué cosas piensa? <And
when I say the word “critical” what things do you think about, or what things do you think?>

REY: Algo como extensivo. ¿Cómo le digo? Uhm – crítico. Como el punto fijo de hacer algo, algo
importante que hay que hacer, crítico. Sí, que es algo de interesarse, sí. Crítico @haha
<Something so extensive. How do I tell you? Uhm - critical. Like the fixed point
of doing something, something important that needs to be done, critical. Yes, that is
something of interest, yes. Critical @haha

KAT: Crítico. ¿Y cuando digo la frase “pensamiento crítico” sobre qué obtiene, o sobre qué piensa?
<Critical. And when I say the phrase “critical thinking” what do you get, or what do you think?>

REY: Pensamiento crítico. Es como – como usted me preguntaba acerca del currículo, que si
podemos agregar ese pensamiento que nosotros tenemos, las ideas que nosotros
compartimos. Obvio, de ideas muy buenas, que concuerden, sí, pensamiento crítico.
Pensar con realidad. <Critical thinking. It’s like - as you asked me about the curriculum, that if we
can add that thinking that we have, the ideas that we share. Obviously, of very
good ideas, that
agree, yes, critical thinking. Think with reality>

KAT: ¿Y qué piensa de incorporando un aspecto crítico en el currículo de inglés, por ejemplo, enseñar
inglés a los estudiantes pero también enseñar a los estudiantes a pensar en problemas en sus
vidas y como superar esos problemas? <And what do you think of incorporating a critical aspect
into the English curriculum, for example, teaching English to students but also teaching students
to think about problems in their lives and how to overcome those problems?>

REY: Sí. Bueno, porque muchas veces nosotros ignoramos eso, muchas veces como jóvenes, porque
ahora los jóvenes como nos interesamos más por el teléfono y no vemos lo que está alrededor
de nosotros, y es muy impor
- - tante porque quizás en una clase ellos concien – concientizan, sí, concientizar, concientizar.
<Yes. Well, because many times we ignore that, many times as
young people, because now we young people are more interested in our phones and we don’t see
what is around us, and it is very important because perhaps in a class they are awa- aware, yes, becoming aware, becoming aware.>

KAT: Yeah.

REY: Ese es el mundo del joven de ahora, sí (.) y no ven lo que está alrededor, no concientizamos, no lo
vemos y no logramos esto muchas veces los jóvenes, sí, entonces sí sería bonito incorporar eso y
enseñarle a algún estudiantes como pensar porque no piensan. Muchos no piensan.
Piensan con los pies no con la cabeza @haha (.) así decía mi abuela, “No pienses con las patas, piensa con la cabeza. Tienes cabeza de gallina” @haha. Las gallinas no piensan @haha.
Tienen cabeza de gallina, sí, es verdad. <That is the world of the young now. And they don’t see
what is around, we don’t become aware, we don’t see it and many times, we young people don’t
achieve, yes, so it would be nice to incorporate that and teach some students how to think because
they do not think. Many do not think. They think with their feet not with their heads @haha (.) so
my grandmother used to say, “Do not think with your legs, think with your head. You have a
chicken head” @haha. Chickens don’t think @haha. They have a chicken head, yes, it’s true.>
(interview, 05/17/17)

As quiet as Reyna tended to be during workshops, she was paying attention to the explicit
discussions I initiated about being critical about English, as well as the implicit criticality of the activities
that I undertook with them. When I asked her if she thought issues like the one she described, about unequal access to English classes, should be talked about in English classes, she immediately linked this issue with “concientizando” [raising awareness] (line 5) in the classroom. While less experienced as a teacher than Cesar, Reyna has years of deeply emotional, difficult experiences, just as he does, that have attempted to keep her from accessing English and other educational opportunities. In Reyna’s interview, unlike in Cesar’s, I gave her the opportunity to define “critical” and “critical thinking” separately, and this allowed her to better articulate differences between the two. Not giving Cesar the same opportunity was a crucial mistake on my part and surely affected the way he answered. Reyna’s answers demonstrate that “critical” to her entails something of great importance, and she then linked “critical thinking” directly to our work together: “como usted me preguntaba acerca del currículo” [like you asked me about the curriculum]. Instead of telling her about the curriculum, I invited her and Cesar into it, which meant that their ideas were valued and the curriculum reflected “las ideas que nosotros compartimos” [the ideas that we shared]. Reyna understood that critical ELT promotes equality in partnership and expression of ideas.

When I asked Reyna again if this kind of critical thinking should be a part of an English curriculum, Reyna linked the lack of conscientization to technology, specifically cell phone use, among young people. At 20 years old, Reyna is just out of adolescence herself, and she uses the pronoun “we” to show she identifies as part of the young generation that she is talking about. While she said the distraction, to her and her generation, is technology and not larger educational issues, for example, school days that are only a few hours each day, Reyna showed an openness to conscientization that perhaps her grandmother instilled in her when she told Reyna analogies like, “No pienses con las patas, piensa con la cabeza. Tienes cabeza de gallina” [Don’t think with your feet, think with your head. You have a chicken head]. Becoming aware, then, entails not running toward a direction uncritically.

**Enrique.** Enrique’s thoughts on criticality are informed over two decades of teaching English. While Enrique demonstrated many critically-influenced activities and lessons with his students during the
time that we worked together, I extended them to focus on placing English as a central subject of critical concern.

KAT: when you see a lot of these kids overcome poverty or be um: (2.0) inspired through English or- or the class (2.0) do you- do you think it would be a good idea um: to incorporate in the classroom some of- some of the social, political, economic issues that they: (.) they see in their world and bring that into an English class and if- if so, have you done that in the past, do you do that now in certain ways, do you think that would make an English class stronger, weaker (.). what do you think about=

ENR: =I think that makes it strong[er]
KAT: [ye]ah?= 
ENR: =absolutely (1.0) yes (.). I mean because it is the way (to) (.). you know the way you live (.). (your) lifestyle (2.0) but (it is like) to be an inspiration to them to live (xx) (.). to live every day (1.0) I KNOW that (1.0) it’s very hard to say, “why are you saying this” (.). maybe the students may think, like, “why are you saying this? You don’t know how I live” (2.5) like they: say (.). “you’re not poor” (1.0) they may think that=

KAT: =yeah they don’t kn- they don’t know YOUR [background]
ENR: [yeah exactly]

ENR: “maybe you (were) a rich (boy or:) then you started teaching English” like (x)=or maybe they have an idea they may know far: idea (.). but I have uh: (.). I have show scar through MANY things (1.0) in my life=I mean- if I if I told all of this- had the chance to tell em ALL the students what I had went through (.). they’d never believe it=I think (.). I think=it’s like yeah I- I’VE told em=some about=it’s like “oh wow” because I’ve been to: other places, for example, Honduras, Costa Rica=and I had to you know sleep on the floor and sometimes I have to sacrifice my stomach and I remember sometimes when I was in Honduras when I have to decide (.). what (.). to do, what decision to make (.). if I pay (.). the taxi I wouldn’t have money to pay for lunch (1.0) something like that=yeah=something like that

KAT: wow (4.0)

ENR: I would sleep on the floor in a terrible house (2.0) sometimes I didn’t have money (3.0) to buy something I need i- something like that=but I’ve learned (1.0) I’ve learned that that’s really interesting for me=so those experiences (.). I (mix) a lot of things I take a little bit of everything (.). my life, the- their environment here (xx) to help ‘em out, create, you know, ideas=give them inspiration (.). to be better (2.0) yeah (1.0) cuz I’ve been through (.). all of the things=maybe some people: (.). like I said will never believe it but (1.0) @hhh it’s true=I think it’s true that (1.5) the teacher I am now is: like um: (.). is like a result like you said in the class (xx) it’s like an (umbrella (x) great) (.). and I have to laugh, cry=go back=sometimes I have a wish to (.). to give up=to quit (.). but I say no ((claps hands together)) I have to (.). keep going (1.0) I have to keep it up and (2.0) well anyways (5.0) never surrender. (interview, 06/26/17)

Enrique is “absolutely” (line 9) encouraging of the incorporation of social, political, and economic issues of his students into the English classroom, but for a different reason from what I had been demonstrating through my critical activities, like the Critical Literacy activity represented in Excerpts 5.2 and 5.3 above. For Enrique, “the way you live (.). (your) lifestyle” as a teacher inspires
students. That is, Enrique sees acknowledging and sharing his own hardship with students as a motivation-builder for them. He did not link how English specifically is tied to some issues of hardship that he and his students experience, or if these issues should be discussed in class. However, in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1., Cesar shows that he does not think learning English is a problem when I ask him if English in Nicaragua, in the face of extreme poverty and social and political issues, is a positive or negative phenomenon, since students feel like they have to learn it to gain opportunities. For Enrique, bringing critical issues into the English classroom is about the ability to relate to one another and show students that, as a role model, he will inspire them to improve themselves. However, he does not use this role to confront the situations that make it difficult to attain a more balanced life in the first place – he does not use the hardships he has faced to be critical of the systems and institutions that have created that hardship for him and for his students. Like Reyna demonstrates in Chapter 4, Enrique invokes a discourse of individualism, that one must overcome as an individual faced with societal obstacles. One must overcome through motivation and inspiration, and part of this process of overcoming means investing their efforts in English.

5.4. Concluding the chapter

Critical discourses of global English and ELT that I introduced and promoted at both sites served to disrupt common assumptions that could affect the way that participants learn and teach English. All of the subdiscourses represented in this chapter and Chapter 4 are smaller “orders of discourse” (Foucault, 1978; Fairclough, 2003) embedded in the larger discourses of English as and for socioeconomic development. Sargeant and Erling (2011) state, “One possible danger resulting from this [English being equated with socioeconomic development] is that policies which do not attempt to take specific account of the sociolinguistic realities that appertain to English use in the societies in which they apply, and are instead structured predominantly around the broad trends of the overarching discourse of ‘English as a language for international development’, will be less likely to achieve positive outcomes” (p. 257). At UZN, the curriculum that the teachers and I were constructing together had the goal of giving teachers the
freedom to explore alternative discourses to “English as a language for international development,” and in so doing achieve a different outcome in terms of their sense of power over their education and future, as well as their subjectivities as Nicaraguan English-speakers. While Reyna – the quietest of the participants – connected to some of the discourses that I was layering, Cesar more often resisted these discourses, but – in terms of technology use – circumvented a conventional discourse that I was unaware of adhering to at the time. At CSB, the small activities I conducted with students, and side conversations I had with Enrique, served to present problems in the policy decisions of the school, the larger NGO that managed the school, and the U.S. Embassy’s Access program that was being implemented at the school, in hopes of planting a seed to think differently about the resources provided for learning English, without disrupting the curriculum that Enrique needed to follow. The final analysis chapter that follows, Chapter 6: Being Made into English Teacher Subjects, analyzes in depth the patterns of subjectivity that have emerged in this chapter and Chapter 4, and it connects these analyses to new data in order to demonstrate the hope, success, disappointment, and pain that becomes of these teachers’ professional English-teaching lives.
Chapter 6

Being Made into English Teacher Subjects

This final analysis chapter explores my last two research questions. First, *what social, cultural, historical, political, and systemic identifications as Nicaraguans and, specifically, as English teachers in Tepetl affect participants’ sense-making of their emerging English teacher subjectivities as they interact together among intertwined conventional and critical discourses?* Second, *how do the social, historical, political, and systemic identifications that I enact, appropriate, and resist as researcher-volunteer affect my own sense-making and emerging teacher-educator subjectivity?* As I define in Chapter 2, Section 2.3., a poststructural approach to subjectivity sees it as an effect of discourse and power. Discourses “…constitute rather than determine a teacher’s identity, the latter concept inferring a (neo)Marxist notion of ‘false consciousness’, in which teachers are relatively passive vis-à-vis the reproduction of dominant class interests through schooling” (Morgan, 2004, p. 173, emphasis in italics in the original). Discourses are systems of *power/knowledge* (Foucault, 1982) in which both professional and personal identities “co-develop” (Morgan, 2004, p. 173) as they are regulated and ascribed social value within speech acts, written texts, gestures, institutional spaces, and more. These final two research questions aim to understand the socio-historico-political space from where participants and researcher interdiscursively pull as they come to understand themselves as learners and teachers within the discursive possibilities that Chapters 4 and 5 reveal. The first and second research questions demonstrated that while teachers possess agency in making choices regarding how they think about and teach English, these choices have been restricted by disciplinary and regulatory discourses which direct them to see English and English teaching in certain ways, which make it difficult to see how critical and differing discourses make sense for – and can be applied to – their teaching experiences.

In this chapter, I examine three discursively-structured relations of power that materialize the teachers’ and researcher’s subjectivities: (1) their backgrounds and experiences as learners and teachers of
English; (2) their activities of being and becoming, in which teachers bring their identities as pedagogical resources into discussing, planning, and doing teaching (Morgan, 2004); and (3) constraints placed on becoming teachers (or a certain type of teacher) by the positioning of others or the larger educational institution. I analyze each teacher’s subjectivities by introducing them separately, though because they develop in relation to one another, they obviously overlap. Within each analysis of the teacher’s subjectivities, since they are co-constructed with my own (Holland et al. 1998; Morgan, 2004), I work through my own process of reflexivity to better understand my agency and constraints within these discursive formations of subjects. Much of this chapter is drawn from the narratives of the teacher participants that I documented in interviews and fieldnotes. These narratives are analyzed beyond content to connect to the wider historical social, cultural, and political contexts that shaped them, as “language ideologies and discourses…have currency in narrators’ communities and with regard to which they position themselves….” (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 176).

6.1. Reyna

6.1.1. Background

Reyna is from the poorest neighborhood in Tepetl, and her neighborhood is often cited as one of the most dangerous areas of town. Having been invited to her home on various occasions and twice attending a night English class with Cesar, located at a school in her neighborhood, I was often warned to only take enough money in my pocket for a taxi there and back. The unpaved, winding dirt streets of the neighborhood mark the end of town, which is paved and quartered into blocks. Reyna lived in a humble, two-bedroom house close to the earth and with a beautiful view of the town below. A piece of land that fills her with pride, Reyna showed me one day all of the fruit trees and plants on the property that have allowed her grandma to make a living, and that were the source of the many gifts of fruit and fruit drinks that Reyna brought me during our tutoring sessions.

Born in Tepetl, Reyna was raised in a smaller town about fifteen minutes’ drive east. She moved to Tepetl when she was ten years old. She is the second oldest of five children, having two brothers and
two sisters. She was raised by her grandmother since she was five months old and continues to live with her. Reyna says, in English, “She is like my mom. I love her like my mom” (interview, 05/17/17). She said that her father never took care of her, and that her mother left Reyna with her grandmother in order to migrate to the capital of Managua to work, where she has been a domestic worker ever since. Reyna says, laughing, “Dice mi- dice mi abuelita que me ponía las camisas de mi herman porque no tenía ropa. Y tenía que ponerme las camisas de mi herman (.) eran grandotas @haha porque no tenía ropa” [My- my grandma says that she put me in my brother’s shirt because I didn’t have clothes. And I had to wear my brother’s shirts (.) they were huge @haha because I didn’t have clothes] (interview, 05/17/17). When Reyna was very young, her grandmother had to move to Tepetl to make it easier to sell food. Reyna and her older brother would help their grandmother sell various goods, even when they were very little, like pomegranate, lemons, nacatamales (a Nicaraguan food similar to a tamale), rosquillas (a type of small, breaded chip or cookie), quesadillas, and pastries. Despite having to work as a child, Reyna said that her illiterate grandmother was very serious that Reyna attend school. The children had to walk a long distance to and from school each day.

Beginning secundaria in 2012 at the age of 13, Reyna was learning under the secundaria school foreign language policy that requires five years foreign language instruction – meaning English language instruction – though the quality of that instruction, according to her and other Nicaraguans, is quite basic, requiring the learning of some words and phrases, often decontextualized and with little to no communicative interaction with peers or teacher. Despite this, she says that she was very interested in English, and during her last couple of years of secundaria, she had the opportunity to participate in the U.S. Embassy’s English Access Microscholarship Program (Access). In order to apply for Access, a student must have very good academic scores (85% or greater) and demonstrate proof of severe economic hardship. Even the application process for Reyna proved trying – at 13 she had to complete the application and questionnaire process by herself because her grandmother is illiterate. She says of the process, “...era largo, y yo solita lo hice porque mi abuela como no sabe leer, no sabe escribir. Ella
aunque quisiera no me podía ayudar, pero ella me apoyaba, me decía, ‘andá’ pero la pobrecita no me podia ayudar porque como no sabe leer ni escribir entonces yo solita tuve que hacer el cuestionario.”

[… it was long, and I did it by myself because my grandmother, like she cannot read, does not know how to write. Even though she wanted to, she could not help me, but she supported me, she told me, ‘go’ but the poor thing could not help me ….] (interview, 05/17/17). Reyna also had to provide documentation like a passport-sized photo, which cost money that they did not have.

She was one of three students from her school to be accepted to the program. Access provided her a scholarship to attend the two-year intensive English program, which functioned out of a primary school campus, CSB, about a three-mile walk from her home (as stated in Chapter 3, Reyna went to the same Access program as the one taught by Enrique during this research, and she had him as a teacher). The program began in the morning, before secundaria would begin in the afternoon. Reyna had to leave her home at 6 a.m. to walk to Access, which ran every weekday for two hours each day. It would take her an hour to walk there, 45 minutes if she walked quickly. She would take the long walk back home, returning just after 10 a.m., to bathe and get ready for secundaria (the school day in Nicaragua is just half a day):

Fue muy duro, fueron dos años asoleada, mojada. Cuando llovía me mojaba, el sol fuerte, porque siempre me iba caminando, a pie porque no teníamos reales para taxis. Entonces fue difícil en ese aspecto porque tenía que levantarme temprano, hacer mis tareas de la escuela, de la secundaria, hacer trabajos de ACCESS. Fue muy difícil. <It was very hard, they were two years, sunny, wet. When it rained I got wet, the sun was strong, because I was always walking, on foot because we did not have money for taxis. So it was difficult in that aspect because I had to get up early, do my homework, for high school, do ACCESS homework. It was very difficult>. (interview, 05/17/17)

Initially, she had a very difficult time in the program and could not understand anything that the teacher said. Discouraged, she wanted to stop but her grandmother told her to continue, that it would help her. Eventually she made friends in the class and began to learn: “Fueron años difíciles pero los terminé, uf, a descansar. Fue muy bonito. [They were difficult years but I finished them, uf, to rest. It was very beautiful]” (interview, 05/17/17).

Reyna’s education stopped after secondary school. She said that she did not have an opportunity to use English after Access and had lost much of her English language ability. She got pregnant at 18
years old and had a difficult and dangerous pregnancy. She began a *bachiller* program at a university two hours south, commuting by bus, but with the pregnancy and the high cost of tuition and travel, she had to leave the program after less than a year of study. Her baby had a heart defect so had to be born by cesarean section. The baby girl was just five pounds at birth and continued to be sick often, at the time of the study. Her baby was 10 months old. Reyna was living with her grandmother, two cousins, her husband, and her baby in a small, two-room home. She was looking for work teaching English when she saw Paulo’s advertisement for an English teacher for UZN. She applied and was called for an interview. The opportunity to work with me, according to her, excited her again about her studies and future. Her grandmother was able to help care for her baby, so after beginning her work with me, newly motivated, she enrolled at the only accredited university in Tepetl to study for *licensura* in English teaching. At the time of the study, she had dreams of finishing a *maestria* in English. She considered it an important opportunity to be able to work for UZN and take part in the training that I was putting together.

### 6.1.2. Becoming an English teacher

For Reyna, my relationship with her meant a chance at being uplifted into a career and pathway that she had desired for a long time. When I first met Reyna in January 2017, she was not enrolled in university due to the life obstacles narrated above. Reyna told me that working with me helped her make the choice to go back to university for *licensura* in English teaching, and by the time she starting teaching for UZN, she was fully enrolled in the accredited university in town. Reyna often demonstrated an agentive self with high motivation to learn.

*Sí, me gusta tomar apuntes para después preguntarle a usted qué se pronuncia esto? “Katie, ¿cómo se pronuncia esto?” Sí, me gusta ir mejorando para no quedarme estancada en lo mismo, sí. ¿Y qué cosa me gustaría trabajar? Uhm – me gustaría enseñar inglés.” <Yes, I like to take notes and then ask you how - “Katie, how do you pronounce this?” Yes, I like to improve so as not to stay stuck in the same (place), yes. And what thing would I like to work on? Uhm - I would like to teach English>. (interview, 05/17/17)

Reyna continued to gain confidence with me as the months passed. In Chapter 4, Section 4.4.4., I analyze a brief representation of how Reyna positions her relationship with me, a “*persona americana*” [American person] as an exciting opportunity that she has never had before. My identity as someone from
the United States is also a political identity, and in previous chapters she often voices her concerns for her
country to develop, the English language being one of the ways to do so. Continuing from that excerpt,
she and I discuss further how she has gained confidence:

KAT: Sí, en dos meses yo he visto un cambio en usted, sí. <Yes, in two months I have seen a change in you, yes>
REY: Sí, porque al inicio, ay, me daba nerviosa, sudaban mis manos, pero ahora no, me siento más en confianza. Something like family. <Yes, because at the beginning, oh, it made me nervous, my hands were sweating, but not now, I feel more confident. Something like family>

Our work together meant a lot to her, to the point that she switches to English to say, “something like family” to me. I do not take this comment lightly, as too many volunteers and researchers use “like family” to make claims about how close they have gotten to those with whom they work. While she positions me as an outsider with her excitement about having never met or worked with an American before, she invites me in as a family member with her comment, which demonstrates the relational quality of my CSLTE work. These are not participants whom I do not talk to ever again, like much classroom-based research on student-teachers in the United States. This is engaged, iterative work, and as of this writing, I am still in contact with all three teachers and the Peace Corps volunteer, Amelia. The space that Paulo, Linda, and I provided Reyna to learn was a significant change in her life. In Excerpt 6.1. below, Cesar, Reyna, and I held our final workshop, in which we were preparing for our first classes together, which would start in one week. I was providing a final talk on moving away from teacher-centered approaches to the classroom, suggesting we meet to create ideas before classes start, as well as reassuring them about their anxious feelings toward teaching.

Excerpt 6.1 – Last workshop before teaching (workshop, 05/26/17)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>so (. ) with these ones=these new ones the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>students talk a lot so we can (. ) form activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tomorrow, Cesar you and I if you want=we can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>start (1.5) to um use some of this (. ) and build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>activities where our students talk a lot, practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a lot in class (. ) um (3.0) and then Monday (. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>with with you Reyna, you and I can (2.5) form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(. ) your first day of class together=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>REY: =okay=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KAT: =yeah and Cesar too you can continue to form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(. ) on Monday (. ) um (. ) what do you think?=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

((KAT points to paper))
((KAT and CES look at each other, KAT nods))
((KAT looks at REY; REY finishes writing a note then looks at KAT))
((KAT nods))
((KAT gestures LH and arm in circular motion as she and CES look at each other))
| 26 CES: =yeah | 27 (REY nods, gives a “thumbs up” with LH) |
| 28 (4.0) | 29 ((KAT looks at CES, then at REY)) |
| 29 KAT: how do you feel? (2.0) about this (.) about | 30 ((REY gives a “thumbs up” again with LH, smiles at KAT, then at CES)) |
| 30 teaching (.) right now | 31 ((REY rubs left temple with LH, looks at KAT, CES smiles at KAT)) |
| 31 REY: ex[cited] | 32 ((CES and REY look at KAT; KAT looks back and forth at CES and REY)) |
| 32 CES: [a little] nervous [@haha]ha | 33 ((KAT gestures with both hands in a circular motion)) |
| 33 KAT: [me too] but I like to | 34 ((CES looks at KAT)) |
| 34 REY: excited about teach | 35 ((KAT looks at CES)) |
| 35 CES: [teach] | 36 ((CES looks at REY)) |
| 36 KAT: good (1.5) i- i’me nervous, but i’m very happy | 37 ((REY and CES smile at KAT)) |
| 37 and excited for you because you both are very | 38 ((KAT nods, looks back and forth to CES and REY)) |
| 38 smart and motivated (.) and you know English | 39 ((CES looks to REY; CES, REY, KAT look at each other)) |
| 39 well (2.0) and now it’s time to (1.0) to | 40 ((CES nods once)) |
| 40 CES: to [teach] | 41 ((REY points at KAT with LH index finger, shakes finger at KAT twice, then looks at CES and laughs; CES and REY smile)) |
| 41 KAT: [pra-] to practice | 42 (KAT gestures with both hands in a circular motion)) |
| 42 CES: practice teaching | 43 ((CES looks at KAT)) |
| 43 KAT: yeah= | 44 ((KAT looks at CES)) |
| 44 REY: =yeah | 45 ((CES looks at REY)) |
| 45 CES: so I am very happy for you | 46 ((REY and CES smile at KAT)) |
| 46 KAT: yeah | 47 (KAT gestures with both hands in a circular motion)) |
| 47 31 CES: yeah | 48 ((CES looks at KAT)) |
| 48 CES: it’s okay | 49 ((KAT looks at CES)) |
| 49 KAT: okay (. ) yeah (. ) well thank you for your time (.) yeah= | 50 ((CES looks at REY; CES, REY, KAT look at each other)) |
| 50 REY: thank you for YOUR time @hh | 51 (KAT nods, looks back and forth to CES and REY)) |
| 51 KAT: my pleasure (1.5) my pleasure | 52 ((CES looks to REY; CES, REY, KAT look at each other)) |
| 52 REY: thank you for YOUR time @hh | 53 (KAT nods, looks back and forth to CES and REY)) |

By the time of this final workshop together, Reyna and Cesar both spoke significantly more in English to me and to each other. This excerpt is the first in which Spanish is not used at all, though the teachers’ responses are shorter than my explanations. Reyna not only voiced that she was excited and gestured with the “thumbs up” two different times, but also she positioned herself as ready to teach, quickly acknowledging that she is nervous like Cesar, then downplaying her (and his) nervousness by demonstrating that discomfort is how one improves. Riegel (1979) theorizes development from a Vygotskian sociocultural-historical perspective, using dialectical psychology to break from traditional psychology’s view that balance and equilibrium are the norm. From a dialectical perspective, change and development are a result of contradictions, or crises. He argues that individuals are more often in crisis –
changing and developing – than they are at peace with themselves and the world; thus, crisis is the norm, and individuals should not feel so stressed and concerned – instead, they should feel excited that they are developing. The resolutions of contradictions provide the basis for further developments of the individual and the history of society. Reyna’s comment invoked this sense of comfortability with and excitement for the unknown experience of teaching her first class, knowing that without discomfort, she would not develop.

Reyna also demonstrated one last expression of gratitude for this opportunity of becoming. After I thanked them for their time, she lifted her left hand and arm quickly and pointed over the table, extending her index finger toward me as she said, “thank you for YOUR time” (line 52). While not naïve to the fact that I am an experienced English teacher and English-teacher educator and that I would not be able to hide this part of me in my role with the participants, I certainly hoped to downplay it, with respect to CSLTE, in hopes of creating an environment in which participants felt comfortable acknowledging and sharing their own expertise. However, I came to learn how my expertise in developing this research project allowed Reyna an opening to explore her new identity as an English teacher. My presence as a volunteer teacher educator deeply and positively affected Reyna:

REY: …la considero una persona muy buena, a la cual le tengo mucha confianza, y bueno, he aprendido mucho porque he practicado incluso mi inglés, mis habilidades, gracias a usted porque si no hubiera tenido esta oportunidad. (...) I consider you a very good person, to whom I have great confidence, and well, I learned a lot because I have practiced even my English, my skills. Thanks to you because if not, I would not have had this opportunity.

KAT: Gracias. Thank you.

REY: Ahí estuviera en mi casa con la bebé y el inglés apagado, desenchufada prácticamente, ((laugh))). Sí, para aquí me ha ayudado mucho y – There I was in my house with the baby and the English turned off, practically unplugged, ((laugh))). Yes, for here you have helped me a lot and -

KAT: Bueno. Good.

REY: Quiero que me siga ayudando la verdad, sí, con mi inglés, a mejorar. I want you to continue helping me, truthfully, yes, with my English, to improve.

KAT: Sí. Yeah.

REY: Sí, porque quiero mejorar, aprenderlo más. Yeah, because I want to improve, to learn it more.

With Reyna, I saw our subjectivities coming together to form an apprenticeship, with criticality becoming not an explicit topic for me to promote with her, nor one for her to promote with students. Instead, criticality came with our relationship formation in itself, an opportunity for further education,
English education, English-teaching education, and social interaction – all areas to which she had limited access prior to our work together. Having a child so young herself, at age 18, kept Reyna from social relationships formed in further schooling and work opportunities outside the home. In her interview, she admitted, “Yo no dispongo de dinero, ahorrata solo lo que el papá de la niña me da para comprar las cosas, nada más, pero que yo tenga dinero propio, no tengo” <I do not have money, right now only what the dad of my baby gives me to buy things, nothing more, but that I have money of my own, I do not have> (interview, 05/17/17). I came to learn how my agency in developing this research project allowed Reyna an opening to explore a new identity as an English teacher and, for the first time possibly ever, a way out of poverty and reliance on the father of her child. Unequal power relationships are not necessarily negative, nor positive, but productive (Foucault, 1980, 1982). Instead of attempting equal footing and voice during all steps of a critically-aware project, one can work with being positioned and positioning others toward harnessing productive subjectivities.

6.1.3. Positioning and being positioned by others

Reyna positioned those who did not want to learn English or did not like English as ignorant, and she strove to position herself in direct opposition to that way of thinking. As presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.1.2., Reyna told me about the demeaning remark, “gringo de montaña” [gringo from the mountain], demonstrating the rather mean attempts by Nicaraguans – friends, family, neighbors, and classmates – to dissuade those motivated to learn English. Reyna further defines the term and shows her determination to not allow it to bother her:

REY: Sí, “gringo de montaña,” dicen. “Ay, es una gringa de montaña.” Cuando uno no es nativo de otro país pero puede hablar el idioma, o sea, eso es una ofensa para uno. Yo lo tomo como ofensa que me digan gringa del monte. <Yeah, “mountain gringo,” they say. “Ah, it’s a mountain gringa.” When one is not native of another country but can speak the language, that is, that is an offense for one. I take it as an offense that they call me a “gringa of the mountain”>

KAT: Okay.
REY: Sí, porque es como ofensivo. <Yes, because it is like offensive.>
KAT: Sí! <Yeah!>
REY: Gringa del monte, o sea, uno está aprendiendo, y si uno sabe otro idioma como a muchas personas les molesta, no les gusta eso. Sí, me he topado con personas que como que les disgusta pero no me doy por vencida. Yo sé lo que quiero y lo que yo quiero es aprender inglés y no me importa lo que las demás personas opinen porque lo que uno quiere uno lo hace. <Gringa of the mountain, that is, one is learning, and if one knows another language like many people bother them, they don’t like that. Yes,
I have run into people who, like, dislike them, but I do not give up. I know what I want and what I want is to learn English and I do not care what other people think because what you want you do.  

**KAT:** *Por qué esa actitud?* Uh- *<Why that attitude?>*  
**REY:** *No sé. Las personas son bien ignorantes, pienso, muchas personas. O sea, no son todas, algunas, pienso que son personas ignorantes. Es muy bonito aprender inglés pero ellos no lo saben.* *<I don’t know. People are very ignorant, I think, many people. That is, they are not all, some, I think they are ignorant people. It is very nice to learn English but they do not know it>*  

(interview, 05/17/17)

Reyna has a strong sense of what she wants, an ability to focus on herself and not be concerned by what others think. She persists by not only enacting her own subjectivity as motivated and not afraid to learn, but also by positioning those with dislike of English as “ignorante” [ignorant]. Norton Pierce (1995) was the first researcher of language identity to go beyond looking at learner motivation and investment as a variable of the individual and towards viewing it as connected to a social identity “in which power relations play a crucial role in social interactions between language learners and target language speakers” (p. 12). In other areas of her interview and in interactive data (e.g., her responses to Poster 1 and Poster 3 represented in Chapter 5, Table 5-1, Reyna separated her own motivated self from those who do not like English or do not work hard enough to attain it. She also, during interviews and interactional data, placed high appreciation for me and my time, and it is because of this that I see Reyna’s positioning of the “ignorant” Nicaraguan as rooted in a more complex social identity living in the context of a poor, rural town in a poor, peripheral country that, as she indicated in her interview, needs to develop. Tying English to development, Reyna’s comments are not merely superficial judgments on learner motivation; they are deeply political points that she wanted me, as a representative of a highly-developed nation, to understand about her in relation to other Nicaraguans. Unlike the sandinistas and the local MINED, for example, that did not allow Peace Corps TEFL to function in Tepetl, Reyna was a progressive thinker who desired to improve herself, her family, and her nation.

Despite her high motivation, Reyna felt the pressure of societal positioning as she worked in workshops with Cesar and me. One of Reyna’s largest concerns when working with us was the way she felt positioned as not as experienced and knowledgeable as Cesar. When Reyna approached me early on about the possibility to meet for tutoring her in English language acquisition and English language
teaching, I did not know at the time that this would develop into a highly critical space for her to develop her teacher subjectivity away from workshops, where Cesar tended to dominate the participation. When I worked with Reyna alone, she was much more comfortable and her excitement for learning became more noticeable. Though Cesar never showed intentions of judging, he gave a dominating impression that could be intimidating for someone who is just entering into the community of teaching, and as demonstrated in excerpts in Chapters 4 and 5, Reyna often took a quiet, listening role to Cesar in workshops. When she did participate vocally, it was to support one of his views with a short phrase or sentence. To demonstrate Reyna’s possibilities for overcoming this positioning, I share two brief excerpts from our tutoring sessions, where she begins to show her comfortability, creativity, and even some criticality in her discourse and activity.

While tutoring initially served as an additional way that Reyna could receive more support from me as an English learner and teacher-to-be, it soon became what Canagarajah (1999) refers to as a “safe house” for her, allowing her to practice her English and practice planning without the interference of Cesar, even though Cesar was, from what I observed and experienced, mostly supportive and inclusive of Reyna. In her interview, Reyna noted the following about Cesar – the only time that she explicitly mentioned her feelings about him to me:

REY: No creo, muchas veces (.) muchas veces yo me siento mal, pero a veces hablando me hace sentir un poco incómoda porque uno se (.) le voy a ser sincera (.) como él usted sabe, tiene más conocimiento porque él tiene más edad que mi, yo estoy joven y él tiene para expresarse, habla bien. <I don’t believe, many times (.) many times I feel bad, but sometimes talking makes me feel a little uncomfortable because one is (.) I will be honest (.) as you know, he [Cesar] has more knowledge because he is older than me, I am young and he has to express himself, he speaks well.>
KAT: Sí, sí. <Yes, yes.>
REY: Muchas veces yo me siento como chiquita ahí. Es feo pero aquí estamos aprendiendo. <Many times I feel like a little girl there [during workshops]. It’s ugly but here we are learning.>
KAT: Sí, sí estamos aprendiendo. <Yes, yes, we are learning.>
REY: Trata de aprender. Dicen que la vida se trata de llorar y reír. <Try to learn. They say that life is about crying and laughing.> (interview, 05/17/17)

Reyna reasons that it is his age and ability to speak well that keeps her from feeling like an equal participant in workshops; however, issues of gender and social class also intersect with their age difference and varying teaching experience to create an environment for Reyna in which she cannot fully
be the teaching subject that she is striving to be. She again invokes a dialectical-psychological perspective (Riegel, 1979), referencing a saying that lifelong (ontogenetic) learning is an iterative process of crying and laughing.

I analyze below an excerpt that demonstrates how liberating planning a lesson becomes when Reyna is not overshadowed by Cesar’s excitement to participate. Cesar had a kind personality and worked with us as a friend and colleague. Cesar was interesting, funny, and motivated, but because of his subjectivity in relation to ours, was almost always first to voice his opinion in workshops and meetings, even tending to talk over or interrupt Reyna or me. In Excerpt 6.2. below, Reyna and I were working through developing a lesson plan together, without the presence of Cesar, when she “displayed more depth and involvement” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 138) in this pedagogical safe space.

Excerpt 6.2 – Reyna’s “wow” moment (tutoring, 06/01/17)

| 1 KAT: so what would you like to do for (1.0) your main lesson in terms of greetings, saludos <greetings> numbers maybe, maybe your numbers are one through ten and not one through [twenty] REY: [yeah] 6 KAT: that’s probably a lot huh 7 KAT: um: (4.0) basic student and job vocabulary 8 (2.0) 9 KAT: that doesn’t [make] sense 10 REY: [no] 11 KAT: so you might do what instead= 12 REY: =pienso que podría hacer nombres de animalitos=eso me llama la atención <I think I could make animal names=that catches my attention> 14 KAT: [que bueno] <that’s fine> 15 REY: por ejemplo, conejo, que lo digan en inglés, jirafa, eso es lo que me llama la atención, los animalitos (. ) DIGO yo @he < For example, rabbit, say it in English, giraffe, that’s what catches my attention, little animals (. ) I say> 18 KAT: i like that 19 REY: como los libritos que me dio, ¿recuerda?= <like the booklets you gave me, remember?> 20 KAT: =uh-huh= 21 REY: =lion, el león; rabbit, conejo, en inglés y español. |

((KAT and REY sit at table; KAT points to REY’s notebook on “you”; KAT places LH and RH up as a frame on “main”; KAT points to paper and reads from it, as REY looks down at paper)) ((KAT looks at REY, REY looks at her and nods, then looks to the paper again)) ((KAT looks at REY, REY nods again)) ((KAT and REY look at paper, KAT looks at REY)) ((KAT shakes her head as she looks at REY)) ((REY smiles as she looks at the paper)) ((REY, smiling, looks toward ceiling, then to KAT; REY’s hands are in her lap and she makes small gestures as she talks; KAT looks at REY as she speaks, nodding her head)) ((KAT smiles)) ((REY looks at KAT, rests her right elbow on table with LH locked with RH, smiling at KAT)) ((KAT smiles at REY)) ((REY raises RH up to the right of her body, then makes palm and fingers flat in the air, palm down; REY places both RH and LH on table, uses RH to tap down on paper))
Away from Cesar, Reyna has much more confidence giving ideas, asking questions, and initiating help with feedback. Instead of a quiet participation of support for Cesar’s comments, demonstrated in data excerpts in Chapters 4 and 5, Reyna moved quickly, latching to my question without even a micropause in line 12 to confidently and quickly give her idea about a lesson. Freely giving ideas was something she could not do in Cesar’s presence. In excerpt 6.2 above, Reyna was animated and smiling while presenting her ideas. She spoke rapidly, ending with an assertive “Diigo yo” [I say]. In line 33, when she said,
“entonces?” [so?] and awaited ideas on what to write, there was an eagerness in her body language as she picked up her pencil and leaned over her notebook. Reyna’s culminating excitement expressed itself in line 52, when she expressed, “wow,” and simultaneously raised her right fist up in the air, indexing a feeling of accomplishment.

A significant achievement towards gaining self-awareness of and confidence in her own knowledge and experience came during one of my final weeks in Tepetl. On 06/22/17, Reyna and Cesar came to my home for a teacher’s meeting. During the meeting, we helped Reyna practice an oral examination that she had to give for her English courses at the university. After we helped prepare her, we talked about how their teaching was going at UZN, and more about their lives in general. Cesar began talking about his brother:

CES: I have a brother who live in the United States.
KAT: o[kay]
CES: [she] would lose about twenty years but right now we keep in contact with him
KAT: okay
CES: yeah a:nd (.) she told us
REY: HE (1.0) no
CES: HE told us eh (.) soon we’re going to invite us to visit the United States. (meeting, 06/22/17)

Reyna demonstrated a cautious confidence, first correcting Cesar by giving the correct pronoun “HE,” but then ensuring that she does not position herself as more knowledgeable than Cesar, quickly adding a “no” to lower the impact of her speech act from correction to uncertain suggestion. Correcting Cesar’s language was brave of Reyna, who saw Cesar as more knowledgeable and who was used to her language being corrected by Cesar over the several months of our work together (as was I my use of Spanish). Aware of her potential face-threatening act, she positions herself within the role in which she is positioned by others: a younger non-expert, newer to English and new to English teaching.

Despite Reyna’s progress of becoming, she never fully is positioned by Cesar or the community as a legitimate English teacher. I have not theorized our work together in this research project as a Community of Practice (CoP) for this reason (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). In Chapter 3, footnote 13, I briefly summarize CoP, including that it assumes a shared commitment to helping each
other and learning together. While Cesar was supportive of Reyna and worked with her and me toward a shared goal of becoming English-teacher subjects, Reyna was uncomfortable expressing herself fully around him. In July 2017, the NicaTESOL regional conference for English language educators was going to be held in Managua. I had been to the conference in the past, but was not able to go during this research because I fell sick during that time. Cesar was going to NicaTESOL with a group of his colleagues, and he told Reyna that she should go. The three of us coordinated the logistics: Cesar would tell Reyna where to meet him and his colleagues, and they would take the bus to Managua and stay at a hostel. Reyna worked to save money for the trip. The morning they were to leave, I received a phone call from Reyna. She was in tears – Cesar had left her in Tepetl, forgetting – as he later told me – to tell her where to meet them to catch the bus. She had been looking forward to this professional development opportunity with great excitement, telling me that she had never been to Managua and had never been to a conference. This was a terribly painful moment for Reyna, and hearing her cry over being left behind was about more than just missing the conference. Regardless if it was an accident or purposeful, leaving her behind felt, to her, like an attack on her legitimacy to be an English teacher.

During Stage 4 of my research, when I was home in the U.S. but following up on the progress of the participants, Reyna informed me of other news that seemed to position her as not as qualified as Cesar: Paulo, the dean of UZN, sent his 11-year-old daughter to Reyna’s house to tell her that she would not be teaching for UZN anymore because the university could not afford to teach the classes. However, Cesar remained teaching for UZN for several more weeks. Reyna felt embarrassed and delegitimized by her older, male colleagues, particularly upset that Paulo could not fire her himself, sending his young daughter instead. While the work I did with her supported her confidence in her growing knowledge of English and teaching English, after I returned to the U.S., Reyna was unable to rely on Cesar, Paulo, and Linda for a continued social and professional community. This is the opposite of a community, especially the essence of CoP. Through my continued check-ins during Stage 4, I learned that Reyna was not able to find paid English-teaching work, but was hired as a “volunteer” to teach primary school children, since
she did not yet have a degree. By the end of Stage 4, Reyna was working in a cigar factory, having to wake up at 4 a.m. and leave her small child. She continued to attend university, but was tired from her strenuous schedule.

6.2. Cesar

6.2.1. Background

Cesar was born in Tepetl in 1972 to what he describes as “padres muy pobres, totalmente pobres” [very poor parents, totally poor] (interview, 05/20/17). His dad was a taxi driver and his mom worked as an educator, but he clarified that at that time (in the 1970s) educators were not professionals – anyone who wanted to teach could teach. Following the Nicaraguan Revolution of 1979, when Cesar was nine years old, Cesar’s father left the family for another woman. He said that during this time his mom raised him and his four brothers alone. During the Contra War, when they were still children and adolescents, he and his brothers had to sell food and newspapers – “y así logramos sobrevivir con mi mamá, nos logró sacar adelante, ella trabajaba lavando ropa ajena también. Luchaba para que a nosotros no nos hiciera falta por lo menos el pan de cada día” [and that’s how we managed to survive with my mom, she managed to get us through, she worked washing other people’s clothes as well. She fought so that we did not need at least daily bread] (interview, 05/20/17). After the revolution of 1979, Cesar’s family was a target of violence because of his father’s political leanings. He recalls,

Sí, sí, yo recuerdo porque incluso meses antes de que mi papa nos abandonara, todavía estábamos con él para cuando la revolución del [19]79. A mi papa, pues nosotros sufrimos las vicisitudes de la guardia nacional dirigida por Anastasio Somoza, buscaba mucho a mi papa para matarlo porque era colaborador de la guerrilla, y en ello pues incluso casi matan a toda mi familia en una redada que anduvieron haciendo buscándolo. Una redada y nos encañonaron a todos pues, pero yap or gracia de Dios no nos hicieron nada. Tuvimos que emigrar a Honduras para la revolución y nosotros estábamos aquí en el mismo julio desde el triunfo regresamos como el 23, 24 de julio regresamos, y ya para ese entonces ya mi papa ya no estaba con nosotros. Yo cuando me percaté él ya no- ya no existía, ya se había ido con otra mujer, ya no estaba en la casa. <Yes, yes, I remember because even months before my father left us, we were still with him for the revolution of [19]79. To my dad, because we suffered the vicissitudes of the national guard directed by Anastasio Somoza, they were looking much for my dad to kill him because he was a guerrilla collaborator, and in that, they even almost killed all my family in a raid, they went through looking for him, a raid and they all pointed at us, but by God’s grace they did not do anything to us. We had to emigrate to Honduras for the revolution. After that, the triumph of the revolution changed and we were here the same July. Since the triumph we returned, like on July 23, 24 we returned, and by then my father was no longer
with us. When I realized he no- he no longer existed, he had already left with another woman, he was no longer in the house.

The hardships of Cesar and his family continued through the Contra War, which begun in 1981, two years after overthrow of the Somoza dictatorship. Cesar said that in 1983, only two years after the war began, there was required military service and that one of his brothers fled to the United States to avoid it. They never heard from him again.

Cesar constructed his schooling experience as being interrupted after primaria school, when he went on to study commercial accounting at around 11 years old and started working for the National Development Bank on contract. This would have been only a couple of years after the Contra War began. However, he said that a government law affected him – presumably due to his age – and he was fired after about one year. He returned to finish his secundaria school, then paid for his licensura (a post-secondary degree) with odd jobs. Cesar chose to continue to be involved politically in the Sandinista movement, but found that they did not support him studying for his licensura, so he broke ties with the political party. He demonstrated a sense of powerlessness in political matters, saying, “Entonces me es indiferente el gobierno que esté, el partido que esté. Al fin y al cabo cuando ellos van a hacer sus cosas las haven aunque uno esté en contra o esté en favor, siempre las hacen. No me interesa la politica.” [So to me, it’s indifferent, the government, that is, the party that is. At the end of the day when they are going to do their things they do them, even if one is against or is in favor, they always do them. I’m not interested in politics] (interview, 05/20/17). He understood that in politics, he had no voice, no agency, and thus, no interest. For his licensura, he studied some English, business administration, and computer technology. After his studies, the government granted him a scholarship to obtain a teacher certificate in primary education, which led him to his current position as a computer teacher at the primary school level.

Like Reyna, Cesar is the only one in his immediate family who knows English, although he is related to Enrique, his cousin, who teaches for Access and who taught Reyna three years prior. Cesar had an indirect path to learning and teaching English, and was still struggling to be legitimized as an English teacher by the government. In his teens and through his licensura (college degree), he studied some
English, business administration, and computer technology, the latter in which he received his degree.

After he was hired as a teacher of technology, the government granted him a scholarship to obtain his primaria school teacher certification. At the time of the study, he was a primary school teacher, but also studying his maestria in English teaching:

...[Yo me he venido pagando mis estudios de inglés a punto pues de que ya terminé mi (xx) solo me falta la investigación, la defensa, el seminario de graduación es lo único que me hace falta, que es lo que tengo pendiente para este año, y aquí estoy pues .... y ahora pues de que yo contento porque por lo menos voy a tener la oportunidad de demostrar a cuan capaz soy de poder enseñar inglés, sí, para lo que estoy preparándome. Le agradezco – Al proyecto que usted está formulando. <...I am a primary school teacher, and after that, I have been paying for my English studies to the point that I finished my (xx) only I need the research ((thesis)), the defense, the graduation seminar is the only thing that it is necessary, that is what I have pending for this year, and, well, here I am. At the disposal of - and now well I am happy because at least I will have the opportunity to show how capable I am of being able to teach English, yes, for what I am preparing myself. I thank you then - the project that you are developing>

At the time of the study, Cesar was completing his thesis, which he was able to co-author with another colleague, his evening English teacher (discussed below), who was also working on his maestria. The opportunity to work with me at UZN allowed Cesar “la oportunidad de demostrar a cuan capaz soy” [the opportunity to show how capable I am] to teach English. This opportunity is a critical element of practice that he had not been provided in his studies. Despite my intentions to form the project as something we developed together, Cesar framed the project as one that I am developing. While I initially resisted this, I came to understand that without my agency to initiate the project after Paulo’s invitation to work with UZN, Cesar would not have had the opportunity to practice teach.

6.2.2. Becoming an English teacher

Cesar’s activities related to becoming an English teacher connected to his past as an English learner and his present as a teacher of technology to primaria students. Cesar often made connections from his own experience as an English-learning subject to his developing role as an English-teaching subject, as demonstrated in Chapter 4 Excerpt 4.1, when he works through a process of “reasoning teaching” (K. E. Johnson, 1999) to conclude that, based on his experiences, using the L1 to provide directions in class “doesn’t work.” K. E. Johnson (1999, 2009) notes the shift in understanding of teacher’s knowledge within the field of SLTE, where in the past, it was assumed that teachers came to be
made into teacher subjects through exposure to external, codified knowledge based in research. However, teachers-to-be like Cesar worked through my teacher workshops and curriculum meetings with knowledge, prior experiences, and pre-existing beliefs, demonstrating that teacher’s knowledge comes “from the inside out” (K. E. Johnson, 1999, p. 25). She states, “…our beliefs shape our representation of reality and guide both our thoughts and our behaviors” (p. 30), and these beliefs “…have a cognitive, an affective, and a behavioral component and therefore act as influences on what we know, feel, and do” (p. 30). She continues, “When teachers enter professional development programs at either pre-service or in-service level, they bring with them an accumulation of experiences that manifest themselves in beliefs that tend to be quite stable and rather resistant to change” (K. E. Johnson, 1999, p. 30). This apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) is one reason why teacher’s beliefs are very resistant to change, but they are also a rich resource for idea development, as teachers remember activities that they enjoyed or from which they benefitted and then apply them to their own planning. In Excerpt 6.3 below, Cesar drew on his learning history to propose an idea in our workshop. I was just finishing critiquing the structural elements of an activity that we were analyzing in the Peace Corps manual, and asked Reyna and Cesar how we could change the activity.

Excerpt 6.3 – Cesar draws on prior learning (workshop 2, 05/02/17)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 KAT:</td>
<td>escribir (2.0) escribir acá, acá, acá (.) y es- es como (4.0) el enfoque estructural, muy tradicional (.) y es- es bueno para una actividad, pero (3.0) entonces (1.5) ¿qué más? (2.0) ¿qué más hay? &lt;One writes (2.0) writes here, here, here (.) and it’s- it’s like (4.0) the structural approach, very traditional (.) and it’s good for an activity, but (3.0) then (1.5) what else? (2.0) what else is there?&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CES:</td>
<td>es como buscarle (2.5) para adaptarle comunicativo pero comienza con lo estructural (1.0) buscando una adaptación para interactuación. &lt;it’s like looking (2.5) to adapt it communicatively but one starts with the structural (1.0) looking for an adaptation for interaction&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 KAT:</td>
<td>=sí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

((KAT, REY, CES sit at table, REY L of KAT, CES L of REY, across from KAT; KAT points to paper in middle of table, looks at CES, then points to white board with LH on “enfoque estructural”; KAT points to paper with LH on “es bueno”, then moves hand in circular motion))

((CES looks at and points to white board with RH index finger; KAT and REY look at him; KAT nods at him; CES looks again to white board on “adaptación” then to the Peace Corps manual in front of him))
por ejemplo, una idea (3.0) uh: es (4.0) a: un estudiante, uh: anda a la pizarra y escribe, a ha- a habla (.) um (.) la:: primera: oración, "During (.) colonial (.) times (.) there was (.) un (.) estudiante, uh: anda a la pizarra y escribe, o ha- -o habla (.) um (.) la:: primera: oración, "During colonial times, there was".

sí, complete (.) y- (.) un::: otro estudiante, anda a la pizarra, y:: complete: [el segundo] <yes, complete. And another student, goes to the board, a::nd complete: the second>.

KAT: [(xxx)]

porque (.) también, yo recuerdo la actividad que hicimos (3.0) cuando la profesora (.) buscó un tema (1.5) y la orientación fue la siguiente (1.0) “voy a poner- voy a iniciar un tema (.) voy a iniciar un cuento (1.5) yo lo inicio, (.) fulano lo continua” y dice una frasecita de tres, cuatro, o cinco palabras, y el que sigue lo continúa para que tenga una historia (.) eso lo hicimos hacer como ocho o nueve años (2.0) pero fue en español todo eso fue en español (2.0) dice la profesora, “Una vez, un pajarito iba volando, y se sentó en una línea (.)sigalo”(.) dice otro, “el pajarito,” dice el otro, “era tan bonito (.) tan bonito (.) que todo el mundo se admiraba”=y dice el otro, “y cantaba tan lindo que la gente (.) eh- (2.0) se contentó al verlo=ya allí iba hasta que- hasta que,” alguien dijo (.) “de pronto, un gato saltó, y se lo comió (.) a sea, los demás van dando una idea, “se lo comió el pajarito también [(xxx)]” <because (.) also, I remember the activity we did (3.0) when the teacher (.) looked for a topic (1.5) and the orientation was as follows (1.0) “I’m going to put - I’m going to start a Topic (.) I’m going to start a story. I start it (.) Fulano continues it” and she says a little phrase of three, four, or five words, and the one that follows continues it so that it has a story (.) we did that about eight or nine years ago (2.0) but it was in Spanish all that was in Spanish (2.0) the teacher says, “once, a little bird was flying, and sat on a line (.) continue..."
Cesar picked up on the change that I wanted them consider, demonstrating that he would have to adapt the activity toward interaction (lines 8-9). I waited for 10.0 seconds to see if Cesar or Reyna would begin to generate an idea on how to make the translation activity more interactive, before beginning an idea myself. Cesar was then able to think quickly about activity that he would like to develop, drawing on a past learning experience to extend the suggestion that I initiated in line 13. As theorized in Chapter 2, self-authoring theory (Bakhtin, 1981) supports the interdependent and dialogic activity of identity development, which affects individual agency and what individuals come to see themselves as able to do through discourse. Self-authoring ‘occurs as “one’s own discourse is gradually and slowly wrought out of others’ words”’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 345), that is, as individuals author their own identities through adopting discursive resources and practices” (Menard-Warwick et al., 2019, p. 112, emphasis in the original). He voiced his former teacher, as well as imagined students as he recreated his experience, reshaping it for the English teaching context (line 46).

When it came time to begin planning a lesson after such activity generation, however, Cesar got caught between what he could imagine doing and what he could actually do in the moment, showing potential for development of his actual English-teaching self, not just his imagined English-teaching self. After introducing the Peace Corps TEFL manual and demonstrating common ways to develop a lesson plan (including providing some models) during Workshop 4 (about three weeks after Excerpt 6.3), I asked

| 44 REY: | [@hahahaha] |
| 45 KAT: | [ah @hh=} |
| 46 CES: | =eso puede ser adaptado en inglés también, lo único que con estructura (1.0) hagamos el story (.) podemos llamar, hagamos un story <that can be adapted in English too, the only thing with structure (1.0) let's make a story (.) we can call it, let's make a story> |
| 47 48 | ((REY looks from CES to KAT, smiling)) |
| 48 CES: | ((CES moves both hands from L side of table, making a half circle to R side of table, looking at KAT, then makes circular gesture with LH; CES then uses RH to make small chopping motions on “hagamos”)) |
if there were content or activities in the manual that Cesar and Reyna were particularly interested in developing into a more substantial lesson plan with a goal, purpose, materials, procedure, and some sort of evaluation. Sitting at the table together, the teachers read portions of the manual in silence for 32 seconds after my question, until Cesar raised his right-hand forefinger up, then pointed to a part of a page, saying, “This: topic is interesting for me—we can (2.5) we can=we can do a roleplay?” Cesar was referring to an activity on Nicaraguan folklore. The manual provides 11 short folklore stories that are, as Cesar said, “bien conocido” [well known] in Nicaragua. The directions on how to use the short folklores are open: “Adapt the activities according to which stories you choose” (p. 176), but with no guidance, a teacher could easily fall into making an activity (or larger lesson) centered, at the very least, on translation and repetition. I responded encouragingly, “Ah (.) good idea,” and he reasoned that some of the folk tales were quite short and thus good for beginner students to try. I asked the teachers which story they wanted to start with. After about one minute of self-talk, social talk, and silence, Cesar proposed, “We can ask them to rewrite (1.0) and make the roleplay with their new (1.5) their new version?” I encouragingly responded again, “Yeah, good idea,” explaining that in each story there seemed to be a number of roles from which students could choose (e.g., a man, a queen, a witch). I asked if they were ready; Cesar looked at Reyna and asked if they could do it, Reyna nodded, and Cesar nodded, and Reyna remained mostly quiet.

We began leafing through the packets that I assembled for them both, which included handouts and resources associated with my workshop topics, until we found the lesson plan format sheet. However, as an experienced English language teacher, I had forgotten how long it used to take me to think through not only a lesson, but just one activity, and that the two teachers had never planned or taught an English class, so the process of planning a lesson would take more time than I expected. Excerpt 6.4 below captures the difficulty that Cesar and Reyna had generating ideas for a lesson.
**Excerpt 6.4 – Learning to plan a lesson (workshop 4, 05/30/17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KAT: and what is the: (2.0) purpose. el propósito (.) de esta actividad (.) por qué: (.) por qué: (3.5) (quieren que) los estudiantes cuenten historias?</td>
<td>((CES, REY, KAT sit around center table, which has notebooks and the Peace Corps manual laying on it)). ((KAT points to CES’s notes; loud automobile drives by))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KAT: en inglés (.) historias nicaragüenses en inglés. por qué? (1.5) por qué? &lt;in English (.) nicaraguan stories in english why?&gt;</td>
<td>((CES and REY stop writing and gaze at KAT in silence, presumably thinking about a purpose for the activity)) ((KAT rests left hand in front of mouth when talking, gesturing with open palm on words “turista” and “voluntario.” CES nods twice after “voluntario”))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>KAT: para decirle a un turista? o: a un voluntario? &lt;to tell a tourist? or: a volunteer?&gt;</td>
<td>((CES and REY continue to quietly gaze at KAT) ((REY quietly repeats “turista”, nodding head and looking towards ceiling, displaying a gesture of thinking)) ((REY and CES nod heads, begin to write on the papers in front of them))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KAT: quizás? (0.2) o:: &lt;maybe? (0.2) or::&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>REY: turista &lt;tourist&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KAT: turista? Hay muchas turistas especialmente en (1.6) (x) si? en junio (.) julio (1.0) agosto &lt;tourist? there are many tourists, especially in (1.6) (x) yes? in june (.) july (.) august</td>
<td>((CES orients to work in front of him and generates ideas)) ((CES uses right hand, holding pencil, to extend over and rest on top of the activity planning model. CES begins to read the directions of the activity; REY looks over activity to read it, as well)) ((KAT gets up from chair and walks to backpack in corner of room, next to video recorder; REY begins to leaf through folder of materials at the table)) ((KAT returns to table, opens notebook; REY continues to leaf through documents; CES continues to orient to the example activity plan on the table; KAT begins to write her own activity plan in her journal)) ((CES reads the example purpose on the example activity plan, begins to mouth words in silence, then write in his notebook))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CES: el propuesto (.) to continue to expand (4.0) &lt;purpose&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CES: ((self talk; inaudible))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The excerpt is from a workshop where participants are discussing the purpose of an activity, specifically why students might be asked to tell stories in English about Nicaraguan stories. The discussion includes considerations of telling these stories to tourists or volunteers, and the potential benefit of expanding the activity. The participants also engage in self-talk and consider the purpose of the activity further.
Studying his *maestria* in English at the time of the study, and having years of experience as a teacher (though not an English teacher), Cesar was much more aware of and sensitive to planning lessons and relying on methods and approaches that matched his values. In line 1, Cesar did not know what to title the activity, pausing for 6 seconds before indicating twice in a row that he did not know. I paused before answering, giving some time for Cesar or Reyna to provide an idea before I gave my own. Cesar seemed to agree with the title I suggested, as he wrote it down. Another 19 seconds pass, but in this time, Cesar was unable to move from the title of the activity to developing its purpose. He repeated, “folklore roleplay” after these 19 seconds, showing that he was still thinking about the title. Both Cesar and Reyna sat quietly writing, thinking, and reading for another 33 seconds (line 11). I attempted to move us away from the title and toward thinking about the purpose, which was met with 5 seconds of silence before I began a phrase about the activity’s purpose, leaving it open for them to answer “*por qué*” <why> (line 19). Met again with silence, I proposed a possible reason for telling stories – to tell tourists and volunteers. Reyna took up the answer “*turista*.” Another 34 seconds passed (line 27) while Reyna and Cesar wrote down the purpose – to talk to tourists – in their notebooks. However, in line 28, after the 34-second pause, Cesar repeated the word “*proposito*” <purpose>, followed not by the purpose that I had proposed and that Reyna had acknowledged, but instead reading out loud the purpose that was in front of him on the example lesson plan that I had shown them prior to writing our own lesson plan. That is, Cesar began copying the purpose of a different lesson plan onto the new activity plan that we were creating.

For almost 12 minutes that follow Excerpt 6.4 above, Cesar continued to copy the model lesson plan onto his own sheet of paper, while Reyna took time to explore materials on the table and in her folder, indexing an attempt to familiarize herself with this new process of planning activities, something that she had never before taken part in. I had not initially intended our activity to be based on writing out a structured activity plan and had thought the model would serve as a generator of ideas and allow the teachers to think about why and how a particular activity could benefit students’ practice. Although unexpected for me to see, I did not interrupt Cesar in his moment of copying the model: one must become
methodological before one can question being methodological (Edge, 2011). Modeling how to teach “…can overemphasize a reliance on the reproduction of what already exists, and so constrain creativity,” but such modelling “…should still have a role to play in our work as teacher educators” (Edge, 2011, p. 49). Auerbach & Wallerstein, (1987, pp. vi-vii) state, “Students naturally expect a hierarchical style of education, similar to their previous learning experiences. It is important, therefore, to start with structured activities at the same time that you are creating an environment for student-directed learning” (pp. vi-vii).

Therefore, the type of planning structure that I used with teachers, represented in the excerpt above, allowed the teachers to feel comfortable in a way of learning that they were used to, with me leading ideas and providing models. I would mediate the silence by leaving my sentences open-ended for them to finish with their thoughts. I would let several seconds pass in silence before providing a suggestion, but upon reflection, I was not ready for the long periods of silence and the inability to break our relationship out of a hierarchical intersectionalities (Crenshaw, 1991) that placed me as an “expert” from the Global North with knowledge above the teachers’, that placed Cesar as an experienced teacher who had more knowledge than Reyna, but that placed Reyna and I in a sociocultural category as younger than Cesar, and female, placing our ideas within the social and cultural lifeworld of rural Tepetl. These intersectionalities of subjectivities presented local and global layers of tension that countered attempts at equal dialogue in the Freirian sense, or discourse in the Habermasian sense.

Amelia also noticed Cesar’s determined nature to accomplish the structure of lesson planning. In a second interview, I asked her to recall any specific strengths or obstacles in teaching development that she noticed when working with Cesar and Reyna during our workshops together:

They were both really motivated. Um, they both really wa- really wanted to learn. Reyna obviously had a lower level um: less of a foundation than Cesar did, but she seemed to be more receptive to (.) um: yeah to feedback and to adjustments and suggestions, and Cesar almost seemed to get like a little bit defensive? When I would (.) not correct him but- (.) offer alternatives to the things he was saying or: I don’t know=suggesting a different way to do things. Um::: a little like there was- I noticed a little bit of a resistance there um (5.0). And then both of them I think (.) from what I observed=and I think I talked to you a little bit about this in emails um: but they seemed to have a really hard time (3.0) generating (1.0) yeah, generating ideas? Like they would get really caught up in: how to structure the class and didn’t seem to be able to (2.5) yeah I don’t know just th- the process of like incubation (1.5) and (1.5) yeah, like developing and generating ideas in a lesson plan seemed to be REALLY overwhelming um (.) and
Amelia also observed what I experienced in Excerpt 6.4 above with Cesar’s seemingly anxious reliance on the model lesson plans to construct his own. The western-centric idea of planning out a lesson became a stumbling point, or a block to creativity and ideas, and it was a model that I immediately regretted showing them when I began to see the heavy reliance on it. I recall the day that Amelia speaks about above – Reyna and I went outside to work together on her lesson plan, and I experienced similar thinking blocks with Reyna. Asking specifically what one would teach, why, and how was a new way of thinking that the teachers were just beginning to explore and deciding whether or not they would find it useful.

When I tell Amelia in her interview that I had provided the teachers with some model lesson and activity plans to practice their own thinking about teaching, Amelia remembered the binder in which I had placed them, and how Cesar seemed to orient to the resources. She recalls that he was “frantically flipping” through the model plans, and she draws a connection between this frantic copying and her conception of critical thinking:

I think what I (2.5) experienced there [in Tepetl] was just a totally different way of teaching and I think (.) that I sort of realized (2.0) something that I’ve- that I’ve known for a while, but experienced (.) @hehe=more profoundly in that moment was just that the education here (.) is not- from like elementary school and up at no point are you taught to think critically, analyze, or: (.) or:: (1.5) um (.) engage with texts or with ideas in a way that challenges concepts. Like there’s no- n- I think it’s- and this is generally speaking right? But generally speaking I think that there’s not a lot of critical thinking that’s taught and it’s definitely, you know, a skill that has to be- that everyone has the capacity to DO but (2.0) if it’s not developed (.) if it’s not taught, then what you know how to do is copy down what the teacher put on the board and not really think about the ideas behind the words that you’re copying down. (interview, 07/27/17)

Amelia links Cesar’s seemingly frantic approach to configuring lesson plans and, without knowing explicitly about such concepts like the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), acknowledges that a lot of what Cesar is enacting as a teacher-to-be are likely practices in which he and other teachers and learners had engaged in during their past schooling experiences. Amelia sees this as related to the
capacity for developing critical thinking in education, and she says that changing from copying to critically thinking entails a “rewiring” of mental processing (interview, 07/27/17).

Edge (2011) argues that there are times when copying can make sense, times when change emerges not from the abstractness of theory or reflection but because of “emergent sensibilities” (p. 50), and that “[a]wareness is what counts, awareness of just what it is that one is doing, trying, undergoing” (p. 50). Edge continues,

It is in this sense of trying to master a craft and looking to learn from what has been done and what is being done, to copy from others but to understand why, to respect where one has come from without being limited by it, and to carry over ideas and practices from one domain to another, that I mean Copy to be understood when I suggest that it is an important part of our teacher education praxis. …We can, moreover, each work on our craft and decide, both individually and with our colleagues, which elements of it we wish to preserve and to renew. Let us get down to earth. (Edge, 2011, p. 51)

Exposing teachers-to-be with methodologies and approaches, and allowing them to explore these structures without forming or judging them in their exploration towards what they want to be is what a critical teacher educator does. Copying activity and lesson plans provided Cesar a space to explore an imagined identity (Pavlenko, 2003) of English teacher, even if this identity did not fit my own ideological construction of ELT in Nicaragua. Video data of Cesar, as well as Reyna, capture highly motivated, focused work and dialogue – they appreciated the opportunity to explore how to be an English teacher, one which was never provided them in the past.

Cesar showed, for the first time in the workshops, uncertainty as he began to write a lesson plan. Cesar demonstrated much confidence in providing opinions on global English and English teaching leading up to this point; however, when it came to the activities of being an English teacher, he was less comfortable sharing his ideas. I often needed to provide a small idea from which they could start generating their own ideas or extending mine. Dialogue, in the critical theoretical sense, assumes equal
footing between interlocutors (Crawford-Lange, 1981; Freire, 1970/1993). That is, all interlocutors are able to speak equally about a topic, coming together in “the encounter between men [sic], mediated by the world, in order to name the world” (Freire, 1970/1993, p. 88). However, here, although Cesar demonstrated strong opinions about ELT during our workshops, when it came to actually create a plan – doing the activity of teaching instead of talking about it – he did not have the experience, yet, to do so with confidence.

Despite feeling uncertain about his lesson planning abilities, and understandably so since he had never taught English before, Cesar demonstrated agency and motivation to improve his English and English teaching, like Reyna. Providing workshops and planning meetings gave Cesar the practice necessary to enact and strengthen this new English-teaching self. Later in his interview, when discussing his opportunities for practice, he states,

*Although these days, yes, I have had a lot of contact with the language because I have been coming here on many occasions with — to practice with you, on some nights I was going with a teacher for two hours a day, the teacher gave the whole class in English. He does not give anything in Spanish, then that makes me — it makes me feel a little more accomplished because I say, yes I understand two hours of constant speaking. It is a good level for me.* (interview, 05/20/17)

The evening English class to which Cesar refers is a free class offered by one of his friends and colleagues. Just as Reyna found motivation to return to university for a *licensure* in English after beginning work with me, Cesar also found new motivation after beginning our work together, starting to take the evening course about two months into our work. Cesar was committed to gaining the English competency and English-teaching competency needed, “*luchando*” [fighting] his way to his new career as an English teacher by finishing his *maestria* degree, going to these free night classes, and beginning to teach for UZN. These activities seemed to initiate a small but noticeable shift in Cesar’s thinking about accuracy and fluency, which came after he began teaching English for UZN. English classes began on Sunday, 06/04/17 for Reyna and Monday, 06/05/17 for Cesar. In one of our final meetings together, held
on 06/22/17, Cesar, Reyna, and I first spent time helping Reyna practice an oral dialogue for an upcoming exam in her English class at her university. After helping Reyna practice, Reyna told us that one day she will finally have a command of English, to which Cesar responded in encouragement:

CES: why not try to speak English=it doesn’t matter if
REY: @hahaha
CES: if you can’t- if you can or can’t speak (xxx) try and speak english=
REY: =yeah i know=
CES: uh: (xxxx) and i know that (. ) i appreciate- i appreciate your effort and i appreciate your help=
KAT: =mm=
CES: =thanks a lot=
KAT: =you’re very welcome=it’s my pleasure (. ) and what you just said is really important because it’s not about being perfect in the language….it’s more important to be fluid and just talk=just talk=
CES: =(yeah=yeah=yeah)
KAT: =don’t worry (. ) and (. ) that strengthens your-
CES: -i i will say that even even to: my students i tell them i tell them “if you if you try to speak
    Never- never mind the form=
REY: =yeah=
CES: =that you speak
KAT: =great
CES: the important thing is that you try to speak
KAT: =mhm
CES: if you don- if you don- if you don’t know how to pronounce one word just ask
KAT: =sure
CES: just ask question=just question what about, or how do you pronounce, or what mean the
word, and then you learn=
KAT: =yeah totally (. ) absolutely (. ) that’s great (. ) and it’s true=it’s true you just-
CES: -i - i compare (. ) i compare the: eh (. ) eh (. ) American learner eh Spanish learning- eh
Spanish (. ) Spanish (. ) American learner (. ) i compare them with that they don’t learn? (. )
If they speak uh: a good Spanish but they speak Spanish=
KAT: =sure=
CES: =it doesn’t matter the way but (. ) when we are learning (. ) english (. ) we feel (. ) we feel ashamed we feel ashamed to speak (. ) why? I don’t know why

Once Cesar began teaching classes for the first time, as well as taking classes from his friend who taught only in English (though students negotiated their English use through Spanish), his views on teaching began to change. In past workshops in meetings, Cesar was quick to correct Reyna’s English and my Spanish any time he noticed an error, using a method of immediate other-repair in the form of explicit correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yang & Lyster, 2010), stopping Reyna or me as we spoke to correct us. As he began to teach for the first time, perhaps he experienced situations in which doing this to his students kept them from participating further in class, or had some other adverse effect on the teaching-learning environment that made him rethink how he corrected others. In past workshops, if Cesar
corrected my Spanish, I would always thank him for his help, but also tell him that, due to how I personally learn and notice new information, I – like many language learners (see Izumi, 2003; Mackey, 2007) – will likely not notice that I am making an error, and thus have difficulty making immediate, explicit feedback work for me.

Cesar also stated that he did not know why Nicaraguans are ashamed to speak English. Bourdieu (1991) indicates that language is a medium for implicit social selection, misrecognized as individual shame, laziness, or some other internal fault of the person, which sees individuals collude with systems of oppression in undermining themselves as capable of educational success (Grenfell, 2011). As Holland et al. (1998) state, “Persons look into the world from the positions into which they are persistently cast” (p. 44), so Cesar looks into his fellow Nicaraguan English learners’ world, one in which, as Reyna showed, places significant judgment on those learning English, and misrecognizes their hesitance to use the language as shame, just as Reyna misrecognizes it as apathy. Perhaps it is less about shame and more about avoiding the social gaze of fellow Nicaraguans that keeps learners from using the language. Where there is little encouragement, there is little attempt.

While teaching English for the first time was one possibility that influenced Cesar’s change in thinking, another variable was his new evening English class that he attended, taught by his friend and colleague. Around late May, 2017, Enrique invited me to attend his class with me; he said that he told his teacher about me and that his teacher would enjoy meeting me. I was able to attend three times, and Reyna came once with us. Cesar’s colleague offered a free, varied-level English class that focused solely on speaking, and which resembled a form of Content-Based Instruction (CBI), where language teaching is situated toward the content or subject that students are learning about, providing students opportunities to learn both language and content at the same time (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). I observed a student-centered class, where the teacher gave each student a different term or concept for the week. The student would learn about that term or concept, then each would take their turn explaining the concept to students and answering questions from them. The concepts were starkly different from one another, with no theme
guiding the discussion. For example, on my first visit to class, one student presented on the term “love,” and was able to get quite a philosophical discussion going, in English with some Spanish, with the students and teacher. Another student discussed the concept of “teaching strategies,” which led him to present related concepts of “learning styles” and “multiple intelligences.” Another student present on the difference between a “protest” and a “strike,” which gave the students, all adults of various ages, the opportunity to vent their frustrations in a political conversation about President Daniel Ortega, and to teach me, their guest, about these issues. This class provided Cesar with a strikingly different learning experience from what he experienced in his past, as described in Chapters 4 and 5 about his English learning. The class – fluid, free, and for everyone – opened up a completely new understanding of how he could practice English, pushing him to use the language without solely focusing on accuracy all the time.

6.2.3. Positioning and being positioned by others

As is clear in the analysis of interview and workshop data in Chapters 4 and 5, Cesar positions native speakers as desirable for learning English, and in so doing, positions Standard English as the goal of his and his future students’ language acquisition. In Chapter 4, Section 4.4.4., I analyze and discuss Cesar’s comment that “nadie mejor, nadie mejor que alguien de- del norte, alguien de Estados Unidos, nos diga cómo enseñar y cómo aprender el idioma” [nobody better, nobody better than someone from the north, someone from the United States, should tell us how to teach and how to learn the language] (interview, 05/20/17). Not only does he position the Global North, NES individual as the expert of the English language, regardless if he or she actually knows the English language system, he also positions Nicaraguan English-speaking experts – his teachers – as suspect:

Yo no sé, pero cuando un profesor de aquí me corrige una palabra yo no quedo muy convencido, salvo que lo escuché muy convencido a él. Pero entonces cuando él me corrige y no estoy muy convencido yo me voy a mi Dict Box – Busco la palabra y miro a donde tiene el énfasis de voz, a donde – ya, para discutir @haha. <I don’t know, but when a professor here corrects me on a word, I am not very convinced, except that I listened to him very convinced. But then when he corrects me and I’m not very convinced I go to my Dict Box. I look for the word and look at where it has voice emphasis, where - already, to discuss @haha> (interview, 05/20/17)

Cesar would rather get his advice from a cell phone app, called “Dict Box,” than from the humans
around him, demonstrating his placing accuracy over fluency and social meaning. Despite never having worked with a native-English speaker until having met me, he still thinks native-speaker access is important, and if he cannot get physical access to a native-speaking voice, then tech access will do. He distrusts corrections from non-native speakers, positioning their knowledge as inferior.

Cesar’s agency to be a proficient English speaker and teacher of English is restricted by environmental forces. The type of job he has, as well as his geographic location, limits his use of and need for it.

KAT: ¿Cuántas – cuántas veces al mes y de qué manera está expuesto al inglés? <How many - how many times per month and in what way are you exposed to English?<

CES Mi role, el maestro - yo trabajo con el estado – me limita mucho. Me limita mucho vincularme con los turistas, me limita mucho de hablar con gente que habla el inglés, y eso pues me reduce aunque yo me mantenga en contacto con el inglés por – por las noches, como le contaba. O cuando me siento a ver noticias yo mucho miro CNN, el de Atlanta, en inglés. <My role, the teacher - I work with the state - limits me a lot. It limits me a lot to connect with tourists, it limits me a lot to talk to people who speak English, and that limits me even though I keep in contact with English at - at night, as I told you. Or when I sit down to watch the news I watch CNN, the Atlanta one, in English>. (interview, 05/20/17)

Because of his career as a technology teacher in a rural town not often visited by outsiders, Cesar is limited in contact with speakers of English and has little use for English professionally and personally. He wants to be known not just as an educator, but as an English educator. To be an English educator is really important for his own personal desires and professional development, and he made clear his attempt to break free of being a technology teacher at a primary school, desiring a new identity as an English teacher:

Y ahí me he mantenido desde entonces como profesor de informática. De hecho yo he estado luchando, luchando, peleando, cuestionando para que me dejen en la disciplina de inglés, pero como repito, es de mi interés fortalecer esa habilidad. La quiero, aunque sea lo último, aunque llegué a donde San Pedro ((knocking)) "good morning" @hahaha <And that's where I've been since I've been a computer science teacher. In fact I have been fighting, fighting, fighting, questioning to be left in the English discipline, but as I repeat, it is in my interest to strengthen that ability. I want it, even if it's the last, although I got to where San Pedro ((knocking)) "good morning" @hahaha> (interview, 05/20/17)

Cesar demonstrates an emotionally strong desire to know English and be known as an English teacher, so strong that he jokes that he wants it even if it is the last goal he reaches before he dies, referencing Saint Peter at the gates of heaven.
With Cesar, we came together in ways that demonstrated respectful disagreement and, at times resistance, toward each other’s ideas. As K. E. Johnson (1999, 2009) argues, teacher’s beliefs are very resistant to change, and with ten years of experience as a teacher and many years of experience as a lifelong English learner, Cesar had much to say about English language teaching. While Cesar also had limited access to English-teaching opportunities prior to our work together, he had access to education, English education, and social interaction without needing his relationship with me, specifically, to open opportunities in those regards. Therefore, while this opportunity to teach was very important to Enrique, and he showed it with nervousness, excitement, participation, and gratitude, he was more able than Reyna to navigate his teaching situation towards the future that he desired as an English teacher, with or without my partnership with him. After I returned to the United States and commenced Stage 4 of my research, checking in with the participants to learn where their English-teaching careers had taken them, I learned that Cesar was more successful achieving his English-teacher subjectivity than turn of events than Reyna was. He was able to finally successfully transition from a technology teacher to an English teacher, teaching English for the Young Learning Program sponsored by the U.S. Embassy, and receiving pay. His position at UZN lasted several weeks longer than Reyna’s, and his higher degree, English competence, and status as an older male in Tepetl likely helped him succeed in his dream to be an English teacher.

6.3. Enrique

6.3.1. Background

At the time of the study, Enrique was 42 years old. He was born in a small town roughly an hours’ drive away, but raised in a small town just 11 miles from Tepetl, until he was 14, when his father died and his mother and three brothers moved to Tepetl. Early on, within his family and community, Enrique was displaying leadership skills. He states that at that time, he felt a very strong responsibility for the family because his mother felt alone and depressed. His oldest brother left the family and now lives in the United States. He does not contact the family, but Enrique calls him once in a while. Although Enrique had a difficult upbringing, he describes his childhood as beautiful, saying, “I have really beautiful
memories” (interview, 06/26/17). When he was younger, Enrique’s dream was to become a professional athlete. He played baseball, soccer, volleyball, and other sports. He admired the athletes on TV holding the torch for the Olympic games. One night, he stated that the entire town experienced a power outage. He explains:

I mean, the whole town was, you know, dark, completely dark. I remember, and I just call all my f- I was, oh gosh, I was, I think I was seven. Seven years, six, seven. And then I called all my friends and then uh, it was so beautiful and quiet, you know, and then I just uh: looked for a- I used to look for a broomstick? But not the whole broomstick, though – just part of it. And then, I broke it into two pieces and then I, just get the newspapers? And then I made like a ball with them and then I just tied em and the tip, the stick. And then just- I just started lighting em with this, pretending to be a torch! Yes. It was the OLYMPic torch. And then I remember that I used to run through all: the streets of the town and all the kids were running after me – “Ahhhh!” It was – it was very fun….THAT’S BEAUTIFUL….so pretending that we were at the Olympic games. (interview, 06/26/17)

When asked what made him change his passion from wanting to become an athlete to becoming a teacher, Enrique responded that he met a woman and wanted to get married, so he could not become an athlete. He did not specify why, but said that leaving behind his dream “was kind of hard to deal with because uh: I was like very depressed because I COULdn’t do it. I COULdn’t make it, so: that was kind of painful to me” (interview 06/26/17). He dealt with depression for about five years, and that was the early days of his teaching profession. Thus, unlike Reyna and Cesar, who dreamed of becoming English teachers, Enrique saw English teaching as a fallback career because he could not attain his dream of becoming an athlete.

Enrique began to learn English on his own when he was quite young. As briefly analyzed in Chapter 4, when he was just five or six, he would sit on the floor of his home watching TV and movies from the 1980s. He continued to demonstrate curiosity for English throughout his childhood, taking his brother’s Hulk comic books and figuring out what certain words meant. However, at age thirteen, when Enrique began his education in English in secundaria, as was the MINED policy in the 1980s and 1990s, he soon found that not only was he more advanced than his peers, but also his teachers. He remembers:

and when I had my first teacher? when I took my first (course) (. ) I mean I’m- I’m not (. ) just giving the credit to myself but I HAD good teachers I’ve LOVED (. ) um all of my life experiences uh I have received, all of what my teachers taught me (but) I remember when I took my first course, I knew a few few words- just a few words. or phrases and things but but I remember when I took THAT course, I wanted more. I- I
remember that my teacher- it’s a lady-HE’s here in Tepetl. She. … yeah but I remember that- m:: we used to write words on the board and she just (would) have the marker (and) write on the board just like dictation? tomato- I remember- tomato, vegetable, things like (that) things like that. but I wanted more=you know-I wanted something more active yeah (. ) so was it was okay because I learned. I learned. (interview, 06/26/17)

Enrique’s first experience teaching actually came when he was still a student, when he was about 20 years old, when his teacher suddenly left the class for three months and put Enrique in charge. The sporadic nature of schooling in rural Nicaragua leaves many students with limited options to continue their study, and Enrique was one of these students:

The longest I have had a teacher (. ) is: (. ) was for three months and then again it was like (cycle)=and then again I (. ) didn’t have a teacher so (all the cycle) like that and (. ) (oo) For many years but I always had the (position) to learn. I want to learn=I want to (. ) disCOVer more. I remember when I do the course (. ) my (. ) This time was like uh it was a great experience for me because my teacher just went to the States?=I I I had a course with him (for three months) and then he said okay I’m leaving to the states=I’m leaving for the states uh (. ) you’re going to be in charge=“why me?” “because you’re my best student” (x) so I (had to) teach the older students were coming after my class=yeah=and Saturdays I remember and on weekdays on Saturdays I remember (and it was my) FIRSt experience teaching. (interview, 06/26/17)

The transient nature of teaching and learning that Enrique experienced about 30 years ago still occurs today in much of Nicaragua. The metaphor of this transient “cycle” of broken pathways to attainment of English still did not deter Enrique from becoming highly proficient in the language.

6.3.2. Being an English teacher

With Enrique, we fell into subjectivities of comradery, where – because of our several years’ experience teaching, often in difficult situations, we were able to form a bond, vent to one another, and give each other advice on teaching. Of the three teachers, I felt that Enrique and I had the most equitable relationship, and for someone who had little advance notice and likely had little say in opening his classroom to my presence, he worked with me with kindness, humor, and professionalism. With over 20 years of teaching experience in a variety of subjects and languages, for different age groups and nationalities (he also taught Spanish to tourists in Managua in the past), Enrique’s language-teaching self was well formed. When I asked him if he had ever received training to become an English teacher, he said the following:
ENR: (like xxx) in those days no (.). like I started like- kay so my (xx) just came like i- i- i- taught? myself? as a teacher taking action in the classroom=I don't know (.). uh (1.5) and then I remember when I um (.). took my classes at university [20:11] to be a teacher? I had (.). eight or nine years teaching experience
KAT: okay so you had had- HAD a bunch of teaching experience=
ENR: =uhuh=
KAT: =then you went to univer(sity)
ENR:                                         (after) yes
KAT: and (you) got a teaching certificate and all of that but you were already (.).
ENR: @huh
KAT: THAT'S really cool=
ENR: =uhuh=
KAT: =so with that experience then=when you had your teachers' certificate program was it- -was it helpful for you or do you feel like you already knew:
ENR: oh okay (4.0) I mean (.). some part was (.). interesting for me because I mean I learned?= KAT: =uhuh=
ENR: =I learned (.). new things but (.). I wanted more=I NEEDED more. I needed more because uh the rest of my classmates (.). okay it w- it was a class that (.). all the classmates were NOT at the same level.
same level (.). the same level of learning so uh: most sometimes were like uh (this mountain)
KAT: dang
ENR: yes because others are like eh elementary level or intermediate and a few of us were advanced

Enrique learned by doing, with little support from a teacher training program. Because of his advanced proficiency, Enrique likely began surpassing the acquisition of his teachers, leading him to have to navigate on his own. In a Foucauldian sense, Enrique was undergoing a process of relating his subject self (a learner-of-English-teaching) to his object self (an English teacher): “…it is the activity of seeking and discovering that makes or constitutes the self as both an active seeker and sought after object” (McGushin, 2011, p. 129). As he actively sought more knowledge as a subject, at the same time he was seeking a new self – the object of this new knowledge acquisition. When Enrique expresses himself through the activity of teaching himself, he is managing a constant process of becoming (Reis, 2011, p. 34), but what he lacks in this process and so importantly needs is a mediating artifact (Engeström, 1987) to push his development. Not only, then, does Enrique become the subject and object of his becoming (his outcome), but also his own mediating artifact toward achieving the outcome that he wanted. He acknowledges that he did learn from the university program; however, his 8-9 years of teaching experience, which he describes as learning how to teach by being “a teacher taking action in the classroom,” is where he began to form his identity-in-activity (Johnson & Golombek, 2016) to the point where his own capabilities surpassed the quality of the English programs he was required to take.
Enrique did not receive official teacher development or training that really helped his development until he became a teacher for the U.S. Embassy’s English Access Microscholarship Program in 2013. A friend of Enrique’s recommended him to the program and he interviewed for the position at the NGO school in Tepetl. When the interviewers asked him why he thought it would be a good opportunity to work for the program, he said that he saw the Access Program’s logo on the wall – a Nicaraguan flag waving with an American flag, accompanying the phrase “Estamos Unidos” [We are United] and he responded to them, “That’s what I want to be” (interview, 06/26/17). He continued that it was something really meaningful to him and that he wanted to make a difference in the lives of youth in Tepetl. He taught the very first Access Program cohort from 2013-2015 (in which Reyna participated), then said that there was a two-year hiatus of the program in the Tepetl location. At the time of the study, he was taking the second Tepetl cohort through their first several months of the two-year program. With the Access Program, Enrique said that they always have teacher training opportunities, roughly three or four a year, and that they are very good: “I definitely learned a lot, yes” (interview, 06/26/17).

Because of Enrique’s prior stages of becoming, at the time of the study he was experienced, knowledgeable, and confident. Enrique enacted teaching through a variety of communicatively-based approaches, including task-based language teaching (TBLT), in which the students worked individually, in groups, or holistically as an entire class to move through a learning task focused on exchanging meaning through working on a “real-world” task (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Because TBLT can often span more than one activity or lesson, students build on the task outside of class and, without a doubt, conduct many parts of the task in their L1. While this was a concern of Cesar’s in Chapter 5, Excerpt 5.4, as he critiqued Johan’s critical, task-based lesson on making a recycled book, Enrique demonstrated no signs of concern with either L1 use or the time it took to move students through a task. One of the tasks that Enrique required his students to do was participate in the imaginary “International School of English.” For this task, students had to individually work on their own inside and outside of class. Each student imagined that they were in an International School of English in Nicaragua. Each student
represented a country and was interviewed in English by Enrique, who held up a fake microphone to each student, about various aspects of their country. The students gave various responses in English, but a particularly interesting part of this task was that students also were encouraged to use the official languages of the countries that they represented. The students and Enrique used English, the language of their country, Spanish, and Nicaraguan Spanish fluidly within each interview. Breaking the L1-L2 dichotomy, Enrique motivated his students in a fun and engaging manner to go beyond Spanish and English in his English class, promoting a translingual orientation to language use (Canagarajah, 2013). While drawing on a student’s L1 is not out of the ordinary in a second- or foreign-language classroom, promoting a language outside of the L1 or L2 is less common; however, by doing so, the students used more English in the interview task with Enrique than they often used during a typical class. At the same time, Enrique was incorporating a task-based project where students had to work outside of class (presumably a lot in their L1s) and over an extended period of time. Unlike Cesar’s concern over using the L1, Enrique encouraged students in English and other languages, and in so doing, allowed them to develop linguistic and cultural awareness, as well as presentation skills and confidence in a fun way.

Teaching English also required active, physical participation by Enrique and his students. Gesture, facial expressions, and full use of the body for expression were common features of his teaching and his students’ learning. On many occasions, Enrique took the students outside of the classroom to work in the CSB’s cafeteria. The students would fold the tables and push them aside, so they could use the long, open building as an activity space. Enrique did a variety of activities in the space, one involving a game for which students formed groups of four or five, and lined up. Enrique placed one chair for each line of students on the other side of the cafeteria. Several phrases written on strips of paper rested on each of the chairs. Enrique would count to three and the first student in each line would race to their chair, grab a strip of paper, then race back to their group to show them. The fastest student would win the chance for their group to be the first to give a response to the teacher – a complete sentence using the word written on the paper – winning points for their group with a correct response. During the co-teaching activity
represented below in Excerpt 6.5, Enrique employs motivation, encouragement, humor, and physical and mental exercise for his students:

**Excerpt 6.5 – Racing to Create Sentences**

| 1 ENR: all right=one (.) two (.) three | 17 ENR: Cindy help me out |
| 2 (6.0) | 18 CIN: making= |
| 3 ENR: all right=KEYla=KEYla= | 19 ENR: =MAKing (.) you can HELP her=xx=[help] |
| 4 KEY: =huh?= | 20 ST2: [mak]ing |
| 5 ENR: =(.) hey (.) come on | 21 my lunch= |
| 6 KEY: um: hanging out?= | 22 ENR: =huh?= |
| 7 ENR: =uh-huh= | 23 ST2: MAKing my lunch |
| 8 ST1: =i (.) i love hanging out with my family | 24 ENR: I’m making my lunch=come on, Cindy=algún |
| 9 because is very (.) (conversing) | 25 idea=I’m making my lunch |
| 10 (1.0) | 26 CIN: (xx) |
| 11 STS: [@hahaha] | 27 ENR: huh: |
| 12 ENR: [@hahaha] | 28 NXI: (xx) |
| 13 ST1: [(xxx)] | 29 ENR: yes but |
| 14 ENR: ah: okay=good=okay=>he=good (.) all right | 30 (2.5) |
| 15 (4.0) | 31 ENR: huh? |
| 16 ENR: another sentence (.) help me out | 32 ST3: making out |
| (2.5) | 33 ENR: hanging out=yes? |
| 17 ENR: Cindy help me out | 34 STS: (@hahaha) |
| 18 CIN: making= | 35 CIN: (xxxx) |
| 19 ENR: =MAKing (.) you can HELP her=xx=[help] | 36 ENR: oh:=I’m making (.) my lunch in the morning |
| 20 ST2: [mak]ing | 37 good=there you go, Cindy |

((CES stands to side of STS, lined up in four rows, raises RH, drops it on “three”))
((Four STS run to four chairs, pick up strip of paper, and run back to their lines))
((ANG walks from back of line, where she has run to the wall, to the front))

((ST1 quickly waves RH in air, then down))
((ENR raises RH, then places papers in RH between ribs and arm to initiate clapping; STS clap))

((ENR looks to ST2, raises RH in air))
((ENR points to the line of STS behind CIN with RH))
((ST2 offers an idea))

((ENR points to CIN))
((ENR looks to C2, raises RH in air))
((ENR points to CIN with RH, then raises RH in air, points again to ST2 when repeating her answer))
((ENR moves one step toward NXI with RH cupping ear))

((ENR uses RH index to make horizontal lines in air three times, then cups his ear again))
((ENR walks to another student and his group, with RH raised))

((ENR addresses ST3 then walks back to CIN))
((STS laugh at ST3’s joke))
((ENR steps toward CIN, nods twice))

((ENR high-fives CIN, initiates clapping; STS clap; NXI goes to back of line and receives high five from a group member))

As Enrique explained to me earlier on in our work together, “We have fun a lot” (field note 6/7/17). He often told me that he did not like the textbook and that it was restrictive. He said his goal was to get through two pages a day, but that he was a few pages behind where he should be according to the
Access syllabus. Enrique told me that he likes “breaking the rules,” not following the guide and creating his own activities, doing his own thing. “I can do it better,” he said (field note, 06/08/17). Enrique demonstrated active resistance to some of the language policy requirements of the Access program, like textbook use. Unlike Cesar, who argued that “nobody better” than North Americans should “tell us what to do” (interview, 05/17/17), Enrique “can do it better” than North Americans and their textbooks. In Excerpt 6.5 above, Enrique took some vocabulary from the textbook, combining it with other vocabulary, and, instead of making students do the associated textbook activity, brought “activity” to its physical essence, moved students to the cafeteria, and introduced a fun competition game. He showed encouragement by giving high-fives to each student and clapping after each of their responses. He promoted others to support their peers in line 19 when he called on students to help out their classmate, Cindy. In the video, students high-fived and encouraged one another after they gave responses. Enrique laughed, nodded, joked, smiled, supported, and, lastly, encouraged students a second and third time to try again after giving incorrect or incomplete answers.

Enrique showed a sincere desire for watching youth grow and develop into better people. While the content of his class is English and students are expected to acquire a good command of it through the two-year program, the goal he has as a teacher goes far beyond English. He is committed to his students' intellectual and emotional growth. In one field note (06/19/17), I write about how Enrique brought a student in front of the classroom and told the others about the student’s recent achievements at a regional soccer tournament, in which his team won first place. The student humbly wore his soccer medal around his neck as Enrique spoke about him for several minutes. On another occasion (06/27/17), Enrique brought a cake for one of the student’s birthdays. Enrique demonstrated sincere interest in the lives of his students, and worked to lift their feelings towards themselves. For Enrique, the students drive him. His students are his “legacy” (field note 6/19/17), where he is “trying to help some of my students find their own world (interview, 06/26/17). He often told me that he wanted them to be better than he was, and to go beyond him. He loved working for Access, finding it to be a program that would support him in going
beyond standard teaching for his students: “I feel like I am myself ((pauses, reflecting)) in the way I’ve always wanted to be” (field note 06/07/17). Foucault (1988) calls “the care of the self” (souci de soi) the activity of facing the paradoxical task of being ourselves, which is a relational activity to our own selves as agents and objects, as well as to others (McGushin, 2011). Enrique understands the relational character of his subjectivity, noting how his ability to discover and express himself are relational activities— they’re social, and they form, maintain, and intensify the relationships that he has with himself and his students. As Enrique fought through the hardship of poverty and losing his father, bullying through his school years, hunger and depression in his later years, his English and English-teaching abilities are resources that he uses to help his students find a different world from their own hardships.

I can make better things, nice things with my life (. ) cuz I feel like it’s a- an empty life just giving to myself basically (. ) and when I share something with my students, a vision, a dream, all (. ) I feel great I- I’m trying to help you know (. ) other people=I remember (. ) just like I said when I look back my- my- how-you-say my background when I was an athlete when I was a kid with that torch

The leadership quality Enrique had since he was a kid carrying the “Olympic” torch during the power outage has been a stable part of his identity through the years. Like he led other kids down the dark streets of his town, so did he lead other students when his teacher neglected his responsibilities and left Enrique in charge of his English class for three months. He led the best grades as a student, started three English programs at three different schools (interview, 06/26/17), and was now leading an English class for some of the most vulnerable children in Tepetl, surpassing his English teacher subjectivity to form a stable self that students could trust, look up to, and work on their own selves with.

**Excerpt 6.6 – Cesar’s positive, motivating chant at the end of each class**

| 1 ENR: i just hope you enjoyed the activity=did you enjoy the class? | ((CES, AME, and STS stand close together in a huddle in the cafeteria, each with an arm extended into the center of the huddle)) |
| 2 ST1: YES we [(x)] | ((ENR continues to smile)) |
| 4 ALL: [YE]AH::: | |
| 5 ENR: DID YOU ENJOY THE CLASS? | |
| 6 ALL: YEAH::: | |
| 7 ENR: WHO’S NUMBER ONE | |
| 8 ALL: AWESOME=WE ARE | |
| 9 ENR: WHAT’S THE LIMIT= | |
| 10 ALL: =THE SKY= | |
| 11 ENR: =WHAT’S THE LIMIT= | |
| 12 ALL: =THE SKY | |
This loud, positive chant contains several uplifting words and phrases that students repeated before leaving class. The chant included everyone. When Reyna took Enrique’s class, she called it “a gift” (interview, 05/17/17). Drawing from his own personal history of hardship, including the structural and political inequalities he suffered in his past teaching experiences, Enrique created an atmosphere for himself and his students that suspended their hardships for a couple of hours each weekday, and used English as the anchor to teach humanization.

### 6.3.3. Positioning and being positioned by others

Like Reyna and Cesar, Enrique was self-motivated to learn English and learn much of it by himself as a child, so when he had his first course at 13 or 14 years old, he knew many words and phrases that his peers did not know. When he moved to Tepetl as a teenager, Enrique recalls of the other students at his school, “I remember I SUFFERed a lot when I came to Tepetl. But believe me, I was mistreated….Uh, they noticed I was different. I FELT different (from) all of them” (interview, 06/26/17). He was a very good and competitive student, the best in his class, and the other best student, a girl, was his only friend. He remembers that the students would bully him: “I remember some of my classmates (.) spit at me” (interview, 06/26/17). When the teacher named him the best student and most positive student, and when he obtained the best grades in the class, the other students did not like this. His narrative echoes Reyna’s experience being called “gringa de montaña” [gringa from the mountain], both of them being positioned by their peers, from perhaps a space of resentment, as trying to be better than everyone.
Enrique said that he began to be positioned as an individual of respect after he transitioned from being a student to being a teacher of English: “so I started feeling more respect—I was a teacher—bilingual=they know me (.) people know who I am= I mean I am the teacher (.) they say “oh Teacher Rick. Teacher Enrique,” yeah. You know me that’s what I do=That’s what I do=I tell- I tell the world=I tell the people that’s what I AM. I’m not a rich man. (.) I’m an English teacher” (interview, 06/26/17). As others began to position him as one deserving of their respect, Enrique positions those who used to bully him as “losers” (interview, 06/26/17). Just as Reyna positions those who do not care about English as “ignorant,” Enrique differentiates his personal and professional pathway from theirs:

I am a teacher (.) that’s what I do (1.0) that’s right oh like I said (.) I have to uh: I’ve been through many difficult things (.) (I said) that (.) but I guess it’s really hard (.) it’s really hard (.) here in Tepetl (.) yes (.) but well (.) I’m here now. and I see those guys= all of them= one of them the one who used to spit on me (.) um: he’s a physical education teacher and for me you know it’s like (.) no offense okay? (1.5) @hh (.) I don’t care I see those people are ordinary people for me=I don’t care (xx) (.) and the other? His brother? Is what= a drunk? (1.0) tch (.) mr. nobody? (1.5) and that? I don’t care (3.0) my life my life goes on=I mean and now I guess I: the i- (.) I think like really bad with myself if I: (.) if I had (.) I mean a chance to be in a position to pay too much attention to their behavior (.) I mean I didn’t let affect that (2.0) personality (.) person had become and now I see (.) I say, “oh wow. (.) tch. they struggle”=that’s it. many times I say, I tell myself that I am weak (.) I say “no I am not weak (.) I am strong.” (.) I am strong. (interview 06/26/17)

While Enrique had the respect of the community for becoming a bilingual teacher, he still struggled under the positioning of his superiors. As briefly described in Chapter 3 when introducing Enrique as a participant, he worked as a teacher at other schools besides CSB. A constant stress of his was finishing grading and other administrative duties that the principal of one of the schools made him do. According to Enrique, these duties were the responsibility of the principal, but Enrique was forced to do them. Enrique also lamented about receiving paychecks late, or even reduced, and other hardships placed on him by the educational institution that kept him from economic stability. Therefore, knowing English, while socially satisfying, did not live up to its vocational and economic promises for Enrique.

When it came to positioning me within his English-teaching experience for two months, he saw me as a sort of affirmation to his English and English teaching abilities. I was a sounding board for ideas, but mainly I was someone who had gone through some similar struggles as an ESL instructor in the United States, from being underpaid and overworked to dealing with unmotivated students to having to
navigate problems of the administration or institution. In essence, I was a safe person for Enrique to confide about his life as an English teacher in Tepetl. This collegiality and friendship was an important part of the SLTE of Enrique, even in such an advanced stage of his career. As he said during one of the final times we dialogued together about my presence in his classroom, “I graduated” (field note 07/19/17). To him, my presence and my acknowledgment of his capacity and identity was enormous for him. It validated that what he has been doing all these years is profoundly impactful, a validation that he did not receive from his Nicaraguan colleagues and superiors.

For Enrique, positioning me as a native speaker of English was not the same as positioning me as an expert of the language, as it was for Cesar when he positioned me as such. Enrique understood my native-speakerness – or my accent and intonation, as he says below – as socially connecting to others who are different from him and his students.

ENR: =when you adjust your: uh: accent or intonation (like that) simple thing in class like (you) did today=(2.0) if you have (the) way of pronouncing English=I mean I’m not like I’m not talking to you like I’m the master, I am the oh the mama hen

KAT: @hehe

ENR: @hehe (n- not kind) (. ) okay, and uh uh even when you adjust, that (thing) that is a SIMple thing, (maybe) that person may think like it’s very simple but it’s not. uh: (. ) the intonation: (1.5) you sound different (. ) your accent sounds different (1.0) it’s YOU who sounds different(.) people are to see different (.) and they are going to feel very different.

KAT: mm (. ) interesting

ENR: it is because (. ) you project (. ) another thing (. ) that you didn’t (. ) project before. and it’s like a: new personality (2.0) it is like eh: new person that (. ) wants to have new things and wants to get new goals in life. and (. ) why? because communication provides that (. ) in the way we speak to people (. ) in the way you TREAT people (. ) (xx) to treat. that’s it.

Enrique’s thinking about pronunciation resembles the notion of performativity (Austin, 1962; Butler, 1990), where one performs a new identity through making, what he says, a “simple” change that makes one feel like a “new person.” Subjectivity is something that is fluid and that changes with language development, and that change in subjectivity allows for a change in motivation and perspective. Prior to learning his perspective on accent and pronunciation, I concerned myself with legitimizing the NNES’s

20 “Momma hen” is a reference to an earlier discussion about a teacher educator in Costa Rica whom Enrique and others affectionally called.
accent and pronunciation as just as legitimate as an NES’s, especially because Cesar was adamant about positioning me and other North Americans as expert speakers. Enrique helped me understand that the performance of accent and pronunciation does not have to be about aiming for an impossible goal of sounding “native.” Working towards a different accent and pronunciation allows for students to imagine, perform, and become different through their developed competence. Enrique also helped me understand that sharing or promoting aspects of U.S. culture, like the textbook used by Access, is not necessarily disconnected to their own culture and values. As Enrique describes below, after I taught the class the “Pledge of Allegiance” for the Fourth of July, adhering to the Access Program’s policy that American cultural activities should be included in classroom lessons, Enrique argued that these cultural materializations allow students to expand their understanding and awareness of the world:

ENR: and the class like the uh: cultural lesson? [that we] had today?
KAT [yeah]
ENR: the – the pledge of uh-
KAT: the pledge of allegiance
ENR: allegiance (. ) and (. ) (xx) because I remember that (. ) i- i just uh: have seen that movie for example
KAT: [oh yeah]
ENR: [an old] movie i like watching=(very quick, low speech)=i love that movie this guy uh: is uh: kindergarten cop?
KAT: yeah (. ) ((with Arnold Schwarzenegger))
ENR: ((with Arnold Schwarzenegger))=yeah it’s pretty funny= I love that movie
KAT: @haha yeah
ENR: and the kids like “yeah yeh” pretending to be (xxx)
KAT: totally, i remember that
ENR: that’s really great (. ) i love that movie
KAT: yeah you’re right the pledge of allegiance is in a lot of (. ) films=a lot of American films so-
ENR: -and it’s great that you brought (. ) you actually created that=opportunity that environment that atmosphere in class=that’s really great because this is something new=now they have a different point of view (with) something they have to like uh: make it work or- or value (in places) we have another culture (x) of culture

The enjoyment of Hollywood film is universal – produced by the United States but belonging to all to consume and enjoy. The nationalism represented in the Pledge of Allegiance is a symbolic representation similar to rituals enacted by youth in Nicaragua’s schools, and Enrique argues that this “different point of view” allows for students to learn about those similarities and differences, but also
expands understandings of government, politics, patriotism, ritual, and more. After fieldwork ended with Enrique, I learned from him that he had his students perform the Pledge of Allegiance at an Access competition against other students taking part in Access at different sites in Nicaragua. Enrique was reminded of a ritual seen years ago in a movie, and further adapted it for his own purposes with his students.

6.4. Concluding the chapter

In this chapter, I show how the teacher participants’ and my different historical backgrounds, political experiences, and social and cultural identities shape our sense-making processes of who we are as English language educators in the moments of interaction together. Our separate subjectivities came together in different ways to evolve into three separate working relationships, and I varied my approach to criticality with each teacher. I understood my relationship with Reyna as one of apprenticeship, Cesar as one of resistance, and Enrique as one of comradery. By analyzing my own teacher-educator subjectivity as co-constructed in the process of working with the three teachers, I found issues with my ideological notions of criticality, including that being positioned as a Global-North NES and “expert” is not necessarily harmful – for Enrique and Reyna, my identity empowered and legitimized their sense of teaching selves, allowing them to receive a sense of validation of their efforts that they might not have felt if I were not positioned as an expert. For Cesar, however, it held him from valuing his and his NNES teachers’ expertise over my own, and this was the concern that I had which propelled a critical identity in me in the first place. In the final chapter, Chapter 7: Conclusion and Implications, I review the findings from Chapters 4-6 with the ultimate goal of contributing knowledge to Global North and Global South teacher-education partnerships, whether they are research-oriented, practice-based, or both. I synthesize the findings to suggest how educators can partner together to create critically-aware and practical English programs in low-income, peripheral areas in the Global South. I also draw implications for disciplinary theory and classroom pedagogy in relation to the critical paradigms of LPP and SLTE, as well as a reflection on the caveats to this research study.
Chapter 7

Conclusion and Implications

“There is an implicit assumption that implementation is an event, that change occurs next Tuesday or in September”
(Hopkins, 1987, p. 195)

The above quotation is used in Wedell’s (2011) chapter on technology in ELT in developmental contexts in order to highlight that change in ELT, especially on the periphery, takes sustained effort over a substantial period of time. I extend his argument to include the fields of ELP/CLP and CSLTE, where this study is situated. Wedell states, “The more ambitious and demanding an educational change is, in terms of its scale, and in terms of the degree of difference it hopes to bring about in what happens in classrooms, the longer it will take” (2011, p. 278). The significance of this study lies not necessarily in changing participants’ and researcher’s thinking, as Hawkins and Legler (2004) indicate is the most common outcome of teacher-researcher collaborative research, but – as Hawkins and Legler advocate – its significance lies in how the study’s design and findings contribute to disciplinary theory and practice in the areas of ELP/CLP and CSLTE. In this critical ethnographic case study, my primary concern, then, was theoretical and methodological: my questions and methodology addressed the potential for synthesis of conventional, critical, and alternative discourses drawn on and enacted by participants and researcher, with the ultimate goal of contributing knowledge to building ethically-minded, critically-aware English programs in low-income, peripheral areas in the Global South. That is, while not necessarily intending to change the discourses-in-activity emerging from my research project, my goal is that my methodology, descriptions, analyses, and conclusions inform future partnerships at the CLP-CSLTE interface, an imperative issue that – based on my findings – has not changed much in the roughly 30 years of critical research in this area. With this goal in mind, I have explored ways that this is possible by first documenting the most salient conventional discourses that participants drew on to explain their beliefs and enact their subjectivities. I then examined how participants responded to the critical and differing discourses of global English and ELT that I promoted in workshops, meetings, and co-teaching activities.
I attempted to synthesize the answers to these two questions in an exploration of how they emerge within the histories, activities, and positionalities of being and becoming English teacher subjects.

Because of the inherently political nature of language and language teaching, this study was informed by critical theories of discourse, power, and subjectivity (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986; Bourdieu, 1977, 1984, 1991; Foucault, 1978, 1982; Gramsci, 1971; Habermas, 1985, 1987). Within these orientations, discourse is “…a situated communicative event or class thereof called activity in which people accomplish social (inter)action through linguistic and other symbolic means, in particular historical and cultural relations” (Shi-xu, p. 290, emphasis in italics in the original). Discourse is socially and culturally constructed, as well as historically constituted, and works through the forms of text (written or spoken), activity, concept, and object. While institutions like the church, science, and education attempt to control, manage, and constrict powerful discourses, what Foucault calls “regimes of truth” (1980, p. 112), discourse is not owned, and individuals are not powerless against resisting discourses or developing new ways of understanding themselves and their world. Individuals re-use and disseminate discourses, absorbing, quoting, reconstructing and transforming them in a process of intertextuality (Kristeva, 1980; Bakhtin, 1986) and interdiscursivity. Individuals are constituted within discourses, and Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of habitus conceptualizes the fairly stable subjective dispositions of individuals that they acquire through participation in social groups and daily practices. Practice/habitus is enacted in social fields, competitive spaces within society (e.g., an academic field, a business organization) in which individuals seek different forms of capital. Foucault’s definition of subjectivity (or what many refer to as identity) means making a subject, or making subject to, which demonstrates the social, cultural, and historical formation of subjectivity, as opposed to a rational, individualistic understanding of identity. Agency becomes possible within the contradictions of discourse, which are performed by a subject that is “always embedded in social practice” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 28).

I constructed an engaged, ethnographic, instrumental case study (Dyson & Genishi, 2005; Glesne, 2011, Stake, 2000) through a combined approach to Engaged Language Policy and Practices (ELP)
(Davis, 2014; Davis & Phyak, 2017) and critical second language teacher education (CSLTE) (Crookes, 2013; Hawkins & Norton, 2009; Kubota & Miller, 2017). This approach allowed me to understand how participants enacted macro-level discourses of global English and ELT within micro-level interactions in curriculum meetings, workshops, and co-teaching activities, in order to construct a case of being and becoming English-teacher subjects through engagement with conventional and critical discourses. The data collection methods I used extracted appropriations, dissonances, tensions, and motivations between the participants and researcher as we created a critical curriculum and teacher praxis different from their past experiences and observations of English learning and teaching. My aim was not necessarily to change participants’ enactments of discourses (though some participants views on global English and ELT changed may have changed during the research), but to learn how they worked with and responded to this different and critical discursive constructions, what this revealed about current CLP-CSLTE theory and methodology, and how CLP-CSLTE research and teaching in the Global South can be realized in the future.

7.1. Discussion of the findings

7.1.1. Conventional discourses

Chapter 4 demonstrated that language planning and policy can be implicit (as it was for UZN) or explicit (as it mostly was at CSB), and as Tollefson (1991) states, highly ideological. There are different reasons for not having an explicit policy, but for Paulo at UZN, it became clear that he really did not know where to begin. While I saw Paulo as a partner with whom to create an English program for his unique university context, he saw me as an expert who could quickly provide a one-size-fits-all curriculum and teacher-education effort without his input or presence. Meeting with Amelia provided a different perspective on Paulo and his intentions for English, demonstrating conflicting discourses between Paulo’s written discourse and Paulo’s discourse-in activity. While what Paulo wrote and what Paulo actually did during our initial work together differed in many ways, this was not an intentional act. I found Paulo and his wife, Linda, to be well-intentioned community members who cared about their
students and the reputation of UZN. They loved learning, were curious about English, and instilled curiosity for learning in their students and their two children. I spent substantial time with Paulo, Linda, and their children outside of the daily office routine, and we came to have almost-nightly conversations about the world, about English, and about our future goals and aspirations. Our evening dinner talks too often involved thoughts on improving the lives of people and learning from one another. Paulo’s plan was short and unspecific because he was unsure of how to move forward with an idea he had, but he wanted that idea to come to fruition so quickly that he prioritized its start date above having an established curriculum and several teacher education workshops. While he promoted collaboration in his planning document, he was unable to or did not know how to realize collaboration face-to-face, too often leaving the office for several consecutive days a week and deciding not to participate in meetings and workshops, despite my constant invitations and encouragement to join. English for his community and more specifically for UZN may be unattainable, but it is what it signifies – the social, cultural, and economic capital (Bourdieu, 1986) – that drives his want for an English program.

The analysis of Paulo’s discourse-as-activity (Blommaert, 2005) looks at how Paulo engaged in a “struggle for recognition” (Green, 2013, p. 145) in the field of Nicaraguan tertiary education (Bourdieu, 1977), since his university is unaccredited and unorthodox compared to accredited universities, and figuring out how to access English for UZN and remain competitive is important for his social capital in Tepetl and the greater northern region. How English is offered and whether it functions practically and sustainably did not seem to be a primary concern of Paulo – it was if he could offer English, period, that concerned him. These misalignments demonstrate that Paulo and I, if we were to create a successful and sustainable English program, needed to synchronize our understanding of our relationship and our roles. Much of the initial asynchronization was due to my own assumptions used to analyze Paulo’s initial planning document, assuming that the alliances and partnerships, creativity and innovation that he wrote about indexed dialogic and democratic possibilities for curriculum and teacher development. Blommaert (2005) draws attention to “[t]exts that do not travel well,” in which he demonstrates how “places matter”
in terms of understanding “very different orders of indexicality, very different values attached to linguistic signs and messages” (p. 78-79). What my understanding of Paulo’s use of the words “exchange,” “fraternity,” “praxis,” and “collaboration” were from my position as an academic from the Global North differed from Paulo’s understanding of these terms. Blommaert (2005) states:

We are facing ‘placed resources’ here: resources that are functional in one particular place but become dysfunctional as soon as they are moved into other places. This process of globalised flow creates difference in value, for the resources are being reallocated for different functions. The indexical links between signs and modes of communication, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, social value scales allowing, for example, identity construction, status attribution, and so forth – these indexical links are severed and new ones are projected onto the signs and practices….I would claim that such reallocation processes are central to the kind of flows that characterise globalisation. Consequently, a critical approach to discourse in the era of globalisation should look carefully into such processes of reallocation, the remapping of forms onto function, for it may be central to the various forms of inequality that also characterise globalization processes. (Blommaert, 2005, p. 83)

Therefore, Paulo’s planning document functioned well for me in the “places” of email exchange and Skype meetings, but became dysfunctional in the physical “place” of Tepetl and, more specifically, UZN when we worked face-to-face because I had placed different values on his discourse than he possibly had intended. What I took as literal intent was, for Paulo, an imagined future whose structure could change at any time. What I internalized as openness because of the lack of detail and direction in Paulo’s plan was actually quite restrictive, as he began to make choices about when and how English would be taught without informing the teachers and me first, which is not conducive to partnership nor the potential for a critically-informed pedagogy. As Foucault argued in his genealogies of prisons and schools (1977) and sexuality (1978, 1985), “…where we might think we have greater freedom, we are, in reality, more tightly constrained than ever before” (Allan, 2013, p. 24). I felt that the Access Program,
with its handbook and rules, would be more restrictive, but in surprising ways, it showed more openness (despite also being deeply saturated with its own values). However, the Access Handbook, the long and detailed document that had “many rules that we have to follow” (Enrique, interview, 06/26/17), provided a lot of space for interpretation, creativity, and teacher agency. Though the Handbook explicitly shares discourses that promote the United States and the culture and values that they want associated with the country, it does not require the use of U.S. or other Global-North created textbooks, it promotes slowing down material and teacher creativity over rushing to stay on schedule, and it acknowledges the importance of both native and nonnative speakers of English in enhancing students’ experiences as English language learners.

The policy and planning documents, discussions, and activities highlighted in Chapter 4 point to a need for critical awareness of global English and English language teaching for several reasons. First, there is an unquestioned desire for learning English without possessing the human and material resources to make this happen in a remote town that rarely sees international presence or uses English outside the classroom. The issue here is that when this unquestioned desire for English fails in some areas of the country, the blame will rest on learners, as Enrique and Reyna voiced, or teachers, as Cesar voiced, who are apparently just not motivated enough. This unquestioned vision of English as an inevitable skill to which communities need access falls within theoretical discussions of hegemony. Gramsci (1971) calls this a hegemonic ideology in that this consent crosses international boundaries and social groups. That is, the discourses that are being used in northern Nicaragua about English are the same discourses that one can find, for example, in Vietnam, China, the U.S., and countries in Western Europe. They are also found within middle-class, Global-North volunteer English teachers and working class Nicaraguans. These orders of indexicality emanate from different centers and create “real or perceived norms” that “co-occur in complex (and often opaque) simultaneous relationships” (Blommaert, 2011, p. 22). Therefore, these orders are not unified sociolinguistic phenomena, but difficult and complex, jumping from one scale of time and space to another during simultaneous social events. Blommaert (2005) states that hegemony
“...thoroughly saturates consciousness in such a way as to reduce ideology to a normal state of affairs” (p. 127).

Moving from global English, specifically, to one element of global English – ELT – a set of different discourses emerge among the imagined identities of the UZN teachers, Reyna and Cesar, about how they see themselves valuing and teaching English, as well as of the Access teacher at CSB, Enrique, who has over 20 years of experience as an English teacher and has already established a teacher identity. While Reyna and Cesar tended towards a stricter following of rules and approaches to teaching, as they came to be socialized into the processes involved in planning lessons and teaching them, Enrique was able to be more flexible in the moment when he managed his classroom, changing directions from original plans and bending or accommodating as he sees the need. Discourses of individual motivation and success, native-speaker superiority, languages as separate systems, and various others are represented by the teachers, caught within orders of discourse (Foucault, 1978), or as “…organized ‘regimes’ which invoke matters of ownership and control and allow and enable judgments, inclusion and exclusion, positive or negative sanctioning, and so forth” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 74). The discourse hierarchy in Nicaragua is as follows: English is important; therefore, English must be taught in secondary school (and now, recently, elementary school). This indexes policy that secondary school teachers must be competent in English. This also indexes new decisions from universities to offer English and teacher training programs, re-organizing and transforming traditional ways of delineating programs, skills, and knowledges. Until very recently, teacher education programs (including English teacher education) did not exist in Nicaragua. Foucault (1972) calls this the archive, where history is not a linear event, but full of discontinuities and shifts, all occurring as discourse changes. As the discourse of ELT on the periphery changes to include teacher education programs, what counts as knowledge, expertise, and experience changes. Whether explicitly providing opinions on teaching or implicitly and actively teaching, “…it becomes clear that rather than being peripheral to our tasks as teachers, the political, cultural, and social
dimensions of English language teaching are embedded in every decision we make” (Hall & Eggington, 2000, p. 1).

Foucault’s (1991) theorization of governmentality is also interesting in this regard. It is often assumed that those in power regulate the orders of discourse, as if human subjects are at the mercy of changing policies, having no agency to act on it. However, the great amount of omission within Paulo’s planning document, as well as his multiple indexes of collaboration and exchange, led me to believe that the teachers and I would have much flexibility in creating a curriculum and praxis together. Unfortunately, this was complicated by a number of resistances. The reversal of this situation is the Access Handbook, a long list of requirements through which emerge certain discourses of global English and ELT. However, within this top-down, powerful institution of the U.S. Department of State is also promotion of flexibility, creativity, and teacher agency, encouragement which I observed firsthand in Enrique’s classroom. Governmentality, in Foucault’s sense, is not a reference to political structures or state management; instead, it refers to “the way in which the conduct of individuals or groups might be directed” (Foucault, 1982, p. 221). Power is not just top-down, state controlled, but it “is always tied to the actions of individual people as delimited by the various discourses and disciplines of a given time period” (Felluga, 2015, p. 121).

7.1.2. Critical and differing discourses

In Chapter 5, I asked how and why participants welcomed or resisted the critical and differing discourses on global English and ELT that I introduced in my work with them. My findings demonstrate the difficulties of implementing critical and alternative discourses in ELT activities in the face of decades of entrenched beliefs about English and ELT. Regarding physical materials, my work at UZN generated a Freirean-inspired critical curriculum, syllabus, and activities, while my work at CSB promoted critical activities. At both sites, this work engaged participants in dialogue in an attempt to incorporate their views into the development of our work together. There are relatively few examples in the literature of
how to do this kind of work (Apple, 1998; Canagarajah, 2005; Crookes, 2013), and the examples that do emerge remain largely theoretical and at the proposal level (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2.1).

Two findings emerged from analysis of the implementation of these critical and differing discourses. First, the participants were introduced to competing discourses at multiple levels. While they lived in one world of conventional ELT practices, circumscribed by conventional discourses of global English, some participants struggled to imagine what it might be like to live in another world of critical ELT. For Reyna and Cesar, without actually having an extended opportunity to experience this critical world of ELT – one caveat being that we were unable to actually teach together due to misinformation about number of students enrolled in their courses (we were told 28, but on the first day of Reyna’s class, no students arrived) – they rightfully were unable to process how critical ELT could be enacted in the classroom. Reyna remained open to critical ELT, linking our work together with “concientizando” [raising awareness] and specifically to the curriculum that we developed with “las ideas que nosotros compartimos” [the ideas that we shared] (interview, 05/17/17). While she saw criticality as inclusive of her awareness and ideas, since she was so new to thinking about her teaching, she showed in interaction that she required mediation through idea generation, activity, and lesson planning at introductory levels to the profession. This introductory practice – getting used to basic activities of being a teacher – obviously made it difficult for her to implement any sort of criticality in her teaching.

Cesar, on the other hand, saw criticality as critical thinking in the emancipatory-modernist sense (Pennycook, 2001), which entails an objective, rational thinking process on difficult topics, like “religión” [religion]. While I was explicit in workshops on my definitions of criticality in the Freirean sense, teaching about Paulo Freire and his ideas, enacting CSLTE in workshop activities, as well as providing an example of how a Nicaraguan teacher created a critical, task-based lesson, Cesar did not link these interactions with his own definition. He saw critical English teaching as deterring from the learning of English, taking too much time and instilling too much use of Spanish in a space that should be reserved for English. His own disappointing experiences in English classes – his apprenticeship of observation
(Lortie, 1975) – strongly affected his level of adamancy about keeping classroom content focused on rules of grammar, new vocabulary, and communicative activities in line with the language level of students. While he was unable to imagine what critical ELT (CELT) would look like, just like Reyna, because he also was just beginning to enact a new English-teacher subjectivity, I argue that he not only could not imagine CELT, but also actively resisted CELT in ways that Reyna did not. K. E. Johnson (2009) states,

…the normative ways of acting and interacting and the values, assumptions, and attitudes that are embedded in the classrooms where teachers were once students, in the teacher education programs where they receive their professional credentialing, and in the schools where they work, shape the complex ways in which they come to think about themselves, their students, the activities of L2 teaching, and the L2 teaching-learning process. (p. 17)

Teachers must spend a great deal of time teaching, first, before they can fully understand their practice, the policies and associated discourses that they come to adopt or resist (K. E. Johnson, 1999).

Within the Access Program at CSB, Enrique demonstrated much more openness to CELT, having come to understand the various issues in education and English language education in Tepetl and greater Nicaragua in his 20 years of ELT experience. Critical issues that he addressed in his classroom lay within the students’ hardships, and he enacted a critical self, for example, when delaying the start time to class by over a half hour to pull one student aside to empower the student to come to class more or to reapply focus after misbehavior. He identified with his students’ dire level of poverty and drew on this mutual experience to uplift hungry, disengaged youth. He was less inclined to see English itself as a problem to be addressed, though he was positively responsive to the critical English activities that I conducted with his students, only concerned with the time needed to teach the required syllabus, as well as generating consciousness-raising. Enrique also already enacted a critical English-teacher identity, whether or not he was conscious of this. For example, Enrique enacted a translingual teacher identity in his classroom through which he not only promoted students’ English language acquisition, but also other world
languages, the Nicaraguan vernacular in juxtaposition to standard Castilian Spanish, and appreciation for other cultures.

Lastly, critical or differing discourses on global English and ELT were enacted within the relationships between the teachers and me, whether or not they were aware of the processes taking place. As Amelia told me in her second interview with me, I “planted seeds” (interview, 07/27/17) with the teachers. Dialogues with Reyna showed her consciousness of inequitable access to English and ELT opportunities that she herself faced. Cesar called attention to my own uncritical assumption that CD technology would be appropriate for our learning context, recurrently teaching me and Reyna about free and easily accessible cell phone applications for learning. Enrique always extended the critical activities that I introduced in class after I finished with the students. Instead of moving on to the plans that he had written for the day, he set them aside to continue engaging students in the issues that I brought to their (and his) attention. Therefore, the notion of criticality as expressed in CLP/ELP and CSLTE research was not the only way in which criticality was performed between participants and researcher.

7.1.3. Becoming English-teacher subjects

As Holland et al. (1998) state, “Social positions cut and cut again across one another” (p. 286); therefore, resistance to critical or differing discourses in Chapter 6 showed itself through complex hierarchies of subjectivity – intersectionalities (Crenshaw, 1991) that attempt to maintain the status quo represented in more powerful conventional discourses. While emerging in data in both Chapters 4 and 5, intersectional tensions within relationships were the focus of Chapter 6. I showed how the teacher participants’ and my different historical backgrounds, political experiences, and social and cultural identities synthesized into three separate working relationships. Morgan (2004) argues,

Both a professional and a personal identity…co-develop as instantiations of discourses, systems of power/knowledge (cf. Foucault, 1980, 1982; Pennycook, 1994) that regulate and ascribe social values to all forms of human activity – oral and written texts, gestures, images, and spaces – within particular institutions, academic disciplines, and larger social formations. (p. 173)
Therefore, the personal histories of the teachers as they narrated in their interviews were intimately connected to who the participants and researcher were (and were continuing to become) as teaching professionals. These histories and present experiences that each individual collects are always connected to and governed by the social world:

[i]nsofar as he or she is endowed with a habitus, the social agent is a collective individual or a collective individuated by the fact of embodying objective structures. The individual, the subjective, is social and collective. The habitus is socialized subjectivity, a historical transcendental, whose schemes of perception and appreciation (systems of appreciation, tastes, etc.) are the product of collective and individual history. Reason (or rationality) is ‘bounded’ not only, as Herbert Simon believes, because the human mind is generically bounded… but because it is socially structured and determined, and, as a consequence, limited. (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 211)

The teachers and my own backgrounds, emerging as habitus, were displayed in body language, facial gestures, what we said and did not say, the written texts we produced, and how we saw one another, and it was through our activities of becoming and being English-teacher subjects that issues of power that affected our subjectivities made themselves present:

Micro-interactions between educators, students and communities are never neutral; in varying degrees, they either reinforce coercive relations of power or collaborative relations of power. In the former case, they contribute to the disempowerment of culturally diverse students and communities; in the latter the micro-interactions constituted a process of empowerment that enables educators, students and communities to challenge the operation of coercive power structures. (Cummins, 2000, p. 44)

Our relationships embodied a synthesis of conventional, critical, and alternative discourses drawn on and enacted by participants and researcher. By analyzing our subjectivities in relation to the competing discourses that we moved through during our work together, I found that criticality came to work in different ways depending on the relationship, and that, ultimately, regardless of the discourses of global
English and ELT, discursively-formed intersectionalities of identities had a far more controlling effect on the successes of each English teacher. For example, Reyna’s early termination from UZN and inability to find paid teaching work, despite increased abilities in English language competence and teaching, speaks to entrenched traditional values upheld in this rural, conservative area of Nicaragua. As she continued to gain more teaching experience and come closer to finishing her degree in English – activities that assisted Cesar in transitioning to an English-teaching profession – she found herself rolling cigars at a local cigar factory for work.

By analyzing my own teacher-educator subjectivity as co-constructed in the process of working with the three teachers, I found issues with my ideological notions of criticality, including that being positioned as a Global-North NES and “expert” did not necessarily entail the reasoning processes of colonialism and imperialism as often tied to the superiority of the Global North educator. For Enrique he saw my identity as giving his students a “different point of view” and the possibility of enacting a different sense of self (interview, 06/26/17). For Reyna, my identity allowed her an opportunity to attempt to break out of oppressing social conditions that kept her at home with her baby, not earning her own wages and dependent on the father of her child (interview 05/17/17). For Cesar, however, my identity did hold him from valuing his and his NNES teachers’ expertise over my own, and this was the concern that I had about the colonial and imperial history between Nicaragua and English-speaking nations which propelled me to explore a critical-teacher-educator subjectivity in the first place.

7.2. Implications for theorizing teachers and teacher educators’ roles in ELP

A critical element of my research is that I maintained a dual role as volunteer and as researcher. As Canagarajah and Stanley (2015) advise, if LPP regards “deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes” (Cooper, 1989, p. 45), then “[r]esearchers have to consider the ethics relating to the why and how of influencing other people’s behavior. LPP has to navigate often tense inter-community relations and conflicting points of view about preferred language policies in a nation” (Canagarajah & Stanley, 2015, p. 33). The
approach that I used within CLP, Engaged Language Policy and Practices (ELP), argues that one of its central tenets “is engagement of all concerned, such as government officials, educators, community members, and students, in dialogue and action toward equitable language policies and education” (p. 2). My findings, however, support critiques of dialogue (Freire, 1970/1993) and communicative action (Habermas, 1985) that problematize their conceptualizations of equal, rational discussion between interlocutors who respect each other as equals. I quickly found how the idea of partnership in a Critical Theoretical sense would meet the figured world of rural Nicaragua, which included intersectional positions of social class, gender, age, nationality, and other markers of identity, which complicated notions of equal dialogue (as they would here in the United States, as well – I am not arguing that oppression through positionality only occurs in areas of hardship). One of the most impactful hindrances that I felt as the UZN teachers and I began to work together was the absence of Paulo and Linda from the workshops and meetings to which they were invited and to which they accepted invitation. At first, field notes argued this as an issue of scheduling – Linda and Cesar must be busy attending to something important for the university. As their absences continued, patterns began to emerge that pointed to clearer reasons.

One of these patterns centralizes the social classes of the participants. Paulo and Linda, who are prominent members of the community, do not know English and thus could not fully participate with us, despite much of our dialogue occurring in Spanish. That they did not know English, but that the two teachers they employed, both from families of severe hardship and of a lower social class than Paulo and Linda, possessed sufficient competence in English was likely face-threatening (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In a country where the rich are supposed to have access to English, not the poor, partnering with us in workshops in which they did not have superior command of the situation could have placed Paulo and Linda in a vulnerable space. As noted in Chapter 4, Paulo pulled Amelia aside one day after a meeting that we had to ask her if she would be willing to tutor him in English, to which she declined. Therefore,
Paulo and Linda – initially seeing this partnership as a positive addition to their program offerings – may have felt their feelings shift as the teachers and I formed relationships from which they felt excluded.

These tensions hindered dialogue, emerging in the data to demonstrate how a critical, Freirean-based notion of dialogue can face challenges. As defined in Chapter 2, dialogue in this sense means, “a horizontal relationship between equals where the participants perform praxis focused on the transformation and humanization of the world” (Crawford-Lange, 1981, p. 259). This definition becomes problematic when horizontal relationships have not been established, and this takes a lot of time and continuous effort and reflection. This understanding of dialogue also entails deep reflection on one’s practices (Hawkins & Norton, 2009), but if one feels superiority over or resentment towards another, then one is not in the state of mind to perform reflection. These constant shifts, along with the regular absence of Paulo from agreed-on meetings, caused me to often have to shift my planning and workshop preparation. Crookes (2013) states, “Freire’s culture circles took for granted adults who could talk with one another and with an animateur—could discuss, reflect, and propose solutions to problems; in other words, cooperate” (p. 49). Students (and in my case student-teachers and administrators) have been socialized over years of participation in their own sociocultural ways of “doing” education, and this was an issue that I naively did not anticipate – that some participants, due to the social, cultural, and economic hierarchies of rural Nicaragua, were unwilling or did not know how to cooperate in dialogue in the sense that I, as a Global North researcher-practitioner in a privileged position, understood the concept.

Though promising, and certainly valuable in some contexts and within some relationships, ELP as an approach may be less successful when the desire for English, and English now, is strong, and where global “regimes of truth” (Foucault, 1980) – like my outsider, NES status from the Global North – disallow for the collaborative dialogue needed to create meaningful planning. Both Davis and Phyak (2017) are part of the groups in which they collaborate (Phyak as a Nepalese scholar working in the Nepalese context and Davis as a university professor in Hawai’i where she has engaged with numerous long-term commitments to teachers, students, and families). ELP may not be as effective when the
researcher is not a part of the community in which she is researching and collaborating. As an Anglo-American, native-English-speaker and PhD candidate in applied linguistics, I was expected to provide an expertise that showed the university what to do and how to do it. Despite my best efforts at collaboration, dialogue, and inclusion, even after nine years of deeply committed work in Nicaragua, my “expertise” of critical ELP and SLTE countered their expectations.

Another theoretical problem that arises regards using Freirean-based CLP and CSLTE efforts for second-language acquisition. Freire worked primarily with first-language literacy. Freirean inspired first-language literacy programs were incredibly successful throughout Latin America, including in Cuba, Mexico, and Nicaragua (Kirkendall, 2010; Roberts, 2000). Freire’s only attempt with second-language literacy was in Guinea-Bissau, where the official language was Portuguese but most citizens spoke a creole, an indigenous language, or a combination thereof (Freire, 1983). Using Freire’s methods of empowerment to learn a global language that in many ways is disempowering is not unproblematic. The fact is that English is so far removed from most Nicaraguans’ real lives that engaging in such exercises is still not what Freire intended when he emphasized drawing on generative themes (1970). A second language being so far removed from the people, in fact, is one reason why, Freire claims, his involvement with the second-language literacy campaign in Guinea-Bissau ultimately failed. Freire “…had to accept Portuguese as the language of instruction, even if his own method was not originally designed for second-language acquisition” (Leonard & McLaren, 1993, p. 135). Freire and Macedo (1987) argue, “With or without Paulo Freire it was impossible in Guinea-Bissau to conduct a literacy campaign in a language that was not a part of the social practice of the people. My method did not fail….If it is not viable to do so, my method or any other method will certainly fail” (p. 112-113). Freire also spoke to his foreignness in Guinea-Bissau as detrimental to the program, as he understood that as an outsider he did not understand the context (Freire & Macedo, 1987, p. 103). Thus, using Freire’s methods of empowerment on something that could be seen as disempowering (e.g. a dominant language to which few have access) needs to be done carefully, critically, respectfully, and reflexively, and Global North researchers and
practitioners should ask how English can become “a social practice of the people” – or at least the communities with which they work – in order to find a Freirean-based project fruitful to the people who are engaged daily in the context.

Lastly, the entire ascription to discourses of English *as* and *for* development also must be assessed. Seargeant and Erling (2011) state,

> One possible danger resulting from this [English being equated with socioeconomic development] is that policies which do not attempt to take specific account of the sociolinguistic realities that appertain to English use in the societies in which they apply, and are instead structured predominantly around the broad trends of the overarching discourse of ‘English as a language for international development’, will be less likely to achieve positive outcomes. (p. 257)

Thus, it is also worthwhile to work with Global North and Global South organizations and institutions to confront their reasoning processes for desiring English *as* and *for* development. In today’s globalized economy, the English language is unquestionably a political and economic presence. Partnerships must conceptualize English in alternative ways that work for learners’ lived realities of constant change and hardship, without depreciating their goals and imagined futures with English, nor devaluing their right to access English – or any knowledge – that they feel will improve their lives. When odds are against learners in realizing a better life through English, researchers and practitioners from the Global North must engage responsibly and ethically by first working to build meaningful human relationships on which to ground English language programs.

Since English “is here to stay” (Ramanathan, 1999), I argue that SLTE and LPP researchers and educators working in the Global South should reconsider positioning English within the discourse of economic development and towards a more empowering discourse that moves beyond development (Watkins & Shulman, 2008). A liberating discourse of global English would reject the reduction of “development” to economy, instead viewing progress as the acquisition of a more dignified, enjoyable,
and meaningful life. Researchers of SLTE in low-income countries should aspire to form networks of communities for “peaceful and sustainable paths forward” (Watkins & Shulman, 2008, p. 48) that confront assumptions about English and inequitable power relations in ELT collaborations. The learning and teaching of English – and any language – is an emotional-intellectual exercise that not only contributes to personal well-being, but also is a starting point for confronting many forms of inequality, not just economic.

7.3. Implications for teacher praxis and CSLTE

Canagarajah (1999) argued roughly 30 years ago for the importance of helping teachers and students on the periphery develop the “instinctive, untutored, and untheorized modes of appropriation” for their own teaching contexts (p. 185). During my short time with teachers, I was able to lay some groundwork on what that might look like for them and their context, and one of my aims was to provide a description and analysis of what this could look like. My research and praxis resulted in some examples in the form of a draft curriculum, teacher workshops, and teaching activities (see Phyak and Bui (2014) and Bui (2018) for other examples). There is little work on critical language pedagogy for beginners, especially beginner users of English who are also beginner teachers in the EFL context. Wallerstein’s (1983) work is a rare case of documenting the extent to which beginners can handle her material and approach, as well as providing ideas for the teacher to work with beginners. Critical Literacy research has been clearer on documenting and analyzing such processes, but its focus is often on child learners in ESL contexts, not adult English educators as beginners of English and beginners of English teaching in remote EFL contexts, where the beginners – Cesar and Reyna – do not have similar abilities, are not peers, and are not immersed in the target language. Therefore, language and language teaching, which must be planned, might move extremely slowly in cases like my research study (Crookes, 2013).

One reason why this work is slow-going, I argue, is because Global-North English teachers who teach in the Global South – whether paid or volunteer, whether teaching English or teaching English teachers – are not teaching with critically-informed approaches. Many of my findings on global English
and ELT discourse echo findings of research on ELT in the Global South conducted almost 30 years ago (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999). At first glance readers might ask, “So what? Your findings have already been found.” Teachers in rural areas on the periphery value Native English Speakers and North American expertise and materials over their own. Upon further reflection, I hope they come to a more serious concern over these findings. That is, why after over 30 years of these types of findings, has very little changed in the way English is taught and learned in areas of extreme hardship? In March, 2006, the field of TESOL publicly confronted the NES-NNES dichotomy in their “Position Statement against Discrimination of Nonnative Speakers of English in the Field of TESOL,” and research continues to be conducted that seems to stay within the confines of academic conferences and publications. Research conducted in CSLTE must reach aid programs, governments, and organizations that teach English in the Global South, and research-praxis relationships should be forged in order to better learn how change can take place. After the teachers and I finished our Freirean-inspired draft curriculum for UZN, we emailed it to the Peace Corps TEFL connections that I made during my fieldwork, both in gratitude for their support of our using their teaching manual and in the spirit of reflexivity, to help them continue questioning and envisioning their work in new ways.

Another change that should be addressed takes place in TESOL programs in the U.S. By making CELT and CSLTE more central to curriculums for the MA TESOL degree and BA certificate, instead of, for example, a final unit at the end of the semester, student teachers can gain practice enacting a critical-teaching self. As Crookes (2013) argues, few teachers-to-be get the chance to observe, let alone take part in critical pedagogy; thus, students leave programs with little understanding of how they might implement change themselves. By providing students with chances to dialogue about social, cultural, and political problems in the U.S. and abroad, as well as practice developing and teaching for a critically-inspired English classroom, teacher educators increase the potential for developing critical-teaching selves.
7.4. Ethical implications for ethnographic case study

In his book *Life is Hard*, an ethnography on the lives and problems of three Nicaraguan families in post-civil-war Managua, Lancaster (1992) states,

All too often, ethnographic writing removes the ethnographer from the scene of his or her investigations and reduces the real men and women who are its subjects to so many abstractions, themselves carriers of abstract structures and principles. Thus, the authoritative voice of Science suppresses all that is disorderly, trivial, or personal. In the process, it finds the world exactly as it had imagined the world to be, and when it is finished, it necessarily leaves everything exactly the way it was. (p. xvi)

Contrary to these traditional ethnographic descriptions, Lancaster’s book is “…written deliberately against that grain. It is disorderly. It misbehaves” (p. xvii). Lancaster hits on a poignant criticism of ethnographic work in that, while it aims to interact with the emic perspective of participants, it also has the goal of maintaining the etic, scientific, or culturally neutral perspective of the outside researcher. That is, it is a descriptive and explanatory account (Watson-Gegeo, 1988), but as Blommaert and Jie comment, “Since most of us are only human, fieldwork is often a period of deep frustration, disappointment and confusion, sometimes even of bitter tears….People contradict each other, and just when you think you found the key to the whole thing, the whole thing changes again” (p. 24). One’s fieldnotes – just as much full of confusion and frustration as they are of exciting documentation and connections – “eventually make way for the aesthetics and genre requirements of academic prose, and contradictions or paradoxes there become coherent and linear fixtures, obscure pieces become symbolic, and what looked like a half-finished jigsaw puzzle now becomes a fine painting” (Blommaert & Jie, 2010, p. 37). That the messiness, confusion, and frustration that come with relationship-building – the most important component of gaining and maintaining access to participants – is so rarely reported brings up an important ethical issue about ethnographic fieldwork. Blommaert & Jie (2010) state,
Consequently, ethnography attributes (and has to attribute) great importance to the history of what is commonly seen as ‘data’: the whole process of gathering and moulding knowledge is part of that knowledge; knowledge construction is knowledge, the process is the product. 

Fieldwork results in an archive of research, which documents the researcher’s own journey through knowledge” (p. 10, emphasis in italics in the original).

This reflexive understanding means that knowledge production of the researcher cannot be separated from the situatedness of the context that he or she studies.

I was actively reflective regarding the ethical standards that not only I had to follow because of IRB, but also the standards that I set for myself during all stages of this research process. This allowed me to confront the dilemmas of my research through reflexivity in writing, demonstrating that “ethics is more than procedural and that reflexivity extends beyond a set of mechanical actions” (De Costa, 2016, p. 5). Motivated by the experience of De Costa (2016), who “…has had to straddle various roles as a teacher, researcher, and advocate while working with marginalized immigrant learners” (p. 1), I combined my roles as researcher and volunteer into one voice for this dissertation. As this dissertation demonstrates, misleading information and miscommunication led to frustration on the part of participants, including myself, and I am ethically obligated to ensure that I do not stifle the voices of participants – even those with whom I had to confront in my role as advocate for the teachers – in the writing stage. I made an effort to describe situations based not only on my subjective viewpoint, but also on the viewpoints of participants who also took part in the experiences. I acknowledge how my positionality affects issues of trustworthiness of the data, and therefore use methods of triangulation – interviews with participants and document collection about the phenomena studied – in the design of the study to balance my perspective. If I proposed democratic methodology during fieldwork, then I am obligated to continue this through analysis and writing.

Especially, I am concerned for the integrity of people who want access to a better life and who are most vulnerable to hegemonic discourses and practices of English that promise that better life.
However, critical pedagogical work with English language teachers and their institutions, especially conducted by an outsider working in the Global South, is very difficult work and certainly one of the reasons why so few researchers partake in such projects. Crookes (2013) argues that taking a critical orientation to English language teaching is tremendously difficult, and that resistance – from administrators, teachers, parents, and students – to critical orientations that address the political nature of learning is expected. He states that this resistance needs to be handled gradually, and that in some cases, it may not be the right time, right area, or right English level to be able to productively and successfully implement a critically engaged project. Pennycook (2001) echoes the difficulties faced in doing critical pedagogical work: “Doing critical work is dangerous work. The memories and narratives we may seek to introduce into our classes or research may indeed be dangerous memories. The effects of what we do may be profound” (p. 138). Pennycook cites Graman’s (1988) work in Nicaragua as an example of how the effects of critical work can change and disrupt hierarchies that those associated with the teachers and learners with whom we work might not like:

One became ostracized from his religious group because of his new perspective on Nicaragua. He later began to ask himself profound questions that will probably have a lasting effect on his intellectual and ethical life. Another students spoke of the willpower she gained in the dialogic class which enabled her to seek a divorce she had wanted for years. (Graman, 1988, p. 447, as cited in Pennycook, 2001, p. 138)

While working with Paulo and Linda was at times very frustrating, my developing empathy and understanding for their situation grew as I continued to reflect about their status in the community, their university, and their imagined futures for themselves, their children, and their students. While research argues that access to English in low-income countries is a privilege reserved for the rich, I argue that it is also accessible to the very poor in the form of international developmental projects. Thus, while the rich can afford quality English courses, programs like the Access Program and Peace Corps TEFL reach out to the most vulnerable areas. Individuals like Paulo and Linda, who are not poor, but who are also unable to
afford the best programs, are ignored by aid programs, and are not situated in the most attractive setting for researchers. I admit that if I had known from the start that Paulo ran an unaccredited university with no campus of its own, I may not have agreed to work with him during the pre-planning stages of this project, due to my own concerns over being able to realize a successful dissertation. Perhaps Paulo knew that he would have to omit information to me and stretch certain truths about his university in order to get the help and attention that no one would give him.

I also came to develop empathy for Linda’s life as Paulo’s wife and as an administrator for the university. Even when she was at her most frustrated with me, I was able to see her through the difficult situation she was in. She often had to run the UZN office alone, without Paulo’s presence, and as the woman of the household was responsible for all of the child-rearing of her two children, having to stop her work to run across town to pick a child up, or stay up late to help a child with a school project. Linda cooked all meals, did all of the laundry, administered much, if not most, of UZN, and on top of it all, since Paulo was often not around to answer my questions, do the best she could to provide answers to issues like teaching logistics. My field notes document a life of stress and rushing, as she juggled her family responsibilities while attempting to advance her own career as a professor, doing so with little support from her partner, Paulo. Thus, Linda’s frustration with me was tied to the social and cultural conditions of her lifeworld, in which I was just one more responsibility to attend to.

7.5. Directions for future study

My research also displays, unapologetically, the incredible difficulties and political nature of this kind of work. As Crookes (2013) states, critical ELT, and by extension SLTE, is “not for the faint-hearted” (p. 5). While I did not necessarily underestimate the demands that this research project would entail, especially since I had years of experience working in the rural Nicaraguan context and knew many of the obstacles that I would face, this research was trying emotionally and intellectually. Unfortunately, many critically-inspired researchers give up after initiating projects. Crookes (2013) laments,
The literature of critical pedagogy contains a number of unfortunate reports whose structure is:

‘I attempted to implement a critical pedagogy in my classroom for the first time and did not experience success, therefore Freire is wrong or critical pedagogy is not applicable to my context. (Crookes, 2013, p. 46-47)

For a project to be successful, it must be sustainable, and it needs long-term involvement. This means investing in the development of local Nicaraguan teachers, not just relying on international researchers, teachers, and volunteers. Global North researchers and educators do have the potential to be ethically-minded, productive collaborators for short-term commitments, be it a few weeks, a few months, or a couple of years. However, they eventually leave, and relying on them is not sustainable. Further research at the interface of language policy, planning, and teacher education in the Global South should span longer periods of time and commit to an iterative process of research and teaching between Global North and Global South partners. One area in which future research can be conducted is through popular English-teaching abroad programs offered through universities, NGOs, or private volunteering organizations. More research can be conducted to learn how to strengthen partnerships between pre-service teachers in the U.S. and English teachers in low-income countries. The development of engaged volunteer programs have the potential to confront the conventional one-way “exchange” from which volunteers often benefit more than those whom they “help.” That is, while volunteers can use their experience abroad as a catalyst for their resumes or academic futures, the teachers and students with whom they work abroad often receive just a few weeks or a few months of partnership with U.S. teachers, little exposure to English and new teaching methods, and few opportunities to improve their professional opportunities with English (Biehn, 2014; Jakubiak, 2012a, 2012b; Romero, 2012). TEFL volunteering abroad, with faculty present who can mediate development, offers a rich space for faculty to pursue research on Global North and Global South student-teachers and teachers, second language acquisition, and language teaching in challenging contexts, with the goal of introducing, but also trying out critical
knowledge and praxis that too often remains at the theoretical and propositional stages and, thus, cannot inform theory, methodology, and praxis.

7.7. Conclusion

From theorizing and designing a methodology to interacting with participants, from analyzing data to (re)constructing the narratives of participants, the entire process in which the participants and I engaged created a broader narrative of the periphery that is left behind when the world thinks about who learns English, how, and why. Thinking of my research as an unfolding narrative – incomplete and needing to be continued by further research – allows me to advocate for these teachers and teachers like them working in other peripheral communities in the Global South.

Introducing alternative and critical discourses alongside conventional discourses of global English and English language teaching provided me a way to dialogue with teachers about English as one potential part of an education that could lead to new possibilities for teachers and students. Appleby et al. (2002) state,

There is danger that language programs in the development context become ends in themselves rather than the means by which to significantly improve education for the disadvantaged. Many English language programs designed specifically for recipient government personnel focus solely on the more mechanical aspects of language. In part this emphasis may reflect the fact that common conceptions of language education focus too narrowly on the technical aspects of teaching, such as discussions of objectives and goals (often unchallenged), materials, equipment and methodology, assessment procedures, and instruction for teachers and teacher educators. (Pennycook, 1994). The assumption is that, if a context is defined as one of national or regional development (by dint of various lower social or economic indicators relative to other contexts), and if language programs are seen as part of the development process, then language development (i.e., improvement in language skills) must contribute to broader social and economic development. Thus, once the context is defined as a country under development,
language programs within that context are assumed to relate to development according to the success or failure of those programs. We have been suggesting, by contrast, that the situation is far more complex than this – and that at the very least language-in-development programs need to address two key domains: the relationship between language programs and other forms of development, and the ways in which the discourses of development construct and limit the possibilities for change. (Appleby et al., 2002, p. 337-38)

It is worthwhile to work with Global North and Global South organizations and institutions to confront their reasoning processes for desiring English as and for development. In today’s globalized economy, the English language is unquestionably a political and economic presence. Partnerships must conceptualize English in alternative ways that work for learners’ lived realities of constant change and hardship, without depreciating their goals and imagined futures with English, nor devaluing their right to access English – or any knowledge – that they feel will improve their lives. When odds are against learners in realizing a better life through English, researchers and practitioners from the Global North must engage responsibly and ethically by first working to build meaningful human relationships on which to ground English language programs.
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### Appendix A: Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal features</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Contiguous utterances (latching)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{</td>
<td>Gesture-speech co-occurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[</td>
<td>Overlapping utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation contours</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>,</td>
<td>Continuing contour (I took bread,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>butter, jam and honey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Questioning intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>Exclamatory utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>Loud speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>underline</td>
<td>Stress/accentuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence (gaps and pauses)</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Elongation (the more colons, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more elongation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Abrupt stop in articulation; cut-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence (gaps and pauses)</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>Micro-pause (0.4 seconds or shorter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>Number inside parentheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>represents the length of the pause,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rounded to the nearest .5 (e.g., 0.5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0, 1.5, 2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Uncertain utterances. Surrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transcriber’s best guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(xxx)</td>
<td>Unintelligible syllables. Each x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>represents one syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralinguistic and Nonverbals</td>
<td>hhh</td>
<td>Outbreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.hhh</td>
<td>In-breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>@</td>
<td>Laughter, indicate laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>particles after symbol, e.g., @hehe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or @haha, or into a word: @yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Aspiration or laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within a word, e.g., fun(h)ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>Description of nonverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conducts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td><em>italics</em></td>
<td>Use of language other than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>Translation of language into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Initial Questions to Paulo about the UZN Program

¿Qué tipos de inglés se ofrecen? [What types of English are offered]

¿Qué niveles se ofrecen? (Por ejemplo, primaria, secundaria, universidad) [What levels are offered? For example, primary, secondary, university]

¿Cuáles son los objetivos del programa de inglés? [What are the objectives of the English program?]

¿Hay profesores nicaragüenses locales de inglés? En caso afirmativo, ¿necesitan ayuda o formación? Si están capacitados, ¿cuáles son sus necesidades? [Are there local Nicaraguan English teachers? If so, do they need help or training? If they are trained, what are their needs?]

¿Hay voluntarios internacionales en el área que enseñan inglés? En caso afirmativo, ¿necesitan ayuda o formación? (Por ejemplo, la mayoría de los voluntarios norteamericanos no tienen experiencia en la enseñanza) [Are there international volunteers in the area who teach English? If so, do they need help or training? (For example, the majority of North American volunteers do not have teaching experience)]

¿Qué recursos de aprendizaje ya tiene y qué recursos de aprendizaje cree que necesita? [What learning resources do you already have and what learning resources do you believe you need?]

¿Ya tiene un plan de estudios establecido o tiene la intención de crear un plan de estudios? ¿Qué enfoque para el diseño curricular está siguiendo? [Do you already have a curriculum or do you intend to create a curriculum? What approach to curriculum design are you following?]

¿Qué enfoques o métodos pedagógicos para enseñar inglés sigue actualmente? ¿Está abierto a cambios en sus enfoques? [What pedagogical approaches or methods for teaching English do you currently use? Are you open to changes to your approaches?]

¿Cuál es la línea de tiempo previsto para el plan de estudios, la capacitación de maestros y el inicio de clases? [What is the timeline for the curriculum, training of teachers, and start of classes?]
1. En conjunto con el programa de idioma en Tepetl en alianza con Penn State Fortaleceremos las habilidades docentes de aquellos facilitadores del idioma en el municipio, a través de jornadas de actualización pedagógica, en coordinación con el Programa Universitario de Tepetl y la colaboración del proyecto de PhD. Katie Master.

1.1. Durante el primer trimestre los 5 facilitadores locales del idioma fortalecerán sus capacidades y serán actores claves de la sostenibilidad del programa en la región, durante la visita e iniciativas de Katie (Enero-Marzo). Los facilitadores serían los 2 propuestos por [local NGO] y 2 propuestos por el Programa de Tepetl que dicho sea de paso cuenta con el apoyo de una colega de California que está realizando una investigación por acá, su nombre es Amelía.

2. Desarrollo de un Programa Curricular Coordinado (Enero-Marzo 2017)

2.1. Formulación de propuesta de programa

2.2. Desarrollo e Implementación metodológica para fortalecer la formación de 100 actores (niños, jóvenes, adolescentes), 20 docentes de inglés de primaria y secundaria y al menos 20 adultos con deseos de aprender inglés en el municipio.

3. Plan de comunicación y divulgación de programa (Desde sus inicios estarán realizándose acciones a favor de establecer una comunicación efectiva del accionar de un proyecto académico que traerá consigo un desarrollo cultural y social, inherente de la educación como derecho universal en un territorio ubicado en la zona norte de Nicaragua con visión de crecimiento nacional). Este punto es una acción en cada momento de proyecto.

4. Relaciones interinstitucionales: Hemos visualizado las alianzas y encontramos una serie de actores que a su momento serán base firme de gestiones para becas y otras colaboraciones sociales para jóvenes de escasos recursos con deseos de estudiar. (Gobiernos locales, Ministerio de Educación, Entidades Bancarias, Casas Comerciales y Centro Técnico Vocacional)

5. Intercambio de experiencias y retroalimentación sociocultural entre estudiantes de inglés de Tepetl y jóvenes voluntarios de Estados Unidos.

5.1. 100 actores culminan su profesionalización como estudiantes de inglés a través de intercambios con estudiantes o personas que Katie considere oportunas a través de la colaboración del programa.

5.2. 20 docentes con mayor dominio del inglés y preparados para brindar un mejor servicio en sus diferentes centros educativos.

5.3. 20 adultos comunicándose con familiares en el extranjero y compartiendo con familiares la expectativa del idioma. (Los adultos que quieren acceder a clases de inglés son personas que viajan a Estados Unidos y desean aprender lo esencial)

21 The name of the town and any people mentioned (except the researcher) are pseudonyms.
5.4. 03 intercambios socioculturales, entre actores y agentes de proyecto para actualizar conocimientos del inglés.

5.5. 20 estudiantes voluntarios y 100 estudiantes de inglés en el programa Tepetl-Penn State participan del intercambio

**OBJETIVOS:**

- Fortalecer capacidades y calidad educativa desde los docentes y hacia todos los niveles.
- Ampliar la cobertura educativa del idioma inglés en todos los niveles bajo calidad.
- Fortalecer un modelo educativo sostenible bajo una identidad cultural basada en la enseñanza del idioma y lazos de fraternidad entre la Universidad Penn State y programa universitario de Tepetl, así como las posibles alianzas locales.
- Incorporar aportes y posibilidades de los intercambios entre jóvenes voluntarios y estudiantes en afán de optimizar habilidades y destrezas en el aprendizaje del idioma y el enriquecimiento educativo en estos espacios.
- Mejorar la creatividad e innovación respecto al proceso enseñanza aprendizaje del idioma inglés como una base primordial de comunicación en el mundo.
- Consolidar equipos locales, para respaldar rutas educativas en el proceso enseñanza aprendizaje del inglés en el municipio y luego en el departamento.
- Desarrollar foros, seminarios de estudio, intercambios, análisis y otros escenarios que permitan una praxis efectiva del idioma y los espacios de comunicación y divulgación del proyecto.

English Translation:

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING-LEARNING PEDAGOGICAL PROJECT IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF TEPETL**

**ACTIVITIES**

1. In conjunction with the language program in Tepetl in partnership with Penn State We will strengthen the teaching skills of the language facilitators in the municipality, through the dates of pedagogical realization, in the Graduate Program of Tepetl and the collaboration of the project from doctorate. Katie Master.

   1.1. During the first trimester, the 5 local language facilitators will strengthen their skills and will be the keys to the sustainability of the program in the region, during Katie's visit and initiatives (January-March). The facilitators will be the 2 proposed by the [local NGO] and those proposed by the UZN Program that, by the way, has the support of a colleague from California who is doing research here, her name is Amelia.

2. Development of a Coordinated Curricular Program (January-March 2017)

   2.1. Formulation of program proposal
   2.2 Development and methodological implementation to strengthen the training of 100 actors (children, youth, adolescents), 20 primary and secondary English teachers and at least 20 adults with a desire to learn English in the municipality.

3. Program communication and release (From its inception actions will be carried out in favor of establishing effective communication of the actions of an academic project that will bring about cultural and social development, inherent of education as a universal right in a territory located in the northern zone of Nicaragua with a vision of national growth). This point is an action in each project moment.
4. Inter-institutional relations: We have visualized alliances and found a series of actors that at the momento will be the firm basis for the management of scholarships and other social collaborations for young people with limited resources who wish to study. (Local governments, Ministry of Education, Banking Entities, Commercial Houses and Technical Vocational Center)

5. Exchange of experiences and socio-cultural feedback between English students from Tepetl and young volunteers from the United States.

5.1. 100 actors complete their professionalization as English students through exchanges with students or people that Katie considers appropriate through the collaboration of the program.
5.2. 20 teachers with greater command of English and prepared to provide better service in their different educational centers.
5.3. 20 adults communicating with relatives abroad and sharing with family members the expectation of the language. (Adults who want to access English classes are people who travel to the United States and want to learn the essentials)
5.4. 03 sociocultural exchanges, between actors and project agents to realize knowledge of English.
5.5 20 volunteer students and 100 English students in the Tepetl-Penn State program participate in the Exchange

OBJECTIVES:

- Strengthen capacities and educational quality from teachers and towards all levels.
- Expand the educational coverage of the English language at all levels of low quality.
- Strengthen a sustainable educational model based on a cultural identity based on language teaching and bonds of fraternity between Penn State University and Tepetl's university program, as well as possible local alliances.
- Incorporate contributions and possibilities of exchanges between young volunteers and students in an effort to optimize abilities and skills in language learning and educational enrichment in these spaces.
- Improve creativity and innovation regarding the teaching learning process of the English language as a fundamental basis of communication in the world.
- Consolidate local teams to support educational routes in the process of teaching English in the municipality and then in the department.
- Develop forums, study seminars, exchanges, analyses and other scenarios that allow for an effective praxis of the language and the spaces for communication and dissemination of the project.
Appendix D: Map of UZN Office

- Room 1: Entrance
  - Paulo and Linda's Administration office

- Room 2: My office
  - Space for workshops and meetings

- Room 3: Not in use

- Room 4: Not in use

- Room 5: Not in use

- Garden Fountain

- Non-functioning toilet

- Closet

- Non-functioning toilet

- Window

- Orange tree
- Lime tree
- Water Basin
- Open courtyard, no roof
- Icotec tree

- Functional Bathroom
Appendix E: Map of Access Classroom at CSB
Appendix F: Interview Questions for Cesar and Reyna

1. ¿Cuántos años tiene y donde nació y se crió? [How old are you? And where were you born and raised?]

2. Cuénteme un poco sobre su vida. ¿Cuántos hermanos y hermanas? ¿Vivió con ambos padres? ¿Cuáles son algunos recuerdos positivos de su infancia y adolescencia? [Tell me a little about your life. How many brothers and sisters? Did you live with both parents? What are some positive memories of your childhood and adolescence?]

3. ¿Cuál es su formación académica: primaria, secundaria, universidad, certificados? [What is your academic training: primary, secondary, university, certificates?]

4. ¿Cuando y donde empezó a aprender inglés? [Where and when did you begin to learn English?]

5. ¿Por qué quiso aprender inglés? [Why did you want to learn English.]

6. Explicame algunas de las luchas y tensiones, y algunos de los logros positivos sobre aprender inglés. [Explain some of your struggles and tensions, and some of your positive achievements about learning English.]

7. ¿Cómo describiría su dominio del inglés? ¿Cuáles son sus mejores habilidades, por ejemplo, hablar, escuchar, escribir? ¿Y en qué cosas le gustaría trabajar? [How would you describe your command of English? What are your best skills, for example, speaking, listening, writing? And what things would you like to work on?]

8. ¿Se siente lo suficientemente cómodo con sus habilidades de inglés para enseñar el tema a los estudiantes de la universidad? [Do you feel comfortable enough with your English skills to teach the subject to college students?]

9. ¿Cuáles son las edades de sus hijos y están aprendiendo inglés, o quiere que aprendan inglés? ¿Por qué, o por qué no? [What are the ages of your children and are they learning English, or do you want them to learn English? Why, or why not?]

10. ¿Tiene otros familiares que saben inglés? [Do you have other relatives who know English?]

11. ¿Cuál es su empleo actual? [What is your current employment?]

12. En el futuro, ¿a quien quiere enseñar inglés? [In the future, who do you want to teach English to?]

13. ¿Qué siente que es positivo sobre enseñar inglés? [What do you feel is positive about teaching English?]

14. ¿En su opinión, cuáles son algunas razones positivas para aprender inglés en Tepetl y en Nicaragua en general? ¿Y cómo el conocimiento del inglés puede ser un beneficio? [In your opinion, what are some positive reasons for learning English in Tepetl and in Nicaragua in general? And how can knowledge of English be a benefit?]
15. ¿En su opinión, hay consecuencias negativas de aprender inglés en Nicaragua? [In your opinion, are there negative consequences of learning English in Nicaragua?]

16. ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre el inglés como lengua mundial? [What is your opinion about English as a world language?]

17. ¿Cuántas veces al mes y de qué manera está expuesto al inglés? [How many times per month and in what way are you exposed to English?]

18. ¿Qué tipo de recursos no tiene actualmente pero desea tener para aprender inglés? [What kind of resources do you not currently have but want to have to learn English?]

19. ¿Ha enseñado el inglés en el pasado? Si es así, ¿a quién y qué edad de los estudiantes, nivel, tipo de escuela o programa? [Have you taught English in the past? If yes, to whom and what age of the students, level, type of school or program?]

20. ¿Cuando digo la palabra “crítico” o la frase “pensamiento crítico,” sobre qué opina, o sobre qué piensa? [Okay. And when I say the word “critical” or the phrase “critical thinking” what you think about, or about what you think?]

21. ¿Qué piensa de incorporar un aspecto crítico en el currículo de inglés? [What do you think about incorporating a critical aspect into the English curriculum?]

22. ¿Ha trabajado anteriormente con de voluntario profesor de inglés de otro país? [Have you worked previously with a volunteer English teacher from another country?]

23. ¿Qué cosas le gustó y no le gustó de la ayuda que recibió de mí? [What were some things that you liked and didn’t like about the help that you received from me?]

24. ¿Hay algo más que le gustaría discutir sobre el aprendizaje o enseñanza del inglés? [Is there something more that you would like to discuss about the learning or teaching of English?]
Appendix G: Interview Questions for Enrique

1. How old are you and where were you born and raised?
2. Tell me a little about your childhood, your memories, your positive memories, negative memories of just growing up here in Tepetl and what that was like?
3. How did you come to be interested in learning English? How and when did you learn English?
4. How older were you when you took your first English course? Tell me about the kinds of classes you have taken over the years.
5. How did you get into teaching English?
6. Did you go to university? If so, what did you study?
7. Did you ever receive training or teacher education in order to become an English teacher at any point in your career?
8. How did you become involved in the Access Program?
9. When you got hired for the Access Program, did they give any specific training for teachers? If so, for how long and what was it like?
10. For Access, are there specific policies that you have to follow about how to teach English?
11. Do you have any flexibility with teaching, or do you always have to follow certain rules?
12. I noticed that you do not teach grammar explicitly, but that you tend to create meaning for students and a context for them to learn the grammar. Tell me about how and why you teach grammar in this way.
13. What are your thoughts about English in Nicaragua and English in the world? Do you think it is a positive thing, a negative thing, both, neither?
14. Do you think that a Nicaraguan who knows English well has better social and economic opportunities in their lives than a Nicaraguan who does not know English? Why or why not?
15. Do you think it would be a good or bad idea to incorporate into the English classroom some of the social, political, and economic issues that your students see in their world and bring that into an English class as context and content? Have you done that in the past, or have you considered doing it before?
16. Looking towards your future, what do you want in terms of your English teaching? Where do you see yourself? What do you see yourself doing in five years?
17. You mentioned that this was the first time that you got to work with a volunteer in your classroom. What was it like for you? What were some of the interesting moments? Although it is always awkward to say so, please feel comfortable expressing any difficult moments about my work with you, too.
18. What kind of advice do you have for other North American volunteers who want to help in classrooms or be supportive of teachers? Do you have any feedback for me after working with me and how I and others can better support you in the future?
Appendix H: Interview Questions for Amelia

1. Before joining the Peace Corps were you involved in volunteering back home at all?

2. How did you become curious about joining the Peace Corps?

3. Did you have a choice in which country you volunteered?

4. Tell me a little bit about the places you work now as a PCV in Nicaragua, and describe what you do and in what capacity.

5. How did you meet Paulo and Linda and get involved with working with them at UZN?

6. What is your experience with and perspective on higher education in general in Nicaragua? Can you comment on how the system works regarding public universities, private universities, small universities, big universities, accreditation, or other issues?

7. Do you feel you’re often asked to help with English teaching or tutoring in Tepetl?

8. What differences do you see in how Cesar and Reyna are becoming teachers for UZN compared to how Enrique teaches at CSB?

9. You told me that you tutor a girl, your neighbor, who is in Enrique’s class. Can you tell me a little bit about what that entails and how you feel about your work with her?

10. In terms of Reyna and Cesar’s teaching development um or just working with them in any sort of workshop or tutoring capacity, do you recall any specific strengths or specific obstacles in their teaching development that you noticed?

11. What is your opinion about teachers like Reyna and Cesar who very much represent a lot of teachers around the world who hired because they know some English, but then must teach it themselves despite having little to no teaching experience and little to no communicative competence in English?

12. With your extensive experience as a volunteer and also before that your study abroad experiences in different Latin American countries, you have obviously formed some very meaningful friendships with so many people. You have also witnessed some of my own struggles as someone who has been in Tepetl for a short period of time, only six months in total. Do you have advice for volunteers like me and others work on a shorter-term basis on how to build meaningful and productive relationships? Or do you think that short-term volunteering cannot reach a point at which such relationships can be made?

13. I have talked to you a bit about my research, that I’m interested in the ecology of global English, how it spreads and effects people especially in peripheral, rural areas low-income countries and how the desire for English is often very strong, but that few socioeconomic opportunities seem to emerge for those who acquire some English. With all of your experience in Tepetl and knowing and seeing these social and political issues in depth, I would value your opinion about incorporating into English classes.
Appendix I: Questionnaire for Students of UZN and CSB

Nombre: _________________________________________ Edad: ______ Sexo: de hombres/de mujeres

Program de estudio (nombre y título de la carrera):________________________________________

1.) ¿Cómo se siente al aprender inglés? ¿Le gustaría aprenderlo o no? ¿Por qué?

2.) Si una clase de inglés básico se ofrecen en la universidad, ¿le gustaría asistir?

3.) ¿Cómo describiría su motivación para ser proficient en inglés? ¿Cómo ve que el inglés es útil para su futuro, o ¿por qué cree que el inglés no es importante para su futuro?

4.) Si usted sabe algo de inglés, ¿Cuántos años ha estado estudiando inglés?

5.) Si practica el inglés, ¿cuáles son los recursos que usa para hacerlo? (Por ejemplo, libros, TV, Facebook, aplicaciones telefónicas, familiares o amigos en los Estados Unidos)

6.) ¿Qué recursos desea que tenga para aprender inglés u otras materias, pero actualmente no tiene acceso?

7.) En su opinión, ¿cuáles son algunas razones positivas para aprender inglés en Nicaragua? ¿Cuál podría ser un beneficio al aprender el idioma inglés?

8.) En su opinión, ¿hay consecuencias negativas al aprender inglés en Nicaragua? En caso afirmativo, ¿cuáles son algunas preocupaciones que tiene con el idioma inglés?

9.) ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre el inglés como lengua mundial? ¿Siente que todo el mundo debería aprender el idioma inglés? ¿Por qué o por qué no?

10.) ¿Cree usted que el aprendizaje del inglés en Nicaragua amenaza la supervivencia de las lenguas indígenas o criollas que se hablan en el país? ¿Por qué o por qué no?

11.) Muchas veces, la gente dice que el inglés puede ayudar a la gente a superar la pobreza y otras circunstancias de la vida. ¿Cree que esto es verdad? ¿Por qué o por qué no?

12.) ¿Hay algo más que le gustaría discutir sobre el aprendizaje del inglés u otros aspectos de su experiencia de aprendizaje?

13.) Si tuviera la opción de aprender el inglés u otro idioma, ¿cuál elegiría? Si elige aprender otro idioma y no el inglés, ¿qué idioma aprendería y por qué?
Appendix J: UZN Draft Syllabus Developed with Teachers

## Unit 1: Me (confidence/uncertainty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 124</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect22</th>
<th>Creative Aspect23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me22</td>
<td>To Be (present tense)</td>
<td>-greetings</td>
<td>-confidence/uncertainty</td>
<td>Cell phone activity: Introducing yourself. Most students and some teachers have never heard or seen themselves speaking English. Learning how we look and sound when speaking English can help us improve our speaking and body language. This activity also uses technology, which is a fun and interactive way to use a tool from our everyday lives. You can also teach students about English learning apps that they can download Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My name is ___</td>
<td>- numbers 1-10</td>
<td>Nicaraguan teachers say that students don’t participate because they are shy or think they will be bullied. Talk with students about how the English classroom is a “safe space,” to support each other. Build an atmosphere of trust and positivity with the students, starting on the first day. Using English is the only way to learn English, and if they don’t participate, they will not learn. “Stand together” activity. Students sit in circle with arms around each other’s shoulders. Everyone tries to stand up together. It is hard, but can be accomplished together! Appendix B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am _____ years old</td>
<td>- basic student and job vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am a _______ (this/that)</td>
<td>- basic classroom commands (See Appendix A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demonstratives</td>
<td>- classroom objects (e.g. desk, chair, chalkboard, whiteboard, markers, eraser, pencil, notebook, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Indefinite Articles (a/an)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 Paulo Freire wanted students to think critically about their life situations, what they were learning and why. Not every class must be critical, but in regard to English, it is important to have honest conversations with our students. These conversations can be had in English or Spanish. The first language is a great resource for learning a second language.

23 Both the critical aspect and creative aspect are just ideas to help guide you. You do not have to do these activities or have these discussions; you might have better ideas that you would like to do. An appendix is provided with sample activities of some of these ideas. Also refer to the Peace Corps Manual for activities, especially the final pages of the manual, the “Multi-purpose activities Index,” on pp. 252-274, which you can creatively or critically adapt.

24 Days are based on a two-hour class period held once a week, on Saturday. This was created for the UZN schedule, which holds university classes on Saturdays, for one-hour block periods, 26 times a year. Teachers can be flexible with changing these timetables.

| Day 2 | *Me and others*  
-Plural nouns  
-Subject pronouns  
-‘to be’ and ‘to have’ (present tense)  
-Adjective + noun word order  
-How many? Numbers 1-21, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100  
**Pronunciation practice:**  
Plural /s/: /s/ cats, /z/ pens, /ez/ couches  
-introductions  
-descriptions to describe myself and others  
-basic verbs associated with ‘doing’ and ‘having’ things:  
I play the guitar/soccer; I walk to school | -confidences/uncertainty  
**Not every class period has to have a critical element.**  
However, if you notice issues in the classroom (or outside of it) that you think students should be thinking about regarding their world, consider including them in the lesson plan. | Decorate the classroom/Decorate your notebook.  
Because English is not a part of our daily lives, we can make a space for seeing it a little more. Make English more visible for you and your students. |
|---|---|---|
| Day 3 | *My daily routine*  
-Review last class (20 min)  
-The Alphabet  
-Direct Object pronouns  
-To Do (present tense)  
-Prepositions “in”, “at”, “on”  
-Possessive adjectives (my/your/his/our/their)  
-telling time  
-days of the week  
-days of the month  
-the weather (It is sunny; it is cloudy) | *Confidence/uncertainty*  
Discuss: What makes it difficult to study English at home? (e.g. my baby needs much of my time; my brothers are loud; I have household chores; I work a lot). Discuss with students problems in their daily routines and work to find resolutions | *Your turn: Design a lesson plan from the today’s lesson content that has a creative and interactive element.*  
Day 4*  
(PCM p. 86-93, p. 109-115)  
**Unit1 Assessment (Quiz)** | *Your turn: Design a lesson plan from the today’s lesson content that has a creative and interactive element.*  
**Confidence/uncertainty**  
Maintaining good health and caring about the health of others improves the learning environment. PCM has many activities to help us talk about health issues.  
|  

---

26 Unit Assessment should take place: What do your students know? What are they able to do with English? It is recommended to conduct a small unit assessment (e.g., a quiz) every unit, and a larger, comprehensive unit assessment (e.g., an exam) every two units. Giving a test or a quiz – written or oral – is a traditional way to assess students’ learning. However, The PCM (p. 12-14) provides information on how to provide performance-based assessment that actually reflects what students can do with the language, not just on their own, but with others. We expand their recommended assessment because in a Freirean-based curriculum, assessment is not just about if students accomplished the goals of the unit. We can also assess social interaction: did the students understand each other? Did you understand them? Were they successful in completing the task, even with a few difficulties or misunderstandings? We also assess ourselves as teachers, as well as our curriculum, in order to learn how we can improve our practice when we teach the same content in the future.

27 English teachers in Nicaragua often express the desire to improve their and their students’ pronunciation, but PCM does not have pronunciation assistance. Knowing the International Phonetic Alphabet and how to use it is a very important first step for language teachers (See Appendix D). A valuable online recourse is “The Sounds of American English” by the University of Iowa, found at http://soundsofspeech.uiowa.edu/english/english.html. The interactive diagram shows how the mouth and tongue move to produce sounds, and it is especially informative for how to pronounce vowels in English. Teachers and students can also download learning apps on their phones. One helpful one for phonetics is “Dict Box.”
## Unit 2: My Family and Household (communication/non-communication)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 5</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect</th>
<th>Creative Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PCM p. 42-45, p. 61-67, p. 100-104, p. 228-230)</td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>-family members -past tense of BE -household chores -inside the house -activities/sports</td>
<td>Communication/noncommunication</td>
<td>My family tree. Students create their family tree with marker and poster. They describe each family member. They present in front of the class to build confidence using English with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation practice: /sh/ (shoulder, relationship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My family history</td>
<td>-verb “used to [x]” (e.g., used to climb trees)</td>
<td>Communication/noncommunication</td>
<td><em>Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that implements a critical element into today’s lesson about students’ lives or about learning English.</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PCM p. 37, p. 42, p. 61, p. 106-109, 155-158)</td>
<td>Past tense regular verbs (-ed) -Contractions (Can’t, Don’t, Haven’t) -WH-questions</td>
<td>-verbs for story telling (e.g. to grow up – she grew up) -phrases (when she/he was young…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation practice: Past tense /-ed/: /t/ jumped; /d/ shaved; /ed/ divided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 7</td>
<td>Parents and families</td>
<td>-Review vocabulary for describing family activities and chores -Review question formation -Review negation (He does not/ he doesn’t)</td>
<td>Communication/noncommunication</td>
<td><em>Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that implements a critical element into today’s lesson about students’ lives or about learning English.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PCM p. 45-48, p. 147, p. 249)</td>
<td>-Opinion expressions (In my opinion) -the modal SHOULD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 8</td>
<td>Give students a quiz on the unit content. After the quiz or activity, review the answers with the class and have a collective discussion about which areas the class can focus on in order to improve. Use the rest of the class period to practice difficult quiz items with games, interactive activities, and problem-solving.</td>
<td>Unit 1 &amp; 2 assessment (Quiz or activity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 9</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Critical Aspect</td>
<td>Creative Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- prepositions of place  
(e.g. in, at, on, between, behind)  
- review adjective + noun word order  
- Giving directions (imperative mood) | *Communication/noncommunication*  
-Linguistic landscape activity:  
Where is English (and other languages) in my current life and daily routine? (Commercials? Music? Street signs? In stores?)  
Have students locate where they see/hear English, and for how long they typically see/hear it. Engage in a discussion about the difficulty of maintaining a language that is not a part of our daily lives, and how we might find ways to practice a language that is not around us. Do students feel stressed or unmotivated to communicate in English if it is not found in the community? Why or why not? | Obstacle course.  
One student leaves the room while other students move desks and chairs around to design an obstacle course. The student comes into the class blindfolded.  
Another student must direct him or her around the classroom using prepositions of place. |
| | *Critical Aspect* | | |
| | **Communication/noncommunication** | | |

| Day 10 | Work places and jobs | - jobs (e.g. farmer, babysitter, cashier)  
- workplaces (bank, farm, hotel)  
- Verbs for work (build, cook, sew, plant)  
- adjectives (responsible, on time, hard-working/lazy, honest/dishonest) | *Critical Aspect*  
-Linguistic landscape activity:  
Where is English (and other languages) in my current life and daily routine? (Commercials? Music? Street signs? In stores?)  
Have students locate where they see/hear English, and for how long they typically see/hear it. Engage in a discussion about the difficulty of maintaining a language that is not a part of our daily lives, and how we might find ways to practice a language that is not around us. Do students feel stressed or unmotivated to communicate in English if it is not found in the community? Why or why not? | *Critical Aspect*  
-Linguistic landscape activity:  
Where is English (and other languages) in my current life and daily routine? (Commercials? Music? Street signs? In stores?)  
Have students locate where they see/hear English, and for how long they typically see/hear it. Engage in a discussion about the difficulty of maintaining a language that is not a part of our daily lives, and how we might find ways to practice a language that is not around us. Do students feel stressed or unmotivated to communicate in English if it is not found in the community? Why or why not? |
| (p. 121-127, p. 218-222) | | | |

| Day 11 | Work places and jobs | - verbs for being careful on the job: beware of, no ___ allowed, Don’t ___ - vocabulary of caution | "Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that implements a critical element into today’s lesson about students’ lives or about learning English." |
| (PCM p. 129-136, p. 163-166; p. 275) | | | |

| Day 12 | Cumulative midterm exam, Units 1-3 | This exam should be longer and more comprehensive than a quiz. However, teachers still are encouraged to use interactive methods of assessment. | "Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that implements a critical element into today’s lesson about students’ lives or about learning English." |
| | | | |

"Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that has a creative or interactive element."
### Unit 4: My country (quality/inequality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 13</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect</th>
<th>Creative Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (PCM p. 147-154, p. 170-181) | Activities in my country | Likes and preferences
Entertainment activities
Music and Nicaraguan folklore stories
A future trip
Invitations | Quality/inequality Discussion: What are some obstacles in your life that keep you from enjoying the things you like and fulfilling the dreams that you have? Brainstorm ideas about how you can move past some of those obstacles in order to find a balance between the things we have to do (for family, for work) and things that we want to do (for our health, happiness, and futures) | Risky/Healthy Activities dialogue (PCM p. 236). Work in pairs and develop dialogues about healthy ideas and bad ideas for activities. Present dialogue in front of class. |

| Day 14 | Buying things in my country | Currency
Buying things (e.g. buy, purchase, clothes, shoes)
Selling things (e.g. sell, market, trade, negotiate) | Quality/inequality Nicaragua is seeing an increase in tourism and volunteerism. Have you encountered a tourist or volunteer? If so, was it positive or negative? Have students read and discuss article on tourists behaving badly. **Appendix H** | Role play: Give directions to a lost tourist to a location in town (e.g., the park), or a tourist destination (e.g. aguas calientes). |

| Day 15 | Traveling in my country | Geographical destinations (beach, mountain, volcano, river, valley)
Items to bring when taking a trip (bathing suit, hiking boots, snacks, life jacket, camera) | Quality/inequality The recent canal project through Nicaragua can bring new opportunities to Nicaragua. It also can negatively impact the environment and people’s lives. How do you see the construction of the canal affecting Nicaragua’s future? **Appendix I** | Chain reaction activity (PCM p. 236). Each student stands and gives an “if…then” statement. The next student continues the “if…then” chain by starting with the effect of the last student’s statement as the new “if.” |

| Day 16 | Environment and Natural Disasters in my country | Vocabulary about nature words (dirt, leaf/leaves, mountains)
Animals (bird, frog, horse)
Vocabulary about natural disasters | Quality/inequality The recent canal project through Nicaragua can bring new opportunities to Nicaragua. It also can negatively impact the environment and people’s lives. How do you see the construction of the canal affecting Nicaragua’s future? **Appendix I** | *Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that has a creative or interactive element.* |

*Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that implements a critical element into today’s lesson about students’ lives or about learning English.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 17</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect</th>
<th>Creative Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **My neighbors and our similarities** | -Past tense verbs  
-Introduce 5 new irregular verbs from verb list  
-Can/can’t (Yes, she can. No, he can’t) | -Countries and continents  
-Nationalities and languages  
-Capitals of countries | **Quality/inequality**  
What are positive things that your neighboring countries are doing that are strengthening their personal health, education opportunities, and economy? What are some problems that these countries face with health, education, and economy? How do their choices affect Nicaraguans? | *Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that has a creative or interactive element.* |
| **Pronunciation Practice:** | /dg/ (judge) vs. /ʃ/ (measure) | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 18</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect</th>
<th>Creative Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **My neighbors and our differences** | -Present progressive (I am graduating)  
-False cognates (e.g. embarrassed/embrazada; assist/asistir; actually/actualmente) | -Life events (e.g. graduate, finish, marry (to get married), move, receive)  
-Diversity and new nouns and adjectives (e.g. ethnicity, gender, handicap, disability, race, religion) | **Quality/inequality**  
*Your turn: Design a discussion or activity that implements a critical element into today’s lesson about students’ real lives or about learning English.* | Gallery walk (PCM p. 260). Students work in groups to present interesting facts about a neighboring country in Latin America. They present posters at “stations” around the room. Students visit each other’s posters and learn about the neighboring country. |
| **Pronunciation practice:** | /ʃ/ /ɡ/ /ph/ (stuff, laugh, phone) | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 19</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect</th>
<th>Creative Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Gender in Central America** | -Adverbs of frequency (e.g., usually, never, often, always)  
-Gerunds (nouns that end in [-ing]: Playing soccer is fun.) | -Responsibility and Gender roles  
-Vocabulary about being responsible in our relationships (adulthood, tradition, advantage, disadvantage, equal)  
-Vocabulary of chores and daily activities (sweep, clean, iron) | **Quality/inequality**  
PCM p. 248: Write Male, Female, Both on the board. Pass out papers with words on them to students, who tape their paper under Male, Female, or Both. Go through each word and ask students if they agree on the placement of each. If students have strong opinions, ask, “Why can’t it be both?” | Weekly chores schedule (PCM p. 247). Review adverbs of frequency. Students make a weekly calendar and check it off with chores they do each day, using a sentence with an adverb: “Usually I mop on Monday.” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 20</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect</th>
<th>Creative Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 4 and 5 assessment (Quiz or activity)</strong></td>
<td>Give students a quiz on the unit content. After the quiz or activity, review the answers with the class and have a collective discussion about which areas the class can focus on in order to improve. Use the rest of the class period to practice difficult quiz items with games, interactive activities, and problem-solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Unit 6: My world (local/global)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 21</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Critical Aspect</th>
<th>Creative Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PCM p. 76-83, p. 210-215)</td>
<td><em>Me and my world</em></td>
<td>-Review continents, countries, nationalities, languages</td>
<td><em>Local/global</em></td>
<td><em>Your turn:</em> Design a discussion or activity that has a creative or interactive element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Past progressive (He was playing)</td>
<td>-Tell your story: Who are you in the world?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Expressions of time (It is half past five; It is four thirty; It is a quarter to six)</td>
<td>-Famous Stories: Famous Nicaraguans and their impact on the country and in the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-Pronunciation practice:</strong> when /t/ is pronounced as /d/: Little (lidl); butter (budr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 22</td>
<td><em>Me and my world</em></td>
<td>-Human Rights vocabulary (e.g. equality, freedom, right, vote, protest)</td>
<td><em>Local/global</em></td>
<td>Introduce and play in class, “Where is the love?” by the Black Eyed Peas. Students work in groups to translate different portions of the lyrics. Come together as a class, explain the meaning, and talk about inequality that exists in America, e.g., degradation of types of English. Appendix K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 223-227)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Freedom and Equality (e.g. oppression, discrimination, poverty, pride, unity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Adverb clauses (because, since)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-Pronunciation practice:</strong> /ough/ as vowel (e.g., thorough (u), thorough (o), thought (a))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 23</td>
<td><em>Me and my world</em></td>
<td>-Modern Inventions (e.g. technology, computer, calculator, internet)</td>
<td><em>Local/global</em></td>
<td><em>Your turn:</em> Design a discussion or activity that has a creative or interactive element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PCM p. 240-244)</td>
<td>-Prepare for final exam on Chapters 3-6</td>
<td>-Globalization (e.g. exchange, collaboration, global flows, economy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 24</td>
<td>Final Exam on Units 3-6 is more comprehensive than a quiz. However, teachers still are encouraged to use interactive methods of assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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