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ABSTRACT

THE DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A CRITICAL LANGUAGE AWARENESS PROGRAM FOR PRESERVICE TEACHERS

by

Gillian Frances Paton

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, 1997

The need for preservice teachers to become more aware of the role language plays in shaping and being shaped by power relations has been identified. The purpose of this study was to develop a Critical Language Awareness Program for Preservice Teachers and evaluate its potential educational value. The evaluations were conducted through focused interviews with educational experts who are familiar with the theory underlying the program and the learning needs of preservice teachers. The study revealed that in the experts' opinions, the program would be useful and have educational value for preservice teachers. However, several minor problems with the program were identified, and it is recommended that they be corrected before the program is implemented at a Faculty of Education.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

In 1993, the Government of Ontario formed the Royal Commission on Learning "to demonstrate its commitment to economic renewal and social justice" (1994 a, p. vii). The Commission's report, *For the Love of Learning*, concluded that Ontario schools are inequitable: "there can be no question that schools work best for those from higher socio-economic backgrounds" (p. 1). It was recommended that schools strive to change the pattern of success and failure so that all students will be educated equally regardless of the students' backgrounds. The Commission proposed that gender, racial, language, and cultural differences should not be regarded nor treated as deficits. Instead, these differences ought to be "acknowledged and valued by schools" as they represent the "different contexts, knowledge, and skills that children may bring to school" (1994 b, p. 58).

The Commission issued several recommendations designed to reduce or eliminate existing barriers to equal education. For example, it was proposed that all teaching materials, practices, curriculum, and assessment tools be systematically reviewed to ensure that they are, "free of racism and meet the spirit and letter of anti-racist policies" (Commission, 1994 a, p. 78). The Commission also considered the role that the ten Ontario faculties of education should play in preparing approximately 6,000 preservice
teachers per year for their future work in diverse education settings. In particular, it was recommended that student teachers should, "understand and appreciate the linguistic, …cultural, and social differences among students, and become aware of how to build on the strengths students from different backgrounds bring to school," (1994 d, p. 25). It was acknowledged that educators, "need assistance in thinking critically about their work in the schools, so that they can do more than merely replicate what they see" (1994 a, p. 17).

Thus, an important way to foster such critical thinking and an appreciation for students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds could be through the provision of a critical language awareness (CLA) program for preservice teachers. CLA studies examine the nexus between language, power and ideology, so that students can begin to understand how language shapes and is shaped by power relations. Through such a program, teachers are prepared to enter classroom settings with an understanding of how their language use can either be a means of maintaining and reproducing dominant social structures or a means of resisting such structures and promoting social equality. Without a critical view of language teachers can unwittingly marginalize students whose gender, social, linguistic or cultural backgrounds do not represent that of dominant social groups. As yet, no Canadian faculty of education offers a specific course which focuses on helping preservice teachers develop a critical understanding of the relationship between language, culture and social structures. The effects of discrimination are far reaching: the construction of poor self-images, lower academic success rates, and the perpetuation of social injustices. Of course, all these social and academic ills, have complex causes which should also be addressed from outside the educational system.
The purpose of this thesis is to design a CLA program and conduct a formative evaluation of the CLA program for preservice teachers using Smith's Evaluability Assessment, (EA) model.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Will the proposed *Critical Language Awareness Program for Preservice Teachers* be of educational value to preservice teachers?

**OBJECTIVES OF THE INVESTIGATION**

The investigation is primarily intended to:

1) design and develop a CLA program for preservice teachers;

2) complete a formative evaluation of the program so that recommendations for program modifications and improvements can be proposed based on the information gathered during focused interviews with educational experts.

**OUTLINE OF THE THESIS**

The chapters of the thesis are as follows:

Chapter Two is a review of the relevant literature on issues related to the effects of school inequalities, and a review of CLA literature including classroom examples of CLA. It also reviews literature on formative evaluation and summarizes Smith's (1989) EA model.
Chapter Three describes the research methodology employed in this investigation. It describes the advantages of a qualitative study for the topic, the design and objectives of the research questions, the method of data collection, transcription and data analysis, and the limitations of the study.

Chapter Four presents the findings of the study based on the participant interviews. The findings are organized into categories which reflect Smith's EA model and the objectives of this study.

Chapter Five first summarizes the data and then the findings are discussed with respect to the literature reviewed. Finally conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made concerning the proposed CLA program.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

For educators, it is not sufficient only to perceive the need for schools to become more equitable and socially just. Rather, according to a transformative approach, educators must be genuinely committed to examining, challenging and changing existing prejudicial practices. The need for re-evaluation and reform is essential given the ethnic and linguistic pluralism inherent in many Canadian cities. For example, in an United Nation's study Toronto was described as the most ethnically diverse city in the world (Majhanovich & Majhanovich, 1993). Moreover, the North York Board of Education 1993 school statistics indicate that in the school population of 60,000 students: 40 percent were born outside of Canada, 71 percent had a mother and/or father born outside of Canada, 43 percent had a home language other than English, and more than 80 first languages from 120 countries of origin are represented (p. 14).

DROP.OUT RATE AS AN INDICATION OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY

In general, however, this wealth of diversity and knowledge is often not valued and nurtured in schools, but instead, is transformed into a barrier that prevents an alarming number of minority students from realizing their potential. It has been demonstrated that in Canadian secondary schools specific ethnic and racial groups show underachievement and high dropout rates (McKay & Myles, 1989; Radwanski, 1988; Wright & Tsuji, 1984).
For example, the Toronto Board of Education investigated their retention rate of a group of students by conducting a five-year study. The study tracked the 4,077 students who started grade nine in the 1987-1988 school year for five years. By the end of their fifth year in the Toronto Board, the 1991-1992 school year: 56 percent graduated with their Ontario Secondary School Diploma, 11 percent had not graduated and were still attending school in the Toronto Board, while 33 percent had left school without graduating. Of the students who "dropped-out", Black, Aboriginal, Portuguese and Latino students had the highest dropout rates. For example, 42 percent of Black students dropped out, only 31 percent of White students and 18 percent of Asian students dropped out (Brown, 1993, p. 3). These findings mirror the low success rates of minority students in the United States.

In the United States, the disadvantages of being a minority student have been extensively studied. In cities such a Los Angles, San Francisco, Chicago, New York and Miami minority students comprise from 70 to 90 percent of the student population. However, the dropout rates of 50 percent or greater are the norm for these students (Darder, 1991, p. 2). Minority students are also over-represented in special education. Irvine (1991) for example, found that African-American students are three times as likely to be placed in a class for the educable developmentally disabled than Caucasian students but only one-half as likely to be in a class for the gifted or talented. The National Assessment of Educational Progress in the United States compared the reading proficiency levels of African American and Caucasian students. Although 53 percent of Caucasian students in grade eleven could perform the reading tasks they were likely to encounter in
college, only 20 percent of African American students could perform these tasks (Irvine, 1991). There are declining annual college attendance rates among middle class African American students in the United States.

Even though the dropout rate of all students has decreased significantly from the 90 percent dropout rate of the 1900, Wehlage and Rutter (1986) explained how historically the labour market has been able to absorb students leaving school with a limited education level. However, given the technological advances and labour market, Wehlage and Rutter (1986) propose that in order to be employable in anything other than menial work students entering the labour market today will have to master the core competencies commonly acquired in high school.

THE PROBLEM OF INEQUALITY

These statistics have led researchers to conclude that the present educational system is "dysfunctional for disproportionately large numbers of children who are not part of the racial and language mainstream" (Crochrane-Smith, 1995, p. 494). In the United States, Asante (1991) has supported this view by explaining how, "African Americans have been educated away from their own culture and traditions and attached to the fringes of European culture; thus dislocated from themselves" (p. 170). The Canadian educational system is also beset with problems of racial, gender and cultural biases. The Royal Commission on Learning, formed by the Ontario government also acknowledged the problem of unequal education in their 1994 report For The Love Learning.
CAUSES OF INEQUALITIES

Researchers have investigated why such inequalities exist. Two causes consistently identified by researchers that are believed to put students at risk of school failure are based on nature (genetic) and nurture (environmental) arguments. The nature argument seeks to explain differences in achievement rates by attempting to establish evidence of genetic deficiencies within certain groups of children (Jensen, 1969). The nurture argument identifies environmental factors like family income, parents' occupation, parents' educational attainment and cultural deprivation as causes of differences in success rates (Cohen, 1968). The problem with both approaches is that the victim is blamed for their underachievement, and this shifts the responsibility for solving the problem from the institution to individual students. As Darder (1991) explains following the twenty years of liberal educational reform, the provision of competency programs and considering individuals as the cause of low success rates this approach has been unable to effect improved success rates. Therefore, Darder argues that it is necessary to consider institutional issues and address the problem by examining and challenging the traditional educational values and practices that structure the relationships in schools. Thus, by shifting the blame for low success rates from the victim to institutional practices and views, one may be able to examine how these practices and views can function to systematically disadvantage students.

The work of educational and cultural critics such as Apple in the United States, Gramsci in Italy, and Bourdieu in France, has helped raise awareness about the role that schools play in reproducing the dominant social structures in these societies. Each critic
has proposed different theories about how dominant structures emerge and reproduce themselves, whether it be through the design of curriculum, the portrayal of dominant beliefs and values as common knowledge or the valuation of linguistic and cultural capital respectively. However, all agree that examining the relationship between education and the maintenance of unequal power relations is important to gain an understanding of how educators can make schools more equitable. Hence, the interests of all students, not just a few, would be valued and addressed by educators.

WHY DO SOME GROUPS OF MINORITY STUDENTS DO BETTER THAN OTHERS: PART OF A LARGER FRAMEWORK

Apple (1988) discussed the importance of educators by examining the relationship between schools and wider societal structures because schools are integrated into the larger social framework. Ogbu's conception of voluntary and involuntary minorities further clarifies the notion of how larger societal structure affect school practices and how this contributes to the varying success rates among different groups of minority students (1992). Ogbu describes voluntary minorities as people who have voluntarily moved to seek better employment or greater political freedom. These students typically experience initial school problems due to cultural and language difference but this difficulty does not result in lasting and disproportionate school failure. For example, contemporary Chinese and Punjabi Indian immigrants are voluntary minorities in the United States. On the other hand, involuntary minorities are people who were brought to the United States or any other society against their will; by means of enslavement, or other forms of coercion. Ogbu
discussed how involuntary minorities have often been relegated to "menial positions and denied true assimilation into the mainstream society" (p. 8). This conception of how wider societal structures affect school success is significant because in Canada, like the United States, there are both voluntary and involuntary minorities among the student population. For example, refugee students are part of an involuntary minority and they represent 13 percent of secondary and 7 percent of elementary students enrolled in a Toronto Board of Education schools (Yau, 1993). While 7 percent of the student population are Black students and 1 percent Native people (Brown, 1993). The need for educators to be concerned and responsive to the needs of the students is particularly important as the immigration rate is now 215,000 immigrants per year (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 1993) and over half (57%) of all immigrants locate in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver (Statistics Canada, 1992).

Educators should not only be aware of the how schools reflect wider societal norms, but also of how these norms are reflected within the classroom environment. Teachers often unknowingly mirror and impose the dominant culture in the classroom (Schmidt, 1995). This can be a problem for bilingual ethnic minority children who have a home culture different from the dominant culture represented in the classroom while they must learn to function within at least two cultures as they develop their literacies (Cummins, 1986). This representation of the dominant culture as the norm is compounded by the fact that their knowledge of languages, customs, and their literature are often ignored or misunderstood (Schmidt, 1995). Although there is no definitive definition of what constitutes school success, in general educators often define success as students being
able to build upon their previous knowledge and experiences to enhance their understanding of the world while also inculcating the pupils into the pre-existing culture of educated knowledge, both thought and practice (McLaren, 1987). Given students with minority backgrounds, these two goals conflict, and typically the inculcation goal supersedes the goal of "drawing knowledge" out of the students. Moreover, one of the variables that contributes to a low success rate among minority students is language, this is because "school success" tends to become largely dependent upon the skilled use of Standard English and knowledge of the dominant culture.

Cummins (1996), a Canadian researcher, has reviewed how cultural and linguistic boundaries among involuntary minorities are more rigid than for voluntary minorities (p. 21). Thus, minority children develop feelings of shame towards their first language (L1) and culture because they are punished for using their L1 in the classroom and are encouraged to reject their own culture and language in order to identify with the majority Standard-English speaking group. This leads to two outcomes: a) the educational disabling of minority children under these condition reinforces the myth of the minority's group inferiority; and b) even more intense efforts by the school to eradicate the "deficiencies" inherent in minority children, namely, their language and culture (Cummins, 1996, p. 25). Given these circumstances, teachers must learn to deal with their own biases, make a professional priority to enhance children's positive self-identity and never underestimate their influence over the students' lives (Wellhousen, 1993).
EXAMINING PRACTICES AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS LANGUAGE

The present thesis is based on the position that educators could benefit from examining and changing their attitudes about language as well as some of their classroom practices. It has been shown that across a wide range of teachers, classrooms and even countries, teachers do about 66% of talking (Edwards & Mercer, 1987). Teachers, argued Dobbs, would benefit from increasing their awareness of how patterns of discourse work because certain types of language, "tend to centralize authority in the teacher and tend to infantilize and even alienate the student" (Dobbs, 1995, p. 26). For example, teachers ought to examine what is said to constitute correct language or standard form. Language is a fundamental aspect of a person's identity because it reflects his or her heritage and social relations, but it also serves to maintain group identity including social, ethnic and national identity (Edwards, 1985). If a language is treated as improper or substandard, then teachers' language practices can unintentionally marginalize and disadvantage minority students. If such language practices are embodied in their institutional functions then this can systematically produce unfavourable or disadvantageous outcomes for minority students without any awareness or ill-will on the part of teachers. By examining language practices educators can begin to examine how language functions as a means of maintaining and reproducing social structures within both the classroom and larger societal relationships.
BENEFITS OF UNDERSTANDING CLA ISSUES

That teachers have a responsibility to understand how language is shaped by and shapes power relations of the dominant culture has been proposed by McLaren (1987) and Clark et al (1990). Yet this language issue is often ignored in teacher education programs (McLaren, 1987). While teacher education programs endeavour to address some of the real issues and create reflective teachers, they also present the kind of knowledge which will allow preservice teachers to enter the existing social structure with relative ease. Nevertheless, faced the problems and outcomes that can occur if such critical issues are ignored it is argued that preservice teachers would benefit from examining how they can work towards reducing inequalities within classrooms (Royal Commission, 1994). The two primary benefits of incorporating an examination of the relationship between power and language into the curriculum are: first, that preservice teachers would "gain an understanding of how language functions to 'position' people in the world, to shape the range of possible meanings surrounding an issue, and to actively construct reality rather than just merely reflect it" (p. 175) and secondly, that "as a part of language studies, student teachers would become more knowledgeable about and sensitive to the omnipresence and power of language as constitutive of their own experiences and those of their potential students" (p. 175; See also Clark et al, 1990).

Piper (1988) has also supported the argument that given the increasing diversity of cultural and linguistic backgrounds likely to be represented in their future classrooms, preservice teachers need more preparatory work to better understand the relationship between language and ideology. He proposed that this work is key to developing teachers'
critical awareness about the traditional and potential roles in society. Although a number of theorists have recommended CLA courses for preservice teachers, currently no Canadian faculty of education currently offers such a course in their Bachelor of Education programs. Thus, the 6,000 preservice teachers enrolled in Ontario faculties of education each year do not have the opportunity to explore how their language and language practices can affect their students.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A TRADITIONAL LA VIEW OF LANGUAGE AND CLA

One reason for the exclusion of CLA from the existing curriculum may be that the theoretical underpinnings of CLA studies depart from traditional views of language like that offered by Language Awareness (LA) studies. Hawkins (1984), one of LA's most recognized proponents, viewed language as a complex system of patterns and a purposeful process. The primary objective of LA is to describe the discourse of a society or social institution in order to promote a greater awareness of the nature and purpose of language. While CLA theorists acknowledge that language is a patterned and purposeful process, they "consider this view of language to be inadequate without a critical dimension" (Ivanic, 1988, p. 3). They argue that language should be viewed critically in order to explain why discourse takes the form it does (Clark et al, 1991; Fairclough, 1992; Ivanic, 1988) and to help people recognize how language constructs and sustains identities.
OVERVIEW OF CLA

CLA theorists have proposed three areas of study as essential components in the development of a critical and explanatory orientation towards language: 1) social awareness of discourse; 2) social awareness of the diversity of languages and language varieties; 3) developing a consciousness and practices for change (Clark et al, 1991). The literature on CLA provides rationales for the development and encouragement of CLA studies. It also provides examples of how the theoretical concepts can be introduced to students at various grade levels.

PROMOTION OF SOCIAL AWARENESS OF DISCOURSE

Promoting social awareness about discourse is the first major area of concern in CLA studies (Clark et al, 1991). People should become aware of "the connection between discourse and its structural determinants and effects" (p. 42); so that they will come to understand that discourse is a social practice. That is, to understand discourse as being shaped by the existing social relationships, and as shaping existing social relationships. Furthermore, people should recognize how socially dominant forces have the power to shape both discourse and other social practices (Clark et al, 1991). Lakoff (1990) distinguishes between micropolitical and macropolitical discourses. The first involves the development and use of tactics to create and reinforce power differences between individuals; while the second involves strategies that determine power relations within and between groups of people. From an understanding how people are dominated it is possible to work towards changing those practices in so far as mechanisms of domination are dependent upon society's unthinking conformity in maintaining and perpetuating them.
On a micropolitical level, French and French (1984) examined turn-taking during a teacher-led discussion in a primary-junior classroom. There was a significant imbalance in the number of turns taken by girls and boys, with the boys taking 50 turns for every 16 turns taken by the girls. Three boys in particular were identified as being particularly talkative; one boy took 17 turns. Even though the teacher directed the discussion by asking questions and selecting the respondents, particular students used strategies that enabled them to contribute more. For example, one micropolitical strategy used was to offer an answer that was out of the ordinary and which invited further probing by the teacher (p. 60), whereas students who offered more conventional answers were simply acknowledged before the teacher passed to the next student. French and French concluded that the "pupils' use of such strategies ensures that, even in teacher-directed question and answer sessions, the allocation of speaking turns to pupils is collaborative business" (1984, p.61). Teachers would benefit from being aware how such a pattern of discourse works on a micropolitical level so they can prevent the monopolization of discussion by a few students.

On a macropolitical level, Van Dijk (1988) discussed how mass media communication is a way stereotypes and racism are produced and reproduced in Netherlands and United States. He examined not only the amount that was stated about minorities but also how and what was said. News about minorities is often evaluative and frequently includes the use of words like 'threat' and 'violence' (p.216). One conclusion was that at local semantic and stylistic levels, ethnic or racial groups or racial relations in a, "multiethnic society, are consistently associated with problems, conflict, difficulties, if
not with violence and illegality" (p. 218). A CLA program would bring attention to the mass media's role in expressing, legitimizing and reproducing dominant ideologies and prejudicial attitudes.

Connected to promoting a social awareness of discourses is the idea that "conventions tend to be naturalised, so that they appear to be just 'there', rather than being put 'there'" (Clark et al, 1991, p. 43). Conventions are seen as givens and not questioned. The naturalised conception of language generally results in the language practices of the dominant group being viewed as standard and unproblematic. A critical approach to language encourages students to examine these standards rather than take them for granted. Further, many superficially harmless customs, conventions and traditions including dress codes, language rules can contribute to a circle of exclusion and intimidation; those who have mastered a particular practice use it unknowingly to intimidate others (Cameron, 1995). In academia questioning linguistic conventions is often a sign of incomplete or faulty socialization even though posing the question 'why' is normally a sign of intellectual proficiency (p. 12).

Milroy and Milroy (1985) discuss the negative effects of narrow, prescriptive attitudes on students. Prescriptivism sets out to prescribe rules concerning the correct and incorrect use of language. Bolinger (1980) characterized this approach as "linguistic shamanism"; these shamans position themselves as public guardians of language and criticize the supposed misuse of language and decline of English (p. 1-9). Ideas of correctness can adversely affect non-native speakers whose usage differs from the mainstream. For example, standardized language tests, are based on such notions of
correctness. These tests often do not take into account dialect variations, frequency of use, nor the difference between conversation and written rules (Milroy & Milroy, 1985). As a consequence, minority or even majority language users may be improperly assessed as having deficiencies in language skills (p. 4). An alternative approach is descriptivism which is concerned with what is said, adding a critical element to such an approach, educators could avoid making inaccurate and unintentionally demeaning judgements about an individual. Teachers would benefit not only from considering the question, "Should we prescribe?" but also "Who prescribes for whom," "What do they prescribe, how is it prescribed, and for what purposes?" (Cameron, 1995).

CLA researchers have suggested a variety of classroom activities which can aid in promoting a social awareness of discourse. For example, students might investigate the "routine imbalances in communication that occur between teacher and student, doctor and patient and judge and witness" (Corson, 1993, p. 191). Ivanic suggested that students, particularly bilingual students, investigate who has the right to speak and why. Students could also explore answers to other questions such as: "Who gives orders or instructions?"; "Who speaks the most?"; "Who interrupts?"; "Who speaks in their L1?"; Who chooses the topics to speak about?"; "Whose voices are valued the most?" The students can be invited to consider such patterns as privileges belonging to people as individuals or as members of social groups with power.

Another way a teacher may promote a greater awareness of discourse is by asking students to investigate the meanings of words. For example, "Where do meanings come from? Who may authorize meanings? Does a meaning exist, if no dictionary affirms it?"
Furthermore, the topic of "high" and "low" language activities could be addressed: students could gain a better understanding of why reading a recipe is perceived to a lower status activity as compared with delivering a lecture. They could also discuss how an activity can gain, or lose status, depending on who is performing it (p. 192). Wallace (1992) also reported several classroom exercises. For example, she asked students, "Who is the audience? What is the author's purpose? Is the language accessible? Why or why not?" (p. 71). Through participating in such activities students may gain a deeper understanding of how language practices are shaped by and shape their social contexts.

**PROMOTION OF SOCIAL AWARENESS OF THE DIVERSITY OF LANGUAGES AND LANGUAGE VARIETIES**

The second area that CLA theory promotes is an awareness of the diversity of languages and language varieties (Clark et al., 1991, p. 49). Smitherman-Donaldson (1988) reviewed academic discourse on African-American speech in the United States and how it was characterized as "baby-talk, confusing, peculiar and lowly" (p.150), and at worst dismissed as being "no language at all" (p. 156). These characterizations were used to support cognitive and social deficiency theories that "premised the assumption of black linguistic inadequacy, so much so that a few scholars called for the eradication of black language" (p. 157). In response, she made three policy recommendations: the promotion and teaching of Black English; the elevation of Black English and other minority languages and dialects on co-equal status with other widely used languages; and the promotion of one or more foreign languages spoken by Third World persons (p.170).
EXPECTATIONS OF CHILDREN WHO SPEAK NON-DOMINANT LANGUAGE

For the United States, Irvine (1991) observed that African-American students who speak standard English are perceived by teachers to be of higher ability and as belonging to the middle-class whereas, students who speak a variety of African-American English are more negatively judged. Generally teacher expectations have been shown to greatly influence the achievement rates of students (Darder, 1991; Irvine, 1991). The findings indicate that when children are perceived as slow, dull and unmotivated they produce behaviour and attitudes that support the negative expectations. Similarly, if teachers have positive expectations of the children, then they often fulfill them. Added to this problem of self-fulfilling prophecies is the finding that Caucasian teachers have more negative expectations of African-American students than of Caucasian students (Irvine, 1991, p. 56). Further, Lightfoot (1978), has discussed how the language of African-American students is symbolic of the social and cultural backgrounds and how this becomes the basis of teachers' hostility towards Black children. Irvine recommended that schools consider the merits of bidialectalism and eliminate the stigmatization attached to minority children who have not mastered standard English (p. 31).

CLA theorists derive their notion of language valuation from Bourdieu's conception of linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 73). Linguistic capital is "more than the ability to produce grammatically well-formed expressions and forms of language; it also includes the ability to utilize appropriate norms for language usage and to produce the right expressions at the right time" (Corson, 1993, p.10). Thus, CLA studies endeavour to make people aware of how devaluing a person's language also devalues the person.
Secondly, according to CLA theorists, greater awareness of and respect for language diversity is needed because "different conventions embody different ideologies, and dominant conventions embody dominant ideologies; the naturalisation of conventions also naturalises ideologies" (Clark et al, 1991, p. 43). Thus, people will understand how their language usage reflects either their subscription to or rejection of the dominant ideologies, which is also a social construction (Clark et al, 1992; Ivanic, 1988; Fowler, 1979). Heller (1985) discussed the relationship between language, social interaction and inter-ethnic relations in Quebec. For example, the use of French or English or both languages can be a statement about the speakers's attitude towards ethnic relations and the person's view of social norms.

Bourdieu, a social critic describes how "language is not simply an instrument of communication: it provides, together with a richer or poorer vocabulary, a more or less complex system of categories, so that the capacity to decipher and manipulate complex structures, whether logical or aesthetic, depends partly on the complexity of the language transmitted by the family" (Bourdieu, 1990, p.73). In simple terms, the vocabulary children use reflects their parents' vocabulary and tends to mirror the parents' social position.

Another feature of a CLA study is that, in contrast to mainstream LA studies, it has a historical orientation (Fairclough, 1992). By examining how historical events have influenced language, it is possible to gain a greater understanding of how the evolution of language is not 'natural', but rather socially and politically determined. Tracing the evolution of language, gives an understanding of why different languages have different
social valuations (Corson, 1993).

Learning activities which encourage an awareness of language varieties are provided by Fairclough (1992, p. 54), Wallace (1992, p. 59), Ivanic and Simpson (1992, p. 140), P. Clark and Smith (1992, p. 239) and Lancaster and Taylor (1992, p. 256). For example, students could discuss the differences between 'appropriate and correct language' usage and the implications of such a distinction (Fairclough, 1992, p.54). Bolinger (1980) also presents discussion ideas on language varieties and the effects of using a non-prestigious form (p. 45-56). It should be emphasized that CLA studies do not encourage students to abandon linguistic correctness and thus become disadvantaged. Rather, students should "appreciate the possibility, advantages, and risks of critical, creative, emancipatory practice as speakers and writers, and as critical readers and listeners, using for example other languages and dialects for prestigious purposes and contexts where Standard English is generally said to be appropriate" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 54).

PROMOTION OF CONSCIOUSNESS OF AND PRACTICE FOR CHANGE

The third central area of CLA is developing awareness of and "practices for change" (Clark et al, 1991, p. 49). Since, language is "determined by its conventions...it is also a voluntary and creative activity that allows its users to critique the same conventions" (Corson, 1993, p. 191). By recognizing that discourse is itself a practice of struggle people can decide whether they are willing to work to help change negative descriptions of people and things (Clark et al, 1991). Hence, CLA can be used as "a resource for developing the consciousness and self-consciousness of dominated people" (p. 44).
For instance, students can explore the idea that discourse is a social struggle and a dynamic entity by examining the purpose and effects of labelling people, the use of sexist, discursively biased, informal, discriminatory, or rhetorical language (Corson, 1991, p.198-207). Improvements in practice related to gender have also been proposed. For instance, Swann (1992), discussed how gender inequality is supported by girls' and boys' use of language. Swann's findings have important implications for educators, namely that we unwittingly encourage female students to speak in such a way that makes them subservient to male students.

Corson (1991) recommended that students examine instances of discursive bias in language to understand how an implicit meaning is conveyed. For example, they could consider the difference between statements like, "They said that they were present at that time" and "They claimed that they were present at that time" (p. 202). The use of propaganda, euphemisms and dysphemisms is discussed by Bolinger (1980), Corson (1991) and Escholtz (1974). The topic of informal language may also be discussed: "people tend to take discriminatory usages for granted if they are in the company of others who are similar in social, gender, or ethnic background" (Corson, 1991, p. 206). Another area of discussion is discriminatory language; that is, how language can depersonalize particular people and sometimes construct them, as "vermin and animals" rather than present them as equal people (Szasz, 1974, p. 38). In summary, merely critiquing the status quo is not enough for proponents of CLA, but rather educators are called upon to understand social power and language usage and how they can use emancipatory practices in support of social justice.
INCORPORATION OF CLA STUDIES INTO COURSE WORK IN ENGLAND AND SOUTH AFRICA

In several countries, educators have attempted to incorporate CLA studies into curricula. For the purpose of the present investigation, the most significant instance of the incorporation of CLA into a curriculum was a teacher training program developed in South Africa at The Johannesburg College of Education (Mehl and Pendlebury, 1991). It had three central aims: "to develop students' critical understanding of language and the ways in which it shapes our perceptions and interactions; to facilitate independent and co-operative learning; and to equip students with the deep knowledge of language required for competent teaching" (p. 2). These investigators asserted that, while the course is firmly rooted in South African conditions, "it would be of interest to teacher educators elsewhere for it is not only under apartheid that language may serve to coerce, to distort, and to interpellate [see Apple, 1988; Kress & Hodge 1979; Thompson, 1984]" (p. 1). The article outlines a list of assignments and activities which preservice teachers would be required to complete in their CLA course.

CLA lessons have also been incorporated into several classroom settings in England. Lancaster and Taylor (1992) analyzed a CLA program implemented at the Modern Language Department of a Shropshire Secondary School in Malady Court. Clark (1992), has described her effort to introduce CLA into her Study Skills course at Lancaster University. Wallace (1992) reported how she incorporated a critical reading component into a college-of-higher-education course. This list is by no means exhaustive, but rather demonstrates that CLA issues are being introduced to students at various learning levels,
in various courses in different countries.

One problem with the literature on CLA is that since it is a relatively new area of study, clear, concise and practical expositions are rare. CLA programs have emerged from a variety of disciplines and areas of study, including French social theory, sociolinguistics, multiculturalism, and linguistics. In order to present students with a clear overview of CLA issues, it is important to have a sound understanding of all these areas. Therefore, the development of CLA is, particularly, dependent on the ability of educators and theorists to synthesize an array of ideas and to present them in a manageable form to practitioners.
PROGRAM EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

In 1969, Guba proposed that "the primary task in evaluation today is the provision of sensible alternatives to the evaluator" (p. 265). He argued that the "evaluation of educational innovations awaits the modernization of the evaluative art" (p. 265). This call for improved methods and the clarification of theoretical ideas, has been answered by evaluators, who have identified and proposed solutions to four broad evaluation problems: what is program evaluation; when should an evaluation be performed; how to ensure that the evaluations are suited to the program and stakeholders' needs; and how to collect evaluation feedback. Several evaluators have developed practical evaluation models; one is Smith's (1989) Evaluability Assessment model (EA). This model offers educational program planners a means of evaluating their program during its developmental stage.

The purpose of this section is twofold. First, the four broad problems with evaluation are examined along with their proposed solutions; and second the EA model, is described to better understand pre-implementation evaluation.

WHAT IS PROGRAM EVALUATION?

In the broadest sense, program evaluation may be defined as "the process of judging the worth or value of a program" (Steele in Boone, 1985, p. 172). However, discrepancies between this and other definitions arise when the evaluators attempt to advance a more specific definition of the purpose and method of program evaluation (reviewed in Boone, 1985).
Scriven (1967) attempted to clarify some of this ambiguity. He proposed that the purpose of evaluation can be conceived in two ways, in terms of goals and roles. The evaluation process only has one functional goal, which is to judge the merit or worth of something, but the evaluation process can play various roles. For example, it can be used in an accountability study, for curriculum development or in a teacher education program. Scriven argued that "failure to make this rather obvious distinction between roles and goals of evaluation is one of the factors that has led to the dilution of what is called evaluation to the point where it can no longer answer the questions which are its principal goal, questions about real merit or worth" (p. 62). With this distinction in mind, program planners interested in evaluating their program may benefit from clearly understanding that while the ultimate purpose is to judge their program, how this process is used (the role which it plays) can be varied.

**WHEN SHOULD EVALUATION BE PERFORMED?**

Guba (1969) discussed the second significant problem associated with evaluation, that of timing. He showed how the performance of evaluations has "become a post facto or terminal technique" (p. 225). Yet such an approach is problematic because the data and information only becomes available at the end of a long instructional period. Therefore, improvements can only be made after the course has ended. There is an irony in this, because even though definitions of evaluation hint at feedback and improvement this is not always the case (Guba, 1969) and this apparent failure has prompted others to explore alternative forms of evaluation.
In particular, Scriven (1967) proposed that evaluations should not be confined to the post facto period and proposed the idea of *formative evaluation* in which the "evaluation feedback loop stays within the developmental agency (its consultants), and serves to improve the product" (p. 62). Such evaluation is used to improve a program while it is being shaped by the developer (Worthen, 1973). Formative evaluation has come to be recognized as an important aspect of educational program planning (Patton, 1982).

HOW CAN EVALUATIONS BE SUITED TO STAKEHOLDERS' NEEDS?

Patton (1987) recognized that "a major challenge in evaluation is matching research methods to the nuances of particular evaluation questions and the idiosyncrasies of specific stakeholder needs" (p. 21). Part of this problem can be solved by evaluators involving various program stakeholders in the evaluation design process. Evaluators who include stakeholders in the evaluation design process, demonstrate that they are "committed to...designs that are relevant, meaningful, understandable, and able to produce useful results that are valid, reliable, and believable" (p. 22).

WHAT IS THE BEST WAY OF COLLECTING DATA?

Deciding how evaluation information can best be gathered is the fourth problem which has been addressed. Boone (1985) proposed that "the most useful approach to evaluation often appears to be more qualitatively or clinically oriented and less-research directed, in that the decisions made are based on limited and sometimes inadequate information" (p. 170). Patton (1987) agreed with Boone's contention that qualitative
methods are generally more effective than quantitative methods. The former "permit the evaluator to study selected issues, cases, or events in depth and detail; the fact that data collection is not considered by predetermined categories of analysis contributes to depth and detail of data" (p. 9). Therefore, if program evaluators want to concentrate on specific issues and understand the program as a whole, then qualitative methods are the best form of data collection. Given the four issues set out, there is one form of evaluation which addressed and proposed solutions to these four common problems.

Evaluability Assessment is an evaluation model that was originally conceived in the 1970's as a means of improving summative evaluations; policy makers and evaluators had often been displeased with summative evaluations. Policy makers often thought that the evaluations were "expensive wastes of time which produced little in the way of useful information"; on the other hand evaluators, "often found programs with grandiose goals and few concrete objectives" (Smith, 1989, p. 13). Thus, the summative evaluations were either as vague as the program or they focused just on the program's weaknesses. This dissatisfaction with summative evaluations prompted Wholey and his associates to explore ways of closing the gap between rhetoric and reality (Rutman, 1980). They formed the concept of conducting a pre-evaluation of the program before a large-scale and resource intensive study was conducted. This pre-evaluation would help determine what aspects of the program could and should be evaluated.
EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT MODEL (EA)

Since the 1970's, there has been a shift in the purpose and utilization of EA. Smith (1989), in his book *Evaluability Assessment: A Practical Approach* reported that most discussions of EA focus on the process "as a highly desirable pre-step to outcome evaluations, to establish the probability of the subsequent study will be useful" (p. 14). He described how "the process has grown into an evaluation tool in its own right--as a way for determining stakeholder awareness and interest in the program and for determining what needs to be done in the program to make it likely to produce results. It has also evolved into a program development tool--as a way to plan a plausible, evaluable program and to determine resource requirements and availability" (p. 14).

The EA model can be of value to program planners who are designing and developing their programs. Even before they implement their program, they can determine with some degree of certainty whether or not the program is likely to succeed in achieving its objectives. This is because one of the primary objectives of EA is to define the theory underlying the program. In particular, the "underlying logic (cause and effect relationships) and functional aspects (activities and resources) with indications of types of evidence (performance indicators) for determining when planned activities are implemented and when intended and unintended outcomes are achieved" (Smith, 1989, p. 15). Bickerman (1988) defined program theory more specifically than Smith as, "the construction of a plausible and sensible model of how a program should work" (p. 5). There are at least six benefits which can be gained from clearly defining a program's theory (Bickerman, 1985).
First, a clearly defined program-theory will identify the problem, the target group and clarify the relationship between the program and the problem. This aids in reducing the possibility of implementing a program which is inappropriate for the group or problem (Bickerman, 1988). Thus, by defining the theory, a strong program-problem match. The second benefit is that the elements and components of a program and their relative importance can be identified. When program planners answer the question: "What aspects of the program, if left out, would doom the program failure," the most critical aspects of the program can be distinguished from non-consequential aspects (Bickerman, 1988, p. 12). Thus, planners can compile a list of activities and which components must be assessed to ensure that they are sound. Time and effort are directed towards refining the important aspects of the program, rather than concentrating on aspects of the program which are relatively inconsequential.

Third, informational and conceptual gaps can be discovered. Such gaps can be corrected and the facilitator can gain a clearer understanding of the program's underlying assumptions and framework (Smith, 1989, p. 18). Constructing a flowchart to visually connect the "program inputs (activities) with proximal and distal goals" is recommended to uncover conceptual gaps (Appendix G) (Bickerman, 1988, p. 12).

Fourth, through early detection of the program's discrepancies and problems, revisions and improvements can be implemented immediately. Smith (1989) observed that the staff of various programs which used EA, "made changes in their programs almost as rapidly as observations of needed changes were discovered" (p. 18).
Fifth, EA can aid in distinguishing between program failure, evaluation failure and theory failure. Program failure is caused by the program not being properly implemented; for example, by carrying out the activities ineffectively or not at all (Smith, 1989). Evaluation failure is caused by "using a faulty set of assessment procedures" or a poorly designed evaluation method (p. 19). Theory failure is the result of "implementing activities which have no or the wrong effect on the problem" (p. 19). Thus, program planners can decide which aspect of the program is faulty and concentrate on correcting the specific problem. The sixth and final benefit of EA is that it increases the probability that a program will be successfully replicated (Smith, 1989). This is because the essential components that can not be changed without altering the nature of the program have been identified.

There are several steps that may be taken to realize the above benefits, (for a full description, see Smith, 1989). This thesis provides the following summary of the steps involved in conducting an EA: determining the general purpose of the evaluation, securing commitment from potential evaluators and identifying work group members. The purpose of the EA may be to a) plan a new program, b) improve an existing program or c) increase the value of a summative evaluation (Smith, 1989, p. 32). The general purposes and several more specific potential outcomes should be identified and expressed in the beginning of the evaluation process; to ensure that people will understand the direction of the EA. Identifying those people who can contribute to the EA process and securing their commitment is critical at the first step of the process. EA evaluators recognize the importance of including stakeholders in the decision-making and evaluation process; so
that they develop a sense of ownership and willingly make necessary changes.

The second EA step involves defining the boundaries of the program to be studied. That is to say, one has to identify and limit the specific areas that will be studied. For example, if one is studying a new nutritional education program for seniors, then the evaluators will want to define the "program goals and then include all of the activities and efforts which contribute to these goals" (Smith, 1989, p. 41). This step is can be difficult because the "goals may be so deeply buried in the rhetoric that even program staff have difficulty in describing and/or admitting to the their real focus" (p. 41).

Identifying and analysing the documents of the program is the third step. Patton (1980) described how such documents are a particularly rich source of information about the program's focus. They serve the dual function of providing "information about program activities and processes and giving the evaluator ideas about important questions to pursue through more direct observations and interviewing" (p. 152).

Developing and clarifying the theory underlying the program is the fourth step. This step permits the benefits previously discussed to be incorporated within the program. Such clarification requires identifying the "assumptions on which program staff act to achieve program goals, i.e., how a program is supposed to work and why, and to identify and gaps in means-ends connections" (Smith, 1989, p. 49).

The fifth step involves identifying and interviewing stakeholders. Smith (1989) defines stakeholders as "those persons or groups who impact a program in very significant ways or who are simply affected by the actions of a program" (p. 82). The interview questions should be directly related to identifying the stakeholders awareness of and
interest in the program. One should formulate questions which will provide information about stakeholder's "perceptions of what the program is meant to accomplish, their concerns/worries about the program's progress toward goal attainment, their perceptions of adequacy of program resources, and their interests in or needs for evaluative information on a program" (p. 88).

Summarizing and describing the stakeholders' perceptions is the sixth step. The intention is to "objectively and systematically identify specific characteristics of the messages of the stakeholders" (Smith, 1989, p. 100). Once the various perceptions have been summarized and categorized, the evaluator can then "identify both common understandings and major differences among stakeholders in their perceptions about what a program is trying to accomplish" and how it is to be implemented (p. 109). For example, an evaluator could answer questions like: is there agreement in general about the overall intent of the program? who is to be served by the program? The answers to such questions will provide a full description of the program with its elements linked and well defined.

Determining whether the program is plausible constitutes the seventh step. Smith defined plausible expectations as "where there is some evidence that the program activity on site will achieve the results expected, and there is no evidence to the contrary" (p. 115). For example, it should fulfill the following requirements: the program's intentions are clear and the activities are suited to the proposed outcome (Smith, 1989; See Smith for extended list).
Drawing conclusions and proposing recommendations is the eighth and final step. Smith strongly suggested that the stakeholders should be involved in the recommendation writing process (Smith, 1989). In order to reduce the tendency to include personal biases in the proposal. The recommendations are then presented and then the responsibility of the program planner to modify the program according to the recommendations or to disregard them.

Educational program planners are not limited to wearing the hat of designer and developer, and to await the intervention of an external program evaluator to understand how their program can be improved. Rather, they can also assume the role of an evaluator during the developmental stages of the program development and evaluation process.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In order to carry out a formative evaluation of a proposed CLA program for preservice teachers, several education experts were interviewed to answer the major research questions:

1) What is the overall evaluation of the CLA program?

2) Where are areas in need of improvement?
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

RATIONALE FOR USING A QUALITATIVE METHOD

Since collecting feedback is a critical component of the EA process, the qualitative method proposed by Smith (1989), Boone (1985), and Patton (1987) was followed. As Patton (1987) explains, qualitative methods are advantageous in evaluation studies because they "permit the evaluator to study selected issues, cases, or events in depth and detail" (p. 9). Thus, the qualitative paradigm is used in this study because it allows for a deeper understanding of the participants' reactions to the program.

INSTRUMENTS

A standardized interview with open-ended questions was utilized (Appendix E). The exact wording and sequence of questions was predetermined so each participant was asked the same questions in the same order. This helped ensure that the data was collected in a systematic and thorough manner. Future researchers will also, "know exactly what was, and what was not, previously asked" (Patton, 1987, p. 113). The objectives of each question are outlined in the section entitled Framework for Data Collection.
FRAMEWORK FOR DATA COLLECTION

The interview schedule (Appendix E) was designed to gather data related to the research objectives. These questions were developed in accord with Smith's (1989) requirements for conducting "interviews with various stakeholders in order to discover their judgement of the program" in mind (p. 27).

Question one is designed as an "ice-breaking" question and to determine if the participants had an opportunity to consider the program. The extension of the question was intended to provide background information, determine how familiar the individuals are with program's ideas and how their work relates to the program.

Question two asks the participants to describe what they perceive to be the program's objectives. This question is designed to reveal both possible intended and unintended outcomes of the program. This will determine if there is a sound program-problem-target group match. That is to say if the program addresses the proposed problem with the correct audience.

Question three is designed to reveal if the individuals believe the program's proposed activities suit the learning objectives. In particular, what changes they think will occur in the students' conceptual knowledge and/or in the student's teaching practices following their participation in the program.

Question four attempts to identify problems that teacher-educators might encounter if they implement the program. This is designed to gain a deeper understanding of the needs of teacher-educators and how the program could be modified to amend areas of concern.
Question five is designed to gain an understanding of how the program is perceived as a whole and to identify strengths and weakness of the program. This will also help identify any conceptual gaps in program.

Question six is designed to provide the participants with an opportunity to add any additional comments, or clarify their thoughts about the program.

PARTICIPANTS

The data collected for this research came from a university in central, southern Ontario. The institution is recognized for its work in the educational field. Since the primary aim of the research was to evaluate a program for preservice teachers it was essential that the participants be familiar with the educational issues, program evaluation and the learning needs of preservice teachers. A small number of participants were required because the study was designed to examine the program in depth and detail.

Two educational experts were selected to participate in this study. The participants were selected based on their teaching experience, familiarity with the theory underlying the program, experience in designing and delivering programs and awareness of teachers' needs.

PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTING DATA

The two educational experts were initially sent an introductory letter requesting their participation (Appendix B) by e-mail. Afterwards they were contacted by telephone to further discuss their participation in the study. During the telephone conversation, the researcher explained the nature of the research, the time frame, why they had been
selected, and assured confidentiality to the participant. If the expert was interested in participating then he or she was provided with a copy of the program (Appendix A) and a list of the open-ended interview questions (Appendix E) to read and consider prior to the interview. Each of the participants agreed to the request and signed a Letter of Consent (Appendix C).

Two focused interviews were conducted. Each of the interviews took place in the Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education at OISE. The researcher read the preamble (Appendix D). The participants then answered the series of open-ended questions (Appendix E). The interviews varied in length from 55 minutes to 80 minutes. Each interview was audio-taped and the researcher made hand-written notes when necessary. The interview recordings were later transcribed for analysis.
### DESIGN OF QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Question</th>
<th>Inquiry Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Extension Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the proposed CLA program be of educational value to preservice teachers?</td>
<td>Is the participant familiar with the program?</td>
<td>Could you give me a sense of how much of the program you did have a chance to look at?</td>
<td>Could we take this time to look at the program and discuss it together?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the participant familiar with the ideas presented in the program?</td>
<td>Could you tell me how your work is connected with the ideas presented in the program?</td>
<td>Has your work focused on examining any of the ideas presented in the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the program accomplish its primary goals?</td>
<td>After reading the program what do you think it trying to accomplish?</td>
<td>Could you describe for me what you think the a) intended and b) unintended outcomes of the program might be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the learning activities appropriate for the learning objectives and the needs of the preservice teachers?</td>
<td>If we look at the objectives together, could you describe for me how you think the activities will accomplish the learning objectives?</td>
<td>How do you think the students': a) thoughts and concepcion about the role of language will or will not be changed? b) teaching practices will be affected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program meet the needs of teacher-educators?</td>
<td>If teacher-educators were given this program to implement what problems do you think they would encounter?</td>
<td>Could you describe: a) additional resources a teacher-educator would want or need in order to successfully implement the program? b) how teacher-educators would perceive the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the overall assessment of the program?</td>
<td>Could you describe your overall impression of the program?</td>
<td>What do you think the program's a) strengths and b) weaknesses are?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What additional comments about the program does the evaluator have?</td>
<td>This ends my questions but is there anything else you would like to add or discuss?</td>
<td>Is there anything you would like me to clarify?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data collected in the interviews was coded, analyzed, and categorized into the following seven broad sections for present purposes:

1) the participant's familiarity with and connection to the program
2) predicted outcomes of the program
3) suitability of learning activities and learning objectives
4) learning outcomes
5) strengths and weaknesses of the program
6) implementation difficulties
7) recommendations for program improvement and incorporation into faculty of education programs.

During this process, effort was made to determine the degree of agreement between the two sets of responses. By comparing the similarities and differences between the respondents' answers, I was able to identify areas of information which were more subjective than others. Furthermore, the primary research issue of whether or not the program could reasonably be expected to be of value to preservice teachers was used as the basis for delimiting these areas.

LIMITATIONS AND CAVEATS

This investigation includes the expert judgement of two education experts in southern Ontario. As a result, this study does not represent the opinions of all education professors across Canada. However, the participants were selected based on their
familiarity with CLA issues and were not randomly chosen. Future researchers could interview a larger number of educational experts to determine if there is agreement between the opinions of a larger number of educational experts. In addition, this study does not address how Bachelor of Education programs can be improved beyond the range of CLA issues. All effort has been made to report the data and present recommendations in the most objective manner as possible. This study is also limited by the fact the potential students have not participated in the course therefore, the recommendations are more speculative. Further studies could include implementing the program and studying a summative evaluation of the program.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the findings of the study of the Critical Language Awareness Program for Preservice Teachers by reporting the participants' responses to standardized open-ended interview questions. The findings of the study are organized according to the following six topics: the participants' familiarity with and connection to the program, the suitability of learning activities and learning objectives, learning outcomes, strengths and weaknesses of the program, implementation difficulties, and finally, additional thoughts and recommendations.

THE PARTICIPANTS' FAMILIARITY WITH AND CONNECTION TO THE PROGRAM

All interviews began by asking the participants to describe how much of the program they had an opportunity to assess. Anna, the first participant, reported that she "very closely looked at and critiqued the program booklet and perused the articles," while Rob, the second participant, said that he "looked carefully at the whole thing and read all the readings." This question was designed to determine if the participants were familiar with the program and could answer specific questions about the program. Since both participants had carefully read and considered the program, the interview proceeded.
The second question asked the participants to describe how their work was connected with the ideas presented in the program. Anna explained that the content is "very pertinent to my previous work as ESL instructor because the students came from diverse cultural backgrounds and had different first languages." She also has experience working with the ideas presented in the program, because in her current position of Professional Development Coordinator for schools, she is "responsible for designing and developing training programs for our employees in a number of areas." In particular, she could "see much of the awareness building that the program does about the power of language very applicable to our design in professional development." Anna explained that the program is not only directly connected to her professional work but also indirectly connected because she works "in an environment that has people who have lived in different family relationships, communities and work organizations and all the thoughts in the program are really pertinent to everyone's lives and to ones' whole place in society."

As a principal of an elementary school, Rob's work is also related to the ideas presented in the program. He explained that "we are constantly trying to make teachers aware of CLA issues; not so much multiethnic but multi-socioeconomic. Many of the things that you've got here we face today." He also teaches an Interpersonal Communication course for a Bachelor of Education program in which "teachers learn to communicate better." He thought that this course would be particularly "valuable for students for two reasons; first for the teachers that are going to teach in Canada, and second, we are starting to train by default, teachers for the international market. A
number of my students in the last two years have gone to Korea, Australia, New Zealand and Japan. I think this course would be really good for students who are going to work in a variety of communities."

**PREDICTED OUTCOMES OF THE PROGRAM**

This section focuses on discovering the participants' thoughts about possible outcomes of the program. The participants were first asked a general question, namely, "After reading the program, what do you think it is trying to accomplish?" Anna said that "I really believe that the program is trying to highlight for educators what language is, what language does, the power of language, and the interplay that it has amongst anyone in any discourse." Anna also discussed how the program is also trying to "raise sensitivity amongst educators and to highlight the onus that is on us as educators of ensuring that we personally have an awareness so we can then pass it on and encourage awareness amongst our students."

Rob agreed that the program is trying to raise awareness. He stated "I think it [the program] is trying to accomplish a heightened awareness and to sensitize preservice teachers to a number of issues that they might not be really aware of." Moreover, it is often assumed that preservice teachers will "pick up this knowledge in different places and yes, some are picking bits and pieces of this information in different places. But I think this program would really sensitize them to the entire issue of the use of language and its importance."
The participants were asked to give a more specific account of the learning outcomes as they were asked "Could you describe for me, what you think the intended outcomes of program are?" Anna responded by explaining "I think the learning outcomes that you stated in all of the sessions are accurate. I think the participants should walk away having learned the effects of language, the varieties of language that are currently within our learning community and how language and they themselves can empower or disempower people." She also thought that another learning outcome would be that "the participants will be given strategies so that they can incorporate this awareness into their classrooms." Anna ended by saying "So I think you have done a real justice to the topic and what the participants of the program will walk with."

Rob thought that the main outcome will be "a heightened sensitivity that the teachers would bring to any situation, with any student, in any different environment that they are teaching in." He liked and thought the poem "Rayford's Song made the point that all teachers have to be aware of what they are doing with kids and when talking with students." He also thought the students may gain "skills that would raise their awareness of how language is laden with other messages." Another intended learning outcome that Rob identified was that the program should help to "break down some of the barriers, whether they be because of socioeconomic or cultural differences, that kids have within classrooms. It should also open new doors to all the kids, there has be free participation in the class despite their backgrounds and language differences. If it helps kids participate more in the classroom then I think that your program certainly succeeds."
The third question in this section asked each participant to describe what they thought to be unintended outcomes of the program. Anna's first comment was that was that she found this question to be more interesting than the previous question, because she believes in "serendipity learning and when people set out to do some learning, often what we as teachers teach, is not what the students learn." She thought that this program "could have a very powerful effect upon the individual and so I think an unintended outcome is that the students within the program, if it is facilitated properly, will gain quite an awareness of themselves." She then added that she thought the students "will gain an awareness that each person does have biases and prejudices and that we have to identify them for ourselves even before we can even we can identify and set up strategies for others."

Rob answered this question by focusing on unintended outcomes that a professor like himself might face when introducing the course to an university. He stated that "with any new course, such as this course, it might step on the toes of other departments' courses. Territoriality is always a problem in universities so a professor would have to ensure that factors offered in this course weren't offered in other courses." If the issues of territory were not addressed this could lead to "criticism of the program and non-acceptance." Another unintended outcome he foresaw was that, "others might even question 'Do we need this?' and say 'Teachers should already be sensitive to everybody and everything.'" He explained that he believed there were "really great ideas in here" and stressed that teachers "need a course like this."
The third group of questions explores the content of the program including learning objectives and activities. The first question asked the participants to describe "How you think the activities will accomplish the learning objectives?" Anna replied "For about 90 percent of the sessions the objectives did correlate very strongly to the activities. It has a lot of variety with regards to types of learning activities." Anna added the caveat that she felt that "the whole idea of synthesis and summary of thoughts did not come across as strongly" as she would have liked. Since the objectives are so "significant and relevant," she wanted to know how an instructor would check and ensure that they have been accomplished. As an illustration of this point, she offered the following "In Session One, an objective states that the students will 'begin identifying possible social and education inequalities'" and she wanted to know "how will a facilitator ensure that all participants have actually learned and accomplished this objective."

Anna proposed two ways for the instructor to ensure that the students are learning the material. The first part of the solution was designed to ensure that the students were capturing the learning at a course level. She thought this could be done by the activities which ask the students to "document factors, analyse social and educational implications, and record it on a flip chart." She also suggested that they be asked to record the ideas generated in class and compile a portfolio of ideas. She felt that this would help ensure that the students are learning on a course level. Anna was also concerned with a second level of learning, namely, the students' own personal learning.
To evaluate kinds of personal learning Anna proposed that the students compile a learning log or learning journal. She thought that "significant learning of this nature will only take place if students continuously, throughout the whole program, compile a learning log or learning journal." They could, for example, "record their thoughts or examples of things that happened during the week that relates to the ideas they have examined in the program." She also thought that "when people go through these ten sessions and they have this personal documentation I think they will be transformed. She focused on "transformational learning as opposed to knowledge learning" because she thought that "the topic and the content you are trying to teach are so significant it can't only happen at a knowledge level it has to also happen at a feeling level and an emotional and effective level." From experience, Anna said "this type of learning cannot normally be captured unless in a personal or learning log that people keep." Therefore, she recommended that such a learning journal be incorporated into the learning outcomes and into the draft of the marking scheme and given a high percentage of the total course mark. She also thought that the students could be required to "quote and utilize their learning logs in the major term paper." She ended by saying "I got goosebumps when I read your objectives and activities, they are excellent, powerful and there can be significant learning here." Following Anna's recommendations the instructor and students "will be able to ensure that everything has been taken into account and that the learning will take place on both levels."
Rob was asked to describe how he thought "the activities will accomplish the learning objectives?" and he explained how he looked at the course from the perspective of an instructor teaching the course. In general he thought, "there is a match between the activity and the objectives." He commented that, "readings are a great way to teach undergraduate and graduate courses; just as you have stressed here. This is because you have the people do the readings and come to class prepared to discuss them. This is sadly not something that is always done a lot in Bachelor of Education courses because a lot of the learning is done from reading lecture notes." He liked the way the readings are used, because, "there are a lot of fun activities, but I think the readings which are much more heavy intellectually, give you styled discussion of the issues and I think that is really important." The main concern with the learning outcomes and activities was that in one or two places there seemed to be insufficient material to constitute a three hour session. He said that this program was similar to a course that he had taught the previous semester because it also had a number of interactive, dramatic and speaking activities in the course of three hours. Therefore, given his experience with similar courses he felt that "in a couple of places more activities would be needed." Rob also recommended that greater emphasis be placed on socioeconomic issues. He concluded by saying "I didn't get the impression that you missed anything in terms of activities, I really thought it was sound."
LEARNING OUTCOMES

The participants were then asked to describe the changes in the students' understanding of language which would be prompted by the program. Each participant was asked, "How do you think the students' thoughts and conceptions about the role of language will or will not be changed?" Anna said "I think their thoughts and conceptions will be significantly changed. It hit me when I read the poem Rayford's Song; it was so moving that if a student's thoughts in reading even this one example about the role of language did not change then there is something wrong with the delivery." In addition, she also believed that "their whole idea about what we are doing in the classroom, how we actually handle students, and the varieties of languages will be changed."

Rob also thought that the students' thoughts and conceptions about the role of language would be changed. He said "I think that it would have to be changed because often you do not know there is a problem unless you see it through someone else's eyes, someone points it to you or asks you about it. I think it would be impossible to leave this course without becoming much more sensitive to language, and being able to see examples of language and power, or how power is used in the larger society and in the classroom." One recommendation was to place greater emphasis on examining sociological control and the control of people though language. He said "You may want to discuss the larger picture with regards to emancipatory discourse, how language controls people, for example, Dorothy Smith's thoughts."
The next question asked the participants to describe "How do you think the students' teaching practices will be affected?" Anna responded by explaining how "What we are hitting at here is not only a cognitive level of development of preservice teachers but we are also looking at affective development." So, she did not think that the "students' teaching practices will be affected until they themselves have gone through some sort of emotional development" because she saw a "connection between the two." She did however add "the students' teaching practices will be highly affected if they themselves have had emotional input and reflection." Anna then said "assuming that they have developed emotionally then one of the changes that I see happening is their interaction with students will be on a much more respectful and appreciative level. I think that once a teacher feels herself at one end of an exchange in dialogue where she has been put down somehow in some discourse she can then empathize with the students." She thought that this would lead to the teachers seeing students in a "different light and develop their sensitivity, empathy, and respect towards them."

When Rob was asked how he thought the students' teaching practices will be affected, he replied "I would certainly hope that they would be effectively comfortable with the material and begin to treat students a little differently than they would have if they hadn't taken this course." He thought that "This course is giving them tools that they would actually use. I think if the teachers can use, and I think they will be able to use, what they learn in this course then they can encourage the rapport, treat the kids more fairly, help the kids also learn about the role of language and how we use language to control people." Rob hoped that the teachers would also be more sensitive to "how they
say the words, which words they use and how they use body language. This is because it is not only the words we use but also how we treat people. Kids learn a lot more in the classroom than just the words that you use, they also learn about interacting with others."

If the teacher mode this behaviour he thought that the "kids would also learn how to treat others in a fair and just manner, and feel free to express themselves."

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM**

The fourth set of questions focused on discovering the participants opinions about the strength and weaknesses of the program. The first questions asked the participants to describe their overall impression of the program. Anna said that she was very moved by the program and that her first overall impression "was that it has been one of the most thorough comprehensive, well researched programs on critical language awareness." She thought that "the approach was very well laid out for someone to even try it because it laid out very specific objectives and steps to follow." She did not feel that she "would have to be running around doing a lot of things to implement the program."

Rob was also impressed with the program content and organization as he stated "My overall impression is that this would be a great and enjoyable course to teach, and I think the students would get a lot out of it. The fact that you have supplied all of the readings, activities, and background materials, is really impressive." He thought in particular that "the students would enjoy learning from it and going through the exercises. This is because they could experience a lot of the content and really understand the ideas. So I had a really positive impression."
The participants were then asked to describe "What do you think the program's strengths are?" Anna said "I think that the design and the layout is very well done for anyone that had experience at all and a willingness to implement it. It is all there for them." She was also "really pleased that it is so sound, specifically from an adult learning perspective because the threading is excellent right from the Ice Breakers, to students sharing information amongst themselves, to the reconnecting thoughts. So from a program design view I was very impressed by it". Anna also discussed how she liked the cooperative learning promoted by program and thinks that this approach should be adopted in more programs.

Rob also agreed that layout was a strength of the program "A major strength of the program is the thought that you have put into the ordering of activities and sessions." He also said "This is a solid, thorough and well organized course outline which will help the people who are going to teach it." Another strength he identified was "The language which you use to describe the program is very straightforward." He also thought that "The articles relate and tie in very closely with the readings so that is great because the students can explore in depth and strengthen their understanding of the content of the article. I liked your objectives and think you have done an excellent job of presenting the materials in an understandable manner."

The respondents were then asked to describe "What do you think the program's weaknesses are?" Anna responded "I don't know if it is a program weakness or it might be a potential implementation weakness but it will be to ensure that as you state usually in the last objective of each teaching session, that the students will identify ways,
strategies, and techniques for people to use so that they can handle situations where they might see language is being used or misused." Anna recommended that she would "like to see these strategies captured in a document so the teachers could take away a "tool kit of techniques". This is because she thought that the students will be faced with questions such as "how am I going to handle this situation in the classroom at this moment?" She thought that if they have a collection of strategies captured in a "tool kit of techniques" then the program would be "one of the most powerful programs that we could ever have." And she also thought that this "would ensure that the people will get both theory and practice from the program." Anna thought that another benefit the students would experience from reflection and the cooperative development of teaching techniques would be that "I think the teachers will see themselves in it, because they have contributed to it and therefore they are empowered by it and would take ownership of the program."

When Rob was asked what he believed to be the weaknesses of the program, he responded "I think the professors teaching this course would have to be careful that they continue to keep updated on new articles released and incorporate them into the framework. Since the course is so complete there might be a tendency to teach it year after year without adding new material, so again the professor would have to be genuinely interested in keeping this course up-to-date and fresh." A second concern with the course that Rob identified was "because there is a lot of material included in this program I worry that there might not be enough flexibility because if you don't get some activities finished do you continue with them in the next session or do you proceed with the next set of activities." Rob suggested that this should be addressed in the Program Booklet.
IMPLEMENTATION DIFFICULTIES

The fifth section addressed program implementation difficulties. The participants were asked "If teacher-educators were given this program to implement, what problems do you think they would encounter?" Anna thought that many of the problems to be encountered by teacher-educators would be "dependent upon their own level of security about themselves and their level of ability to deliver the program." She recommended that "the only teacher-educators that should be given this program to implement during the pilot phases should be ones who have previously demonstrated a sensitivity and awareness of different cultural backgrounds and religions." This is because she felt that "if any teacher-educator was given this problem there could be severe problems given the content and the power of the program if they did not understand the ideas and have a genuine commitment to ideas in the program." Another problem identified by Anna was that "the students could be uncomfortable if the educator didn't seem really capable of delivering it." Anna explained this is because the content of the course is "coming from a subjective perspective, that knowledge and power is within us and that we can control what we think about and how we use language. So we are teaching from the inside out which is a new type of thing that we are teaching in teacher education." Anna stressed that because of this approach "we would have to make sure that whoever delivers the program has that philosophy and that they understand that this is a very subjective, personal type of content that has to come from the inside out. This will help avoid teaching the students examining purely cognitive information such as differences in standard language and non-standard languages."
When Rob was asked "If teacher educators were given this program to implement, what problems do you think they would encounter?" he said "The first problem is the same as you would have with any new course, that is going through the steps of getting a new course introduced. Universities are not known for openness and willingness to accept new courses. It is probably not that easy to get a new course started in most universities. Some courses have been taught for a hundred years and haven't been changed." Then he said that "the course would have to be advertised and inform the students about what the content of the course will teach them." Assuming that all of the administrative tasks have been attended to, he believed that "it would be easy to teach this course because there is a lot of material, the activities and readings are all there so the professor wouldn't need to do this work." He then repeated the initial problem facing teacher-educators who were given this course to teach of ensuring that it was accepted and offered by the university.

The second question asked the participants to describe how they thought the program would be perceived by teacher-educators? Anna said "In my experience I have noted that male teachers are more reticent about implementing this type of program. So the perception of male teachers implementing this program might be very different from that of female teachers." Anna also described how she can see "teachers on one end of the continuum wanting, needing, accepting and utilizing this program and then I see teachers on the other end of the continuum feeling threatened." She also voiced how "pending the background, the experience and the professionalism of the teachers I think they would think this program is needed, and very timely."
When Rob was asked how he thought the program would be perceived by teacher-educators, he said "I would recommend that you include in the general information section of the program, a literature review that would help convince people of the need for this program." This is because he was, "not sure the program has enough pedagogical background. You would need to outline very clearly what this particular area entails or unleashes and why it is important for the students to learn about this content." He thought that what is presently included is "pretty good for the pre-implementation stage but I am not sure that it would convince professors new to this area." Moreover, he recommended that they also "need to be convinced that the program will address the need and examine the problem." Another perception that Rob could foresee was that the program might be criticized for "not addressing the issue of social justice enough." As he explained "language is really important, it is power, it is control and it is really important for students and teachers to know how it is used and manipulated." He ended by saying that others would endorse the program, especially educators "interested in language and control or feminism." Rob also noted that those with this background would be most likely and best suited to teach this type of course.

The participants were then asked to "describe what additional resources a teacher-educator would want or need in order to successfully implement the program?" Anna said, given that the program was designed to cater to various learning styles, videos could also be incorporated into the existing program structure. This is because although, "there are a variety of activities suited to different learning styles, most of the resources are text based, the students could also benefit from watching videos." Anna observed that in her
experience of delivering awareness raising programs she found that "the most powerful resources I used were videos." Anna added that she had also included skits, and found them to be "significant leaning opportunities" and was pleased that the programs included skits. Anna concluded by saying that she "was amazed that there are such a variety and compilation of resources, articles and activities."

When Rob was asked to "describe what additional resources a teacher-educator would want or need in order to successfully implement the program" he expressed concern that in some places there may not be enough activities. He described how the "problem is something that an instructor thinks might take one hour could end up taking only ten minutes." He noted that the instructor must be able to properly gauge the amount of time that the students will need to complete an activity and in the event of miscalculation, be able to reallocate class time. Rob suggested that the program needed more readings and greater emphasis on language issues related to "socioeconomic principles" because this is an area he believes would be particularly useful for students. Another comment Rob made was that the instructor will need to have "additional readings which specifically address student driven issues" as well as the ability to "encourage the students to bring articles and contribute other resources they may find to class".

ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final question asked the participants "Is there anything else you would like to add or discuss?" This provided the participants with another opportunity to propose recommendations for program improvement or to identify areas of concern.
Anna discussed several points. First, she said that through her experience in delivering programs, the program evaluations should not be laid aside for mid-point and end point of the course. But rather it should occur at the last 5-10 minutes of each class. Anna explained how she does "an informal feedback session; it is very short and quick and called a 'Plus-Delta'." This Plus-Delta evaluation consist of doing a "round robin around the classroom and asking each person what did they learn, what did we do well today and then on the other side of the coin is, what do we need to improve in this class, this program, each other, and the facilitator." Anna said that "It is the most powerful thing that I have ever done because it gives people a voice. They are actually stating what is on their minds, what they are having difficulty with, and what they are learning or not learning." Furthermore, Anna believes that it "breaks down the barrier of non-learning and tells each person that their opinion, input, and participation is so significant that I'm not going to wait till mid-point or end-point to discover how you feel about the course." Instead the instructor reinforces the idea that "In every session what you think and feel is significant to me." Therefore, she strongly suggested that a mini-feedback time be incorporated into each session because, "continuous improvement cycles are what we need in our classes, work, and whole lives." 

The second recommendation Anna proposed was that "the facilitator and students should view the classroom as a small microcosm." This will help the students understand how "the whole dynamic of CLA and all of the issues and concerns are not out there, or just occurring in classrooms with students but rather all of these things are also present in the classroom with the twenty preservice teachers." So, Anna recommended that the
instructor should bring this concept into the classroom and let the students discuss the
issues using their own experiences. The instructor needs to highlight for students that they
will encounter the issues continued within the program in the course, in their classrooms
and personal lives. Therefore, Anna recommended that "the facilitator has to be confident
that they can facilitate those kinds of issues and allow the students to discuss what ever
happens within this program." Anna thought that this would discourage the "people from
doing the program for the sake of 'niceties' and saying "I'm aware that I have to
encourage the students to share their backgrounds with others'." Anna stressed that "it has
to be more than that, it has to be: how are the preservice teachers going to be social
activists within their own schools and encourage social action?" Anna thought the 'tool
kit for teaching' would help the students bring about change as well as dealing with the
issues during the course of the program.

The third recommendation that Anna made was the students could create a
"portfolio of critical language awareness ideas including, articles or poems that they have
shared with each other." This would further encourage "collaboration and exchange." If
the students created portfolios, it would allow them to "capture the ideas in a succinct
fashion so that people will actually take the portfolio, the program and readings with
them." Anna noted that she was impressed by the activities contained within the program
because they are "very well designed and they will encourage the students to discuss the
ideas." Anna concluded by reiterating "if they don't document their learning and the
activities then the program is going to lose a lot of the power." Another recommendation
that Anna made was that "at the end of the program, during the last session, you might
want to include a celebration. So rather than just filling out evaluation forms, also have some sort of symbolic celebration for the twenty students who learned and shared together. I think it is very significant and we should be doing it more in our classroom. So we could celebrate each others' strengths and contributions." Anna ended by saying "I feel that I really know the program because it is so detailed. I have never seen anything so well checked before and I really liked the lay out, it is so succinct, in each session the objectives, titles, activities and readings are so clear and not cumbersome." Indeed, when she "checked each of the objectives to see whether there was a strategy to utilize with each of the objectives and not a trick was missed."

When Rob was asked if "Is there anything else you would like to add or discuss?" he replied "I think it is an excellent program for students and I think it could definitely be of educational value to them. You have done an excellent job and I would enjoy teaching it." The main concerns are "first, getting the program into a university curriculum and secondly, would the people you are talking to at the university be aware enough to know what you are talking about?" Rob explained that "there is always difficulty in convincing people of something that they have never even heard of so that is a concern. You would need to explain it to people." Furthermore, it is not clear that administration of the university teacher training programs regard CLA issues as sufficiently important to warrant an entire course. As Rob stated "I don't know how aware they are of this particular area. I would hope that would have some sensitivity towards the need for it and I think it can be applied to everything."
The two interviews proved to be both informative and insightful as the participants highlighted aspects of the program which could be improved. The participants views also revealed a genuine interest and positive reaction towards the program.
SUMMARY

The Ontario Royal Commission on Learning formally recognized that children from minority cultural backgrounds are not educated as well as their classmates from the dominant or majority backgrounds (1994). Educational critics attributed this disparity to numerous causes, including genetic deficiencies and poor family environments. As discussed in Chapter Four, the proposed causes and their respective solutions did not lessen the gap between the failure of rates of groups of students from different backgrounds. Following a number of ineffective school reforms, the causes of high failure rates among students from minority backgrounds have been re-evaluated. Recent criticism has proposed that the initial response to the Royal Commission on Learning tended to blame the particular circumstances of individual students, while the real causes of the high failure rates have been the institutional values and practices which shape the school environment. This proposition requires educators to examine the internal structures and personal beliefs that sustain and perpetuate a system of schooling that discourages a relatively large proportion of minority students from completing their education.
The proposed CLA Program for Preservice Teachers is intended to be interpreted as a means of promoting and encouraging the minimum conditions for social justice in Ontario schools. The program endeavours to help preservice teachers become aware of their underlying, often unexamined beliefs about language, and the means by which it can be used as an instrument of power. The need for preservice teachers to become aware about the interplay between language and power has been identified by several educational critics.

This study focused on designing, developing and evaluating a CLA Program for Preservice Teachers in order to determine whether educational experts believe that this program could be of educational value to preservice teachers. Two educational experts, who have a sound understanding of the ideas presented in the program, the needs of preservice teachers and the schools, participated in the study. These experts were asked to read and evaluate the program and then to answer standardized open-ended interview questions. The interviews revealed that the participants had carefully considered the program, were qualified to participate in the study based on their knowledge and experience with preservice teachers and schools, and were able to propose recommendations for program improvement. This chapter summarizes the major findings of the interviews and proposes recommendations for program improvement.
MAJOR FINDINGS

The standardized interviews were with Anna, a Professional Development Coordinator for schools and Rob, a Faculty of Education Professor and principal of an elementary school. The primary finding was that they believed the CLA program could be of educational value to preservice teachers, and that based on their professional experience there is a need for the program. They both recognized that issues contained within the program are issues that teachers face today and that preservice teachers need assistance in dealing with language differences. In addition, Rob suggested that this program would be particularly useful for teachers who are planning to teach in Canada, because of the cultural diversity, or for teachers planning to teach in communities such as Japan, New Zealand or Korea. In general, this program is able to help preservice teachers work in diverse educational environments.

There was agreement among the participants' responses with respect to the predicted outcomes of the program. Both participants believed that the program is trying to raise awareness about the role and power of language and the means by which language can be used in a variety of discourses and contexts. This finding confirms that the programs' primary objectives, outlined in the General Information Section of the program are accurate. Moreover, the participants thought that the specific learning outcomes outlined in each session of the program are a reasonable representation of what the students might be expected to learn through the program. That is, the students will learn the effects of language on others, become aware of the varieties of language within our community and how language can either be used to empower or disempower others. Students will also
learn strategies that they can use in the classroom to deal with language related issues. The participants also thought that the teachers' future students would benefit from their teachers' heightened sensitivity to language issues.

When the participants were asked to assess the content of the program, and in particular, to evaluate the suitability of learning activities and learning objectives, there was agreement among the participants' answers. Both participants agreed that there was a strong correlation between the activities and objectives, and that the activities would prove useful and effective in teaching the content of the program. However, Rob suggested that more emphasis should be placed on examining socioeconomic issues and that in some places more activities would be needed. Anna's primary concern was that the idea of synthesis and summary was not sufficiently emphasized in the program. She therefore recommended that the students be encouraged to create a "Tool Kit of Teaching Techniques" so that they could develop their ability of applying the theory to practice and synthesising the ideas presented in the program. The participants expressed satisfaction with the readings and they thought the readings complimented the activities and were insightful.

During the interviews, it was discovered that the participants believed that students' thoughts and conceptions about the role of language would be changed significantly after participating in the program. In particular, the participants felt that the preservice teachers would become aware that there are problems associated with language differences. They also thought that the preservice teachers would become aware of how language is used and misused, and be able to identify examples of language being used as an instrument of
power in both the classroom and society. The additional knowledge and sensitivity gained through the program would benefit preservice teachers because they would have had an opportunity to consider language issues before teaching and be able to address issues that arise in the classroom in a fair and just manner.

Both participants expressed a positive impression of the program. They also identified what they believed are strengths and weaknesses of the program. The participants agreed that the strengths of the program are its clarity, organization and comprehensiveness. The program is well organized, they said, and provides a wide array of activities, objectives and readings for the participants to explore. These strengths would allow the instructors of the program to implement and conduct the program with relative ease. Finally, another strength of the program, they found, is the strong correlation between the activities and readings, and this led the participants to conclude that the students would gain a sound understanding of the issues.

The participants also identified weaknesses in the program. Notably, that there is no means of fully ensuring that the students are actually learning the material and developing strategies that they can use in their future classrooms since there are no exams or tests included in the program. A participant suggested that this weakness could be amended by asking students to develop a portfolio of teaching strategies. Another participant thought that a potential weakness of the program is that the professor teaching the program might not incorporate new articles into the existing reading list. It was suggested that this problem could be addressed by highlighting the necessity of continuously updating the program as new issues arise and new articles are published. The
last weakness identified by a participant was that it is not clear what a professor should do if all of the activities in a given session are not completed. This issue could be resolved by instructing the professor to be attentive to the learning needs of the students and include the students when deciding whether to examine an issue in greater detail or to proceed to the next topic.

The participants agreed that the main implementation difficulty would be ensuring that the instructor teaching the program is knowledgeable and sensitive to ideas and issues considered in the program. The instructor should also have a genuine commitment to promoting social justice and awareness within the classroom. If the instructor did not have a background in such issues then this could lead to significant structural and contextual problems. It is therefore recommended that only professors with academic knowledge or experience with language issues should teach this program. The second implementation problem identified was the administrative difficulty associated with introducing a new course in an existing degree program. This problem might be solved by supplying the faculty with background information about the program and offering the course as an elective option.

The participants thought that teacher-educators would receive this program in a positive manner if they were familiar with the content of the program, shared a similar commitment to promoting social justice, and saw the need to incorporate such an awareness-raising course into the Bachelor of Education program. However, if teacher-educators were unfamiliar with the ideas contained within the program, or they did not perceive the need for the promotion of social justice, then there might be resistance to
implementing the program. A participant suggested that in her experience male professors may be more reticent about implementing the program than female professors. The other participant suggested resistance to the program could be avoided by supplying teacher-educators with literature and an explanation of why the program is unique and needed. Overall, the participants were extremely pleased and satisfied with the variety of resources and readings contained within the program, but it was suggested that videos could be incorporated into the program and that the program needed greater emphasis on issues related to socioeconomic principles. It is recommended that the instructor of the course encourages the preservice teachers to supply articles that are related to their own interests. It is important to recognize that the readings and activities provided in the program are only suggestions, and that the students and the instructor should modify the program so that it suits their learning needs and interests.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

The interviews revealed areas where program modifications and improvements could be made to the CLA Program for Preservice Teachers. It is recommended that the following modifications or improvements be made before the program is implemented in a Faculty of Education.

1. Ensure that the instructor teaching the program has a sound understanding of the ideas and issues presented the program as well as a commitment to promoting social justice and understandably what that means.
2. In the Program Booklet, include short informal evaluations of the program to be conducted at the end of each session with the students. For example, the instructor could ask the students what they enjoyed or did not enjoy during the session or what other topics else they would like to explore. The program could be modified in accordance with the students' responses.

3. Include a comprehensive Literature Review in the General Information Section of the program. This will help faculty who are unfamiliar with topic gain an understanding of the ideas and issues.

4. In the Program Booklet, encourage students to examine language practices that are used by fellow classmates in order to provide students with concrete examples of language practices which can be used as a foundation on which the wider implications of the course can be explored.

5. Include more time in program sessions for the students to discuss and develop teaching strategies that will help them promote social justice within their future classrooms. Ask the students to develop a "Tool Kit of Teaching Techniques."

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Since the area of CLA study is relatively new there are many avenues of study. For future researchers interested in this project, it is recommended that they implement the program in a Faculty of Education setting and conduct an evaluation of the program based on the participants' experiences. There could also be a follow-up study conducted to
determine if the strategies developed in the program were useful in the classrooms, and how the program affected teaching practices. The program could also be shortened so that it could be introduced as a professional development day workshop. As an alternative, the program could be expanded to include a second or companion course that builds on the knowledge students gain from this program. In the opinion of this researcher, the best approach to future research would be to implement the program and to conduct an evaluation of the program with the participants of the course.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information gathered during the focused interviews, it is recommended that the program be implemented in a Faculty of Education setting after the recommendations for program improvement have been implemented. Overall, it may be concluded that the program is sound and if properly used would accomplish the proposed objectives, and based on the opinion of the educational experts surveyed, the program can be considered as possessing potential educational value for preservice teachers.
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INTRODUCTION

The proposed *Critical Language Awareness Program for Preservice Teachers* is designed for students completing a Bachelor of Education degree at a Faculty of Education. The program endeavours to help preservice teachers develop a greater awareness of the power of language and the role it plays both inside and outside the classroom. The program is based on Critical Language Awareness (CLA) theory that examines and sets out to explain the "connection between discourse and its structural determinants and effects" (Clark, 1991, p. 42). Thus, it is hoped that the students will gain an understanding of the interplay between language, power and social structures. In particular, the students will be provided with the opportunity to examine how language can be shaped by and in turn shape interactions and perceptions. Through examining and questioning their own and popular beliefs about language, it is hoped that the students will gain a greater understanding of how language can function as a means of maintaining and perpetuating existing social inequalities. It is assumed that the preservice teachers have a commitment to social justice, and this proposed program provides them with the knowledge and tools to realize their ideals. The focus of the program is on examining CLA theory and how this theory affects educators' roles in a pluralist school environment with an explicit dedication to social justice.
The need for students to learn about language was initially highlighted in the report, *A Language for Life* (The Bullock Report, 1975). Language Awareness (LA) programs were developed and implemented in schools and faculties of education to support the recommendation that greater attention be devoted to helping students become functionally literate and improve foreign language learning. The primary aim of the LA programs was to help students and teachers understand the properties of language and language use. Hawkins (1984) one of LA's most recognized proponents viewed language as a complex system of patterns and purposeful processes. Thus, LA programs helped students be able to describe the discourse of a society or social institution in order to become more aware of the nature and purpose of different forms of discourse. Although these efforts have contributed to a greater awareness of language and the different forms of language used in various contexts they do not encourage students to critically analyse the reasons why the differences exist.

CLA theory however, does encourage this critical component to be included when learning about language and considers the LA "view of language to be inadequate without a critical dimension" (Ivanic, 1988, p. 3). The need for students to develop critical thinking skills have also been supported by the development of critical literacy and critical oracy programs (Luke, 1997, Davies and Corson, 1997). By helping students and teachers understand how language can function to position people in the world it is hoped that they will be able to work together to recognize and transform social inequalities and injustices which are perpetuated through language and language use.
CLA theorists have identified and proposed three main areas of study as essential components in the development of a critical language awareness program. The three areas are 1) a social awareness of discourse; 2) a social awareness of the diversity of languages and language varieties and 3) a consciousness of and practice for change (Clark, 1991, Fairclough 1987). The proposed program contains all three elements as preservice teachers are introduced to the ideas that 1) discourse is a social practice that is both structured and structuring; 2) different languages and language varieties are not accorded that same status, consequences of this and possible reasons why this inequality exists and lastly 3) they can promote greater social justice and equality through their own language use if they choose to. The proposed program is based on exploring these three central areas of CLA theory as developed in the work of Fairclough, Ivanic, Janks and Clark. It also explores other language and educational issues which are not directly informed by CLA theory but still examine the close link between language, education and power.

The proposed program presents a variety of topics, activities and readings for ten three-hour sessions. By no means should the session topics, activities or readings be interpreted as unalterable items. Rather, they should be viewed and used as suggestions on how students could begin exploring language issues that they deem to be of personal interest. The program is designed to encourage student initiation and participation; therefore, the students are responsible for identifying specific session topics that they want to investigate. The recommended readings are gathered from numerous sources and reflect a variety of writing styles: academic, creative, historical, investigative and narrative. The
students are encouraged to consult other sources to further enhance their knowledge. The suggested activities are substantially learner-centred so the preservice teachers can direct the program and develop their knowledge through independent and collaborative learning activities. Although there are no clear-cut answers or solutions to the issues included in the program, it does provide students with a forum to discuss the issues and consider their own positions and practices. Thus, it is hoped that the students will begin to recognize the potential for change and move towards supporting perceptions and language practices that promote greater equality within schools.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The need for preservice teachers to possess a greater understanding of language and learning issues has been recognized by various educational critics. In the report "For the Love of Learning", the Royal Commission on Learning (1994) recommended that educators "understand and appreciate the linguistic, religious, cultural, and social differences among students, and become aware of how to build on the strengths students from different backgrounds bring to school" (vol. III, p. 25). It also acknowledged that preservice teachers "need assistance in thinking critically about their work in the schools, so that they can do more than merely replicate what they see" (short version, p. 17). McLaren advocates the inclusion of a CLA program in teaching training. He contends that from such a program preservice teachers and teachers would "gain an understanding of
how language functions to 'position' people in the world" and "become more knowledgeable about and sensitive to the omnipresence and power of language as constitutive of their own experiences" (McLaren, 1987. p. 175).

INFORMAL EVIDENCE OF A NEED

Are preservice teachers interested in exploring CLA issues? The author interviewed three preservice teachers and three teachers who had graduated from a Bachelor of Education program in 1995 in order to gain preliminary impressions. During individual conversations that lasted between twenty-five minutes and two hours, I presented the respondents with an outline of CLA issues and session topics which would explore these issues. Each respondent said that he or she would be interested in such a program. When asked whether they would want the material presented in a lecture style or a more hands-on approach, five of the six respondents said, "hands-on." One respondent explained that this would provide her and other preservice teachers with teaching ideas and presentation techniques that could be used later. When asked to describe whether they would want theory or practical knowledge, most respondents said they wanted to know how CLA issues applied to them. Two respondents noted that they would also like some theory so they could understand the origins of the practical ideas. Overall the conversations proved to be valuable because they suggested that an interest in the topic exists and how a program might best be delivered.
PROGRAM RATIONALE

Educators recognize that there is a significant discrepancy between the success rates of certain groups of children within current educational systems, particularly children from non-dominant backgrounds. Systemic patterns of group underachievement have prompted the recommendation by the Royal Commission Learning that educators should devote greater attention to resolving the problem and responding to the needs of our pluralist society. The educational problem cannot be resolved through making superficial or cosmetic changes because it is embedded so deeply within the system. It is argued that through examining, challenging and changing underlying beliefs and prejudices and then reforming institutional practices that the nature of the system can be fundamentally modified. One small but influential way greater equality can be encouraged is through increasing awareness about language usage.

PROGRAM GOAL

The goal of this program is to introduce and familiarize students with the ideas and theory of CLA so that they can begin to reflect on the concepts as demonstrated in their own language practices. This will assist in developing a critical orientation towards language and language practices so they can encourage practices which are consistent with social justice within schools.
THREE PRIMARY OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

1) To develop students' critical understanding of language and the ways in which it shapes our perceptions and interactions.
2) To facilitate independent and cooperative learning as appropriate.
3) To provide the students with an opportunity to develop, clarify and possibly change their own social and language practices so that they will be in greater accord with principles of social justice.

PROGRAM AUDIENCE

The proposed program is designed for preservice teachers enrolled in Faculties of Education who are interested in investigating the interplay between language, power and social inequality. The program accommodates and encourages participation by all grade levels of preservice teachers. The content of the program examines issues which affect all age levels of children and focuses on helping the preservice teachers develop a solid understanding of the issues and how they relate to their future work as teachers.

The program emphasises student initiation and involvement; therefore, the students should also enjoy participating in collaborative learning activities and discussion sessions. The ideal number of participants is between 15-20 students. The program is not intended to be delivered as a large lecture style course, so there should be no more than 25 people. A small course enrolment will help ensure that each student has an opportunity to contribute to the discussion and activities.
ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE STUDENTS

1) The students will have little or no previous knowledge about this area of study.

2) The students will be interested in learning more about how they can effectively teach students who come from a wide variety of backgrounds.

3) Some students, despite fair-mindedness, may be hesitant to examine possible prejudices and biases.

4) Some students will be more open than others to acknowledge that minority students face discrimination and problems within the school system, though, generally, they are all committed to fair practices and a just society.

5) The students represent a wide variety of talents, knowledge and experiences.

6) The learners are interested in learning both theory and practical information about the subject.

7) The learners have completed an undergraduate degree that has developed their writing, reading, listening and speaking skills.

ROLE OF THE INSTRUCTOR

The instructor is to assume a facilitative role. The instructor will help guide the discussions, organize the material, provide resources and additional information, lead introductory lectures and evaluate students' work. The instructor should be familiar with the practices of critical pedagogy and encourage the students to take control of their own learning.
ROLE OF FACULTIES OF EDUCATION

The program is designed to be offered by Faculties of Education. It could be offered as one of the elective courses required to complete the Bachelor of Education degree program. The Academic Coordinator would be responsible for examining and proposing modifications to the program so that it meets the requirements of individual Faculties of Education. The administration of the Faculty of Education would be responsible for implementing the program. This includes selecting an instructor, classroom, timetable slot and providing students with information about the program in the course calendar.

LEARNING DESIGN

The program is designed to maximize student initiation and participation. Therefore, preservice teachers will be given the opportunity to identify topics that are of particular interest to them and modify the program so that it reflects their interests, needs and experiences. Although the program is primarily designed to help preservice teachers develop their own understanding of CLA issues, it also includes opportunities for students to develop lesson plans based on the subject matter so that CLA ideas may be used in their subsequent professional careers. The program is also designed to provide the students with an opportunity to use the four different types of learning styles; abstract conceptualization, reflective observation, active experiment and concrete experience.
TIME FRAME

The course is divided into ten three-hour sessions so that it can be delivered during one semester. Beyond the thirty hours of classroom time, students would be required to spend time preparing for class work, reading and completing assignments.

FORMAT

Each session consists of:

- a reconnecting activity
- small and/or large group discussions
- activities and/or presentations
- a fifteen minute break

Each session outline includes learning objectives, recommended activities and instructions that the instructor may use at his or her discretion. No time restrictions have been placed on individual activities as the students and instructor are best able to decide how much time they want to devote to each activity.

PROGRAM OUTLINE

Session One: Introduction

Session Two: Language and Identity

Session Three: "Correct" versus "Incorrect" Language

Session Four: Language Conventions
Session Five: Non-Standard Varieties of Language in Schools

Session Six: Language Change

Session Seven: Writing and Reading

Session Eight: Oral Language

Session Nine: Signing and Seeing

Session Ten: Lesson Plan Presentations and Wrap-Up

The topics of the course are based on the three areas of study identified by CLA theorists and ordered so that the students may build upon the ideas as the program progresses. The first two sessions focus on familiarizing the students and instructor with each other and helping the students begin considering the connection between language and inequalities. During Session Three the students examine various academic approaches to language and how a critical orientation can be useful to understanding broader social and educational implications of popular views of language. Session Four, Five and Six focus on examining language and language use from broader social and educational perspectives and developing critical thinking skills. During Session Seven, Eight and Nine the students focus their attention on exploring specific forms of language in order to gain an understanding of how prejudices and dominant views are transmitted through each form of language. In Session Ten the students are provided with an opportunity to present how they could introduce CLA ideas to their future students.
SITE, MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS

The following items are needed:

- room large enough to accommodate tables and chairs for the participants
- wall space for posting chart paper
- felt-tipped markers
- chart paper
- masking tape for posting charts
- chalk board, chalk
- reproduced handouts
- overhead projector and transparencies
SESSION ONE

INTRODUCTION

Objectives

1) To become acquainted with one another through team-building activities.

2) To learn about the students' needs, interests and expectations.

3) To present an overview of the proposed program.

4) To demonstrate a commitment to ensuring the program is personally relevant by modifying the program in collaboration with the students so that the program reflects and incorporates their interests, needs and experiences.

5) To begin identifying possible social and educational inequalities.

Round Table Introductions

- Welcome the students to the course.

- Invite the students to introduce themselves to the class and share a brief description of their previous experiences and why they choose to enroll in the program.

- Encourage the students to consider what topics they are interested in exploring so that later in the session they can identified and incorporated into the program.
Small Group Introductions

- Divide the students into small groups and ask them to introduce and share something about themselves with their group members.
- Explain that after the small group discussions, they will reconvene as a large group and each group member will introduce a fellow member and describe what the small group discovered about the person. Reconvene and listen to the introductions.

Sharing Our Experiences

- In order to help the students begin identifying possible social inequalities, ask each student to discuss with a partner a situation in which they felt subordinate or superior to another person.
- Ask the students to consider if the language that was used during the situation reinforced the unequal distribution of social status. For example, a conversation between a doctor and a patient, a police officer and civilian, a door-to-door salesperson and a resident of home.
- Reconvene as a large group and invite the students to share their experiences.
- Ask the students to speculate about what caused the feelings of subordination or superiority and possible social implications. A class member can record the ideas on the chalk board. For example, was it caused by differences in gender, social class, perceived monetary worth, expertise in the area of discussion?
Examining Student Success Rates

- Ask the students to divide into small groups and analyse the dropout statistics for secondary school students published by the Toronto Board of Education.
- Ask each group to compile a list of social factors that they think may affect the dropout rate. For example, cultural background, socioeconomic status, home language or parental presence at home.
- Reconvene as a large group.
- Ask the students to share their ideas about why the success rate varies between groups of students. The students can also consider how this affects the role of an educator.

Course Description

- Present an overview of the proposed program including a description of the objectives and session topics to the students. The instructor can explain how the course endeavours to help students gain a critical understanding of the role of language in our society. This is so they can become aware and begin to question attitudes and language practices both inside and outside the classroom.
  
  Explain that the proposed topics may be thought of as a 'springboard' to help the students begin thinking about what interests them, and that the course will be modified to suit their needs.
Session One

Discovering the Students' Expectations and Interests Using Response Cards

- Distribute an index card to each student.
- Ask the students to write on their card any topics or issues they want to explore and that were not previously mentioned. They can also include any questions about the subject matter, format or goals of the course.
- Request that the cards be passed around the group in a clockwise direction. As each card is passed on to the next person, ask the students to read it and place a check mark on the card if it contains a topic, question or concern for them as well.
- When each student has his or her card original card back, each person will have reviewed the groups' questions.
- At this point, collect the cards and respond to the students' questions and concerns. These questions or additional areas of interest can be used to modify the course to suit the learner's needs.
- Invite the students to voice their concerns or new areas of interests as the program progresses so that they may also be included in the program.
Marking Scheme

- Invite the students to participate in designing a marking scheme. Individual learning contracts or a group contract may be created if desired.
- Ask the students if they would like self and/or peer evaluation to be included in the evaluation process for such things as class presentations, participation or lesson plans.
- The following scheme may be used as a rough draft:

  40% Major term paper (15 pages). The individual students may choose a topic that is of personal interest and related to a CLA issue. The students may choose their specific topics later in the program as they learn more about CLA issues and identify what they want to explore in depth.

  20% Class presentations.

  20% Two lesson plans on a CLA topic that can be used in future classrooms.

  20% Class participation.
SESSION TWO

LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

Objectives

1) To recognize how language is intimately linked to one's sense of identity.

2) To consider how and why students may choose to preserve their linguistic, cultural, and social identities by rejecting teaching material that reflects the dominant culture and ignores their experiences.

3) To identify ways teachers can help students value their own languages and cultural experiences.

Recommended Reading


Name Tag Mix Up and Discovering What is in a Name

- Ask the students to fill out a name tag and drop it in a hat.

- Pass the hat around and ask the students to pick out a new name tag. Invite the students to circulate around the room and find the owner of the name tag.
• Ask the students introduce themselves to the person and share any of the following things about their names:
  • what I like or dislike about my name
  • who I was named after
  • a nickname that I like or dislike
  • the origin of my name

Sparkling Speculation

• As a large group, encourage the students to speculate and answer the question; how do you believe your language is linked to or reflects your identity?
• For example, they may use categories like; national origin, culture, socio-economic class, social group or personal identity.


• Ask the students to use the article by Kohl, "I won't learn from you: Confronting student resistance" for this activity.
• Ask the students to divide into small groups and give each group a copy of the following questions.

First ask the students to share "what" happened in the article and as they were reading it:
  • What did you feel as you were reading it?
  • What did you observe or think about?
What and why did the grandfather resist by choosing not to learn English or the students choosing not to listen to the ethnocentric history lesson?

Next ask the students to ask themselves "so what":

- What benefits did you derive from reading this article?
- What did you learn or relearn?
- What are the implications of students choosing not to learn by rejecting teaching material that reflects the dominant culture and ignores their experiences so that they can preserve their cultural, social or linguistic heritage?

Finally, ask the students to consider "now what":

- How do you want to do things differently in the future?
- What else do you want to know about this issue?
- Afterwards, reconvene as a large group to discuss any points in the article or discussion which were found to be particularly insightful.

Expanding Panel Discussion

- Divide the students into four groups.
- Ask each group to pick a different section of the chapter by Cummins:

  1) Identity and Empowerment
2) *Empowerment Through Negotiation of Identity: The Pajaro Valley Experience*

3) *Disempowerment through Negotiation of Identity: The First Nations Residential School Experience*

4) *Coercive and Collaborative Relations of Power*

- Ask the students to discuss their reactions and the material presented in their section with their group members.

- Afterwards reconvene as a large group. Ask for one volunteer from each group to serve as a representative for a panel-discussion group. The students can arrange themselves so that the panel is clustered together and everyone can clearly see the representatives.

- Begin the panel discussion with questions like; how can a teacher deal with language differences in the classroom? What are the effects of these approaches?

- Encourage other students to ask the panel discussion-prompting questions and comment on the points raised by the panel. Afterwards, reconvene as a large group and invite the students to share subsequent thoughts or reactions.
SESSION THREE

"CORRECT" VERSUS "INCORRECT" LANGUAGE

Objectives

1) To identify how interactions and perceptions about language can be unwittingly shaped by the beliefs of more powerful social groups.

2) To recognize the difference between viewing language as a set of patterns, a purposeful process or as a way of constructing and sustaining identities.

3) To investigate why some languages and language varieties are valued more than others, and to identify possible social and educational effects.

4) To understand what being "silenced" means and the consequences of being silenced.

Recommended Reading


Free-Form Role Playing

- Ask students to divide into three groups.

- Ask each group to develop a short skit illustrating a parent-teacher interview.
• Reconvene as a large group and enjoy the skits.

• Afterwards, encourage the students to consider the skits and their own experiences and respond to the following questions. Did the skits illustrate any expectations about the conduct of a parent-teacher interview? If so, what are they? How are such expectations learned? Why do such expectation exist? How is the teacher's identity sustained by the language that he or she uses?

Curious Crews

• Ask the students to divide themselves into four crews and pick one of the following tasks to complete.

• After the crews have prepared, reconvene as a large group.

• Invite the crews to present and discuss their ideas with the other students. The students can refer to the recommended readings to help them complete their tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crew</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Questioners</td>
<td>Develop and ask two questions about the readings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shaman and Prescriptivism Defenders</td>
<td>Describe two points your crew agrees with or finds helpful in viewing language a 'set of patterns' and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Linguistic and Descriptivism Defenders</td>
<td>Describe two points your crew agrees with or finds helpful in viewing language as a 'purposeful process' and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Example Givers</td>
<td>Give one or more examples and explanations of each approach to language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is Correct Language?

- In a large group discussion ask the students to consider the social implications of prescriptivism and descriptivism. For example, what are the social effects of labelling some types of language correct and others incorrect? What happens when people do not use what is typically deemed as correct or appropriate? What assumptions are made about the language user, if their language differs from the social standard? How can language be used to classify people as belonging to a certain social class?

- The students can also consider how a critical orientation differs from the previous two approaches. Ask the students to be specific and answer in a sentence or two the primary differences between the three approaches. The students can use Ivanic’ article to make a comparison between the three approaches.

Rayford’s Song

- Display the poem, Rayford's Song on a transparency. Ask for volunteers to read the poem to the class.

- In a large group discussion ask students to discuss their reactions to the poem. What did you like or dislike about the poem? Did you feel comfortable with the variety of English Raymond used? What messages did the teacher send to the students about what type of language is appropriate and what type is not?
• Explain how "silencing" can occur unintentionally? How do you think people feel about being silenced? Why are they silenced? Can you recall a time that you felt silenced or silenced someone else? How can a teacher validate the student's voice and language?

• The students can also consider how the teacher could value Rayford's variety while also exploring with the students the power relations that make it seem out of place in certain settings. The students can brainstorm as a large group to develop ways teachers can help future students gain critical awareness of variety from this teaching episode.

**Partner Discussions**

• Ask the students to discuss the article by Cecil with a partner.

• For example, the partners can discuss the results of the research study. Are the expectations of teachers unintentionally influenced by whether a student speaks standard English or Black English Vernacular? What effect can these expectations have on a student's success rate? What wider social and educational effects can biases towards other languages and varieties have?
For Next Session

- Assign this activity before the next session on 'Language Conventions'. Ask the students to divide themselves into eight small groups with people they can meet outside class to complete the assignment.

- Ask each of the eight groups to choose a different language convention to investigate from the following list:
  1) Sexist Language
  2) Jargon
  3) Informal/personal conversations
  4) Labelling
  5) Rhetorical language
  6) Propaganda
  7) Euphemisms/dysphemisms
  8) Prejudicial/Discriminatory Language.

- Explain that each group is responsible for preparing and delivering a class presentation on their specific language convention. The presentations might include such information about the function of the convention, its effects on people. How and if the language convention is representative of dominant culture? How people can identify the convention and alternatives to using the convention in their language practices?
• Suggest that they should find and use examples from actual classroom talk, school board publications, school books, and personal encounters to illustrate their convention. Encourage the students to use a variety of teaching techniques in their presentation including audience participation.

• The recommended readings for Session Four can be used to help the students gain an introductory understanding of their chosen convention. Encourage the students to consult other sources.
SESSION FOUR

LANGUAGE CONVENTIONS

Objectives

1) To recognize how powerful social groups can choose the language used to describe people, things and events.

2) To become aware of how language conventions can marginalize and discriminate against certain groups of people.

3) To recognize that conventions are contrived and naturalised.

4) To identify ways we can oppose using language that disempowers people.

Recommended Reading


The Colour of Our Words: Group Brainstorming Session

- Divide the students into two groups.

- Ask the students to brainstorm with their group members and write on chart paper any phrases that use colours to implicitly convey a negative or positive attribute about the object of the phrase. For example, white lies, black market,
black sheep, blue blood, true blue, green-eyed monster, green thumb, red neck, red-blooded, yellow belly, or pinko.

- Afterwards, post the lists and reconvene as a large group. Ask the students to consider how the colour is used to convey, change or reinforce the hidden meaning of the phrase. The students might also consider what greater social effects such phrases have.

**Learning From Our Classmates**

- Ask the eight groups to present their language convention presentations to the class.
- Encourage the students to discuss the presentations and ask questions.
- The students can also deliberate about alternative ways of incorporating lessons on language conventions into their future curriculum units.

**For Next Session**

- Ask students to consider when they are reading the article for next session whether they agree or disagree with the ideas presented in the article by Corson. Explain that during the next class they will debate the ideas presented in the article.
SESSION FIVE

NON-STANDARD VARIETIES OF LANGUAGE AND SCHOOLS

Objectives

1) To consider why people can be disadvantaged if their language practices differ from dominant norms and practices.

2) To consider how education contributes to the legitimization and reproduction of dominant ideas about language.

3) To consider the effects of students using non-standard varieties of language in schools.

4) To consider how educators can challenge existing inequalities.

Recommended Reading


Group Learning

• Ask the students to divide into four groups.

• Ask each group to choose one of the following categories which includes two topics discussed by Corson:

  1) Early Contributions and Prejudices and Stereotypes
2) *Some Relevant Research On Non-Standard Varieties and Critical Awareness of Variety*

3) *Practical Classroom Knowledge and Other Critical Knowledge About Varieties*

4) *Work In Progress and Problems and Difficulties: Future Directions*

- Ask students to discuss the ideas presented in their sections and identify points they agree or disagree with. Encourage the students to relate the material to personal experiences and previous knowledge.

- Reconvene as a large group and ask each group to present a summary of the group's discussion.

- Invite the other students to ask each group questions and discuss the material.

For example, the students could discuss the following: How can students from non-dominant backgrounds be disadvantaged in schools if their language differs from dominant norms and practices? How barriers do teachers face in valuing non-standard varieties of language in schools? How can teachers value non-standard varieties of language?
Active Debate

- Ask the students to divide themselves into two teams; one team who generally agrees with Corson's ideas and the other team who generally disagrees with the ideas in the article by Corson.
- Assign the "pro position" to one team and the "con position" to the other team.
- Ask each group to consider and develop arguments to either defend or refute the question; 'Is the role of education to maintain and reproduce dominant ideas about language?' Encourage the students to draw upon their own experiences to illustrate their position.
- Allow the students enough time to develop their opening arguments, points, counter-points and examples.
- Ask the students to choose a spokesperson to deliver the opening argument.
- Arrange the chairs in a circle so that the two teams can face each other.
- Begin the debate by having the spokespersons present their opening arguments.
- The debating teams can then present their points and counterpoints. Encourage each member of the groups to participate in the debate.
- When you think it is appropriate, end the debate. Hold a class discussion on what the participants learned about the issue from the debate experience. Also ask the participants to identify what they thought were the best arguments raised on both sides. Clarify any points or questions the students may have.
The instructor can also lead the students through a discussion about how is knowledge about language reproduced? What knowledge about language is reproduced? How is knowledge about language transmitted? How can educational policies be modified so that greater equality can be encouraged within schools?

**Formative Evaluation**

- Ask the students to anonymously complete a formative evaluation sheet (Appendix A).
- Remind the students that this program is designed to help them become more aware about the interaction between language, power and social structures. Explain that the questionnaire is a means of identifying areas of the program that need improvement and any new areas of interest that the students may have developed since the first session and want to explore in the second half of the course.
- Encourage the students to offer suggestions on how the course could be modified so that it reflects their interests, needs and expectations.
- Collect the evaluation forms and modify the course according the students' requests and responses.
SESSION SIX

LANGUAGE CHANGE

Objectives

1) To discuss the formative evaluation and how the course could be modified to better meet the students' needs and interests.

2) To recognize that language is not fixed, but is dynamic.

3) To identify how and why some languages are replaced with other languages.

4) To recognize that historical events including social, economic and political changes can cause changes in the language that individuals use.

5) To identify different techniques people use to adjust to changes in their language.

Recommended Reading


Formative Evaluation Discussion

• Discuss the findings of the formative evaluation.

• Invite the students to add any further thoughts about the course.

• Tell the students how the program will be modified to better meet their needs and interests and ask for their feedback.
Trading Words, Trading Ideas

- Distribute two index cards to each student.
- Encourage the students to identify words or expressions that they know that have changed because of some particular social change or pressure. For example, the labels used to describe people, the jargon used in educational and business settings or euphemisms used by the media.
- Ask the students to circulate around the room and trade cards with their classmates.
- Reconvene as large group and invite the students to discuss their findings, possible reasons why words and expressions have changed and their social effects.

Study Groups

- The chapter by Aitchison can be used to help the students complete their tasks.

Divide the students into two study groups.

- Assign one study group the topic of 'language suicide' and the other study group the topic of 'language murder'.
- Distribute a copy of the following assignment to each study group.
Your Study Group's Tasks Are To...

1. **Clarify** the content: What does your topic mean? When and why does it occur? What are some effects of language change?
2. **Create** examples from your own experiences or use examples provided by Aitchison to illustrate the main ideas of your topic.
3. **Identify** points that are confusing or with which you disagree.
4. **Assess** how well you understand the material.
5. **Prepare** a short presentation for the class that summarizes the points your study group discovered and discussed.

- Reconvene as a large group and enjoy the presentations.
- Encourage the students to ask questions. This will clarify the idea that language change can be caused by the process of socially prestigious languages replacing less socially prestigious languages. The students can discuss the effects of language change and how more socially prestigious groups can influence language change.
Linking History With Language Change: A Canadian Example

- The instructor can introduce this activity by describing larger social, political and economic events can cause language change.

- Divide the students into three groups. Distribute markers and chart paper.

- Ask the groups to map-out the events described in the section by Heller entitled "Social and Historical Background". The students could use a time line, a flowchart, a picture-gram or any other method to help them understand some political, social and economic factors that have contributed to language changes in Quebec.

- Invite the students to present their diagrams to the class and discuss the historical events that have affected the use of French and English in Quebec.

Presenting Our Knowledge

- Divide the students into two groups.

- Ask each group to choose a section of the article by Heller that describes how individuals in Montreal, Quebec adjusted to language change. One group may choose to examine social interactions while another group may examine business interactions.
• Ask the groups to prepare a presentation for the whole class. Suggest that the presentations include skits that illustrate different techniques that people use to deal with language change. The students can also include a discussion period about how language change can exclude people from certain conversations and social interactions.

• Reconvene as large group and enjoy the presentations.

• Afterwards encourage the students to discuss and clarify any points raised in the presentations. The students can also discuss how language choice, particularly during a time of change, can represent an individual's political or social frame of reference or viewpoint.

• The instructor can also draw upon the words or expressions that the students identified in the first activity to illustrate that language choice can represent social or political struggles and to show that when power relations change so does language.

For Next Session

• For the next session, "Writing and Reading", ask the students to read the Saturday comic section of a newspaper and choose one comic strip to evaluate.

• Ask the students to evaluate their chosen comic strip. They could examine things like who is and is not represented? What are the roles of the characters?
Are stereotypes or biases presented? If so, what are the stereotypes or biases?

What does the text and illustrations convey to readers?

• Ask the students to summarize their findings and bring the comic strips to class so that the rest of the class can also evaluate it.

• Also ask the students to bring one or two books for elementary children to the next class.
SESSION SEVEN

WRITING AND READING

Objectives

1) To consider why some language activities have greater status than others, and the effects of such appraisals on others.

2) To recognize how prestigious social groups have shaped certain types of written language and how people can be prevented from using and understanding the types of language.

3) To critically examine books and discuss how books can serve as a means of maintaining and perpetuating negative stereotypes and biases.

Recommended Reading

Christensen, L. (1994). Unlearning the myths that bind us: Critiquing fairy tales and films. In B. Bigelow, L. Christensen, S. Karp, B. Miner, & B. Peterson (Eds.), Rethinking Our Classrooms. (pp. 8-13). Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools Ltd.


Contemplating Cartoons

- As a large group invite volunteers to display and discuss the cartoons that they examined.
- The students may also discuss the effects of the "fun and harmless" messages implicitly conveyed in cartoons and the ideas presented by Christensen

Taking a Closer Look

- Ask the students to divide into small groups. Ask each group to analyse the books that they brought to class for the ten characteristics discussed in the article by the Council on Interracial Books for Children. For example, the students could examine both the text and illustrations for such things as stereotypes, tokenism or the depiction of minority characters in subservient roles.
- Afterwards, reconvene as a large group and ask the groups to present a summary of the issues that they discussed.
- The instructor can also ask the students to consider the effects that books can have on students and how books can serve as a means of maintaining and reproducing stereotypes. The students might also consider how they can encourage their future students to be critical readers and challenge the texts?
Writing Our Own Stories

- Divide the students into small groups.
- Ask each group to consider how they would ideally like stories for children to be written. Ask each group to create a rough outline of a very short story for children. Explain to the groups that the activity is intended to raise their awareness of how difficult it can be to depart from reflecting dominant ideas or views in books. The activity is intended to challenge the students and encourage them to use their imaginations and develop a short story outline that incorporates some qualities they wish to see in books. The students are free to choose such things as the story line, setting, characters and time period.
- Afterwards ask the students to reconvene as a large group and listen to the story outlines.
- Ask the groups to explain why their story outlines took the form they did. The students might also discuss the difficulties they had in deciding the content of the story.

Rules and Restrictions

- Use the article by Hamilton for this activity.
- Ask the students to form small groups. Ask each group to compile a list of rules about how to write a 'good' paper. For example, they could identify words that should not begin sentences or the need to use an objective voice in academic papers.
Reconvene as a large group and invite each group to present their collection of ideas.

Ask each group to consider whether rules help or hinder their writing? Which of the rules do they 'just follow' in order to avoid being penalized? Who prescribes the rules? Why are they prescribed? What effects can certain types of writing have on people who are unfamiliar with the rules or the language? How can teachers encourage students to value their own voices and ideas?

The students can discuss the suggestions presented by Hamilton.

For Next Session

Ask students to examine an interaction between a teacher and a few students within a classroom before the next session on 'Oral Language'. The students may choose the educational setting, the grade level and the participants.

Ask the students to consider: who initiated the conversation? What was the purpose of the conversation? Who directed the conversation? How was the conversation directed? Whose voices and ideas were valued the most? Why did the conversation take the form it did? Did the conversation establish or maintain social identities or power relationships and if so, how was this accomplished?

Suggest to the students that they summarize the interaction and their findings so that they can be discussed in class.
SESSION EIGHT

ORAL LANGUAGE

Objectives

1) To recognize how verbal interactions can be shaped by and in turn shape social identities.

2) To examine how teachers can encourage and discourage students from verbally sharing or discussing their ideas and experiences.

3) To recognize the significance of oral language and consider why oral language is often valued less than written language.

4) To identify ways educators can encourage emancipatory discourse within classrooms.

Recommended Reading


Reminiscing and Relating

- Divide the students into small groups.

- Ask the students to reminisce about their earlier school days. Encourage them to discuss with their group members how they felt about talking in class (i.e., in groups, with friends and with teachers).
• Ask the students to identify factors that either encouraged or discouraged them from speaking in class.

• Reconvene as a large group and ask a representative from each group to present the findings of their group. Encourage the students to discuss why there are similarities and differences between the answers.

Role Playing

• Divide the students into four groups.

• Ask each group to choose one of the case studies presented by Cazden. Ask each group to prepare a short skit illustrating the type of scenario discussed in their case study.

• Reconvene as a large group and watch the skits.

• Afterwards encourage the students to examine how the teachers' responses either encouraged or discouraged further interaction between the students and the teacher? They may also discuss such things as: how do students learn what are appropriate topics to share with the class? Who decides what is appropriate and what is not? What is the role of the teacher during Sharing Time?
Incorporating Our Own Case Studies

- Invite volunteers to discuss the interaction between a teacher and a few students which they examined outside of class. Encourage the students to discuss their findings and how conversations in the classroom can be shaped by the teachers and students.
- The students can discuss whether their findings confirm or refute Cazden's findings?
- They may discuss how social interactions are affected if such variables as the statuses of people involved, gender, topics, or context, were changed. The students might also discuss if they learned any strategies that could help them in the classroom.

Team Quiz

- The students can use Corson's article to help them complete this activity.
- Divide the students into three teams and name one team, 'A', the second team 'B' and the third team 'C'. Ask Team A to prepare a short quiz based on the article by Corson to be given to the other two teams (five questions). Team B and Team C can use this preparation time to review the article.
- Reconvene as a large group and begin the quiz.
- Direct Team A to ask Team B the first question. If Team B correctly answers the questions, then Team A directs its next question to Team B
(until they are unable to answer). If Team B is unable to answer the question then Team C is asked the same question. If Team C correctly answers the question then Team A asks Team C the next question.

- Repeat the process until the quiz has been completed.

- Once the original answers have been correctly presented either by Team B or C then all class members can debate and discuss the issues reflected in the questions. Encourage students to draw on their own experiences to illustrate their answers.

- Team A could develop the following questions as; what is the significance of oral language? Could students benefit from more oral language opportunities in the curriculum? Why or why not? Why is oral language not commonly valued as much as written language? How can teachers encourage students to value their spoken language? How can the use of certain types of oral language be disadvantageous to some students?

- Afterwards, ask the students to evaluate the interactions that took place during the quiz. Did the students participate in the discussion equally? If they did not equally participate, what are techniques that the instructor could have used to encourage more people to share their ideas and experiences? The instructor can invite the students who did not participate why they did not? The students who did participate could be invited to discuss why they choose to participate.
## SESSION NINE

### SIGNING AND SEEING

#### Objectives

1) To identify reasons why signed languages are not accorded the same status as spoken or written language.

2) To identify personal, social and educational effects of the dominant audist culture legitimating and disseminating information about the deaf community and its members.

3) To identify ways of challenging the dominant beliefs about sign languages.

#### Recommended Reading


#### Silent Alphabetical Line-Up

- Ask the students to line up in alphabetical order by their last name without talking or writing notes to one another.

- Afterwards, ask the students to consider how they were able to obtain the necessary information from each other in order to complete the activity. What would have happened if they were also not permitted to use any body gestures?
Partner Exchange

- Ask the students to discuss with a partner their perceptions and assumptions about sign language.

- For example, the students could discuss: what is sign language? Do they think sign language is a legitimate language? What barriers do they think sign language users face? Are the labels deaf or hearing-impaired, harmful or helpful? What connotations, if any, do the labels have beyond simply describing the medical condition?

Curious Crews

- Ask the students to divide themselves into four crews and pick one of the following tasks to complete. The article by Branson and Miller can be used to complete the activity.

- After the crews have prepared their answers, reconvene as a large group.

- Invite the crews to present and discuss their ideas with the other students. The students can refer to the recommended readings to help them complete their tasks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crew</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Questioners</td>
<td>Develop and ask at least two questions about the reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agreers</td>
<td>Describe at least two points your crew agrees with as presented in the article and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disagreeers</td>
<td>Describe at least two points your crew disagrees with as presented in the article and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Example Givers</td>
<td>Give two or more examples and explanations of how the interests of the Deaf community are not met by schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generating Our Own Questions**

- Ask the students to divide into four groups.
- Ask each group to discuss the article and generate two or more questions based on the ideas presented in the article by D. Stewart and C. Tane Akamatsu.
- Reconvene as a large group and invite each group to ask their questions to the rest of the class. Encourage the students to respond to the questions.
- For example, the students can discuss why educators supported an oral-aural philosophy for much of the twentieth century? What is the relationship between the deaf community and the hearing community? Why have sign languages been oppressed?
What Can We Do? Large Group Brainstorming Session

- The session can be ended by asking the students to brainstorm and propose ideas about what change need to be made in order to reverse the pattern of oppression.

- The students might think of short and long term changes that could be made. The students might also consider how they would introduce the topic in their classroom.
SESSION TEN

LESSON PLAN PRESENTATIONS AND WRAP-UP

Objectives

1) For the students to present, discuss and exchange their lesson plans with everyone in the class.

2) To identify the personal or professional outcomes of the course.

3) To identify areas of the program that need improvement.

Rotating Our Resources

- Ask students to divide into four groups and present their two lesson plans to their group members.

- The group members can discuss the plans and offer feedback. For example, how the lesson plan could be improved, extended or modified to suit a different grade level.

- Afterwards, the students can form new groups and repeat the process.

- Continue this activity until each person has presented his or her lesson plans to everyone in the class.

- The students can also make photocopies of their lesson plans and exchange them with their classmates. The students will then have a collection of lesson plan ideas that can be used in future classrooms. Allow each group enough time to discuss and consider the lesson plans.
Gallery of Learning

- Divide the students into small groups.
- Ask the students to discuss with their group members what they have gained from participating in the program. For example, have they acquired, clarified or changed any of their personal or professional views or ideas.
- Ask the groups to list the outcomes on a chart paper under a title like "What We Have Gained". Post the charts on the walls.
- Invite the students to walk by each list and place a check next to gains that they have also made through participating in the program.
- The instructor can survey the charts and discuss with the students the most popular items and unusual outcomes. Invite the students to recommend how the program could be improved in the future.

Summative Evaluation

- Ask the students to anonymously complete the university required summative evaluation form.
- Thank the students for participating in the program.
APPENDIX A

FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Formative Evaluation of CLA Program

The information collected in this evaluation is intended to identify strengths and weaknesses of the program. It is anonymous, however a summary of the findings will be discussed in the following session. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

1. Describe how satisfied you are with the program.

2. Describe any areas of concern you have with the program.

3. What would you like to be changed in the program?

4. What would you like to keep the same in the program?

5. What would you like the instructor to do differently?

6. Any additional comments.
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INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO THE PARTICIPANTS

Dear (Name of Participant):

My name is Gillian Paton and I am full-time M.A. student in the Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education at OISE. I have designed and developed a Critical Language Awareness Program for Preservice Teachers. The purpose of the program is to help students enrolled in Faculties of Education become aware of the interplay between power and language. It is hoped that they will gain a greater understanding of how language can be unintentionally used as a means of marginalizing and discriminating against people and how they can encourage greater equality within the classroom. Currently, no Canadian Faculty of Education offers such a program.

I am writing to ask you if you would be interested in reading the program outline so that I could then interview you to discover your opinion about the program. I would give you a copy of the interview questions and program before the interview. The open-ended interview questions are designed to investigate whether educational experts, like yourself, believe the program could be educational value to preservice teachers. Your time and expertise would be greatly appreciated.

If you would like to know more information about the research or program please do not hesitate to contact me either by e-mail or phone (597-2900). If you agree to participate in the study I could meet with you at your convenience to give you a copy of the program and interview questions. Thank you very much for considering my request.

Kind Regards,

Gillian Paton
APPENDIX C

LETTER OF CONSENT

Dear Name of Participant:

The purpose of this study is to conduct an evaluation of a Critical Language Awareness Program for Preservice Teachers. If you agree to participate in this study, you will be provided with a copy of the program and the interview questions, prior to the interview. During the interview, you will be asked to respond to the open-ended questions. Your responses will be tape-recorded and transcribed.

The information gathered during the interview will remain confidential. All audio tapes, transcripts of tapes, field notes, computer discs and other confidential information will be kept in a locked room. Your name will be replaced with a pseudonym for reporting purposes. You are free to withdraw from this study at any time. If you are willing to participate in this study, please sign and return the bottom section of this form to the researcher. I would like to sincerely thank you. Your time and participation in this study are greatly appreciated.

Yours Sincerely,

Gillian Paton.

I, ____________ agree to participate in this study and understand that I am free to withdraw from this study at any time. Signature of Participant: ________________.
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW PREAMBLE

I would like to thank you very much for participating in this study. The purpose of this interview is to discover your perception and opinion of the program. The information gathered during the interview will be used to determine whether or not the proposed program could be of educational value to preservice teachers. I will audio-tape the interview and make written notes. The interview will be transcribed and the data include the findings in my Master of Art's thesis. The information shall remain conditional as I will replace your name with a pseudonym for reporting purposes. If you have any questions before or during the interview please feel free to ask me. Thank you very much again. I believe that your expertise and experience will prove to be an indispensable part of this study.
APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1) I realize that I sent you a lot of material, and you may or may not have, had an opportunity to look at it. However, could you give me a sense of how much of the program you did have a chance to look at?
   a) If they have not had an opportunity to review the program I would ask them:
      Could we take this time to look at the program together and discuss it? At this point I would review the program with the participant, and then proceed with the interview questions.
   b) If they did have had an opportunity to review the program, I would ask them:
      Could you tell me how your work is connected with the ideas presented in the program?

2) After reading this program, what do you think it is trying to accomplish?
   a) Could you describe for me, what you think the intended outcomes of the program are?
   b) Could you tell me what you think any unintended outcomes of the program might be?
3) If we look at the objectives together, could you describe how you think the activities will accomplish the learning objectives?
   a) How do you think the students' thoughts and conceptions about the role of language will or will not, be changed?
   b) How do you think the students' teaching practices will be affected?

4) If teacher educators were given this program to implement, what problems do you think they would encounter?
   a) Could you describe what additional resources a teacher-educator would want or need in order to successfully implement the program?
   b) Could you describe how you think this program would be perceived by teacher-educators?

5) Could you describe your overall impression of the program?
   a) What do you think the program's strengths are?
   b) What do you think the program's weaknesses are?

6) This ends my questions, but is there anything else you would like to add or discuss?
   I would like to thank you again for all of your time and effort. Once I have gathered and analyzed the data I would be more than pleased to discuss the findings with you.
APPENDIX F

OBJECTIVES OF SPECIFIC INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

QUESTION NUMBER:

1) to understand if the participants have considered or read the program.
   a) to understand how familiar they are with ideas presented in the program and how they connect to it?

2) to understand what the participants perceive to be the program's objectives
   a) intended outcomes
   b) unintended outcomes

4) to understand if the activities are suitable to the learning objectives
   a) what changes they think will occur in the students' conceptual knowledge
   b) what changes they think will occur in the student's teaching practices

5) to identify problems that teacher-educators might encounter if they implement the program
   a) to understand the needs of teacher-educators
   b) to understand how the program could be modified to avoid any areas of concern

6) to gain to understanding of how the program is perceived in general
   a) to identify strengths of the program
   b) to identify areas of the program which should be modified

7) to provide the participants with an opportunity to add any additional comments
APPENDIX G

OVERALL LOGIC AND PROGRAM THEORY MODEL OF THE CRITICAL LANGUAGE AWARENESS PROGRAM FOR PRESERVICE TEACHERS

If

CLA Program instructor has the required knowledge, experience and resources to implement the program.

Then

If

Instructor facilitates the ten sessions as described in the CLA program booklet to interested students.

Then

If

Students react favorably towards the course content and classmates by participating in the discussions.

Then

If

Interactions with students improve through their teachers' awareness and the students also learn about CLA issues.

Then

If

Preservice teachers use their knowledge and teaching strategies within their classrooms.

Then

If

Students develop an understanding and awareness of CLA issues and devise teaching strategies that
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