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Abstract

INTEGRATION AS IDEOLOGY: SURVIVAL ESL AND THE NATION-STATE

Renée Pinchero
Master of Arts 1998
Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning,
International and Community Development
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto

Using a critical, feminist framework, this thesis will examine what has become known as "Survival ESL" within the larger social, political, and economic context of the nation-state. The overall goal of Survival ESL is teach immigrants the linguistic and cultural knowledge they need in order to participate in their new society and it is subsequently within this context that Survival ESL engages in progressive pedagogies (i.e. communicative language teaching, communicative competence, and the situational/functional syllabus). Thus, it is to this end that Survival ESL lays claim to a discourse of empowerment. However, the larger sphere in which Survival ESL is situated is characterized by the inequality inherent to the capitalist nation state. The ideologies of racism, sexism, class, and integration, operate within this larger context to organize and naturalize a certain set of relations: a set of relations in which immigrants are marginalized. Thus, despite Survival ESL's discourse of empowerment, its failure to critically engage with the social and ideological implications of both its pedagogical orientation and the larger social relations within which it is situated supports an integrationist framework. As demonstrated through a survey of the existing curricular materials, it will be argued that this framework operates to enable immigrant learners to function within an existing set of relations: a set of unequal relations. Thus, it will be argued that only by engaging in a critical or transformative pedagogy which explicitly confronts these relations of power can a Survival curriculum begin to be genuinely empowering.
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"We have no choice...but to rebuild the tongue which we have lost with the tongue that we have found."

Since the sixties, a wave of Turkish immigrants has been coming to Germany in search of work. They have been admitted into the affluent society only as "guest workers", official aliens who are allowed to contribute to the national economy but who have never become part of the nation itself...

"He had typed his letter without knowing how to type, painfully finding the letters, just like I had to painfully find my words in German. This man had lost much of his Turkish; his mother tongue had become entangled with his newly acquired German, and now not even his wife could understand him without difficulty. But this man never spoke out against Germany. He kept repeating, *Home is where you have a job.*"

-from the Afterword by Alberto Manguel, in Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Mother Tongue*
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

bell hooks (1994) has argued that theory can be a practice of liberation. It is a way of questioning those taken-for-granted realities, those world views, which have woven themselves so insidiously into the deep structure of our societies and our subjectivities. It is with this in mind that I find the value, even the imperative of undertaking this project.

So I gain truth when I expand my constricted eye, an eye that has only let in what I have been taught to see. But there have been other constrictions: the clutch of fear around my heart when I must deal with the fact of folks who exist, with their own lives, in other places besides this narrow circle I was raised in. I have learned that my fear is kin to a terror that has been in my birth culture for years, for centuries: the terror of a people who have set themselves apart and above, who have wronged others, and feel they are about to be found out and punished. (Minnie Bruce Pratt, from Identity: Skin Blood Heart, 1984, p. 17)

Attention to the role which "common sense" — or ideology — plays in our everyday lives is imperative. For this project it is even more exigent considering that Survival ESL is to a large extent based on everyday assumptions about "survival" in Canada. Dichotomies of modern/traditional, developed/undeveloped, advanced/backwards, etc., constitute the inveterate logic which provides our frame of reference for making sense of the world in which we live. We are born in racist, sexist, and classed worlds where people are not equal. The myth of individualism is both a powerful and a comfortable one for those of us who have a relative amount of privilege. Racist, as do sexist, and class-biased, assumptions are interwoven into the deep structure of our society and it is for this reason that the process of uncovering how these inform and shape our own lives is one which is never-ending. It is also for this reason, that these relations need to be theoretically explored, excavated, and articulated.
The advent of what has come to be viewed as "Survival ESL" is seen as a progressive and innovative step away from the more technically oriented approaches of the past to second language learning and the positivistic, decontextualized approach to language which dominates the discipline of linguistics. Based on certain (progressive) pedagogical methods, approaches, and assumptions, Survival ESL proclaims itself to be learner-centered, empowering, and relevant to the lives of immigrants. The term Survival ESL describes the type of language program or curricula which is taught to non-English speaking newcomers to Canada. There are a range of programs (i.e. government, community or grassroots level, private institutions, etc.,) where the survival label would describe the general "approach" to language learning. In sum, Survival ESL is for learners who have little or no knowledge of the English language, or who may also have literacy problems in their native languages (i.e. ESL literacy). The principle aim of these programs is to teach immigrant learners the language and cultural skills needed to function in the everyday situations within which people find themselves.

Moreover, Survival ESL operates within larger relations of power. While the move towards "Survival ESL" reflects a recognition that language is linked to the larger social, political, and economic context, the "real world" of language is ultimately one in which relations of power do not exist. It is within this context that Survival ESL —despite its commitment to progressive pedagogical objectives and methods, and its concomitant discourse of empowerment, operates to integrate newcomers into an existing set of relations. This larger sphere is organized within the logic of capitalist, racist, and sexist ideologies —all of which organize and negotiate that elusive entity, the Nation.

---

1 Of course the orientation of these would differ. I will subsequently discuss this issue.
These same ideologies, however, operate at a deeper structural level to naturalize certain unequal relations and organizes how we live in and perceive the everyday world (Ng, 1993; Smith, 1987) In examining the Survival ESL curriculum within this context, both its discourse of empowerment and learner-centredness as well as some of its fundamental pedagogical assumptions are called into question.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine what has come to be known as "Survival ESL" within the larger sociopolitical context of the "Nation", and to critically analyze the ideological and pedagogical implications of this context specifically from the standpoint of immigrant women. The following will argue that the notion of "integration" functions ideologically in both the discourses of nationalism and Survival ESL within the national context, and subsequently, operates in exclusionary/inclusionary ways to organize a certain set of unequal social relations. Subsequently, this study will critically examine the central theoretical tenets of Survival ESL as they are reflected in the published materials. Finally, this study will synthesize and discuss the existing critical pedagogies and discuss both their relevance to Survival ESL and their contribution to designing a critical and transformative approach.

While proposing a definitive method or pedagogy for Survival ESL would belie the central arguments and fundamental aim of a critical pedagogy, this paper will ask the question which is central to any critical approach, 'to what extent is Survival ESL answerable to larger moral and political questions, and thus, to what extent does it offer a
Specific questions this study will address are:

1. What is the larger social, political, and economic context within which Survival ESL operates, and consequently, how do the ideologies of sexism, racism, and class operate within this context to create and negotiate the larger sphere of social relations which constitute the nation?

2. What are the underlying ideological, theoretical, and pedagogical assumptions of Survival ESL as they are reflected in published curricular materials?

3. How does the ideology of integration operate in both the discourses of nationalism and in Survival ESL, and consequently, to what extent does this ideology operate in both exclusionary and inclusionary ways to organize, perpetuate, and negotiate social relations?

4. How are issues of language, power, and social relations necessarily fused together within the nation-state?

5. What are the possible alternatives to the existing Survival ESL curriculum as it is reflected in published materials?

---

2 These refer to Alastair Cummings' remarks concerning a transformative pedagogy. See Cumming, 1994, p. 692.
Organization

The following consists of seven chapters. In the next chapter I will give an outline of the research problem as well as define the key concepts used in this study. Thus, I will discuss the use of the analytic categories "immigrant" and "immigrant woman", I will define my use of the term ideology, my critical, feminist framework, as well as discuss the theory and pedagogical assumptions underlying what has become known as Survival ESL. The third chapter will explore the discourse of nationalism: the construction of the "Nation" and the categories of citizen/self and the immigrant/other, as well as their relation to the political economy of the State. Furthermore, this chapter will examine how the ideologies of sexism, racism, and class marginalize and exclude immigrant women from equal participation within the "Nation". Chapter four will discuss the relation between culture and curriculum, as well as examine the nature of language and its relationship to the nation-state. The fifth chapter will offer a critical analysis of the Survival ESL curriculum as it is reflected in the published materials. In chapter six, I will briefly discuss alternatives to Survival ESL and argue for a critical approach.
CHAPTER 2

Ideology

The concept of ideology is central to this thesis. Roxana Ng (1995) has argued that 'ideology is often inaccurately used to reference a set of political beliefs or values, or to identify a specific bias in approach or statements pertaining to special interests' (Ng, p. 36). In addition, what is inferred in this use of ideology is an objective position from which a political bias can be measured. In the first instance, there are no "objective" positions from which one can speak. All positions are interested. Moreover, ideology is explicitly connected to relations of power and refers to the operation of (often) unconscious assumptions about the world in which we live (Tollefson, 1991).

Marx and Engels (1972) have argued that ideology refers to the ideas of the ruling class (those in power) which are propagated through the institutions of the State in order to justify and "naturalize" the inequality inherent in capitalist relations. Following their lead, Ng has identified ideologies 'as those processes that are produced and constructed through human activities and are ways in which capitalist societies are ruled and governed' (Ng, 1995, p. 36). In other words, ideologies are products of certain social relations. These relations subsequently render ideologies invisible and are perpetuated and normalized through the State's institutions. The production and acceptance of this "common sense" is contingent upon coercive relations of power which characterize our society through the manufacture of consent (Chomsky and Herman, 1988). Italian social theorist, Antonio Gramsci has referred to this consent as hegemony (see Carnoy, 1985, chap. 3). For Gramsci, hegemony explains how the dominant group gains consent over the dominated through the control of the dissemination of ideas (see Carnoy, 1985). (The
concept of hegemony will be discussed in chapter 2.)

Attention to ideology is imperative because it is this "common sense" which gives meaning to the social relations in which we are entangled. Subsequently these social relations are informed by the ideologies of racism, (hetero)sexism, and class. Far too often studies engage in the "race, class, gender" analyses without much attention to how these operate in actual lived experience. Part of the problem is that "race, class, gender" are treated as static categories, rather than sets of relations (Ng, 1993). However, race, class, and gender are dynamic sets of relations which organize how we live in and perceive the everyday world. These relations in turn, are informed and sustained by ideology which is perceived as "common sense". In other words, the ideologies of racism, (hetero-)sexism, and class become the common sense logic within which we ascribe meaning to our worlds. Thus, this ideological "common sense" functions at a deeper structural level and constitutes our frame of reference in that everyday world. Consequently, ideologies work to obscure the inequality of that world by naturalizing a certain set of social relations which are always organized within a specific social, economic, and political context.

To examine Survival ESL within this context is not only relevant but imperative for several reasons. Firstly, immigrants as a group are situated on the periphery of the nation-state. Non-English (or French) speaking immigrants occupy the lowest socioeconomic status (Pendakur, 1992). The ideology of individualism —that which propagates the myth that all are equal and that hard work alone determines success—operates as a common sense assumption within our society obscuring the gross inequities which characterize the Canadian nation-state in general. Moreover, the Survival ESL
curriculum itself is based on "common sense" assumptions about both "immigrant need" and "survival" in Canada. Thus, it is within this context that ideology as it informs our common sense, must be investigated with respect to both how it informs immigrants' relation to the Nation and the Survival ESL curriculum.

Feminism and Feminist Analysis

Within the women's movement both nationally and internationally, recent debates concerning the utility of the term feminism have ensued. To attempt to summarize these here would belie their complexity. However, it is important to highlight the fact that the use of the term has historically been problematic in that it has been conflated with the experience of white, predominately middle class, heterosexual, Western women, and subsequently, was (and in many cases continues to be) imbued with the ideologies of racism, class, heterosexism, and ethnocentricity. Thus, in some ways, feminism has served as yet another oppressive ideology, specifically in its complicity in constructing both women from the "Third World" and "immigrant women" as passive, victimized Others, in need of some western-styled emancipation.

Feminism within the context of this thesis is understood as the "liberation of women from all forms of oppression: ideological, psychological, social, and physical" (Nathani, 1996, p. 63). Women are both the subjects and objects of oppression, thus, the diversity and complexity of women's experience of discrimination is based on the various relations in which they enter into in their daily lives. Given this however, women as a collective group are subjects of domination in some form because they are women. On a global level, women labor more than men, yet women collectively hold less power and
wealth (Waring, 1997). Moreover, women are threatened daily by physical violence at the hands of men and male-defined, male-controlled institutions. Thus, it is due to the universal nature of women's oppression that this thesis in a critical feminist analysis.

**Dorothy Smith and the Idea of Standpoint**

Dorothy Smith (1987) has argued that "ruling" in capitalist societies involves a complex of organized practices such as government, law business, and educational institutions, in addition to the everyday "texts" (forms of knowledge) and documents that interpenetrate and mediate these practices (Smith, p. 3). [i.e. texts includes everything from legal statutes, to parking tickets]. In short, Smith argues that in capitalist societies we are ruled by forms of organization which shape and give meaning to our *particular* experiences (i.e. as individual people) in *abstracted* and *generalized* forms. Subsequently, these forms become the standard or the universal and people within capitalist societies are *organized in relation* to this universal.

Moreover, Smith (1987) argues, that the universal *is* the male standpoint. The universality of this standpoint has been achieved through the systematic historical exclusion of women from both the "public" sphere and positions of power. Therefore to take up the standpoint of women is to take up a standpoint outside the "common sense" frame of reference (Smith, 1987). This however, does not imply a common viewpoint among women but rather what we have in common is the organization of social relations which has accomplished our exclusion' (Smith, p. 78).

Within the context of the nation-state, immigrant women suffer from the most exploitative and unequal social relations (see Ng, 1993; Boyd, 1992; Rockhill, 1987).
Thus, as Smith argues, it is imperative to begin an analysis of these relations by granting epistemic privilege to this experience of oppression. Beyond this, in Canada, the universal can be defined as heterosexual, white, Anglo, European, and middle class. The perpetuation and normalization of this world view is a matter of ideology or common sense. To take up a standpoint outside of this universal is difficult: the hegemony of this perceived "universal" is insidious. However, due to the dynamic nature of social relations hegemony is never totalizing. Hence, locating the analysis within the context of immigrant women's lived experiences is to undertake a standpoint outside of this universal and subsequently, to embark on the development of a counter-hegemony: a position which seriously challenges the legitimacy of the universal norm. In arguing that immigrant ESL learners are a vital community resource, Brian Morgan (1997) argues,

[T]he vantage point of newcomers can be informative and scrutinizing in ways that elude the common-sense beliefs of more established citizens...It is precisely through our engagement with alternative ways of knowing and signifying the world that we become aware of the partiality of our own knowledge. (Morgan, 1997, p. 17)

It is in this vein that the following analysis commences from the standpoint of immigrant women in order to demonstrate how the ideology of integration operates within the nation-state and the Survival ESL curriculum in exclusionary ways, and organizes the relations of our everyday world while simultaneously "naturalizing" the inequities which characterize those relations.

'Immigrant' and 'Immigrant Women' As Analytic Categories

As previously argued, race, gender, and class must be understood not as homogeneous categories for analysis but as dynamic relations integral to the construction of
contemporary social life. (Ng, 1993, p. 50). Thus, the use of the term "immigrant" and "immigrant women" within the context of this paper needs to be understood in terms of the relations which produce these categories with respect to a certain time and place. As products of specific concrete social relations, these categories serve to organize our productive and reproductive activities (Ng, 1993) at both the global and local levels. Consequently, these categories are discoverable in the everyday world of experience (Smith, 1987).

While the terms "immigrant" and "immigrant" women refer to a certain legal status, their "everyday use" appeals to the common sense understanding that immigrants are people from "undeveloped" and more "primitive" societies. Moreover, the common sense use of this term often evokes images of "those people" pouring into "our" "First World" countries and subsequently draining our resources (see Habermas, 1995). Ng (1993) has argued that the everyday use of the term "immigrant women" refers to women of color including women from southern Europe and the Third World, who don't speak English (or who speak with a non-white accent), and who occupy low status jobs (Ng, 1992, p. 20). In addition, this category as it operates within popular discourses is based on the racist common sense assumption that immigrant women are the passive victims of an inherently oppressive and immutable culture. Consequently immigrant women's problems are often attributed to their immutable oppression rather than as a consequence of the complexity of social relations within which they are located in their new society (see Ng, 1992). The following thesis however, will retain both the categories "immigrant" and "immigrant women" as it is this
"common sense" or everyday use which the following seeks to investigate.\(^3\)

**ESL For Adult Newcomers to Canada**

The Canadian government explicitly emphasizes the role of language with respect to the successful participation of immigrants in Canadian society. For example, Canada's multiculturalism policy states that:

> it is vital...that every Canadian, whatever his ethnic origin, be given a chance to learn at least one of the two languages in which *his* country conducts *its* official business and *its* politics... [hence] the government will continue to assist *immigrants* to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in *order to become full participants in Canadian society* (from Ng, 1995, p. 41) [emphasis added]

There are a number of language training options for newcomers to Canada. These range from formal, federally and provincially funded programs, to those offered at community colleges or private institutions, to less formal community-based, grassroots programs. The scope and mandate of these programs are variable and not all would be described as Survival ESL [although the central instructional tenets would be the same, i.e. communicative language teaching, situational-functional syllabi, etc.].

In 1992, the federal government announced a new Federal Language Training Policy comprised of two distinct programs: Language Instruction for Newcomers (LINC) and Labor Market Language Training (LMLT). LMLT targets higher English proficiency newcomers destined directly for the labor market. This program seeks to integrate language training specifically for labor market participation (Baril, 1993). This program also provides training

---

\(^3\) It is also important to point out that the category also signifies not only immigrant women's common oppression but also the history of resistance to this oppression. Thus, in this sense, immigrant women form an "imagined community" in the political sense signaling their engagements in oppositions struggles. See for example Mohanty's discussion on the use of the term "Third World" women (Mohanty, 1991).
allowances. However only "independent class" immigrants are eligible. Consequently, because most women enter automatically as family class immigrants ("dependents"), they are deemed ineligible for this program regardless of whether they are headed for the labor market or not (Boyd, 1992).

LINC on the other hand, is the language training program accessed by a greater number of non-English speaking immigrants and consequently, the LINC program is significant for several reasons. Firstly, as the new national language training program, LINC will become available to school boards, private trainers, community based training programs as well as community colleges through a bidding process for contracts (Baril, 1993, p. 9). Thus LINC will cut across a wide range of institutions. More significantly, however, the overall mandate of LINC as described by the Federal Immigrant Integration Strategy of 1993 is in line with the overall scope of "Survival ESL" curricula, namely the aim to provide "the basic communication skills which can help persons function in our society" (quoted in Baril, 1993, p. 10). Thus LINC, like Survival ESL is viewed as involving 'more than just helping a newcomer find a job and a place to live, but to aid newcomers in adapting to, and understanding the values and customs of their adopted society, the way in which these new social institutions work, as well as their rights and obligations' (Federal Immigrant Integration Strategy, quoted in Baril, 1993, p. 47).

Although the goals of LINC, as a government mandated language training program

---

4 Within the context of immigration policy and practice, the universal male operates to automatically construct the husband as the "breadwinner" and subsequently, all those related to his are his "dependents". These legal categories have serious implications with respect to the amount of "freedom" one is entitled to.

5 LINC's pedagogical approach would be categorized as Survival ESL.
are more likely to be explicitly linked to integration and assimilation than community or grass roots level programs, the "survival" approach undertaken is exemplary in that both LINC and Survival ESL aim to provide introductory language training and cultural orientation. Moreover, the published materials which were surveyed for this study were compiled in a bibliographic form for LINC instructors.\(^6\) They were chosen for their expressed Canadian content.

**Access to Programs: the Nature of Survival ESL**

There are a variety of barriers which inhibit or exclude newcomers from language training programs: funding, lack of coordination among settlement services, immigration status, limited training time, absence of training allowances, lack of day care, and transportation are just a few.\(^7\) For immigrant women in particular, access to language training programs is even more difficult due to the unique nature of both external and internal barriers. Immigrant women unlike immigrant men experience these barriers differently. For example, many immigrant women work the "double-shift" or in some cases a triple shift. As well the systemic sexism of the programs themselves precludes women's participation or eligibility for example, in NLTP due to their family class status (see Doherty, 1992). Also immigrant women face internal barriers such as their interpersonal experience of the male/female dynamic where immigrant women's lack of English often makes them

---


more vulnerable to forms of male control (see for example, Rockhill & Tomic, 1995) Thus, it is important to point out that the majority of those who do not have access to any language training are women. Subsequently, not speaking one of the two official languages in Canada is a major factor in the relatively low socioeconomic status of immigrant women (cf. Pendakur, 1992; Boyd, 1992; Women in Canada: A statistical report 3rd. edition, 1995).

It is also important to note that the nature of the Survival ESL classroom itself often erects further barriers. Most "survival" classes are linguistically and culturally diverse with respect to the learners, however, these classes are generally taught by teachers who speak only English [teachers white, "Canadians" who speak Canadian English i.e. with a "white" accent]. Moreover, these classes are often characterized by continuous intake which means that new students may be attending class everyday. The problems and obstacles for students resulting from this complexity are exacerbated by lack of funds and resources and continual government cutbacks in settlement services in general. It is not my intention to discuss the complexity of these problems here, however, it is important to raise these issues in order to appreciate the tentative nature of Survival ESL.

**Survival ESL and the Discourse of Empowerment**

Because Survival ESL is designed for the express goal of teaching English and cultural orientation to immigrant newcomers for settlement purposes, it is within this context that Survival ESL in effect, prepares immigrants for integration into the Nation. Survival ESL engages in progressive pedagogical objectives and instructional techniques (subsequently outlined) in order to achieve its overall goal: to provide immigrant newcomers the linguistic and cultural skills that will enable them to function within the larger society.
Thus, the endorsement of progressive pedagogies comes not only from the belief that language learning is more effective when relevant to the lives of the learners, but because progressive pedagogical orientations place both the learner and his/her individual needs at the center of curriculum development. Consequently, it is within this context that Survival ESL lays claim to a discourse of empowerment: however, as will be argued in this thesis, this integrationist framework of empowerment is problematic.

Central Tenets of Survival ESL

There is no unitary or monolithic beast which constitutes a theory and practice of Survival ESL. Instead the term better describes the general conceptual orientation or approach undertaken by programs which teach ESL to non-English speaking immigrant newcomers (such as the LINC program outlined above). In sum, the principle goal of these programs is to provide both introductory language training (with the primary emphasis being on spoken language) and cultural orientation to newcomers for settlement and integration purposes. Moreover, the Survival ESL approach is based on certain basic principles taken from various fields within both adult education and applied linguistics (Auerbach, 1986). The instructional assumptions underlying Survival ESL are best characterized as "progressive". Thus, Survival ESL tends to be learner centered in that it explicitly emphasizes the pedagogical importance of the learner’s experience and knowledge and thus aims to locate the project of language learning with the learners themselves. Moreover, Survival ESL is based on the premise that meaningful communication and language learning takes place when language is contextualized and relevant to the needs of the learner.8

---

8 See Cummins (1996) for a discussion on progressive pedagogies. This will subsequently be discussed in detail in chapter five
Consequently, Survival ESL is based on a broader view of language which sees language as primarily social thus, deviating from the more insular view propagated by the discipline of linguistics which views language as a neutral tool for communication (i.e. O'Grady & Dobrovolsky, 1987). This progressive understanding of language as a social phenomenon is one which has been endorsed by the larger field of TESL and is reflected in both its research and practice. Consequently, the Survival ESL curriculum subscribes to a more holistic view of language learning and teaching which focuses primarily on spoken language as it is used in the "real world". The following introduction to the survival text, Functioning In English sums up the basic tenets underlying Survival ESL:

The book is built on the premise that spoken communication, which is our goal, is part of something broader - social interaction. As such, language must be seen as being governed not only by linguistic rules (grammar, phonology, etc.,) but also by sociolinguistic rules (setting, topic, relationship between speakers, etc.,), which determine the effectiveness, appropriateness and perceived meaning of any chunk of language. (Functioning in English: Communicatively-Based Units for the Teaching of Speaking, Mendelsohn, Laufer, & Seskus, 1984, p. iii)

Because the principle objective of Survival ESL is to meet the needs of the immigrant learner, the Survival ESL classroom aims to bring both the students and the classroom closer to the language needs of the real world and thus, curricula, teaching methods and techniques, test materials, and assessment are designed for this purpose' (Center for Applied Linguistics in Auerbach & Burgess, 1985, p. 477). Moreover, within the survival discourse the learner is seen as a source of knowledge and the expressed intention of Survival ESL is to draw and build upon that knowledge:

When students feel invested personally in a classroom that validates their lives, interests and real world, they learn faster and retain more because what they are learning is meaningful and pertinent to them...Student-centered conversation, by focusing on students' knowledge and experience, permits the teacher as facilitator, to tap into this resource, affirming the
value of each individual in the class. Our goal is for students to develop a way to direct their own learning and feel comfortable with what they DO know so that from their conversation course, they can develop competencies and continue to learn and improve. (from the introduction to *A Canadian Conversation Book*, Carver, Fotinos, & Cooper, 1993, p. i).

Subsequently, it is within the overall "learner-centeredness" of Survival ESL that it is surrounded by a discourse of empowerment (Nunan, 1988; Ramírez, 1996; Savignon, 1991)

The Organization of the Syllabus

The organizing principle of Survival ESL is that 'adults begin by learning from the situations within which they find themselves and therefore, language learning should be experience-centered and reality based' (Auerbach and Burgess, 1985, p. 477). Thus, the fundamental premise of Survival ESL is that both language content and use, should reflect the reality of immigrants' lives (Auerbach, 1986). Subsequently, the syllabus of Survival ESL is organized around everyday activities. A typical syllabus would be divided into units such as personal information, health, banking, shopping, employment, etc. This type of syllabus has been called "competency-based", "situational/functional" and "notional-functional". The differences among these are difficult to distinguish as they overlap in both their overall approach, organization, and objectives and tend to be largely contingent upon the author's understanding of the term (cf. Auerbach, 1986; Wallerstein, 1983; Nunan; 1988; Ramírez, 1996; TESL Talk, vol. 14, nos.1/2, 1983). In some sense, all of these labels more or less capture the structure and approach reflected in survival syllabi. Consequently, I will draw upon all of these in describing the nature of Survival
ESL, however, I will use the term situational-functional throughout this thesis.\(^9\)

The situational/functional curriculum or syllabus as it is used in Survival ESL attempts to deal with the adult situations of daily life (as witnessed by the thematic content listed above) and is subsequently, often characterized as providing "life skills" language. Moreover, this approach attempts to organize language learning activities so that language is used within its social context. These contexts focus specifically on the language that students need in typical daily interactions. For example, the use of dialogues has become almost a hallmark of the situational-functional curriculum. The dialogue is generally presented as a conversation between two speakers within a given situation, for example, between a patient and a doctor, or a bank teller and a client. The dialogue often focuses on particular language functions such as 'asking for information'. In addition, the dialogue allows for students to learn vocabulary pertaining to that situation as well as relevant cultural and sociolinguistic information (Bechtold, 1983, p. 150). Thus, the dialogue allows learners to develop certain competencies in a given situation. Consequently, the motivation behind the situational/functional model is to enable learners to function in their everyday lives within the larger society.

**Communicative Competence**

The achievement of a "communicative competence" stands in contrast to more traditional pedagogical orientations which focus on the students' ability to produce grammatically correct forms (cf. Elson, 1983: Ramírez, 1995). This concept was born out of a distinction made by Dell Hymes (cited in Wardaugh, 1986, p. 238) between

\(^9\) I will draw largely upon those distinctions made by Nina Wallerstein (1983, p. 26) who describes four different approaches to ESL
linguistic and communicative competence. The following sums up this distinction:

Whereas linguistic competence covers the speaker's ability to produce grammatically correct sentences, communicative competence describes his ability to select, from the totality of grammatically correct expressions available to him, forms which appropriately reflect the social norms governing behavior in specific encounters (Gumperz in Wardhaugh, 1986, p. 241).

Thus, the notion of communicative competence emphasizes not only correct language use but learning the rules which govern this use. In other words, communicative competence focuses on "the social and functional rules of language use along with the skills needed to negotiate meanings within specific sociocultural situations" (Ramirez, 1995, p. 37). The notion of "communicative competence includes not only grammatical appropriateness, but appropriate body language, facial expression, tone of voice, and register" (Elson, 1983, p. 24). Thus, the concept of communicative competence also incorporates a broader understanding of language and fits into survival ESL's overall goal to aid in both language learning, cultural orientation and settlement into the new society. Therefore, the concern with teaching students to use appropriate language in appropriate social situations is central to the Survival ESL curriculum.

**Communicative Language Teaching**

The achievement of communicative competence relies upon having students perform communicative tasks around real life situations (i.e. making an appointment with the doctor, describing symptoms, answering questions in a job interview, etc.). The methodology or teaching approach which is used in this endeavor has come to be known as communicative language teaching (CLT). CLT has been described as "more a cluster of approaches than a single methodology" (Nunan, 1988, p. 24) in that it does not endorse
a singular way of teaching (i.e. more characteristic of traditional pedagogies) recognition of the complexity of learners' experiences. Subsequently, CLT has been praised for its flexibility; 'CLT is conducive to a diverse set of sociopolitical contexts, a diverse set of learning goals, and a diverse set of teaching strategies' (Savignon, 1991, p. 265).

However, the basic principle underlying all communicative approaches is its concentration on language as it used for communicative purposes. Thus, CLT concentrates on having learners engage in different communicative activities such as using dialogues as discussed previously:

The purpose of communicative activities is to practice language in real-life, meaningful situations. The activities should reflect the actual exchange of information the students will be involved in on a daily basis. These student-centered activities also provide students with an opportunity to personalize information by using their own knowledge and life experiences. In other words, the emphasis is on the fluency in the language and the exchange of relevant information. (from Canadian Concepts I: Teacher's Manual and Resource Package (2nd ed.), 1997, p. 3)

Moreover, CLT supports a holistic approach to language learning and consequently integrates different language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) into language learning activities. Thus, CLT explicitly recognizes that language in the "real world" is not decomposed into individual pieces, but rather that we use many language skills simultaneously when we use language. Within the context of Survival ESL, this means having students' perform integrative, communicative tasks around "everyday" situations (making doctor's appointments, asking for directions, giving personal information, going to the supermarket, etc.). CLT aims to make both the language and materials as "authentic" as possible as well as making sure these have a relevant place in students' lives (Elston, 1983; Savignon, 1991). Hence, 'the goal of the communicative
approach is always to bring students to a level of communicative ability that gives them the competency to function in the real world.' (Elston, 1983, p. 24) [emphasis mine].

Summary

The pedagogical assumptions of Survival ESL can be generally characterized as progressive in that they endorse a holistic approach to language learning. The instructional techniques and objectives outlined above not only explicitly recognize the social nature of language but the centrality of the learner within the curriculum. The learner's life experiences are viewed as central to effective learning — and the curriculum is defined in terms of the learner's needs. These "needs" in turn are subsequently defined with respect to the linguistic and cultural knowledge required to participate within the larger society — i.e. the nation. Thus, it is within this context that the discourses of learner-centredness and empowerment lie at the heart of the Survival ESL curriculum.

However, the larger sphere of social relations within which Survival ESL is situated is characterized by inequality: inequality which is both maintained and naturalized through the ideologies of racism, sexism, and class. Consequently, these ideologies operate as unconscious assumptions or "common sense" which provide a frame of reference for how we perceive and live in the everyday world. Therefore, in order to understand how Survival ESL operates within an assimilationist or integrationist framework and more importantly, to understand why this is problematic, it is necessary to examine how the ideologies of racism, sexism, and class were, and continue to be, integral to the discourse of nationalism. Thus, in the next section, I will investigate how these ideologies were fundamental to the establishment and maintenance of the capitalist
nation-state as well as how they continue to operate hegemonically within the everyday world to organize, perpetuate, and naturalize a certain set of unequal relations.
The Nation-State

The historical rise of the nation-state as a specific form of government was rooted in the changing relations precipitated by the capitalist mode of production. The nation-state became a political and economic unit within which capitalist relations could be negotiated and organized (Carnoy, chapter 2 & 3, 1984). Moreover, the very idea of the "Nation" (and the related idea of "race") was also intimately related to the political economy of a specific historical moment. A moment which has also been located with the emergence of the capitalist mode of production (Hobsbawm, 1995; Habermas, 1995; Miles, 1993). Subsequently, the "Nation" was a historical construct born out of the transition from the feudal mode of production to a capitalist one. Moreover, this idea of the "Nation" was (and continues to be) predicated upon a perceived homogeneity of an "imagined community" (Miles, 1993; Hobsbawm, 1995; Habermas, 1995). The basis of this community is the "imagined commonality" of the people: a perceived fundamental essence which constitutes both the "Nation" and its inhabitants as a whole unit (Miles, 1993; Walzer, 1995).

Both the nation-state and the capitalist system were founded upon certain principles; equality, individual freedom, and democracy. These principles were fundamental to the capitalist nation-state and were seen as universal in the sense that these were the entitlement of all men within the imagined community of the Nation. This

---

10 See Benedict Anderson's (1991) discussion of the concept of the "imagined community" of the nation. He is the one most often attributed to developing this concept.

11 Julia Kristeva (1993) has made a distinction between what she calls the "organic" nation and the contractual nation. She argues that both are characterized by a perceived homogeneity; however, this homogeneity is premised upon different criteria.
signaled a radical break with the principle of "divine right" which sanctioned the authority of the feudal system and State. Subsequently, the preservation of this imagined community — the "Nation" — and its ideals lay at the root of the State's power. In reality however, these foundational principles were a priori belied by the fact that capitalist system necessarily requires the exploitation of labor power (Wallerstein, in Miles, 1993, p. 8). Capitalism by its very nature is a predatory system premised on the accumulation of wealth and a division of labor which relies on the structural separation and subordination of human beings: men from women, "us" from "them", etc., (Mies, 1986, p. 74). Thus inequality is a structural requisite of the capitalist nation-state which also necessitates the subordination of certain social groups internal to the Nation. It is within the context of this requirement that the ideologies of sexism and racism have historically served to reconcile the contradiction inherent in the existence of the capitalist nation-state: namely the proclamation of the universality of certain fundamental principles with the requirement of the internal subordination of people.12

The Ideology of Racism

The nation-state as an "imagined community" distinguishes itself from those outside of that community and, in this sense, the idea of a nation-state by its very nature is exclusionary. However, because the capitalist nation-state requires the internal subordination of certain groups, the capitalist nation-state requires the creation of an internal outsider. It is within this context that the racialization of certain groups has

---

12 It is important to recognize the complexities of nationalism and the fact that Western nationalism is somewhat different from other nationalisms, such as those based on the liberation of a shared history of oppression (see for example, Yuval-Davis 1989; Mojab, 1997). However, as Yuval-Davis has argued, nationalism in the West has been central to the development of the capitalist nation-state.
historically served to create the requisite "outsider within". Miles argues that prior to the development of capitalism, discourses similar to the ideology of racism were used as justification to overtly exclude or expel certain groups: however within the context of the capitalist nation-state, the ideology of racism becomes necessary in order to reconcile the inherent contradiction between the fundamental principles of equality, and individual freedom and the exclusion of certain groups inside the Nation.

Miles (1993) has argued that the ideologies of racism and nationalism are interdependent: both are predicated upon the "dialectic of inclusion and exclusion that is integral to the formation of imagined communities" (Miles, 1993, p. 78: see also Walzer, 1995). Throughout the history of the nation-state, the "socially constructed category 'immigrant' has inserted into the nation-state a population that potentially may be defined as an unacceptable Other" (Miles, 1993, p. 11). Thus, the ideology of racism has been instrumental in demarcating the boundaries of the "Nation" both externally and internally, distinguishing those who do belong — the citizens, "Canadians", the national Self — from those who don't — the immigrants, aliens, foreigners.

Historically, the common sense perception has been that "immigrants" are outside of the Nation as they do not share the (imagined) commonality of the Nation's people. They are perceived as having migrated from outside of the nation and therefore, are not part of the community. However, the historical migration of people was intrinsic to the very establishment of the capitalist system;

---


14 The peasant class were historically considered of a different "breed" of people just as the white working class are racialized, hence the term "white trash".
The long transition from feudalism to capitalism... a transition that was inseparable from the creation of the nation-state as a political reality, was effected by means of a revolutionary and ongoing transformation of social relations, including an uprooting and moving of people from one spatial location to another... the migration of people (Miles, 1993, p. 10)

Moreover, the logic upon which the capitalist system is predicated, namely, the accumulation of wealth continues to require the migration of people as a constituent of the capitalist mode of production. For example, Canada explicitly links the structural demands of the nation's political economy to its immigration policy. The immigration program in Canada is "designed with the expressed purpose of directing demographic growth on the one hand and meeting labor market demands on the other" (Ng, 1981, p. 83: see also Boyd, 1986). The arrival of immigrants increases the labor pool of workers and consequently drives wages down. More specifically, immigrant women become particularly important to the capitalist nation-state as they provide a cheap, reserve pool of labor while increasing the demand for consumer goods (Ng, 1981; Ng & Das Gupta, 1981).

The continual migration required by capitalist expansion not only serves to debunk the myth of the homogeneous nation, but also exposes the contingency of the category "immigrant". For example, throughout the history of the nation-state only certain groups of migrants have been constructed as "immigrants". The "establishment" of Canada as a nation-state offers a blatant example. The fact that Canada was "founded" by migrants who sought to accumulate wealth through the expansion of capitalist relations is one which has been erased from the common sense view of Canadian history (see Bourgeault, 1992). These European migrants were not viewed as "immigrants" but instead were constructed as the "founding fathers" of the Canadian nation. Subsequently,
racist ideologies were evoked to justify the violent destruction and subordination of the indigenous populations. First Nations peoples were constructed as "savages" and "uncivilized" in order to exclude them from the Canadian nation.

The contingency of the category immigrant is also demonstrated by the fact that this tag was attached to different groups of people at different times: the Irish, the Italians, the Germans, and the Poles were all at one time constructed as immigrants—aliens within the Canadian nation. In every case, ideas of "race" were evoked in order to construct these groups as outside of the Nation's homogeneous community. Hence, both the ideas of "race" and "nation" have served as the "criteria" for the simultaneous exclusion/inclusion of certain groups of migrants throughout history; yet, as Miles' has extensively argued these ideas remain elusive at best. To invoke the category "race" (or the category "immigrant" for that matter) is to reify this idea thus, essentializing a set of socially constructed relations: however, as Miles has argued "race" is the product of a certain set of relations which are determined by history and therefore always contingent upon a specific historical moment. Furthermore, as Ng (1993) has argued, "race/ethnicity are ideological constructions which arise out of the struggle for dominance and control" and are directly related to productive and reproductive activities. (Ng, 1993) It is out of these political struggles that a political consciousness arises: a specific political identity. The evocation of a "race" is thus, always contingent upon the historical and material conditions of a given time and place.

Whiteness, civilization, Europeaness (Britishness in particular) continue to underwrite the perceived essence of the Canadian nation. Capitalist expansion and the continuation of the colonial project under the rubric of "development" operate to maintain
the conceptual categories of developed/undeveloped, modern/traditional, civilized, primitive, which map our world and justify certain relations of power. Thus the construction of Canada as a modern, developed, and civilized nation is a direct consequence of the current relations of power. The construction of those outside of this conceptual paradigm as "immigrants" relies on the essentialization of certain arbitrary and socially constructed differences which in turn are a direct product of a specific set of political and economic relations. Difference as it is conceived within this Canadian paradigm becomes essentialized into fixed ideas of race or ethnicity. This is, in short, the construction of Otherness. As Bannerji (1996) has argued, difference within this logic "is not a simple marker of cultural diversity, but rather, measured or constructed in terms of distance from civilizing European cultures...color of skin, facial and bodily features—all become signifiers of inferiority..." (Bannerji, p. 117). These "signifiers of inferiority" subsequently inform the category immigrant.

In his analysis of European migration history, Miles (1993) has demonstrated how the post-1945 period marks a major shift in the relations of power on a global level. Most significantly for Miles, it marks the beginning of the end of the colonial period. Hence within this context of shifting geopolitics, migrants from former colonies (i.e. the "Third World") became the object of racialization as a social group: migrants from the "Third World" consequently, become "immigrants". The history of Canadian migration doesn't mirror Britain's, yet both its status as a former British colony (founded by British subjects) as well as its position as a "First World" nation within the context of this shift of global relations have resulted in a similar "common sense" understanding of contemporary migration. At this point in history, the common sense understanding of the
category "immigrant" within the "First World" has been conflated with migrants from the "Third World". Migration is thus understood as the movement of "Third World" peoples to the "First World" (see Miles, 1993, p. 186). These immigrants in turn, are perceived as "flooding" the "First World" and subsequently draining its resources (Habermas, 1995).

However, migration is much more complex than contemporary history represents. Not only do people migrate for different reasons — both structural and personal (see Tyree & Donato, 1986; Phizacklea, 1996), but migration is not a one-way avenue. For example, within the expansion of capitalism and its continuation of the colonial project under the guise of development, the migration of "First World" professionals and "experts" has also come to characterize the current period of migration. However, to reveal the complexity of migration under the capitalist mode of production is to reveal the political and economic interests of both the capitalist system and the capitalist nation-state. Consequently, it is within this context that the ideology of integration plays an important role in obscuring the complexity of migration, the vested interests of the capitalist class, the construction and maintenance of the nation-state as an exclusive entity, and finally, the exclusion of certain socially constructed groups from that nation. Thus, it is to the integration of ideology to which I shall turn.

The Ideology of Integration

The notion of integration is endemic to the imagined community of the Nation and functions ideologically within both the discourses of nationalism and immigration. Miles (1993) has argued that the perception of the Nation as a homogeneous unit presupposes the need to integrate into an already preexisting structure: this integration is
defined as *a priori* problematic (Miles, p. 175). Hence, it is in this manner that integration operates ideologically as an exclusionary/inclusionary process:

the notion of integration therefore [serves to] exteriorize in thought, and politics, those populations [i.e. migrants] which are already, indeed always have been, a constituent element of the social formation (Miles, p. 175).

The ideological consequence of integration is a legitimation of the common sense notion that "they" are apart from "us". The unequal access to political and economic resources afforded to "immigrants" is constructed as a problem of integration: a problem which is attributed to the characteristics of the groups themselves (Miles, p. 175; see also Ng, 1992; Ng & Das Gupta, 1981). For example, the cultural and social differences between "immigrant women" and *Canadians* (re: Anglo, European culture) are overemphasized as well as conceptualized along a modern-traditional axis. Thus, the category "immigrant women" is based in part, upon the racist common sense assumption that immigrant women are passive victims of an inherently oppressive culture (see Mohanty, 1991). That oppression is perceived as immutable and thus, as a result, the problems faced by immigrant women are oversimplified and attributed to their "home" cultures and subsequent adjustment difficulties in their new country. However, as Ng (1992) has argued, many of the problems faced by immigrant women are not only complex, but are the specific products of Canadian society (Ng, 1992: see also Mies, 1986; Boyd, 1986; Doherty; 1992). Yet the ideology of integration in tandem with common sense assumptions about immigrant women, operates to obscure how the social relations of, for example, the Canadian nation-state, organize and exacerbate immigrant women's marginalization.
The failure of immigrants to access the "universal" principles upon which the capitalist nation-state is founded is viewed not as a constituent of the capitalist system, but rather as *a failure of the immigrants themselves to integrate into that system*. The ideals of the Nation are always upheld as achievable and their failure to be accessed by everyone obscured by ideology. This is how ideology works on the common sense level. Consequently, the idea of integration simultaneously bolsters the idea of an all-inclusive nation while simultaneously, excluding all of those who do not, will not, or cannot, become part of the homogeneous community (i.e. by virtue of their language, culture, or appearance).

Consequently, it is this ideological context within which Survival ESL is situated. The idea of integration within the Survival ESL curriculum however, is somewhat paradoxical. In one instance, integration is perceived as a technical barrier: immigrant learners need only to acquire certain linguistic and cultural skills in order to integrate into the nation. However, this integration is already perceived as problematic (and in some instances unattainable) within the larger ideological everyday context by the fact that it is immigrants' essential difference (language, "race", culture) which by definition excludes (or even precludes) them from integration into the "homogeneous" nation. This exclusion manifests itself in the peripheral location and unequal access to national resources that are afforded to immigrants. Finally, the unequal relations and exclusion of immigrants from the larger sphere of the nation has serious implications for a Survival ESL curriculum whose claims to empowerment rests with its objective to facilitate immigrant learners' integration into the larger society. I will discuss in more detail, the ideology of integration and its implications for Survival ESL in chapter five.
The Ideology of Sexism

The ideology of sexism has also been an integral component to the establishment and maintenance of the capitalist nation-state. The conceptual separation of the public and private spheres was essential to the reorganization of gender relations within the capitalist mode of production (cf. Reddock, 1994; Ahmed, 1992; Mies, 1986; Bourgeault, 1992). Dorothy Smith (1985) has argued that "gender is basic to the 'economic' division of labor and [subsequently to] how labor resources are controlled" (Smith, 1985, p. 2). Hence, in order to understand how ideologies operate to conceptually separate women's work from the public domain which is identified with the capitalist nation-state, it is essential to understand how gender relations became separated from economic relations within this context.

Smith (1985) has argued that while patriarchy as a system of subordination is not reducible to capitalism, the shape which patriarchy assumes is determined by the mode of production (see also Shiva, 1989; Mies, 1986). Employing a Marxist analysis, Smith argues that it is specifically with the rise of capitalism that the individual as a "free agent" arrives on the historical scene. Within the context of capitalist nation-state, the autonomous individual stands in contrast to the indentured persons of the feudal State: the individual is conceived as a free agent entering into social relations as an individual (Smith, 1985, p. 8). This is the same autonomous individual that creates the conditions for a democratic society. However, underlying the capitalist system and the concomitant Nation-State are two types of individuals: 'one owning the means of production and seeking labor power to apply to it, and the other only owning his own labor power which must be sold in order to live' (Smith, 1985, p. 8). These relations of exchange are
characterized by an unequal interdependency. Smith argues that in analyzing these unequal relations from the standpoint of women, a further barrier to equality is revealed. Smith describes this as the "behind the scenes" work of the individual. The individual worker is produced through his wife's domestic labor. Also, within the early forms of capitalism, marriage between bourgeois families brought relations among properties and so these families were somewhat akin to corporations. Women's labor was appropriated through marriage, as was her property, and her sexuality controlled (i.e. in the case of her father's control over her marriage) to ensure the consolidation and continuity of property (Smith, p. 10).

The appropriation and privatization of women's labor was imperative to the reorganization of gender relations within the emergent capitalist mode of production in Europe, as well as for its expansion in the colonies. Because capitalist relations presupposed the "individual" as a free agent, all relations of unequal interdependency became conceptually externalised with the emergence of the capitalist system (Smith, 1985). Thus, the unequal relations between women and men were perceived as outside the mode of production. This in turn, required a change in the definition of women's work. Maria Mies (1986) has used the term "housewivization" to describe the sexist domestic ideology which was, and continues to be, instrumental in reconceptualizing women's work as part of women's natural domain: i.e. as women's societal role. The "housewivization" of women meant that women's labor was conceived as outside the relations of production and subsequently, outside the Nation. This reorganization of the sexual division of labor and the requisite reconceptualization of women's work were necessary for the establishment of the capitalist nation-state both within the European
context as well as in its colonies. This domestication of women under capitalism was
justified and perpetuated through ideologies of sexism which were essential to their
exclusion from the universals which sanctioned the capitalist nation-state.

The history of emergent capitalism in Canada provides a lucid example of how the
ideologies of sexism (as well as racism and class) were instrumental to Canadian nation-
building. The establishment of capitalist relations and an imperialist colony, and the
concomitant colonization of the Aboriginal peoples in Canada, were contingent upon a
reorganization of existing gender relations (Bourgeault, 1992). The extant social,
political, and economic relations between men and women had to be renegotiated into a
form more conducive to western capitalism (Etienne and Leacock in Bourgeault, 1992,
p. 89). Thus the relatively egalitarian relations between men and women (which were
oriented towards a communal and subsistence way of life) had to be destroyed and
replaced by those in which men both as a group and as individuals assumed superior
status over women. Women in turn were forced to assume a subordinated social position
to men and subsequently became "domesticated" as their status in the community
diminished. Their labor was reconceptualized and pushed into the realm of the "private".

This domestication of women was a prerequisite for the establishment of the Canadian
nation-state.

In arguing that the ideologies of racism, sexism, and subsequently, integration
have historically operated to exclude certain groups from equal participation within the
nation, the question of how these ideologies become normalized and subsequently, come
to be viewed as everyday common sense, remains. Moreover, we need to investigate
why, within the context of an ostensibly democratic form of government, the members of
the nation accept these unequal social relations? In order to address these questions we need to investigate the nature of the State itself under capitalism and subsequently, investigate how this nation-state governs.

Hegemony and the Manufacture of Consent

The modern nation-state is seen as a neutral arena of debate where elected representatives and appointees lead the public while simultaneously reflecting the public's wishes (Carnoy, 1984, chap. 1, p. 10). However, just as the idea of the "Nation" is a product of a specific historical moment, so is the rise of the democratic Nation-state as a specific political order. Marx and Engels have argued that the historical form which the State as a political body undertakes is rooted in the mode of production at that specific moment\textsuperscript{15}. Within the liberal democratic tradition, the rise of the modern nation-state is viewed as the "collective will of men"\textsuperscript{16} yet, as Marx and Engels argue in the \textit{German Ideology}, the rise of the modern nation-state is a product of the capitalist mode of production. Consequently,

The ancient state was above all, the state of the slave owners...just as the feudal state was the organ of the nobility...the modern representative state is the instrument for exploiting wage labor by capital. (Carnoy, 1984, p. 49)

Thus, according to Marx and Engels, the modern nation-state as a political order within the capitalist moment, arises to keep class antagonisms in check. The State is not a unitary body, but rather a product of a certain set of relations which are continually

\textsuperscript{15} Thus, the distinction made between superstructure the political order and structure, the economic mode of production to which the political order, the superstructure, is subordinate.

\textsuperscript{16} See for example, Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau.
renegotiated as the mode of production changes (cf. Yuval-Davis & Anthias, 1989). The State then entertains competing interests and its legitimacy is continually challenged. However, 'because economically the bourgeoisie are the most powerful group within the Nation, the State becomes the political expression of this ruling class' (Carnoy, 1984, p. 49) Thus, the modern nation-state becomes a distinct political and economic unit within which capitalist relations could be negotiated and organized.

A fundamental question still remains unanswered: how, given the supposed contradictions that Marx and Engels describe, does the nation-state gain consent? This is the very problem with which Italian theorist Antonio Gramsci was concerned when he set out to understand the failure of the Italian Left Party and the consequent victory of fascism supported by much of the working class (Carnoy, 1985, p. 65). Gramsci developed the concept of hegemony (first introduced by Marx) to explain how this consent was won: and it is precisely this problem that needs to be addressed with respect to the democratic nation-state.

**What is hegemony and how does it function?**

The representative democracy of the capitalist nation-state assumes a radically different form than that of the previous feudal or slave States where the power of the State was centrally located. Thus, under Feudalism, direct force or coercion was used to govern. The possibility of revolution (in the Marxist sense) was much greater as the "oppressors" were easily identifiable. However, under the capitalist mode of production relations of power become externalized and are more complex than in previous eras as the individual is perceived as a free agent who enters into relations freely (Marx & Engels, 1972; Smith, 1985, 1987). Within the capitalist nation-state, the business of government
is disseminated throughout its institutions. In other words, the power of the capitalist nation-state is centrifugal (see Foucault, 1980). The power to govern lies within the State's institutions —the media, education, the judicial system, medicine, etc.,— all of which constitute various aspects of the State apparatus. For it is within these institutions that the social relations of society are given meaning: certain experiences, knowledges, ideas and symbols are legitimated and constructed as common to all of the Nation's inhabitants. Thus, it is through the Nation-State's institutional apparatus that the predominance of ruling class ideology —certain values and norms arising out of a specific set of relations — is perpetuated. The ideologies of the ruling class are "normalized" through these institutions. In other words, these institutions serve to propagate and negotiate,

an order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout society in all its institutional and private manifestations, informing with its spirit all taste, morality, customs, religious and political principles, and all social relations, particularly their intellectual and moral connotations. (Carnoy citing, Williams, 1973, p. 162)

The key for Gramsci was the fact that the ruling class have control over the domain of ideas. The concept of hegemony serves to explain how a certain set of ideas and ideals, organized into a coherent ideology, reigned supreme as the ideas/ideals representative of all the inhabitants of the Nation. Thus,

...the system's real strength does not lie in the violence of the ruling class or the coercive power of its state apparatus, but in the acceptance by the ruled of a "conception of the world" which belongs to the rulers. The philosophy of the ruling class passes through a whole tissue of complex vulgarizations to emerge as "common sense": that is, the philosophy of the masses, who accept the morality, the customs, the institutionalized behavior of the society they live in. (Fiori from Gramsci's biography, quoted in Carnoy, 1984, pp. 68-9)
Subsequently, the ideas or ideologies of racism, class, and sexism are products of a certain set of relations. Race, class, and gender are not static categories but are rather the products of a certain set of fluid relations "which change over time as people's relations to productive and reproductive activities change" (Ng, 1993, p. 51). Within the nation-state, ideas about these sets of relations come to organize a specific world view which "naturalizes" their inherent inequality. They operate *hegemonically* and consequently come to be seen as "common sense". This "common sense" is "embodied in peoples' daily practices as the normal way of doing things" (Ng, 1999, p. 57). In other words, certain *ideas* or ideologies such as racism, sexism, and class, come to be viewed as the taken-for-granted realities which determine how we exist within and perceive the world in which we live. Over time systems of ideas are developed and become systems of domination as they permeate the fabric of our society (Ng, 1993; Smith, 1987). As a result, these unconscious assumptions, or "common sense" ideas, function at a deeper structural level within the Nation-State and subsequently, obscures its inherent inequality.

It is also important to note that the ruling ideas of the dominant class are never totalizing. The concept of hegemony explains how the dominated participate in their own domination by (partially) accepting the world view of the ruling class. However, these ideas and ideologies are contested and questioned in various institutional, public, and interpersonal spaces. Gramsci has called the development of these oppositional discourses counter-hegemonic, and it is within the context of the development of a counterhegemony that Gramsci sees the possibility for truly meaningful structural change (see Carnoy, 1984, chap. 3; Wink, 1997)
The ostensible "advent" of globalization has increased the complexity of the capitalism system and the relationships of economic exploitation. In the first instance, the advent of globalization is not new but rather is a continuation of the colonial project (Mies, 1986). The capitalist system must be understood as a global system since it is premised on the accumulation of wealth and the continual increase of the rate of profit (Amin, 1986; Mies, 1986). Thus, within this current shift of global relations and the consequent increase of the international division of labor, some have argued (i.e. Habermas, 1995; Brecher, 1995) that the nation-state system is bankrupt and no longer relevant as it gives way to supra-national, economic alliances such as the European Union. While there is truth to this claim, it cannot be argued that nationalisms are no longer relevant, but rather are being renegotiated. The discourse of nationalism is just as relevant now within the capitalist nation-state as it ever was. Moreover, the Nation is perceived as having a finite quantity of economic and social resources which are believed to be the "birthright" of its citizens. Thus, the increasing economic impoverishment of the mass population and the concomitant erosion of power of the middle class within the capitalist nation-state is conceptualized in terms of "the shrinking pie". The perceived increase of demand for the Nation's resources by "outsiders" (i.e. immigrants) is blamed for this decrease rather than it being a constituent of the capitalism system. Subsequently, outsiders within the Nation — the immigrants — are scapegoated for the inherent inequality of the capitalist system. Hence, the existence of the common sense view is that immigrants are a "drain" on the system.

For Marx, "economic impoverishment through the increased exploitation of labor was a key factor in the ability of a revolutionary party to raise working-class
consciousness to the point of bringing that class to a confrontation with the power of the State" (Carnoy, 1984, p. 79). However, the hegemony of the ruling class (whose profits are increasing) operates not only to reconceptualize this impoverishment in terms of "shrinking pie" and thus, gain consent by the subordinated, but it also puts the subordinated classes in conflict with each other. The mass media (whose interests also lay with the ruling class) is an "informal" institution of the State which plays an important role in manufacturing this consent and "normalizing" a certain world view for example, in its presentation and "racialization" of immigration, unemployment and crime statistics (Chomsky & Herman, 1988).

Although Survival ESL operates within the context of non-formal education it is not immune to the hegemony of the State. In fact, as argued above, all institutions within our everyday world — formal and popular — are governed by this hegemonic common sense (although not unproblematically). The non-formal nature of Survival ESL perhaps makes it even more vulnerable to this hegemony in that many of its social assumptions are left unarticulated (as will be discussed in chapter five). Thus, this has serious implications considering that this common sense not only provides the "everyday" context of Survival ESL, but also guides how immigrants' needs are defined and negotiated within the curriculum.

The next section will subsequently examine how the categories of "immigrant" and "citizen" are differentiated with respect to their legal and everyday use. Each of these categories operate hegemonically within the nation to naturalize disparities among different socially constructed groups within the nation. This is problematic considering one of the fundamental aims of Survival ESL curriculum is to facilitate integration and
settlement with the understanding that immigrants are preparing to become citizens of the larger nation.

The Nation and Its Citizenry: the legal vs. the common sense citizen

Citizenship in the everyday world is experienced differently by the Nation's population. This experience is contingent upon one's location within the social relations which constitute the Nation. Historically, citizenship was explicitly restricted to a small group of people. Criteria such as property rights, inheritance rights, and economic independence were used to exclude certain groups such as women, the emerging working class, and "foreign" labourers from participation in the Nation. These criteria were explicitly informed by the ideologies of racism, sexism, and class in order to justify this exclusion (i.e. inferiority of the Other). With the commencement of universal suffrage (which came as late as 1960 in Canada when the Aboriginal Peoples were granted suffrage), all people were granted formal political rights. The formal extension of political rights to all of the Nation's inhabitants ostensibly signaled the achievement of equality and the defeat of these exclusionary ideologies. However, the terrain of citizenship is complex and the category "citizen" (like the category "immigrant") functions differently as it operates politically and ideologically within the context of everyday life.

The category citizen like the category immigrant, refers to a certain legal status. The ideologies of racism and sexism still operate to define who can obtain that legal status. For example, under German law almost any one who can claim German ancestry through parentage is eligible for German citizenship. However, certain groups of
migrants, such as the Turks, who have lived in Germany for as many as two or three generations are entitled only to work and pay taxes in Germany, but are ineligible for citizenship. Within the Canadian context, certain groups of migrants such as domestic and agricultural workers (who are mainly from the Philippines and Jamaica respectively) are allowed only to enter Canada as "guest workers" and are refused certain rights afforded to other immigrants (such as the right to form a union). Garcia (1996) has pointed out that only traditional countries of immigration such as Canada and the U.S. have awarded citizenship to all born within their territories. By contrast, other countries, such as those in Continental Europe, have demonstrated what Brubaker (in Garcia, 1996, p. 12) has called "territorial closure" by severely restricting access to formal citizenship.

Within the realm of the everyday world, however, even those who have obtained the legal of "citizen" status are excluded both ideologically and substantively from participation within the Nation. Hence it is useful to make the distinction between formal and non-formal citizenship (cf. Staeheli & Cope, 1994; Garcia, 1996). Formal citizenship refers to the legal rights and responsibilities of a citizen as defined by a political community such as the State and is associated with belonging to that community (i.e. Garcia, 1996). As Garcia has argued, the "practice of [instituting formal] citizenship becomes a method of inclusion which in principle gives people who differ in age, sex, beliefs or color of skin the same basic entitlement" (Garcia, 1996, p. 7). These rights are quantifiable as they are encoded in law. However, non-formal (or substantive) citizenship is more difficult to assess. Non-formal citizenship (or rights) refers to the quality of citizenship including one's ability to access equal social, economic, and political resources (Staeheli & Cope, 1994). Thus, the concept of non-formal citizenship
refers to how citizenship is *experienced*. It is clear that not all those with formal citizenship rights have equal access to the Nation's resources and subsequently, not all "citizens" are equal members of the community. As Staeheli and Cope (1994) have argued, analyzing contemporary citizenship is more complex than in previous eras because of the legal institution of equality. In previous eras, the barriers to participation within the nation where encoded in law and thus, were more "visible". Within the contemporary nation-state, however, the perceived "universality" of equality as it is propagated by the common sense notion of citizenship as the attainment of certain formal political rights, obscures the inequality inherent in the nation-state. The discourse of individualism aids in supporting this common sense belief, to the extent that it promotes the view that the only barrier to achieving equality within the Nation lies with the individual him/herself. However, as Staeheli and Cope continue, we need to look beyond political rights to the social relations of inequality, including the economic processes of privilege and power that *informally*, and *hegemonically*, exclude certain groups of citizens. In other words, the formal entrenchment of universal equality within the Nation is belied by the gross inequalities which are a constituent of the capitalist nation-state. Not only do the demands of the capitalist nation-state preclude universal equality, but the *structural exclusion* of certain groups of people, such as women or immigrants, is maintained through the ideologies of racism and sexism (Staeheli & Cope, p. 447).

Consequently, the nation's citizenry is demarcated along "ethnic" or "racial" and gender lines. These internal "boundaries" are informed by racist, sexist, and class-biased ideologies which differentiate among the Nation's population *regardless of their legal status*. These ideologies subsequently inform *common sense* notions of citizenship. For
example, "the citizen" within the context of the Canadian nation is commonly (and unconsciously) understood as male, middle/upper class, and Anglo-European. Thus, this is the "universal" or ideal against which the Nation's population is measured (see discussion in Chapter 1). People who do not 'measure up' —i.e. visible minorities, women, immigrants— are constructed as outsiders. In addition, notions of citizenship are also tied to ideas of productivity (Revolutionary Communist Group, 1976) and economic independence (Staeheli & Cope, 1994) which not only exclude groups ideologically but have real material consequences. Thus, the informal exclusion of certain socially constructed groups is a structural requisite of the Nation. These internal, informal, "boundaries" exclude certain groups from participation through the systemic institutional practices which rely upon and are sanctioned by common sense assumptions. For example, women's inadequate access to child care informally excludes them from the same (equal) participation in the Nation (economically and politically) as their male counterparts, thereby perpetuating their common sense "non-citizen" status. This is of course also mediated by class privilege where women of the upper/middle class have greater opportunity to "participate" in the Nation as they are able to contract women from the lower classes to take care of their children or perform other domestic duties.

It is also important to note that the common sense understanding of categories such as citizen, immigrant, or non-citizen, as they operate ideologically within the context of the everyday, are not absolute but rather are always contingent upon the social relations within which they are used. For example, within certain national discourses white, middle class women are perceived as closer to this ideal and thus, are conferred with the status "citizen" entitling them to certain national resources which may be denied to a non-
English speaking immigrant of color. Alternatively, a white, Eastern European immigrant-status male may be perceived as a "citizen" while a Canadian-born white, single mother on family assistance is not.

Most legal status immigrants who attend Survival ESL programs are preparing to become legal citizens. Thus until that time, legal status immigrants have only some of the rights and responsibilities (such as paying taxes) as legal citizens. However, after three years the assumption is that immigrants will attain full membership privileges. Thus, it is within this context that above is significant. The common sense category of citizenship is based on "everyday" perceptions. Thus, those who are perceived as outsiders — by virtue of their "race", culture or language — are perceived as outside of the nation regardless of their legal status. Certain social groups are thereby, constructed as "immigrants" based on certain common sense assumptions and subsequently, their low socioeconomic status is justified (and their presence often resented). It is within this context that the common sense categories of citizen and immigrant operate hegemonically within our society: and it is consequently this hegemony that has implications for Survival ESL.

**Racism and Sexism in the Everyday World**

In order to understand how the ideologies of racism, sexism and class collude to exclude certain groups both formally and informally from the Nation, one needs to examine how this exclusion is experienced and practiced in the everyday world. Because immigrant women as a social group occupy the lowest socioeconomic position within the Canadian nation (and for those who do not speak English, that status is even lower)
(Boyd, 1992; Pendakur, 1992; Doherty, 1992; Women in Canada: A Statistical Report, 1995) it is imperative to begin with this experience of exclusion. Within the context of Survival ESL curricula, it is imperative to understand how this exclusion is experienced within the material realities of immigrant's lives. Therefore, in order to understand the specific needs of immigrant women within the Survival ESL curriculum, it is essential to understand how immigrant women are positioned within the context of the nation-state and how the ideologies which bolster the capitalist nation also operate to naturalize this peripheral location.

The occupational segregation of immigrant women into "unskilled", "un/non-productive" labor is one of the major factors which maintains immigrant women's low status. However, the devaluation of this work is a product of the sexist and racist ideologies which were, and continue to be, essential to the maintenance of the capitalist nation-state. In the first instance, women's work does not create a surplus value and thus there is no profit to be gained by this type of work (Waring, 1997; Communist Revolutionary Group, 1977). This work is consequently considered "unproductive". When this same work is performed for money it is considered to contribute to the "growth" of the national economy (and by the same logic, growth in the national economy is for the Nation): it becomes "productive". In the same vein, because this work is seen as an extension of the work that women do naturally it is labeled "unskilled". Thus, the ideologies of sexism operate to devalue the work that women do within the Nation. In addition, low wages, low job-security, and poor working conditions are further justified by the ideologies of racism which construct immigrant women as a cheap, expendable labor force. The same labor force which is necessary to the capitalist nation-state in order
to provide cheap goods and drive wages down. Despite the devaluation of immigrant women's work and their occupational segregation, the marginal status of immigrant women and their relative dependence on husbands or family is not perceived as products of the Canadian capitalist nation-state but rather as a consequence of their (inherently more oppressive) cultural traditions to which they are perceived to be immutably bound (see Ng, 1992). Hence, racist and sexist ideologies feed common sense notions of immigrant women which in turn operate to justify their low socioeconomic status and their subsequent exclusion from the Nation.

Moreover, this creates a paradox with regard to integration which is especially acute for immigrant women. The common sense perceptions of immigrant women justify their marginalization within the existing order of the nation: at the same time however, the ideology of integration as it operates within Survival ESL, attempts to empower immigrant women by integrating them into this order. Integration then within this context operates as a means of subjugation — despite survival ESL's discourse of empowerment— to maintain women's marginal status. The low status of immigrant women needs to be understood within this context not only to debunk the myth of immigrant women's immutable oppression and passivity, but to create a pedagogy which addresses the problematic of integration for immigrant women within the nation-state.

Canada: Multiculturalism and the Canadian Nation-State

Given the above discussion with respect to the hegemony of the capitalist nation-state it is worthwhile to examine how these ideologies operate within the Canadian context. At first glance, the Canadian nation as an officially recognized *multicultural*
nation seems to preclude the essentially "homogenous community" of the capitalist nation-state described above which subsequently, requires the creation of Others — internal outsiders. However, this Canadian multicultural national identity needs to be situated within the historical context of Canadian nation-building.

The architecture of the Canadian "nation" built within a "multicultural mosaic" can only be understood within the history of exclusions which made the existence of a Canadian, capitalist, "multicultural", nation possible (Bannerji, 1996, see also Bourgeault, 1992; Ng, 1993). The exclusionary processes which lie at the heart of Canadian nation-building began with the migration of the French and English in search of the accumulation of wealth, and their subsequent colonization of the Native peoples. The reorganization of existing, relatively egalitarian relations was crucial to the establishment of capitalist relations and the eventual foundation of a capitalist liberal democratic state. Ideologies of racism, sexism, and class were fundamental to the justification of the colonial project and the renegotiation of the extant relations (Ng, 1993; Bourgeault, 1992). Subsequently, these ideologies were developed into systems of domination as they permeated the fabric of daily activities.

"Colonialism stands as the point of entry within which we must examine the social relations of the Canadian nation and the cultural forms which characterize them" (Bannerji, 1996). The advent of multiculturalism within the contemporary nation-state appears to be somewhat recent despite the fact that not only has multiculturalism been a reality since the emergence of the capitalist nation-state (Miles, 1993), but that Canada in particular was expressly multi-cultural prior to European contact. Given this, the relatively recent "official" recognition of multiculturalism in Canada appears to be
somewhat anachronistic. The policy of multiculturalism was procured within the context of the social upheaval of the 60's (which characterized the whole of the Western world), the growing militancy of the Aboriginal peoples, the increasingly vocal "minority" population, as well as the growing intensity of the already extant antagonism between "French" and "English" Canada (which was marked by the Quiet Revolution and culminated in the FLQ crisis of October 1970) (cf. Burnaby, 1996; Ng, 1995). Thus, "state-sponsored multiculturalism" (a term borrowed from Himani Bannerji) was designed to reconceptualize and reorganize the changing social, political, and economic realities at that time. Official multiculturalism became necessary to neutralize conflict within the Nation (Das Gupta, 1994). Thus, as Ng (1993) has argued, multiculturalism within contemporary Canada 'is an artifact created by the administrative processes of a liberal democratic state at a particular historical juncture' (Ng, p. 35). The proclamation and policy of multiculturalism has created an ideological frame of national unity which operates to contain and manage the increasing threat posed to the State's legitimacy by groups challenging their ongoing exclusion through systems of domination and institutionalized sexism, racism, and class (see Bannerji, 1996; Ng, 1993).

State-sponsored multiculturalism in Canada has been confined to institutional spaces were the possibility of any serious threat to the state's hegemony can be offset (Yudice, 1995). The presence of Others in these spaces (through the construction of categories such as "visible minority"\(^{17}\) is central to the manufacturing of the distinct pluralist unity of Canadian nation-hood. Thus, "difference" within Canadian nationalist, "multicultural" discourse is fundamental. Bannerji (1996) argues that,

\(^{17}\) See Bannerji's (1996) discussion of this term.
In the ideology of multiculturalist nationhood, however, this difference is read in a power-neutral manner rather than as organized through class, gender, and race. Thus, at the same moment that difference is ideologically evoked it is also neutralized, as though the issue of difference were the same as the diversity of cultures and identities, rather than those of racism and colonial ethnocentrism—as though... different cultures were on par or could negotiate with the two dominant ones! (Bannerji, 1996; 109)

The ideology of multiculturalism thus, operates to propagate that myth that all peoples are afforded the same opportunities for success within the Canadian nation. Yet, not only does this liberal, state-sanctioned multiculturalism obscure the structural inequality inherent to Canada as a capitalist nation-state, but it eclipses the ongoing systematic and systemic exclusion of certain social groups.

In addition, multiculturalism establishes the foundation for a notion of a Canada which is culturally and socially transcendent: a transcendence necessary for both the erasure of its colonial past as well as its claim to a universalist liberal democratic state (Bannerji, 1996, p. 108). An examination of the Multiculturalism Act of 1974 not only confirms this, but further reveals that the policy itself is extremely circumscribed in that Canadian multiculturalism is explicitly confined to bilingualism:

It was the view of the Royal Commission, shared by the government...that there cannot be one cultural policy for Canadians of British and French origin, another for the original peoples and yet a third for others. For although there are two official languages there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other. No citizen or group of citizens is other than Canadian, and all should be treated equally. (from the proclamation of the multicultural Act quoted in Ng, 1995, p. 39) [emphasis mine]

Firstly, the artificial separation between language and culture is belied by Canadian history itself. For example, the brutal suppression of Native languages (as demonstrated through the establishment of the residential schools for Aboriginal children) was a
primary tool in the Canadian government's violent attempt to "assimilate" the Aboriginal peoples. Secondly, the Multiculturalism Act sanctions the language of the colonizers as the languages of power: English and French. Thus, this policy denies the correlation between language minorities, a history of oppression, and their concomitant low socioeconomic status within the Nation which has subsequently been well documented (cf. Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins, 1988). In addition, the artificial separation of language from culture undermines Canada's claim to be a multicultural society. Also undermined is the Act's guarantee of the equality of all cultures as it explicitly ignores the history of oppression and subordination in which issues of language are fused with culture, identity, and power (Cummins, 1996; Rockhill & Tomic, 1995). In the final analysis the institution of official bilingualism becomes an essential means by which the Anglo-European constituents can retain hegemony over other "minorities".18

Furthermore, this separation of language and culture reveals how different groups within the Nation are constructed and subsequently conceptualized within this policy. The policy makes a distinction among three different groups: the Europeans (the French and English), the Aboriginal Peoples, and all Others (non-English/French speaking immigrants). What is made explicit by this Act is the fact that it is ultimately European culture which underwrites Canada's Nationhood. Thus, the Act explicitly makes reference to a Canada already in existence:

> [R]esources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada...Second, the government of Canada will assist members of all cultural groups to

18 This hegemony includes the domination of the Franco-Europeans outside of Quebec.
overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society
(quoted in Ng, 1995, p. 41) [emphasis mine]

The colonial legacy upon which the Canadian nation was built provides the social and cultural referent for our Canadian identity: thus, this colonial legacy infuses meaning into Canadian images, traditions, symbols, and values. Consequently, Whiteness, Europeaness, and Englishness (including the English language) ultimately serve as that unitary, transcendental signifier of Canadian identity and culture. In addition, the Multiculturalism Act of 1974 expressly defines the category immigrant outside of Canadian society and explicitly states the problematic of integration. By establishing the problematic of integration, the Multiculturalism Act confirms the 'reality' of a preexisting (uniform) Canada: which is immutable to change by newcomers to the country and presupposes their conformity. This integration however, is an impossible requirement due to their essential differences and "outsider" status. Thus, what is implicitly sanctioned (even propagated) by the Act is the integration into a set of already existing —unequal —social relations.

Finally, the offer to provide assistance to "overcome cultural barriers" should not be necessary in a multicultural society where ostensibly all cultures exist on equal terrain. Hence this explicit separation of language from culture creates a paradox. In the first instance, the Multiculturalism Act guarantees only the right of all Canadians to access the official languages and thus, language is erected as merely a technical barrier to be overcome in order to participate in the Canadian nation. This is clearly articulated in the Canadian government's pledge "to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society" (from Ng, 1995, p. 41, emphasis added). Yet this pledge is simultaneously belied by the fact that
the problem of integration is already established in terms of immigrants' *innate* cultural characteristics.

**Summary**

In summary, the historical development of the capitalist nation-state was contingent upon a certain set of unequal relations despite its foundational principles of democracy and universal equality. In order to justify this inequality certain social groups such as immigrants had to be excluded — both ideologically and materially — from the Nation. Subsequently, the ideologies of racism, sexism, and class were, and continue to be, fundamental in justifying this ongoing exclusion and are therefore instrumental in the negotiation and maintenance of these relations. It is through the perpetuation of these ideologies that the exclusion of immigrants — as perceived outsiders — is both maintained and naturalized. The ideology of integration becomes an important hegemonic tool in constructing both the homogeneous nation as a preexisting unit into which outsiders must assimilate at the same time that it defines this integration as problematic or unachievable.

Moreover, because this hegemony is perpetuated and naturalized through the institutions of the State, it is important to examine how these institutions operate within the context of everyday life. In the next section, I will discuss the role of education as a socializing agent of the State. Both formal and non-formal education play an important role in reproducing the nation's citizenry; a fundamental component of which is "culture" (as will be discussed). The next section will also examine the field of second language
education as it relates to Survival ESL. This field is significant in that it is this body of theory and research which determines Survival ESL's theory and legitimates its practice.
CHAPTER 4

Culture

Fundamental to the examination of the relationship between Survival ESL and the larger sphere of social relations within the capitalist nation-state is an investigation of the nature of culture. Like ideas about "race", the essential nature of culture remains somewhat elusive. This is problematic in light of the fact that "culture" also constitutes the "commonality" of the Nation's imagined community. In fact, in some respects culture is much more tangible than ideas of "race" or ethnicity, and thus culture ultimately embodies the materiality of the Nation's essence. A shared history, a common (national) language, shared customs, and traditions all serve to infuse the Nation with its substance.

However, the waters of culture are murky and difficult to navigate due to its transient, highly contested, and continually negotiated nature. Any one culture is necessarily always in a state of flux due to its essentially social nature. Moreover, culture is not necessarily bound to a specific geographic location, or tied to a particular ethnicity. One might use different criteria to define a specific culture, such as religion (Islamic culture), language (French Canadian culture), income (working class culture) or age (youth culture). One can also speak of subcultures; cultures within cultures, for example, all of the above might exist within a more broadly defined culture. (Given this all nations are multicultural.) However, culture is generally understood within a fixed geographic location (marked by guarded boundaries), with a specific polity, and is intimately linked to its political economy. It is this understanding of culture which is closely tied to the idea and the ideal of the nation-state. Within the discourse of

---

19 It is important to note that the dominant culture is never qualified with an adjective, but is referred to as the neutral, all-inclusive, "culture".
nationalism, culture (similar to "race") is perceived as a reified, static, entity. Historical symbols and traditions serve as evidence of a culture's fixed and unitary existence. This idea/l also represents what Leistyna and Woodrum (1996) have called the "common sense notion" of culture. The common sense notion of culture reflects a selective, sanitized, and homogenized view of the social reality of, for example, the Nation. It represents the norms, beliefs, and practices of the dominant group as natural and historically transcendent (Leistyna & Woodrum, 1996, p. 3). Thus, the common sense view of culture is one which sees culture as existing outside of the relations of power. However, 'to speak of culture without addressing power relations displaces and trivializes the deep contradictions inherent in both the concept and the materiality of culture' (Bannerji, 1996, p. 110). Moreover, culture is neither static nor bound to a specific temporal or geographic location. Thus, culture is best viewed as a process which exists only within the realm of social relations. Culture is intimately tied to, and produced in, peoples daily activities and livelihood (Wallerstein, 1983, p. 5). Therefore, culture is continually reproducing and renegotiating its past as well as being transformed to prepare for the future. Within this context, the struggle for power and control —the ordering and reordering of social relations— is intrinsic to culture.

Reproduction of Culture and the Role of Education

Education plays a fundamental role in culture. Historically, both formal and non-formal education have been tied to the production, reproduction, transmission, and maintenance of culture and thus, has served as a primary socializing agent within societies (Lundgren, 1988). With the rise of industrialization and the modern nation-state
compulsory mass education was explicitly used as a mechanism for promoting a social/cultural revolution — of socializing the people into a new social, political, and economic order. The examples of Lenin's Communist Russia and Mustafa Kemal (Ataturk's) Turkish Republic are instructive in that they both illustrate how: i) education was recognized as a fundamental aspect of "culture" and therefore, a system of national education was needed for explicitly socializing people into that new order; ii) and therefore, the motivation behind educational (curricular) reform was both necessarily (and in these examples, explicitly) ideological in nature and (despite their different paths of development) intrinsically tied to the political economy. These examples serve to highlight the explicit political function education has served historically, as well as cross-culturally. The formalization of education on the national level marked the beginning of the institutionalization of education into the State apparatus. and subsequently, formal education became the primary socializing agent of the nascent Nation. It was responsible for the creation of the new secular citizen. Thus, education was directly linked to ideas about civic participation: the existence of "universal" education was explicitly linked to providing students with the social/cultural knowledge needed for that participation. Hence, it was also at this time that education assumed an "equalizing" currency within the discourse of nationalism. Subsequently, the institution of education became essential in maintaining, legitimating, and negotiating capitalist social relations.

---

20 Also, within the 20th century, national liberation movements often rely on "cultural revival" and an idealization of the past as a symbol of their, essentially distinct, culture.

21 In reality mass education was (and continues to be) a form of social control. As well certain level of literacies were required within the context of the new industrial nation.
Thus, the educational curriculum—the selection, organization, and legitimation of certain knowledges, experiences, and ways of being in the world—served and continues to serve as the text which prescribes, dictates, and guides this socialization or acculturation process. Consequently, the current battles being fought over curriculum in Canada in the popular, political, and academic realms, are battles among competing groups over the production, reproduction, and transformation of culture. Hence, these battles must necessarily be understood in terms of the ideological underpinnings of education as a socializing institution.

However, this intimate relationship between curriculum and culture is often obscured. The political implications of this relationship are belied by the technical character attributed to curriculum within popular and academic discourse. In the first instance, curriculum—this includes Survival ESL curriculum—and the business of schooling within the contemporary capitalist nation-state is reduced to the outcomes of finding employment. Thus, education is explicitly linked to the larger political economy of the nation-state, and is conceptualized in terms of outfitting individual students with the skills needed to find employment (a kind of capitalist empowerment). Secondly, cultural knowledge within this paradigm is reduced to learning a set of fixed behaviors, symbols, and codes. This approach to culture precludes its essentially dynamic and social nature, in addition to obscuring the relations of power within which culture always exists.

This technical approach to curriculum is what ultimately characterizes Survival ESL. (I will argue this more extensively in chapter five.) Learning a language becomes part of the technical business of survival. This survival in turn is defined primarily in terms of economic survival (see Sage, 1993). While arguably this is a primary aspect of
survival within a capitalist state, the economic aspects often eclipses the social, cultural, and psychological aspects of survival. These economic aspects are defined in terms of the economic demands of the nation-state. This often translates into a survival curriculum which is designed to provide immigrants with the linguistic and cultural skills necessary for minimum wage jobs (see Auerbach, 1986; Tollefson, 1991).

In addition, "culture" within the Survival ESL curriculum is conceptualized in terms of the common sense notion of culture: a set of (neutral) Canadian conventions, holidays, traditions, etc.. Teaching culture in these terms is often perceived as providing immigrants with the appropriate cultural capital needed to "survive" or subsequently succeed in Canada. While newcomers do need a certain cultural knowledge to negotiate their new society, this cultural knowledge is not disinterested. Rather it is invested with the values of a certain group and operates hegemonically in our society (Wink, 1997, p. 34) Thus, the common sense view of culture and its propagation within the education system has social, political, and pedagogical implications for Survival ESL learners. (This will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.)

Language

The "common sense" view of language divorces language from the realm of politics and ideology. Within this context, language is perceived as an instrument for communication: a tool that we use to describe the world in which we live. This technical understanding of language is supported by the positivism of linguistics which analyzes language as a "system of elements [sounds, words, etc.,] and rules needed to form and interpret sentences" (O'Grady & Dobrovolsky, 1987). The individual within this
paradigm is one who produces language qua our predisposed, innate capacity for
language (Chomsky, 1975). Subsequently, the discipline of linguistics studies language
outside of the social contexts in which it is used. Questions of language as it is used for
communication are relegated to sub-disciplines such as sociolinguistics (i.e. the
conventions which dictate how/when we use language within a social context) and
applied linguistics (which focuses primarily on language learning); however, even
within these disciplines there is a conspicuous absence regarding discussions of power.
Instead what is offered is a description of language use as it is governed by different
social and cultural conventions; yet, the power relations which necessarily determine,
govern, and negotiate these conventions are largely omitted (Peirce, 1993; Fairclough,
1989). Language however, is intimately related to power on many levels as it functions
ideologically to create, construct, constrain, and resist the material relations of the world
in which we live. In other words, language plays a fundamental role in the production,
maintenance and change of social relations (Fairclough, 1989, p. 1). Robert Phillipson
(1992) has argued extensively that language operates ideologically within the institutional
realm as a means of effecting or maintaining unequal power relations. Phillipson names
the ideology linguicism:

linguicism involves representation of the dominant language, to which
desirable characteristics are attributed, for purposes of inclusion, and the
opposite for dominated languages, for purposes of exclusion. (Phillipson,
p. 55, emphasis added)

This exclusion through language takes many forms simultaneously. Issues of power
govern its use, who can speak, when, and what can be said, as well as defining what are
the "normal" patterns of speaking etc. between and among persons in varying
relationships (Fairclough, 1989). Furthermore, language functions to manufacture
consent by creating and legitimizing certain world views. (cf. Chomsky & Herman, 1988; Leistyna & Sherblom, 1997; Morgan, 1997). At the same time language is fundamental as a means of resisting these hegemonic views and offering alternative realities, meanings, and subject positions (cf. Anzaldua, 1987; Trinh, 1989). It also governs and ascribes meaning to the relationships which constitute that world (Weedon 1987) and subjectivities are produced, legitimated, and resisted through language (Peirce, 1993). In other words, language is fundamental to developing a counterhegemony. Therefore language must be understood in terms of how its use is both socially determined and determining. This is not to argue that language is deterministic but to recognize as Weedon has argued, in summarizing the post-structuralists,

the common factor in the analysis of social organization, social meanings, power and individual consciousness is language. Language is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested. (Weedon, 1987, p. 21).

The very nature of language as a social phenomena means that it is necessarily embroiled with issues of power and is therefore political. It is precisely this essentially political nature of language which has implications for both Survival ESL theory and practice.

**Language and the Nation-State**

The arrival of the nation-state as a form of governing necessitated a national language: a language of the State (law, economics, government, education, etc.). Subsequently, language became an important form of control. The maintenance of a national language was (and continues to be) central to organizing capitalist relations within the Nation-state. In addition, 'the adoption of a national language served to
depoliticize one variety, which is declared to be the symbol of all people: the nation' (Tollefson, 1991, p. 9). The language of the state — of governing — becomes representative of the language of the Nation, and therefore functions symbolically to create the myth of both a homogenous and unified nation. Consequently, the role of a national language is by its very nature hegemonic in that it functions as a means of excluding/including certain groups. It functions to service the interests of the state (i.e. those with economic and sociopolitical power — the ruling class), while simultaneously masking its hegemony by facilitating the myth of an inclusive nation. Symbolically, this depoliticization of the national language serves to politicize all those languages (and consequently, speakers of those languages) which are not "officially" recognized as languages of the Nation. These "other" languages are then constructed as "minority" languages, despite the fact that the "official" language may be spoken by only a minority.

The standardization of the national language is also part of the hegemony of the ruling class for it not only deems one language as symbolically representative of the Nation, but also one variety or dialect of that language. The idea of a standard privileges a certain "dialect" which in reality is neither more nor less efficient: yet this 'one dialect is elevated as the "standard" and subsequently deemed the "superior" and literate form of the language (Wiley & Lukes, 1996). The standard — which is that variety or dialect spoken by the dominant class — is then used "to position speakers of the same language within a hierarchy" (Wiley & Lukes, 1996). Hence, speaking another language or an "accented" variety or dialect other than the national standard "serves as an essential axis along which Othering practices get to play themselves out...[and subsequently serves as] a primary tool for racialization especially when used in conjunction with skin color"
It is precisely this racialization which informs the common sense category, "immigrant," and operates to exclude (or justify the marginal position of) specific groups of migrants. Thus, the standardization of the language operates as an exclusionary means of restricting access to the Nation's resources. Moreover, education—whether it be formal (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988) or non-formal such as Survival ESL—plays a fundamental role in this exclusionary/inclusionary process.

Similarly, the idea or ideal of monolingualism [or in Canada bilingualism but this is restricted along certain geographic boundaries] is construed as the "natural" condition of the imagined homogeneity of the Nation-state. Linguistic diversity within the nation is viewed as "imported" by immigrants. It is also viewed as a threat to national unity: a divisive force which threatens the well-being of the larger national community (Wiley & Lukes, 1996; see also Cummins, 1996). The hegemony of the dominant class whose language (or dialect) is representative of the nation is upheld on the grounds that it protects the national community. Consequently, non-official languages, accents, dialects, and varieties operate in exclusionary ways to mark and position speakers within the Nation. For example, the presence of certain non-white, non-European accents perceived as a refusal (and therefore a threat) on the part of the "immigrant" speaker, eliciting comments such as, 'Why don't they just speak English?'. Concepts of national identity, loyalty, patriotism, and citizenship are associated with speakers of certain languages or language varieties and thus, those who don't speak the national language (or a standard variety of that language) are constructed as outside of the community regardless of their legal status (Tollefson, 1991, p. 12).
The existence of a national, standardized language is also framed in "pragmatic" terms (see Benesch's 1993 discussion on the ideology of pragmatism): it offers a mode of communication in which all of the nation's citizens can participate. (This is ostensibly one of the main arguments within the English Only movement in the U.S.: see for example the discussion by Auerbach, 1993; Wiley & Lukes, 1996). Also related to the "pragmatic argument" is that argument which frames the issue of a national language in terms of equity. As Tollefson points out,

the policy of requiring everyone to learn a single dominant language is widely seen as a common-sense solution to the communication problems of multilingual societies. The appeal of this assumption is such that monolingualism is seen as a solution to linguistic inequality. If linguistic minorities learn the dominant language, so the argument goes, then they will not suffer economic and social inequality. (Tollefson, 1991, p. 10)

While not knowing the language has real material consequences—i.e. those who do not have knowledge of either of Canada's two official languages occupy the lowest socioeconomic status (Pendakur, 1992) — both the "equity" and the "pragmatic" arguments are problematic, specifically as they are related to Survival ESL. For instance, Survival ESL programs are from an institutional perspective both implicitly and explicitly designed for an exclusionary integration. The lack of government funds and coordination of settlement services ensure that learners in LINC, for example, will have only a very basic knowledge of the English language when they finish the program. Consequently, learners are only eligible for minimum wage jobs (see Tollefson, 1991, chap. 5) and are able to function in the most rudimentary way within the capitalist nation (i.e. pay bills and taxes, vote, etc.). This has serious implications for the quality of citizenship that immigrants can enjoy upon "naturalization". One response to this allegation is that
immigrants have come to Canada in search of a better life and consequently, any life in Canada is better than the life that many had in their native countries. Not only is this common sense assumption based on ignorance of the complexity of forces under which people migrate (i.e. Brettnal & Simon, 1986) but it serves to justify the mediocrity of services provided by the government and their subsequent exploitation of immigrant labor.

Moreover, in contrast to both the popular pragmatic and equity arguments is the reality of the "civilizing" legacy of language education — particularly English language education (see Pennycook, 1994). This legacy not only continues today under the auspices of "development" and "modernization", but continues to be primarily responsible for the gross inequities and status between dominant and "minority" language speakers. Moreover, this popular "equity" argument is belied by the research data that show the marked correlation among language minority students whose language is not encouraged (either through access to bilingual programs or some variant thereof), low academic achievement, and low socioeconomic status (see for example, Cummins, 1996; Walsh, 1991; Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins, 1988). Learning the dominant language functions more as a gate-keeping exercise by defining who is allowed access to social, economic, and political resources, and who is not. However, 'equality of access' arguments are framed in such a way that they preclude the research data that support the fundamental importance of developing one's native language and experiencing a sense of affirmation in order to "succeed" within the Nation.
The political and hegemonic nature of an official national language is made most explicit through use of language planning and policies which operate (overtly or covertly) to exclude certain groups of people. Consequently, language policies continue to function as one of the central means of control both at the national and international levels (Hornberger & Ricento, 1996; Tollefson, 1991; Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992). Within Canada, language policies have historically served as an essential tool in developing, maintaining, and legitimating the continuation of colonial claims and capitalist relations. For example, the establishment of residential schools for First Nations children designed for the express purpose of "assimilation"—i.e. the obliteration of their language and culture—demonstrates the savage legacy of Canadian language policy as a means of control.

Given the hegemonic role that language plays in the maintenance of the capitalist nation-state, the common sense view of language as divorced from the realm of politics and social inequalities seems extremely anachronistic. However, within the field of second language education it is precisely this political view of language which is endorsed.

Second Language Education Research

The area of second language education (SLE) research has also succumbed to the common sense view of language. A large body of SLE has supported a view of language (and consequently language learning) which is apolitical, asocial, and ahistorical (Pennycook, 1990). The area of applied linguistics, (the area most influential to TESL
theory and practice) has been historically constituted as a closed system of knowledge resulting in a fixed corpus of theories and methods which remain divorced from the local conditions of where language instruction takes place' (Morgan, 1997, p. 17). This is not to argue that critical work is not being carried out but rather that much of this critical pedagogical work has remained largely marginalized within SLE (Morgan, 1997).

Alistair Cumming has identified three major orientations of research in the area of TESL: descriptive, interpretive, and ideological (Cumming, 1994). The descriptive approach to research "aspires toward comprehensive accounts of the systematic nature of languages, cognition, and discourse as a basis for guiding educational policies and practices" (Cumming, p. 675). This approach seems most in line with traditional linguistics and is the type of work which guides traditional pedagogy. Interpretive approaches to research view language in terms of different cultural frameworks and explicitly link knowledge and language learning to particular social and cultural contexts. This research also strives to assess the effectiveness of different language learning curricula as they are related to different contexts. Hence, the interpretative approach explicitly recognizes both the social nature of language and the intrinsic relationship between culture and knowledge (Cumming, p. 685). It is this type of research which guides more progressive pedagogical approaches and curricula including Survival ESL. The last approach is described as ideological. Ideological orientations to TESL research are concerned with political transformation and the empowering of language minority

---

22 For example Alastair Pennycook, Alistair Cumming, Jim Cummins, Elsa Roberts Auerbach, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Brian Morgan, and Catherine E. Walsh. I will discuss some of this critical work in the next chapter.

23 The difference between traditional, progressive, and critical pedagogies will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.
students. Thus, this approach is concerned with the promoting social equity and the transformation of social relations. Moreover, Cumming argues that an ideological approach rejects positivistic modes of inquiry and is critical of normative school practices and theories (Cumming, p. 690). Consequently, the ideological orientation overtly concerns itself with issues of power including how pedagogy and language research are implicated in the larger relations of power. It is this ideological approach which motivates the development of critical pedagogies.

Cumming argues that the majority of SLE falls within the first two categories. He further argues that the fundamental problem with critical pedagogical research in L2 education is that there is not a great deal of it that gets published. The lack of published work, however, reflects not so much a paucity of critical work into questions concerning ESL in the workplace, ESL and gender, ESL and anti-racist education,...but rather the difficulty in getting it published. (Cumming, 1994, p. 691, emphasis mine)

Consequently, as Morgan (1997) argues, without published materials certain practices and pedagogical orientations become normalized and consequently, supported as objective pedagogy. Morgan's article (1997) on the politics of publishing an article about critical pedagogy and teaching about the Gulf War is acutely demonstrative with respect to this point. He argues that the marginalization of critical pedagogy within major TESL journals establishes the rules and norms of what is deemed valid knowledge (see also Clarke, 1994). The absence of critical issues in these journals invalidates critically engaged pedagogies (both theory and practice) which are subsequently perceived as unauthoritative. At best, these "dissenting voices" are represented as an "alternative" among equals (Morgan, 1997). Thus, Morgan's remarks are incisive;
[p]ublishing normalizes, in Foucault's sense (1982), the taken-for-granted ways we practice theory and theorize practice in education....[p]ractioners are encouraged to contribute to theory-building in ESL insofar as they reaffirm its existing knowledge base and hierarchy of authority. For critical teachers, the disadvantage is greater: activities that transgress both theoretical and pedagogical norms appear ungrounded in the foundations of the profession and thus deserving of reprimand. It is primarily through publishing that alternative ways of teaching and theorizing are either promoted or marginalized. (Morgan, 1997, p. 16)

The consequent failure of SLE research and theory to address questions of language and power has pressing ideological as well as pedagogical implications (cf. Fairclough, 1989; Peirce, 1993; Benesch, 1993). The conspicuous absence of issues of power and ideology seem rather glaring given their intimate relationship to language. Yet this omission of the "political" dimensions of language is executed in the name of scientific objectivity. This is in part, due to the common sense belief that to explicitly omit the political dimensions (for example, in SLE) is to somehow maintain a position of neutrality. However, to approach language and language learning from an assumed position of neutrality is to take up a political position: one which endorses the hegemony of the dominant class and the existing set of unequal relations.

Moreover, as Pennycook (1990) has pointed out,

[w]hen the notion of language is so politically based, standing in a difficult relationship to the questions of the status of dialects and standard forms, and is intimately connected to the development and maintenance of the nation-state, and when much of SLE is tied to the contentious issues of bilingualism, minority education and internationalism, it is not surprising that, within an education system that has itself turned its back on political and cultural issues, there has been a reluctance to deal with the full array of social, political and cultural implications that arise within SLE (Pennycook, 1990, p. 305).

Thus, the failure of SLE to examine the ideological implications of its work is also due in part, to the fact that SLE has divorced itself from the larger body of critical educational
theory which in turn concerns itself with the broader social and political issues (Pennycook, 1990; Clarke, 1994). Consequently, certain research "methods" and practices which are embedded within specific ideological positions and subsequently support a specific world view, are elevated as neutral, objective, and academically sound, and subsequently, become the taken-for-granted way of doing things (see Benesch, 1993; Auerbach, 1993).

The failure of SLE to critically engage with the ideological underpinnings of certain theories and practices has resulted in the propagation of certain reductionist pedagogical paradigms which conceptualize language learning in terms of skills for employment (Elson, 1997). The argument behind these "skills-based" approaches, particularly within the field of Survival ESL, is that pedagogical outcomes need to be directly commensurate with employment opportunities (see Leistyna & Woodrum, 1996 for a critical discussion). For example, Sage (1993) argues that because most ESL learners are displaced, unemployed, or at risk of losing their jobs, ESL teachers and curricula need to focus specifically on employable skills that will enable immigrants to find a job in a 'new and rapidly changing economy' (Sage, p. 65). To a certain extent, Sage is correct in that Survival ESL curricula need to prioritize employment if it reflects the "needs" of that particular classroom. However, Sage views these "employable skills" as mutually exclusive with critical pedagogies dismissing the teaching of what she calls "political issues" as a luxury that cannot be afforded. Moreover, she defines these "skills" in terms of how they are defined from an institutional perspective: Sage argues that immigrants need to be taught the skills that are in high demand within the nation-state. Thus for Sage, the teaching of "employable skills" within the context of ESL is a neutral
and ideologically-free endeavor. Consequently, Sage's advocacy on behalf of immigrant learners epitomizes the integrationist approach: she narrowly defines the learners' needs in terms of teaching skills that institutions demand while simultaneously supporting the idea that the current trend of low paying and low security jobs (those in demand from an institutional perspective) are inevitable. However, as David Cooke (1993) responds, this "new" economy

is an intensified version of the old, requiring workers to put their skills to the service of owners and corporations. Significantly, the high-tech world described is a management view, controlled by large corporate interests and oriented accordingly. It isn't a world created or directed by the workers nor by a community with a stake in a given enterprise or economic sector... And herein lies the tragedy of the New World Order—teachers cooperate in squeezing learners into a workplace with few choices and arguably no noticeable soul. (Cooke, 1993, pp. 90-1)

Developing a curriculum or pedagogy which aids immigrant learners in finding employment is a primary objective of Survival ESL and one which is not mutually exclusive with a critical pedagogy as Sage argues. However, the type of empowerment that Sage advocates is disingenuous in that it prepares immigrants to work passively within a system which is exploitative and disempowering.

The pedagogical consequence of this reductionist approach has meant that a large focus of SLE has been on efficacy in terms of language learning: i.e. the syllabus development in terms of the selection and sequencing of language items with consequent emphasis on the mechanical and technical aspects of language (Elston, 1997). The current focus on skills, techniques, and efficacy in terms of learnability is perceived as "scientific", objective, and free of political bias, despite its ideological underpinnings (see Giroux, 1993; Leistyna, Woodrum, Sherbloom, 1996). Furthermore as Elston (1997) has
argued, the current drive "to reduce SLE to the most minimum package possible" is a consequence of the current corporatization of culture and is framed within the logic of capitalist system (Elston, p. 56). He argues that SLE is even more vulnerable (than mainstream formal education) to the effects of this marketplace logic given both its tenuous history and the public perception and devaluation of SLE (specifically for "immigrants") as a remedial service.

Most attempts to situate SLE within a larger context have ultimately been limited in their scope, concentrating mainly on instrumentalist/functional models (Pennycook, 1990; Auerbach & Burgess, 1985; Auerbach, 1986, 1995) which are commensurate with the needs of the capitalist nation-state. One of the fundamental problems has been that SLE theorist have failed to articulate what larger social vision their pedagogical approaches support (see Simon, 1992). Thus, this failure has resulted in the often implicit and often unknowing endorsement of assimilationist frameworks which support and perpetuate the existing societal inequalities.

Second Language Education, Literacy, and Women

Within the field of TESL there has been a conspicuous lack of research into the area of gender and ESL (both feminist and non-feminist) (Willet, 1996; Toohey & Scholefield, 1994; Angwin, 1994; Schenke, 1996). This lack of gender analysis is due in part to the gendered division of labor within the field itself. Gilding (1994) for example, has argued that women have remained largely marginalized within the prestigious fields of SLE research and theory has been dominated by men. Yet the "practice"—the teaching of language and literacy—has been historically constructed as
'women's work'. The marginalization of feminist research within both TESL and SLE has therefore, had consequences for the type of research which is carried out in these areas. Thus,

gender is one of the major social relations continually negotiated as we engage in social practices. It is a complex and contradictory system that operates not only on language practices and identities of learners and teachers but also on the practices and identities of researchers — the questions we ask, the methods we use, the interpretations we make of our data, the implications we draw from our research, the controversies we choose to argue... (Willet, 1996, p. 344) [emphasis mine]

As a consequence, the language learning subject within SLE has been characterized as unitary and male (Peirce, 1993; Gilding, 1994). In other words, research within TESL operates within the discourse of rationalist inquiry and from the standpoint of the universal male. Consequently, this "scientific" discourse has propagated the artificial separation within the general field of SLE, between cognitive and social processes (Willet, 1996: see also Morgan, 1997). This separation in effect, precludes "serious" SLE research into how the larger sphere of social relations affects language learning. Despite the fact that feminist research in linguistics (i.e. Lakoff, 1975; Spender, 1985, Kramarae, 1980, 1983, 1983) has effectively demonstrated that the social arena of power relations has direct bearing on male and female linguistic interactions, this research has had little impact on the field of TESL and consequently, Survival ESL. Thus, within TESL (as well as SLE) the effects to which women's participation within the language learning classroom is governed by the men in their lives or in the classroom is yet to be systematically documented (Rockhill, 1987) which in turn, is problematic within the context of for example, curriculum development. While it is also important to highlight the fact that gender differences within ESL are difficult to research because women's'
experiences are complicated by their own unique locations within social relations (i.e. as women's experiences are also organized within the interstices of race/ethnicity and class, in addition to their own unique personal experiences) (Schenke, 1996) this nevertheless, does not preclude a specifically feminist analysis of relations of power within the context of language learning and language use.

Consequently, in attempting to meet learners "needs", the universal paradigm perpetuated through this gender blind research ignores the fact that literacy and language learning are gendered. It is seen as women's work but not as women's right (Rockhill, 1987, p. 153; see also Rockhill & Tomic, 1995). Within the material realities of immigrant women's lives, literacy is experienced as both a threat and a desire (Rockhill, 1987). Literacy is desired because it offers women an opportunity to gain more control over their lives, to participate in different activities, and access different spaces (such as the public sphere) which have been denied to them. Moreover, literacy, (like education in general) has a specific symbolic power in that it increases the status of the individual. Yet it is precisely this symbolic and actual power that literacy offers women which constitutes a threat to the male/female power dynamic. The idea of literacy as a threat however, stands in stark contrast to its discourse of empowerment —one which extends far beyond Survival ESL to the popular discourse of the everyday world. This gendered nature of literacy therefore, has consequences for both how women experience language learning and how they live literacy daily. Due to this gendered experience, immigrant women and men have different communicative practices with respect to how, where, and to what extent they use language to interact with different social spheres which are further governed by relations of power. Consequently, immigrant women's lived difference --
both in communicative practices and experiences of literacy — have implications for Survival ESL. However, as will subsequently be discussed, "survival" is conceptualized as a universal set of needs defined from the male universal standpoint. As a result, this has implications for the further marginalization and isolation already suffered by immigrant women.

**Summary**

Education operates as the nation-state's primary socializing institution and therefore, has serious implications for the reproduction of the inequalities which characterize the larger social sphere. Within the context of second language education — particularly for non-English speaking immigrants — these issues are especially exigent given the role that language plays in the maintenance of the capitalist nation-state from which immigrants are in effect, excluded. The lack of analysis around issues of power as they relate to language, language learning, and language use, within SLE has had a direct influence on both the conceptualization and development of the survival curriculum. In effect, survival ESL's failure to examine the social implications of both its pedagogy and its relation to the larger sphere of social relations has meant that Survival ESL has undertaken an integrationist approach: an approach which further perpetuates and naturalizes those existing relations. Despite Survival ESL's engagement with progressive pedagogies, its failure to examine the larger ideological implications of language outlined above, essentially undermines its claims to empowerment. Thus, it is to a discussion of the survival curriculum itself that I will now turn.
Coercive vs. Collaborative Relations of Power

The discourse surrounding Survival ESL is one of empowerment (Rockhill & Tomic, 1995). In the first instance, Survival ESL is designed for the purposes of preparing immigrants for settlement in the target country: thus, in effect, Survival ESL aims to prepare immigrant newcomers for citizenship. Consequently, the objective of Survival ESL is to meet the linguistic and cultural needs of immigrant learners in order that they may participate within the larger society—the nation. The endorsement of progressive pedagogical methods and objectives (communicative language teaching, communicative competence, and the situational/functional syllabus) signals Survival ESL's commitment to develop a curriculum which will meet these needs. Thus, it is this commitment which lies at the heart of its discourse of empowerment. However, in order to understand the framework within which Survival ESL assesses empowerment, it is important to understand how power operates within both Survival ESL and the larger context of the capitalist nation-state.

Power is neither tangible nor something which is manifest from "above", but rather power is produced within social relationships (Pennycook, 1989; Cummins, 1996). In Negotiating Identities, Cummins (1996) has identified two "types" of power which characterize social relationships (Cummins, 1996, p. 14-15). The first is what he calls coercive relations of power. These 'refer to the exercise of power by a dominant group (individual or country) to the detriment of a subordinated group (or individual country) and operate on the assumption that there is a fixed quantity of power' (Cummins, p. 14). Within the logic of coercive relations of power, the more power afforded to one group
results in less for another. It is this logic, and subsequently, coercive relations of power which operate within the capitalist nation-state. The perception is that the more power afforded to "them" — the outsiders, the immigrants — the less there is for "us", the citizens of the Nation. This understanding of power is ultimately transformed into the material reality which results in the unequal status and division of resources to certain groups perceived to be outside of the Nation. In addition, coercive relations of power are "reflected in and shaped through the use of language or discourse and usually involve a definitional process that legitimates the inferior or deviant status accorded to the subordinated group (individual or country)" (Cummins, p. 14).

However, Cummins (1996) has further argued, that within the context of collaborative relations, power is perceived as additive rather than as having a fixed sum. Interpersonal or intergroup relations are seen as capable of generating power thereby empowering all of the participants, thus "power is created with others rather than being imposed on or exercised over others" (Cummins, p. 15). Moreover, Cummins argues that this empowerment results in the affirmation of identities — of learners, newcomers, teachers, citizens — and gives rise to a greater sense of community. The negotiation and affirmation of identities in turn, are crucial to the existence of a genuinely democratic society. Thus, collaborative relations of power are imperative for the creation of an authentic multicultural Canada which goes beyond the celebration of diversity.

Consequently, collaborative relations of power belie the logic of both nationalism and the capitalist system by challenging the exclusionary processes which characterize each.
Empowerment and Survival ESL

It is important to note that coercive relations of power implicitly (and explicitly) play themselves out at various levels of immigrant language training programs: coercive relations characterize government funding, access, policies, and the overall scope of these programs, as well as the coordination of immigrant settlement services in general (see previous discussion). However, within the Survival ESL curriculum, the discourse of empowerment is explicitly promoted despite the larger context. To open almost any Survival ESL text (or any ESL text published within the last twenty years) is to open up to a discourse heralding its "learner-centredness" as demonstrated through the "validation of student experience" and "the provision of "real life" situations which "reflect the everyday experiences of students", thereby offering the opportunity for "meaningful communication". The following is representative;

When students feel invested personally in a classroom that validates their lives, interests and real world, they learn faster and retain more because what they are learning is meaningful and pertinent to them....Student-centered conversation, by focusing on students' knowledge and experience, permits the teacher as facilitator, to tap into this resource, affirming the value of each individual in the class. Our goal is for students to develop a way to direct their own learning and feel comfortable with what they DO know so that from their conversation course, they can develop competencies and continue to learn and improve. (from the introduction to A Canadian Conversation Book, Carver, Fotinos & Cooper, p. ii, 1993).

Communicative Language Teaching, communicative competence, the situational/functional syllabus, and the competency-based approach to curricular development, have all been venerated as those progressive pedagogical tools and objectives which constitute the foundation of curricula which are empowering. These pedagogical tools and progressive instructional techniques are perceived as being driven by, and attendant to,
the needs of the learners. These "needs" in turn, are understood in terms of the linguistic and cultural requisites for participation in the larger sphere of society; for example, to make doctors' appointments, to read the classifieds, or to go the bank. Consequently, it is to the extent that these progressive instructional principles enable individual learners to function within the larger society that Survival ESL lays claim to the discourse of empowerment. However, as Cummins (1996) has argued, "instructional techniques become effective only to the extent that they contribute to collaborative relations of power" (Cummins, p. 137) and are therefore, critical of normative practices. Yet the emphasis on enabling immigrants to function within a larger society characterized by coercive relations severely circumscribes the potential to genuinely empower learners. Moreover, the conspicuous lack of discussion within Survival ESL around the ideological implications and social assumptions underlying these instructional techniques contributes to the perpetuation and maintenance of these coercive relations (see Auerbach & Burgess, 1986). In short, empowerment within Survival ESL is narrowly conceived and confined to progressive instructional techniques which enable individual learners to integrate into an existing order of social relations. However, the existing order of the larger sphere is never challenged.

Cummins (1996) has further argued that central to any educational framework for empowerment is the process of identity negotiation and the explicit challenge to coercive relations of power. In order for a survival curriculum to be genuinely empowering, learner-centred, and relevant to the lives and needs of the learners, it must promote, and engage in, a critical examination of the larger social relations in which learners are entangled. Thus, both the negotiation and affirmation of identities, as well as the
opportunity to challenge the coercive relations of power which organize the social relations in which we live, are essential for empowerment. This empowerment is defined in terms of the opportunities it provides for newcomers to exercise psychological and social control over the conditions of their lives (Freire & Macedo, 1987) and to participate in a meaningful and substantial way within the Nation. Consequently, a survival curriculum needs to do more than engage in progressive pedagogies and methods which attempt to contextualize language within the everyday. It must also be self-consciously critical and promote a critical engagement of that everyday. This is not to argue however, that individual teachers do not work to challenge coercive relations of power and promote collaboration in their classrooms, but to argue that Survival ESL as it is reflected in the curricular materials (as well as within the larger discourse of SLE) is largely uncritical. This is problematic given that in addition to the common sense assumptions which provide the society's invisible frame of reference, published survival curricular materials in some sense, prescribe and legitimize certain classroom practices as well as student-teacher interactions. In the absence of an examination of the "political" and within the context of the discourses of nationalism and integration, the failure to critically engage with the larger context of unequal social relations within which language is used is problematic in that it implicitly supports the coercive relations of power which characterize the Nation. Consequently empowerment within Survival ESL is not understood in terms of promoting collaborative relations of power, but rather is perceived as enabling immigrant learners to participate within an existing set of relations. As a result, it is within this context that Survival ESL is ultimately situated within an assimilationist framework.
Survival ESL: Intercultural or Assimilationist?

In addition to providing a framework for empowerment, Cummins (1996) also outlines three distinct orientations to pedagogy—traditional, progressive, and transformative—and discusses the instructional, and social assumptions which underlie each. Cummins argues that traditional pedagogy is characterized by what Freire (Freire & Macedo, 1987) has called the "banking" approach to education. Within this approach, teachers are seen as "authoritative" sources of knowledge and skills who subsequently deposit these into students' memory banks. Consequently, learning within the traditional pedagogical paradigm is narrowly conceptualized in terms of memorizing a set of facts and skills which are transmitted from teacher to student. Thus, knowledge within this paradigm is viewed as static and fixed, and learning is extremely structured and hierarchical. The instructional content of traditional pedagogical approaches focuses primarily on the surface features of language or literacy and emphasizes the correct recall of information which consequently contravenes the fundamental principles of language learning (Cummins, pp. 153-4). The social assumption underlying a traditional pedagogy is that learners will attain a certain "cultural literacy"—a fixed body of knowledge and certain set of skills that all citizens within the nation should know. Moreover, this "cultural literacy" reflects the perspective of the dominant group and through the omission of alternative perspectives curbs the opportunity for these alternatives to be accessed. In effect, traditional pedagogy offers a curriculum which is sanitized with respect to both the historical and current power relations (Cummins, p. 155).

---

24 Cummins borrows this term from E.D. Hirsch. see Cummins, 1996, p. 155.
Progressive pedagogical orientations differ from traditional approaches in that these supports a more holistic view of both language and learning, and thereby recognize that the learner and the learner's experience are central to this paradigm. Moreover, knowledge within this framework is viewed as "catalytic" and consequently, collaborative inquiry between students, and between student and teacher is essential to both the generation of knowledge as well as to the learning process itself (Cummins, 1996, pp. 155-6). Moreover, language learning within the progressive orientation is understood as taking place within the context of meaningful communication and thus, instructional techniques within the progressive classroom are designed accordingly. Despite the fact that, as Cummins has argued, the instructional assumptions operating within progressive pedagogical orientations are generally supported by research with respect to their efficacy, the social assumptions of this approach are rarely articulated. Subsequently, the focus of progressive pedagogies do not move beyond the walls of the classroom. While progressive pedagogies explicitly aim to promote tolerance and acceptance within the classroom community which in turn is aimed at increasing the individual learner's self-esteem within the educational context, little is done to challenge the inequities of the larger society (Cummins, p. 157). Consequently, as Cummins and others have effectively demonstrated, these larger inequities are a determining factor in the academic success and overall empowerment of learners both within and outside of the educational context. As a result, this lack of attention to the larger sphere of inequality undermines the progressive instructional assumptions.

---

25 See for example, the collection of essays on this subject in Cummins & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988
Transformative pedagogical orientations are similar to progressive orientations in that their instructional assumptions are essentially the same. Both support a holistic approach to learning and view the learner as central to curriculum development.

However, unlike progressive pedagogies, transformative orientations are explicit about the relationship between the classroom and the larger sphere of society. Thus, transformative orientations clearly articulate the social assumptions underlying both curriculum and pedagogy. Within a transformative approach, issues of power, and status are highlighted and students are encouraged to analyze and critically engage in the social realities of their own lives and their communities (Cummins, 1996, p. 157). The objective of a transformative approach is to affirm the identities and experiences of those in the classroom as they relate to society and thus, to have learners develop an ability to understand the 'deeper meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences of any action, event, process, experience, policy, etc.,' within that larger sphere (Shor in Cummins, p. 157).

In assessing these three orientations, Cummins' argues that traditional and progressive pedagogies tend to focus more on the instructional assumptions which underwrite each. Thus, they are concerned more with the conceptions of language, knowledge, and learning that underlie various forms of teaching. By contrast however, transformative pedagogical orientations also explicitly focus on the social or ideological aspects—the ways in which relations of culture and power are addressed within the curriculum (Cummins, 1996, p. 153). As a consequence, Cummins characterizes both traditional and progressive pedagogies as assimilationist or integrationist in their orientations and relationship to the larger society. Both pedagogical orientations fail to
adequately address the relations of power which characterize society and the classroom. Due to this failure, both traditional and progressive pedagogies in effect, perpetuate coercive relations of power. Thus, both orientations are essentially (either explicitly or implicitly) exclusionary within the larger context of social relations. By contrast, the transformative approach offers an intercultural orientation in that it highlights issues of power and actively works to transform these relations into collaborative relations of power. Hence, this approach seeks to engage critically with the larger society and subsequently include and affirm the identities, knowledges, and skills of all of the participants. The intercultural framework operates within a discourse of inclusivity: however, this discourse does not romanticize nor exclude the inequities of the larger society, but rather operates to have all participants confront and work to transform those relations.

The Survival ESL Curriculum: A Critical Examination of Survival ESL Materials

Survival ESL: Interested Knowledge

All knowledge is interested and all curricula are ideologically embedded (Auerbach & Burgess, 1986; Benesch, 1993, Pennycook, 1989). Therefore, in assessing Survival ESL curricula we must begin with the question, 'whose interests does Survival ESL serve?'. As previously argued, the discourse of "empowerment" lies at the heart of the survival ESL curriculum. This is turn, rests on its explicit aim to meet the needs of immigrant learners. Thus, content and language are selected and organized in terms of the situations which reflect the everyday reality of immigrants' lives. Thematic units such as housing, transportation, employment, shopping, banking, health, and Canadian culture
form the core content and determine the overall organization of the survival syllabus. The problem however, lies not so much with the content of this type of syllabus, but rather with how Survival ESL itself is conceptualized. In the first instance, as Auerbach and Burgess (1985) have argued, the notion that survival skills can be taught as a body of knowledge (both linguistic and cultural) to be transmitted from teacher to student is highly problematic (see also Auerbach, 1986, 1995). The construction of Survival ESL as an universal type of knowledge ignores the fact that survival strategies are both highly contextualized and individualized. "The immigrant experience" is not reducible to a singular, unitary experience, but rather this experience is dynamic and contingent upon the social relations within which newcomers are located. This is not to argue that immigrants as a social group do not lack a certain knowledge of the target country's language and culture but that the presentation of "survival" as a fixed body of knowledge precludes the reality of how the interstices of race, class, and gender form an axis along which experiences are constructed. In other words, the social relations within which people are enmeshed are informed and negotiated by ideologies of racism, sexism, and class and as a result, different groups of immigrants (for example, immigrants of color vs. immigrants from Eastern Europe) may have very different experiences (see Willet, 1996). Consequently, their interactions with the dominant society (and the subsequent meaning they acquire) may be constructed very differently.

From the standpoint of immigrant women who are the most marginalized within the capitalist nation-state, it is important to investigate how the dominant cultural sphere is gendered. In general, men's and women's lives are organized quite differently in relation to this "public" space as a consequence of how this sphere has been historically
organized. In short, men *own* the "public" while women are threatened by/in it (Rockhill, 1987, p. 162). As a result, immigrant women's and men's experiences and communicative practices are structured and consequently *lived* quite differently. For example, Kathleen Rockhill (1987) has argued that immigrant women tend to engage in literacy or English language activities that relate to the household, certain social services, as well as around the schooling of children. Moreover, due to the nature of these relations, women tend to rely on the written word more than do immigrant men. By contrast, immigrant men tend to use and engage in spoken English activities within the context of employment and on a social basis. Thus, immigrant women's experience with the dominant cultural sphere of English is more confined than men: an isolation which is exacerbated by the fact that immigrant women are segregated into occupations such as domestic service and manufacturing in addition to their household duties, where they are afforded little interaction with the English speaking public and consequently, the English language. Given this, immigrant women and men not only have different communicative practices but different "survival" needs. Yet the conceptualization of Survival ESL as a universal re: male — body of knowledge and set of skills fails to be sensitive to these gendered differences. Thus, Survival ESL risks increasing immigrant women's personal isolation and subsequent marginalization within the nation-state.

In sum, by attempting to empower immigrant learners by addressing their survival "needs", the conceptualization of "survival" as a universal body of knowledge risks being "disempowering" thus (implicitly) perpetuating newcomers' problems. Of course, in making these claims there is always the danger of essentializing these differences; however, the point here is to recognize the contingency of experience. The presentation of
"survival" as a universal body of knowledge and skills is reductionist in that it belies the multiplicity of experience, identity, and survival strategies which are always contingent.

Henry Giroux (1993) has argued that both formal and non-formal educational settings legitimates certain types of knowledge while disclaiming others (Giroux, p. 14). It is within this context that the presentation of survival as universal body of knowledge and skills is not only shortsighted but also tends to be exclusionary. The universal by its very nature as such, excludes all experiences or survival strategies outside of that frame. Consequently, the paradigm within which Survival ESL operates disclaims the survival knowledge and skills that immigrants already have. However, in order for a curriculum to be genuinely learner-centred it must focus on the learner's construction of the knowledge (Lee, 1994, p. 3). Yet, the framing of "survival" ESL as a body of knowledge which immigrants lack fails to locate the enterprise of survival with the knowers themselves; those whose perspective is organized by exactly how they are located outside of the nation-state and excluded from participation. In other words, it fails to recognize the fact that immigrants themselves are in better position to define what they need for "survival". In addition, the teacher (the "native" Canadian) is perceived as endowed with the "insiders" knowledge of survival which s/he will impart onto the students despite the fact that many immigrants may have much more 'first hand' knowledge of survival than the teacher.

Moreover, the concept of survival implies a minimal existence (i.e. beyond death) and thus, it is this "survival" that is implicit in Survival ESL's overall objectives. This conceptual framework defines immigrants' "needs" as those linguistic and cultural skills

---

26 This idea is adapted from Smith's standpoint "theory" for developing a feminist sociology. See Smith, 1987
that will help them survive from day to day: to eat, to sleep, to work. Hence, psychological, emotional, and social survival are not implied nor supported by this concept. Yet, as Wallerstein (1983) has pointed out, while immigrants need English to do well in their new country, emotional and social stability are also needed to preserve cultural integrity (Wallerstein, p. 5). Learning English creates inevitable cultural conflict in terms of identities. Subsequently, the negotiation of cultural identities becomes a central issue within Survival ESL. However, as Rockhill and Tomic (1995) have argued, the imposition of "illiteracy"—of not knowing the language—often becomes the totality of that new identity (Rockhill & Tomic, pp. 210-11): an identity which reinforces immigrants' outsider status. Moreover, while Rockhill and Tomic (1995) acknowledge that learning the language (and "cultural" knowledge) of the new society is crucial for "empowerment". They argue however, that the process of this empowerment is highly contradictory. In one instance it affords the outsider with a certain "insider's" knowledge, yet this process is simultaneously one of colonization;

[a]s the hegemony of English is reinforced, all that one cannot speak or fit into its discursive structures is invalidated—is subjugated—(re) constructing the ethnocentricism of the dominant society. (Rockhill & Tomic, 1995, p. 210)

Consequently, the conceptualization and construction of Survival ESL in terms of what immigrants lack amounts to a "liberation through subjugation". The process of identity negotiation is one which is crucial for the empowerment of learners and their subsequent 'academic' success (Cummins, 1996). Research in formal education (for example, the research dealing with language minority students) has demonstrated the fundamental importance of this process and the implication this has for the individual as well as the collective status of groups within the community (see Cummins, 1996; Skutnabb-Kangas
& Cummins, 1988; Walsh, 1991). The negation of identities in the classroom has a reciprocal relation to the larger sphere; for example, for how immigrant learners view themselves in relation to the Nation, as well as and how "empowered" they can feel.

In addition, the conceptual framework of survival supports the idea that what are being taught are "life skills" (which has also been used interchangeably with Survival ESL (see Auerbach and Burgess, 1985; Auerbach 1986). The idea of "life skills" is problematic because it infantilizes immigrant learners and thereby, undermines the basic principles of adult education in general. This infantilization is demonstrated through the often condescending tone which lessons take such as the following example:

Care of your Teeth
Brush your teeth after every meal. If you can't brush, rinse with mouthwash or plain water. If you have food between your teeth, use a toothpick. Use dental floss everyday. A water Pik and a rubber tip are two other ways you can keep your teeth and gums clean and health. Ask your dentist what is best for you. You should see your dentist twice a year for a checkup. (Speaking of Survival, Freeman, 1983, p. 43)

In attempting to deal with situations that are 'relevant' to newcomers' lives this example reveals how survival ESL's failure to engage with the social implications of this survival paradigm not only results in infantilizing learners, but echoes the racist and sexist common sense of the larger society. As a result, both this infantilization and the racist/sexist common sense which supports this "life skills" approach ultimately reduces Survival ESL's claims of empowerment and "learner-centredness" to empty rhetoric.

Furthermore, the presentation of survival as a fixed, universal body of knowledge often focuses on specific practices or "skills" as they are defined within a consumerist logic. The definition of these skills within this framework is due in part to the
dichotomous logic that underwrites survival curricula. Modernity and civilization are equated with capitalism and constructed in opposition to the perceived traditional and "primitive" societies of immigrants' native cultures. Thus, immigrants are perceived as lacking certain "modern" and "civilized" skills which are needed to live in a "more advanced" (re: consumer) culture. While in some cases the fact that Canadian culture is more "consumer-oriented" than other cultures may be true, both the racist premise upon which it is built and the subsequent outcome—the teaching of survival in terms of consumer skills—is problematic. In the first instance, "consumerism" despite being ideologically embedded and laden with certain values, is not problematized but presented uncritically. In addition, 'the consumer' is narrowly conceived as one who can find 'the best deals'. Thus, units on "shopping" focus on how to shop: how to compare prices and how to compare name brands. For example, the shopping unit in Canadian Conversations focuses on how to be a "good" consumer. A picture of two cans of peas (one small, one large) is shown with their respective prices and weights. The students are asked to answer questions such as:

Which can of peas is smaller?
Which can is cheaper?
Which can of peas is a better buy?
(from Canadian Conversations, Book 1, Carver, et al., 1993, p. 74)

A subsequent example in the same book has a section entitled, "Saving Money When You Shop" (p. 85) which lists several money saving techniques (i.e. shop in the discount stores, shop during sales, buy dark jackets and coats, make your own clothes, follow label instructions, buy socks and stockings in the same color) and asks students to discuss them. While arguably, being able to find inexpensive items may be important for newcomers with little money, the type of "skills" presented in such examples focus more
on how to do the business of shopping (which arguably is moot) than for example, on the language needed to be an informed consumer or the problems immigrants might have in attaining affordable goods. Furthermore, this approach to shopping lessons ignores the fact that many immigrants will shop in their own community markets/stores where they are available.

In summary, the construction of Survival ESL as a fixed, universal body of knowledge more or less reflects the traditional "banking" approach to pedagogy. Firstly, knowledge and skills are divorced from their larger social, political and cultural contexts. This artificial separation in turn, ignores the complexity of "needs" which immigrant learners have— social, psychological, and emotional, in addition to the economic. Secondly, learning is conceptualized as a one way process in that the teacher imparts the knowledge of "survival" onto the learners. However, within the empowerment framework outlined previously, learning must be dialectic. Subsequently, this dialectical process within Survival ESL must begin with the teacher learning the social and cultural realities of immigrants' lives, their knowledge of survival, and thus, their "needs" (see Wallerstein, 1983).

**Interested Knowledge and the Functional/Situational Syllabus**

The emphasis placed in Survival ESL on learning language and communication skills that enable students to function in their everyday lives is often expressed in terms of the situational/functional syllabus. [List these here: Wallerstein, 1983, p. 26 taken from both competency-based and notional functional models]. This framework organizes relevant content into certain communication tasks oriented to help students function in different
social situations. Thus, the situational/functional model uses language within its social context for specific social purposes (giving/asking for personal information; giving in opinions; expressing likes/dislikes). The logic motivating this model is that it provides opportunities for authentic and meaningful communication in 'real adult' situations. By using language within common, everyday situations, the situational/functional model concentrates on developing competencies in those situations (Auerbach & Burgess, 1986, p. 477). However, this selection, organization, and presentation of language and knowledge forms is always ideological and therefore, propagates a certain world view (Auerbach, 1995; Smith, 1987; Giroux, 1993).

Within Survival ESL, the aim to present authentic communication and situations has motivated the use of situationally realistic language activities as well as what has become known as "realia": job application forms, classified ads, and shopping flyers all represent examples of realia. The use of this "realia" in the classroom has been praised for its relevance, authenticity, and focus on language and knowledge as they are realized in the material world of language use. Thus, often texts provide "authentic" examples of language as it used (or suggestions for replacing those examples with something more appropriate to the specific community). For example, texts such as Welcome to Canadian English: a basic handbook for students living in Ontario (Butovsky & Podoliak, 1989) and English for Living and Working in Canada (McArthur, 1993), provide "real" examples of Canadian job application forms, health card applications, classified ads, and street maps.

Gilding (1994) however, has warned against the "lure" of the kinds of competency-based approaches which are characteristic of Survival ESL and Adult Basic
Education (ABE): 'while competency based curriculum can be a means of liberalizing the most mechanistic and instrumental forms of education, its basis for empowerment is only viable from the point of view of a critical literacy' (Gilding, p. 32). However, the competency-based approach promoted by the situational/functional paradigm of Survival ESL emphasizes only certain mechanistic and functionally driven outcomes. Thus "competency" is 'narrowly understood as a constellation of skills, knowledge and linguistic forms that are reduced to what can be observed in performance' (Gilding, p. 32). As a result, the situational-functional syllabus/curriculum adopts an ends-means approach which in turn operates within an assimilationist framework. In short, within the ends-means approach is the underlying assumption that learners should assimilate into preexisting structures and practices without questioning the power relations inherent in them. To the extent that objectives are framed in terms of the needs and demands of institutions rather than the learners, and content is limited to knowledge necessary to function according to externally defined norms, relations of domination and subordination are reinforced. (Auerbach, 1995, p. 14).

Thus, the situational/functional model concentrates on developing certain literacies and knowledges —the means— for gaining specific outcomes; namely the ability to function within an existing order.

As Rockhill (1987) has pointed out, it is within this context that we need to ask 'how, from the range of skills available, do certain ones become privileged as functional requirements and how do these in turn conform to particular cultural, gender and ideological prescriptions' (Rockhill, p. 160). Donaldo Macedo (1997) has called this emphasis on functioning and performing, the instrumentalist approach to learning language and knowledge: 'the instrumentalist approach leads to the development of 'functional literates', groomed primarily to meet the requirements of our contemporary
society' (Macedo, p. 39). The above examples represent bureaucratic forms of knowledge and skills which are required by institutions and are characteristic of more traditional orientations to pedagogy. Thus, within the context of the functional/situational syllabus, the emphasis is often placed on developing what Freire and Macedo (1987) have called a functional literacy. Skills and knowledge are narrowly conceived within the logic of the market place and "needs" are defined from an institutional perspective. It is precisely this kind of functional literacy which is required by all members to function within a highly industrialized capitalist and technocratic society (Freire & Macedo, p. 147). For example, many institutions such as banks, have moved to automated services in order to "save" money (re: increase their rate of profit): however, this is only possible if the members of that society have the language skills and knowledge to function within those contexts. As a result, the promotion of a functional literacy has implications for participation within the nation: civic participation is reduced to a static or formal understanding of membership (citizenship) such as the ability to pay taxes, vote, etc... Consequently, empowerment within the situation/functional model is reduced to the ability of individual learners to use certain forms of knowledge and linguistic skills to function within a given set of relations: relations which are generally characterized by coercive relations of power. Thus, the promotion of a functional literacy echoes the banking approach both in its instructional and social assumptions.

In addition, the situational/functional model within the context outlined above, has implications for the conceptualization of language learning itself; namely, not knowing English (i.e. in English Canada) is reduced to a merely technical problem to be overcome (see Chapter 1). When conceived in these terms, the larger issues of how
different power relations may restrict access to becoming literate in English or participating equally within the nation, are occluded from the curriculum (Sauve, 1990; see also Rockhill, 1987).27

Language in the 'Real World'? : Communicative Competence and Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative language teaching (CLT) stands as one of the cornerstones of Survival ESL curricula. The instructional assumptions underlying CLT are aligned with most progressive pedagogies in that CLT supports the view that language learning is most effective when communication is meaningful and relevant to the lives of the learners. Therefore, it is with this assumption that CLT aims to promote communicative activities that represent authentic communication which are both meaningful and contextualized. Moreover, in supporting a holistic view of language learning, CLT aims to integrate different language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) into each activity or lesson rather than teaching these skills in isolation. It is therefore within this context which CLT signals a move away from the more traditional approaches to language learning that tend to decompose language and isolate it from how it is used.

27 Furthermore, this emphasis on learning certain "functional" skills and bureaucratic forms of knowledge ignores the fact that immigrants from the same culture or country tend to form communities (either in terms of an extended family or a larger community) in which literacy skills are often distributed among different family or community members. See for example, see Burnaby & Klassen, 1993.
Traditional Pedagogy Revisited?

However "archaic" the traditional approach might seem, there is some question as to whether traditional pedagogies have really disappeared from the communicative language front. For example, many of the Survival ESL texts surveyed. The materials cited within this thesis are listed with the rest of the bibliographic references] emphasized the "memorization" of isolated vocabulary lists; however these exercises were often disguised in forms that made them appear more "communicative". One such example is illustrated in the housing unit (this was exemplary of the other units as well) in Canadian Crossroads (Frankel & Meyers, 1992, pp. 61 -72). In this example, the learning of vocabulary is essentially executed through the memorization of a list of vocabulary words which pertain to furnishing a house. However, this "memory work" is made to appear more "communicative" by "contextualizing" the vocabulary words with pictures. Students are then asked to "furnish" a house by putting the appropriate words in the appropriate rooms. There remains some question however, as to how "meaningful" this exercise really is. Firstly, the vocabulary itself is only contextualized through pictoral form and students are not actually using it for communication. (This exercise is however, a great deal more "meaningful" than just learning a list of vocabulary.) In addition, there is also some question as to how meaningful this exercise is within the broader context of the immigrants' lives. For example, the house that the learners are asked to furnish is a two story house with six rooms. Given the economic position that most immigrants generally hold within the nation, there is some question as to whether immigrants are likely to live in houses or apartments (which come with their own set of problems) and

---

28 As stated in chapter two, the texts surveyed were taken from an annotated bibliography which compiled a list of suitable LINC "survival" texts with a specific focus on Canada. see Cumming et al., 1993
more importantly, many newcomers probably would not have enough money to completely furnish their homes with furniture and appliances. Vocabulary pertaining to the problems that immigrants have in finding affordable housing or furniture and dealing with a recalcitrant landlord or an often unhelpful bureaucracy might be more "meaningful" with respect to the lives of the learners.

A similar example is illustrated in the "communicative" text *Expressways 1* (Molinsky & Bliss, 1988). In this text, basic linguistic structures such as the following are given in what is essentially a fill-in-the-blank/drill exercise:

A. Excuse me. Where are the______?
B. They are in Aisle ________.

(Molinsky & Bliss, p. 36)

In this example, learners are given a list of vocabulary (contextualized through pictoral form) and are asked to practice the dialogue by filling in the blanks with different words. The students repeat this structure a number of times and then are asked to "make" their own dialogues based on both the given structure and vocabulary list. Despite the fact that the above attempts to have students learn vocabulary within the context of an exchange between two people, this type of activity resembles more of a drill than a meaningful "communicative" exchange. The opportunities students have to "create" their own dialogue is reduced to a replication of the drill itself. While the incorporation of drill-like exercises are often part of the "eclectic" mix of pedagogical techniques characteristic of CLT where they are used as a means of practicing different language structures (Elson, 1983), the general purpose of these drills is to serve as a supplement to more meaningful exercises. In other words, these techniques may be used to introduce or reinforce a specific linguistic structure within the context of the whole lesson. Yet survival texts
such as the one cited above (see also, Canadian Concepts 1, Berish & Thibaudeau, 1997 and A New Start - Canada, Selman & Mrowicki, 1984 for similar examples) often use these drill-type exercises to constitute the totality of the lesson.

The use of dialogues has a central place within both CLT and consequently the survival curriculum as it offers a substantive means for contextualizing language. Dialogues offer the opportunity for students to learn different language skills simultaneously as well as the suprasegmental elements which also convey meaning in speech (i.e. tone, intonation, volume, etc.). In other words, the use of dialogues provides learners with an opportunity to learn language as it is used. It is in this respect that the use of 'the dialogue' within CLT stands in contrast to more traditional approaches which have students learn language outside of its social context. For example, a traditional pedagogy might present a list of sentences such as 'he is/are on time for his appointment', 'The shirt is/are red', etc., and have students choose the correct verb form. The focus in these examples is on having students learn the correct form rather than on being able to use that form to communicate. The use of dialogues within CLT however, attempts to move away from this approach motivated by the premise (which as argued is supported by the research) that students learn language best when it is made meaningful. Yet, as Auerbach and Burgess (1986) have argued, the use of dialogues within Survival ESL often still focuses only on the production of correct language forms in a way more reminiscent of a traditional pedagogical approach. Consider the following examples:

In this example, students are asked to practice this dialogue several times and then complete the same dialogue in a subsequent exercise by filling in the missing words.

Yuki: Rosa?
Rosa: Hi, Yuki.
Yuki: Hi. What are you doing?
Rosa: I'm going to the drugstore.
    What about you?
Yuki: I'm going to the bank.
Rosa: Are you in a hurry?
Yuki: No.
Rosa: Good. Let's go to the drugstore together.
Yuki: OK.

(from *Canadian Crossroads I*, Frankel & Meyers, 1992, p. 50)

In the subsequent section, students are asked to practice a similar dialogue.

Rosa: ABC brand razor blades, please.
Cashier: These?
Rosa: Yes. How much are they?
Cashier: They're $4.59.
Rosa: That's a good price.

(Frankel & Meyers, p. 52)

After practicing the dialogue several times, students are asked to "create" new sentences by substituting different words (which are given, i.e. Band-Aids, shampoo, etc..) and by responding appropriately in the last question as to whether the price is a "good" one or not. While both of these dialogues do contextualize the language as well as offer examples of language as it is spoken in the 'real world' (i.e. "Rosa?" instead of "Are you Rosa?")), the opportunity for meaningful communication is severely limited. In both of these examples these exercises resemble more of a drill than a dialogue in that students are asked to practice the same structures repeatedly and substitute vocabulary in order to memorize the given structure. Neither the language nor the knowledge forms presented are connected to any other meaningful communication. These fill-in-the-blanks type of exercises grossly oversimplify communicative interactions (see Rockhill, 1987). In other words, learners repeat dialogues and fill in the blanks as they would in a more traditional drill exercise.
In short, the examples above illustrate that despite Survival ESL's attempt to adopt CLT, in reality what is often is *practiced* is a more traditional approach to language learning which focuses primarily on the structure and recall of different language forms. This practice however, is inconsistent with the rhetoric of affirming learners' experiences as well as providing opportunities for meaningful communication. It is also inconsistent with the respect to the efficacy of language learning itself (Cummins, 1990).

Consequently, the practice of CLT in Survival ESL often appears in line with more traditional approaches yet, it disguises itself in progressive/communicative rhetoric. Once this disguise has been removed however, CLT looks a lot like the "old", decontextualized, traditional pedagogical approaches of the past. This in turn, undermines the instructional assumptions of the progressive pedagogies to which Survival ESL ostensibly subscribes.

*Contextualizing Reality: The 'Relevancy' of Survival ESL*

As previously argued, the use of dialogues to reflect everyday situations form an important part of the survival curriculum. Survival texts often use dialogues as a means of teaching language and other cultural/social information which are directly relevant to the lives of immigrant learners' lives. However, the survey of the curricular materials reveals that it is questionable as to whether the situations that are reflected in these dialogues are relevant to, and meaningful within, the social and cultural realities of newcomers' lives (Wallerstein, 1983; Auerbach & Burgess, 1985; Auerbach, 1986). For example, often the 'reality' that is portrayed reflects the reality and lifestyle of the middle class. Consider the following exercise in which learners are asked to develop a dialogue
for the following situations using expressions of strong or weak "like" or "dislike" in a "strong" or "weak" manner:

Situations
1. A friend asks a friend about a trip to Paris.
2. A wife asks a husband about a new dress she's bought.
3. A parent asks a child about a new type of breakfast cereal

(from Functioning In English, Mendelsohn, Laufer, & Seskus, 1984, p 28)

Although this exercise generally reflects progressive pedagogical principles in that it provides learners with an opportunity to build on their own knowledge and generate "new" language, these situations that learners are expected to respond to seem "unrealistic" with respect to the material realities of the students themselves. Thus, the irrelevance of the situation makes it more difficult for learners to develop appropriate language in that the situations are abstracted from their real life context. By not explicitly exploring the social implications of these situations and their relationship to the learners in the survival classroom, the fundamental instructional principle upon which Survival ESL lays claim —language is best learned when relevant to the learners— is undermined. Consequently, because the discourse of empowerment within Survival ESL is largely based on its meeting the linguistic and cultural needs of the learners, the failure to make the content (and therefore, the language) relevant, severely undermines the discourse.

In addition, lessons which attempt to incorporate language and situations which are more realistic with respect to the realities of newcomers' lives are sometimes problematic in that they often grossly oversimplify that reality (Wallerstein, 1983; Auerbach, 1986). Consider the following passage from a lesson on housing. Although the situation presented aims to portray a potential problem that newcomers might
encounter and thereby attempts to build on the language and cultural knowledge needed to confront that problem, the reality itself is somewhat oversimplified.

Turn On the Heat
...It was 3 degrees yesterday, and Mary Casella's apartment had no heat. Mrs. Casella's children were sick, and she was very upset. She turned on her oven, and she dressed the children in jackets and hats. She didn't know what else to do.

Mary Casella didn't know about the law in Weston: landlords have to give their tenants heat from October 15 to April 15 if the temperature inside is less than 20 degrees celsius.

What should you do if it's less than 20 degrees in your apartment and you don't have heat on or after October 15? First, call the building manager or landlord. Maybe he doesn't know there's no heat in your apartment. Or maybe there's a problem with the heat and he's fixing it.

What if your building manager isn't there and you have to leave messages for him? Wait just a day or two. Then call the Weston Housing Authority (WHA) at...

The WHA will help solve your problem. They'll send a representative to your house to check out the problem and to talk to the landlord. Your landlord will have to give you heat within 24 hours. If he doesn't turn the heat on, he'll have to pay the City of Weston $50 for every day you don't have heat.

(From Canadian Crossroads 3, Brod, Frankel, & Fuchs, 1993, p. 128)

The above passage is somewhat superficial in that although it offers learners information about their rights as tenants, it fails to portray the often experienced reality of slum landlords and a slow and (often) ineffective bureaucracy which is unable to solve the problem. The following example presents a similar rose-colored reality:

Ana's Pay Cheque is Wrong

Ana: I can really use this. Hm. That's strange.
Co-worker: What's the matter.
Ana: They haven't paid me my overtime.
Co-worker: Tell your foreman.
Ana: Excuse me, Jim. I think there's a mistake on my pay cheque.
Foreman: Oh! What's the problem?
Ana: I worked three hours overtime last week. I didn't get paid for it.
Foreman: Okay. Leave it with me. I'll look into it for you.
Foreman: Ana Pinto didn't get her overtime pay last week.
Secretary: Let me see. Look. You didn't claim any overtime for her.
Foreman: Are you sure? I must have forgotten. She worked three hours
Secretary: okay. Add the extra hours to your next time sheet. Tell her she'll
get her
money next week.
Ana: Did you get a chance to ask about my overtime?
Foreman: Oh yes? Don't worry. You'll get it in your next pay cheque.
(Butovsky & Podoliak, 1989, p. 246)

Despite the fact that both of the above examples offer "real-life" situations in
which immigrants may find themselves, the oversimplification of this reality belies the
problems which immigrants often encounter. For example, the reality of many immigrant
workers is that employers may be less than forthcoming in their compliance of labor
regulations. For immigrant workers, an unfamiliar system and lack of language and
cultural knowledge is intimidating and employers often rely on this intimidation to avoid
complying with labor regulations.

Other examples (English for Living and Working in Canada by McArthur, 1993)
advise students of their rights as employees for example, to refuse to do an unsafe job and
instruct them to take action such as informing the Employment Standards Board.
However, such examples, often oversimplify the reality of a bureaucracy which may take
years to act on a complaint and the immediate reality of needing money to feed children.
In a country where jobs are difficult to come by and pay wages that are barely livable, the
reality for many immigrants is that they are forced to tolerate less than honest employers.
Moreover, the "solutions" offered by these examples reflect an integrationist ideology in
that they offer individual and (often ineffectual) bureaucratic solutions. By contrast, a
transformative approach might explore more proactive "solutions". For instance, within
the context of the examples cited above, problems around housing or employment might be better addressed by forming a tenants' group or a labor union. Another alternative would be to leave the problem "open-ended" so that the learners might solve (see problem-posing in the next chapter).

The examples of CLT cited above are indicative of the type found within the Survival context. However, these are problematic given Survival ESL's commitment to a learner-centered and "empowering" pedagogy. In effect, these examples offer social and cultural knowledge that are "decontextualized from the lives of the learners. Moreover, the reflection of oversimplified realities and institutional "solutions" to the complex problems faced by immigrant learners echoes the integrationist ideology characteristic of the larger nation-state. In other words, the same social assumptions which operate hegemonically within the context of the nation are often reflected in, and propagated by, Survival ESL curricula. As a result, Survival ESL implicitly supports the coercive relations of power which operate within this context.

*Communicative Competence*

Within both CLT and the survival curriculum, one of the principle aims is to help students develop a communicative competence of the language. The notion of communicative competence explicitly recognizes the social nature of language and therefore, includes an understanding of how "we are able to use language in an appropriate way, socially and culturally as well as grammatically, in order to communicate [and interpret] a particular message in specific circumstances" (Elson, 1983, p. 23). As stated in the introduction to *Functioning In English*, "language forms are
seen as successfully conveying a particular meaning only if the language is linguistically and sociolinguistically correct" (Mendelsohn, et al., 1984). Thus, communicative competence includes learning the rules and conventions which govern communication: such as who can speak, what can be said, by whom, etc... Consequently, the use of dialogues is also fundamental to teaching communicative competence because dialogues offer the opportunity to include the cultural context for linguistic and social interaction. In other words, the dialogue and other similar progressive instructional tools give social and cultural information with respect to language behaviors in certain situations (Brechtold, 1993). However, in their design to teach socially appropriate language use and conventions, Survival ESL curricular materials often operate to shape the lives of immigrants' rather than reflect them (Auerbach, 1986): in other words, 'instead of describing an oversimplified reality, texts often prescribe particular roles for students' (Auerbach, & Burgess, 1985, p. 483; see also Tollefson, 1991, chap.5). For example, the following presents a communication activity around the situation of a job interview. Learners are asked to pair up and create a dialogue based on a job interview for employment as a waiter or waitress. A list of duties to be performed as well as the required experience of the potential employee are listed:

Duties
--to wait on tables
--to help the cook occasionally
--to help mix alcoholic beverages at the bar
--to work split shifts

Abilities or Knowledge
--fluent English
--knowledge of food in general
--knowledge of the kind of food in this particular restaurant
--fluency in the language of the country where the food originated
--the ability to get along well with people.
In the above example, learners are asked to assume the roles of the interviewee and interviewer and decide which of the above qualities/qualifications and characteristics would be most important in applying for the job. Subsequently, students are asked to compose a dialogue that incorporates these choices. Although both the interviewer and interviewee are represented here, the focus is specifically on the skills and knowledge of the person being interviewed which in effect implicitly represents the immigrant learner. Despite the fact that this example is subtle, the assumption underlying this exercise is that immigrant learners' will work at minimum wage jobs and therefore, their employment needs are restricted to this type of work. (I will address this further below.)

Consider also the following example:

Your First Job: Ana Gets a Job

a. Ana didn't work in Chile. She was a student.
b. Last week she went to a factory for a job.
c. She got the job.
d. She started yesterday.

(from Welcome to Canadian English: part 2. Butovsky & Podoliak, 1989, p. 133)

This example is a little more explicit with respect to prescribing certain expectations that immigrant learners might have about "succeeding" in their new society. However, in both examples the assumption about the reality of immigrants' lives and their subsequent linguistic and cultural needs are based on certain social assumptions that remain implicit and are informed by the common sense of the larger society rather than those realities and needs being defined by the immigrants themselves. Although the reality for many immigrant learners is that they must work minimum wage or low paying jobs, the lack of
analysis into for example, why this is the case\textsuperscript{29} "naturalizes" this situation and all of the common sense assumptions surrounding it. Moreover, the further assumption implicit in both of these examples is that immigrants should accept (and in even be grateful for) their marginalized position within the nation. Within Survival ESL, examples such as these clearly demonstrate the integrationist ideology. Although these language learning activities attempt to be empowering by addressing the realities of the learners' lives, they facilitate immigrants' integration into an existing order in which they are marginalized.

Moreover, the situational content and language conventions taught within the context of "communicative competence" are also often prescriptive in terms of behavior: the notion of communicative competence as it is manifest within the survival curriculum often prescribes certain socially and culturally acceptable behaviors which are taught as a set of language skills (Auerbach, 1986). For example, the lesson "Being Tactful" in Functioning in English (Mendelsohn, et al., 1984, p. 25) explicitly teaches "polite forms" which are required in certain social situations. The instructions read as follows;

"[s]ometimes we have to be polite about something or someone even though we do not really like them. This is called 'being tactful'" (Mendelsohn, et al., p. 15). The lesson goes onto to instruct students to build a dialogue around a given number of questions that have been asked by someone's father (from the dominant culture) at dinner:

1. How are you enjoying your stay in this city?
2. How do you find the food here?
3. What do you think of your English classes?

\textsuperscript{29} Although the assumption is that immigrants must work their way to better jobs: i.e. 'pay their dues'
Learners are also explicitly told they feel negatively about all of these things, but "must not offend anyone by being tactless" in their answers. In addition to the incredibly condescending tone which characterizes this lesson, learners are told that a tactless offence is defined in terms of a negative answer. This cultural "truth" is reinforced by the example in the text that precedes this exercise in which the person responds affirmatively despite the fact that she does not agree. However, this exchange is not neutral but rather is layered with assumptions about what constitutes appropriate behavior for people with different status in society — yet these power relations remain unnamed. For example, the above places "the father" in a symbolic position of "authority". Thus, the symbolic authority of the father to whom the learners (who have relatively "less" power in this social exchange) must respond is analogous to the position of the immigrant newcomer in a new country. The father holds more power and it is within this power differential that students are told they must not be offensive. In addition, what is considered offensive in this context is their feelings about their new society. The implication here is greatly problematic in that it suggest that to reveal the problems which learners may have is (culturally) offensive. Consequently, this example supports the argument put forth by Auerbach and Burgess (1985) which contends that Survival ESL curricula often overemphasize passive behaviors and polite forms as the sociolinguistically correct responses for immigrant learners.

It is also worth pointing out that women and men would respond differently in this situation: i.e. due to the power relations of the larger society. For example, immigrant men hold more symbolic power in society as men and therefore, would be viewed as
closer to the status of the father. Consequently, a male immigrant speaker would probably "be allowed" more latitude with respect to his honesty.

Other examples that use situationally relevant dialogues to convey sociolinguistically appropriate behaviors and cultural conventions (unproblematically) present more implicit relations of power that characterize the "everyday". Consider the following two examples which involve an exchange between a doctor and patient.

A. My stomach hurts.
B. when did it start?
   A. This morning.
   B. Does it hurt when I touch your stomach?
   A. a little.
   B. You might have appendicitis.
   A. is that dangerous?
   B. Maybe, I'll take some tests.
   A. Do I have to go to the hospital?
   B. no

B. your tests are negative, so you're okay.
A. but I still have pain in my stomach.
B. I'll give you a prescription for some pills. Take the pills three times a day.
A. thanks doctor.
(from Speaking of Survival, Freeman, 1982, p. 13)

A: OK, Tony. Let's check you out. Open your mouth, and stick out your tongue. Say a-h-h-.
B: A-h-h-h
   A. Inhale, exhale, inhale.
   B. I'm sorry. I don't understand.
   A.(demonstrates). Breathe in, breathe out, breathe in.
   B. O.K.
   A. You need some medicine, Tony. Here's your prescription.
   B. Thanks, Doctor. I'll take care of it right away.
(from English for Adult Competency, Keltner, Howard, & Lee, 1990, p. 57-58).

In both examples, accompanying exercises serve to check the comprehension of the dialogue (i.e. with respect to the surface features of the language). The power relationship between the patient and the doctor is self-evident, however, it remains
implicit with respect to the lesson. In both these examples, the patient (who represents
the learner) consents to the doctor's requests and medical advice without question despite
the fact that the patient's illness remains a mystery to the patient.

Thus, the examples provided above demonstrate how normative behaviors and
codes determine the appropriateness of language and language use (Wardhaugh, 1986, p.
309). Moreover, the notion of communicative competence is an explicit attempt to locate
language use within the larger social and cultural spheres. While this is definitely a
progressive step in recognizing the socio-cultural nature of language, the notion of
communicative competence (both the notion itself and how it is reflected in the curricular
materials) fails to locate "appropriate language use" within the larger sphere of power
relations which in turn, directly determine what is appropriate. In other words,
sociolinguistic conventions are not culturally and socially neutral practices: the issues of
who speaks, when, how, and to whom are governed by how the interlocutors are
organized in relation to both society in general and to one another. Linguistic and
cultural conventions are guided by "common sense" assumptions about appropriate
behavior: however, it is precisely through this appeal to common sense that coercive
relations of power are obscured.

Consequently, a notion of communicative competence which occludes issues of
power is not only myopic but fails to reflect the reality of language use in peoples' lives
(Peirce, 1993; Fairclough, 1989). Within Survival ESL curricula, the notion of
communicative competence needs to be extended beyond the rules of use in a particular
society "to include an understanding of the way rules of use are socially and historically
constructed" (Peirce, 1993, p. 15). As a consequence of this exclusion within the
Survival context, the curriculum fails to consider how immigrants who are located at the periphery of the nation experience these conventions. Thus, it is also within this context that the notion of communicative competence within the context of Survival ESL curriculum often functions within an assimilationist framework.

**Culture and the Survival ESL Curriculum**

Cultural orientation is one of the fundamental goals of Survival ESL (Wallerstein, 1983; Baril, 1993); however, one of the most problematic aspects of Survival ESL is the teaching of culture. Robert Courcherene (1996) has explicitly addressed this problematic. He writes,

> One of the most difficult problems teachers face on a daily basis is how to strike a balance between what they perceive should be taught in terms of Canadian culture—they realize students are going to need this knowledge to succeed in society—and the integration of cultural knowledge from students from other countries, also part of Canadian culture (Courcherene, p. 13).

He continues however, to argue that some teachers 'are no longer confident or feel comfortable teaching Canadian traditions such as Christmas for fear that they may be accused of not giving equal time to all cultural traditions or that they may offend' (Courchene, p. 13, [emphasis mine]). Thus, Courchene asks, "As Canadians, do we not have the right to use this symbol as it is closely tied to our culture and history? Do we not have the right to teach our traditions?" (Courcherene, p. 13). However, in the first instance, Courcherene clearly establishes the us/them dichotomy which is integral to the maintenance of the capitalist nation-state. *Who* are the Canadians he is addressing? Secondly, his vision of Canadian culture is both ethnocentric and class-biased.
Courcherene equates the symbols of a specific tradition to what he perceives to be

*Canadian*. This tradition however, references the European, Judeo-Christian past and a history predicated on subsequent colonization. Yet it is this ethnocentric view of Canadian culture which is prevalent in the survival materials. Furthermore, this *vision* erases the power relations which have established this exclusionary version of Canada and Canadian identity. Consequently, Courcherene endorses a common sense notion of culture: an endorsement which is common place in the survival curricular materials. For example, *Canadian English Made Easy* (Berish & Thibaudeau, 1994) presents culture as a thematic unit which focuses on "Canadian" holidays and celebrations (such as Christmas, Thanksgiving, Canada's "Birthday", Easter, Valentine's Day, etc..) and incorporates this cultural content into different language activities. Most of these units concentrate on what people — "Canadians" — do, what they eat, and a limited explanation of why these traditions exist and certain holidays celebrated (cf. *A Canadian Conversation Book*, Carver et al., 1993). Many of the celebrations which have become the hallmark of Canadian culture such as Canada's "birthday" (confederation day) or Thanksgiving are directly tied to the (ongoing) colonization of the Aboriginal Peoples. Subsequently, these are not celebrated by all "Canadians". Moreover, this unproblematic presentation of such Canadian traditions erases the (often violent and continued) history of exclusion in which they were born. In addition, this prejudicial presentation of culture circumscribes critical inquiry into why certain groups such as the Aboriginal peoples suffer gross inequities in status and distribution of national resources.³⁰

³⁰ In addition, these holidays are infused with consumerism. Many Canadian holidays and "traditions" involve for example, the exchange of gifts: however, the problems of those who cannot afford to do so or do not have enough money to eat are not addressed.
Other books such as *Canadian Concepts I* (Berish & Thibaudeau, 1997) present "Canadian Capsules" within each unit which amount to "sound bites" of cultural information. For example, capsules such as the following serve to infuse the curriculum with specifically "Canadian content": "The Aboriginal Peoples of Canada are the Inuit of the Arctic and First Nations of other parts of Canada" (Berish & Thibaudeau, p. 72); "You can be a citizen after three years" (p. 71); "It is very important to be on time for business meetings in Canada" (p. 73). Other examples (i.e. *English for Living and Working In Canada*, McArthur, 1993) teach Canadian culture by describing different Canadian institutions such as the structures of government. Despite this variety of approaches, all of these examples not only offer a grossly oversimplified and unrealistic version of Canadian culture, but they reify the culture itself by transforming it into a set of knowable facts --dates, celebrations, holidays-- to be subsequently learned, subscribed to, and practiced by the outsider. Thus, this orientation to culture not only belies culture's inherently dynamic and social nature, but locates immigrant learners outside of that knowledge. Consequently, this approach to teaching culture most closely represents traditional pedagogies: immigrant learners are explicitly situated as passive recipients of the target culture. Acculturation in the classroom is conceptualized as a one-way process and subsequently, alternative cultural identities are occluded. In sum, this orientation to teaching culture is exclusionary and echoes the discourse of nationalism. Hence, this "common sense" presentation of culture epitomizes the banking approach to education, the limitations of which have been clearly articulated by Cummins & Sayers; traditional pedagogy aims to indoctrinate, both in its instructional and social goals. Facts are to be memorized, religious or cultural truths internalized, inquiry circumscribed, and contradictions obscured. The goal may appear laudable —to build a strong culture—but a culture whose
identity is based on ignorance of all around it is living in a fool's paradise. (Cummins & Sayers quoted in Cummins, 1996, p. 155)

In effect, this orientation to teaching culture within Survival ESL curricula betrays the discourse of empowerment upon which it rests.

The other orientation to teaching Canadian culture witnessed throughout the Survival curricular materials is one which seems to be more in line with progressive pedagogies. These approaches (there were notably fewer of these) implicitly tend to recognize both the multicultural reality of Canada and the importance of including learners' own cultural knowledges in the curriculum. However, many of these attempts to be more inclusive often result in tokenism or what Bannerji has called an "exoticization of the Other" (Bannerji, 1996). Many texts limit this progressive multiculturalism to the representation of learners from different cultural backgrounds: these textbook characters (or caricatures) then exchange information (Berish & Thibaudeau, 1994, 1997). Other examples ask the students themselves to exchange cultural information in the form of a comparison. For example, in the Take Part series (Pietrusiak & Brady, 1986), Canadian "cultural notes" are included at the end of each unit. At this point, students are encouraged to compare cultural information such as how different customs around birthdays are celebrated in different countries to Canadian culture (see Pietrusiak & Brady, 1986, Teacher's Manual, p. 10). Although these examples appear to be somewhat more progressive in that they ostensibly support classroom collaboration and highlight the exchange of student generated knowledge, this approach still implicitly upholds the dominant Canadian culture (by this I refer to one which is representative of the dominant class in Canada) as the norm against which other cultures are measured. In the first
instance, the comparison is clearly demarcated within a dichotomous logic. It becomes a comparison between "us" (Canadians) and "them" (immigrants); "your country" and "Canada". While this type of exchange has the potential to discuss the disparities between the two cultures, for example, in terms of status, critical inquiry is circumscribed through the benign exchange of differences. This attempt to be more inclusive is problematic in a system which positions immigrant learners as "Others" and implicitly posits difference as a deficit, for example, with respect to integration (Shore, 1994, p. 55).

Secondly, this orientation to teaching culture fails to examine the issue of cultural difference as it is experienced within the dominant culture, for example, in terms of cultural conflict. Cultural conflict manifests itself in many interactions both within and outside the family as immigrants attempt to negotiate and fuse cultural identities. Consequently, despite the attempt by some survival curricula to be more inclusive these attempts tend to result in tokenism. This attempt to "include" learners own cultures and knowledges through a "sharing" and "celebration" approach characteristic of progressive pedagogical orientations, in effect, ignores the fact that not all those in Canada have the same status. Attempting to create a "positive" classroom atmosphere by concentrating on the celebration and exchange of "cultural difference" rather than on the material realities and effects of inequalities that result from this "difference" is not only naive with respect to empowering learners, but is consequently hegemonic. The erasure of issues of power in which these differences are constructed within Survival ESL curricula upholds the hegemony of Canadian multiculturalism which facilitates the myth of inclusivity at the national level and subsequently, operates to neutralize dissent and naturalize the inherent inequalities.
Cultural Capital

Wallerstein, (1983) has rightly argued that 'we need to teach the appropriate manner by which to get around in the dominant culture' (Wallerstein, p. 6). This includes teaching immigrant learners about "normative" dominant cultural behaviors, social conventions, and ways of speaking, as well as providing information about that culture's customs, celebrations, and traditions. In fact, to withhold this information is to disadvantage immigrant learners: there is no denying that there exists negative ramifications for those who do not conform to certain cultural conventions. Subsequently, one of the arguments put forth in favor of teaching learners the "dominant" Canadian culture — both its traditions and conventions — is to give them access to a certain cultural capital. The concept of cultural capital has been described by Levine (1990) as 'the ability to gain access to the generalized social approval, standing and legitimacy that flow from a capacity to understand particular symbolic forms and codes' (Levine, 1990, p. 13). In other words, cultural capital is more than just a way of behaving, it's a way of being in the world: of speaking, thinking, moving, dressing, etc.,.

In the first instance, the idea that one can "teach" cultural capital is problematic due to the subtle and nuanced nature of culture. In this respect, certain aspects of cultural capital cannot be taught as if it were a skill. More significantly, cultural capital is not neutral but reflects the "ways of being" of a certain class, namely the dominant class. Not only does the teaching of cultural knowledge and culturally appropriate conventions often negate learners' identities, values, and experiences — as well as their own cultural capital (see Freire & Macedo, 1987) — but it also normalizes certain practices which are invested with the world view of the dominant class. Consequently, the cultural capital of the
dominant class is hegemonic: it is both a tool and a product of a certain set of unequal relations and operates to validate and normalize certain 'ways of being' while simultaneously devaluing others (see Wink, 1997).

Moreover, to assume that cultural capital is simply about learning a specific way of *functioning* symbolically which automatically enables a person to gain access to a certain status is erroneous. Not everyone has the same access to the dominant culture's capital. Yet the concept of cultural capital itself often elevates culturally specific practices to the status of universal and obscures the fact that not everyone has the same access (see Auerbach, 1995). For example, immigrants of color who speak with an accent have a "marked" difference in Canada which precludes access to the same cultural capital as a white Anglo, Canadian. In other words, learning appropriate symbolic forms and codes of the dominant culture does not mean that all people with this knowledge will be treated equally. The following quote by June Jordan is incisive:

A few days ago, a white woman telephoned to ask me to appear on her television program: she felt free to tell me that if I sounded "Black" then she would not "hire" me. This is what I am trying to say to you: language is power. And that woman is simply one of the ruling powerful people in white America who feel free to reject and strangle whoever will not [or cannot] mimic them — in language, values, goals. (June Jordan quoted in Rockhill & Tomic, 1995, p. 209)

Because 'cultural capital' operates hegemonically within the nation to normalize certain behaviors which are inscribed with power, it is imperative to make this hegemony. Learners can critically engage with the dominant culture's capital while affirming their own. Thus, this critical engagement with normative behaviors and conventions of the new culture allows learners to choose to some extent, what types of behaviors they want to endorse or at least be aware that certain cultural conventions, etc. are invested with
power. Therefore, a critical engagement with the notion of cultural capital de-naturalizes certain modes of being. To do otherwise within the context of Survival ESL is to engage in the ideology of "civilization" which often characterizes the global spread of English (see Pennycook, 1994) and subsequently, is also implicit within Survival ESL itself.

Summary

Despite the fact that Survival ESL links language to its broader social context, its failure to examine the political nature of that context is problematic and ultimately supports an integrationist framework. Survival ESL's endorsement of progressive pedagogical techniques and its claim to help learners integrate into the larger society serve as the basis for its claim to a discourse of empowerment. Subsequently, learner's needs are defined in terms of enabling learners to function within an existing social order: an order characterized by coercive relations of power and an order in which immigrants as a social group are marginalized. Moreover, learning English, "is touted as the key to success: however, what is often obscured is how that success it limited by power relations" (Walsh in Auerbach, 1995, p. 12) as these are organized institutionally, discursively, and in everyday life. This is not to argue that there is no room in the survival curriculum for a transformative approach; however, within the present Survival ESL curriculum (as it is represented in the published curricular materials), the empowerment of learners is narrowly conceived. Thus, in effect, the current survival paradigm is framed in such a way that mutually excludes any substantive participation within the nation. Consequently, Survival ESL's failure to engage in a transformative
pedagogy ultimately facilitates and "naturalizes" the inequality which characterizes the
capitalist nation-state.

Hence, in the final chapter, I will briefly outline what a transformative Survival
ESL curriculum might look like, and argue that a radical shift in the survival paradigm is
necessary in order for it to be genuinely learner centered and empowering.
CHAPTER 6

Reconceptualizing the Survival ESL Curriculum

In order to develop a transformative and therefore, genuinely "learner-centred" and "empowering" Survival ESL curriculum, a reconceptualization of the survival framework is imperative. One of the overall goals of Survival ESL is to promote "life skills" or "survival" English and cultural orientation in order to enable immigrant learners to participate within the larger context of their new society. It is within this context that the Survival ESL claims to empower learners. However, a reevaluation of this "survival" paradigm is needed. We need to ask, 'how empowering is a framework which infantilizes immigrants, imposes upon them certain identities such as "illiterate", and positions immigrant learners on the periphery of the survival curriculum?'. As Freire has argued, one of the fundamental aspects of any liberatory — i.e. empowering — pedagogy is the conceptualization of learners as active agents of culture not passive recipients of history (Freire & Macedo, 1987) —this includes the culture of their new society. Therefore, in order for Survival ESL to be genuinely learner-centered and empowering we need to critically examine how immigrant learners are positioned within the survival paradigm and subsequently, reconceptualize learners in terms of survivors. In other words, we need a radical shift in the survival paradigm. In the first instance, immigrant learners must be placed at the center of curriculum development. This means that curriculum development must begin with immigrant learners' knowledge of survival and with their standpoint as "outsiders" within the nation. In this way, immigrant learners begin by defining their own needs and drawing upon their knowledge and life experiences, rather than having the
teacher (or the text) begin with her/his perceptions of what that survival entails. It is in this way that a survival curriculum can begin to be genuinely learner-centered.

In order to develop a Survival ESL curriculum which is learner-centered and empowering, a reconceptualization of language learning itself is also needed. Like education in general, learning a language is not a neutral process: and thus, like education, learning a language — particularly within the context of Survival ESL — can either be a tool for domestication (i.e. assimilation) or liberation (Freire, 1995; Freire & Macedo, 1987). Liberation however, can only come about when people are able to use language to critically engage with the world around them. Hence, learning a language is not merely a matter of acquiring a skill like for example, learning how to cook, but is a fundamentally political act which has deeper ideological and social implications.

However, within Survival ESL, not knowing English is more or less viewed as a technical barrier to be overcome and therefore, learning the language is viewed as neutral and “pragmatic”. Thus, despite survival ESL’s commitment to progressive pedagogies (such as CLT) which signify a more holistic approach to learning — an approach which also takes into consideration the learner’s own experience as an affective factor — its failure to critically engage with the ideological underpinnings of both the classroom and the world beyond has implicitly supported a functional or integrationist framework. This integrationist approach in turn, promotes a functional literacy which aims to enable learners to function within the existing society. This is problematic considering that within the existing society immigrants are marginalized. Moreover, Survival ESL also fails to overtly politicize language and language use. This too is problematic considering the inherently political nature of language itself. Language is a primary site in which the
social relations of the nation are organized. It is through language that we construct and negotiate our identities and validate our experiences. In short, language is the primary site in which we make sense of the world in which we live. It is also through language that the existing unequal relations of the capitalist nation-state are naturalized as common sense. Thus, language is hegemonic. However, hegemony is never totalizing and therefore, language also offers the opportunity of developing a counter-hegemony: a means of resisting and transforming the relations in which we live. It is within this political context that learning a language must be reconceptualized in terms of developing a critical literacy. The development of a critical literacy is best understood in terms of moving beyond learning the technical aspects of language—the word—to enabling learners to use language to critically engage with the larger sphere of society—the world—and therefore work to actively transform the conditions in which they live (Freire & Macedo, 1987). The critical literacy framework views education as a process: a process that learners engage in, or are subjected to. Thus, by promoting a critical literacy, Survival ESL is able to move beyond instrumentalist approaches to learning English which are inherently integrationist to developing a curriculum which works towards transformation of the existing relations. In other words, in order for Survival ESL to be genuinely empowering it must adopt a transformative pedagogy which develops a critical literacy: anything less is an education for domestication not liberation (Freire, 1995).

Empowerment within the current survival paradigm is narrowly conceived in terms of enabling learners to function within the larger society—to fill out job applications, to read the telephone book, to write cheques and pay bills, to compare prices at the supermarket, etc. Empowerment is reduced to the individual learner's ability to
perform these functions within an existing set of relations. By contrast, critical literacy is concerned with developing an awareness about how that larger sphere operates to shape our lives and works to enable us to act upon this sphere—not merely function within it. Thus, empowerment within the critical literacy framework is viewed in terms of enabling learners to critically engage with the world around them and to act—both as individuals and as members of a community—in it (Freire, 1995; Freire & Macedo, 1987). Within the framework of critical literacy, learners are encouraged to locate themselves within the larger society and identify their own problems, solutions, and goals. Consequently, the development of a critical literacy is crucial for meaningful participation.(Cummins, 1996).

Reconceptualizing Integration

One of the primary objectives of Survival ESL is to facilitate immigrants' participation within, and integration into, the larger society. However, as previously argued, the concept of integration as it operates within the discourses of nationalism and Survival ESL is problematic as it operates to facilitate the integration of immigrants into a nation in which that integration is already precluded by virtue of their perceived "differences". In other words, integration works ideologically within a society to justify the exclusion and low status of certain social groups within the nation-state.

Despite its ideological workings, integration is nevertheless necessary to enable newcomers to participate within the larger society. Immigrant newcomers need the linguistic and cultural knowledge of the dominant culture in order to become members of that society. Hence, to deny immigrant newcomers the opportunity to integrate is in itself
exclusionary. Integration therefore, seems to pose somewhat of a paradox. Is there anyway to escape the ideology of integration?

In the first instance, Survival ESL (both its discourse and practice) needs to explicitly examine *HOW* integration operates hegemonically. The social and ideological assumptions which are buried within the concept itself need to be excavated and articulated. Therefore, certain questions need to be addressed by both practitioners and theorists: 'what it is that immigrants are integrating into?' and 'how is this integration conceived?' Using these questions as a point of entry allows for a re-visioning of both society itself and an integration which is inclusive. This re-visioning however, does not romanticize the larger society, but rather begins with a confrontation of the coercive relations of power which characterize that society. Consequently, this critical inquiry aids both teachers and learners to uncover the unconscious assumptions which underwrite the ideology of integration and obscure the power relations which support nationalism's exclusivity. Thus, through an interrogation of integration as a concept, learners can begin to actively negotiate their own integration. Within the context of the survival classroom this means that an intercultural orientation must define the overall framework of the curriculum (see Cummins, 1996, p. 138). An intercultural approach views learners' cultures, languages, and knowledge as adding to the classroom rather than being a barrier to integration. Within the context of the classroom acculturation and education are two-way processes. Thus, through both an intercultural orientation in the classroom and a critical engagement with the larger society (i.e. through the development of a critical literacy), immigrants and teachers can engage in an integration which empowers learners to (substantively) participate within the larger society.
Problem-Posing: A Transformative "alternative" to Survival ESL

In order for a curriculum to be genuinely learner-centered and empowering, it must engage in a critical or transformative pedagogy. Transformative approaches attempt to confront the coercive relations of power which characterize the larger society by developing a critical literacy in the language learning classroom. Only within this context can learners participate in any meaningful way within the nation. Critical pedagogical approaches to language learning explicitly recognize the political nature of language and language use, and therefore promote a critical engagement with language (Pennycook, 1990; Bee, 1993). Moreover, critical pedagogical approaches explicitly explore both the educational, social, and ideological implications of that pedagogy. This means and explicit articulation of both the instructional and social assumptions which underlie the Survival curriculum.

All of the materials illustrated in chapter five, could be used within a transformative framework. For example, a critical or transformative pedagogy might have immigrant learners inquire into how the realities presented in the textbook are different from their own and why they think that is so. Only through this type of critical engagement, one which goes beyond a commitment to progressive instructional techniques, can a pedagogy within Survival ESL claim to empower its learners. In the last section, I will briefly outline one example of a transformative pedagogy which has been applied to the Survival ESL curriculum. This model has been developed by Nina Wallerstein and Elsa Roberts Auerbach (Wallerstein, 1983; Auerbach & Wallerstein, 1987) who have taken Paulo Freire's concept of problem-posing31 and applied it to

31 See for example, Freire & Macedo, 1987.
Survival ESL. Problem-posing offers a transformative framework for Survival ESL curricula which focuses on the development of critical literacy within the context of second language learning and cultural orientation. Within this framework, "empowerment" is understood as more than enabling immigrant learners to "function" within society. Empowerment is understood in terms of enabling learners to analyze their problems and act to transform the conditions within which they live (Wallerstein, 1983; Auerbach & Wallerstein, 1987; Freire & Macedo, 1987).

Problem Posing: What is it?

Problem-posing as a pedagogy uses inductive questions about certain situations which are related to the lives of the immigrant learners in the classroom. 'Problem-posing seeks to draw out students' shared experiences of society through questions which are posed so that students can draw their own conclusions" (Wallerstein, 1983, p. 17). Pictures, dialogues, role plays, etc. are all used to generate the language and content of the classroom. These "codes" are used to initiate critical thinking about these situations and are subsequently crucial to developing a critical literacy of the language. Although, it is the instructor's responsibility to initially choose codes which are relevant to the lives of the learners in the classroom, the instructor's choice is not based on his or her perception of survival in the everyday world (although this knowledge is not discounted) but rather through listening to and observing the learners themselves -- their greetings, their absences, their cross-cultural behaviors, their informal conversations, their daily

---

32 Or "codification's" Freire's terms, see Wallerstein, 1983, p. 9.
concerns, important celebrations. Thus, once the learners are comfortable, they may want to bring in their own "codes".

There are essentially five steps in the problem-posing approach. The first involves describing the content or feelings evoked by the code (picture, dialogue, role play, etc..) presented. Secondly, learners are asked to define the problem or describe what they think the problem might be. The third step involves learners' discussing how the situation applies to them. Learners are thereby able to share similar experiences with others in the classroom. Fourth, learners are asked to address the problem itself. They are asked why they think it is happening and how it is connected to the larger social, cultural, and historical context. Thus, in the fourth step, learners are asked to make the connections between the problems in their own lives and the larger societal context. Finally, in the fifth step, learners are asked to offer alternatives or solutions to the problem.

*Dialogue, Critical Thinking, Action*

Central to problem-posing is the concept of dialogue. Unlike the dialogues presented in the previous chapter, the Freirean concept of dialogue goes beyond this common sense understanding of dialogue as "conversation". The goal of dialogue in the problem-posing classroom is critical thinking and action (Wallerstein & Auerbach, 1987, p.1). Thus, dialogue is the manner in which learners engage in a critical inquiry into the forces which shape and give meaning to their lives and subsequently, ends in action (Wallerstein, 1983, p. 16). Action involves learners seeing themselves as actors: not just

---

33 I avoid the use of "method" because of its prescriptiveness (see Pennycook's discussion, 1989).
actors in the language classroom but as individuals who can see the larger causes of their problems and subsequently have a vision for how things can be better (Auerbach & Wallerstein, 1987, p. 6). Action therefore, is not a neutral process but is overtly political in its connection between the classroom (the site of instruction) and the larger community (society). The five steps outlined above are the "tools for dialogue" which include critical thinking and action. Consequently, the process of dialogue as it is actualized through the five steps of problem-posing, allows learners to define their own educational and "survival" needs.

**Problem-posing in the language classroom**

The language that is generated in the classroom during these five steps becomes the focus for the language lesson itself: teachers use learner generated sentences, dialogues, and role plays as the subject of the "language lesson". Thus, instructors are able to concentrate on the linguistic structures, vocabulary, and social information within this context. From an instructional perspective, problem-posing allows instructors to engage with progressive pedagogical tools and instructional techniques in order to teach or reinforce the language. At the same time, the linguistic and thematic content of the lesson is generated by the learners themselves, thereby ensuring that both are meaningful and relevant to them. Consequently, learners in the problem-posing classroom develop and control their own curriculum.

In addition, problem-posing offers a viable approach to dealing with the diversity of the Survival ESL classroom. In the first instance, because the structure of the problem-posing class moves from being descriptive to being more analytic (i.e. from describing a
certain code to analyzing the broader implications, etc.), this approach is suitable for learners of all levels including beginners (see the examples offered by Wallerstein, 1983 and Auerbach & Wallerstein, 1987). Moreover, this structure allows learners to take up the language to the extent of their own abilities. Consequently, problem-posing is suitable for a multi-levelled classroom.

Also, because problem-posing is focused on the process, it allows for a diversity of experiences to be reflected. It also allows for a critical, feminist, anti-racist, approach within the classroom. Problem-posing begins with the learner’s standpoint and thus, issues, such as those concerning women, do not merely become an adjunct to the curriculum, but rather are part of the process of becoming literate in the second language (see Schenke, 1991). Cummins (1990) has argued that in order for a curriculum to be both effective from a learning perspective and empowering, learners need to be “actively involved in generating their own knowledge rather than ... [being] passive recipient’s of other people’s knowledge” (Cummins, p. 8). Through problem-posing learners are active in generating knowledge: knowledge of their problems, knowledge of solutions, in short, knowledge of survival. In aiming to develop a critical literacy, problem-posing encourages learners to locate themselves and therefore, 'does not impose a version of liberation onto learners but rather takes cues from the lives of the learners themselves as to what knowledge has the most liberatory potential and worth' (Bee, 1993, p. 122; see also Schenke, 1991).
Summary

Only through the adoption of a transformative or critical pedagogical framework can Survival ESL succeed in developing a curriculum which is genuinely learner-centered and empowering. Thus, the overall goal of any "Survival" curriculum must not be "survival" per se nor "integration" as it is presently conceived, but rather the development of a critical literacy. A transformative framework which attempts to develop a critical literacy explicitly recognizes that "both the language classroom and the larger society are complex sites of social interaction and are therefore, not places of 'neutral' language transactions' (Toohey & Scholefield, 1994, p. 2). In short, this critical approach recognizes the inherently political nature of language and language use as well as the political relationship between education and the larger society. Only through the development of a critical literacy can an ESL curriculum for immigrant newcomers move beyond mere "survival" to an education for meaningful citizenship (regardless of legal status). Hence, the development of a critical literacy creates a counter-hegemony that challenges the present inequities and offers alternative ways of perceiving and living in the everyday world.
Conclusion

The advent of Survival ESL has been viewed as a progressive step towards second language education for newcomers. In the first instance, its engagement with progressive pedagogical objectives and instructional techniques such as communicative language teaching, communicative competence, and the situational/functional syllabus signals both a recognition of the inherently social nature of language and a commitment to a more holistic approach to language learning. The endorsement of these pedagogical tools also signals a commitment to the immigrant learner him/herself. It is within this context that Survival ESL works to meet the specific "survival" needs—both linguistic and cultural—of adult newcomers in order that they may participate in their new societies. Hence, it is also within the context of these progressive pedagogical tools and the design to meet the needs of immigrant learners that Survival ESL lays claim to a discourse of empowerment.

However, the context within which Survival ESL is situated is characterized by the inequality of the nation-state. Ideologies of racism, sexism, and class operate within the larger society to organize, negotiate, and perpetuate a certain set of unequal relations: a set of relations in which immigrants as a group suffer. Consequently, these unequal relations belie the fundamental principles of universal equality and democracy that were the foundation of the capitalist nation-state. Moreover, an examination of its historical development reveals that this inequality is an integral part of its existence. Thus, despite its discourse of universal equality, the capitalist system itself is predicated upon unequal relations and therefore, inequality is a structural requisite of the capitalist nation-state.

Yet the discourse of nationalism is one of inclusivity based on the "imagined community"
of the nation which in turn, is premised upon its perceived homogeneity. Consequently, the ideologies of racism, sexism, and class operate to reconcile this inherent disparity by excluding certain groups internal to the nation. It is therefore within this context that certain groups of migrants have been excluded from equal participation in the nation. In the first instance, however, migration itself is inherent to the capitalist system: in contrast to, for example, the feudal system, capitalist relations required the migration of people; yet only certain groups of migrants were racialized as "immigrants". Thus, ideologies such as racism were (and continue to be) fundamental to constructing perceived essential differences (such as "race", language, culture) which set certain groups outside of the "homogeneous" nation. In short, since the very establishment of the capitalist nation-state, "immigrants" as a social group have inserted into the nation an "unacceptable" Other, thus, reconciling its inherent contradiction.

It is therefore within this context that the ideology of integration has been fundamental to the maintenance of the myth of the homogeneous nation. The ideology of integration as it operates within the discourse of nationalism, supports the idea of a preexisting homogenous unit and defines the integration of certain groups of migrants into that unit as a priori problematic due to their "essential" differences. (In some cases this integration is precluded altogether.) Consequently, it is this failure to integrate (i.e. these differences) which justifies the exclusion of "immigrants" from equal participation. In addition, it is important to note that the "everyday" or common sense use of the category "immigrant" operates differently from its formal understanding. Technically, "immigrant" refers to a certain legal status. However, its common sense use refers to certain social groups regardless of their legal status. These social groups are racialized
and are constructed as "immigrants" (re: outsiders) despite the fact that they may have been here for generations. This category subsequently serves to naturalize the exclusion of certain social groups within the nation. It is this "common sense" use that has implications for Survival ESL.

The question however, remains of how this inequality is maintained, legitimated and becomes a "natural" part of our everyday world. The concept of hegemony as developed by Antonio Gramsci, serves to explain how this consent is won and how the ideologies of racism, sexism, and class constitute our "cultural" frame of reference. Hence, hegemony helps to explain how certain ideas of the ruling class — ideas which justify the exclusion of certain groups — are propagated through the State's institutions, and become part of our "common sense"; that inveterate logic which organizes how we perceive and live in the everyday world. Moreover, education as an institution (both formal and non-formal) is the major socializing agent for the State's citizenry. Thus, it is in this respect that education serves to perpetuate and naturalize the unequal relations which characterize the nation. In short, education as an institution of the State, is hegemonic and therefore, has serious implications for the ability of Survival ESL to empower its learners.

In the first instance, one of the major objectives of Survival ESL is to socialize or prepare immigrants to integrate into the larger society: i.e. to become members of the nation. Moreover, Survival ESL surrounds itself in a discourse of empowerment due to its commitment to meet the (survival) needs of its learners. These "needs" are subsequently met through an engagement with progressive pedagogies. However, given the above discussion, this is seriously problematic. An examination of the survival
curricula reveals that this empowerment is severely circumscribed by the fact that it is limited to its progressive pedagogical methods. Consequently, Survival ESL's failure to examine the social assumptions underlying its pedagogical objectives and the ideological implications of its pedagogy, ultimately fails to empower its students. Survival ESL as its reflected in the curricular materials, therefore serves to aid immigrant learners to function within an existing order: an order in which immigrants as a social group are severely marginalized and in effect, excluded from the nation. The consequent promotion of a functional literacy within Survival ESL has serious implications for the extent to which immigrants will be able to become meaningful participants within the nation and therefore, for democracy itself.

Thus, it is only by engaging in a transformative pedagogy, that Survival ESL can seriously lay claim to a discourse of empowerment. By contrast, a transformative approach (such as the problem-solving method cited in the previous chapter) is explicit about both the instructional and social assumptions underlying its pedagogy as well as the political relationship between the classroom and the larger society. Moreover, transformative approaches explicitly confront the coercive relations of power which characterize the nation. Consequently, a transformative classroom attempts to "de-naturalize" a certain order of social relations. Empowerment within this context can only be realized through the development of a critical literacy: hence, the promotion of a critical literacy is the goal of any transformative curriculum. Through the development of a critical literacy, immigrant learners learn to read the word and the world of their new society: consequently, learners are able to critically analyze their situations and act to transform the conditions of their lives. Hence, a critical literacy is one which is
counterhegemonic. Only through a commitment to the development of a critical literacy can Survival ESL hope to prepare immigrant learners for meaningful participation within the nation.
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