14 Identity in Language and Literacy Education

CAROLYN MCKINNEY AND
BONNY NORTON

The end of the twentieth and early years of the twenty-first century have witnessed a burgeoning interest in issues of learner identities in language and literacy education.[1] This interest has been accompanied by a shift in the conception of identity which foregrounds the sociocultural rather than the psychological, and conceives of identity not as static and uni-dimensional but, following poststructuralist theorists, as dynamic, multiple, and a site of struggle (Hall, 1992a; Weedon, 1997; Norton, 2000). The foregrounding of identity in language and literacy education has led to a much more sophisticated understanding of language learners that locates them in the social, historical, political, and cultural contexts in which learning takes place and explores how learners negotiate and sometimes resist the diverse positions those contexts offer them. Significantly, we would argue that this understanding has opened up the way for pedagogies that are critical and that respond to different forms of diversity in unprecedented ways.

In the context of addressing gender and English language learning, Norton and Pavlenko (2004: 509) argue that:

> EFL and ESL classrooms represent unique spaces where different linguistic and cultural worlds come into contact. Such classrooms offer unparalleled opportunities for teachers to engage with cross-cultural differences and the social construction of gender and sexuality and thus to help students develop linguistic and intercultural competence.

While this is true, many working in critical approaches to diversity in language and literacy education, including Norton and Pavlenko, would argue that the multilingual classroom is not automatically a productive site for such work. One of the greatest challenges in responding to cultural and linguistic diversity in language classrooms is to move beyond stereotyping difference or merely celebrating diversity as if it had no links to social inequality and no structural or material effects (May, 1999; Kubota, 2004). Difference and power

relations must always be considered together in pedagogy that responds meaningfully to diversity, whether such diversity is structured on the grounds of gender, race, class, or other forms of difference.

In this chapter we address the question: What does the recent foregrounding of identity in language and literacy education mean for educational practice and educational change? We explore what it means to respond to diversity in language and literacy education through a range of approaches, working across different levels and contexts, from young and adolescent learners in formal schooling to older learners in higher education or adult education programs. We begin by tracing the critical and poststructuralist theoretical lenses on language, identity, and pedagogy that inform the examples of classroom practice we present. We then provide examples of practice from different regions of the world, highlighting both the possibilities and challenges of making the classroom a space that accommodates multiple identities and investments. We conclude that responding to diversity in language and literacy education requires an imaginative assessment of what is possible as well as a critical assessment of what is desirable.

Theoretical Lenses

Theorizing language

Educators interested in identity, language, and learning are interested in language as a social practice, through which relationships are defined, negotiated, and resisted. A number of theorists have been influential to such educators, most notably Mikhail Bakhtin (1981, 1963/1984) and Pierre Bourdieu (1984, 1997), whose poststructuralist theories of language foreground struggles over meaning and legitimacy. This is opposed to the structuralist view of Saussure, which conceives of signs as having idealized meanings and of linguistic communities as being relatively homogenous and consensual.

Bakhtin, a Russian philosopher, takes the position that language needs to be investigated as situated utterances in which speakers, in dialogue with others, struggle to create meanings. In this view, the notion of the individual speaker is a fiction as all speakers construct their utterances jointly on the basis of their interaction with listeners, both in historical and contemporary, actual and assumed communities. In this view, the appropriation of the words of others is a complex and conflictual process in which words are not neutral but express particular predispositions and value systems. Bourdieu, a French sociologist, focuses on the often unequal relationships between interlocutors and the importance of power in structuring speech. He suggests that the value ascribed to speech cannot be understood apart from the person who speaks, and that the person who speaks cannot be understood apart from larger networks of social relationships. To redress the inequities between what Bourdieu calls "legitimate" and "illegitimate" speakers, he argues that an expanded

definition of competence should include the "right to speech" or "the power to impose reception" (1997: 648).

The fact that there is no guarantee to the right to speech for speakers follows from Bourdieu's theorizing of discourse as "a symbolic asset which can receive different values depending on the market on which it is offered." (1997: 651). Simply put, "language is worth what those who speak it are worth" (p. 651) and "the dominant usage is the usage of the dominant class" (p. 659). Bourdieu's foregrounding of power relations in language use has important implications for how language learners are positioned by others, for the opportunities they get to speak, and for the varieties of language that we teach and that they use. In the light of such theory, becoming a "good" language learner is a much more complicated process than earlier research had suggested (Norton & Toohey, 2004).

Theorizing identity

The work of Christine Weedon (1987/1997), like that of Bakhtin and Bourdieu, is centrally concerned with the conditions under which people speak, within both institutional and community contexts. Like other poststructuralist theorists who inform her work, Weedon foregrounds the central role of language in her analysis of the relationship between the individual and the social, arguing that language not only defines institutional practices, but serves to construct our sense of ourselves and our "subjectivity" (Weedon, 1987: 21). Weedon notes that the terms *subject* and *subjectivity* signify a different conception of the individual than that associated with humanist conceptions of the individual dominant in Western philosophy. While humanist conceptions of the individual presuppose that every person has an essential, unique, fixed, and coherent "core," poststructuralism depicts the individual (i.e., the subject) as diverse, contradictory, dynamic, and changing over historical time and social space. Drawing on the Foucauldian notions of discourse and historical specificity, subjectivity in poststructuralism is understood as discursively constructed, and as always socially and historically embedded. Identity is thus always in process, a site of struggle between competing discourses in which the subject plays an active role. In the exercise of such agency, learners may have differential investments in a variety of subject positions, best understood in the context of shifting relations of power.

In the field of language learning, Norton (Norton Peirce, 1995; Norton, 2000) has sought to integrate the poststructuralist conceptions of identity and human agency by developing an enriched and productive notion of "investment." Departing from current conceptions of "motivation" in the field of language learning, the concept of investment signals the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language, and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice it. Investment is best understood with reference to the economic metaphors that Bourdieu uses in his work, in particular the notion of "cultural capital." Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) use

the term *cultural capital* to reference the knowledge, credentials, and modes of thought that characterize different classes and groups in relation to specific sets of social forms. They argue that cultural capital is situated, in that it has differential exchange value in different social fields. If learners "invest" in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital. As the value of their cultural capital increases, so learners' sense of themselves and their desires for the future are reassessed. Hence the integral relationship between investment and identity. This notion of investment has been taken up by other scholars in the field, and is proving productive for understanding the complex conditions under which language learning takes place (McKay & Wong, 1996; Angelil-Carter, 1997; Skilton-Sylvester, 2002; Pittaway, 2004; Potowski, 2004).

Poststructuralist approaches to theorizing identity have been fruitfully put to work to de-essentialize and deconstruct identity categories such as race and gender by post-colonial theorists such as Stuart Hall (1992b) and Homi Bhabha (1994). In theorizing 'cultural' identity, Stuart Hall focuses on identity as in process, 'becoming', and stresses the importance of representation following from the discursive construction of identity. In his notion of 'new ethnicities', Hall provides an alternative theorizing of race that recognizes experiences of race without homogenizing them. Hall emphasizes a multi-faceted rootedness which is not limited to ethnic minorities and which can be applied to other forms of difference. However, one of the difficulties in theorizing difference in this way is that people often wish to assert their identities as homogenous and unitary, foregrounding a particular aspect of their experience such as gender, race, or religious affiliation. We see this in the current strength of nationalisms and religious fundamentalism in different parts of the globe. Such unitary assertions of identity are often referred to as *strategic essentialism* (cf. Spivak in Fuss, 1989; Yon, 1999). The terms *identity politics* or the *politics of difference* reference this particular coalescence of identity and power relations, emphasizing the material effects of difference. Foregrounding identity and the issues that this raises are central in responding critically to diversity in language and literacy education.

Theorizing pedagogy

Critical approaches to language and literacy education can be traced back to the work of Paulo Freire (1970), who emphasized that any literacy learning worth the effort should encourage students to learn to read both the word and the world. Following Freire, theorists aligned with critical pedagogy emphasize that it aims to develop students' knowledge of the self and the social world, and the ways in which these are historically constructed in the context of frequently inequitable relations of power. In its application to the classroom, theorists of critical pedagogy often refer to the development of critical literacy (Lankshear & McLaren, 1993; Luke, 1997), which focuses on the written text,

or, indeed, any other kind of representation of meaning, as a site of struggle, negotiation, and change. However, there have been critiques of critical pedagogy and critical literacy that have arisen from the attempts of practitioners to work with critical pedagogy in the classroom, where they have encountered resistance from students to dealing with social inequality (e.g., Ellsworth, 1989; Weiler, 1991; Janks, 2002; McKinney, 2004). These scholars problematize the assumption underlying critical pedagogy that revealing social inequalities to students will necessarily bring about change, whether personal, or collective. Such assumptions ignore the multiple investments that the learners bring to the classroom.

More recent work in critical pedagogy thus foregrounds issues of student identity, considering what students' investments might be, and how students are positioned both inside and outside the classroom. As the focus on investment and positioning implies, such work brings together critical theory and poststructuralist theoretical frameworks. While critical theory maintains the focus on teaching for social justice and foregrounds issues of power and inequality, poststructuralism signals multiplicity and complexity, a move away from a dogmatic approach to the deconstruction of binary oppositions such as oppressor/oppressed; masculine/feminine; advantaged/disadvantaged; white/black. The plurality in the titles of recent edited collections showcase pedagogy using such multiplicity of perspectives: *Negotiating Critical Literacies in Classrooms* (Comber & Simpson, 2001) and *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning* (Norton & Toohey, 2004). There is now a clear recognition of the need to address issues of diversity or difference on multiple levels and to explore the intersections of different elements of difference – e.g., race, class, and gender – while also acknowledging that these intersections are not static and will differ according to subjects and specific contexts.

Critical pedagogies in practice

What then does theorizing language as sociocultural practice and identity as central to learning mean for critical classroom practice? Thesen argues that

> Although academics might embrace the concept of multiple identities in theory, in practice they often stop short of doing more than imposing their own versions of which identity categories are salient. (Thesen, 1997: 506)

Thesen may be right precisely because the multiple positionings of learners and teachers provide a significant challenge to addressing diversity in the classroom (Morgan & Ramanathan, 2005; McKinney, 2005). However, while it is useful and realistic to recognize such challenges, they do not make critical approaches invalid; the converse rather is true. Recently, scholars have developed models for critical practice that attempt to balance different and competing elements. Janks (2000) argues for a synthesis model of critical

literacy education that brings together domination (recognition and analysis of power), access (to privileged forms of language and literacy), diversity (recognizing diverse social identities), and design (the ability to use multiple modes to "challenge and change existing discourses", p. 177). In a similar spirit, the New London Group (2000) have argued for a "pedagogy of multiliteracies" that combines the different elements of situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformed practice. In this section we present examples of practice across different levels of education that take seriously the diverse identities of learners, while seeking to expand the range of possibilities available to them.

Working with young learners

One might think that critical approaches, in their focus on power and social inequality, and their use of complex poststructuralist approaches to meaning making, are appropriate only for work with adolescents and adults. However some educators have worked creatively with very young learners from pre-first grade through the first few years of formal schooling in remarkable ways, showing young children's abilities to take critical perspectives on their own social worlds (O'Brien, 2001; Vasquez, 2004) and to adopt the positions of active meaning-makers despite being positioned as passive (Sahni, 2001).

Vasquez's work (2004) with very young learners (4–5 years old) takes place in a multiracial Canadian pre-school class where she aimed to help children understand the social issues around them. Reminiscent of a Freirean problem-posing approach where social issues are elicited from the lived experiences of adult learners (see Auerbach & Wallerstein, 2004), Vasquez listens carefully to her learners, believing that they will raise social and cultural issues about their everyday lives which will be fruitful for exploration in the curriculum. Vasquez discusses a successful example where children raised the issue of their exclusion at an annual school cultural event, The French Café, and shows how oral and literacy activities grew out of this issue, including the drafting of a petition.

In another part of the globe, working with 5–8-year-olds from multi-ethnic backgrounds in urban Australian schools, O'Brien's focus (2001) is on the teaching of critical reading. In particular she describes a number of successful activities where children worked on reading the construction of (often stereotypically) gendered identities in a range of texts including informational literature and children's literature. Through a series of classes and fun activities around Mother's Day catalogues, O'Brien takes the children through a process of critiquing gender construction and consumerism. Like Vasquez, the children are being taught to read their social worlds critically, using creative pedagogies where they get to talk about, read, and make texts of their own.

In a similar spirit, Sahni's (2001) work in a rural North Indian village concerns the empowerment of lower caste children who are not usually given a voice to "appropriate literacy" (p. 19). Such appropriation entails learners'

involvement in meaning making for their own purposes, including pleasure, as well as an appropriation of a "power-commodity" such as literacy which is usually a "a set of practices controlled by dominant classes or culture" (p. 19). She calls for a conception of empowerment that allows for a focus on individual children and their learning, and shows how children moved in their writing from a position of rote copying to the development of imaginative and creative pieces. Through the invention of imagined worlds in such pieces, children were able to change their social positioning and express their aspirations, demonstrating empowerment at a micro-level. The unleashing of imagination here plays a powerful role in dramatically re-shaping the previously restricted positions and expectations of these lower caste children as learners.

Working with adolescents

Educators have used or advocated a range of critical approaches with adolescent learners, from the use of popular culture (Ibrahim, 1999; Moffat & Norton, 2005) to multimodal pedagogies (Stein, 2004; Kendrick et al., in press).

Ibrahim (1999) explores the intersections of race and gender in the differential ways in which 'continental African' immigrants to Canada learned and appropriated (American) Black Stylized English (BSE) and tapped into black hip-hop and rap genres. Since rap and hip-hop is one of the sites in which the students invested their identities, Ibrahim proposes that rap and hip-hop, as well as Black popular culture, are curriculum sites that make legitimate forms of knowledge generally regarded as illegitimate. However, considering that some of the lyrics of rap and hip-hop songs may be sexist and racist, Ibrahim cautions that the use of such texts would need to be critically framed. Such deconstruction of popular culture texts, from which young people derive pleasure, can of course be met with resistance. As Ibrahim notes, if such texts are merely deconstructed and critiqued, they will not be transformed into legitimate forms of knowledge. In their poststructuralist approach to reading gender in an Archie comic, Moffat and Norton (2005) offer one possibility for critical framing that does not necessarily 'police' young people's pleasures. In the deconstruction of binaries, a poststructuralist reading is able to examine how texts simultaneously reproduce and subvert dominant relations of power, in this case relating to gender.

In a very different context, Stein (2001) explores the way in which a South African ESL classroom in an under-resourced township school can become "an important site for the institutional reappropriation and transformation of textual, cultural and linguistic forms, which have previously either been marginalized, infantilized or undervalued by the colonial and apartheid governments" (p. 152). Stein (like Brito, Lima, & Auerbach, 2004) initially set out to design a pedagogical intervention that would value learners' previously ignored and unvalued multilingual resources; however she found learners drawing on cultural resources in their oral storytelling that were not captured within the linguistic mode. Stein's learners revelled in the opportunities they

were given to produce oral counter-texts that subverted the canon, and to draw on topics sometimes considered taboo. She thus advocates the use of multimodal pedagogies (i.e., drawing on a number of semiotic modes including linguistic, bodily, and sensory) as a way of addressing the diverse needs of disadvantaged learners. Stein (2004) does however raise the challenge of assessment in such pedagogies, which are currently linguacentric.

In another African context, Kendrick et al. (in press) note that multimodal pedagogies that include drawing, photography, and drama, while by no means new pedagogies, could be incorporated more systematically into school curricula in Uganda. Drawing on their research in two regions of the country, they argue that multimodal pedagogies offer teachers innovative ways of validating students' literacies, experiences, and cultures, and are highly effective in supporting English language learning in the classroom. They draw on Mushengyezi (2003) to make the case that communication planners in Uganda should not overlook the importance of indigenous forms of communication such as popular theatre, drumming, and storytelling for enhancing student learning at all levels (pp. 107–117). They do recognize, however, that limited resources place constraints on teachers' actions, particularly in a context in which professional development is not widely supported.

Working with post-secondary students

The higher education or college level provides many spaces that are conducive to critical language and literacy work, including the writing class, English for Academic Purposes (EAP), and academic literacy courses. Here we present Lillis's (2003) innovative recommendations for a critical approach to teaching student writing as well as McKinney and van Pletzen's (2004) experience in using critical literacy with privileged learners at a South African university.

In the United Kingdom, Lillis (2003) worked with a small group of students to develop their academic literacy. The students were all female and considered non-traditional in higher education on the basis of one or more of the following categories: age, social class, ethnicity, and religious affiliation. While it is common for students to receive written 'feedback' from their university tutors on the essays they submit, Lillis developed a methodology of 'talkback', which enabled students to make informed decisions about their writing in a dialogic engagement with the tutor. Drawing on Kress's (2000) notions of 'critique' and 'design', Lillis argues for the need to move away from the dominant model of critique in academic literacy practices to one of design, where there is a serious attempt to change institutional practices in order to validate students' knowledge. Such a practice opens up disciplinary content to external interests and influences, allowing students to explore and represent the relationships between their own lived experiences and disciplinary academic knowledge.

Working with relatively privileged students at a historically white and Afrikaans university in South Africa, McKinney and van Pletzen (2004)

introduced critical reading into their first-year English studies course using two curriculum units on South African literature. In exploring representations of the apartheid past, McKinney and van Pletzen encountered significant resistance from students to the ways in which they felt uncomfortably positioned by the curriculum materials on offer. McKinney and van Pletzen attempted to create discursive spaces in which both they and the students could explore the many private and political processes through which identities are constructed. In doing so, they re-conceptualized resistance more productively as a meaning-making activity which offers powerful teaching moments. McKinney (2005) argues for the importance of recognizing the teacher's multiple identity positions and the difficulties of providing a supportive environment, while at the same time challenging investments in social inequality such as racism and sexism. Like Lillis, she emphasizes the importance of a 'design' element in critical literacy so that students are not left in the space of critical deconstruction, but are afforded opportunities to design their own texts which position them differently and enable them to produce visions of an alternative reality (McKinney, 2004).

Working with adult learners

Adult language and literacy classrooms are also sites of a range of critical interventions. While problem-posing methodology is common practice in Freirean critical pedagogy for adults (Frye, 1999), we complement discussion on this approach with critical reading (Wallace, 2003) and more recently a 'pedagogy of inquiry' that draws on Queer theory (Nelson, 1999). Frye (1999) uses a problem-posing participatory methodology in an immigrant women's only ESL class in the USA. In setting up the class, Frye responded to the particular needs of the women for a class which would not be communicatively dominated by men, which would be available during the daytime (thus safer to get to), and which had childcare facilities. Consistent with a participatory approach, Frye developed her curriculum around topics of concern elicited from the learners, such as their difficulties in relating to their children's schools and teachers, but draws our attention to inappropriate assumptions that all immigrant women from a Spanish-speaking home country will share the same needs and interests. For example, she discusses differences and animosities that arose across age and social class differences, as well as the challenge of moving from the posing of problems to taking social action.

In the United Kingdom, Wallace (2003) has worked with adult language learners on critical reading courses that address the socially embedded nature of the reading process and explore text-focused activities that address how meaning and power are encoded in texts. In doing so, she makes use of a range of popular texts, including newspaper articles, magazine articles, and advertisements. Wallace contrasts her approach with dominant EFL methodologies such as communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based learning, arguing that such approaches are 'domesticating' for learners, teaching them

only how to fit in with dominant cultures rather than to question and reshape powerful discourses. She points out that in reading texts designed for the 'native' population of a particular country, immigrant learners have an advantage in their 'outsider' status precisely because they are not the ideal reader/audience of the text and thus find it easier to discern problematic assumptions in the texts.

In advocating a pedagogy of inquiry that draws on Queer theory, Nelson (1999) describes an example of practice that also capitalizes on the knowledge that immigrant language learners bring of the cultural contexts in their originating countries. Nelson's concern is with opportunities in language classrooms to explore the way in which "sexual identities are not universal, but are done in different ways in different cultural contexts" (p. 376). The teacher Nelson observes invites learners (themselves a diverse group in terms of gender, age, and originating country) to give different interpretations of two women walking arm-in-arm and to reflect on the possible cultural meanings of this within the United States context as well as their 'home' contexts. Nelson contrasts a pedagogy of inquiry, which asks how linguistic and cultural practices naturalize certain sexual identities, most notably heterosexuality, with a pedagogy of inclusion which aims to introduce images as well as experiences of gays and lesbians into curriculum materials. Nelson's approach can fruitfully be applied to other issues of marginalization, helping learners to question normative practices in the 'target' culture into which they have entered.

Conclusion

The examples of practice that we have discussed draw on complex notions of what it means to respond critically to linguistic and cultural diversity in the language and literacy classroom. Foregrounding learner identity, and the intersections of race, gender, class, and sexual orientation, all the examples we have examined raise different challenges in attempts to create a discursive space conducive to open dialogue and learning, which are central to critical pedagogies. Such pedagogies reveal tensions in the oft competing interests of: responding sensitively to (cultural) difference while at the same time addressing issues of social inequality; attempting to give learners access to dominant or privileged ways of knowing and doing, while at the same time validating learners' own knowledge and lived experience; using multimodality to provide learners with creative opportunities for meaning making, while at the same time taking seriously logocentric assessment practices and limited professional development opportunities; bringing youth popular culture into the official curriculum without undermining it or learners' pleasures; and finally of teachers creating a discursive space that is supportive and non-threatening, while at the same time encouraging shifts in learners' perspectives. It is in the moment by moment unfolding of classroom practice that we can assess and negotiate our achievements and disappointments. Ultimately, responding to diversity in

language and literacy education requires an imaginative assessment of what is possible, as well as a critical assessment of what is desirable. Recognizing the significance of learner and teacher identities in the language and literacy classroom is at the heart of this process.

NOTE

1 Such interest is evidenced in the special journal issues devoted to the topic of identity of *Linguistics and Education* edited by Martin-Jones and Heller (1996), *Language and Education*, edited by Sarangi and Baynham (1996), *TESOL Quarterly* edited by Norton (1997), and special topic issues of *TESOL Quarterly* on gender (2004, edited by Davis & Skilton-Sylvester) and race (2006, edited by Kubota & Lin) as well as several monographs on the topic (Day, 2002; Ivanič, 1998; Kanno, 2003; Miller, 2003; Norton, 2000; Toohey, 2000).

REFERENCES

Angelil-Carter, S. (1997). Second language acquisition of spoken and written English: Acquiring the skeptron. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 263–287.

Auerbach, E. & Wallerstein, N. (2004). *Problem-Posing at Work: English for Action* (revised edn.). Edmonton, Alberta: Grass Roots Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1984/1963). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, trans. C. Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London/New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. R. Nice. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16(6), 645–668.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*. London/Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Brito, I., Lima, A., & Auerbach, E. (2004). The logic of non-standard teaching: A course in Cape Verdean language, culture and history. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (eds.), *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning* (pp. 181–200). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comber, B. & Simpson, A. (eds.) (2001). *Negotiating Critical Literacies in Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Davis, K. & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2004). Gender in TESOL. Special issue of *TESOL Quarterly*, 3(3).

Day, E. M. (2002). *Identity and the Young English Language Learner.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297–324.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.
Frye, D. (1999). Participatory education as a critical framework for an immigrant women's ESL class, *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 501–513.
Fuss, D. (1989). *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference*. New York/London: Routledge.
Hall, S. (1992a). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, & T. McGrew (eds.), *Modernity and Its Futures* (pp. 272–325). Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers and The Open University.
Hall, S. (1992b). New ethnicities. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (eds.), *"Race", Culture and Difference* (pp. 252–259). London: Sage.
Ibrahim, A. (1999). Becoming Black: Rap and hip-hop, race, gender, identity, and the politics of ESL learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 349–369.
Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: a synthesis for critical literacy education. *Educational Review*, 52(2), 175–186.
Janks, H. (2002). Critical literacy: Beyond reason. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 29(1), 7–26.
Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating Bilingual and Bicultural Identities: Japanese Returnees betwixt Two Worlds*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Kendrick, M., Jones, S., Mutonyi, H., & Norton, B. (in press). Multimodality and English education in Ugandan schools. In *English Studies in Africa*, 49(1).
Kress, G. (2000). Design and transformation: New theories of meaning. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (eds.). *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures* (pp. 153–161). South Yarra: Macmillan Publishers Australia.
Kubota, R. (2004). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (eds.), *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning* (pp. 30–52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kubota, R. & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL. Special issue of *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3).
Lankshear, C. & McLaren, P. (eds.) (1993). *Critical Literacy: Politics, Praxis and the Postmodern*. New York: State University of New York Press.
Lillis, T. (2003). Student writing as "academic literacies": Drawing in Bakhtin to move from Critique to Design. *Language and Education*, 17(3), 192–207.
Luke, A. (1997). Critical approaches to literacy. In V. Edwards & D. Corson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, vol. 2: Literacy* (pp. 143–152). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
Martin-Jones, M. & Heller, M. (1996). Introduction to the special issue on Education in multilingual settings: Discourse, identities, and power. *Linguistics and Education* 8, 3–16.
May, S. (1999). Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference: Avoiding essentialism. In S. May (ed.), *Critical Multiculturalism: Rethinking Multicultural and Antiracist Education* (pp. 11–14). London/Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
McKay, S. & Wong, S. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 577–608.
McKinney, C. (2004). "A little hard piece of grass in your shoe": Understanding student resistance to critical literacy in post-apartheid South Africa. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 22(1&2), 63–73.

McKinney, C. (2005). A balancing act: Ethical dilemmas of democratic teaching within critical pedagogy. *Educational Action Research*, 12(3), 375–391.
McKinney, C. & van Pletzen, E. (2004). "This apartheid story . . . we've decided it's gone we've finished with it": Student responses to "politics" in a South African English Studies course. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9(2), 159–170.
Miller, J. (2003). *Audible Difference: ESL and Social Identity in Schools.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Moffat, L. & Norton, B. (2005). Popular culture and the reading teacher: A case for feminist pedagogy. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 2(1), 1–12.
Morgan, B. & Ramanathan, V. (2005). Critical literacies and language education: Global and local perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 151–169.
Mushengyezi, A. (2003). Rethinking indigenous media: Rituals, "talking" drums and orality as forms of public communication in Uganda. *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, 16, 107–128.
Nelson, C. (1999). Sexual identities in ESL: Queer theory and classroom inquiry. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 371–391.
New London Group (2000). A pedagogy of multiliteracies designing social futures. In B. Cope and M. Kalantzis (eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures* (pp. 9–37). South Yarra: Macmillan Publishers Australia.
Norton, B. (ed.) (1997). Language and identity. Special issue of *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3).
Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
Norton, B. & Pavlenko, A. (2004). *Gender and English Language Learners.* Alexandria, VA: TESOL International.
Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (eds.) (2004). *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9–31.
O'Brien, J. (2001). Children reading critically: A local history. In B. Comber & A. Simpson (eds.), *Negotiating Critical Literacies in Classrooms* (pp. 37–54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Pittaway, D. (2004). Investment and second language acquisition. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 4(1), 203–218.
Potowski, K. (2004). Student Spanish use and investment in a dual immersion classroom: Implications for second language acquisition and heritage language maintenance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(1), 75–101.
Sahni, U. (2001). Children appropriating literacy: Empowerment pedagogy from young children's perspective. In B. Comber & A. Simpson (eds.), *Negotiating Critical Literacies in Classrooms* (pp. 19–35). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Sarangi, S. & Baynham, M. (1996). Special issue of *Language and Education*, 10(2&3).
Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2002). Should I stay or should I go? Investigating Cambodian women's participation and investment in adult ESL programs. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 53(1), 9–26.
Stein, P. (2001). Classrooms as sites of textual, cultural, and linguistic reappropriation. In B. Comber & A. Simpson (eds.), *Negotiating Critical Literacies in Classrooms* (pp. 151–169). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Stein, P. (2004). Representation, rights and resources: Multimodal pedagogies in the language and literacy classroom (pp. 95–115). In B. Norton & K. Toohey (eds.), *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thesen, L. (1997). Voices, discourse, and transition: In search of new categories in EAP. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 487–512.
Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English at School: Identity, Social Relations and Classroom Practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Vasquez, V. (2004). *Negotiating Critical Literacies with Young Children*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Wallace, C. (2003). *Critical Reading in Language Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (2nd edn.). Oxford: Blackwell. (1st edn. 1987.)
Weiler, K. (1991). Freire and a feminist pedagogy of difference. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(4), 449–474.
Yon, D. A. (1999). Interview with Stuart Hall, London, England August 1998. *Journal of Curriculum Theorising*, 15(4), 89–99.