This qualitative study, employing an ethnographic research method, investigates how dialogue journal writing, which allows teachers and learners to engage in ‘written conversation’, may provide an opportunity to bring critical pedagogy and foreign language education together in a productive way in the context of a critical literacy practice. The data consisted of informal written interviews and more than 600 journal entries written by 30 16-year-old high school students in Tehran. The results were qualitatively analysed in search of themes relevant to empowerment as a critical educational value and critical writing as a critical literacy practice. The study revealed that writing dialogue journals as a language education activity in EFL pedagogy may empower learners and provide them with opportunities to express their ‘voice’. It further revealed that dialogue journal writing led to gains in critical self-reflective EFL writing ability.
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In the history of language teaching, with its attachment to linguistic issues rather than educational theories (Crookes & Lehner, 1998), the focus has been mainly on the what of language teaching. Little, if any, attention has been paid to educational views as the how of language education. The nature of the field, which not only deals with language but also with education, however, necessitates paying as much attention to its educational aspects as to its linguistic dimensions (Pennycook, 1990).

Critical pedagogy (CP) as an educational theory rooted in critical theory, which is a general approach to power and knowledge in social contexts (Freire, 1972; Torres, 1999), can be a candidate to fill this educational gap and bridge education to social life and meet the needs of language education to an understanding of educational practices in broader social and cultural terms (Pennycook, 1990). This was the approach we adopted when we became involved in developing and implementing the syllabus for English as a foreign language at a high school in Tehran in the academic year 2001–2002. The study presents our attempt to investigate questions arising out of such an educational practice.
Critical Foreign Language Education

Critical pedagogy as a general educational theory, when brought into language teaching and literacy education, brings in all its social concerns. In CP-based foreign language education, mere proficiency or communicative ability will not suffice. It will be a must to do more than teaching language skills at a functional level and within competency-based programmes (Pennycook, 1990), that is, merely being able to use the language and just to know the semantic meaning is not enough (Kabilan, 2000).

In ‘critical language pedagogy’ (Brown, 1997; Reagan & Osborn, 2002), in addition to being able to use language communicatively, leaners must also have the opportunity to think about what to communicate. CP in foreign language education, then, pursues the joint goals of developing communicative language abilities and simultaneously applying this ability to developing a critical understanding and awareness of the world (Crookes & Lehner, 1998; Norton & Toohey, 2004; Walsh, 1991). By applying critical language pedagogy to foreign language teaching, learners are not only given the chance to learn the foreign language in context and to use it in authentic situations, but also they are given the opportunity to do more than language learning, to think and act as critically conscious beings (Graman, 1988).

Based on a critical literacy approach to foreign language education, the ability to read and write at the functional level is just the first step. ‘Functional literacy’ as the decoding and encoding ability and ‘cultural literacy’ as the acquisition of cultural knowledge necessary for reading and writing are just tools at the service of critical literacy (Lankshear, 1993; McLaren, 1988). This higher order type of literacy practice involves reading and writing both the world and the word (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Masny & Ghahremani-Ghajar, 1999).

Dialogue journal writing

Writing, with numerous pedagogical models and approaches in the history of education (Holmes, 2001), is a major aspect of both first and foreign language literacy. Models of writing pedagogy may be generally divided into product and process approaches, with the former emphasising linguistically accurate written products (Holmes, 2001; Silva, 1990) and the latter focusing on the nonlinear meaning approximating process of writing (Hillocks, 1987; Zamel, 1987).

What lacks in both product and process oriented approaches to teaching writing, however, is a view of writing as a means of education that goes beyond writing proficiency. Writing can be viewed from a ‘post process’ (Trimbur, 1994) and critical view, focusing on post-cognitive, social, cultural, and ideological issues (Atkinson, 2003a, 2003b). If looked at from a broader perspective than a mere functional instrumental view, writing can be an act of exploring social issues and a tool for taking action to improve life conditions (Auerbach, 1999). It can be part of critical literacy practices aimed at critical consciousness – a major goal pursued by CP (Perry, 1996).

A place for ‘risk free experimentation’ (Crumley, 1998) with written language, which can provide the opportunity for writing as a critical literacy practice with the characteristics referred to above, is dialogue journal writing (DJW). Dialogue
journal (DJ), as Peyton (2000: 2) defines it, is a written conversation in which ‘a learner and teacher communicate regularly… Learners write as much as they choose on a wide range of topics and in a variety of genres and styles. The teacher writes back regularly responding to questions and comments, introducing new topics, or asking questions’. As a kind of ‘interactive writing’ (Hall, 1994), it allows learners and teachers to engage in written communication and conversation (Peyton, 2000). DJW, in which, instead of formal accuracy, the content is emphasised (Tonthong, 2001), provides learners with an opportunity to express themselves and to develop a personal voice which is lost in traditional education (Worthington, 1997).

Two research issues

The contribution of DJW to empowerment as a major concept in CP, which is centrally about students’ participation, gaining their voice and being able to think and act critically (Giroux, 1992; Shor, 1992), is the first major issue we focused on in the present study.

The second point of focus in this research is how DJW contributes to critical literacy. The investigation of this contribution is based on Ada’s (1988, cited in Cummins, 1989) model of critical literacy as an example of critical approaches to literacy education. The four modes in her model are presented as phases of a process called ‘creative reading act’, but can be generally considered a model of critical literacy, applicable to writing as well. Below, where the data analysis procedure is reported, we will present a more detailed image of the four modes, accompanied by sample student writings.

Specifically, we set the following as our guiding research questions: First, how may dialogue journal writing contribute to the Empowerment of high school learners of English as a foreign language? Second, how may writing dialogue journals help learners move beyond descriptive uncritical writing and towards critical self-reflective writing?

The research method we employed here is based on tenets of qualitative research paradigm, although qualitative and quantitative approaches may not represent paradigms as such (Chaudron, 1986). Considering the key elements of ethnographic studies as indicated by Le Compte & Presseire (1993, cited in Cohen et al., 2000), which include the investigation of the world view of the participants, data collection in natural settings, holistic view and consideration of total phenomenon, and a move from description to explanation and theory generation, this study can be viewed as a small scale ethnographic study (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999).

The Study

Participants in this study were 30 16-year-old male high school students in Tehran, with one of the researchers as their English teacher. Three of the students had lived in English speaking countries for one, three, and five years, and 25 of them had attended private language institutes for at least one and at most eight years. The study took place during an academic year from 23rd September, 2001 until 21st May, 2002.

The site of the study was a private high school situated in northern Tehran. The syllabus of the school was different from that of the public schools planned
by the Ministry of Education. Two 90-minute sessions were allocated to English classes every week. In addition to the official English book, extra activities were also practised including reading extra texts on different topics, viewing films in English, class discussions in English, and different writing activities.

The official English book contained seven lessons each consisting of sections on vocabulary, reading, grammar, pronunciation and some situational conversations. The extra activities included reading texts on subjects like biographies of famous Iranian and foreign authors, school and education, simple poems, etc. As well as focusing on the vocabulary and structure of the texts, students practised some reading strategies like scanning, skimming, and guessing and also critical reading. Moreover, they discussed the content of the texts in their class discussions or wrote about them in their writing activities including dialogue journals.

Data
The journals
The bulk of more than 600 journal entries amounting to more than 600 pages was our main source of data. Students wrote journal entries on a weekly basis during the year with no limitation in choosing topics. They were told to choose a topic of their interest and not to worry about grammar or spelling of their writing but instead to focus on expressing their thoughts and feelings freely on paper. Every now and then, however, in the responses to their writings, the teacher drew their attention to the role of formal aspects of language as tools of expressing meanings. Students were also allowed to use Farsi words in their sentences if they needed a particular word for which they did not know the English equivalent.

The teacher read and responded to the journal entries every week. The focus of the responses was the content of the messages the student tried to communicate and formal issues were only secondary concerns. The teacher commented on the points students made, answered their questions, asked questions that guided them to a more critical view, and when necessary, helped them with formal problems in their writing, mostly indirectly and sometimes directly. Regarding the topics, however, students were completely free and there was not even any hint on the part of the teacher as to what to write about.

Students wrote journal entries on a wide range of topics: from reflections on classroom activities to their feelings about national holidays, and from why they hated some school subjects to who their favourite author or poet was. Frequently they wrote on more than one topic in a journal entry. The quantity of entries also varied from student to student and from entry to entry: from less than half a page to several pages.

A major point the teacher emphasised, when introducing DJW and also throughout the year, was that writing journals was not simply a matter of reporting or describing. Moving beyond mere descriptions towards critical writing and creativity was referred to as a major characteristic of DJW.

Considering the level of language proficiency of the students it did not surprise us to see that their writing was replete with different kinds of formal mistakes. However, the students tried their best to express themselves with the limited formal knowledge at their disposal.
**Written interview**

Our other data collection procedure was an informal written interview with six open ended questions. Based on a preliminary analysis of the journal entries, six questions were developed and administered in Farsi and students responded to them at length in their mother tongue. The questions were aimed at generating student ideas about different aspects of their experiences with CP and DJW.

**Analysis and discussion**

The process of analysis was guided by the data analysis procedure offered by Cohen *et al.* (2000: 147), which is based on an understanding of data analysis as ‘making sense of the data in terms of the participants’ definition of the situation, noting patterns, themes, categories, and regularities’.

**DJW and empowerment**

*The journals*

The journal entries were read in search of any instance of *expression-of-the-self* (not just *emotional self-expression*) from an independent standpoint, be it agreeing or disagreeing, logical or illogical, reflective or aggressive. Although this is obviously not an objectively delineated criterion, it was the general view which helped us colour-code instances of students’ *speaking out* in their journal notebooks as indicators of their gaining voice in an empowering sense. The colour-coded instances of the major theme of empowerment were categorised into the following minor themes:

**I hate that**

Repeatedly we encountered sentences in students’ writing that showed their discontent with something in the classroom, the school, or society in general. They found their journal notebooks a place that let them speak out. The following examples illustrate this minor theme:

- *By the way your classes have become so boring…*
- *Your texts are borning [boring] and not interesting….*
- *The norooz homework Not good, Because that too much, And Not deep, And I just write And write And write, And I hate that.*
- *our school put our exam in the time 7 [at 7 in the morning].… I think it’s not good….*
- *I hate you … You are the worst English teacher I have ever seen.*

**I think it’s good**

In students journal entries we found many cases of their use of DJs as a site to express their positive attitudes. When writing DJs, in addition to dislikes they expressed, it seems students had a lot to say about what they liked. This minor theme is illustrated by the journal extracts below:

- *My Idea about two class of last week. For me It’s good I like this teach and I think It’s good for student.*
- *I think about class it was better of the other class. We were in our groups. It is very well because we are active in our groups. And when we are in our groups we like to learn English.*
- *I liked the text [about school]… It was interesting because It was about us…*
- *… the examination was good because it was new and its reading was good.*
I think

The points the students made about their thoughts and beliefs depicted an important theme. It is a strong indicator of their use of DJs as a place to find their own voice. In reflecting such beliefs they moved beyond saying what they liked or did not like and wrote the why's of their likes and dislikes, as in the following excerpts:

- I think the English lesson in the Book of high school grade two isn’t good. because it isn’t interesting… For example the picture of book is funny and it isn’t suitable. I think a good book is interesting and the picture’s are real. every thing in our book is black and white and it isn’t good.
- Class is good because … [the relation between] students and teacher is good and the teacher answer the all of the students question.
- I believe that the best way for learning is seeing, looking, waiting [watching], and observe something….

I asked myself why

The last empowerment-related minor theme is shaped by students assertions that go beyond simply expressing ideas and reasoning. Not surprisingly, when provided with the opportunity, the students wrote about should/shouldn’t and must/mustn’t. The following examples depict this theme:

- You have to explain about the quality of our class.
- … you’d told us we can write everything we like … so why did you tell me I was impolite in my previous journal?
- I asked my question in the class but you didn’t answer me. I raised my hand too many time but you said fell down your hand: I asked myself why?
- We are in the English class not in the speaking about everything class.

We were encouraged when students wrote so freely about their experiences. In the cultural context of schools like the one in which we carried out this research, students are traditionally silenced and given no say beyond textbooks and tests. In such a context, being able to break the ‘culture of silence’ (Freire, 1998) even on paper is a considerable breakthrough towards empowerment. Empowering education as opposed to domesticating schooling, attempts to help learners participate in their own education, gain their voice, and move towards transformation (Shor, 1992). In the small social context of school and in the smaller context of dialogue journal notebooks, the main realisation of empowerment is students’ being able to gain their voice at the minimum level of writing freely.

The written interview

In the informal written interview, anonymously answered by students at the end of the year, they answered a question on the extent to which DJW provided them with the opportunity to express their views. This was supposed to show us their views on the empowering role of writing DJs. Their responses to this question elucidated their awareness and approval of this empowering role. Excerpts of students’ responses, which were written in Farsi, along with their English translation, come next to illustrate their views. They believed:

- نوشتن journal باعث ایجاد اعتماد به نفس در دانش آموختگان گردید.
(Writing journals created self-confidence for the students.)

• شرکیت بود که همه به‌چه‌ها از این شاکس استفاده کردند... زمینه خویش برای بیان همه چیز بود.

(It was a chance that every body had ... to express any view.)

Some of the students believed that it was a good opportunity for critiquing and others found DJW very helpful in enabling them to let the teacher know about their viewpoints:

• باعث می‌شد راحت‌تر در مورد کل‌سیستم بگویند.

(It helped us comment on class activities more comfortably.)

• زبان مشکل ایجاد می‌کرد ولی ... این فرصت را ایجاد کرد که ما هر آنچه می‌خواهیم بگوییم یا انتقاد کنیم ابراز نماییم.

(It was difficult to say everything in English but ... it helped us express our comments and criticisms.)

• باعث می‌شد هر چه می‌خواهیم بگوییم و ترسی نداشتیم باشیم.

(It helped us not to fear and to say whatever we wanted.)

Others focused on its being a unique opportunity to be expressive and to write about things which they had no other opportunity to write about:

• یا حد متوسطی زمینه برای مسالی که فرصت ابراز آنها را نداشتیم بار بزد.

(To some extent it paved the way for saying things that we had no other opportunity to talk about.)

• فعالیتی بود که با یک ... مسالی را که هیچ فرصتی برای مطرح کردن آن نبود به معلم خود منتقل کنیم.

(It was an activity through which we could express the points that we had no other opportunity to talk about.)

• من در زندگی تا به حال جانی پا چیزی برای ابراز عقیده‌ها تا به این حد نداشتیم.

(I have never had such an opportunity to express my views.)

Twenty-seven out of the 30 participants, one way or another, as the excerpts above show, expressed their approval of the empowering role of DJW, in their responses to this written interview question.

The contribution of DJW to critical literacy

We returned to the journals for this issue, to see to what extent the four thinking modes presented by Ada (1988, cited in Cummins, 1989) are present in them, and to look for evidence of increased critical thinking over the period of the study.
Ada’s four modes of writing are called (1) descriptive, (2) personal-interpretive, (3) critical, and (4) creative. The descriptive mode involves a factual view in which surface level descriptions of facts are the main considerations (Ada, 1988, cited in Cummins, 1989). It deals with questions like: What happened?; Who did what to whom?; When?; and Where? In strictly descriptive writing, objective facts are presented without any particular personal interpretation or critical evaluation. The descriptive mode is illustrated here by two examples:

- At the first of class... we said our comments... Then we had to write the words that we learnt them in last class. And then we read the text... Then the teacher explained to our how we can learn it. The class finished.
- At the beginning of class our teacher gave us a paper... after that he asked us what kind of books we like and then we discussed many things for example we talked about AUTHORS... Also we talked about different novels...

Personal interpretive mode of literacy involves learners’ relating facts and surface level information to their own experiences. This is a step forward towards analysing the received information ‘in the light of one’s own experiences and emotions’ which is, in Ada’s (1988, cited in Cummins, 1989) words, part of ‘true learning’. Writers who move beyond description towards the personal mode of writing, not only describe the facts but also try to see them from their own personal point of view and relate them to their own feelings. As in the following examples, I, me and my, as key words in expressing individual attitudes, are obviously frequent in the personal mode of writing:

- We spoke about Authors and... poems. We had a good time and I learn many things.
- ... the class is very good for me. I think if speaking in class is going to be more, that’s good.

Critical mode, appearing out of an engagement in a more abstract process of critical analysis, not only involves description and personal interpretation but also reasoning and analysis of the topic or situation that is being written about. It is different from personal mode in that it is an attempt to distance oneself from the topic of concern, to view it from a broader perspective, and to ask questions like how and why (Cummins, 1989). The following extracts from students’ journal entries are examples of critical mode of writing:

- We have to stay until 7 o’clock in school but I think is good, because I can work better than home and I can learn better.
- ... my comment for exam is very good, Because this examination was very different than other exams, Because other exams have fix answer but this exam the questions have different answer, Because any one had different idea for all of questions, And I like this examination....

Finally, the creative mode includes the other three modes, but goes beyond them and moves towards suggestions for change. It involves the ability to present suggestions and solutions, and to creatively attempt to transform
what is dealt with (Ada, 1988, cited in Cummins, 1989). The following example clearly illustrates the creative writing mode:

- I think we have some problems in our class, first that some students don’t speak in class . . . you must give some confidence to these students . . . . We must go to video class in one of our two sessions in the week . . . . I have another suggestion for our class. Say to all of the students to buy a little notebook and write all of the new words . . . that we learnt it . . . . I think it will be a good and useful work for us and at the last of the year we know how many new words we learned.

We labelled all the journal entries with one of the four labels: descriptive (D), personal (P), critical (Ct), or creative (Cv). Then the journal entries written by each one of the students during the year were divided into four groups based on their temporal sequence so that the first group of the entries roughly illustrated the characteristics of the student’s writing in the first quarter of the year, the second group illustrated the second quarter and so on.

The first quarters of all the thirty students’ writing were put next to each other to gain a general picture of the DJs written in the first quarter of the year. The second quarters of the 30 students’ writings and also the third and fourth quarters were considered as well. We considered the proportion of the descriptive, personal, critical and creative entries (Figure 1) as an indicator of the characteristics of students’ writings in each of the quarters and also as an illustration of the changes in the quality of the entries as students continued writing.

In the first quarter of the year, 70% of the entries were either descriptive or personal ones. In the second quarter there was a clear decrease in the number of descriptive and personal entries and an increase in the number of critical and creative ones. The changes in the number of descriptive entries and creative ones continued in the third quarter but unlike the shift from the first to the second quarter, there was a very small increase in the number of personal writings and a small decrease in the number of critical ones. In the fourth quarter there were very few descriptive entries and creative writing formed a large proportion of the entries. More than 80% of the entries in this quarter were either critical or creative.

Figure 1 The distribution of writing modes for the four quarters of the year
**Discrepant and negative cases**

In the process of analysis of the journal entries we faced some discrepant cases, which did not fit the general patterns found in the data analysis process. Also the results of the informal written interview, although generally supporting the main themes found in the journal entries, contained some negative cases. In student responses to the question on the extent to which they thought writing DJs empowered them, there were three cases of their expression of the belief that DJW had had very little role in empowering them.

Regarding the development of the students’ writing from descriptive to creative, there were two kinds of discrepancies. First, there were two students whose writings did not move much beyond personal writing throughout the year and they just moved back and forth between descriptive and personal modes. Second, two other students wrote creative journals from the very beginning of the year. The writings of these four students, then, did not fit the general pattern illustrated above. Understanding these discrepant and negative cases needs in-depth case studies, which are beyond the scope of our present research. The cases, however, are mentioned here to provide a clearer picture of the whole study.

**Conclusion**

This study was an effort to explore the contribution of DJW to critical pedagogical values in language education, empowerment in particular. We also set as our goal investigating the contribution of DJW to the development of learners’ writing as a critical literacy practice.

**Empowerment**

The research question on the contribution of DJW to empowerment, was our first research question guiding the study. Analysis of the journal entries in search of clues to the empowering role of DJW revealed that students consistently took the opportunity to speak out. DJ as a place for ‘risk-free experimentation with language’ (Crumley, 1998), provided learners with the opportunity to express their dissatisfactions and what they thought was not favourable, using *I don’t like...* or *It’s not good...*. Back to Shor’s (1992: 14) question, ‘Do students feel free to disagree...?’ as a major concern in empowering students, one may conclude that DJW grants students the freedom to disagree, hence, playing a major role in empowering them. In addition, the journals provided the students with opportunities to express reflective opinions and assessment of their own learning, attested by the many sentences starting with *I think...* or *I believe...*, and a further type of assertion, typified by the use of expressions such as *Why did you...*, *Why didn’t you...*, *You should...*, or *You shouldn’t...*. Such reflective thinking, rendered possible through writing journals, as a positive answer to Shor’s (1992: 14) question ‘Do they [students] act like involved participants...?’ is further evidence of the contribution of DJW to empowerment as a major concern in CP, and a manifestation of students’ gaining power to question the teacher and to break the disempowering ‘culture of silence’ (Freire, 1998).

Participants’ responses to one of the written interview questions on empowerment as our second body of data, strongly supported this empowering role of
DJW, with 27 out of the 30 participants endorsing the role of DJW in empowering them. The journals and student responses to written interview questions provide a coherent picture of the issue addressed by the first research question and elucidate the point that DJW provides learners with an opportunity to gain their voice and enables them to be heard (Freire, 1998; Shor, 1992; Shor & Freire, 1987), hence contributing to empowerment as a tenet of CP (Shor, 1992).

Considering the role of transformation as a salient aspect of empowerment, one might think the participants in this research are still far from being actually empowered; nothing really changed as a result of their independent expressions and their voice was not heard beyond the limited context of the journal notebooks. Ideally this is not unacceptable but considering empowerment as non-absolute, it may be a matter of degrees and what counts is the move towards a greater degree of empowerment.

In the cultural context of our schools, teaching practices of the teachers as well as student learning are strictly test-oriented and confined to textbooks. Students’ voices are therefore reflected in grades on standardised tests and later in national rankings in university entrance exams. They are heard as far as their scores can reach. This domesticated and uncritical type of voice, however, is far from a critically empowered personal voice.

Student responses to written interview questions on empowerment is an indication of gaining this lost personal voice as an opportunity they had rarely found before. Assertions like it helped us not to fear and to say whatever we wanted and it paved the way for saying things that we had no other opportunity to talk about and particularly I have never had such an opportunity to express my views indicate that DJW was really an empowering opportunity and students actually gained their lost personal voice. Therefore in the socio-cultural context of educational settings like the one we dealt with, where ‘culture of silence’ (Freire, 1998) is the dominant practice, we believe, being able to express the self, even in journals with such a limited scope does qualify as a move towards empowering education.

DJW and the development of critical literacy

Our second guiding question of the study focused on the issue of whether DJW helped learners move away from factual and descriptive view in writing and towards creative views. Analysis of the journal entries, as presented before, revealed that as the participants continued writing, the proportion of descriptive and personal journal entries decreased and the proportion of critical and creative entries increased, so that in the last quarter of the year in writing almost all journal entries the writers moved beyond factual descriptive mode with just 1% of the entries written in descriptive mode. Eighty-two percent of the entries were written in either critical or creative mode, with 42% of them being creative ones. The change in the proportion of the entries with different modes, showed a clear transformation in students’ view of writing, which is a major goal of critical literacy (Ada, 1988, cited in Cummins, 1989; McLaren, 1989). This transformation could be attributed to the critical awareness and the generative atmosphere developed through teaching activities throughout the year and fostered by the democratic space created by the DJW opportunity. Considering the change in writing modes in the four
quarters, one may conclude that writing DJs does provide learners with a potentially valuable and generative opportunity to move beyond descriptive uncritical writing and towards critical and creative modes of writing.

Qualitative naturalistic inquiry, to which our microethnographic study is not an exception, does not provide generalisations that can be abstracted and applied (Edge & Richards, 1998). However, it does provide evidence that ‘makes transferability judgments possible on the part of potential appliers’ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, cited in Edge & Richards, 1998). The following are what we offer out of the present study as possible judgments transferable to other foreign language education contexts.

The findings of the study indicate that DJW as an educational activity is a potentially rich and generative procedure for filling the educational gap in foreign language teaching referred to before (Pennycook, 1990). It can be a potentially important contribution to the implementation of CP as an educational theory in EFL contexts (Norton & Toohey, 2004; Reagan & Osborn, 2002). Helping learners move beyond functional instrumentalist (McLaren, 1988) views of EFL, the study shows, DJW may empower learners in order for them to be able to explore their own worlds with the words they have at their disposal (Freire & Macedo, 1987).

DJW has also appeared to contribute to critical literacy (Lankshear, 1993; McLaren, 1988). If employed in language education, DJW seems to be able to do a great service to post-process and critical writing practice (Atkinson, 2003a; Clark & Ivanic, 1997). It may be employed to help learners move beyond a functional view of reading and writing (McLaren, 1988) and towards world literacy at the same time that they deal with word literacy (Freire & Macedo, 1987).
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