

Reading “Further and Beyond the Text”: Student Perspectives of Critical Literacy in EFL Reading and Writing

When language learners are taught within a critical literacy framework, both their conventional literacy skills and their abilities to critically engage with texts may deeply improve.

Shin-ying Huang

Critical literacy is widely practiced in classrooms in many countries and across levels of education. Research that explores critical literacy in English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms, however, remains scarce. The few studies that do exist focus on development of critical literacy without explicit attention to development of language skills (see, e.g., Burns & Hood, 1998a; Kuo, 2009; Wallace, 2003). These studies also do not systematically examine students’ understanding of critical literacy in relation to their language development. Merely exploring the potential of critical literacy implementation from the instructor’s perspective is not enough to provide a holistic picture of its implications for ESL and EFL learning.

Therefore, in this article I explore how critical literacy and conventional literacy can be simultaneously promoted in an EFL reading and writing course. I also examine students’ perspectives of critical literacy in relation to language development, discussing specifically what critical literacy means to them, how critical literacy helps their reading and writing, and how their EFL literacy improved as a result of the course.

Conceptual and Empirical Studies of Critical Literacy

Despite the different ways in which critical literacy has been conceptualized as a result of different theoretical underpinnings (Brown, 1999; Comber, 2001), Lankshear (1994) observes that it can generally be understood as encompassing three dimensions: (1) a general attitude toward literacy, (2) a particular way of engaging with texts, and (3) a manner of participating in the world that involves language and literacy. This study explores the dimension of critical literacy as a way of problematizing texts.

Luke and Freebody (1999) drew attention to ways of engaging with texts in their four resources model of reading. They identified a proficient reader as having coding competence, semantic competence, pragmatic competence,

Critical literacy and language skills development can be integrated with positive results.

and critical competence, and explained these four competencies in relation to the simultaneous practices of a reader as code breaker, meaning maker, text user, and text critic. They defined a text critic as someone who is aware that “texts are not ideologically natural or neutral—that they represent particular points of views while silencing others” and is also able to “critically analyze and transform texts” (¶ 21).

Therefore, a text critic possesses an understanding of the ways in which power pervades texts (Wallace, 2001) and how readers are often positioned by texts and their writers (Burns & Hood, 1998b). As a text critic, a reader needs to “question the voices behind texts, who is represented and who is not, and what positions texts are assuming” (Stevens & Bean, 2007, p. 6). Such a reader should then be able to “construct a reading that may actively resist and challenge the preferred reading of a text” (Bean & Moni, 2003, p. 639).

Empirical Studies in English-Speaking Contexts

As a result of the emphasis of critical literacy on reading both the word and the world (Freire & Macedo, 1987), classroom practices, as Behrman (2006) identified, include reading multimodal texts that explore social issues, reading texts on the same topic written from different perspectives, reading from positions other than the preferred one, authoring texts from different perspectives, researching social issues, and taking social action.

Of these six approaches, researching social issues and taking social action relate to “critical world literacy” while the other four practices focus on developing “critical word literacy.” Examples of the former can be found in classrooms that examine the unequal relations of power implicated in familiar sociocultural practices and institutions (see, e.g., Chafel, Flint, Hammel, & Pomeroy, 2007; Foss, 2002; Laman, 2006; Leland et al., 2003; Vasquez, 2003). Literacy classrooms where the latter is emphasized explore reading as a social and constructed practice, looking particularly at the power relations between a text and its readers as a result of how information is selected and presented by

the author (see, e.g., McDaniel, 2004; McLaughlin & DeVoogd, 2004; Wilson, 2001; Wooldridge, 2001). This study draws from the latter examples but includes a focus on conventional literacy development in addition to critical word literacy.

Lesley (2001) similarly sought to integrate critical literacy and the development of basic reading skills in her introductory university reading course. The course focused on four types of student work. The first was an in-class dialogue journal through which her students responded to reading materials and class discussion as well as to fellow students’ journals. In the reader’s resource notebook, the students documented new vocabulary and the reading strategies they learned and found useful. This helped the students monitor their skills development in the course. Her students also wrote reader response essays on the core text and revised an essay using five vocabulary words from their reader’s resource notebooks. Finally, the students wrote a literacy narrative through which they reflected on the trajectory of their literacy development. At the end of the course, the students progressed from a 9th-grade to a 12th-grade equivalent reading level. Although the skills emphasis of the course mainly centered on the reader’s resource notebook through which students monitor their learning of vocabulary and reading strategies, the study demonstrates that critical literacy and skills development can be integrated with positive results.

Empirical Studies in ESL and EFL Classrooms

Literature on the theory or practice of critical literacy in ESL and EFL classrooms is both limited (Ko & Wang, 2009). Among the few studies, Wallace (1992, 2003) explored with her EFL students the social and ideological underpinnings of literacy practices and analyzed texts to consider the ways readers are affected by how authors present a topic and the related participants, establish relationship between the reader and the subject matter, and organize ideas. Focusing on authors’ decisions of textual practices led her students to understand how texts are social and ideological constructions imbued with human bias, intention, and design.

In a tertiary English conversation course in Taiwan, Kuo (2009) explored critical literacy using

a dialogue activity. After the class read two picture books—one about Holocaust victim Anne Frank and the second about Ruby Bridges, the first black child to attend a formerly all-white public school in New Orleans—students created group dialogues that incorporated elements of the two stories and aspects of their own experiences.

Kuo (2009) found that most students reflected positively on the activity, but one shared his concerns that the lack of focus on conventional literacy instruction may have detrimental effects on his ability to perform well on language proficiency exams. Kuo therefore cautioned that critical literacy should not be emphasized “at the cost of reading delight and spelling/grammar correctness” (p. 493) in EFL classrooms.

Buns and Hood (1998a) presented descriptions from several ESL educators in Australia who incorporated critical literacy in courses with students of different proficiency levels. These educators researched different aspects of developing critical awareness of texts. For example, Rice (1998) used the following questions to help students critically examine and discuss texts. The questions address several aspects of texts, including topic, source, author, audience, linguistic choices, and purpose (p. 56):

- Where might you find this text? How can you tell this?
- What is the topic?
- What is its purpose? (What is its genre?)
- To whom is it written?
- Who probably wrote it—what would their position be? In what institution?
- Why was the text written? Are there any economic/material interests affecting why it has been written in the way it has?
- How does the language of the text help to achieve its purpose?
- What other ways of writing about the topic are there?
- What sort of ideal reader has this text constructed?

In another contribution to the same volume, Reade (1998) asked an additional question, “What is your position?” (p. 45), which encourages students to consider their own views.

These dimensions of texts were also explored by Fraser (1998) and Perkins (1998), both of whom included a language skills component as part of the focus on critical literacy. Fraser integrated critical interpretation of texts with development of discussion skills. Perkins added critical analysis of texts as part of reading comprehension exercises. Neither study, however, evaluates the extent to which students successfully developed language skills. How and whether such a balance can be achieved needs to be given explicit attention, for “the relationship of critical to mainstream literacy [should be] one of dependency rather than add-on” (Hammond & Macken-Horarik, 1999, p. 532). That is, neither critical literacy nor conventional literacy should be relegated to subordinate status.

Methodology

This research was conducted in an English Reading and Writing course, which I taught in spring 2009. The course was an elective offered to non-English majors at a university in Taiwan in which I am a faculty member. Thirty-six students enrolled in the course.

I used a teacher research approach (Crookes, 1993; Mertler, 2006) to investigate the implementation of and students’ perspectives regarding critical literacy in this EFL classroom. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) defined teacher research as a “systematic, intentional inquiry by teachers about their own school and classroom work” (pp. 23–24). It enables teachers to study their classrooms and improve their practices while at the same time contribute to theory construction about the process of teaching and learning.

Data for this study included students’ written work and my teaching journal. Students’ written work involved two pieces from the beginning of the semester (“Introduction and Reflection” and “Reflections on Reading and Writing”) and one from the end (“Final Reflection”). The “Introduction and Reflection” paper prompted students to reflect on themselves as readers and writers; “Reflections on Reading and Writing” asked for students’ perspectives on the characteristics of good readers and writers; and the “Final Reflection” paper asked students to reflect on their learning in the course in relation to both critical literacy and EFL reading and writing. In the teaching journal, I recorded my plans for each week

Reading materials were based on the four themes of commerce, environment, gender, and language.

of the class, reflections after each class, and details of conferences with individual and groups of students about their writing and their learning in the course. These different data sources allowed me to explore students' learning in a holistic manner.

In the analysis, data were organized and coded into three categories: (1) what critical literacy means to the students, (2) how critical literacy helps their reading

and writing, and (3) how their EFL literacy improved as a result of the course. The codes were clustered into themes after further rereading and analysis, and then the data were examined again to ensure that the themes adequately represented the range and breadth of students' perspectives.

The Course: Addressing Both Critical and Conventional Literacy

I introduced students to critical literacy by focusing on the notions of text critic as explained by Luke and Freebody (1999). I also suggested a set of questions, adapted from Rice (1998), as possible angles through which to examine texts:

- What is the topic?
- What is the writer's purpose? How does it relate to the source of the text?
- What was not said about the topic? Why? What are the consequences?
- Whose interests are served by the text?
- What are other ways of writing about the topic?

I refer to these as "critical questions" as they help readers to consider texts from critical perspectives.

After the conceptual discussion, we applied the notion of critical literacy to a short article of 410 words, "The Life of Jackie Chan." The article, found in *Mosaic 2: Reading*, a popular commercial English textbook in Taiwan, was originally published at the entertainment website www.starpulse.com. I chose this article because of the students' familiarity with

the life and works of the celebrity Jackie Chan, which placed them in a better position to consider how the author purposefully selected information for an article published on a website that follows entertainers.

Throughout the course, reading materials were based on the four themes of commerce, environment, gender, and language. These themes allowed students to read texts on a variety of topics and with a range of vocabulary. From each theme, I chose two articles on the same topic, but written from opposing points of view. We discussed each of the articles separately before exploring them from a critical perspective in light of each other.

As an example, article 1 in the language theme was posted to the "Global American" section of a website dedicated to the PBS television broadcast *Do You Speak American?* (www.pbs.org/speak/ahead/globalamerican/), and opens with the words "We are the world. Not everyone is thrilled." The article recounts the unsuccessful promotion of French to show how "language cannot be dictated by elites ruling from above. It is the one naturally democratic force in the world—surging up from below." It also predicts the further expansion of English as a result of India and China's reliance on English as "their passport to affluence." These arguments rationalize the "inevitable spread" of English and justify the author's recommendation that everyone learn English.

The class discussed the following questions after reading the article:

- What is the topic?
- What is the author's position on the topic? Where in the article can you find evidence to support your answers? Specifically,
 - What is the author's view on the spread of English?
 - What is the author's view on the future of English?
 - What is the author's view of the consequences of the spread of English?
- How does the author argue his point? That is, how does the author come to the conclusion that everyone should learn English?
- In the article's opening, "We are the world. Not everyone is thrilled," who does "we" and

"everyone" refer to? That is, does the article specify the author's name and affiliation? Which publication is the author writing for?

Even though these questions do not directly explore the article from a critical perspective, they served as the basis for a later discussion that examined the views of English not presented, the author's purpose for writing, and the interests served by the article.

Then, in class, students wrote reactions summarizing their thoughts on the issues raised in the article. These reaction pieces served two purposes: They allowed students to express in writing their thoughts about a text they had read, and they allowed me to ensure that the students were familiar with the article, placing them in a better position to engage in the practice of a text critic.

Students then read article 2, "English Hegemony and English Divide" (Tsuda, 2008), as an assignment before class discussion. The article explains how "English dominates and threatens other languages, functions as a domestic and international gatekeeper to create and reproduce the structure of inequalities between the English-speaking people and the non-English-speaking people" and that the unequal relations of power affect "almost all the domains of our life including economy, politics, social classes, education, science, media and so on" (p. 49).

After discussion of the article to ensure that students comprehended its thesis and argument, we re-examined article 1 in light of article 2, focusing on these questions:

- What views of English are not presented?
- What is the author's purpose in writing this article?
- Whose interests are served by the article?
- What are other ways of writing about the topic?

Then, students wrote a short essay of a few paragraphs to counter arguments posed in article 1. The purpose of this assignment was not only to help students critique the readings, but also to allow them to write from perspectives that were not included in the text—that is, to produce countertexts (Behrman, 2006). The rationale of the countertext and the

in-class reaction piece was for students to "talk back" to texts and argue their own ideas so that they would not develop "an over-deferent stance towards the text" (Wallace, 1992, p. 61).

It was also important that part of the course covered conventional English writing skills, an essential component of many English-language proficiency examinations. The writing component of the course focused on the structure of different genres of writing, emphasizing organization and coherence and progressing from paragraph to essay. Each assignment was written twice, with both self review and peer review between the first and second versions. Time was also spent discussing students' grammatical mistakes.

By integrating conventional and critical literacy, students engaged in the practices of code breaking and meaning making during comprehension discussion, text usage when writing the in-class reaction piece, and text critic during the discussion of article 1 after reading article 2 and when writing the countertext. The countertext, through which students argued for viewpoints not mentioned in article 1, falls under the genre of argumentation, which is given significant attention in EFL writing instruction. Thus, through simultaneously placing emphasis on both conventional and critical literacy, the study combined both reading and writing components to the critical literacy instruction, enabling students to read and write both the word and the world (Freire & Macedo, 1987).

Student Perspectives of Critical and Conventional Literacy Learning

In presenting students' perspectives of what critical literacy meant to them, how it helped their reading and writing, and how their EFL literacy has improved as a result of the course, I aim to maintain their voices and therefore as many of their words as possible, including minor grammatical mistakes. I assigned each student a number for identification purposes. Thus, in the discussion that follows, "S36, O" or "S36 (O)," for example, refers to the original quote of student number 36, and "S28, T" or "S28 (T)" refers to a quote of student number 28 translated from Chinese.

The study found that students understood critical literacy as conscious reading that helped them to uncover

Critical literacy enhanced students' reading comprehension and motivated them as writers.

hidden messages and consider multiple perspectives. Critical literacy also enhanced their reading comprehension and motivated them as writers. Students EFL development also benefited from the course emphasis on conventional literacy. These findings will be elaborated in the following sections.

Critical Literacy as Conscious Reading

Students' understanding of critical literacy centered on the notion of "conscious reading" (S36, O). It involved examining authors' intentions and considering multiple ways of viewing an issue.

Uncovering Hidden Messages. Several students reflected that critical literacy draws their attention to the ways in which authors position their readers. In the words of S28 (T), "Critical literacy allows a reader not to accept the author's message at face value." Another student understood the importance of the source of a text for uncovering hidden messages:

Now before I read an article, I will need to know who the author is and where the article comes from. It can make me understand what the article writes for and who will be the reader. If an article comes from a superstar's blog, it may write some positive news for his/her fan.... If the source of the article is a political commentary magazine, he would imply some arguments in an implicit way to express his thought. (S35, O)

This student has learned that an author's affiliation and an article's intended readership are important for understanding why and how an article is written.

Being critical is also understood as a way of reading that draws attention away from emphasis on the technicalities of language to meaning making. One student reflected that critical literacy helps readers "know what the deep meaning the writer wants to tell. That is focusing on the meaning rather than those gorgeous vocabularies or grammar. Due to this, the readers can save time for thinking about the writer's position." (S23, O).

The result of being able to unearth the author's underlying message, as S8 (O) observed, is the

difference between submissive and active reading: "Before the class, most of the time, I read and then I believe. I seldom think about what is the true meaning of the author. Now I can learn how to 'read' not just 'watch'." S18 (T) also succinctly pointed out, "Reading this way can help us to *see through* an article rather than just *go through* an article." These students emphasized how reading critically made the difference between reading as an onlooker and reading as a participant.

Multiple Perspectives. Reading critically also helped students contemplate the multiple perspectives of an issue. One student observed,

Critical stance isn't about criticizing and opposing the author but understanding an article, an issue, or an event from a variety of angles, and considering what other viewpoints are available and possible other than the one proposed by the author. (S28, T)

Another student pointed out that, when attempting to understand an article, the subtle messages can actually be more important than those explicitly stated:

Critical literacy has helped me being a thoughtful reader. Not just to understand the article for the sake of getting to know what is said but now I can focus more on what is not said. What is not said is usually more important than what is said.... What's more, the critical questions help us to think further and beyond the text: What are other possible developments to the article? The self-interrogation makes us think more and provides the base for future reading/writing. (S13, O)

This student explained the necessity of going beneath the surface and the limits of an article to consider other possible ways of understanding an issue, which then becomes the incentive for ongoing reading and writing. In other words, critical literacy serves as the motivation for intertextuality and further understanding of the world.

One student compared questioning an article to authorship:

Critical literacy makes me read like a writer. So when I read an article, I will ask some questions: "What is it talk about so far? Why does it talk these things? How does it present them?" After these questions,

I will compare it with other articles to help me analyze which view it does not take and decide if I agree with it. By these steps, I am just like another author of this article even if I am just a reader. (S9, O)

By considering alternative angles through which to view a topic, readers are indeed engaging in the act of rewriting.

Critical Literacy as Better Comprehension

Unexpectedly, as a result of the emphasis on multiple viewpoints, reading critically contributed to better comprehension among these students. In the words of S33 (O), “Critical literacy can make readers understand the articles more. From the viewpoint that different to the authors’ view, we usually can think the articles’ meaning much deeper.” One student speculated on the reason:

When I couldn’t understand an article, I try to read other articles which were not the same stance.... And when I use critical stance to reread it, I can easily understand it, and I also have my viewpoint in mind. Maybe the reason is that when I use critical stance to read it, I can compare, generalize, and conclude the article. So I think critical literacy really helpful for me. (S30, O)

Not only is attempting to understand an issue from different perspectives helpful for EFL readers, but asking critical questions also resulted in better comprehension for them:

The critical questions help me scrutinize an article, ensure that I do not miss any details, and judge whether I have a comprehensive understanding of the article’s contents. Without this, I would not be constantly questioning what I am reading, and would often end up misconstruing an article’s underlying meaning. Therefore, critical literacy helps readers to thoroughly analyze an article, and is therefore helpful for reading. (S27, T)

In this case, critical questions improved the student’s understanding of an article through dissecting and analyzing the contents.

The unforeseen result of better comprehension is most illuminating. This effect of critical literacy could be specific to foreign language learners, as it has not been found in research regarding native English

speakers. This also points to Luke and Freebody’s (1999) four reading practices as interactive: A reader not only engages in all four acts when reading, but each can influence the others.

Specifically, not only are code breaking and meaning making prerequisites for assuming the role of a text critic, but acting as a text critic also enhances a reader’s command as a coder breaker, meaning maker, and text user. The ways in which being a text critic contribute to the practices of code breaking, meaning making, and text usage for EFL learners is an area that warrants further investigation.

Critical Literacy as a Reason to Write

Freire (1970) pointed out that a critical literacy stance is a “praxis” stance, involving not only reading the word and the world, but also rewriting the word and the world. In the design of this course, I focused on the literal meaning of “rewriting,” with the second writing assignment serving as a form of rewriting through which students countered the positions proposed in the texts they read. That is, they were called on to present in writing other possible versions of the world.

How critical literacy can be incorporated into writing instruction has rarely been discussed in the literature. Brown (1999) shared her dilemma about “how [students] can use their increased critical awareness to develop their writing skills” (p. 37). She raised two questions: “Do we encourage learners to use what they know to position the reader as they want to and to convey meaning in the way that suits their purposes—just as other writers do?” and “Do we encourage learners not to make certain ideological assumptions when they construct text—about gender, race and class, and so on?” (p. 37). Echoing this dilemma, I did not explicitly emphasize the connection between critical literacy and EFL writing. The students themselves, however, made this connection.

Several students found that critical literacy gave them an incentive to write and made writing meaningful. For example, S13 (O) shared, “I can write from more different perspectives after I’ve learned critical literacy.... I used to write just for writing but now I’m getting more hooked on writing in expressing my thoughts.”

Other students considered that critical literacy provided them with food for thought and, therefore, a

reason to write. S34 (T) aptly summed it up: “One of the biggest problems I encountered in my writing was that I could never think of what to write about. But

Take Action!

Incorporate both reading and writing components to the critical literacy instruction.

1. Choose two articles on the same topic written from different points of view. The aim is to critically examine one of the articles (e.g., article 1) in light of the other (e.g., article 2) for how the author constructed a text to serve his/her purposes and the consequences and power relations resulting from that construction. Therefore, the two articles should be chosen so that they complement each other for this aim.

2. The following steps can help engage students in the critical examination of article 1:

- a. Students read article 1 and discuss as a class to ensure comprehension.
- b. The class discusses the article for how the author constructed his or her argument(s).
- c. Students write a reaction piece to discuss their thoughts on issues raised in the article.
- d. Students read article 2 and discuss as a class to ensure comprehension.
- e. The class reexamines article 1 in light of article 2 using the critical questions to illuminate author intentions and textual construction.
- f. Students write a countertext, a short essay to counter arguments posed in article 1.

3. The reaction piece and countertext serve for students to “talk back” to the texts they read and argue their own ideas.

Try to relate the conventional literacy instruction to the critical literacy work. For example, choose articles based on topics related to content area instruction or target particular areas or levels of vocabulary. Comprehension of the articles can become the focus of a few reading workshops. The reaction piece and countertext can become the focus of a few writing workshops.

being critical has pushed me to think more; therefore, I have more to say when I am writing.”

Although Brown (1999) suggested the possibility of encouraging learners to avoid ideological assumptions when writing, it seems unlikely that a state of ideological neutrality could ever be achieved. It is perhaps more practical to encourage learners to be candid about ideological underpinnings in their writing. As a teacher–researcher, I believe that students can be taught to be conscious writers who make explicit any assumptions in their writing.

Balancing Conventional and Critical Literacy

In this EFL reading and writing course, students’ learning in relation to critical literacy was rewarding. An important aspect of this research, however, was to find out whether the course design was successful in terms of both conventional literacy development and critical literacy.

All the students reflected that their writing improved as a result of instruction in this course. They discussed different aspects of improvement, including paragraph and essay organization, knowledge and ability to handle different genres of writing, better understanding of the writing process as a result of self review and peer review, and improvement from regular practice.

Quite a number of students mentioned their satisfaction with knowledge of how English writing is organized. As one student pointed out,

The course taught me how to write English composition. For example, I learned about coherence and organization of an essay (i.e., from thesis statement to body paragraphs and then conclusion). I also learned about the different forms of writing, including comparison, definition, and cause/effect. (S3,T)

Several students also discovered the usefulness of revision. For example, S11 (T) stated,

By rereading my own work...I noticed things that did not occur to me when I was writing. Also, reviewing my classmates’ writing allowed me to see how others approached the assigned writing topic, and pushed me to think about how I can improve my own writing.

The course also changed students' attitude toward writing in English. One student stated, "I'm not afraid of writing and it's easier for me now to start writing" (S13, O). Another student similarly reflected, "I found out I like English writing in this class and I have been motivated in improving my English writing" (S19, O). Indeed, lowering affective filter (Krashen, 1985) and increasing motivation (Lightbown & Spada, 1999) are conducive to language learning.

Benefiting From the Dual Focus

This study shows that EFL students' learning can benefit from simultaneous emphasis on both critical and conventional literacy. In addition to the conventional literacy practices of code breaker, meaning maker, and text user, critical examination of texts further expanded their practices to include text critic. The study also makes apparent the need to assess critical literacy implementation from the students' perspectives.

The results of this study differ from the findings of Rice (1998) and Eastman (1998). Rice wondered whether a critical literacy disposition is dependent upon Western cultural values, drawing the conclusion that linguistic factors alone do not determine the success of critical literacy development in ESL classrooms.

Similarly, Eastman questioned the extent to which people of different cultural contexts are able to come to terms with a world view that "rests within the western tradition of analytical thought and logic" (p. 26) and wondered whether it is realistic to integrate critical literacy into a curriculum for second language learners "when survival language is their priority" (p. 27).

In this EFL classroom in Taiwan, although the students experienced this approach toward reading and writing for the first time, most were able to benefit from an emphasis on critical literacy and expressed favorable attitudes toward its inclusion in the course. It is therefore questionable to assume that critical literacy is culture specific, just as Luke and Freebody's (1999) four practices of reading belong to all readers, not just Western ones. Second- and foreign-language learners, however, may have difficulty applying critical literacy in situations where

they feel less at ease with the language. As S34 (T) explicitly stated, "When we are reading in Chinese, we often use the critical perspective too, and it's just when we encounter a foreign language in reading that we forget to read in this way."

My findings suggest that factors beyond cultural orientation need to be taken into account. Eastman (1998) herself speculates whether it is appropriate to emphasize critical literacy when some students are more eager to learn the language than to be critical of it. Perhaps it is not students' cultural background that obstructs them from coming to terms with critical literacy; rather, they may have more pressing concerns. It may be that teachers need to intentionally and explicitly structure courses so that second- and foreign-language learners are aware that conventional literacy is not being sacrificed for the purpose of critical literacy.

Note

I would like to thank the editors and the three anonymous reviewers for their detailed and insightful comments and suggestions. This research benefited from the funding support of National Taiwan Normal University (Grant-97091031).

References

- Bean, T.W., & Moni, K. (2003). Developing students' critical literacy: Exploring identity construction in young adult fiction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(8), 638–648.
- Behrman, E.H. (2006). Teaching about language, power, and text: A review of classroom practices that support critical literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(6), 490–498. doi:10.1598/JAAL.49.6.4
- Brown, K. (1999). *Developing critical literacy*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Burns, A., & Hood, S. (Eds.). (1998a). *Teachers' voices 3: Teaching critical literacy*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Burns, A., & Hood, S. (1998b). Introduction and acknowledgements. In A. Burns & S. Hood (Eds.), *Teachers' voices 3: Teaching critical literacy* (pp. iv–v). Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Chafel, J.A., Flint, A.S., Hammel, J., & Pomeroy, K.H. (2007). Young children, social issues, and critical literacy: Stories of teachers and researchers. *Young Children*, 62(1), 73–81.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Comber, B. (2001). Classroom explorations in critical literacy. In H. Fehring & P. Green (Eds.), *Critical literacy: A collection of articles from the Australian literacy educators'*

- Association (pp. 90–102). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Crookes, G. (1993). Action research for second language teachers: Going beyond teacher research. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 130–144. doi:10.1093/applin/14.2.130
- Eastman, L. (1998). Oral discussion in teaching critical literacy to beginners. In A. Burns & S. Hood (Eds.), *Teachers' voices 3: Teaching critical literacy* (pp. 22–28). Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Foss, A. (2002). Peeling the onion: Teaching critical literacy with students of privilege. *Language Arts*, 79(5), 393–403.
- Fraser, H. (1998). A place for critical literacy in developing discussion skills. In A. Burns & S. Hood (Eds.), *Teachers' voices 3: Teaching critical literacy* (pp. 47–54). Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D.P. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Hammond, J., & Macken-Horarik, M. (1999). Critical literacy: Challenges and questions for ESL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 528–544. doi:10.2307/3587678
- Ko, M.-Y., & Wang, T.-F. (2009). Introducing critical literacy to EFL teaching: Three Taiwan college teachers' conceptualization. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(1), 174–191.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.
- Kuo, J.M. (2009). Critical literacy and a picture-book-based dialogue activity in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10(4), 483–494. doi:10.1007/s12564-009-9048-6
- Laman, T.T. (2006). Changing our minds/changing the world: The power of a question. *Language Arts*, 83(3), 203–214.
- Lankshear, C. (1994). *Critical literacy* (Occasional Paper No. 3). Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Curriculum Studies Association.
- Leland, C.H., Harste, J.C., Davis, A., Haas, C., McDaniel, K., Parsons, M., & Strawmyer, M. (2003). "It made me hurt inside": Exploring tough social issues through critical literacy. *Journal of Reading Education*, 28(2), 7–15.
- Lesley, M. (2001). Exploring links between critical literacy and developmental reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 45(3), 180–189.
- Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned* (Rev. ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1999). Further notes on the four resources model. *Reading Online*. Retrieved June 6, 2008, from www.readingonline.org/past/past_index.asp?HREF=/research/lukefreebody.html
- McDaniel, C. (2004). Critical literacy: A questioning stance and the possibility for change. *The Reading Teacher*, 57(5), 472–481.
- McLaughlin, M., & DeVoogd, G. (2004). Critical literacy as comprehension: Expanding reader response. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(1), 52–62. doi:10.1598/JAAL.48.1.5
- Mertler, C.A. (2006). *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perkins, J. (1998). Developing critical literacy with post-beginners learners. In A. Burns & S. Hood (Eds.), *Teachers' voices 3: Teaching critical literacy* (pp. 29–39). Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Reade, H. (1998). Incorporating a critical literacy perspective in an intermediate reading class. In A. Burns & S. Hood (Eds.), *Teachers' voices 3: Teaching critical literacy* (pp. 39–6). Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Rice, J. (1998). Portable critical literacy strategies. In A. Burns & S. Hood (Eds.), *Teachers' voices 3: Teaching critical literacy* (pp. 55–60). Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Stevens, L.P., & Bean, T.W. (2007). *Critical literacy: Context, research, and practice in the K–12 classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tsuda, Y. (2008). English hegemony and English divide. *China Media Research*, 4(1), 47–55.
- Vasquez, V. (2003). *Getting beyond "I like the book": Creating space for critical literacy in K–6 classrooms*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Wallace, C. (1992). Critical literacy awareness in the EFL classroom. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical language awareness* (pp. 59–92). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Wallace, C. (2001). Critical literacy in the second language classroom: Power and control. In B. Comber & A. Simpson (Eds.), *Negotiating critical literacies in classrooms* (pp. 209–228). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wallace, C. (2003). *Critical reading in language education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wilson, L. (2001). Critical literacy and pop music magazines. *Australian Screen Education*, 25, 104–105.
- Woodbridge, N. (2001). Tensions and ambiguities in critical literacy. In B. Comber & A. Simpson (Eds.), *Negotiating critical literacies in classrooms* (pp. 259–270). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Huang is an assistant professor in the Department of Foreign Languages at National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan; e-mail syh@ntnu.edu.tw.

More to Explore

IRA Journal Articles

- "Critical Literacies and Graphic Novels for English-Language Learners: Teaching *Maus*" by Christian W. Chun, *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, October 2009
- "Jump-Starting Language and Schema for English-Language Learners: Teacher-Composed Digital Jumpstarts for Academic Reading" by Judith Rance-Roney, *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, February 2010

Copyright of Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy is the property of International Reading Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

5 Predicting Reading Literacy in Primary School: The Contribution of Various Language Indicators in Preschool . 93 Susanne Ebert and Sabine Weinert.Â Reading and understanding written information is a complex process that goes far beyond the ability of a simple recoding of letters.Â From a longitudinal perspective, BiKS focuses on developmental processes that are relevant to education and achievement in preschool as well as in elementary and secondary school by studying children from the ages of 3 to 15 in two panel studies that are aligned with each other. 17. BiKS also looks closely at the formation of transition decisions, examines their preconditions, and follows the effects of these decisions across the ensuing school years. language English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners ranged from 1,000â€“4,000.1 Whereas a 3,000â€“5,000 word family reading target may seem attainable for learners, with hard work, the 8,000â€“9,000 target might appear so unachievable that teachers and learners may well conclude it is not worth attempting. Thus, the lexical size target is a key pedagogical issue, and one might ask why the various estimates are so different.Â underlining unknown words in a text is different from simply reading a text, and so it is unclear how this affected the reading process.Â traditional MC test format with a contextualized sentence would take far too much time, considering that the learners needed to read two texts and nish two extended comprehension tests, as well. Reading â€œFurther and Beyond the Textâ€: Student Perspectives of Critical Literacy in EFL Reading and Writing. Author: Shin-ying Huang. Issue Date: 2011. Abstract(summary): First page of article.