Applied Linguistics and Culture:
Social Contexts of Identity and Agency

Rod Pederson

(Woosong University)

Pederson, Rod. (2005). Applied linguistics and culture: Social contexts of identity and agency. *English Teaching, 60*(1), 125-147.

The recent epistemological controversy surrounding Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for a greater inclusion of the socio-cultural aspects of language into the corpus of Applied Linguistic Theory has served to focus theoretical attention on the relationship between language and culture. However, Linguistic and Social theorists such as Fairclough (1989), Pennycook (2001), Foucault (1984), and Bourdieu (1991) posit the interrelationship of language, culture, and power through post-structural theories of discourse. This paper extends the epistemological debate by interrogating how issues of power may affect the motivations for second language learning, second language identity formation, and second language literacy and social agency. In doing so, the author contends that the current theories and pedagogies may not only be insufficient to student needs, but may also have deleterious aspects.

I. INTRODUCTION

> To try to understand linguistically the power of linguistic expressions, to try to ground in language the principle and mechanisms of the efficacy of language, is to forget that authority comes to language from outside (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, pp.167-168)

Linguistic (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Halliday, 1975; Savignon, 1991) and Social theorists (Habermas, 1973; Hymes, 1966) have long called for merging the social aspects of language into the theoretical corpus of applied linguistics. The continuing controversy revolving around this call focuses on the epistemological foundations of the field and may be best exemplified by the work of Firth and Wagner (1997) who raise the question of whether research in applied linguistics needs to be cognitively based or whether such theories are incomplete without the inclusion of the social aspects of language acquisition and use. A continuum of theorists believe that epistemologies in applied linguistics either

need to be strictly cognitively based (Beretta, 1991; Crookes, 1992; Gass, 1998; Pica, 1994), or must include social constructivist epistemologies (Block, 1996; Blyth, 1995; Corson, 1997; Hymes, 1966; Kramsch, 1993). Key to understanding this bifurcation within the field is recognizing that the former believe that the social aspects of language may only be a matter of inquiry if they relate to the cognitive functions of language acquisition, whereas the latter do not see the two positions as mutually exclusive. By raising this epistemological question, Firth and Wagner (1997) are not only claiming that the field has a bias towards linguistic cognitivism and empiricism, but that the theoretical neglect of the social aspects of language may be deleterious to the field and second language learners.

While calls for the inclusion of socio-cultural theories question what some theorist's (Block, 1996; Firth & Wagner, 1997) believe is the empirically linguistic orientation of the field, if these social issues were included, we would still be lacking a coherent theoretical discussion within the much-debated relationship between language and culture. As much as theories of language acquisition may be incomplete without consideration of the social aspects of language, so they may be incomplete if they do not consider the relationship among language, culture, and power. The difference here lies in whether the social aspects of language are viewed as a means to define cognitive functions or to investigate the relationships among language, social structures, and social agents. Some linguistic (Fairclough, 1989), social (Bourdieu, 1991), and educational (Willinsky, 1998) theorists link the acquisition and use of a second language to issues of identity. If language acquisition and use inherently implies the inclusion of extra-lingual phenomena, then, issues of culture and power need to be included in any consideration of second language motivation, identity, and literacy. This paper examines the relevant literature regarding the relationship among language, culture, and power in applied linguistics and the social sciences in an attempt to determine whether current theories in applied linguistics are sufficient to the needs of second language learners.

II.   APPLIED LINGUISTICS

The call for a greater inclusion of the social aspects of language into the field of applied linguistics has a history that runs through the linguistics of Whorf (1956), the sociolinguistics of Hymes (1966), and theories of communicative language teaching (CLT) (Berns, 1990; Breen & Candlin, 1980; Canale & Swain, 1980; Savignon, 1991), to English as an international language (EIL) (Pennycook, 2001; Tollefson, 1995; Willinsky, 1998). Whorf (1956) posited that language was a manifestation of culture. Hymes (1966) and Halliday (1975) theorized language acquisition and use as being inseparably bound to social behaviors, and as such, proposed the utility of social theories for applied linguistics. In so doing, they opened the door for applied linguistics to theorize how language interacts

with the social aspects of culture and power. Hymes (1966) relates that the practice of sociolinguistics

> ⋯must be to identify the rules, patterns, purposes, and consequences of language use, and to account for their interrelations. In doing so, descriptive sociolinguistics will not only discover structural relations among sociolinguistic components, but disclose new relationships among features of the linguistic code itself (p. 5).

By evoking the relationship among rules, patterns, purposes, and consequences, Hymes foreshadows the post-structural/discursive understandings of language theorized by social theorists such as Foucault (1972) and Bourdieu (1991). However, although Hymes' (1966) approach opens a way to theorize about the relationships between language and the social world, it remains limited as his focus narrows to the functions of discrete linguistic forms. Hymes writes:

> A truly sociolinguistic approach is interested in the relation of linguistic variables to group membership for its own sake. If linguistic variables are not significant indicators of group membership in a given case, sociolinguistic theory will be interested precisely because such a case may help disclose the circumstances in which features of language do and do not so function (p. 4).

By focusing on how society and culture affect linguistic variables, Hymes' approach lies more in Widdowson's (1989) rendering of linguistics applied rather than applied linguistics where the first implies a direct pedagogical application of structural linguistic theory as opposed to discovering how these theories may, or may not be applied in practice. Moreover, while Hymes (1966) opens the means of inquiry into the relationship among language, culture, and power, he also occludes such inquiry by omitting the relationship between these variables and social agency. According to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology* (Marshall, 1994) social agency has two opposing meanings encompassed within theories of human action: first, human action as determined by the hegemony of social structures, and second, the possibilities for human action within social structures. The first implies a determinism, through social forces, that both defines and restricts the possible actions of individual agents. The second implies that the possibilities for human action are a compendium of social forces and individual subjectivites. In this way and individual agent may not only engage in action to change her own social world, but may also contribute to change in the larger social structures of society. Thus, the potential positive and negative repercussions of English acquisition may be said to reside in the social agency of individual students, and in terms of the efficacy of TESL pedagogy, in the

potential social agencies of a group of students.

Traditional theories of culture in applied linguistics may not foster an examination of the cultural issues inherent in second language acquisition and use. The majority of these theoretical constructs focus on the concept of acculturation and revolve around varying ideas of social distance (Acton & de Felix, 1986). Good examples of this orientation are Schumann's (1976) acculturation model and theory of social distance, Cummins' (1981) differentiation of basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), and Gardner's (1983) socio-educational model of bilingual proficiency. The general deficiency of these models lies in their orientation towards predicting cultural problem areas that will affect L2 acquisition, thereby betraying their linguistic orientation. More revealing is the way acculturation is viewed. Valdes' (1986) rendering of acculturation testifies to the assimilationist view of culture in SLA theory: "After the learners are guided to a recognition of the cultural base of their own attitudes and behavior, they are ready to consider others in a more favorable light" (p. 2). The problem here is that this view of culture may subjectively construct identities rather than allowing students to investigate culture for the purpose of constructing their own identities (Freire, 1987). According to Hall (1997) individual identities are constructed through a myriad of social forces including social relationships, education, and media representations. For example, if EFL students are exposed to pedagogical forms that represent Western cultures in ways that are viewed as being more "modern" than their native culture, identities may be constructed that view native culture as being inferior to idealized conceptions of other cultures. In this way, the discursive aspects of language acquisition and use are not only viewed as being of secondary importance to linguistic competency, but are what Vaut (1982) calls "Those skills that provide the students with the practical abilities that enable them to function in the new society" (p. l).

The possible problems of theoretically separating language from issues of culture and power become more apparent when considering the early recognition of the need to integrate culture with language learning (Politzer, 1959). An example of this includes theories such as Lambert's (1974) social psychology model of bilingual proficiency, which examines the concepts of additive and subtractive bilingualism in terms of personal identity, cultural assimilation, and social agency. However, Auerbach and Burgess (1987) and Pennycook (2001) report that the applications of such relevant theories are often pedagogically reduced to the level of non-critical survival English. Even applicable theories, such as Lamberts' (1986), are insufficient to the consideration of the relationship between language and culture. Bourhis' (1990) rendering of Lambert's (1986) theory illustrates how culture is only considered in what is gained or lost, not as a critical investigation into the workings of culture and how individual identities and agencies might be cultivated. Bourhis states (1990):

> When language proficiency in the second language fosters no need to replace
> or reduce the importance of the first language, additive bilingualism results
> and changes in self-identity are positive. When proficiency in the second
> language entails a threat to the first language, subtractive bilingualism results
> and may lead to a loss of cultural identity and social alienation. Subtractive
> bilingualism is often experienced by linguistic minorities who are encouraged
> to learn a national language as a way of promoting cultural assimilation to the
> dominant host culture (p. 140).

By emphasizing linguistic and cultural maintenance, as opposed to how language acquisition may affect individual subjectivity and agency, Lambert (1986) restricts the relationship among language, culture, and power to the individual instead of situating it among larger discursive systems. According to Lankshear (1997), the failure to interrogate the discursive aspects of language and culture may reduce linguistic competencies and social agency in both first and second languages and cultures. Viewing language acquisition and use as part of a discursive process allows us to theorize how the difficulties our students face in navigating the social terrains of second language and culture contexts may not be based solely in linguistic competencies.

III. LANGUAGE AND POWER

Many social (Habermas, 1988; Hymes, 1966) and linguistic (Fairclough, 1989; Halliday, 1975; Savignon, 1991) theorists have acknowledged the direct relationship between language and power, whether this conception lies in the theoretical forms of discourse, discursive practices/regimes (Foucault, 1972), or linguistic habitus and capital (Bourdieu, 1991). Even in the most basic conceptions of language as a symbolic system, its relation to power remains evident. According to Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), "···the correspondence between social and mental structures fulfills crucial political functions. Symbolic systems are not simply instruments of knowledge, they are also instruments of domination" (p. 13). Foucault (1972) and Derrida (1998) support Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1992) contention that symbolic systems are diffuse with power relations, and are thereby, political in nature. Foucault (1972) furthers this agreement through his theory of Enunciative Modalities by showing that relations of power are inherent in sign-relations (p. 54). Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1992) deconstruction of the relationship between language and power concludes that relations of power are evident in even the smallest level of linguistic exchange.

> ···linguistic relations are always relations of symbolic power through which

> relations of force between speakers and their respective groups are actualized in a transfigured form. Consequently, it is impossible to elucidate any act of communication within the compass of linguistic analysis alone. Even the simplest linguistic exchange brings into play a complex and ramifying web of historical power relations between the speaker, endowed with a specific social authority, and an audience, which recognizes this authority to varying degrees, as well as between the groups to which they respectively belong (pp. 142-143).

Deleuze and Guattari (1988), Street (1995), and Pennycook (2001) support Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1992) contention that the relationship between language/symbolic systems and power inevitably lead to the arena of political consequences. Central to Bourdieu's (1992) theory of language and power is the conception that socialization into language equates to socialization into the manifestations of power and that such power is political in that "authority comes to language from outside" (p. 147). Bourdieu maintains that language must be seen within a socio-historica1 context that reveals the relations to power and political advantage. These conceptions allow us to see that issues of empowerment may not be solely based on linguistic competency, but must also include socio-historically constructed conceptions of language/ethnic groups and the effects of second language theories and pedagogies.

   The movement of language theory into socio-cultural realms generally includes the conception of discourse[s] (Bourdieu, 1991; Fairclough, 1989; Pennycook, 1998) which are products of post-structural theories of the inter-relationship between language and the social world. Issues of power in post-structural discourse theories are most often expressed in terms of ideology and politics. For example, Gee (1993) sees language as being "…inextricably bound up with ideology and cannot be analyzed or understood apart from it" (p. ix). Lankshear (1997) extends this definition in terms of the pertinence of language to social structures of power and domination: "Now, for language, communication and meaning to be social-cultural is for them to be political, for them to be inseparable from the production and operation of institutionally structured power" (p. 46). Rose (1996) explicates the links among language, discourse, and power by claiming that discursive practices

> ...do not inhabit an amorphous and functionally homogeneous domain of meaning and negotiation of meaning among individuals - they are located in particular sites and procedures, the affects and intensities that traverse them are personal, they are structured into variegated relations that grant power to some and delimit the powers of others (p. 175).

In each case, the theoretical implications are the same: language cannot be unbound from

issues of power relations and culture.

Within these conceptions of discourse, Bourdieu's (1992) theoretical constructions of linguistic habitus, capital, and market (field) are clear. Although Bourdieu's works are not cited directly, these concepts are often central to the theoretical constructions of other language theorists (Gee, 1996; Lankshear, 1997; Norton-Pierce, 1995; Pennycook, 2001). Central to his constructions is the idea that linguistic capabilities (capital) are products of a linguistic habitus that are always produced for a profit of 'distinction' within a specific linguistic market (field) (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

> Any speech act or any discourse is a conjuncture, the product of the encounter between, on the one side, a linguistic habitus that is, a set of socially constituted dispositions that imply a propensity to speak in certain ways and to utter determinate things (an expressive interest), as well as a competence to speak defined inseparably as the linguistic ability to engender an infinite array of discourses that are grammatically conforming, and as the social ability to adequately utilize this competence in a given situation; and, on the other side, a linguistic market, i.e., a system of relations of force which impose themselves as a system of specific sanctions and specific censorship, and thereby help fashion linguistic production by determining the 'price' of linguistic profits. (p. 145)

Ibrahim (1999) supports this claim by showing how immigrant black youths in Canada are ridiculed for their deviation from perceived linguistic standards and are then forced to endure sub-standard levels of social standing and education in relation to their peers. The relationship between all aforementioned arguments and the formation of a second language identity lies in the relationship between language and power, as Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) state: "Linguistic competence is not a simple technical ability, but a statutory ability. This means that not all linguistic utterances are equally acceptable, and not all locutors are equal" (p. 146).

Investigation of the relationship between language and power is incomplete without an examination of how the legacy of colonialism/imperialism may affect second language acquisition. Kachru (1982) illustrates how the mere thought of a second language may effect the learner through the evocation of "...memories of language being used as a powerful –sometimes ruthless- instrument for religious and cultural subjugation and for colonization" (p. 1). The colonial relations between language and power are supported by Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1992) assertion that the "correspondence between social and mental structures fulfills crucial political functions. Symbolic systems are not simply instruments of knowledge, they are also "instruments of domination" (p. 13). Bourdieu and Wacquant (Ibid) further explicate the implications of power within this relationship

through the elucidation of communication in colonial/post-colonial contexts. They write:

> Let me take the example of the communication between settlers and natives in a colonial or post-colonial context. The first question that arises is, what language will they use? Will the dominant embrace the language of the dominated as a token of his concern for equality? If he does, there is a good chance that this will be done through what I call a strategy of condescension: by temporarily but ostentatiously abdicating his dominant position in order to 'reach down' to his interlocutor, the dominant profits from this relation of domination, which continues to exist, by denying it. Symbolic denegation (in the Freudian sense of Verneinung), i.e., the fictitious bracketing of the relation of power, exploits this relation of power in order to produce the recognition of the relation of power abdication elicits. Let us turn now to the situation, which is in fact the most frequent one, where it is the dominated who is obliged to adopt the language of the dominant--and here the relation between standard, white English and the black American vernacular provides a good illustration. In this case, the dominated speaks a broken language, as William Labov has shown, and his linguistic capital is more or less completely devalued, be it in school, at work, or in social encounters with the dominant (p. 143).

Pennycook (1998) also ties issues of power to language teaching through the history of English language teaching (ELT) to the subjugation of colonialism: "The history of the ties between ELT and colonialism has produced images of the Self and Other, understandings of English and of other languages and cultures that still play a major role in how English Language teaching is constructed and practiced" (p. 19). Kubota (2001) and Sung (2002) agree with these findings by illustrating how neo-colonial discourses construct the othering dichotomy of the NS/NNS designation and are embedded in theories and pedagogies in applied linguistics in a multiplicity of ways. Further links between second language acquisition and issues of power may bee seen by examining the nature of second language literacy. According to Willinsky (1988) languages and literatures were forced on the colonized "…in an effort to teach them why they were subservient to a civilization born to rule" (p. 4). Most important to this discussion of colonial/imperial relations and language is Pennycook's (2001) genealogy of EFL, which traces aspects of colonial domination back to epistemologies in applied linguistics. The issues of power that are the products of colonial/imperial relations are relative to applied linguistics as they not only help to define the motivations for learning a second language, but also what kinds of literacies and identities may result.

   Implicit to the relationship between colonialism/imperialism and second language learning is the growth of capitalism as an international social, political, and economic

system. Willinsky (1998) reports that the linguistic and economic subjugation of colonial populations is directly related to the emergence of capitalist economies. Kachru (1982) extends this relationship between economic relations and second language learning by relating economic franchise to levels of English fluency. The relationship between linguistic ability and economic franchise is supported by Bourdieu and Wacquant's (1992) contention that accumulation of linguistic capital results in "profits of distinction" (p. 145). Foucault (1984) further links the relationship between economic and linguistic franchise to social power by positing the question "How can the growth of capabilities be disconnected from the intensification of power relations?" (p. 48). Cheng (1982) illustrates how these economic and power relations affect language use in individual nations by documenting language use patterns in China: "When China is inward looking, the English there acquires more Chinese elements; when China is outward-searching, English there is more like the norm in the West" (p. 172). If the power of learning a second language, particularly English, affects motivations, identities, and literacies of learners then theory must not only account for the acquisition of language, but also consider why a specific language is dominant in second language learning.

One of the end results of the colonial/imperial legacy and the institution of international capitalism is the de-facto establishment of English as a lingua franca. Kachru (1982) confirms this evolutionary process by reporting that "English has now, as a consequence of its status, been associated with universalism, liberalism, secularism, and internationalism" (p. 11). The internationalization of English as a lingua franca and its attendant regimes of knowledge and power have rendered any conception of literacy to necessarily include aspects of English literacy (Pennycook, 2001). This end-product of the relationship among language, and power is confirmed by Robert Burchfield (1998) in his assertion that "English has become a lingua franca to the point that any literate educated person on the face of the globe is in a very real sense deprived if he does not know English" (p. 206). By this Burchfield means that EIL is intimately linked to social, economic, and political franchise. However, as the implications for the inexorable development of English as a lingua franca do not equate to a commonality of interests or identities (Scheff, 1990), applied linguistic theory needs to interrogate the relationship between language and power. Kachru (1982) recognizes this relationship by observing that the dissemination of English is irrelevant to linguistic factors: "The language has no claims to intrinsic superiority; rather, its preeminent role developed due to extra-linguistic factors" (pp. 11-12).

Summarizing these various theoretical positions in the context of the relationship between language and power may be best accomplished through Pennycook's (2001) 7-point schematization of Foucault's (1991) theory of power. Pennycook states:

(1) Power is not something owned or possessed but rather something that operates throughout society.

(2) Power does not have some ultimate location or origin.

(3) Relations of power are not outside other relations but are part of them.

(4) There is no position outside power and no position from which one can arrive at the truth outside relations of power.

(5) Power is always linked to resistance: Where there is power, there is resistance.

(6) Power is not merely repressive but is also productive.

(7) It is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together (p. 91).

First, aspects one and two theorize that power is not something owned or possessed but rather something that operates throughout society and, power does not have some ultimate location or origin (p. 91). This means that power has no ultimate ownership or residence within society. Power may be said to operate through social structures, but not to have its source in them. This view of the fluidity of power is illustrated by how classroom teachers have the ability (power) to construct theories and methodologies that may affect the larger structure of applied linguistics. In addition, this view of power is useful as it theorizes a greater access to social agency than structural models of power in that power is also available to the individual and/or collective agents. This move allows us to theorize how change to larger structures may then occur. The third aspect of power is similar to the first two aspects, but pushes ahead by theorizing that all social relations are imbued with relations of power. Relations of power are not outside other relations but are part of them (p. 91). This aspect again speaks to the prospects for increased social agency as subjects within any social relationship are both affected by, and have access to social power. In this way, it may be seen that although students may be affected by the relations of power running through the discourses of applied linguistics and their own societies, they also have the ability to affect these relationships by appropriating English for their own means. This understanding of power naturally leads to the fourth aspect of power. There is no position outside power and no position from which one can arrive at the truth outside of relations of power (p. 91). This move goes beyond the third aspect of power by theorizing how the productions of knowledge and truth claims are aspects of the constructions of power. This move illustrates how students may have access to power, but cannot gain access to it until they are able to recognize the relations of power that affect them.

Pennycook's (2001) fifth aspect of power, power is always linked to resistance: where there is power, there is resistance (p. 91), reflects how students often resist traditional pedagogies (Aeurbach, 1995) and how alternative theories of language and power challenge traditional views in applied linguistics. The sixth aspect of power, power is not merely repressive but is also productive (p. 91), theorizes a duality of power that allows us to critique social repression while theorizing ways to access power to change these repressive relations. The works of Auerbach (1995) and Pennycook (2001) illustrate how the concept of problem posing may not only illuminate unequal relations of power, but also

provide the means of access to power for the development of greater social agency. The seventh aspect of power, it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together (p. 91), completes a discursive understanding of power by theorizing power as being one part of a matrix of discursive practices (language, knowledge, truth, culture, and power). This theory of power is useful in that it allows for an analysis of micro (individuals and small groups) and macro (social structures) relations of power that can describe how the relationship among language, culture, and power affects both the teacher-educators within the field of applied linguistics and the teachers and students that are its consumers.

IV. SECOND LANGUAGE MOTIVATIONS

The predominant motivational theory for second language learning is Gardner and Lambert's (1972) conception of integrative (assimilatory) and instrumental (for specific purposes) motivations. Gardner (1985) further extends his model into three aspects: attitude toward L2 learning, the desire to learn a specific language, and intensity. According to Lantolf and Genung (2000), Gardner's conceptions of second language learning motivations continue to dominate SLA theory, but fail to include the socio-historical dynamic and are therefore, proficiency based. By focusing on "…the relationship between attitudes towards members of a particular speech community and proficiency in a second language SLA theory ignores how culture and power influence classroom dynamics and the motivations for beginning second language study" (p. 2). Drawing on the works of Vygotsky and Leontiev, which posit that the social embeddedness of motivation and learning, Lantolf and Genung (2000) extend the notion of motivation into the realms of subjectivities and power through activity theory.

> From an activity theory perspective, all distinctly human forms of psychological behavior arise from some need and are directed toward some object, which, in turn, is projected to an anticipated outcome. The projection from object to outcome, even if vague, is the motive for an activity and it is the link between object and outcome that imbues our behaviors, mental or physical, with meaning (p.11).

Kachru (1982) links the definition of motivation into realms of knowledge and power by stating that: "English is often learned because of its literary heritage, because of the status it may confer on the reader or speaker, because of the doors it opens in technology, science, trade, and diplomacy" (p. 4). Lankshear (1997) furthers the conceptions of motivational possibilities by linking educational success to acquisition of the dominant language and knowledge structures (p. 29). In the final analysis, all conceptions of second language

motivation may be encapsulated within Bourdieu's theory of linguistic and cultural capitals which states that: "high linguistic capital brings high profits of distinction" (Fowler, 1997, p. 28). Lankshear (1997) emphasizes the relation of linguistic capital to motivation by claiming that "language as a 'broker' is intended to focus on ways in which dominant and subordinate groups alike (try to) enlist the 'services' of language to act as an 'agent' on behalf of their respective interests" (p. 29). Clearly, the concept of linguistic capital indicates a direct relationship between second language learning motivations and the social dynamics of profit and power.

As motivations for second language learning may affect the speed and proficiency of individual second language acquisition (Ellis, 1997), a reciprocal relationship is suggested between the speed and fluency of acquisition and the effects of profit and power on the agency of individual learners. In this way, enhanced fluency leads the individual into regimes of knowledge and power (Foucault, 1972) without the benefit of commensurate understandings of these regimes. Lompscher (cited in J. Lantolf & P. Genung, 2000) validates the social constitution and ramifications of motivation by stating that " motivation constitutes the very nature of what psychology is all about, namely, how people regulate multiple interactions within the world, including themselves" (p. 11). In other words, from a critical perspective, motivation in itself is insufficient without an investigation of how one is situated within the social world. Norton-Pierce' (1995) theory of investment attempts to demystify the disconnection between the individual and the social world while acknowledging its predominance in SLA theory. This reciprocal relationship between motivations and issues of power are further extended when the relationship among language, culture, and power is viewed in terms of the precedents of colonialism/ imperialism, the growth of Capitalism as an international socio-political model, and the growth of English as an international lingua franca.

V.   SECOND LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

Theoretical conceptions of the self, identity, and identity formation are myriad and complex. As the construction of individual subjectivities are linked to notions of critical pedagogy through reflexivity (Freire, 1987; Kincheloe, 1999), discussions of identity formation are necessarily also discussions of literacy. From social constructivist positions, politics of identity, and strong/weak We theories, to identities inferred within the interplay between the conceptions of field and habitus, issues of identity and agency reverberate through every facet of social life. As many and complex as these constructions are, their complexity and the implications that flow from these complexities, are multiplied in the context of second language learning. The incorporation of another language connotes far more than the mere acquisition of a secondary linguistic system: one must also consider the

socio-cultural aspects of the relationships among language, discourses, and power that are inherent in all linguistic activity (Norton-Pierce, 1995; Pennycook, 1998). Discursive theories view identity as a compendium of social practices, including language, culture, knowledge, and power (Gee, 1996; Hall, 1997). This conception of identity is helpful in viewing identity as not residing in any one place or practice, thereby allowing a more complete investigation of identity.

The discussion of how second language motivations form reciprocal relationships with issues of knowledge and power in terms of political/economic hierarchical positioning raises the question of how conceptions of personal identities for second language learners are formed and to what extent these conceptions are influenced by the equation of language, culture, and power. These questions are germane to the overall discussion as conceptions of identity formed within regimes of power and knowledge without critical reflection are defined as oppressed in the fields of sociology (Bourdieu, 1991; Foucault, 1972) and critical pedagogy (Freire, 1981; Giroux, 1985).

The various sociological and psychological conceptions of identity are diverse, interconnected, and often convoluted. The most basic conception of identity may be seen in Zaretsky's (1994) definition as "...the product of interaction between self and society" (p. 204). Given that individuals are born into specific geographical spaces, it may be assumed that culture plays a significant role in the formation of identity. McCracken (1992) affirms this connection by stating that culture asserts itself through experiences that present themselves:

> ···to the senses of the individual, fully shaped and constituted by the beliefs and assumptions of his or her culture. This world has been constituted by culture in two ways. Culture is the 'lens' through which all phenomena are seen.. Second, culture is the 'blueprint' of human activity. ..specifying the behaviors and objects that issue from it (pp. 72-75)

Smith (1986) extends this issue through the inclusion of ethnicity in cultural identity (p. 3). The cultural component of identity allows a majority of theorists to view identity formation as socially constructed, a process that is at once historical, yet somewhat individual in terms of a personal reflective, or narrative, construction (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Dewey, 1966; Gee, 1993; Giddens, 1991; Lankshear, 1997).

Within the social constructivist conception of identity, relationships between language and identity are frequent. Benveniste (1971) relates the centrality of language to identity by stating that language serves as "...the psychic unity that transcends the totality of the actual experiences it assembles and that makes permanence of consciousness" and that subjectivity "is only the emergence in the being of a fundamental property of language" (p. 224). Bourdieu's (1992) conception of habitus also is consistent with the social

constructivist's line of thought. Foucault's deconstruction of identity is simply, and eloquently, stated as the human individual being "...a kind of creature whose ontology is historical" (p. 11). Gee (1996) summarizes the constructivist viewpoint in his taxonomy:

> So, what we see here, and it is a crucial point, is that the who we are and the what we are doing is really enacted through a three-way simultaneous interaction among (a) our social or cultural group memberships; (b) a particular social language or mixture of them; and (c) a particular context, that is, set of other people, objects, and locations (p. 69).

Or, as Descartes (1985) wrote: "Actors, taught not to let any embarrassment show on their faces, put on a mask. I will do the same" (p. 2).

   The extension of language into discourse and discursive practices/formations is also common in literature regarding identity (Foucault, 1972; Gee, 1993; Lankshear, 1997; Rose, 1996). Although the door to issues of culture and power has been opened in applied linguistics through the inclusion of notions of discourse (Canale and Swain, 1980; Firth and Wagner, 1997), these conceptions of discourse are far less comprehensive than those from the fields of social theory and critical pedagogy as they are based on structural linguistic renderings of the term (as communication between two locators) as opposed to post-structural conceptions that view discourse as a complex matrix of interconnecting social forces including language. Lankshear (1997) summates the importance of discourse to identity formation in terms of its relation to the social world, writing that:

> As with language, so with Discourse more generally. Only once norms and rules (for use) are established and observed can linguistic meaning be 'stamped' and communicated, and people participate in speaking the language as part of the process of giving shape to human life. Likewise, as the terrain of the larger project of creating, shaping, and bounding social life, discursive practice is characterized by norms and conventions which permit cultural meanings beyond language alone to be made and communicated. Both the norms governing linguistic meaning and those governing cultural meaning-making in and through discursive practice have to be transmitted and learned. Education, socialization, training, apprenticeship and enculturation are among the terms we use to refer to the processes by which individuals are initiated into the Discourses of their identity formations. Outside of Discourse there is no human life as social and cultural life. Knowledge of Discourses is not innate. Initiation into Discourses is cultural activity, and the Discourses themselves are, simultaneously, means and outcomes of cultural process (p. 17).

From these post-structural perspectives of language and its relationships to the social world, one can not only begin to see the relevance of these theories to the corpus of theories in applied linguistics but also begin to appreciate Foucault's (1984) seemingly flippant observation that nothing exists outside of discourse.

The link from a social constructivist process of identity formation to issues of language, knowledge and power lies in the concept of division. The concept of division in terms of identity formation may be seen in processes of categorization (Bourdieu, 1991; Calhoun, 1994; Clark, 1981; Lankshear, 1997; Merton, 1996; Rose, 1996), the assignment/ acceptance of roles and status sets (Bourdieu, 1991; Calhoun, 1994; Merton, 1996), conceptions of imaginary groups (Calhoun, 1994), the importance of naming (Scheff, 1994; Shibutani & Kwan, 1965; Snook, 1990), and the strong/weak We theories (Goffman, 1963; Lemert, 1994; Scott, 1991; Taylor, 1989). Perhaps the strongest example of division within these constructs is the concept of the strong/weak We as it relates to identity, domination, and the realities of current international-political economies. Lemert's (1994) definition of the strong We is particularly poignant:

> The white guy is the particular embodiment of liberal culture's identifications of humanity. This is a culture of which the foundation is the Self the moral subject which, as many have observed, is the modern equivalent to the soul. The moral Self, like the soul, can have only one identification: with Humanity, if not God (p. 115).

The effects of the strong/weak We theories of identity formation, in terms of the exercise of power, may be seen in both historical and current contexts. Mennell's (1994) explication of strong/weak We theories relationship to power illustrates its extra-temporal applications.

> When the power ratios between established and outsiders is very unequal, the oppressed and exploited cannot escape from their position. This is one of the conditions that make it most likely that they will take for their own we-image what the established say about them. This process of stigmatization is a very common element in domination within such highly unequal power balances, and it is remarkable how across many varied cases the content of the stigmatization remains the same (p. 182).

Willinsky (1998) confirms this relationship by noting that the effects of colonial/imperial power continue to influence conceptions of identity: "The frame of mind in which teachers and students listen to those who speak other languages than they do, and the frame of mind in which they understand their own position in the world as English speakers may still bear traces of the history of imperial conquest and dominance" (p. 194). Margaret Mead (1986)

furthers the relationship between power and identity in second language learning by noting the many and various problems faced when students:

> ...saturate themselves deeply and meaningfully in one other culture and language, and that in a high culture with whose members they can engage in sophisticated discourse, they tend to become locked into a kind of we-they position, in which one language and culture tends to become better, higher than the other.. But we need to go further and consider how to rescue students from the various traps that lie in the intense immersion in a second high culture, whether it be the trap of romanticism, of finding a counter culture, of excessive guilt over past imperialism and western chauvinism, or the development of a kind of double personality, complete with kinesics (pp. 14-15).

Mead's observations foretell the various theories of identity formation developed within applied linguistics (Cope, 1986; Curran, 1976; Lozanov, 1978), including Lambert's (1974) use of Durkheim's concept of anomie, which all hypothesize developmental stages in second language identity formation. However, these theories do not go far enough because they do not include the necessity of critical reflection and analysis within their corpus, nor do they consider the ramifications of how others view the individual second language learner. Habermas (1976) points out the fallacy of this omission by stating that: "No one can construct an identity independently of the identifications that others make of him" (p. 107). The need to conceptualize second language identity formation in terms of a critical analysis of group affiliations is supported by Habermas' (1998) discussion of identity. Habermas writes:

> The identity of a group refers to the situations in which the members can utter a simple 'we'; it is not an ego identity writ large but rather supplements the individual's identity. How we make our native traditions and forms of life our own by selectively developing them determines who we recognize ourselves to be in these cultural transmissions--who we are and would like to be as citizens. Serious value decisions result from, and change with, the politicocultural self-understanding of a historical community. Enlightenment over this self-understanding is achieved through a hermeneutics that critically appropriates traditions and thereby assists in the intersubjective reassurance or renovation of authentic life orientations and deeply held values (p. l60).

The necessity of critical reflection and analysis in identity formation is obvious. Given the additional relations of power and knowledge that exist in the formation of a second language identity, the need for critical thought is multiplied and, therefore, needs to be a

component of second language literacy.

As Foucault (1984) suggests, individuals need to critically work their way through questions of "How are we constituted as subjects of our own knowledge? How are we constituted as subjects who exercise or submit to power relations? How are we constituted as moral subjects of our own actions?" (p. 49). Obviously, these questions are relevant to individuals within both first and second language social contexts. Encapsulated within these questions lie the reasoning that necessitates the inclusion of relevant theories from the social sciences of sociology, psychology, and critical pedagogy into the corpus of theories of applied linguistics. The argument implicit in the alternative theories presented here is that while linguistic competence alone may foster social agency, its context is limited by the exclusion of social relationships of power (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996; Pennycook, 2001). This limited educational context, then, may not only disempower students by not fostering the appropriation of a new discourse, but may also be guilty of committing what Bourdieu (1991) calls "symbolic violence" by doing so. While these theoretical constructs have begun to be better represented within the literature of the field, the arguments of Block (1996) and Firth and Wagner (1997) maintain that these social views of language continue to marginally represented in the literature of the field. Pederson (2001) supported these assertions by finding that critical studies within three of the flagship journals in applied linguistics (Applied Linguistics, TESOL, Quarterly, and Studies in Second Language Acquisition) only received 7.6% of the publishing space over a 10 year period from 1989-1999. The cross-section of theories presented here clearly relate that the field of applied linguistics still has a long way to go to meet the social needs of students.

VI. CONCLUSION

The intricacies inherent within the relationship among language, culture, and power are many and various. The various theories reported here from the social sciences intimate that the field of applied linguistics does not adequately recognize or address how issues of culture and power are intimately tied to linguistic concepts, abilities, and functions. Although empirical studies are intrinsically useful to the study of how languages are acquired and used, they are not truly applied unless they are considered within a larger social context. Language use does not occur in a vacuum. Moreover, theories that include social contexts in terms of culture are incomplete if they do not also consider the dialectics of power inherent to linguistic and social systems. It is therefore necessary for theories of second language acquisition and use to include critical theories of culture and power.

The need for a greater inclusion of social, psychological, and post-structural/critical theories into the field of Applied Linguistics is necessary if adequate theories of second language literacy are to be developed. As the majority of literature attempting this inclusion

is not based on studies involving second language learners, research into how issues of culture and power affect students in second language classrooms is necessary. Certainly, the theoretical constructs presented in this paper suggest that current mainstream theories and pedagogies do not have the ability to allow students to investigate issues of culture and power in terms of identity formation, social agency, and social justice, much less appropriate such desirable aspects in conjunction with the language that is connected to them. Although theoretical arguments deploring applied linguistics' inordinate empirical linguistic emphasis and positing the necessity of greater inclusion of social considerations are useful, they are unlikely to be convincing unless they are supported by systematic inquiry.

Finally, references to the possible "deleterious" effects of current theories within the field may be viewed as overstatement or unsupported conjecture from cognitive/positivist perspectives, as opposed to more social constructivist perspectives that theorize potential harm in ignoring the social aspects of language. The central question to this debate is what is the job of a second language educator? Is it to be merely involved in theorizing the best way to acquire a language, or is it necessary to also consider the social ramifications of theory and pedagogy? Is it the responsibility of educators to equip second language students with the skills necessary to function in a second discourse, or is imparting the linguistic code with a smattering of culture sufficient? In other words, is it the responsibility of second language educators to equip students with the tools necessary for the investigation of culture for the purposes of enhanced agency and social justice? Proponents of critical pedagogy maintain that this is what any form of education should be about (Freire, 1981; Giroux, 1989). Given the preponderance of theories reported in this paper, this question is clearly fallacious. If theory and pedagogy are solely focused on the acquisition of the linguistic aspects of language, students will only be prepared for entry into the lower strata's of society (Auerbach & Burgess, 1987). This politics of assimilation is deleterious to learners as the preponderance of thought in educational, social, and literacy theories conclude that pedagogy is not (politically) neutral (Foucault, 1972; Giroux, 1985; Shannon, 1988). The real question is: how long will the fields of applied linguistics, SLA, and TESOL continue to pass over the latter parts of the equation of language, culture, and power to the detriment of students and the development of knowledge within the fields themselves?

REFERENCES

Acton, W., & de Felix, J. (1986). Acculturation and the mind. In J. Valdes (Ed.), *Culture bound* (pp. 20-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Auerbach, E. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical

choices. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language Education* (pp. 9-33). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Auerbach, E., & Burgess, D. (1987). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. In I. Shor (Ed.), *Freire for the classroom: A source book for liberatory teaching* (pp. 112-128). Portsmouth, Ma: Boynton/Cook.

Benveniste, E. (1971). Problems in general linguistics. Miami: University of Miami Press.

Berns, M. (1990). Contexts of competence, social and cultural considerations in communicative language teaching. New York: Plenum Press.

Beretta, A. (1991). Theory and construction in SLA: Complimentary and opposition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*(4), 403-511.

Block, D. (1996). Not so fast: Some thoughts on theory culling, relativism, accepted findings and the heart and soul of SLA. *Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 63-83.

Blyth, C. (1965). Redefining the boundaries of language use: The foreign language classroom as a multilingual speech community. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study* (pp. 68-29). Boston: Heinle.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, J. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bourhis, R. (1990). Social and individual factors in language acquisition: Some models of bilingual proficiency. In H. Bridget et al. (Eds.), *The development of second language proficiency* (pp. 126-139). New York: Cambridge.

Breen, M., & Candlin, C. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 89-112.

Burchfield, R. (1998). The English language. In J. Willinsky (Ed.), *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end* (pp. 213-214). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Calhoun, C. (1994). *Social theory and the politics of identity*. Cambridge, MA. Blackwell.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47.

Cheng, M. (1982). Chinese varieties of English. In B. Kachru (Ed.) *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 162-177). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Clark, J. (1997). The effects of flexible specialization on industrial politics. In C. Lankshear (Ed.), *Changing literacies* (pp. 94-95). Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Cope, C. (1986). Supervision in ESL. In V. Joyce (Ed), *Culture bound* (pp. 25-25). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Corson, D. (1997). Critical realism: An emancipatory philosophy of applied linguistics? *Applied Linguistics, 18*(2), 166-188.

Crookes, G. (1992). Theory format and SLA theory. *Studies in Second language*

Acquisition, 14(4), 425-449.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and the language minority student: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-30). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Curran, J. (1976). *Counseling-learning in second languages*. Apple River, IL: Apple River Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus*. London: Althone.

Derrida, J. (1998). *Monolingualism of the other, or, the prosthesis of origin*. Stanford, Ca: Stanford University Press.

Descartes, R. (1985). The philosophical writings of Descartes. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 96-97). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York. The Free Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA and language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.

Firth A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (Some fundamental concepts in SLA research). *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Random House.

Freire, P. (1981). Education as the practice of freedom. In P. Freire (Ed.), *Education for critical consciousness* (pp. 1-61). New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, Mass: Bergin & Garvey.

Gardner, R. (1983). Learning another language: A true social psychological experiment. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 49*(2), 139-146.

Gardner, R. (1985). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of Attitudes and motivation. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass, S. (1998). Apples and oranges: Or why apples are not orange and don't need to be: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 83-90.

Gee, J. (1993). Orality and literacy: From the savage mind to ways with words. In L. & L. Cleary (Eds.), *Linguistics for teachers* (pp. 257-265). New York: R. R. Donnelly & Sons.

Gee, J. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Giroux, H. (1985). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory culture, and schooling*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Giroux, H. (1989). *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Goffman, I. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Habermas, J. (1973). *Theory and practice*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1976). *Communication and the evolution of society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1988). *On the logic of the social sciences*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1998). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage

Halliday, M. (1975). *Learning how to mean*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hymes, D. (1966). *Why linguistics needs the sociologist*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Miami Beach.

Ibrahim, A. (1999). Becoming black: Rap and hip-hop, race, gender, identity, and the politics of ESL learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 349-370.

Kachru, B. (1982). (Ed.). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kincheloe, J. (1999). *The Post-formal reader: Cognition and education*. New York: Falmer Press.

Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive constructions of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 9-37.

Lambert, W. (1986). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In J. Valdes (Ed.), *Culture bound* (pp. 20-29). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lankshear, C. (1997). *Changing literacies*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Lantolf, J., & Genung, P. (2000). An activity theory perspective on foreign language learning in the classroom setting: A case study. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangere, 12,* 13-25.

Lemert, C. (1994). Dark thoughts about the self. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Social theory and the politics of identity* (pp. 237-238). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Lozanov, G. (1978). *Suggestology and outlines of suggestopedia*. New York: Gordon & Breach.

Marshall, G. (1994). (Ed) *The concise Oxford dictionary of sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McCracken, G. (1992). Culture and consumption. In H. Dittmar (Ed.), *The social psychology of material possessions: To have is to be* (pp. 74-75). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Mead, M. (1986). Some cultural approaches to communication problems. In J. Valdes (Ed.), *Culture bound* (pp. 179-80). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mennell, S. (1994). The formation of we images: A process theory. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Social theory and the politics of identity* (pp. 214-215). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Merton, R. (1996). *On social structure and science*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Norton-Pierce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(3), 9-31.

Pederson, R. (2001). *Language culture and power: Epistemology and agency in applied linguistics*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. New York: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Phillipson, R., & Skutnaab-Kangas, T. (1996). English only: Worldwide or language ecology? *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), 429-452.

Politzer, R. (1959). *Developing cultural understanding through foreign language study*. Report of the Fifth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Teaching. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Rose, N. (1996). *Inventing ourselves: Psychology, power, and personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Savignon, S. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(2), 261-277.

Scheff, T. (1994). Microsociology. Emotions and identity: Theory of ethnic nationalism. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Social theory and the politics of identity* (pp. 66-67). Cambridge, MA. Blackwell.

Schumann, J. (1976). Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 26*(2), 391-408.

Scott, J. (1991). *Domination and the arts of resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shannon, P. (1998). *Reading poverty*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Shibutani, T., & Kwan, K. (1965). *Ethnic stratification*. New York: Macmillan.

Snook, I. (1990). Language, truth, and power: Bourdieu's ministerium. In R. Harker et al. (Eds.), *An introduction to the work of Pierre Bourdieu: The practice of theory* (pp. 122-123). London: Macmillan.

Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy development, ethnography, and education*. New York: Longman.

Sung, K. (2002). Critical theory and pedagogy: Remapping English teaching in Korea. *English Teaching, 57*(2), 65-89.

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tollefson, J. (1995). *Power and inequality in language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Valdes, J. (1986). (Ed). *Culture bound*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vaut, E. (1982). ESL/coping skills for adult learners. *Language in Education: Theory and Practice, 46* (pp. 49-64). Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Widdowson, H. (1989). Knowledge of language and ability for use. *Applied Linguistics. 10*(2), 128-137.

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Zaretsky, E. (1994). Identity theory, identity politics: Psychoanalysis, marxism, post-structuralism. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Social theory for a changing society* (pp. 203-204). San Francisco: Westview Press.

Rod Pederson
Department of TESOL-MALL
World Language Institute
Woosong University
17-2 Jayang-Dong dong-ku
Taejon, 300-718, Korea
Tel: (042) 630-9245 / H.P.: (042) 638-0761
Fax: (042) 631-3180
Email: docrod588@yahoo.com