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ABSTRACT

In the discipline of Composition and Rhetoric, two themes have emerged in recent scholarship on critical pedagogy: one, researchers have been reporting on a tendency in students to resist praxis informed by critical pedagogy (Arroyo; Kill; Kopelson); and two, scholars have begun to acknowledge the importance of accounting for geographic location in praxis (Mauk; Ball and Lai; Reynolds). This dissertation demonstrates that accounting for location in praxis can potentially counter the propensity in students to resist critical pedagogy practices by examining how students receive such practices in the context of a place-based teacher research project located both geographically and pedagogically in Hawai‘i. This project details the evolution of my Composition I and Composition II students’ increasing involvement in an exploration of resistance to critical pedagogy over the course of five semesters, the culmination of which was a final semester of data collection when my students were formally enlisted as co-researchers. Our inquiry into resistance as well as other noteworthy interactions that took place in the classroom during our work together in the project collectively point to the intricate role geographic location plays in the ways of knowing and interacting that students bring to the classroom. While working collaboratively with my students as co-researchers in this teacher research project grounded in a specific place relevant to the students’ lives, I observed a generally positive reception to critical pedagogy practices by the students, even when the focus of our research was on resistance to critical pedagogy that students often demonstrate. Moreover, the location-based narratives that emerged in student writing and classroom discussions in two composition courses taught at the University of
Hawai‘i afforded opportunity for rhetorical analyses of the dominant discourses of one place in terms of how they are reproduced by students and, as such, provide an exemplum of how critical pedagogy practices can be productively contextualized within a particular location.
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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is about a teacher research project I conducted with my students over several semesters, from fall 2005 through spring 2007, in two composition courses I taught at the University of Hawai‘i. I say with because in this project my students and I were co-researchers: we worked together on an exploration of student resistance in the classroom. At the same time, my students are also the research subjects in this project as this study documents and offers an analysis of the writing students produced and discussions that took place in the classroom during and as a result of our work as co-researchers. One of the goals of the project was to have students respond to the concept of resistance to critical pedagogy practices and situate these findings within current scholarship on the same: I wanted to understand what students themselves had to say on the subject and ascertain how it aligned with what teacher–scholars were saying about students and their resistance.

A significant body of work over the last ten years in Composition and Rhetoric has focused on student resistance to critical pedagogy practices in the classroom. Susan Arroyo explains that “despite the overwhelming and extensive popularity of social epistemic practices [. . .] many advocates have recently expressed frustration over students’ resistance not to the dominant culture in which they live, but to critical pedagogy itself and the critical teachers themselves” (3 sic). In response to the scholarship on student resistance, such as Arroyo’s, and my own teaching experiences wherein I encountered students resisting such practices, I designed a teacher research project informed by my critical pedagogy philosophy as well as two conceptual
frameworks advocated in the current scholarship on teacher research that align with the objectives of critical pedagogy (Cochran-Smith and Lytle). This dissertation examines students’ reception of this teacher research model through an analysis of the data students produced, written and oral, in terms of the objectives of critical pedagogy.

I consider myself a critical pedagogy practitioner (in the vein of Freire’s work with its roots in the critical theory of the Frankfurt school) in that I work to employ classroom practices that encourage students’ questioning of hegemonic discourses. In this project, I use critical pedagogy to encompass a set of objectives, what I also refer to as the tenets of critical pedagogy throughout this dissertation, drawing from the definition Elizabeth Ellsworth provides in her germinal 1989 article, “Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy”:

[Critical pedagogy] support[s] classroom analysis and rejection of oppression, injustice, inequality, silencing of marginalized voices, and authoritarian social structures. Its critique [is] launched from the position of the radical educator who recognizes and helps students to recognize and name injustice, who empowers students to act against their own and others’ oppressions (including oppressive school structures), who criticizes and transforms her or his own understanding in response to the understanding of students. The goal of critical pedagogy [is] a critical democracy, individual freedom, social justice, and social change—a revitalized public sphere characterized by citizens capable of confronting public issues critically through ongoing forms of public debate and social action.

Students would be empowered by social identities that affirm[] their race, class, and gender positions. (302)
To facilitate attainment of these somewhat abstract objectives in terms of the hegemonic discourses a particular group of students encounter in their lives, I believe that a critical pedagogy approach should employ course content that relates to students’ lived realities so that the learning we do in the classroom potentially provides some benefit to them in their lives outside the academy. To more concretize these tenets, my approach to critical pedagogy is thus also informed by current scholarship on location in the field of Composition and Rhetoric by scholars such as Jonathan Mauk and Nedra Reynolds that posits that location is an essential variable informing learning and as such should also inform teaching practices. The design of this project, its delivery, and goals are rooted in these current themes in critical pedagogy scholarship that demand attention to location in praxis.

Several conceptual frameworks guiding teacher research align closely with critical pedagogy practices: this project in particular draws from the principles of “teacher research as social inquiry” and “teacher research as ways of knowing in communities” as defined by Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Susan Lytle in “The Teacher Research Movement: A Decade Later.” According to Cochran-Smith and Lytle, teacher research as social inquiry is “grounded in critical social theory and aimed explicitly at social change. [. . .] Knowledge is understood to be constructed collaboratively by teachers, students, administrators, parents, and academics with the end [goal being] more equitable social relations” (18). The conceptual framework guiding teacher research as “ways of knowing in communities” overlaps significantly with teacher research as social inquiry. The focus of the principles informing this framework is on the “discourse of learning communities [and] the conjoined efforts of teachers and students as inquirers. The role here is on
blurring the boundaries of research and practice and on conceptualizing practice as a critical and theory-building process” (18). Like teacher research as social inquiry, “the larger goal [of this framework] is to create classrooms and schools where rich learning opportunities increase students’ life chances and to alter the cultures of teaching by altering the relations of power in the schools and universities” (118). The focus on knowledge as collaboratively constructed and the objective to facilitate social equity in both these models parallels that of critical pedagogy.³

In this project, enlisting my students as co-researchers manifests my commitment to supporting avenues to realize knowledge as a collective effort. Moreover, in soliciting students to write on and discuss student resistance so as to provide a particular perspective on the topic potentially furthers equity in the classroom in that, as it is presented here (particularly in Chapter 6), this information works to construct a fuller picture of my students and their epistemologies. Finally, as my and my students’ research was conducted through classroom activities and assignments, praxis and research were inextricable from one another, and this characteristic of the model ultimately resulted in my assertion that this particular teacher research model is also a critical pedagogy practice. This is not to assert that what I present here is a perfect, pure, or an ideal critical pedagogy practice; indeed, this dissertation will discuss the shortcomings and potential flaws of this model as well as its strengths and potential promise.

The work my students produced as co-researchers over the course of several semesters incorporated discussions of their home lives and experiences outside of the academy. Students’ reflections on our discussions and their own writing were in turn used to examine the learning we did in the classroom. The entirety of behaviors from which
data were acquired in this project, primarily but not limited to writing and discussions, I call “social behaviors.” Political Science scholar R.J. Rummel defines social behavior as:

the acts, actions, or practices of two or more people mutually oriented towards each other's selves, that is, any behavior that tries to affect or take account of each other's subjective experiences or intentions. This means that the parties to the social interaction must be aware of each other—have each other's self in mind. This does not mean being in sight of or directly behaving towards each other.

(Rummel)

I see students’ “social behaviors,” including what they said and what they wrote, as behaviors that are in some way and to varying degrees responding to a multitude of “others.” Moreover, these behaviors manifest and respond to the social conditions tied to a specific geographic place, in this case Hawai‘i. The discussions in Chapters 4 and 6 will illustrate how our work as co-researchers furthers understandings of the impact geographical location and the social and cultural forces tied to it have on students’ social behaviors produced in the classroom.

Considering this is a project whose design is informed by the principles of critical pedagogy and teacher research models closely aligned with that pedagogy and given that the focus of my and my students’ research was resistance to critical pedagogy, readers may wonder how my students received the critical pedagogy practices deployed in this research model. The inquiry into this reception resulted in the overarching thesis of this dissertation: *While working collaboratively with my students as co-researchers in a teacher research project grounded in a specific place relevant to the students’ lives, I observed a generally positive reception to critical pedagogy practices by the students,*
even when the focus of our collaborative research was on resistance to critical pedagogy that students often demonstrate. In order to interrogate this thesis, this dissertation is guided by the following scholarly questions:

1. How did students respond in writing and discussions to the practices and assignments delivered in courses designed within the context of a collaborative teacher research project on resistance by a teacher overtly committed to critical pedagogy?

2. What pedagogical and/or scholarly outcomes arose from working with students explicitly as co-researchers in a teacher research project investigating the relations between critical pedagogy, students’ social behaviors, and location?

3. What are the implications of these findings in terms of current scholarship on critical pedagogy and location?

In what follows, I provide an overview of the chapters of this dissertation, tracing how the project moves from drawing connections between location, subjectivity, social behaviors, and critical pedagogy first at a theoretical level to increasingly “located” environments in one place, Hawai‘i.

**Mapping this Teacher Research Project**

I began the work of this project wanting to understand my students’ resistance to my critical pedagogy practices. Naturally, such an undertaking demanded a critique of critical pedagogy as well as careful consideration of whether what I perceived as resistance correlated to students’ perceptions of resistance, intentional and unintentional. I simply could not determine what my students intended without their input. This project details the evolution of my students’ increasing involvement over the course of several
semesters in this inquiry, the culmination of which is a final semester of data collection during which my students were formally enlisted as co-researchers. The story of the evolution is as important as the narrative of that final semester. The work we did on resistance, as well as other noteworthy interactions that took place in the classroom during our work together in the project, all point to the intricate role geographic location plays in the ways of knowing and interacting that students bring to the classroom. In addition, the work we did together highlights the variability between and within a location. Ultimately, my students showed me that while I may understand location as significant, its complexity cannot be overstated. To demonstrate this point, Chapters 2-4 of this dissertation look at location at increasingly micro-levels, moving from discussions of location at the theoretical level, in terms of the archipelago of Hawai‘i and the University of Hawai‘i, and then to classrooms at this institution.

In Chapter 1 I define this teacher research project in terms of the project’s goals, its subject matter, the research model, and methodology. As reflexive self-positioning is a standard practice in teacher research implemented to increase the transparency of the researcher’s subjectivity and its impact on the project, it is appropriate that I discuss how growing up in Hawai‘i has influenced me as a community member and a teacher. I thus begin with two narratives: one that details my personal history and another that explains my teaching philosophy. I trace how my experiences and the politics of this place have informed my teaching philosophy and the relationship between that philosophy and the goals of this particular project. These narratives work to create a context for this dissertation through which readers can better understand the impetus for the project as
well as the many ways my own experiences influence my approach and subsequent analysis.

I then situate this project within the scholarship on both student resistance to critical pedagogy and teacher research. The scholarship that details research on student resistance to critical pedagogy follows a particular trajectory that draws correlations between students’ subjectivities and their resistance. Such research informed my decision to enlist my students as co-researchers in the hopes of providing a student-constructed screen through which to examine students’ subjectivities and their corresponding behaviors. An overview of the literature on teacher research highlights thematic parallels between several of the objectives of teacher research and this project, including the promotion of emancipatory practices and collaboration. Finally, a discussion of teacher research projects wherein students have been enlisted as co-researchers explicates how this project fits in and contributes to the body of research produced through and on teacher research.

To further define this project, I provide an overview of the theoretical frames that I drew from in the design of its methodology; specifically, I discuss how indigenous studies, feminist studies, and current work in ethnography informed the methods I employ as well as my ethos as a teacher and researcher. Collectively, the work of this chapter is to describe this project’s defining characteristics in terms of my role, the overall goals of the project, how it responds to current scholarship, and the methodology that informed how it was conducted.

Chapter 2 frames this project in terms of scholarship on critical pedagogy and location. In it, I argue that critical pedagogy is more fully realized when location is
accounted for. This discussion provides the foundation for one of the premises of this dissertation: that students can complicate our understanding of location by creating, in classroom discourse, a heightened awareness of the intricacies and multiplicity of the discursive spaces they inhabit. Chapter 2 begins by tracing the evolution of critical pedagogy from John Dewey to Paulo Freire, then situates “liberatory” pedagogy, as articulated by Henry Giroux, in relation to critical pedagogy. Looking closely at the work of these theorists, it becomes apparent that such pedagogical practices cannot be simply transplanted from location to location but must rather be adapted to account for the unique sociopolitical forces of a particular location. An analysis of several of the critiques of critical pedagogy by scholars such Elizabeth Ellsworth and Russel Durst similarly implicate the importance of “locating” critical pedagogy. The work of scholars such as Jonathan Mauk and Nedra Reynolds is then employed to demonstrate that recent scholarship in Composition and Rhetoric increasingly highlights the important role location must play in classroom praxis. This scholarship on location explicates the many ways social and physical space impact subjectivity and learning, thereby reinforcing the need to account for place in classroom practices.

To more closely examine how location affects classroom social behaviors that indicate forms of resistance (which include forms of resistance to critical pedagogies), I draw from Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of habitus and Kenneth Burke’s theory of consubstantiality. Bourdieu’s theory has mostly been employed to explain class stratification; however, as class and other identity markers such as gender, race, and as Reynolds argues, geographic location, are often inextricably linked, his theory of habitus can be useful to explain the way social behaviors are normed in distinct ways depending
on the temporal and spatial parameters of the field influencing the habitus. Moreover, as an examination of a colonized location demonstrates, such as the one I undertake in this study, any habitus is not exclusive but overlaps with other habituses, often resulting in conflict.

To elucidate the more nuanced ways students negotiate conflicting discursive spaces in colonized locations, I draw from Kenneth Burke’s theory of consubstantiality, which provides a framework to explain why an individual belonging to one group often finds him/herself in opposition to another. I then employ Stuart Hall’s Theory of Articulation to more fully capture the multitude of ideologies an individual encounters and how ideologies are shaped in distinct ways depending on other surrounding forces, which include location. I close the chapter with a discussion of the work of post-colonial theorists such as Arjun Appadurai, Homi Bhabha, and Vilsoni Hereniko, who have all noted that colonized people often experience inner conflict when negotiating the designs of the dominant culture with that of their native epistemology. I argue that while not the same, by extension all people living in a colonized location experience differing degrees of allegiance to the various cultures alive in a particular location and, as such, experience conflict. The discussion of this scholarship provides the departure point for a closer examination of the specific forces and their potential manifestations in one location, the research site of this dissertation, Hawai‘i, which I describe in Chapter 3.

The work of Chapter 3 is to capture the uniqueness and specificity of the research site of this dissertation in historical and political terms: how the location and the forces tied to that location—cultures, histories, languages, and politics—make Hawai‘i unlike any other place within the continental United States, and indeed the world. This account
lays a foundation for understanding the sociopolitical forces that students and teachers negotiate in their daily lives and ultimately in the classroom. In this chapter, drawing from indigenous scholarship and historical accounts, I provide a very brief overview of life in Hawai‘i following western contact through the present. The changes a capitalistic economy had on the archipelago are represented in the rise of Hawai‘i’s plantation era and the corresponding immigration of plantation laborers from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and to a lesser degree other countries. The greed and ethnocentrism of western businessmen and missionaries affected the Native Hawaiian community in terms of population decrease (over 90% decline in less than 100 years) as well as in the marginalization of the indigenous culture. Moreover, the privileging of western capitalism by the increasingly dominant Caucasian community also worked to disenfranchise all other non-Anglo settlers in Hawai‘i. Much of this marginalization was facilitated by the stigma placed on those speaking Pidgin, the creole language that after first contact with whalers was to become one of the main languages of communication among the various ethnic groups living and working in Hawai‘i.

How these events have informed the politics of today is represented in the chapter through an overview of the activist movements by Native Hawaiians to regain sovereignty and the simultaneous upward mobility of Japanese-Americans in the islands over other settlers that came to the islands to work on the plantations. Current demographic information for the state and the University of Hawai‘i is used to demonstrate our unique ethnic make-up compared to the states on the continent. In addition, this statistical information highlights that the student population at the university mirrors that of the community. As the student population seems to be a
representative sample of the larger community in demographic terms, one assumption might be that the classroom is a microcosm of the larger community in terms of issues of importance in the community as well as the various responses to them. In later chapters, the extent to which this is the case will be discussed.

In Chapter 4, I detail the preliminary research that I conducted for this project. This preliminary research period lasted over a year. I discuss two classes: the first, a stretch Composition I course taught over two semesters during the 2005-2006 academic year, was made up of students who did not automatically place into a standard Composition I course; however, ethnic demographics of the class was fairly representative of that of the university as a whole. The second class, also a Composition I course but taught during the fall 2006 semester, was made up of a cohort of students participating in the University of Hawai‘i’s Manawa Kūpono project. Because this project targets Native Hawaiian students, I had the experience that semester of teaching a class whose majority was Hawaiian students, something I had never before nor since experienced.

A survey was a primary source of information gathered from both these classes. One of the key parts of the survey examined in this chapter are the responses to a question that asks what texts students liked best. The data gathered from the answers to this question sharply differ along ethnic lines. Another set of data discussed involves what students chose to write about when given a choice between Hawaiian authored/produced texts and Euro-, Asian, or African-American authored/produced texts. As the discussion of these data demonstrate, students overwhelmingly chose not to write on Hawaiian texts. The most common reason students gave for this choice is lack of
knowledge about Hawaiian culture. The data in this chapter reaffirm that location impacts student engagement in the classroom, not necessarily in terms of the degree to which a student is engaged, but in terms of how and what a student chooses to engage with. Through the discussion of data, this chapter illustrates how this preliminary work informed the final case study documented in this dissertation. A significant contribution of this chapter is that it provides another level of location, the classroom, and as such depicts the evolution of the project through which my students moved from being research subjects to co-researchers.

In Chapter 5, I describe key components of the formal case study for which I eventually enlisted students as co-researchers and through which I sought empirical answers to the dissertation’s key questions referenced above. In doing so, the chapter provides a detailed explanation of the specific research site: I describe the two courses from which I gathered data during the “formal” case study; I provide a demographic snapshot of the students in each of the classes drawing from information gathered from a survey administered at the beginning of the semester; I also give a detailed explanation of the work we did in the courses, including homework, readings, and formal and informal written assignments. I conclude the chapter with an explication of the corpus of data collected and how it was handled.

In Chapter 6, I explain the interactions that occurred over the course of the semester described in Chapter 5 in terms of the scholarly questions guiding this project. A primary source of the data discussed here is student writings. I convey what students wrote on the role of family in education as well as their ideas on race and racism both in Hawai‘i and on the continental United States. I also discuss interactions that occurred
within the context of this particular classroom where the teacher and students were co-researchers.

The data presented in this chapter support the discussion in Chapter 2 that posits an individual experiences conflict as they negotiate competing habituses or discursive spaces. In their writing, students often reproduced dominant discourses that minimize difference in Hawai‘i through such narratives as the melting pot that depict Hawai‘i as an idyllic paradise where all the *locals* live in harmony. The pervasiveness of such discourse is similarly represented in the terms students employed, such as “motherland” and “mainland,” when referring to the continental United States. Complicating these representations of Hawai‘i were subtle references in their writing to racism and socioeconomic disparity in Hawai‘i. I also discuss student representations of the continental United States in their writing. Often, in references to the continental United States and the people that live there, students made sweeping generalizations about perceived lifestyles and attitudes. I examine these essentializing representations in the context of students’ more idyllic representations of life in Hawai‘i.

Collectively, these data depict the evolution these students are moving through as they negotiate what seems to be internalized dominant discourse and begin to interrogate it in terms of their own experiences. I do not believe this “evolution” can be solely attributed to the teacher research design of this classroom; however, working with students as co-researchers did create a dynamic where collegial interrogation of the various discourses students (and I) negotiate often occurred in the classroom. I do believe that our work as co-researchers and the data produced from that work provide tangible
examples of students’ reception, reproduction, and interrogation of such discourses. As the negotiation of and potential resistance to such discourses are primary tenets of critical pedagogy, examinations of my students’ work in this context similarly reveals how they received and responded to the critical pedagogy practices implemented in this teacher research project.

**Conclusion**

What I hope this dissertation demonstrates is that as the project moved on and the initial work on student resistance was left behind during the final case study, my students continued to provide provocative information on a variety of issues, including their education, perceptions on racism both in Hawai‘i and on the continental United States, the extent to which certain discourses have dominated and are reproduced by students, and how students are questioning some of that discourse. These data affirm that location is key not only in how material is negotiated but also in what material is negotiated. Moreover, analyses of these data illustrate the conflict students experience as they move among locations with different discursive practices, such as home and the classroom. I will not argue that such interactions do not happen in other teaching scenarios; but what I will argue is that they can happen in a scenario wherein students are co-researchers with the teacher because their work as co-researchers facilitates discussions about complex and often avoided topics. I suggest that such facilitation occurs because engaging students as co-researchers becomes a means through which students can assume authority over the teaching and learning to some extent in the classroom. Given the opportunity to occupy that kind of a position in the classroom, many students seemed both eager and willing to discuss the specific assignments, comment on how they were delivered, and
express their ideas about what I perceive as very difficult subjects, such as grand narratives and corresponding practices that reproduce perceptions of Hawai‘i and Hawaiians as inferior and childlike in comparison to the dominant continental United States.

The paradigm set up in the teacher research model I propose here differs somewhat from the open discussion policy that many critical pedagogues implement in their classrooms where students are invited to offer their opinions and question the discourses of the community and the classroom, practices which I myself implement and believe have promise for encouraging students to assume a more active role in the classroom. In this empirical co-researcher model, students were asked to participate, particularly in the gathering and producing of data, and once they agreed, their participation became essential in order for our project to move forward. As such, their opinions and questions were not framed as “optional” but as instrumental to our class succeeding. Despite the limited opportunities for students to explicitly exert their agency in specific classroom activities, such as those involving classroom management and the implementation of this project, the teacher research classroom seemed to create a level of investment that many of the students that I worked with during the course of the project, particularly in the final semester, appeared to have adopted. Students’ discussions of race, gender, and location in their writing in combination with their inquiries of and suggestions for assignments (which will be discussed in Chapter 6) support that in this teacher research classroom students consistently engaged with topics in ways that facilitate many of the objectives of critical pedagogy.
Critical Pedagogy is more fully discussed in Chapter 2.

Ellsworth writes this definition in the past tense because in her article she questions the viability of the tenets of critical pedagogy as they are laid out in the following precisely because of their being abstract in terms of context. I believe that accounting for geographic location, as argued throughout this dissertation (and implied by Ellsworth in her article), addresses this significant concern about critical pedagogy. Despite her concerns, I find this to be a good comprehensive definition of critical pedagogy with the caveat that it is necessary to articulate these abstract objectives in terms of specific geographic location.

Social equity is often used synonymously with social equality; however, I use the two terms in slightly different ways: social equity to refer to all individuals having access to the means to benefit one’s self and/or their community, and social equality to refer to individuals attaining relatively the same conditions.

I will provide a more thorough discussion of the term local in Chapter 3. It is important to note here that local is used often by ethnic groups who see themselves as having strong ties to Hawai‘i to denote a belonging to the islands; as such it is a contentious term as its use undermines Native Hawaiian claims. However, in this dissertation, its more customary use as a geographical marker is also employed. To distinguish between the two uses, whenever I use local as an identity marker, I will italicize it, and when I use it as a geographical marker I will write it in plain text. The exception to this practice will be in cases where I am quoting other people, in which case I will write they word as he/she has.
In Chapter 6, I will discuss several interactions in the classroom wherein students seemed to exercise their agency in terms of classroom management and implementation of certain practices aligned with this project; however, as I will note in the conclusion, the limited number of these specific kinds of interactions is one shortcoming of this project.
CHAPTER 1

A Methodology for Teacher Research as Critical Pedagogy

In the fall 2005, I conducted research for a project that I would be presenting on at the spring 2006 Conference on College Composition and Communication. This project grew out of an intersection between my experiences as a student in the public school system in Hawai‘i and those I was having as a new teacher. Specifically, it resulted from a disconnect between my expectations and the realities of the classroom. As will be discussed in this chapter, I grew up in a fairly rural district on O‘ahu, and after entering college, I became acutely aware of how little of Hawai‘i’s history in terms of colonization was taught in primary school. I had thus taken a keen interest in ensuring that my students had access to material that could increase their awareness of the particular cultural and historical ramifications of colonization in Hawai‘i and its effects on the ways all of us negotiate living here and interacting with each other. Coming from my own position of having a sense of a positive relationship with the Hawaiian culture, I assumed my students would have reactions similar to mine when presented with texts that reflect the experiences of Native Hawaiians and settlers living in Hawai‘i, that my students would appreciate and even embrace such texts. However, some of the in-class discussions on assigned texts and patterns in terms of writing topics suggested that there were problems with my assumption: students were not receiving my critical pedagogy practices as I thought they would. These experiences prompted my inquiry into student resistance to critical pedagogy and, ultimately, led to the teacher research project detailed in this dissertation.
The work of this chapter is to define this teacher research project as an empirical co-researcher model—a project in which my students and I collaboratively investigated student resistance and gathered qualitative data mostly based on experience and observation. In order to frame this project in terms of its impetus, purpose, and goals, I open the chapter with two narratives: the first, a self-reflection, canvases my experiences growing up in Hawai‘i and places me, the researcher, in the research site; the second explains my teaching philosophy. Together these two sections help to clarify how my own experiences and teaching goals brought me to this project. Moreover, as teaching cannot be separated from research in a teacher research project, understanding how I approach teaching helps elucidate my agenda as the teacher researcher of this project.

Following these opening narratives that situate me and offer readers some insight as to my experiences, influences, and motivations, I move to discussing the student resistance to critical pedagogy that I am committed to better understanding and intervening in. I provide an overview of the scholarship on student resistance to critical pedagogy and explain how the trajectory of this research resulted in my realization that a significant contribution to this body of work necessitated collaborating with my students as co-researchers in an investigation of student resistance.

A research model wherein students and teacher collaboratively conduct research in the classroom, by its very nature, is a teacher research project; thus, the next section offers a discussion of the literature on teacher research to explain how such projects and their corresponding approaches have evolved over the last two decades so as to situate this project within that body of work. This examination of scholarship on teacher research will illustrate how the tenets of teacher research—the assertion that theory can and should
come from the classroom, the importance placed on collaboration, and the facilitation of emancipatory goals—align closely with those of this project. I close this section by further elaborating on my project’s underlying ethical agenda by drawing on the role that feminist studies has played in teacher research.

In the final section of this chapter, I build on the narratives and the review of teacher research to more specifically outline my project’s methodology. This discussion not only explains the theoretical frameworks that inform the methodology guiding this dissertation but also works to clarify how the methods employed in this project facilitate the goals of the methodology. It is useful here to articulate the difference between method and methodology as Sandra Harding does in her introduction to *Feminism and Methodology*, “Is there a Feminist Method?” Harding clarifies that method “is a technique for (or way of proceeding in) gathering evidence” (2), whereas methodology “is a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed” (3). I offer the above definitions of these two essential features because sometimes the methods (or practices) employed to address a particular methodology (or theoretical frame) are conflated with the methodology itself. When distinction between methodology and method is not clearly articulated, the ways in which a particular method does (or does not as the case may be) address the goals of methodology are not readily apparent and researchers can hide behind the claims of methodology.

Culminating the chapter with a discussion of the methodology guiding this dissertation thus highlights the ways in which the methodology encompasses both my approach to and implementation of the project. The theories that I draw from in the design of the methodology, primarily theories from indigenous and feminist studies, work
to clarify my ethos as a teacher researcher, the role I hoped my students would assume as co-researchers in this project, and the ways in which the methods I employed in the design and delivery of assignments as well as in the gathering and analysis of the data were incorporated specifically to facilitate the goals of the project. The most apparent representation of the co-researcher aspect of this project lies in the collection of data. My students produced data in the form of response papers to assigned prompts and thick descriptions of events that they chose to examine, and synthesized this work in written analysis papers. I, on the other hand, relied on surveys administered to my students, the writings students produced, and observations of classroom interactions as my data sets. As will become clear, my students and I were not equal collaborators. I had sole control over significant parts of this project, including, but not limited to, the design of assignments and the write-up of the results presented here. I hope this project will demonstrate, however, that collaboration does not have to be “all or nothing” in order for it to yield outcomes that can further understandings of productive critical pedagogy practices.

**Locating the Researcher**

*Placing Myself in the Research Site*

In *A Community Text Arises*, Beverly Moss describes the conflict that sometimes exists between the different roles researchers negotiate as “tensions.” In her book, Moss, like myself, is writing about a community to which she belongs. She notes that while such positioning can, and I believe does, result in representing issues from a different and valuable perspective, it also demands that the researcher more fully account for her personal investment and biases in relation to the research community and project. Many
ethnography scholars, beginning most notably with Clifford Geertz who, building upon the work of Max Weber and Gilbert Ryle, has been credited with ushering in the interpretive turn, have drawn attention to there being no such thing as unbiased data collection and analysis. Rather, modern ethnography scholars argue that data analysis is the product of interpretation that is inextricably influenced by the researcher’s professional and personal epistemologies. Gesa Kirsch notes that researchers “inevitably interpret and appropriate participants’ stories in context of their work, filter interviewees’ comments through their rhetorical framework, and analyze participants’ narratives based on their own knowledge, training, and lived experiences” (49). Drawing from her experiences with her own ethnographic work, Moss further explains that these influencing factors are both personal as well as professional and can result in tensions that direct the representation of an ethnographic project. She writes of her own experience: “Some of these are personal tensions that affected the lenses through which I saw the ‘stories’ in this study and the way I painted the pictures and constructed the narratives” (13).

Considering the complex and sometimes contentious social context of my own research site, not to mention the tensions that often exist between my roles as a family member, community member, researcher, and teacher—particularly in light of my own ethnic background and the problematic history of ethnographic work by Westerners in the Pacific Islands—I have a heightened awareness of what Moss notes as need for “more self-conscious acknowledgement and examination of the competing roles any researcher must face” (13). Like so many other variables in this project, I cannot disassociate my interests from the location of this project; my pedagogy (which will be discussed in the
following section) as well as my interest in and approach to this project are products of my experiences growing up in this particular geographic location. In his discussion of pedagogical narratives, Geoffrey Sirc warns against the frequent focus on teacher’s experiences and their interpretations of students’ experiences, which can be analogously applied to the teacher-researcher role in my case, saying that it results in “no memoirs from students” (525). I do not want this project to be solely my story. Such an approach counters the methodology informing the design of this project as it runs contrary to the idea that knowledge is co-constructed among students and the teacher in classroom activities. Enlisting my students as co-researchers is surely one way to minimize my authority over the project; despite this, it is impossible for me to erase my (dominant) presence in the narrative that emerges from the representations in this dissertation. In offering the following accounting of how I position myself in the social and political context of Hawai‘i, which is both my community and the research site, and how my personal experiences led to this project as well as colored my approach to it, I begin to convey the knowledge I bring to the classroom and show how my epistemologies have been impacted by one location.

Let me begin by saying I frequently self-identify as being haole (or Caucasian), specifically of Sicilian ethnicity; however, for as long as I can remember I was told in various contexts that my Sicilian ethnicity made me something other than haole, and this was always presented as being a compliment. I’m not sure being half Sicilian qualified me for this exemption or if it was a rather unique set of experiences growing up (unique perhaps compared to what is perceived to be the experiences of other haole children who grew up in Hawai‘i). I do not pretend to know about “most” haole kids’ experiences in
Hawai‘i, but I do know what is perceived to be their common experiences: being economically privileged, frequently receiving private school educations, having easier access to better jobs, living in affluent neighborhoods. And this list extends to impact more daily facets of life: having spending money, wearing “cool” clothes, participating in activities that cost money. No matter that it is common knowledge that such perceptions are stereotypical and belie a slew of complexities, they still exist and in some communities more than others. It is the work of another project to discuss the implications of how lived realities and perceptions of these experiences compare specifically in terms of being haole in Hawai‘i. In what follows, I do not intend to represent the experiences of all haole; I only tell my story.

We came to Hawai‘i when I was 10 and moved into a house on the Windward side of O‘ahu in Kahalu‘u. Kahalu‘u is still known as being largely populated by non-haole locals, particularly Hawaiians, but in the 1970s this was even more so the case. There were three girls my age living on my street; two were Hawaiian and one was Samoan. My whole family became close to the Hawaiian family that lived next-door, socializing during the week and on weekends. It was from this family that I remember first being exposed to Hawaiian food, culture, and music. This exposure superceded all my interactions with every other ethnic group. Upon moving to Hawai‘i, my mother also enrolled me in hula classes that were held for two hours two days, and sometimes three days, a week. Unlike many other settlers in Hawai‘i, my first experiences in the islands were largely influenced by Hawaiian culture.

In the 1970s, we weren’t taught about the overthrow of the Hawaiian kingdom in school. The word colonization was never mentioned that I can remember. However, I
knew that Hawaiians were oppressed and disenfranchised in their own land. I don’t remember being told this. I don’t recall any discussions of it in either a teaching or political context. I don’t even know when I knew it, but I knew it after being in Hawai‘i only a short time. Positioning myself in relation to this knowledge became and still is an intricate part of my subjectivity (arguably how all non-Hawaiians in Hawai‘i position themselves in relation to such knowledge is a dominant part of their subjectivity). I was (and am) proud that I belonged to a hula halau (school), I practiced using the few Hawaiian words I knew, and I liked the way being part of this community made me feel. Because of my particular experiences growing up, belonging to a halau and my friendships, I had access into Hawaiian communities in ways that many non-Hawaiians often do not have: I had a certain cultural capital, and while this cultural capital did not afford one socioeconomic status in the larger western-influenced community, it gave me privilege in the community I wanted to belong to. I claimed Hawai‘i as my home, and as I got older I understood with that privilege came responsibility. I tried to honor the land as I had been taught by my kumu (teachers); I spoke out about the Hawaiian history of colonization when I found myself in social contexts where uninformed or anti-Hawaiian sentiments were expressed; in college and graduate school I wrote research papers that demanded I learn more about the history and traditions of Hawai‘i; and as a teacher I incorporated discussions about Hawaiian issues in my classes. However, it is important to note I am also very proud to be Sicilian. I have never claimed to be of Hawaiian ethnicity and am very aware of how much about Hawaiian life I still do not know.
I have been lucky to know my position in the politically charged social context that has emerged in Hawai‘i since the 1970s (of which I will provide an overview in Chapter 3). However, I am painfully aware that many of my students are still negotiating where they stand and how to express their perspectives and positions. Some students, *local* and non-*local* alike, question Hawaiian programs and sovereignty movements, thinking their experiences as outsiders in Hawai‘i are not understood. Similarly, some Hawaiian students are silent, others outspoken in class, thinking their experiences of disempowerment and oppression are not understood by others. And I frequently find myself wanting to find a way, a pedagogical approach if you will, that will help them hear and listen to each other, to not feel threatened and/or defensive, to help them explore complicated issues of colonization—an approach that will facilitate their positioning themselves as responsible citizens within the context of the geographic location in which they find themselves in.

My experiences and pedagogical goals have guided me in this task. My work in rhetoric and composition in particular has enabled me to formulate a form of critical pedagogy that I believe facilitates my desire to create an open learning environment in the classroom where my students are able to explore and hopefully begin to articulate their position in academia and the wider community. In what follows, I will explain this teaching philosophy, some of the ways it manifests in the classroom, and how it influences this dissertation both in terms of it being a research model that accounts for the unique sociopolitical context my students negotiate as well as a critical pedagogy praxis that can be applied in the classroom to facilitate students’ engagement with and control over their learning.
Teaching Philosophy: Located and Emancipatory

My teaching is influenced largely by two basic tenets: first, that one of the primary functions of the academy is to produce responsible citizens who, as Aristotle asserted over 2000 years ago, participate in public discourse. This tenet is further enhanced by theories of contemporary critical pedagogy (as will be more fully explained in Chapter 2) in that I believe that students should be given the tools to participate in and even challenge such discourse in ways that benefit themselves and their communities.

Second, geographic location influences learning—reception, perception, and application—and must likewise influence pedagogy. Living and teaching in Hawai‘i’s multi-cultural context has heightened my awareness that the classroom is a community of learners where, in order for the richest meaning of the educational experience to be realized, knowledge must be co-constructed with each member enabled to share his/her experiences and epistemologies. As such, I do not see myself as having a store of information that I aim to impart to my students. Rather, I can teach them tools that help them to critically interpret different forms of public discourse so they better understand how they, their communities, and communities other than theirs are influenced by the myriad of texts they encounter. At the same time, I can give students strategies that help them articulate their ideas so that they are better able to recognize their own valuable contributions to both our learning environment and the larger community. Successful attainment of these tenets relies on active engagement with and appreciation of diverse perspectives—ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, gender orientation—and acknowledgement that all of these identity markers are experienced in unique ways in Hawai‘i.
My philosophy that critical pedagogy necessarily accounts for location in praxis is shaped by my understanding of rhetoric as epistemic and the idea ushered in by Kenneth Burke that rhetorical texts expand far beyond the traditional boundaries of judicial, legislative, and ceremonial to include a myriad of genres including literature, art, and oral traditions. Students are exposed to and influenced by such texts every day by watching TV, listening to the radio, and interacting with their families. The land similarly becomes a text that influences their habits of everyday life. In Hawai‘i, for example, some of my students get up early to surf before school, pick flowers to make lei for a friend or family member, know when and where the fishing is good (even if they don’t fish), and know when the whales come here to mate. They listen to and read news that often covers controversial local issues, such as the Kamehameha School’s admission policy that gives priority to students of Hawaiian ancestry, or why we need to ship our prisoners—and our trash—to the continental United States. And they hear music on the radio with explicit political messages. Some of this music addresses national and international concerns, but other music, such as local “Jawaiian” music, talks about issues specific to Hawai‘i like Hawaiian sovereignty and cultural reaffirmation.

Place-based rhetorical experiences such as these shape my students’ epistemologies, and my pedagogy tells me I would be remiss as a teacher if I did not engage such texts in the classroom, if I did not provide space for them to engage these texts the classroom. As such, we discuss current events, political speeches and movements, movies, artwork, as well as their experiences both in and out of school. We examine the different languages they employ in various situations to demonstrate that the ability to accommodate rhetorical situations with language use is a savvy skill. In
Hawai‘i, this often means discussing why we use Standard English in the academy and Pidgin with friends and/or family. Praxis like this works to counter the dominant discourse that speaking a non-standard language, Pidgin for example, is an inferiority marker.

Unfortunately, as a student and teacher in Hawai‘i, I have all too often witnessed the sentiment that students need to leave their home culture and epistemology behind in order to succeed in the academy and beyond, similar to what Richard Rodriguez suggested in *Hunger of Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez: an Autobiography*. Or, at the very least, the dominant colonial discourse dictates they must draw sharp boundaries between home and professional life, adopting standardized norms to achieve in the later. This perception furthers the narrative that students’ home lives and cultures are inferiority markers that in no way benefit them in a globalized, capitalist economy. I believe differently. I contend that when students bring their home culture into their learning community, they are more active participants and can more clearly see ways to apply their learning to their lives outside of the academy. The sophisticated ways students negotiate themselves in the classroom to accommodate both worlds often run the risk of being undervalued by academics unfamiliar with the competing norms for communicating and the allegiances students may feel to the various communities to which they belong. Many faculty in the English Department at the University of Hawai‘i are aware of these complexities and work hard to counter misperceptions of students from Hawai‘i as inferior learners. Despite these efforts, I feel that all of our work still falls short because none of us, not even those of us from here, can possibly fully understand all the intricacies of each individual student’s ethnic and cultural influences.
and how he/she negotiates them in relation to his/her education. While I don’t believe anyone expects teachers to have the entirety of this knowledge, I have often felt that furthering what I understand about students lives even a little would leave me better equipped to facilitate the learning process in ways that students realize to be applicable to their lives. As the discussion in Chapter 6 will demonstrate, my students are negotiating critical pedagogy in sophisticated ways, ways that we can partially understand if we provide space for them to explain their classroom interactions rather than we, as teachers, assuming to know those experiences.

Considering my pedagogical positioning, asking my students to conduct research with me so as to have their valuable insight into the project, seems a natural progression in the teacher-student relationship in a teacher research project. An overview of the scholarship on student resistance to critical pedagogy similarly points to such a collaboration being a viable “next step” that can potentially further the conversation on student resistance by adding student interpretations to the analysis.

**Locating the Project in the Literature**

**Critical Pedagogy: Locating Student Resistance**

A 2007 volume of *JAC* includes two articles that directly address both resistance and critical pedagogy. One, by Henry Giroux, calls for liberatory pedagogy (a form of critical pedagogy) as the means to resist the negative effects of neoliberalism; and a response essay by Wendy Wolters Hinshaw entitled “Teaching for Social Justice? Resituating Student Resistance” critiques a proposal for facilitating students’ acceptance of critical pedagogy in the classroom. Finding these two articles, one appealing for critical pedagogy and another discussing reasons why students might be resisting this
pedagogical approach in the classroom, in the same journal at the same time is representative of the current dilemma surrounding critical pedagogy in the academy in general and in the discipline of Composition and Rhetoric specifically. The articles represent that 1) there is significant agreement, in Composition and Rhetoric as well as other disciplines such as Education, that critical pedagogy should inform our teaching practices (Berlin; Bizzell; Freire; Giroux; Herzberg; Shor); and 2) scholars and teachers continue to acknowledge that students are resisting this pedagogical approach despite that many teachers consider critical pedagogy essential to facilitate students becoming responsible citizens who participate in public discourse in informed and responsible ways (Arroyo; Berlin; Chizhik and Chizhik; Durst; Ellsworth; Kopelson; St. Denis and Schick).

Numerous articles over the last decade have focused on student resistance to critical pedagogy, with some theorizing reasons for this resistance and others proposing pragmatic solutions to counter such resistance in the classroom. An overarching theme in many of the discussions of student resistance is subjectivity, albeit approached from a variety of perspectives. For example, the article Hinshaw critiques advocates promoting compassion in students; Karen Kopelson in “Rhetoric on the Edge of Cunning: Or, The Performance of Neutrality (Re)Considered As a Composition Pedagogy for Student Resistance” suggests teachers (particularly teachers perceived as representing minorities) alter their subjectivities to neutral stances in relation to course content; and in “Acknowledging the Rough Edges of Resistance: Negotiation of Identities for First-Year Composition,” Melanie Kill argues that students’ social behaviors are impacted by “the roles generally perceived to be relevant to a particular rhetorical situation” (217), and she
illustrates this supposition by explaining students’ behaviors in terms of perceived classroom expectations. While the scholars here focus on different specific concepts, the articles share a commonality in that they all address either social behaviors and/or subjectivity, two concepts bound together. Rummel’s discussion of social behaviors (from which the definition in the Introduction was taken) explicates that subjectivity is imbricated in social behaviors: he writes,

[social] behavior apprehends another as a perceiving, thinking, [m]oral, intentional, and behaving person; considers the intentional or rational meaning of the other's field of expression; involves expectations about the other's acts and actions; and manifests an intention to invoke in another self certain experiences and intentions.

Implicit in this definition is that subject positions are constituted throughout the performance of any social behavior. Moreover, as hinted at in the themes of the articles, this complex relationship between social behavior and subjectivity is further complicated by the social contexts in which they are enacted. The connection between subjectivity and social contexts is not new nor provocative: in the early part of the 1900s, sociologist George Mead argued that an individual’s subjectivity, which Mead calls the “social self,” rather than being a fixed “inborn” essence, is constituted in and through culture and social contexts. This theoretical discussion was later continued by other sociologists and philosophers, notably Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault. What is provocative and receiving increasing attention in current scholarly conversations is the intimate connection between social contexts and specific geographic place.
The ‘social and cultural contexts’ Mead and others invoke are not free floating signifiers; rather, they are grounded in real geographic locations with unique characteristics that, in significant ways, determine the governing principles of a social space and, at the same time, set it apart from other social spaces. Edward Soja, in his examinations of the political organization of space, argues,

[Localization] establishes the framework for human spatial interaction. The differences from place to place, in relative as well as absolute location, and in terms of other features such as climate, economy, language, wealth, and culture, shape the nature and intensity of relationships between people and between the locations they occupy. (3)

Just as the specific features Soja mentions do, social contexts thus vary depending on location. In short, cultures and social contexts are not monolithic but are uniquely defined in relation to geographic locations. Likewise, social behaviors and subjectivity are best understood within specific located social contexts. Soja asserts, “It is essential, therefore, in any comprehensive analysis of individual or group behavior to at least recognize the potential influence of locational attributes” (3). In light of this interconnectedness between location, social and cultural contexts, subjectivity, and ultimately social behavior, student resistance as a social behavior can be more fully understood when contextualized within the geographic location in which it occurs.

Discussions of student resistance to critical pedagogy, however, in general undertheorize the role geographic location plays in student resistance, despite that much of the scholarship emphasizes subjectivity. For example, Kill’s work on student resistance, which is discussed within the context of genre studies and focuses on the
successful acquisition of what she terms “rhetorical agility,” examines how such acquisition can be facilitated through teachers’ and students’ “renegotiation of classroom identities” (215). Kill frames her argument noting the impact social contexts have on the identities students perform. She posits, “It is by engaging in the generic actions and interactions that are valued in particular communities that we perform and develop identities appropriate to the places and spaces we want to occupy” (217). However, in her analysis of student writings, she considers student responses almost exclusively in relation to the expected norms of the academy. In other words, she does not account for how a student’s classroom social behavior is also shaped and informed by the values of the larger social community outside the academy that the student negotiates on a daily basis. While Kill insightfully argues that students’ responses are influenced by what is assumed to be appropriate positioning between the student and teacher, she fails to acknowledge that students cannot completely leave the subjectivity they perform in their “at home” community at the classroom door. While it is not in the purview of this dissertation to argue that genre studies should also account for location, the classroom is not a-located and performance of any identity or subjectivity is rarely, if ever, informed by a singular, isolated context, if indeed there is such a thing. To move Kill’s discussion forward entails acknowledging that to fully capture the meaning of students’ classroom interactions, analysis of them must take into account the larger social context students negotiate every day.

While reviewing the scholarship on student resistance, much of which involves some kind of teacher research project, I have found that most of these teacher research projects follow a similar empirical research model: the teacher-researcher identifies some
phenomenon; the teacher-researcher collects data from anywhere between one and several students; the teacher-researcher describes these data; and finally he or she offers an analysis of that data in relation to the original research problem identified in the project (Biggs Chaney; Chizhik and Chizhik; Gorzelsky; Faiman-Silva; Kill; St. Denis and Schick; Welsh). I concur that empirical teacher research is a viable model through which to further the conversation on student resistance; however, I wanted to depart from this common teacher research paradigm in one particular way. I hoped to include my students’ input in terms of what they thought about my research topic and provide space in the project where I incorporated their perspectives on resistance, both in terms of data collected and analysis of that data. For me to account for location in ways that previous scholarship had not, I needed to account for the common geographic location my students lived and reacted in as well as the micro-locations (specific city and culturally-influenced home life) that informed their social behaviors. This goal to include students’ perspectives in my study of student resistance eventually resulted in my enlisting them as co-researchers in the project. The current scholarship on teacher research further supports this decision. While there may be relatively few documented cases of teachers working with their students as co-researchers, particularly at the college level, a survey of the evolution of teacher research over the last two decades similarly suggests that working with students as co-inquirers can add depth to a project through students adding what they see as important variables to explore and analytical threads to include.

**Teacher Research: A Research Model for this Project**

As noted in the previous section, teacher research projects are often implemented to explore student resistance to critical pedagogy (Biggs Chaney; Chizhik and Chizhik;
One explanation for this pairing between teacher research and explorations into critical pedagogy is the equal importance the two fields place on theory and practice. Ruth Ray argues in *The Practice of Teaching: Teacher Research in Composition* that it is the work of composition scholars to reconcile oppositions between theory and practice/research and teaching, saying that she sees “teacher research as a means to [reconcile such oppositions] because it is based on the premise that theory comes from many places, including the classroom, and that theory is generated by many people, including teachers in collaboration with students and other teachers” (xi). Enacting critical pedagogy and responding to resistance to it entails a convergence between theory and practice. Indeed, scholars often use theory to inform new and/or analyze existing practices as is evidenced by many situating discussions of their respective teacher research projects within some theoretical frame. For example, Kill’s argument is grounded in theories of identity performance; St. Denis and Schick discuss their findings in terms of critical discourse analysis and Foucauldian power structures; and Welsh draws from resistance theory to critique emancipatory critical pedagogy. Part of what makes teacher research so valuable in such inquiries is that it provides a means to explore these connections between theory and practice.

As the review of the teacher research movement that follows will show, another reason teacher research is an obvious choice to conduct such inquiry is because the overarching principles informing the field of teacher research overlap with that of critical pedagogy in significant ways, particularly in terms of interrogating hegemonic discourse and empowering marginalized groups. Moreover, and specifically related to this project, at the foundation of the teacher research movement is advocacy for collaboration with all
participants. This focus on and privileging of all voices, notably students’, helped to create room for the eventual teacher-and-student as co-researchers paradigm that has been adopted in this dissertation.

Teacher research has its roots in the late 1960s and evolved in response to the devaluing of teaching and teachers because of the “false dichotomy” between teaching and research in institutional settings (Ray 49-50). Early teacher research projects, notably Lawrence Stenhouse’s, were aimed at countering the perception that teachers were conduits in disseminating knowledge but played no role in creating it or instigating change based on that knowledge. Stenhouse’s work represents what Cochran-Smith and Lytle call a “paradigm shift” in the way teachers are viewed. The influential 1987 anthology, *Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change*, includes essays that explore how and why to conduct teacher research with an overarching argument that it is teachers who should generate theories through collaboration with other teachers and not adhere to findings produced through university-based research endeavors.

Corresponding with this effort to redefine the teacher’s role, many who embraced the idea of teacher research as “agency for change” grounded their projects in critical and democratic social theory. Critical and social theory increasingly informed examinations of alternative ways of knowing and constructing knowledge as well as provided the theoretical foundation through which to critique dominant discourse in academic institutions that sanctioned top-down knowledge dissemination (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 15-16). Much of the work during this period was aimed at interrogating and reversing the traditional avenues of knowledge transmission, which by their very top-down nature
implied the privileging of knowledge tied to certain discourse communities. Teacher research advocates countered these established institutional practices arguing that teachers are the instrumental force behind the work of schools: Stenhouse, for example, pronounced that because of their proximity to knowledge, its construction and transmission, “It is teachers who, in the end, will change the world of the school by understanding it” (qtd. in Rudduck 1988). The goals of emancipating the practitioner so as to improve curriculum (Stenhouse 1), correlated with the efforts of other teacher researchers committed to progressive education. Cochran-Smith and Lytle write of this group that they “emphasized the importance of teachers as expert knowers about their own students and classroom” (16). The idea of a teacher having particular knowledge in relation to her own students suggests that there is specificity and distinctness between classrooms and schools. This assertion ultimately has implications in terms of the impact of geographic location on both the teachers’ knowledge and students’ ways of knowing and marks an important first step that eventually led to incorporating students as knowers and contributors in the process as well.

Out of these foci on teacher research as a means to redefine the teacher’s role, question hierarchical understandings of knowledge, conduct social inquiry, and promote the agenda of progressive education, Cochran-Smith and Lytle note three conceptual frameworks that dominate the field: Teacher Research as Social Inquiry; Teacher Research as Ways of Knowing in Communities; and Teacher Research as Practical Inquiry (16-18). As discussed in the Introduction, I draw from the first two conceptual frameworks in this project as they accentuate interrogation of social discourses, promote collaborative inquiry, and support the perspective that practice can and should inform
theory. Like critical pedagogy, the social inquiry approach has its roots in the Frankfort school (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 18), and as such is compatible with the overarching objectives of this project, including its goal to intervene in hegemonic discourse. In addition, in its advocacy for “the conjoined efforts of teachers and students as inquirers” and “conceptualizing practice as a critical and theory-building process” (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 18), the second conceptual framework, ways of knowing in communities, supports the empirical co-researcher model of this project and its examination of my own classroom practices, which, in turn, will hopefully inform theoretical assertions about the efficacy of critical pedagogy.

Feminist studies has also been influential in the projects of several teacher researchers, most notably Ray’s. As Ray describes it, feminist theory lends itself nicely to, and potentially furthers, the goals outlined above; because of its advocacy for the emancipation of marginalized groups and affirmation of “other” manifestations of knowledge not traditionally privileged in Western discourse, feminist theory aligns with the objectives of teacher research. Ray explains:

There are many instructive parallels between feminist literary criticism and teacher research, not the least of which is their shared goal of addressing inaccuracies and inequities in research and teaching. Both are redemptive and revisionary in nature and purpose. Teacher-researchers have sought to reveal and challenge the “false hierarchy of knowledge,” which privileges and valorizes the role of theory and university theorists, while ignoring and trivializing the role of teaching and teachers in the making of knowledge. (29)
Indeed, as I will discuss later in this chapter, I too draw from feminist studies to inform the methodology for this project primarily because of its focus on empowering silenced voices through practical means such as collaboration.

While the scholarship discussed thus far in this overview of teacher research does not specifically detail projects that incorporate collaboration with students, the ideas and goals put forth by many of the researchers point to such collaboration. Ray notes that collaboration should occur between teacher researchers and students (xi); and Cochran-Smith and Lytle explain that some branches of the teacher research movement advocate teachers as “expert knowers” of their students. Implicit in this second assertion, when taken in the context of a general movement in the field to overturn hierarchical constructs of knowledge, is that students also have a voice in the construction of knowledge. Feminist scholars such as Sandra Harding have long asserted that the researcher should collaborate with their research subject so as to empower them and avoid their exploitation. Work in feminist studies that defines the scope of collaboration (as will be more fully discussed in the next section) correlates to the evolutions in the teacher research movement in that ideas of how and with whom researchers should collaborate have expanded to include not just other teachers but, as Ray advocated over 15 years ago, students. As the discussion that follows will demonstrate, collaboration between teachers and students in teacher research projects, while still relatively scarce, have had positive outcomes in terms of initiating change for the benefit of all parties.

The accounts of teachers enlisting students as co-researchers in teacher research, while limited, span a variety of models for the role of the co-researcher. In almost all
cases, students are involved to some degree with collecting data, and in more inclusive models students assist with analysis of the data. In this project, the role my students assumed is most similar to that of teacher-researcher Tracy Smiles’s students as she explains in “Connecting Literacy and Learning through Collaborative Action Research”:

“Co-researchers” does not mean their roles were “equal” to mine. [. . .] For instance, students did not pose the question that guided the study, participate as extensively in the final data analysis, nor did they write field notes, transcribe literature discussions, create protocols, conduct interviews, or write up results. However, students did collaborate in the data collection for the duration of the study, made corrections to my interpretations, offered insights to more fully shape my interpretations, and reflected on their own thinking as they looked back on, analyzed, and discussed the data. (34)

I cannot speak for Smiles, but in my case, my model did not incorporate my students as much as I would have liked, particularly in relation to data analysis; however, as I will discuss at length in Chapter 6, the extensive role my students did play in data collection and interpretation transformed our classroom interactions in terms of the topics that were raised for discussion and how those topics were discussed.

Smiles sums up her experience working with her seventh graders as co-researchers on language and literacy saying that “engaging students in authentic inquiries […] can enlighten both students and teachers while simultaneously informing practice and creating new roles for students and teachers” (32). In almost all the scholarship I read by teachers who have undertaken projects where they worked with their students as co-researchers, the authors similarly noted that the work transformed interactions in a variety
of ways. In “Student Voices: Generating Reform from the Inside Out,” Susan Yonezawa and Makeba Jones discuss an extensive educational reform project wherein high school student co-researchers conducted interviews, assembled data, and made recommendations for future actions. Yonezawa and Jones suggest such involvement bring[s] students to the table as educational partners [. . . Their] presence changes the conversations adults have with students and one another. The student coresearch teams we worked with certainly changed the kinds of questions teachers asked themselves and altered discussions adults had within their schools.

(210)

Similarly, Sandra Gattenhof and Mark Radvan’s article, “In the Mouth of Imagination: Positioning Children as Co-researchers to create a Professional Children’s Theatre Production,” discusses a project wherein primary school children were enlisted as co-researchers and brought attention to ideas that the adults never considered.

The scholarship I discuss here is evidence that teachers have worked successfully with their students as co-researchers at the elementary, intermediate, and high school levels, with the researchers overwhelmingly asserting that co-researching with one’s students changes the dynamics of projects in terms of topics emphasized, interpretations of data, and how conversations evolve with generally positive outcomes. Despite the success of teacher research projects at the primary school level, however, there is little scholarship indicating such projects at the university level. It may be that one reason for the relative lack of such projects is the limited contact time university teachers have with a single set of students. We frequently interact with a set of students for a semester or a quarter. Of course, some of those students will take our classes again, but many of them
we will never see after the semester ends. In an elementary or high school setting, a teacher not only works with the same set of students for an entire academic year, there is a strong likelihood that many of those students will remain in the rather small educational community of the school for several years. Moreover, students in primary school may feel more compelled to work with their teachers due to internalized demands of their positioning as students (in the Foucauldian sense), a demand which may be easier to ignore when a student enters college. However, such a teacher research practice aligns with current pedagogical foci and trends in the university. The project I discuss in this dissertation demonstrates that while time constraints can place limits on a project, they need not be a complete detriment to the overall outcome. Moreover, as such a project can facilitate a learning environment wherein the content of student writings and discussions encompass topics aligned with the objectives of critical pedagogy, working within these time constraints can be worth the effort. Of course, that content will necessarily vary depending on where such a project is undertaken; in this dissertation, content that specifically relates to Hawai‘i’s geographic location and the lived reality of students in that place will be discussed.

In the field of Composition and Rhetoric, as in other disciplines, many teachers strive to complicate the learning to include students’ lived realities, an approach informed by critical pedagogy. Such initiatives have resulted in an increased focus on gender, race, and class as those are categories of subjectivity that are often embedded in students’ material realities. However, as important as these politicized foci are, they do not represent the full picture of students’ “lives.” In “The Politics of Place: Student Travelers and Pedagogical Maps,” Julie Drew argues:
Unfortunately, when we [composition teachers] do attempt to account for the politics of place we tend to stall at the door of the classroom. We fix students in classrooms, imagining through such pedagogical norms as race, class, and gender writing topics that we’ve placed academic writing within a cultural context. (63) But, Drew argues that “seeing” and understanding our students exclusively within the context of the classroom minimizes the complexity of their material realities and the spaces they inhabit and the impact both have on classroom interactions (60). With the increasingly diverse population of students that teachers interact with in their university classrooms, it would be impossible to anticipate all the different material conditions as well as cultural contexts students negotiate in their lives outside the university. For example, in Hawai‘i, where my study took place, the history of colonization and immigration further complicates such diversity in distinct ways, a subject I will take up in Chapter 3.

I am increasingly convinced that the only way to get a fuller picture of the various discursive spaces students inhabit and make those spaces part of the critical pedagogy project is for students to re-articulate them within the frame of classroom discourse. One way to accomplish this is to provide students the space to inform the teacher, not just on subjects the teacher may think she wants to know but also on what the students think is important. Enlisting students as co-researchers in teacher research provides a vehicle through which such an objective can be realized. Drew suggests that “by including students in our research—not as objects of study, but rather as co-inquirers—we stand a better chance of locating and understanding the multiple discursive pedagogies at work in both the classroom and other spaces” (60).
Drew’s arguments are convincing, but despite advocating a project that incorporates teacher and student as co-researchers, her work does not indicate that she has undertaken such a project. My project continues the work that scholars like Drew have begun in that it offers an illustration of how, in the context of a teacher research project, a multiplicity of voices can converge in the classroom to reveal located student perspectives, where students find the voice to assert their authority. The outcomes in such a research scenario are impacted significantly by students bringing the complexity of their lives into the research project and the classroom. These outcomes thereby exemplify how and why location can be a motivating force in both research and pedagogy. The methodology that informs the design and implementation of such a project plays an essential role in the realization of these pedagogical goals. As I will demonstrate in the next and final section, a methodology informed by indigenous and feminist studies as well as current work in ethnography can facilitate attention to place, mediate the teacher’s authority, and promote collaboration.

**Methodology**

A methodology that incorporates theories for responsible and ethical research does not change in general terms from context to context (although the methods necessarily do): research subjects, in this case students, need to be respected in terms of what they know, the importance of the project to them, and how the research affects them. These tenets are fundamental to my ethos as both a teacher and researcher. Moreover, collectively they represent many of the concerns raised in recent years by scholars working in the fields of indigenous and feminist studies, critical pedagogy, and ethnography: issues such as what constitutes valid data, the argument that classroom
learning should be applicable to lived experiences, and what practices constitute ethical research.

Based on the scholarship and my own teaching experiences, I realized that for this project to illustrate the complexity of my and my students’ experiences in the classroom as well as contribute to the scholarship in meaningful ways, I needed to enlist my students as co-researchers. As a teacher committed to critical pedagogy, I believe that knowledge and learning are co-constructed between the teacher and students, and collaborating with my students through various activities such as collecting data and incorporating their discussions of data in my representations thus represents my understanding that I am not the only one in the classroom with something to teach; students also bring a store of knowledge to the classroom that we can all benefit from in our learning. Collaborating with students in this way also aligns with current scholarship on research and ethnography in addition to indigenous studies. In Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples, Linda Tuhiwai Smith articulates a methodology for conducting responsible research in an indigenous contexts through a Maori lens. Her goal is to define research practices that promote the agenda of indigenous people: practices that reaffirm their culture, history, identity, and claims of sovereignty. My project differs significantly from Tuhiwai Smith’s context as it does not solely involve the indigenous people of Hawai‘i, nor is it directly aimed at promoting Native Hawaiian sovereignty. However, my research subjects/co-researchers, my students, include Native Hawaiians, and I am concerned with capturing how my students negotiate and respond to complexities and conflicts that exist in Hawai‘i that are sometimes,
perhaps often, drawn across ethnic lines. Moreover, such a theoretical frame does specifically address the concerns of my research site due to the familial relationship between the Hawaiian and Maori culture and their similarities as Pacific Island people who have been colonized.4

In the western world, valid data have long been understood as coming in limited forms, specifically verifiable facts represented by numbers (distance, time, temperatures) and oral accounts void of any affectation or emotion. In 1995, the germinal anthology *Women Writing Culture* was published. In it, feminist ethnographers argued that data that had previously been dismissed as unreliable and too subjective by traditional western anthropologists, data in the form of storytelling and personal experiences for example, were not only good data, but extremely rich sources of cultural information. In the western academic arena, these proclamations were provocative. However, from many indigenous perspectives the idea of placing the same or more value on storytelling and personal experience as one does on scientific fact has long been accepted. Noenoe Silva writes that Hawaiians knew their Western counterparts did not give the same weight to historical accounts conveyed through storytelling as they did. However, in the face of the challenge to their epistemological traditions, they did not abandon their way of knowing; they set out to prove it was accurate. In the context of discussing a board commissioned by Hawaiʻi’s King Kalākaua in 1880 in order to (among other things) “gather, revise, correct and record all published and unpublished Ancient Hawaiian History” (95), Silva writes,

They [the board] were no doubt acutely aware that traditional epistemologies were dismissed by the Europeans and Euro-Americans, and they hoped to use the
scientific tools available to contest that dismissal by showing that science proved what they had always known. [...] that moʻokūʻauhau [genealogy] and moʻolelo [storytelling] constituted valid knowledge. (97)

Many of the theories that scholars like Tuhiwai Smith and Silva are now writing about represent epistemological practices that took root hundreds of years ago, ideas that Western scholars have only begun to arrive at in the last half of the last century.

In addition to acknowledging narrative and storytelling as data, several of the methodologies Tuhiwai Smith advocates can be similarly aligned with methodologies promoted in feminist theory, including collaboration, a significant characteristic of this project. While I am persuaded by the arguments and revisions promoted in feminist theory and see them as valuable to be referenced here as supportive analogs, I nonetheless continue to return to Tuhiwai Smith for guidance in methodology, since Tuhiwai Smith, with her focus on colonized indigenous contexts, addresses specific situations applicable to my project. For example, she discusses how a research project conducted within the academy can realize benefits for the indigenous community and improve relations between the indigenous people and settlers. Tuhiwai Smith writes,

> Indigenous developments within an institution such as a university can mediate and structure new relations between institution and community, between indigenous people and non-indigenous people between communities of the ‘researched’ and communities of ‘researchers.’ (134)

Indeed, one goal of this project is, through a documenting of students’ ideas about resistance, to ultimately promote discussion and understanding where there has been little. Tuhiwai Smith’s articulation of the potential for research conducted within the
academy extends Henry Giroux’s claim that while the academy is a site of “sociocultural reproduction,” it also provides space for “contestation of dominant ideologies and practices” (*Theory and Resistance* 115). Within Tuhiwai Smith’s frame, this contestation manifests in the building of a stronger, interconnected community. Such explications of the possible positive outcomes of resistance to dominant hegemonic narratives address the goals of my project more fully.

Tuhiwai Smith also discusses concerns for the non-indigenous researcher involved in a project that crosses cultures as mine does. She writes:

> When undertaking research, either across cultures or within a minority culture, it is critical that researchers recognize the power dynamic which is embedded in the relationship with their subjects. Researchers are in receipt of privileged information. They may interpret it within an overt theoretical framework, but also in terms of a covert ideological framework. They have the power to distort, to make invisible, to overlook, to exaggerate and to draw conclusions, based not on factual data, but on assumptions, hidden value judgments, and often downright misunderstandings. They have the power to extend knowledge or perpetuate ignorance. (176)

Feminist scholars such Gesa Kirsch have made similar arguments, saying that researchers’ analysis is filtered through their own lived experiences and values. However, Tuhiwai Smith’s direct engagement with the effects that such bias can have and has had in indigenous contexts provides a ready reminder to me of the pitfalls to avoid. Moreover, sometimes such end results can occur despite the best of intentions. A researcher isn’t always aware of what she is missing or not seeing. Tuhiwai Smith’s theory similarly
emphasizes the importance of employing practices that promote collaboration and
reciprocity so as to counter a researcher’s own limitations and oversights. As the
narrative of Chapters 4 through 6 will demonstrate, I have adopted and adjusted methods
as this project evolved so as to minimize the dominance of my perceptions in the
interpretations and analysis of data.

Theories of collaboration have been a main focus in the scholarship on
ethnography in general and in the discipline of Composition and Rhetoric in particular for
over the last decade, with many scholars advocating very specific practices in order for a
project to be called collaborative. Kirsch and other feminist scholars, such as Joy Ritchie,
argue that the research participant should be included at all stages of the research project
so that the project is more likely to speak to the interests of both the researcher and
researched. In “Beyond the Personal: Theorizing a Politics of Location in Composition
Research,” Kirsch and Ritchie argue that the researcher should, “collaborat[e] with
participants in the development of research questions, the interpretation of data at both
the descriptive and interpretive levels, and the writing of research reports” (8). Similarly,
Tuhiwai Smith’s research model calls for the researcher to collaborate with the
researched from the very inception of the design to ensure that research participants are
not exploited. Unfortunately, due to the constraints of the 16-week semester during which
I had contact with a particular cohort of students, each class did not have much input on
the project at the outset. Most of the project was designed before I actually met them;
however, I did incorporate what I had learned from students over the course of previous
semesters. Moreover, I did attempt to counter my authority over the design of the project
by soliciting their opinions on the importance of the project at the beginning of the
semester in a variety of freewrite exercises. However, I readily acknowledge that this practice, while well-intentioned, does not compare to collaboratively creating a project from the outset. Thus, I would consider my articulation of my students as co-researchers complex.

In its call for collaborating at all junctures of the research process, a methodology based on collaboration also involves the research subjects in the analysis of the data. Again, due to the constraints of my current project being a dissertation and my having contact with students for only sixteen weeks, I was not able to get the kind of feedback on the data and the analysis I offer in this project that I would ideally like; however, the methods through which several assignments and class exercises were carried out enabled me to acquire some student feedback in terms of data analysis. As I will explain in Chapter 5, students were asked to produce thick descriptions of particular events and then draw from that data in their written analyses on resistance. Those student-produced analysis papers based on data the students had collected make up one set of data that I examine in Chapter 6. I also elicited student input on data analysis during class discussion by presenting data I had coded to my students. After looking at their writing responses to prompts on resistance, I assembled a list of keywords representing common themes that emerged in the writing. I presented this list to the students on an overhead and asked them if we could make any summations based on what I had pulled from the freewrites. Students immediately began telling me I missed some concepts, particularly the role religion plays in their ideas and how they interact. Several students initiated a discussion about how home life and family influences their interactions in discussions and activities at school, and other students quickly joined in. As an example, some
students explained that they sometimes resisted participating in discussions involving controversial issues that they might support but that their family did not because they felt that expressing their support of something like abortion amounted to a betrayal of family values.

Kirsch asserts in *Ethical Dilemmas in Feminist Research*, that researchers should “collaborate with participants as much as possible so that growth and learning can be mutually beneficial, interactive and cooperative” (4). Classroom interactions like the ones noted above that occurred throughout my conducting research for this project illustrate moments when I realized the benefits of collaboration. Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine the extent to which my students realized any benefits, but I believe that, at least minimally, the project had a positive outcome for my students. In the example, these students assumed agency over information because it was information I did not have— they were the experts and they had to explain it to me. Through their explanations, they taught me by explaining classroom dynamics in ways that I had not entertained prior. As a teacher, I could see them grow as learners and contributors to our community. I realized the possibility of these kinds of learned behaviors, particularly claiming and valuing personal knowledge as being relevant to academic learning, eventually extending to how they interacted in other communities to which they belong.

Responding to the larger context of research as well as teacher research in my field, I worked to design a project that gave my students authority, at least to some extent, over the project and the learning they did in the classroom. It is significant to note that such practices not only speak to my goals as a researcher, but they represent who I am as a teacher. As a critical pedagogy advocate, I hope to facilitate students’ participation in
their community in ways that enable them to advance themselves and their own communities. Similarly, I want to provide ways for my research subjects to be empowered within the context of the project. Teacher research has mostly been understood to be a means to inform pedagogy. As discussion of student data in Chapters 4 and 6 will demonstrate, my research adds to this understanding of teacher research through its implication that teacher research, particularly when informed by a collaborative methodology aligned with the indigenous and feminist theories discussed here, can be a critical pedagogy practice through which students critically engage with their own learning.

**Conclusion**

This dissertation was borne from my interest in understanding my students’ resistance in the classroom. A review of the scholarship on student resistance provided here revealed that a significant body of research discusses student resistance in terms of subjectivity; however, location remains undertheorized in the research. Moreover, while a corpus of this work involves some kind of teacher research, with the exception of Jim Henry’s project, little if any of the scholarship indicates students’ involvement as co-researchers in these projects. An overview of the literature on teacher research shows that several studies wherein students were enlisted as co-researchers realized successful outcomes, making a teacher research model that incorporates co-inquiry a viable option. In addition, the importance placed on social inquiry, community, and collaboration in the field of teacher research aligns with my goals as both a teacher and researcher. I see students playing a vital role in the construction of knowledge in the classroom, and in my teaching I see my students as collaborators in the learning process. I wanted to adapt
these characteristics of my pedagogical approach to this research project. An empirical co-inquiry teacher research model provided a vehicle through which I was able to do that.

The methodology explained in this chapter informs my overall approach to this dissertation, specifically how the teacher research project was designed and implemented. Inherent in the methodology is a focus on collaboration. In addition, with its attention on the research subjects’ subjectivity in terms of their role in the project, this methodology also accounts for geographic location. The narratives detailing my own experiences growing up and my teaching philosophy that I opened the chapter with explain my teaching and research objectives and thus work to clarify why incorporating these elements into the methodology was imperative. In short, the theories from indigenous and feminist studies as well as current work in ethnography that inform my methodology inform my ethos as a teacher and researcher.

As the theoretical discussion in the next chapter will show, subjectivity impacts all our negotiations in life in very complex ways, and it is no different for me. The narratives I opened this chapter with work to demonstrate the ways in which my subjectivity and positioning in the community influences my teaching philosophy and ultimately this project. I account for location in my pedagogy through the texts, languages, and experiences I bring into the classroom but also by providing space for multiple perspectives to be voiced. This approach carries over to my research and is reflected in my decision to enlist my students as co-researchers. This co-research resulted in data in the form of student writing and discussions that highlight the important role location plays in student learning and therefore must play in praxis, an outcome
supported by the literature as the synthesis of the scholarship in the next chapter will demonstrate.
Notes

1 Throughout this dissertation I write “teacher research” rather than “teacher-research” following the example of Cochran-Smith and Lytle, two of the foremost teacher research scholars and practitioners.

2 Haole is used to refer to “White person, American, Englishman, Caucasian…formerly any foreigner” (Pukui and Elbert 58).

3 I will trace the connection between Giroux’s liberatory pedagogy and critical pedagogy in the following chapter.

4 The Maori and Hawaiians share many similarities in language, oral traditions, cultural practices, as well as in their history of colonization, and Tuhiwai Smith cites Hawaiian practices to support several of the methods she proposes in *Decolonizing Methodologies*; for example, in her advocation of securing approval from elders before conducting interviews with community members, she sites practices employed by Native Hawaiian researchers (15).
CHAPTER 2
Critical Pedagogy:
Why Location Matters

Paulo Freire, one of the leaders in the critical pedagogy movement, consistently emphasized the importance of tailoring theory to specific locations: for a theory to be successful it cannot be applied in the same way in different places to all people. In the face of his pedagogical approach being adopted by scholars and teachers worldwide, Freire asserted, “You don’t have to follow me. You have to re-invent me” (Torres). At a point in time when the rhetoric of globalization has worked to minimize the significance of geographical location in identity formation, recent scholarship in Composition and Rhetoric has re-emphasized that taking into account location is essential in designing successful pedagogy practices: practices that students feel are applicable to them and their lives outside of the academy precisely because location does influence identity and in turn learning (Mauk; Ball and Lai; Reynolds). In “Location Location Location: The ‘Real’ (E)states of Being, Writing, and Thinking in Composition,” Jonathon Mauk states:

an examination of materiality, of space, is also an examination of identity. In other words to understand the problems and nuances of any set of practices, as they are acted out by a particular group of people, we must have some intellectual tools for understanding the spatial-social complexities of those practices—for understanding how material existence and geopolitical location figure into knowing and acting. (210)

Critical pedagogy unquestionably informs many teachers’ teaching philosophies. Many of us want our students to be critically conscious; we want the learning in our classrooms
to translate into students being empowered to negotiate real world problems and resist oppressive norms for their own and their communities’ betterment. Complicating the attainment of such a pedagogical goal is the reality that the communities our students represent in the classroom are numerous and variable, with each student drawing from more than one discourse community as she learns and interacts. Teachers simply cannot anticipate how one student’s community might be better served or the problems students and their communities face, nor do I believe that anyone expects them to. As such, critical pedagogy teachers may not know how to tailor discussions and assignments so they address the specific concerns of our students. However, the tenets of critical pedagogy suggest that kind of specificity in its call for an awareness of the hegemonic discourses students negotiate because hegemonic discourses vary depending on location.

The thesis of this dissertation posits that when students are enlisted as co-researchers in teacher research informed by critical pedagogy practices and grounded in a specific location related to students’ lives, such practices are well-received in terms of the objectives of critical pedagogy by students precisely because of the emphasis on the locations our students negotiate as well as the nuanced relationships these locations have with each other. To illustrate my point, I document a teacher research project wherein my students and I collaboratively conducted research on student resistance. I cannot discuss how a teacher research project that posits location as a dominant feature is a critical pedagogy practice without first examining the pedagogy itself and its relationship to both resistance and location. Thus, I will begin this chapter with an overview of critical pedagogy to further explicate its objectives and the role location plays in its successful application. An examination of several of the critiques of critical pedagogy will provide a
departure point for a more nuanced discussion of the role of location in critical pedagogy practices. I will then draw from current scholarship in Composition and Rhetoric on location and Bourdieu’s theory of habitus to demonstrate the intricate relationship between location, context, and subjectivity. Although Bourdieu’s habitus has mostly been applied to explain class distinctions, here I am more interested in his articulation of the process of internalization of social behaviors and will apply the theory for that purpose.

Hawai‘i is the site of this research project and provides an example of the complex ways social, political, and cultural forces tied to location impact subjectivity. Residents of Hawai‘i, whether short or long term, negotiate these forces that are uniquely informed by the state’s location, history of colonization, and the social and economic relationships between various ethnic groups. Understanding the implications of these variables is particularly relevant as my co-researcher/research subjects are students in and/or from this place. To elucidate some of the complexity informing social interactions in a colonized location such as Hawai‘i, I will close this chapter with a discussion of postcolonial theory and Kenneth Burke’s theory of consubstantiality in terms of situations that students at the University of Hawai‘i are likely to encounter. The work in this chapter is largely theoretical and as such provides the foundation for later chapters that will illustrate through examples how these theories of critical pedagogy, location, and subjectivity manifest in social behaviors in one very specific place.
Critical Pedagogy: Citizenry and Resistance

Critical pedagogy can be traced to the progressive education movement ushered in by John Dewey with the publication of *Democracy and Education* in 1916 and the theories of the Frankfurt school founded in Germany in the early 1920s. Dewey’s concepts of education countered traditional practices that were based on the idea that learning consisted mostly (if not solely) of students learning what teachers had to teach in a one-way (teacher to student) process. He argued that students should not be passive receptacles for a teacher’s lectures. Freire later famously labeled this traditional approach to teaching the “banking concept of education.” In contrast, Dewey asserted that students also bring knowledge to the classroom and that their knowledge should be taken into account. In progressive education environments, students participate actively in their learning and learning is likewise applicable to students’ public lives. For Dewey, dialogic classroom practices resulted in ethical democratic citizenship, the ultimate desired outcome of education.

Critical pedagogy shares the basic tenets of progressive education but further articulates the goals of education to include the facilitation of students’ critical awareness of the power structures at work in society, and this is a direct reflection of the influence that the Frankfurt School has had on critical pedagogy. Incorporating their “real life” experiences and knowledge with more theoretical academic learning allows students to not only critique oppressive institutions of power but also resist them. For some scholars, such as Freire, Henry Giroux, and Ira Shor, the idea that such learning can result in student resistance to hegemonic forces is where critical pedagogy takes on a more radical edge in what Freire eventually termed “liberatory pedagogy.” Although the term is not
coined until 1994 with the publication of *Pedagogy of Hope*, the ideas informing liberatory pedagogy began much earlier.

In 1968, Freire published his groundbreaking work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. In it, Freire outlined an idea of education as a liberating tool rather than a system that reproduces power and reinforces class hierarchies that result in the oppression of certain marginalized groups within a society. The ideas of knowledge as socially constructed, teachers and students as co-learners, and education to facilitate critical consciousness that enables interrogation of hegemonic discourse—what Freire called problem-posing education—derived from both Dewey and the Frankfurt school and are some of the hallmarks of critical pedagogy. However, for Freire, as well as those who worked with him or were influenced by his work, such as Giroux and Shor, critical pedagogy signifies a call for active protest. Freire writes, “Problem-posing education, as a humanist and liberating praxis, posits as fundamental that the people subjected to domination must fight for their emancipation” (*Pedagogy of the Oppressed* 86). It is this particular branch of critical pedagogy that eventually becomes known as liberatory pedagogy. Students in classrooms designed around the tenets of liberatory pedagogy would thus not only recognize hegemonic discourses and their reproductive purposes, they would also actively resist them in order to liberate themselves or a group marginalized by the dominant discourse. This resistance could manifest in a variety or combination of ways: verbally or physically, through protest or institutional infiltration, and/or through participation or refusal to participate in systemic activities that reproduce privilege and/or oppression.
The pedagogical philosophies guiding each critical and liberatory pedagogy are very similar. Where they differ is that the ultimate goal of critical pedagogy is to promote responsible and ethical democratic citizenship whereas liberatory pedagogy advocates active resistance to oppressive social conditions. However, being a responsible citizen may at times entail active resistance or protest. Thus, the distinction may be more in how pedagogical practices are presented to students in the classroom rather than in actual content. James Berlin, whose work is most closely aligned with critical pedagogy, offers the following explanation of this pedagogical philosophy as it informs the design of one of his 1983 courses, which suggests a leaning toward a more radical desired outcome:

The focus [of the course] is on the relation of current signifying practices to the structuring of subjectivities—of race, class, and gender formations for example—in our students and ourselves. Our effort is to make students aware of the cultural codes—various competing discourses—that attempt to influence who they are. Our larger purpose is to encourage our students to resist and to negotiate those codes—these hegemonic discourses—in order to bring about more personally humane and socially equitable economic and political arrangements [. . .] hoping to encourage resisting, negotiating subjects within positions of power in the dominant culture. (“Composition and Cultural Studies” 50)

Berlin’s course outline demonstrates that an important characteristic of critical pedagogy is that it can facilitate resistance as well as/in addition to negotiation, whereas a practitioner of liberatory pedagogy might assert that the only way to be a responsible citizen is to always be resisting. Giroux, a liberatory pedagogy advocate, explains the
pedagogy he believes necessary for “the rebuilding of a socially committed state” capable of countering neoliberal ideology (“Beyond Neoliberal” 14). He argues that such a pedagogy is a form of cultural politics that raises the issue of how education might be understood as a moral and political practice in a variety of sites outside of schools. Pedagogy as defined here is fundamentally concerned with the relations between politics, subjectivities, and cultural and material production. As a form of cultural production, pedagogy is implicated in the construction and organization of knowledge, desires, emotional investments, values, and social practices. At stake here is developing a notion of public pedagogy [. . .] which is capable of contesting the various forms of symbolic production that secure individuals to the affective and ideological investments that produce the neoliberal subject. (“Beyond Neoliberal Common Sense” 45)

The difference between Berlin and Giroux’s pedagogy seems more in tone than actual content: Berlin discusses hegemonic discourses that “attempt to influence” and explains that the course “encourages” students to resist. In contrast, Giroux’s tone is more dire: there is a need for a pedagogy that is “capable of contesting” because there is a lot at stake. I am confident Berlin would assert that his project has the same urgency and importance. At the most basic level, liberatory pedagogy departs from critical pedagogy in that it is more aggressive in its promotion of active resistance. Simply, one could say that liberatory pedagogy is critical pedagogy’s radical sibling: they share similar values and end objectives in terms of benefiting peoples in oppressive contexts. The means promoted to achieve such ends is where the two approaches differ.
Juxtaposing Giroux and Berlin is not meant to highlight these differences in their pedagogies but to emphasize the similarities. Most teachers who adhere to the principles of critical pedagogy support resistance to oppression and hegemony to some extent. Thus, in this project, I will use critical pedagogy to encompass both critical pedagogy and its radical offshoot liberatory pedagogy, and I assume that inherent in this pedagogy is the implication of resistance that counters oppression. However, as discussed in the Introduction, efforts at implementing critical pedagogy practices are often met with a different kind of resistance from students than the one intended: students are perceived to be resisting exactly the course content meant to liberate them. In other words, they resist the form of resistance sought in critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy scholars have offered both critiques of the pedagogy to explain resistance as well as practical ideas to facilitate its reception. Like the scholarship on student resistance already canvassed demonstrates, implicated in most if not all of this work is location.

**Location, the Politics of Place, and Subjectivity**

Critical pedagogy can and has been applied across different geographical locations—from Brazil to the United States, to name just two well-known examples among many others— and in various disciplines; however, as one of the goals of critical pedagogy is to encourage resistance to specific and often located institutions and systems of power that reproduce hegemony and influence individuals' social behaviors, how critical pedagogy practices are implemented in a classroom must necessarily take into account the geographical, historical, cultural, and social contexts of that location. These variables collectively make up what I refer to as the politics of place and intricately
influence the social behaviors, interactions, identity and subjectivity of its inhabitants. Nedra Reynolds articulates the relationship between location and identity in *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*: She writes “identities take root from particular sociogeographical intersections, reflecting where a person comes from and, to some extent, directing where she is allowed to go. Geographical locations influence our habits, speech patterns, style, and values” (11). Likewise, some specific institutional systems that reproduce dominant discourse are also location-specific.

Louis Althusser famously categorized such institutional systems that reinforce normed ideologies and societal hierarchies as Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA) (family, church, schools, etc) and their more aggressive counterpart Repressive State Apparatuses (RSA) (police, military, etc.). The very nature of these apparatuses (family, church, police, and military) suggests that for ISAs and RSAs to be effective at maintaining status quo, they must address the issues and agenda of a specific location(s). Thus, if individuals’ social behaviors and the material manifestations of hegemony and oppression are both influenced by location, a pedagogical practice, i.e., critical pedagogy, aimed at examining both would necessarily have to take into account specific geographical location, too. Indeed, Freire himself asserted that his theories should never be universally applied but rather must account for the social and political context of a particular place; Giroux explains:

Because [Freire] was always concerned about the relationship between context, pedagogy, and politics[,] one didn’t imitate Paulo, one tried to use his work as theory rather than a method, and this meant one had to be a producer of theory rather than one who simply implements other’s theories. (“Giroux on Freire”)
Too often, however, scholars lay claim to the overarching themes of critical pedagogy without careful consideration of how such a pedagogy is implemented in classroom practices or whether the way it is implemented facilitates the pedagogy’s goals, both of which entail accounting for where the pedagogy is enacted and to whom it is being delivered. It seems that often course topics are either associated with critical pedagogy or not, and the mere inclusion of a topic that does correlate with the overall themes of critical pedagogy can result in a course being labeled a critical pedagogy course (Thelin, “William Thelin’s Response” 118). This practice is problematic because it begs the questions: Whom is the critical pedagogy serving? Whom is it emancipating? Answering those questions demand interrogating the pedagogy, how it is implemented and its (and the teacher’s) agenda. In other words, as both Patricia Bizzell and Russell Durst have asserted, a critical pedagogy must be willing to critically examine itself.¹

The key terms most tied to critical pedagogy—such as oppression, hegemony, empowerment, emancipation, resistance—dictate themes without any real specificity. Elizabeth Ellsworth argues that the language used to discuss critical pedagogy is often “more appropriate for philosophical debates about the highly problematic concepts of freedom, justice, democracy, and ‘universal’ values than for thinking through and planning classroom practices to support the political agenda” (302). Embracing such terms without interrogation can work to mask the enduring and reproductive nature of particular social institutions, like the academy. Ellsworth notes that critical pedagogues often employ terms like “empowerment” and “dialogue” that “give the illusion of equality when in fact the authoritarian nature of the student/teacher relationship is left
intact” (307). In a discussion specifically addressing critical pedagogy’s claims of student empowerment, Ellsworth writes, “educational researchers who invoke concepts of critical pedagogy consistently strip discussions of classroom practices of historical context and political positions” (302), and notes how difficult it is in reality to create a classroom dynamic where students are actually empowered to counter the teacher’s authority. Ellsworth’s argument makes it clear that the objectives of critical pedagogy are more likely to be realized when classroom practices at the most practical level promote its agenda. Empowering students is a fundamental tenet of critical pedagogy, and it is not enough to declare it happening. As Ellsworth asserts in her article, the power structures in place in the academy are quite durable; thus specific practices need to be consciously employed to undermine the institutionalized roles of student and teacher. Ellsworth, in short, is arguing that the classroom as a location needs to be accounted for.

In Critical Teaching for Everyday Life, Shor attempts to address concerns like Ellsworth’s by offering a set of practices to employ in the critical pedagogy classroom aimed at minimizing the teacher’s authority and empowering students. Shor asserts that many students arrive in their classrooms already in a state of resistance because the institution alienates them. He argues, “For a classroom to reverse the effects of mass alienation [of students by the institution], it needs to present itself as unequivocally identified with the students” (121). He then suggests the following practices to counter this alienation: students and teacher should sit in a circle as opposed to the traditional set-up wherein rows of student desks face the teacher and the teacher assumes a position in the front of the class; there should be “quiet space for deliberation as a whole and in groups”; teachers should avoid presenting themselves as over-specialized so as to
“demystify” their position. In other words, they should assume a variety of roles including that of counselor and tutor; classroom interactions should promote consciousness raising and should not be “business-like”; students should assume a role in determining the governance of the class; teachers should act as initiators; and culturally censored information should be exchanged (119-122). Through this list, Shor paints a picture of what a critical pedagogy classroom might “look” like and the physical practices a teacher can employ to minimize her authority. Shor thus gives us a model for classroom practices that, he asserts, aligns with critical pedagogy. Unfortunately, one could do all that Shor suggests and still not empower her students. Accounting for the location of the classroom in terms of it being part of the larger institution and informed by that institution’s accompanying power structures through classroom practices is essential but not enough. As the classroom is located within an ISA, both its micro-location (the school setting) and macro-location (the geographic location) must be considered and course content must be adapted accordingly.

In a 2005 article "Understanding Problems in Critical Classrooms," William Thelin documents a case that supports this assertion; he writes about his own critical pedagogy classroom discussing its failings despite his efforts to adhere to Shor’s practices. In the article, Thelin focuses on “blundered implementation,” arguing that failed attempts can “function as an opportunity to advance knowledge and to understand the ongoing project of critical pedagogy” (114). However, the examination of a failed critical pedagogy must move beyond discussions of implementation to include content. Following Thelin’s initial article, a published exchange ensued between Thelin and Durst over Thelin’s course and critical pedagogy practices in general. Durst voices one critique
that is particularly relevant here in terms of its relationship with students’ resistance, course content, and location. Durst argues that some students may resist critical pedagogy because they do not find critical pedagogy compatible with their pragmatic objectives for being in school (111). Although Durst sees these students as not likely (to want to) be “radicalized” in their education, I posit that is not why critical pedagogy practices may not be well-received by these students. Rather, it is because the content of the critical pedagogy seems irrelevant to their lives.

In Ellsworth’s discussion of empowerment, she first speaks of it in terms of expected norms within one location, the classroom; however, she then furthers this discussion of location to encompass the larger context students negotiate. She asserts “student empowerment has been defined in the broadest possible humanist terms and becomes a ‘capacity to act effectively’ in a way that fails to challenge any identifiable social or political position, institution, or group” (308). Her point here takes the argument for location beyond the classroom and extends it to the wider social and political context: to empower students means to facilitate their engagement with named social and political forces they face in their daily lives both in and out of the classroom. The students Durst considers, who may see their education as a pragmatic means to a specific end, namely employment, may not (at first) be interested, for example, in discussions of how women or people of color have been consistently marginalized in places they have never been; however, they may be interested in how power is enacted and maintained in the workplace settings where they currently or plan to work. Jim Henry’s *Writing Workplace Cultures: An Archeology of Professional Writing* documents graduate students’ research and analysis of local cultures in their own workplaces. Of particular relevance here is that
when students were given opportunity to choose their own topic of research, most chose their own workplaces precisely because what was happening in their workplaces directly impacted their lived realities.

A critical pedagogy is most likely to be successful in terms of how it is received by students when form aligns with the pedagogy’s goals and the content is relevant to students’ lives. In “Place-Based Pedagogy for the Arts and Humanities,” Eric Ball and Alice Lai argue that incorporating ‘located” texts into critical pedagogy “help to reprivilege place(s) in education through dialogical creation of pedagogical focus that is meaningful enough to pique students’ interest and to draw them toward increasingly critical considerations of the ‘common good’” (282). Ball and Lai call this approach a “radically place-based pedagogy”; however, I believe that incorporating local material is also just good critical pedagogy practice. Either way, Ball and Lai make an argument similar to the one I make here: accounting for location may be one way to counter students’ lack of interest, which is probably often perceived as resistance. A-located course content may have been a factor that prompted the different forms of student resistance Thelin experienced with his course, not how the course was implemented: there is no explanation in the articles of whether or how the critical pedagogy topic informing Thelin’s course related to students’ lives. In his closing remarks to the list of course practices outlined above (and that Thelin incorporated), Shor asserts, “This theory should be adapted and amended, re-invented, used or disregarded depending on the requirements of the teaching situation” (123). Taking Ellsworth and Shor’s comments on location and reading them in the context of Durst and Thelin’s critiques and explanations, there seems to be an implied relationship between accounting for location in course
content and student resistance. Ball and Lai argue that “radically place-based pedagogy assumes that the kinds of local content that are incorporated into the curriculum, and the ways these are approached, should also vary with the locale” (274). To successfully implement a critical pedagogy entails attention to both form (the how) and content (the what), and location must be accounted for in relation to both.

A hypothetical comparison based on Freire’s early teaching experience and a teaching situation described by Verna St. Denis and Carol Schick in a 2003 article on student resistance further illustrates the necessity for tailoring content to meet the needs of specific locations outside the classroom. Freire initially worked mostly in impoverished communities in rural Brazil where illiteracy was a significant obstacle. In such a situation, one of the first necessary tasks is to facilitate literacy. However, as is frequently the case in such teaching situations in underdeveloped countries such as Brazil was during the 1960s, creating an understanding of the importance of being literate when children are needed to work to feed the family might be a rather significant obstacle. Freire writes, “To surmount the situation of oppression, people must first critically recognize its causes” (Pedagogy of the Oppressed 47). Recognizing one of the causes negatively impacting literacy rates would include being able to identify how keeping communities in a state of survival mode (needing all to work in order to eat) hinders the pursuit of individual and community betterment in the form of education. Education might provide such individuals the means to resist the systems reinforcing oppression, but as long as families only have time to focus on survival, that goal cannot be realized. An educator in such a situation as Freire was would likely have to convince the community that the long-term benefits of education significantly outweigh the immediate
sacrifices that possibly entail some already overworked individuals of the family taking on the responsibility of two in order for one to receive an education.

In contrast, critical pedagogy would necessarily be applied differently in a location such as the one St. Denis and Schick examine in “What Makes Anti-Racist Pedagogy in Teacher Education Difficult?: Three Popular Ideological Assumptions.” At their research site in Western Canada, the students are mostly members of the dominant culture and the pedagogy is aimed at facilitating awareness of “the dominant identification and power relations through which [the students] are produced and unwittingly implicated in reproducing the status quo” (55). St. Denis and Schick’s students are, “almost exclusively white-identified, mostly lower middle-class Canadian citizens, many from third-generation, non-Anglo immigrant families” (56). St. Denis and Schick’s article explicates their students’ resistance to “anti-racist, cross-cultural” critical pedagogy as the product of three ideological assumptions: 1) Race doesn’t matter (culture does); 2) Meritocracy—Everyone has equal opportunity; and 3) Goodness and Innocence—by individual acts and good intentions, one can secure innocence as well as superiority. As the categories St. Denis and Schick articulate indicate, their population is notably different from the one Freire encountered in rural Brazil. Freire’s Brazilian students are more obviously members of an oppressed group, whereas St. Denis and Schick’s students, according to their research, are more invested in denying inequity between their experiences and other marginalized groups. In their specific case, St. Denis and Schick note that Aboriginal peoples are the largest marginalized group in their location. Both projects are informed by the same universal theory: students should be
encouraged to identify causes of oppression and marginalization and resist them in order to change societal norms. But the way a theory is implemented, to encourage literacy despite that it might affect labor needed to put food on the table or engaging students complicit in the reproduction of hegemonic discourse, differ at a fundamental level because the nature of the problem, the student population, and the location in which the problem exists also differ.

The previous examples illustrate how systems of oppression physically manifest differently depending on location. But this is only one part of the role location plays in critical pedagogy. There is more at work in critical pedagogy than just its materiality. Location is also important in the human aspect of critical pedagogy: the way social behaviors, both the teachers’ and the students’, manifest and/or represent localized normed ideologies and influence interaction in the classroom.

Current scholarly conversations on location in Composition and Rhetoric help to clarify the connection between location and social behavior, specifically in terms of teaching and learning. Reynolds, whose work specifically addresses location and pedagogy, asserts that taking location into account can “lead to a richer understanding of how people learn to read, write, and interact with texts” (Geographies of Writing 3). For Reynolds and other like-minded scholars such as Julie Drew, examining the geographic location where learning takes place facilitates an understanding of the motivations and influences from both within and outside the academy that inform students’ classroom social behaviors, which is essential if a pedagogical approach is to be effective. Reynolds’ work begins to explicate how location impacts social behavior in subjective ways, saying, “Many of our experiences in life ‘take place’ in a location, and then we
draw upon characteristics of those locations to construct memories and judge or respond to other places” (*Geographies of Writing* 3). Applying this theory implies that out-of-classroom experiences are inextricably intertwined with classroom interactions and that the flow of influences is multi-directional with numerous experiences in a variety of locations affecting each other. Reynolds then points to how acknowledging location as a significant variable in pedagogical approaches specifically speaks to the tenets of critical pedagogy: “Understanding the importance of lifeworlds is one place to begin in understanding difference, otherness, and the politics of exclusion—topics that define the causes of critical literacy, social justice, and liberatory education” (*Geographies of Writing* 3).

If one of the goals of critical pedagogy is to give students the tools with which to resist their own and others’ marginalization, teachers need to recognize that who is marginalized and how that marginalization is reproduced is very different depending on where it is happening. To use a specific example, learning about the relationship between African Americans in the southern United States and Native Americans does not translate to explaining the relationship between Native Hawaiians in Hawai‘i and the settlers who migrated to work on the plantations. There are some parallels between the two in that both situations involve an indigenous people and laborers brought in to work the land who lived in horrific conditions. But there are more stark differences: immigrant settlers in Hawai‘i, despite experiencing slave-like conditions, were not slaves, and one could argue that African Americans have not realized the same kind of social and financial mobility as quickly as some Asian settlers have experienced in Hawai‘i, particularly those of Japanese descent.\(^2\)
An example of how not accounting for these different historical contexts in the classroom impacts the success of critical pedagogy practices occurred in one of the classrooms I discuss in Chapter 4. Students in this class expressed ideas that racial tension is mostly a problem that involves only African Americans and Caucasians. As was further validated by student writing discussed in Chapter 6, many students do not recognize socioeconomic disparity as being drawn along ethnic lines in Hawai‘i, and, in general, do not acknowledge racism as an issue in Hawai‘i. The common practice of framing discussions of racism exclusively in the context of African Americans and Caucasians when teaching in Hawai‘i might be subverting recognition of the racial issues the students in Hawai‘i experience. As long as the role location plays in all parts of our lives, particularly education, is displaced, practicing a critical pedagogy that the majority of students in our classrooms receive and apply in ways advocated by Freire, Giroux, and Berlin, will likely fall short of the pedagogy’s goals.

Critical pedagogues whose work is not focused on student resistance also look at student identity/subjectivity and similarly emphasize the role location plays in this dynamic. In “English Studies in Levittown: Rhetorics of Space and Technology in Course Management Software,” for example, Darin Payne examines the implications of space in virtual platforms. As virtual space is another location that shapes students subjectivities, analysis of virtual space in this context can be analogously applied to the physical geographic place of face-2-face classrooms. He provides the following insight on the instrumentality of space:

[S]pace [. . .] is, like rhetoric, epistemic in nature and architechtontic in its scope and influence on everyday life. [. . .] If space is epistemic, as critical geographers,
postmodern philosophers, and contemporary sociologists have argued, then we have an obligation to understand how our intellectual work with each other and with students is shaped by the space that governs it. (484)

The politics of the places we teach in—their culture, history, social dynamics—impact the knowledge students bring to the classroom, how they learn, and also necessarily how we teach. Ignoring the politics of place can result in ineffectual teaching practices precisely because such teaching practices do not account for distinct located epistemologies. In “Composition’s Imagined Geographies: the Politics of Space in the Frontier, City, and Cyberspace,” Reynolds explains the ways technology in the 21st century has informed a “general sensation of a shrinking planet” (233) wherein time and space are considered “negligible and transparent” (234), and cultural difference is minimized if not completely overlooked. She goes on to say,

it is important to challenge the idea of a single and objective sense of time or space, against which we attempt to measure diversity of human conceptions and perceptions [. . .] feminist and other cultural geographers insist that divides are real, that differences are material and concrete, and that space cannot be treated as transparent or ‘innocent’. (“Composition’s Imagined Geographies” 235)

When the richness and uniqueness of a geographical location with all its history and social dynamics are not foregrounded in pedagogy, treatments of difference and diversity and their impact on subject positioning in the classroom run the risk of being reductive. But, as Reynolds suggests, the role of place-based diversity and difference is intricate and significant in how our students learn. How a student identifies informs her subjectivity, which in turn influences how she positions herself in relation to the teacher, other
students, and how she reacts to and in class discussions. Ultimately, location thus impacts not only students’ engagement with critical pedagogy but their resistance to it as well. If a teacher reductively erases location, she also truncates opportunities for identification and engagement. To say these variables influencing reactions and interactions are complex doesn’t do the interrelationships justice. To illustrate the multitude of forces at work and their resultant social behaviors, I suggest that the metaphor of a dense, intricate web might be more accurate. To better explain the durability of each strand of such a web, I turn to Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of habitus and Stuart Hall’s Theory of Articulation.

**The Habitus and Theory of Articulation**

Bourdieu’s theory of habitus is helpful in understanding not only the complex ways individuals are influenced by the structures in place in a given location, but also the extent to which social behaviors necessary to operate successfully within a specific space are internalized. Bourdieu defines habitus as “a system of acquired dispositions functioning on the practical level as categories of perception and assessment. [. . .] as well as being the organizing principles of action” (*Logic of Practice* 13). Loïc Wacquant further elucidates Bourdieu’s concept, explaining that habitus is a process through which Cumulative exposure to certain social conditions instills in individuals an ensemble of durable and transposable dispositions that internalize the necessities of the extant social conditions, inscribing inside the organism the patterned inertia and constraints of external reality. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 13)

In other words, the environment within which an individual operates informs her social behavior on the most fundamental levels: the way she thinks, walks, speaks, interacts, and reacts. Habitus is, in short, the *modus operandi* through which an individual
consciously and subconsciously learns how to negotiate a specific environment, a concept that Bourdieu delineates by the term “field.” Wacquant defines field as consisting of “a set of objective, historical relations between positions anchored in certain forms of power (or capital) [. . .].” (16). A field constitutes any space in which a set of values peculiar to it dictate the social behaviors necessary to successfully negotiate one’s self within the field. Examples of fields include the family, social institutions like school, and professional realms such as that of the arts.

It is important to note that a particular field can be discussed at both micro and macro (or local and global) levels. While there are certain distinctions between fields, Bourdieu explains that there are no fixed parameters to a particular field; they are rather identified by the individual researching it: “The boundaries of the field can only be determined by the empirical investigation. Only rarely do they take the form of juridical frontiers […] even though they are always marked by more or less institutionalized ‘barriers to entry’” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 100). Thus, while there might be some universal principles that govern the workings of a field on a macro level, distinct nuances and meanings emerge when that same field is examined in a localized context.

To illustrate this point, I will use an example designating the field “the United States as a democratic country” (the country’s geographical borders being the boundaries). Within that field, the social behavior of voting is considered a right and responsibility. It is “good” to vote; young American children are taught that their ancestors have died for this right. People who do not exercise their right to vote are frequently considered apathetic and even irresponsible. These commonplaces are very much part of the public discourse on democracy and what it means to be a responsible
citizen. Many teachers encourage their students to begin to get involved in public
discourse through this simple act of voting. I, too, actively encourage my students to vote,
or at least I did. In 2003, I had a conversation with a friend that captures how events
understood within a localized context can take on a different meaning and changed how I
understood what not voting means in one particular location at a very specific point in
time.

I was teaching Composition I during the summer of 2004. The impending Bush-
Kerry election was the political discussion of the day. In my classes, we regularly
discussed what voting meant and how voting does matter. In class, I frequently
encouraged my students to vote in the upcoming presidential election. After school one
day, I joined a colleague who is Native Hawaiian for dinner. I bring up his ethnicity
because, as will become evident, his ethnicity is a key factor in this exchange. While we
discussed our classes, I repeated my “we have to vote, you have to vote” mantra. I’m sure
I said it several times, and the lack of emphatic agreement from my colleague must have
bothered me because I asked if he were going to vote. I was really quite confident of my
position that no matter the political agenda, voting was instrumental to being a
responsible citizen of the world. I was indoctrinated in the discourse that not voting easily
correlated to being lazy, or worse, apathetic. I knew my friend was neither, so I could not
understand his hesitance to agree with me. After pressing a few more times, he explained.

Despite how important he knew the upcoming election was, as a Native Hawaiian
living in Hawai‘i, his support for his own country took precedence. He could not, he
explained, argue that Hawai‘i was illegally annexed and then vote in an election for the
president of the country he does not acknowledge as being rightfully his. It is important
to note that there are many Hawaiians who do not feel this way. But there are also many who do. While a majority of both groups may believe in the value of voting and a people’s right and responsibility to participate in the act, our conversation that day made me realize how much location plays a role in how to exercise one’s rights. Obviously his ethnicity and politics affected his position on voting, but both of these attributes are tied to a very real and specific location and the socio, cultural, historical forces at work in that place. My colleague chose not to vote not because the act of voting goes against what he believes in, but because in the context of what he and many other Hawaiians are fighting for, namely sovereignty, the United States has illegally asserted domination over the islands. Abstaining from voting had much less to do with any attitudes toward the efficacy of voting than it was a political statement relative to a particular location and specific people’s place in that location. In the grand narrative of democracy, not voting is often understood to be indicative of political irresponsibility; however, looked at within the localized context of Hawai‘i, with the history of colonization and continued marginalization of its indigenous people, not voting in an American election can be both a political and democratic act.  

As I noted at the beginning of this example, the United States as a democratic country is the designated field. Within this field as it is largely understood, my colleague’s actions would likely be perceived as irresponsible, but understood within Hawai‘i’s localized context, his actions are informed, deliberate, and purposeful, hallmarks of democratic citizenry. However, his actions cannot be understood this way unless Hawai‘i’s historical relationship with the United States as well as the current Native Hawaiian sovereignty movement is known. This example also illustrates that
individuals, particularly marginalized peoples, often understand the intricate workings of a particular field and make informed decisions to act in certain ways so as to resist a field’s dominant discourse.

This ability to resist the structure of a habitus, however, has been a point of contention in terms of Bourdieu’s theory. Applying Bourdieu’s theoretical frame to students implies that students inherently know (he would use the term genetically) all the right social behaviors in order to maintain (and even possibly advance) their positions as students within the academy. What is most useful about the concept of habitus is not necessarily its notion that individuals are shaped by the social forces to which they are exposed—many have made similar arguments—but rather the extent to which these forces influence social behavior. Bourdieu argues there is a genetic link between field and social behavior (Bourdieu and Wacquant 13), making such social behaviors hard to abandon. The intrinsic way a field influences social behavior in this theory has resulted in some scholars critiquing Bourdieu’s concept of habitus as being an overly deterministic schema. Giroux, for example, argues that:

As important as Bourdieu’s theoretical advances are, especially over liberal and structural-functional models of schooling, they remain trapped in a notion of power and domination that is one-sided and over-determined. For instance as important as the notion of habitus is in linking the concept of domination to the structure of personality needs, its definition and use constitute a conceptual strait-jacket that provides no room for modification or escape. (Theory and Resistance 90)
According to Giroux, Bourdieu’s theory provides no space for resistance to the hegemonic discourses at work in a field, which is exactly the kind of resistance scholars such as Giroux hope to facilitate through critical pedagogy. The two theorists seem at odds, with Giroux arguing that “Bourdieu disregards the assumption that reflexive thought may result in social practices that qualitatively restructure one’s disposition or structure of needs, one’s habitus” (Theory and Resistance 90). Bourdieu counters by saying that individuals can resist, although it might be difficult: “habitus is [. . .] an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures. It is durable, but not eternal!” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 133). I posit that the actuality of students’ experiences lie at numerous points between Bourdieu and Giroux: while critical pedagogy can indeed foster the kind of resistance Giroux and critical pedagogues hope to achieve, it is not easy for students to recognize and critique their own positions within the dominant structures. Moreover, as I will discuss later in this chapter, sometimes resistance does not “look” like what a critical pedagogue expects (recall my friend’s action of not voting). By accounting for a plurality of fields, the contradiction between Giroux and Bourdieu, I believe, can begin to be explained.

The problem with resolving a deterministic critique of Bourdieu is that much of the focus has been placed on what he has termed a genetic link between an individual and a field. Such a connection would inhibit resistance. Bourdieu is not far from the mark here, and positioning ideology as a critical element making up that genetic link may help explain why. Bourdieu, as noted earlier, tells us that a habitus is “a system of acquired dispositions functioning on the practical level as categories of perception and assessment
as well as being the organizing principles of action” (Logic of Practice 13). A field, then, is subsumed in values and ideas, ideology/ies, that govern such dispositions. If ideology is understood to be a fundamental element that shapes the structuring of a field and its resultant habitus, definitions of ideology can expand an understanding of Bourdieu’s genetic link theory. In Critical Practice, Catherine Belsey illustrates just how pervasive ideology is, explaining that it is the “sum of the ways in which people both live and represent to themselves their relationship to the conditions of their existence.

Ideology is *inscribed in signifying practices* — in discourses, myths, presentations and representations of the way ‘things’ ‘are’” (sic 42). Belsey’s definition of ideology is very similar to Bourdieu’s of habitus. Belsey does draw a clearer connection between ideology and identity; the person is more present in her wording, whereas for Bourdieu, the individual is almost an abstract. Belsey also notes how pervasive ideology is; it is reproduced in every part of our lives. It is no wonder, then, that these systems are, as Bourdieu said, quite “durable.” However, to incite resistance to a durable, dominant ideology, critical pedagogues do not necessarily have to start from scratch and plant ideas foreign to our students to encourage them to question hegemonic forces ingrained in their lived experiences. Resistance is possible because there is not only one habitus, not a single ideology, nor even a dominant/subordinate binary. There are many. The problem with Bourdieu’s theory is that he fails to account for individuals operating in more than one field simultaneously. Fields overlap, which means ideologies interact.

Stuart Hall’s Theory of Articulation can help illustrate the relationships that exist between and among fields and ideologies. He describes articulation using the metaphor of an “articulated” lorry truck “where the front (cab) and the back (trailer) can, but need not
necessarily be, connected to one another” (“On Postmodernism” 53). He explains:

The so-called “unity” of a discourse is really the articulation of different, distinct elements which can be re-articulated in different ways because they have no necessary “belongingness.” The linkage that matters is a linkage between that articulated discourse and the social forces within which it can, under certain historical conditions, but need not necessarily, be connected. (“On Postmodernism” 53)

Hall’s definition creates a much more fluid and dynamic picture of the discourses individuals negotiate and the corresponding elements informing them and thus problematizes Bourdieu’s more monolithic depiction of fields. Hall uses his Theory of Articulation to interrogate the binary dominant/subordinate ideological frame of Althusser, which parallels Bourdieu’s monolithic representation of fields.5

The notion of the dominant ideology and the subordinated ideology [sic] is an inadequate way of representing the complex interplay of different ideological discourses and formulations in any modern developed society. Nor is the terrain of ideology constituted as a field of mutually exclusive and internally self-sustaining discursive chains. They contest one another, often drawing on a common shared repertoire of concepts, rearticulating and disarticulating them within different systems of difference or equivalence. (“Signification” 104)

Through his critique, Hall better captures the interplay between fields and ideologies in the modern world. Hall provocatively suggests that the increasing number of intercultural interactions that occur in the modern world results in individuals negotiating numerous ideological forces, and these ideologies do not organize themselves in a neat
little hierarchical order within one’s subconscious. It is not, therefore, a simple matter to determine which ideological force informs social behavior when two or more are in conflict. Indeed, the ultimate course of action one takes can be the result of the interplay of several ideologies. Hall explains it best drawing from his own experience in the Caribbean and England. He tells of the many ways he has been “interpellated”: in England, for example, he has been “hailed” as “‘coloured,’ ‘West Indian,’ ‘Negro,’ ‘black,’ ‘immigrant.’” He goes on to discuss how many of these labels take on different meanings where he was raised in Jamaica (“Signification” 108). Ultimately, Hall asserts he does not identify more with a single label as represented in either location.

Hall articulates through his own lived experience that there is no singular ideological force informing one’s identity. Moreover, sometimes the representations one reproduces or responds to through their social behaviors are in conflict. This confluence of ideologies simultaneously at work is precisely how resistance can take shape. While many of these influences are strong, there are many, and at any given time what was perceived as a subordinate ideology may become dominant in an individual. Moreover, it would be a mistake to underestimate just how embedded these ideologies are or how tied people are to the values of the fields within which they operate. Moreover, significantly, Hall differentiates between the meaning of the same labels in his native Jamaica and what they represent in England. Similar to the account of my colleague and voting, Hall thus reinforces that the name of a field may be consistent, but that the social behavior it demands may alter depending on location. Consequently, what the behavior means to both the sender and the recipient will also potentially change.

Neither Giroux nor Bourdieu seem to resolve the conflict individuals may
experience as they negotiate operating between two or more fields. Bourdieu does acknowledge the existence of and interplay between multiple fields. He posits that “interrelation of different fields is an extremely complex one”; however, he avoids offering any analysis of this complexity other than to say that attempting to clarify the relationship between fields is “too difficult” and one risks “saying things that are relatively simple” because there are “no transhistoric laws of the relations between fields” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 109). In other words, it is difficult at best to determine how the dynamics between fields interact and how this interaction affects an individual’s subjectivity. The earlier example of my colleague’s decision about voting begins to explicate just how complex the interplay between fields is, especially when a field has the same name and similar values across locations but different end objectives. What is apparent in that example is that investment in performing behaviors associated with ideas of success in a particular field is always complicated by the values and beliefs, the ideologies, intrinsic to other fields an individual participates in. As became apparent in my conversation with my colleague, he was very aware that his actions were likely to be misinterpreted by some people he associated with. The academy is similarly another location where fields collide.

Within the frame of these competing fields, considering the academy as an insulated field represented by a single, monolithic ideology is problematic and overly reductive. Within this field, ideolog(ies) reproduced in the larger geographic community must also be considered. In addition, further complicating the idea of a monolithic field is the presence of subfields, some of which, in the case of the academy, can be identified by departmental and disciplinary boundaries. The ideological forces of all these fields
influence how students interact and react in dynamic ways. For example, and just taking into consideration the social behaviors normed by subfields within the academy, I have had students majoring in the sciences who have commented to me both in meetings and on course evaluations that mine was the first course in which they had ever been expected to engage in class discussion. In many English courses, not participating in discussion in class is often considered a problem, with some teachers even identifying those who don’t participate as being unprepared for college. In contrast, in many science classes, according to my students, such classroom interaction is often not invited. This very simplistic example demonstrates that the kind of social behavior considered as a marking of a “good” student can differ dramatically inter-departmentally, and even intra-departmentally. Moreover, my account here does not account for the kinds of interactions that are considered culturally acceptable at home.

Postmodern theory uses the idea of fragmentation to explain the complexity of this relationship between fields, both in their number and the ways they influence each other and ultimately subjectivity. In postmodernism, fragmentation is used to account for the existence of multiple epistemologies that constantly influence identity and subjectivity, similar to the experiences Hall described. Fragmentation does contribute much to explaining the multiplicity of fields or discourse communities, but it does not seem to do justice to the violence that frequently occurs when the ideology of a marginalized group is constantly at risk at the hands of the dominant ideology. Rather, this model seems to connote that disparate ideologies are represented by equally fragmented bits. Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith argues that the concept of fragmentation works to undermine the potential power of ideological frameworks.
operating outside the dominant western discourse. She asserts, “Fragmentation is not a phenomenon of postmodernism as many might claim. For indigenous peoples fragmentation has been the consequence of imperialism” (28). The myriad of fields and the ways they overlap and interplay is compounded in an increasingly globalized world where different cultures confront and collide continuously. Furthermore, unlike Bourdieu, who as a French sociologist was probably working within a more monolithic cultural frame than I find myself in, there is not one dominant field as Hall, who is also working within a colonized context, indicates through the account of his personal experiences. And this returns me to my argument: student interactions in the classroom are motivated by more than the extent to which they are tied to the ideological forces of a single field, rather their social behavior is the result of conflicted alliances to several different fields.

**Consubstantiality in a Colonial Context**

Postcolonial theorists explain how, particularly in colonized locations, the interplay between fields in a globalized economy manifests as an encroachment of the dominant ideology upon marginalized ideologies. I look to postcolonial studies here for two reasons. First, the location where my study is being conducted is colonized: the monarchy of Hawai‘i was overthrown by the American government in 1893, the Hawaiian language was banned in 1896, and the control over much of the land was seized by American settlers. These events have resulted in the dominant discourse in the archipelago being largely influenced by Euro-American ideology. And second, the work of postcolonial theorists provides a clear example of the disjuncture between the ideologies of the colonizing culture and that of the colonized and the effects such competing ideologies have on those (particularly marginalized) groups residing in
colonized locations. Arjun Appadurai asserts that along with recent movements to establish a globalized market coincides a marked increase in “contexts for violence” in which those who operate on the margins of the dominant culture becoming the ones most often victimized. He argues that these contexts for violence “rang[e] from the most intimate (such as rape, bodily mutilation and dismemberment) to the most abstract (such as forced migration and legal minoritization), [with] the most difficult one [being] the worldwide assault against minorities of all kinds.” Appadurai’s assessment of the role many marginalized peoples are forced into around the world clearly demonstrates that all the postmodern fragments are not represented equally; indeed, some ideologies are privileged at the expense of others.

Examining the forces at work in a particular location draws attention to the way marginalized discourses counter and resist the dominant discourse that would silence them and how such resistance has occurred historically. Without awareness of discourse communities informed by ideology different than the dominant one, the multitude of variables influencing individuals in a particular location cannot be explained, or worse, risk going unrecognized. In other words, the ideologies reproduced by the habituses of numerous fields collectively affect an individual’s subjectivity, and for my purposes, what students bring to the classroom and their learning. In a colonized location such as Hawai‘i, where the values of different fields can dominate simultaneously, the interaction between fields intensifies, and in some cases the interaction turns violent in ways that Appadurai has termed (above) both “intimate” and “abstract.” The low number of Hawaiian students registered at the University of Hawai‘i is a clear example of the kind of “abstract” violence experienced by a marginalized people that Appadurai refers to
(student demographics will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter). And this lack of representation coincides with an overrepresentation of Hawaiians in the state’s prison population (Prison Policy Initiative), a situation that potentially correlates to variety of “intimate” forms of violence.

The work of other postcolonial theorists like Homi Bhabha helps to further illustrate the ways manipulating multiple competing habituses can problematize an individual’s subjectivity by drawing attention to the inequity between discourses of various fields and how individuals react when faced with such inequity. To apply Bourdieu’ theory here, competing ideologies correspond to the habitus of one field conflicting with the habitus of another when an individual is trying to negotiate two fields (or more) at the same time. Students residing in colonized locations, particularly those raised in such locations, are simultaneously exposed to and negotiate different and competing fields constantly, and this can result in, as Bhabha claims, “social contradiction and antagonism” (162). However, being torn between two habituses may not always result in an individual firmly deciding between the two. A student can construct an identity when participating in a particular field such as school, for example, and construct another when operating in their home environment. While moving between competing fields is complicated enough, the situation intensifies when other individuals from the home environment have a presence in the school. In such a situation, a student might have to decide to which field she will show allegiance at a particular point in time. For example, a student may be faced with enacting social behaviors deemed appropriate to succeed in the academy; however, doing so may result in her being perceived as abandoning her culture by members of her home community who may be fellow students.
in the class. This hypothetical example is reductive in its binary representation. Most students negotiate a much more dynamic interplay among fields in their lives and in the classroom.

Language use in Hawai‘i better illustrates just one of the many such ways this kind of conflict plays out for students in this location. Hawai‘i Creole English, or Pidgin as it is commonly called, is a significant factor identifying an individual as local to Hawai‘i. A student’s ability to speak Pidgin often affords acceptance in the larger local community, and being local is privileged in many social contexts; however, at the same time, an inability to speak Standard English is often perceived as a factor negatively affecting a student’s ability to achieve in the academy and in Western society (i.e., in securing a “good” job). Thus, in the context of the classroom, local students will often employ either Standard English or Pidgin depending on to whom they are speaking to (i.e., the teacher vs. peers) and the subjectivity the student wishes to establish at any given moment. Often these shifts between the two languages are instantaneous and constant. Students who have grown up in Hawai‘i know when and where it is appropriate to speak Pidgin and when it is not, often without being actually told. This consciousness leads to conflict about which language affords the cultural capital that will benefit the student in the long run. Influencing the student’s decision whether to embrace her native Pidgin language or Standard English is the extent to which being perceived as being able to achieve in a Westernized academic institution is privileged by the groups the student belongs to both in and out of the academy. Unfortunately, as Gloria Anzaldúa, Mike Rose, Richard Rodriguez and others have discussed, often as part of the ideological frame in societies where a local culture is in contestation with a dominant mainstream culture it
is implied that all remnants of the local culture must be abandoned in order to succeed in the dominant culture. While the actuality may not be quite so bleak in its entirety, in the case of Pidgin speaking it is. I am continually amazed that despite moves within the academy to legitimize Pidgin as a language (I myself recently successfully petitioned my department to acknowledge Pidgin as a language to fulfill the foreign language requirement), my students, nieces, and nephews regularly make comments that reproduce the idea that Pidgin speakers don’t just sound “stupid,” they are “stupid.”

Ultimately, because of the stigma that speaking Pidgin correlates to speaking deficiently and thus marks someone as thinking deficiently, for many students speaking both Pidgin and Standard English cannot co-exist. Burke’s theory of consubstantiality helps to explain why identifying with one group often results in distancing one’s self from another. Burke writes, “one need not scrutinize the concept of ‘identification’ very sharply to see, implied in it at every turn, its ironic counterpart, division” (23).

Identifying as a Standard English speaker suggests that the student adheres to the ideology that privileges the speaking of that language. As Anzaldúa has notably argued, as a representation of culture, language use is strongly connected to one’s identity. She writes in *Borderlands/La Frontera*, “Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity—I am my language. Until I take pride in my language, I cannot take pride in myself” (58-59). Thus, the consequence of denouncing Pidgin is all too often the similar rejection of some of the values of the cultures that privileges its speakers. It is not a decision that is comfortable nor easy, as the more a student uses Standard English, for example, she is formulating an identity that likewise reproduces the dominant status of the culture the language represents. Moreover, establishing such an alliance often implies making some
kind of value judgment about the individual members belonging to the respective groups between which the student is negotiating. The decision to adopt Standard English can be perceived by other Pidgin speakers as a statement that their language is not as prestigious as Standard English and that its speakers are also likewise inferior.

Vilsoni Hereniko, in discussing the effects of competing identity associations for Pacific Islanders in “Representations of Cultural Identities,” offers an explanation that clarifies this conflict, saying that individuals are often “torn between being traditional…and being realistic,” notions that are often in conflict with each other (150). Hereniko is referring to the conflict that many indigenous Pacific Islanders experience when faced with practicing their native culture or adopting western ways in order to survive and “succeed.” But the dilemma Hereniko is describing can be analogously applied to the conflict between non-Anglo culture and the dominant Euro-American culture in Hawai‘i as well (with different consequences than Hereniko notes indigenous people experience).12 I return to the example of speaking Pidgin to provide a clear illustration of one such conflict many students who grow up in Hawai‘i face. It is important to note that negotiating this kind of conflict does not necessarily indicate resistance; speaking Standard English or Pidgin in and of itself would probably not be perceived as resistance in the classroom. I will next show how choosing to adopt one language or the other, however, can lead to perceived and real resistance13 in a (hypothetical) critical pedagogy classroom.

A teacher practicing critical pedagogy in an English class at the University of Hawai‘i might attempt to have his students explore how the privileging of Standard English is a function of the dominant ideology by assigning readings written in Pidgin for
discussion in the classroom. The teacher would likely present the premise that those who reinforce the perception that speaking Standard English is better than Pidgin are also complicit in the marginalization of Pidgin speakers. Such a proposition would likely, either directly or indirectly, ask students who speak Standard English to examine their role in that marginalization. Bourdieu would tell us that the idea that speaking Standard English is “good” is so ingrained that most students may have never questioned the consequences of adopting the language. Students may have never entertained the thought that these consequences might be negative for some people in the community, perhaps their families and friends; it is likely that the only way the language dilemma has thus far been thought of is “they can’t speak Pidgin if they want a good job” or with some other similarly reductive stigma. To move from this position to the thinking of one’s self as being complicit, albeit indirectly, in marginalization is a difficult and uncomfortable move for most students. Entertaining the premise that her ideas about Standard English might be wrong would counter the student’s basic epistemology. In such a situation, Standard English speakers in the class might be silent, say they don’t understand readings in Pidgin, or argue that Pidgin texts have no place in the classroom, all social behaviors associated with resistance to critical pedagogy in the classroom.

But what about the student who has not adopted Standard English? Let’s assume he is a part of a discourse community that has an awareness of the dominant discourse and the ability to resist it through language use. For example, he consciously uses Pidgin to resist the encroachment of standardization on his sensibilities. This student might flourish in the classroom described above, or he may not. Perhaps this student perceives the teacher to not be truly invested in the issue. Perhaps he has identified the teacher as
someone not from Hawai‘i who, he believes, doesn’t really understand the implications of using Pidgin, when Pidgin is used, and how speaking Pidgin denotes one’s relation to a very particular community. Rather, this student may think the teacher is teaching texts with Pidgin because it is the “in” thing to do. In other words, despite this teacher’s best intentions, the student sees a teacher who represents the dominant discourse community. No matter all the theoretical knowledge the teacher may have about marginalized languages and identity, because of the position the teacher holds in the classroom, he represents the academy.

This student might be silent in class or speak Pidgin in ways that are inaccessible to the teacher. (Pidgin is not uniform and there are different dialects within Hawai‘i.) This student might be trying to embrace both the cultural values reproduced in his community outside of school and the desire to succeed in a Euro-Western academy. The student may even learn quite a lot from the teacher but does not adopt the social behaviors deemed appropriate to the school setting, specifically speaking Standard English. If the teacher remains distanced from truly understanding the dynamics of Pidgin use, he will perhaps misread the student’s silence as apathy or a cultural norm. (I cannot count the times I have heard that Hawai‘i’s local kids are quiet in the classroom and that it is cultural.)

For both the Pidgin Speaker and the Standard English speaker, language choices can lead to different forms of resistance in the classroom. What is important to note is that considering where these interactions are occurring is essential to understanding the social behavior as resistance. To adequately understand the scenarios described above, at the very least, minimal knowledge of the history of Pidgin and the current status of
Pidgin in the community is needed. But also, it is important to recognize that a teacher who represents the student population because of his ethnicity and other visible markers in California or Massachusetts, for example, does not hold the same status in Hawai‘i where the demographics of the faculty at the University of Hawai‘i do not mirror that of the student population. Because of the sheer fact of they way they “look,” many teachers on the continent are likely to connect with the student population in some way which allows them an “in” when discussing life experiences. With Hawai‘i’s cultural and historical context, gaining access to the community and in the classroom can be even more challenging and take a supreme commitment from teachers. It is, at best, difficult to talk to students about resistance if the student does not believe a teacher understands what he has to resist, or if he feels that, on some level, it is the teacher that should be resisted.

**Conclusion**

Recent scholarship in Composition and Rhetoric increasingly points to the necessity to account for location in critical pedagogical practices. In this chapter, I have drawn from the work of Bourdieu and Hall to emphasize not only the intricate role location plays in the enactment of a subjectivity but to highlight that location is not a monolithic entity: there are locations within locations, each with their own sociopolitical and cultural norms. Hall’s own experiences demonstrate the multiplicity of fields with which an individual can associate. Burke’s work on consubstantiality further clarifies that belonging to one field necessarily brings you in conflict with another. When one identifies as a Standard English speaker, for example, that process of identification naturally creates a division with other similar groups, such as Pidgin speakers. The degree of division will naturally vary and change, but, according to Burke, in
identification division is inherent. As the example of language use suggests, this complicated web of fields and their influences can be illustrated by the competing discourse communities present in a colonized location such as Hawai‘i.

In the following chapter, I bring more specificity to this discussion by examining the historical, cultural, and political context as it has evolved in Hawai‘i over the last 200 years. This account will work to demonstrate just how unique a location like Hawai‘i is to underscore one of the premises informing the overarching thesis of this dissertation: location does indeed matter, and if we ignore it we risk misunderstanding what happens in our classrooms.
In “Can We Be Critical of Critical Pedagogy,” Durst asks how can a pedagogy be critical when it does not critically interrogate itself. Patricia Bizzell, despite her general support of critical pedagogy, has asked the same question. In *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*, Bizzell queries the agenda of critical pedagogy and why that agenda is never critically examined or explained. Bizzell explains, “My objection to Freire came to be precisely that he pretended his critical literacy methods merely pointed out truths on reality for students to discover—that is, that his methods were strictly objective and value-free” (21). Although one of the primary goals of critical pedagogy is to interrogate the agenda of dominant discourse, rarely do any critical pedagogy practitioners examine the agenda of their own pedagogy. As the discussion on the following pages will suggest, this lack of critical inquiry, particularly in terms of how a critical pedagogy furthers an agenda unrelated to the specific students to whom it is being delivered, has likely had some impact on the student resistance many critical pedagogy practitioners have noted.

This mobility will be more fully discussed in the next chapter.

The following is an account of what transpired between my colleague and myself. While I received permission from this colleague to write about this exchange, I assured him/her I would not use his/her name.

As it addresses a fundamental argument in this dissertation, it is important to note that even though I would consider myself fairly literate in Native Hawaiians’ fight for sovereignty, I did not recognize this resistance to vote for what it was.
Althusser’s work had already expanded on Marx’s idea of a single dominant ideology to which society reacts and responds.

I do not think that even pre-modern societies considered to be “isolated” operate within a single ideological frame, but obviously immigration, diaspora, technology, etc, have further complexified the number of influences within a society.

Scholars have posited different terms that relate to similar concepts. For example John Fiske argues that discourse communities better represents what I explain here as fields (Müller). And, most of postmodern scholarship relies on “ideology” to convey a structured and durable set of beliefs that inform actions, which is at work in any field.

I provide a fuller explanation of the history of the overthrow in the following chapter.

One specific example of the way examining location-specific events can lead to an understanding of the contestation that occurs when different discourse communities interact is Native Hawaiian resistance to colonization through the publications of the Native Hawaiian newspapers. Noenoe Silva discusses this resistance and how the dominant narratives have glossed over it at length in her book, *Aloha Betrayed*.

Scholars such as Charlene Sato and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo have written extensively on the ways Pidgin is perceived as an inferior language, which has worked to stigmatize its speakers as intellectually inferior to Standard English speakers.

Anzaldúa and Rose both argue that stigmas that suggest behaviors associated with marginalized cultures impede the ability to achieve should be countered; Rodriguez, however, has been criticized for seeming to subscribe to the idea that non-dominant culture traits inhibit one’s ability to succeed.
Hereniko is specifically discussing the effects of colonization on indigenous Pacific Islanders. It is not my intention to appropriate the experience of colonization experienced by Pacific Islanders or any indigenous people, but rather to suggest that others residing in colonized locations also experience and negotiate competing ideologies. However, it must be noted that the conflict Hereniko notes has worked to disenfranchise many indigenous cultures.

I draw a distinction here between perceived and real because not all social behaviors scholars and teachers may perceive as resistance necessarily are resistance.

I have experienced all three responses in my classes.

A closer analysis of demographics at both the university and in the state will be provided in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3

Contextualizing the Research Site and the Researcher:
The Politics of Place and Epistemologies

When the colonizers of the North American continent were fighting their war for sovereignty from England, James Cooke arrived on Hawaiʻi’s shores. When the Civil War was being fought, plantations and paid slave labor were the backbone of Hawaiʻi’s increasingly capitalist economy. Plantations did not begin to decline in Hawaiʻi until the 1920s. One could easily argue that the events considered milestones in American history were not experienced in all states and by all people in the same way. The competing narrative of the Emancipation Proclamation and the reality of Blacks in America is one example of how the American experience of history is not monolithic. A brief history of Hawaiʻi further demonstrates this. Our state does not “look” any more like any other state in 2010 than it did 1778. The demographics and historical experiences in Hawaiʻi have created an awareness of ethnicity in the people that is perhaps unique. Many of us know, for example, that Asians are not a single ethnic group (as it is frequently portrayed within the continental United States in the media, census data, etc.): Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, Filipinos, and other groups frequently categorized as Asian, do not share a language, food, or cultural norms. For those who grow up in Hawaiʻi, these distinctions are known. At the same time, the oppression of Hawaiians has manifested differently than it does for the Cherokee or the Chickasaw. As Nicholas Thomas argues in *Colonialism’s Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government*, colonization rarely evolved the same way in different places, with the (mis)treatment of indigenous people and non-Anglo settlers enacted in varying degrees of subversiveness. Hawaiʻi’s location and history, both pre-
and post-contact, impacts the everyday lives of the people; more specifically, location is inextricable from the indigenous culture, how colonization was experienced, and the experiences of the settlers who live here.

The following brief history of Hawai‘i since contact with the West provides a contextual explanation of how the experiences that occur in one location shape the social and political climate and can inform the individuals in that place. Following the historical overview, I provide a demographic snapshot of the state and the University of Hawai‘i. This chapter thus moves the theoretical discussion of the previous chapter to an examination of one specific place, the site of this research project, Hawai‘i, to illustrate in more concrete terms the many ways the discourses in one location are potentially articulated and how geographic location impacts that articulation.

Hawai‘i: A Brief Contextualization

Prior to 1778, Native Hawaiians, their language, and their culture thrived in the archipelago of Hawai‘i. However, Captain James Cook’s arrival in the Hawaiian Islands in that year triggered a string of events that would eventually lead to the devastating decimation of the Hawaiian population. In his book, Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai‘i on the Eve of Western Contact, David Stannard asserts that the Native Hawaiian population ranged from 800,000 to well over 1,000,000 when Captain Cook arrived. Contact with the west, particularly through diseases such as smallpox, took its toll on the Hawaiian people; by 1900, the population of Hawaiians had declined to 37,656 (Kawamoto 193). In the century between contact and the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893, Native Hawaiians went from being a strong and thriving people to fighting to keep their culture, language, and people alive.
The establishment of plantations played a key role in the colonization of Hawai‘i and the marginalization of Native Hawaiians. In the 1830s, a Honolulu mercantile firm founded by New England businessmen sent William Hooper of Boston, Massachusetts to establish a sugar plantation in the islands (Takaki 21). In 1835, the first plantation was founded at Koloa, Kaua‘i, marking the beginning of Hawai‘i’s plantation era (Reinecke 39). Caucasian businessmen like Hooper saw the Native Hawaiians and their system of government as standing in the way of their efforts to civilize the islands. Contrary to western tactics of exploiting the land and laborers in an effort to realize the most capital gain for relatively few individuals, as is evident in the slave plantations that populated the new world, Hawaiians have a more reciprocal relationship with the land and the ali‘i, their chiefs.

The Hawaiian concept of mālama ‘āina, or taking care of the land, is a result of their familial relationship with the land; it is their older sibling. As Lilikala Kama‘elehiwa explains in *Native Lands and Foreign Desires: Pahea Lā E Pono Ai?:* “In traditional Hawaiian society [. . .] it is the duty of younger siblings and junior lineages to love, honor, and serve their elders.” As not only are the ali‘i their elders, but so is the land, Hawaiians “take care of her, to cultivate her properly, and to make her beautiful with neat gardens and careful husbandry” (25). But the elders have a responsibility in this relationship too. When the land is well-taken care of, it in turn takes care of the people by providing sustenance. As for the ali‘i, they too had responsibility as protectors of the people. It was expected that the ali‘i respect proper ritual and enact pious social behavior: if they were “stingy or cruel to the commoners, the cultivators of the ‘āina [land], he or she would cease to be pono [in harmony], lose favor with the Akua [gods] and be struck
down, usually by the people” (Kama‘eleihiwa 26). In other words, if both parties in this reciprocal relationship were not fulfilling their duties to each other, there would be repercussions. Specifically, there were practices in place in Hawaiian society for chiefs who did not take care of his/her people and keep them safe to be disposed. It is important to note that within this system of governance, the land has autonomy. The aliʻi did not own the land; they were merely governors over the land. And, if they didn’t do a good job, as Kamaʻeleihiwa notes, the people could take action to replace them with aliʻi who were pono.

Considering this traditional relationship Hawaiians have with the land and their chiefs, it is a small surprise that they were not interested in working long hours on plantations for little or no reward, performing labor that exploited the land and for which someone else, a foreigner no less, reaped the benefits of their labor. The idea of reciprocity between land and people was not only incomprehensible to western settlers, it created obstacles to their capitalistic ventures, which were frequently cast as practices that promoted civilizing the natives. Hooper wrote the following about his enterprise:

“I have succeeded in bringing about a place, which if followed up by other foreign residents, will eventually emancipate the natives from the miserable system of ‘chief labour’ which has existed at these Islands, and which if not broken up, will be the effectual preventative to the progress of civilization, industry and national prosperity. … The tract of land in Koloa was [developed] after much pain … for the purpose of breaking up the system aforesaid or in other words to serve as an entering wedge … [to] upset the whole system.” (qtd. in Takaki 22)
Although at first Hawaiians were recruited to work on the plantations, the Natives of Hawai‘i, whose tradition is to act as stewards of the land which in turn takes care of its people, found that plantation work went against their relationship of reciprocity with the land. Moreover, Hawaiians, whose population had decreased dramatically since first contact, were able to sustain their livelihoods from the land through fishing and farming, making them more resistant to plantation life. Even though the gradual obtainment of exclusive water rights for sugar plantations beginning in 1853 further devastated the Native Hawaiian lifestyle that had relied on a complex agricultural system, few Hawaiians resorted to working on the plantations (McDougall 2008).

The plantation owners interpreted this lack of interest by Native Hawaiians as laziness and did not hesitate to man their labor force from outside the islands when the Hawaiians proved unwilling. Takaki writes, “Hooper soon became frustrated by the inefficiency and recalcitrance of the Hawaiian laborers and began to employ a few Chinese [. . . noting in a correspondence that] ‘A colony of Chinese would, probably, put the plantation in order’” (Takaki 22). The president of the Royal Hawaiian Agricultural Society echoed Hooper’s sentiments about Hawaiian laborers, stating, “‘We shall find Coolie labor to be more certain, systematic and economic than that of the native. They are prompt at the call of the bell, steady in their work, quick to learn, and will accomplish more [than Hawaiian laborers]’” (qtd. in Takaki 22). Hooper’s model was quickly followed by other plantation owners, and these mostly American businessmen and sons of American missionaries thus initiated a mass immigration of laborers to the islands.
The first immigrant laborers came from China in 1852, and by 1872 there were 2038 Chinese in Hawai‘i (Reinecke 40). Chinese laborers were soon followed by Portuguese (1878), Japanese (1885), Koreans (1904), and other small groups from Europe (Reinecke 55-59). The Japanese became the largest immigrant group brought in to work on the plantations; by 1924 their population totaled 120,074 (Reinecke 57-58). It is important to note that although the members of these ethnic groups were all brought to Hawai‘i to work on the plantations, they were kept stratified in distinct, separated living areas.\(^1\) Economic, cultural, and linguistic marginalization of non-Caucasians in Hawai‘i, both the immigrant laborers and Native Hawaiians, increased as the economic and political power of American businessmen in the islands grew. Queen Lili‘uokalani, the last reigning Hawaiian monarch and a prolific writer in both her native language and English, provides a Native Hawaiian perspective of the American capitalistic enterprise in her autobiography, which she wrote in English, *Hawai‘i’s Story by Hawai‘i’s Queen* (1964). I quote at length what The Queen writes of the American businessmen’s usurpation of power in Hawai‘i as it is most eloquently stated in her own words as someone who witnessed these events:

> For many years our sovereigns had welcomed the advice of, and given full representations in their government and councils to, American residents who had cast in their lot with our people, and established industries on the Islands. As they became wealthy, and acquired titles to lands through the simplicity of our people and their ignorance of values and of the new land laws, their greed and their love of power proportionately increased; and schemes for aggrandizing themselves still further, or for avoiding the
obligations which they had incurred to us, began to occupy their minds. So the mercantile element, as embodied in the Chamber of Commerce, the sugar planters, and the proprietors of the ‘missionary’ stores, formed a distinct political party, called the ‘down-town’ party, whose purpose was to minimize or entirely subvert other interests, and especially the prerogatives of the crown, which, based upon ancient custom and the authority of the island chiefs, were the sole guaranty of our nationality. Although settled among us, and drawing their wealth from our resources, they were alien to us in their customs and ideas respecting government, and desired above all things the extension of their power, and to carry out their own special plans of advancement, and to secure their own personal benefit. (177-178)

Many of these settlers felt that acquiring this personal benefit which Queen Liliʻuokalani alludes to could be expedited by Hawaiʻi becoming an American territory, which would work to further compromise Native Hawaiian authority in government.

Not only did these Americans have an economic advantage, they also had the United States military behind them. In 1893, with the help of the United States marines, in an event President Cleveland later called an “act of war” and a “substantial wrong” (Kawamoto 199), the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown by the same Americans whom the Hawaiians had welcomed into their lands. In 1895, Queen Liliʻuokalani was imprisoned in her palace for eight months after an aborted attempt by her supporters to restore her to the throne. Following the overthrow, the push for Americanization became even more overt. In 1894, English replaced Hawaiian as the official language of
instruction in all Hawai‘i schools (Kawamoto 197), and the Hawaiian language was officially banned in 1896. This act not only represented the political dominance of the American businessmen, but the disdain for all things considered un-American, including language.

The effects of privileging Standard English on Native Hawaiians were devastating, and there are many mo‘olelo (stories) among Hawaiians that tell of the abuses their ancestors suffered when caught speaking Hawaiian. With the marginalization of their language coincided an increasing displacement of Hawaiians in their own land. In the events that propelled the territory toward statehood, all ethnic groups residing in the islands, but particularly those of color, were frequently portrayed in the media as well as in general public discourse collectively as “Hawaiians” or locals; the later of which is a complex and contentious term that has come to exude cultural capital in Hawai‘i. That many settlers in Hawai‘i self-identify as being local has undeniable consequences that have worked to further disadvantage Hawaiians and their fight to regain sovereignty.

Arguably, acknowledging Native Hawaiians as a distinct ethnic group would encourage recognition of Hawaiian land claims and the legitimacy of their active protests to the overthrow and later to statehood, whereas conflating other ethnic groups of color into the term local with Native Hawaiians perpetuates the marginalization of Hawaiian culture and claims. In “Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai‘i,” Candace Fujikane articulates the complexity of what local means particularly for Asian settlers in Hawai‘i; she writes, “while ‘local’ is sometimes used as a geographical marker to distinguish ‘local Asians’ in Hawai‘i from ‘Asian Americans’ on the U.S. continent [. . .], it is more popularly used to establish a problematic claim to Hawai‘i”
Although Fujikane’s work focuses on Asian settlers in Hawai‘i, and in this particular instance, what local means in relation to Asian settlers in Hawai‘i, members of other ethnic groups who have seen or now see themselves as having strong connections to the islands also frequently self-identify as being local, including haole.

As noted, local is a contested term in Hawai‘i and is often used to refer inclusively to Native Hawaiians, local Asians, and (sometimes) Caucasians (see Sato 1985; Kawamoto 1993; Watson-Gegeo 1994 for examples of this). This approach suggests that the experiences of any one of these ethnic populations adequately represents that of another. A homogenous local group also implies an equality amongst these different groups’ claims of ties to the islands. kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui articulates why such a grouping is problematic in a discussion of the practice of conflating Hawaiian and other writers of color in Hawai‘i as belonging to a single local group. hoʻomanawanui writes:

The lumping together of Kānaka Maoli and local writers assumes a common alliance and background, assumes shared values, themes, and literary metaphors, and assumes a position of “solidarity” of “writers of color” against a common enemy—all things haole. Yet on closer inspection it is not difficult to see that there are obvious differences, the most important being that Kānaka Maoli are indigenous to Hawai‘i. Everyone else is a settler. (120)

Fujikane further explains how identifying as local has been used to mask complicity in the marginalization of Native Hawaiians. She writes, “the term has also been used by privileged classes of Asian settlers to claim a history of oppression for themselves [. . . and] is often used to mask the political power that Asian settlers have historically
exercised, often against Hawaiians” (“Introduction” 27). As noted above, Fujikane’s focus is on the experiences of Asian settlers in Hawai‘i. She writes, “Other groups in Hawai‘i besides Asians can also be identified as settlers, but we leave it to those communities to identify their responsibilities to Hawaiians” (“Introduction” 6).

The term local has been and is still used by other ethnic groups, specifically haole, with similar results. The situation surrounding local haole settlers in Hawai‘i differs in many significant ways from that of local Asian settlers; however, as a haole who has grown up in Hawai‘i, I posit that claiming the identity of local works to provide cultural capital and veils the ways local haole, like the Asian settlers Fujikane addresses, “participate in U.S. settler colonialism” and is thus similar in the larger narrative. It is important to note that far fewer haole claim local as an identity marker than Asian settlers; however, their role in colonization is significantly greater. I speculate that there could be several reasons for this relative lack of self-identifying as being local by haole (which, of course, are all interrelated): 1) a historical tendency for Caucasian groups to want to distance themselves from all people of color and their cultures (how this tendency manifested in education in Hawai‘i will be discussed next); 2) a lack of acceptance by other local groups of haole claims to local; and 3) a lack of investment by many haole to possess the kind of cultural capital associated with the term because, as a group, they held the economic and political power in the islands.

Amidst this political backdrop, Hawai‘i Creole English, or “Pidgin” as it is commonly called in the islands, has emerged as the language identified with being local. Until the 1970s, a period of time credited with the beginning of the Hawaiian renaissance, communication in Hawai‘i has been acknowledged as occurring in two ways: through
Standard English and its “deficient” counterpart, Pidgin. Yet although the speaking of Pidgin has often been correlated with inferiority in the dominant discourse, many of its speakers perceive it as an act of resistance to the dominant colonial discourse (Kimura).

Speaking Pidgin is most commonly associated with Hawaiians and immigrant laborers in Hawai‘i, and while it may have been used to resist it was also used as means of identification in marginalizing practices, particularly those involving education. Most immigrant laborers first learned Pidgin as the main language of communication, and Hawaiians, particularly those in close proximity to plantations, seemed to have socialized with the immigrant laborers and their descendants more regularly than with the Caucasians. However, at some point, the local Asian community, most notably those of Japanese descent, surpassed the Hawaiians on the social ladder. Sociolinguistic scholar Charlene Sato writes, “Today [in 1991], Hawai‘i’s middle class is primarily Caucasian and Asian, while the working class is largely composed of native Hawaiians, Filipinos, and recent Asian and Pacific Island immigrants” (“Language” 125). Hawai‘i’s story, until recently, has been most often told by members of the two dominant ethnic groups, from their perspective, and to their advantage.

After the turn of the century, the Caucasian population in Hawai‘i increased as a result of the general ‘move west’ enabled by the new railroads connecting the east and west coasts on the continent. Many of these new families could not afford the elite private schools that had been established in the early 1800s “for missionary and other privileged haole children” (Sato, “Linguistic” 262). The Caucasian community whose children were attending public schools began expressing concern that “Caucasian children should not be interacting with Pidgin English-speaking ‘local’ children” (Kawamoto 201). This
eventually led to the establishment of the English Standard Schools in 1924; these were schools for which children had to pass English language proficiency tests in order to be admitted to designated public schools around the islands. The schools, which remained in place until 1948, were attended “almost exclusively by Caucasian children,” which “further stratified Hawaiian society” (Kawamoto 202). Language use was also correlated with patriotism—Sato notes, not only was Pidgin “declared not a language,” but also “branded un-American” (“Linguistics” 267). Thus, local Asians were aware that speaking Pidgin made them seem like outsiders. To be American meant to speak Standard English.

After World War II, there was another dramatic push for Americanization in the islands, this time by the local Asian community and its supporters. Many local Asians had fought as Americans in the war or volunteered in the American war effort. At the same time, they lived under the threat of being ‘relocated’ to concentration camps, with curfews exclusively for Asians and other forms of discrimination. Many local haole, particularly those in the Republican party who maintained political and economic power in the islands, generally opposed statehood because if Hawai‘i were a state the positions that afforded them such legal and economical power would be jeopardized. Historian Benjamin Shearer, whose research foci include colonial empires and ethnic genocide, writes, “But for the majority of island Republicans, ethnic equality and the resulting tempered political power that was sure to result in a broadened electorate was enough to drive them away from support for statehood. The ‘Big Five’[^5] feared the destruction of their labor practices as well as a shift away from the outer islands to Honolulu as the center of power” (306). In contrast, the local Asians saw statehood as a path toward liberation from the slave-like conditions of plantation labor. A.A. Smyser, the *Honolulu*
Star-Bulletin’s political editor at the time, states, “The goal [of statehood] was democracy for all in Hawai‘i, to give our Asian population a political voice equal to their numbers” (Borreca). To counter anti-Japanese sentiments, Governor Burns made the case for the local Japanese by “praising their war record, their political skill and their patriotism” (qtd. in Borecca). In this political climate, speaking Standard English so as to sound more American took on even more significance.

It is important to note that contrary to the media coverage at the time, there are many stories of protests against statehood by Native Hawaiians, but as Hawaiian activist George Kanahele explains, “The Hawaiians as a community were only on the periphery of the power struggle” during the post-WWII period (Kanahele 2). Ultimately, the drive to become American by many in the local Asian community and haole in Hawai‘i’s Democratic Party culminated in statehood in 1959. But the post-WWII era also heralded in other perspectives about what it meant to have rights, views that would challenge colonialism not just in Hawai‘i but around the world.

During the 1950s and through the 1970s, civil rights movements took shape around the world. Unprecedented challenges to imperial colonialism and oppressive states were happening globally with dramatic effects: in South Africa, the anti-Apartheid movement was underway; the Maori in New Zealand were fighting to reclaim their land rights and sovereignty; on the continental United States, the Black civil rights movement as well as protest against the Vietnam War as a colonialist undertaking were shaking the country. Against this global backdrop, particularly in the 1970s, Hawaiians were experiencing what some have termed a renaissance. As Kanahele articulates in his 1979 article “The Hawaiian Renaissance,” Hawaiian mele (song) was regaining its popularity,
the practice of hula kahiko (ancient hula) and male hula as well as other Hawaiian traditions, such as feather work and kapa making, were being revived. And then in 1975, the building and sailing of the Hokule’a, a traditional Hawaiian voyaging canoe, was to come to symbolize Hawaiians’ reclamation of their traditions and culture.

This resurgence of cultural practices coincided with political movements, and indeed, particularly for indigenous peoples, the two are inextricably intertwined. Hawaiian scholar and activist Haunani K. Trask explains the interconnectedness between artistic and political endeavors for Pacific indigenous peoples; she writes, “Life is a confluence of creativities; art is a fluid political medium, as politics is metaphorical and artistic. Perhaps this is a traditional Polynesian, or Native, view” (18). And just as the mele increasingly contained messages of resistance to the encroachment by settlers on their land and Hawaiians’ general disenfranchisement, Hawaiians protested for water rights in the Waiāhole and Waikāne Valleys and against the evictions of Hawaiian farmers in Kalama Valley. It was at this time that one of the most enduring resistance efforts began: the movement to reclaim the island of Kahoʻolawe from the US Military after years of being the target location of bombing exercises.

But the Hawaiian political and cultural renaissance was not embraced by all. While all efforts at cultural revitalization have not had an end goal of political sovereignty, ethnic groups who have settled in Hawai‘i have frequently seen them as such and thus as a challenge to claims that settler identity is tied to the islands. Resistance to the Hawaiian sovereignty movement has manifested both in silent opposition and legal battles. In 1996, Harold Rice challenged the Hawaiian-only vote for trustees of the Office
of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) to the United States Supreme Court. The mission of OHA, an agency overseen by the State of Hawai‘i, is:

To mālama (protect) Hawai‘i’s people and environmental resources and OHA’s assets, toward ensuring the perpetuation of the culture, the enhancement of lifestyle and the protection of entitlements of Native Hawaiians, while enabling the building of a strong and healthy Hawaiian people and nation, recognized nationally and internationally. (Office of Hawaiian Affairs)

Rice claimed that allowing only those of Hawaiian descent to vote for OHA trustees, which are state offices, amounted to racism and was, as such, in violation of the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution. Rice won his case in 2000. Other attacks against institutions whose purposes are directed toward the betterment of Hawaiians followed, including suits against the Department of Hawaiian Homelands, also a state agency. Most notably, there have been several lawsuits against Kamehameha Schools, a private school established by one of the last reigning monarchs of Hawai‘i whose mission is to educate children of Hawaiian ancestry. Several lawsuits have charged that the school’s policy of giving preference to children of Hawaiian descent is racist, and, most recently, due to the potential for large monetary settlements, one attorney has even solicited clients wanting to sue Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate via an email campaign (Daysog).

What precedes is a rather reductive overview of the events that transpired and continue to evolve since first contact with Westerners and present day. What I give here does not begin to convey the politically complex practices that have taken place. The work of scholars such as Lilikala Kame‘eleihiwa, Jon Osorio, and Noenoe Silva provide much fuller accounts that, in particular, recast how Native Hawaiians responded to the
colonization efforts of Westerners. Their work shows that Hawaiians actively resisted efforts of colonization and passionately tried to protect their land and way of life. Silva argues that this corrected historical record that documents how Kānaka Maoli fought against colonization has profound effects on their descendants:

What does it matter that the history of resistance is documented and analyzed? Why does it matter that we read what Kānaka Maoli wrote in their own language a hundred and more years ago? We might just as well ask: How do a people come to know who they are? How do a colonized people recover from the violence done to their past by the linguicide that accompanies colonialism? Although stories are passed on individually in families, much is lost, especially during times of mass death due to epidemics. When the stories told at home do not match up with the texts at school, students are taught to doubt the oral versions. The epistemology of the school system is firmly western in nature: what is written counts. When the stories can be validated, as happens when scholars read the literature in Hawaiian and make the findings available to the community, people begin to recover from the wounds caused by that disjunction in their consciousness. (3)

Many young students of Hawaiian descent have found new pride in their heritage and are angry at the injustices that resulted in their disempowerment in their own land. Silva tells of an event in which a reproduction of an 1897 petition of protest to the annexation of Hawai‘i was made public to demonstrate the effects such work is having. Silva writes, “the petition, inscribed with the names of everyone’s kūpuna, gave people permission from their ancestors to participate in the quest for national sovereignty” (4). Many such
students occupy our classrooms with a new and long overdue sense of empowerment; they can see themselves through a Kānaka Maoli lens as being descendants of strong, articulate, intelligent Hawaiians from whom much was taken both physically and ideologically.

Reactions to this new historical record among descendents of settlers is also varied, with some having a new understanding of the injustices that took place and Hawaiian claims to land and sovereignty, and others becoming more defensive about their own complicity in the reproduction of ethnic hierarchical practices. I have had students from places as far as New York demonstrate a keen understanding of Hawai‘i as part of a larger colonial project, who take on research projects that will help them further their understanding of injustices that occurred and seek out a role in supporting Hawaiian claims to land and sovereignty. And I recently had a student, who self-identifies as local Asian and likely represents another significant part of the student body, who called Kamehameha Schools admission policy racist in class one day, arguing that he had equal claim to everything in Hawai‘i as it was his people who “built it.”

It is this politically charged context that informs many of my students’ epistemologies, how they approach knowledge, and how they self-identify. Often, they are faced with negotiating how they should position themselves within and against others’ political positions without completely understanding the historical contexts of the issues. For example, many students express a lack of understanding about what Hawaiians regaining their sovereignty means for them both in real and abstract terms even though they often voice a position on the issue. For many students, classroom
interactions lead to their thinking about their possible complicity in another’s marginalization for the first time.

In the next section, I will compare the demographic make-up of the University of Hawai‘i with the overall state population. This discussion serves several purposes. First, the demographic data will show that the student population at UH is a representative sample of the larger community. Just as these students mostly mirror the ethnic make-up of the state, it is likely that they are invested, albeit to varying degrees, with many of the concerns that align and divide the members of the larger community in this place. As has been discussed, students cannot completely separate their home lives and experiences from their academic lives. The classroom is thus potentially as contentious as the larger public arena. Secondly, a discussion of the data and some of the coding processes illustrates the extent to which Native Hawaiians continue to be marginalized specifically in terms of education and representation. These data sharply contradict the grand narratives that represent Hawai‘i as a place with little or no discrimination where everyone lives in equity and harmony, and, as will be discussed in Chapter 6, many of my students are invested in and reproduce such narratives.

Demographics

According to the systemwide Fall Enrollment Report for 2008\textsuperscript{12} published by the Institutional Research Office at the University of Hawai‘i in 2009 (Figure 1), Caucasians represent only 20% of the student body in the UH system. However, reading the statistics this way can be deceptive, as this number oversimplifies the implication that almost 80% of our student body is not Caucasian. In part due to the material ways other ethnic groups, particularly those often denoted as being Asian, were encouraged to maintain difference
from each other during the Plantation era as well as because of Hawai‘i’s close physical proximity to the Asian continent, in Hawai‘i there is heightened awareness that Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Filipinos (to name only Hawai‘i’s dominant groups) are distinct ethnic groups. However, these ethnic groups are often lumped together to collectively represent “Asians” in statistics denoting ethnicity on the continental United States (in the US Census Bureau, for example). In response to Hawai‘i’s particular social context, the data on the student body at UH reflects a sensitivity toward ethnic distinction among Asian groups by separating many of the different groups. Thus, statistically, the ethnicity represented by the largest number of students is actually Caucasian: students of Japanese ethnicity represent 13.7% of the student body, Filipino 13.1%, Chinese 5.2%, Hawaiians 16.7%, Pacific Islanders 3.6%; and 27.4% of the student body is categorized as “Other” or “Mixed.”

![Figure 1. Enrollment by Ethnicity, University of Hawai‘i Systemwide. (IRO)](image)

This statistical representation of the University of Hawai‘i’s student body largely mirrors that of Hawai‘i’s wider community. According to the Hawai‘i Health Survey of 2007 (Table 1), conducted by the State of Hawai‘i Department of Health (Onaka and
Horiuchi), Caucasians make up 23.3% of the population (compared to 20.3% of UH student body), Japanese 19.6% (13.7% of student body), Filipino 15.1% (13.1% of student body), Chinese 5.1% (5.2% of student body), and 12.4% of the population is categorized as “Other” or “Unknown” (27.4% of student body). Hawaiians, according to this survey, make up 24.2% of the population in Hawai‘i (16.7% of student body).

**Table 1. Adapted from the State of Hawai‘i Health Survey 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Unknown</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in general, each ethnicity is represented in the larger population of Hawai‘i and within the UH system student body similarly. Notably, for Japanese there is a six point discrepancy between the numbers and for Hawaiians there is an almost eight point difference between their representation in the general population and within UH’s student body. However, I pose the following hypothesis to explain the discrepancies in representation among these two ethnic groups: many of Hawai‘i’s Japanese who are not attending UH are going to college on the continental US or elsewhere, whereas many Hawaiians not represented in the UH numbers are probably not enrolled in any post-secondary institutions. According to a report published by Kamehameha Schools-PACE
Native Hawaiian families have the lowest mean family income of all ethnic groups in Hawai‘i: Native Hawaiian mean family income was 15.9% lower than the state’s collective average and the mean income for Japanese families exceeded that of Hawaiians by 58.3% (Kanaʻiaupuni, Malone, Ishibashi). Studies show family income is a leading indicator of the likeliness of college completion (see Figure 2). Therefore, taking income levels into account, Japanese in Hawai‘i are more likely to attend college than Native Hawaiians; if they are not attending college within the UH system, students from Japanese families might be attending college elsewhere.

Figure 2. Educational Outcomes and Socioeconomic Status (Roy)

The economic and educational disparity between ethnic groups demonstrated by these numbers, however, provides only a partial explanation for the disparity in
representation. The methods employed in data collection and coding, particularly in the case of the Hawai‘i Health survey, point to deeply embedded discrimination that privileges Caucasians.

According to the “Methodology” section of the Hawai‘i Health Survey: Introduction 2002, ethnicity is determined by the following procedure:

The Respondent can list up to four ethnicities for both their (and for each household member) mother and their father. The choices were White/Caucasian, Hawaiian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Samoan/Tongan, Black/African American, Native American/Aleut/Eskimo/Inuit, Vietnamese, Asian Indian, Portuguese, and Guamanian/Chamorro. In addition, they can specify another ethnicity if it is not listed, or they can reply they do not know, or refuse to answer. OHSM codes these eight possible choices for each individual to one ethnicity in order to comply with prior Census rules coding race/ethnicity. Specifically, if Hawaiian is listed for the Mother or Father, the person is coded to Hawaiian. Otherwise, the person is coded to the first ethnicity listed (other than Caucasian or unknown) for the Father. If the Father’s responses are Caucasian and/or unknown, the person’s ethnicity is coded to the first ethnicity listed (other than Caucasian or unknown) for the Mother. If there are no other responses other than Caucasian or unknown, the person is coded to Caucasian. Otherwise, the person is coded to do not know, refused, or missing.

This coding process makes apparent several significant phenomena: 1) the coding process relies heavily on self-identification if we assume that a person is likely to mention the ethnicity they most self-identify with first; 2) this coding process differs depending upon
ethnicity (being coded as Caucasian or Hawaiian is determined through a different process); 3) the coding process implies that you must acknowledge being 100% Caucasian for you to be categorized as Caucasian; and 4) Hawaiian is similarly singled out as any mention of Hawaiian qualifies an individual to be categorized as Hawaiian.

The coding process thus suggests that census statistics are concerned with representing Caucasians as homogenous, which is problematically reminiscent of the slavery era in the United States when the “one-drop rule” was used to determine slave status. There also seems to be an effort to distinctly track individuals of Hawaiian ancestry. This practice might be in place to account for programs designed for the betterment of the Hawaiian community. However, the opposite case may also be made: that as Hawaiians have a legal claim to the lands of Hawai‘i and as such could potentially pose a threat particularly in light of sovereignty movements in recent years, their representation in the state must be tracked. The process of coding probably serves both agendas. This methodology and its implications are further problematized in light of the fact that for one to be coded as Hawaiian in the national US census statistics, one must identify that he/she is full Hawaiian (Census 2000 Summary File). Whatever the case may be, as institutionalized processes influence individuals’ social behaviors and beliefs, the way self-identification is sometimes validated and at other times not in the census coding process likely has a profound effect on individuals. For example, if an individual knows that she must always assert being Hawaiian over other ethnicities in order to be recognized as being Hawaiian, it can change the relationship she has with her different ancestral heritages. Furthermore, while it is hard to determine the extent to which classifying as Caucasian only those who can claim no other ethnicity manifests
consciously, such a practice definitely resembles racist practices used to create separation along ethnic lines. As I noted when introducing this section, my students frequently reproduced narratives that represent Hawai‘i as an idyllic melting pot where people of all cultures live in harmony. If the goal is to truly facilitate students becoming critically involved in their communities, this contradiction between material reality and perceptions is one more example of a site-specific issue that demands interrogation in pedagogical practices.

**Conclusion**

The brief glimpse of the archipelago’s sociopolitical and historical context canvassed here provides some insight into the ways where we are distinctly affects those of us who live here in Hawai‘i: the way we experience the world, our ways of knowing, and the way we learn. At the same time, this account is meant to further understandings of the way reproduction of hegemonic discourse has been and continues to be uniquely tailored to this place and the people. As the theoretical work discussed in the previous chapter shows, subjectivity impacts all our negotiations in life in very complex ways, and it is no different for me. Moreover, as the self-reflective narratives in Chapter 1 illustrate, my subjectivity and positioning in the community influences my teaching philosophy and ultimately this project. I account for location in my pedagogy through the texts, languages, and experiences I bring into the classroom but also by providing space for a multiple perspectives to be voiced. A pedagogy that demands silenced voices to be heard is obviously a response to awareness that silencing has occurred.

In the following chapter, I move this discussion of location to a more micro level through a snapshot of classes I taught over three semesters in 2005 and 2006. I explain
how the preliminary research conducted during these semesters informed adaptation in the design of this project, the research questions, and the practices employed during the final data collection stage. The data discussed in the next chapter further explicate the intricate ways one’s relationship to place, whether tenuous or substantial, informs social behaviors—learning, teaching, and, ultimately, how one conducts research. While I may be able to account for how location influences my teaching and research, how geographic location impacts learning is variable and requires the learners’ input in order to fully capture the relationship. Thus, the following chapter offers another explanation of why, for me, it became necessary to enlist my students as co-researchers.
Notes

1 At the historical Hawai‘i Plantation Village located in Waipahu on O‘ahu, that this stratification between ethnic groups was preserved through living conditions is evidenced in the way immigrant life is represented. An advertisement for this historical site reads: “The Plantation features 30 original and replica homes and buildings representing each ethnic group's lifestyle from 1900-1930.”

(https://www.hawaiiweb.com/oahu/sites_to_see/hawaii_plantation_village.htm)

2 While it is customary to write foreign words in italics, as I reside in Hawaii where Hawaiian is the native language, Hawaiian words are not foreign. Therefore, Hawaiian words will appear throughout this dissertation in plain text.

3 During the semester I collected data for this project, a student in one of my classes told me that when at home in Hawai‘i he refers to himself as Chinese but when away from Hawai‘i he tells people he is Hawaiian. He is not of Hawaiian descent. This comment will be discussed more thoroughly in Chapter 6.

4 The common name for the creole spoken is Hawai‘i is “Pidgin” (with a capital “p”) which should not be confused with linguistic term “pidgin” which generally refers to the linguistic category of simplified languages that develop as a means of communication between speakers of two or more different native languages.

5 I say “acknowledged” here because there is clear indication that many Hawaiians were working to preserve their language.

6 “The Big Five” in Hawai‘i was made up of five sugarcane corporations—Castle & Cooke, Alexander & Baldwin, C. Brewer & Co., Amfac, and Theo H. Davies & Co.—and often considered an oligarchy. Several of the companies were founded by
missionaries or missionary descendants, and through the 1930s still had missionary
descendants serving on the board of directors. All of these companies still maintain a
significant presence in Hawai‘i today.

7 Renaissance is a contested term for this period—some object to it because its literal
definition, “rebirth,” implies that Hawaiian culture and traditions were dead; however,
others align it with the European Renaissance experienced following the Dark Ages
which realized a resurgence of cultural and political thought (see George Kanahele, “The
Hawaiian Renaissance”). I use this term to represent the latter.

8 Intricate feather work in the making of royal cloaks, royal standards (kahili), as well as
garland and other ornamentation plays a significant role in Hawaiian culture.

9 Kapa: cloth “made from wauke or mamaki bark; formerly clothes of any kind or
bedclothes” (Pukui & Elbert).

10 These protests were more significant because the two valleys were ahupua‘a, land
divisions that ran from the mountain to the sea upon which resources from the land and
water were cultivated to provide sustenance. The ahupua‘a were self-sustaining and
intrinsic to Hawaiian life.

11 The island was considered a barren wasteland by the military and the US government
used this to justify the bombing exercises; however, scholars such as Rodney Morales
and Davianna McGregor have shown that the island is a wahi pana (sacred land) where
the traditions of wayfinding and astronomy were taught at its peak on Moaʻulaʻike and
that its southern point was an important departure point for canoe voyages to and from
Tahiti.

12 These statistics on the student body in the UH system include data from the community
I have chosen to use systemwide data rather than data from only the main campus because, during the writing of most of this dissertation, I taught at both Kapi‘olani Community College and the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, and, because of this, some of the data represented in this dissertation as well as my perspective on teaching is influenced by experiences on both campuses. The general trend in ethnic breakdown in the student body is similar on all campuses with the Fall Enrollment Report for 2007 for the University of Hawai‘i main campus (a Fall 2008 report is not yet available) showing that, on that campus, the ethnic make-up of the student body is as follows: Caucasians, 26.1%; Japanese, 17.1%; Filipino, 7.9%; Chinese, 7.5%; Hawaiian, 9.1%; Pacific Islander, 3.8%; Other or Mixed, 15.1%.

13Notably Koreans are not accounted for in this report.

14Again, Koreans are not accounted for as a specific group in the statistics provided by the state.
CHAPTER 4
A Dissertation in the Making

I think of this chapter, and indeed refer to it throughout this dissertation, as the chapter on preliminary data. However, what is presented on the following pages is just as significant as the data discussed in Chapter 6. I realize it is not always customary to include preliminary research in the discussion of a project, but as I hope the discussions on location in the previous chapters have demonstrated, the richness of a particular event is best understood within the context in which it occurs. The evolution of the project I detail on the following pages offers the best explanation of why working with students as co-researchers became a necessary project to undertake. As I explain the demographic data I collected, survey information about texts we read in class, and the information students wrote about in freewrites and cover letters, it becomes increasingly apparent that they told me things about their own classroom interactions and perceptions of school in terms of resistance and otherwise that I don’t think I would have figured out on my own. Sure, I may have realized that their individual propensities to like certain texts more than others were influenced by their personal experiences; however, to be able to hear their reasoning in their own voices complexified my understanding of my students and their relationship to their learning and expectations of the academy in profound ways. Ultimately, what I hope this chapter conveys is that working with students as co-researchers is not something I undertook because it was a novel approach that seemed like a “neat” idea. For me, at this juncture, it became the best way for me to further my goals as a critical pedagogue.
Preliminary Data: From Inquiry to Project back to Inquiry

As noted in Chapter 2, this project was born out of my experiences in the classroom wherein I detected patterns in the ways students received and responded to certain texts. More specifically, I noticed a tendency in students to avoid writing on and discussing texts with content that related in any way to the colonization of Native Hawaiians and Hawai‘i. At face value, this claim seems to run counter to the argument laid out throughout this project that incorporating texts that relate to students’ lives will result in the positive reception of critical pedagogy practices: texts that address Native Hawaiian issues, after all, do relate to the lives of students who live in Hawai‘i on some level. What will become clear on the following pages is how competing discourses informed by micro-locations within a macro-location, like Hawai‘i in this case, complicate what it means to “take location into account.” As I planned to present a paper on this phenomenon at an upcoming conference, I began to formally collect data to support my claims. I thus designed a survey (which will be explained in detail on the following pages) in order to explore what students had to say about their reception of these texts and determine any correlating factors in terms of demographics.

Prior to beginning this project, I applied to the University of Hawai‘i’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval as my project entailed research involving Human Subjects, my students. In addition to filling out the required application, I provided the IRB with a copy of the following: 1) the Consent Form I would use to inform my students of the nature of the research and the kind of information I would be collecting (Appendix A); and 2) the Survey I planned on administering to my students (Appendix B). On October 19, 2005, I received a memorandum (Appendix C) and the “Protection of Human Subjects Assurance Identification/IRB Certification/Declaration of
Exemption” (Appendix D) from the University of Hawai‘i’s Committee on Human Studies (CHS). The documents indicate that my project, now assigned identification number CHS #13987, was “determined to be exempt from Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations.” The implications of this exempt status includes my not having to seek out expressed consent from my students to use information gathered during the course as data as well as not having to submit renewal applications for full committee review. I did, however, need to notify my students of the research by means of the Consent Form, which they were allowed to keep.¹

To obtain preliminary data on my students and their responses to the content of my course, I administered the survey approved by IRB during the Fall 2005 semester to two Composition I classes. In what follows, I discuss responses to only the first two questions of the survey in addition to some data acquired from students’ writing samples. The information garnered from these few sample data sets resulted in two findings that would have a significant impact on the current project in terms of methodology, content, and scope: 1) students did not respond the way I thought they would to class materials; and 2) anomalies showed up in survey results that I was not expecting. Both of these results made me abruptly realize that I did not know nor anticipate my students’ reactions as well as I thought I did. I will begin here with a preamble addressing the problems with surveys in general, then discuss my survey in particular and the resultant anomalies.

The results of surveys are often much more complex than the coded number assigned to represent an answer to a particular question might suggest. Rarely, if ever, does circling “yes” or “no” on a survey sheet accurately capture the elaborate thought process that precedes the act of selecting that response. Respondents’ answers are
influenced by a number of factors that must be taken into account by the researcher. Matthew Miles and A. Michael Huberman address this complexity in *Qualitative Data Analysis* and admonish researchers to “Remember you are not only sampling people, but also settings, events, and processes” (41). Further complicating the perceived simplicity of a survey tool is that, in a classroom setting, it is often difficult for students to disengage themselves from the knowledge that assessment practices are intertwined with education despite their being assured that their survey answers will not affect their grades.² It may very well be impossible to account for all the variables influencing answer choices or possible interpretations of a survey’s results, and sometimes it becomes evident that a choice of “a”, “b”, or “c” simply does not come close to doing justice to the respondents’ lived experience; however, surveys can also be useful. In this case, for example, particular data collected from the survey overwhelmingly refuted my original premise. This survey thus became a departure point in determining strategies to collect additional data as well as in refining the language and types of questions in future survey tools.

Prior to administering the survey to my classes, I explained my project and distributed the Consent Forms. One of the classes I administered the survey to was taught online through Kapi‘olani Community College in the fall 2005 semester. I went through this process toward the end of the semester, and this resulted in a low number of responses to the survey; I thus decided not to include the results from that survey in my data. In my face-to-face class, a stretch two-semester Composition I course designed for students who did not pass the writing placement exam, I had 100% participation, but I immediately noticed a different problem. Question 2 of the survey reads:
How do you self-identify? In other words, if someone were to ask you about your background, which of the following best matches your response?

The possible responses students could select were:

1) Hawaiian;

2) local to islands;

3) from the continental US;

4) from a country other than the US.

I (mistakenly) assumed this was a straight-forward question. My goal with providing these rather limited choices was to get a broad reading of how many of the students in my classes considered themselves as being from Hawai‘i, and, within that group, how many self-identified as being Hawaiian. I was particularly interested in determining if the students in my classroom represented these specific groups in the same proportions as does the overall population of the university (as presented in Chapter 3). I never got to the point of conducting that cross-analysis as my students’ responses presented an obstacle I had not anticipated.

Out of 15 students, 5 responded they came from a country other than the United States. Thinking of this particular class, seeing and talking with them three times every week, I didn’t recall having 5 international students. In fact, I thought I only had 3 foreign students. When I asked the class about this, they confirmed what I thought. I knew I had to re-administer the survey. There must have been a misunderstanding with the wording of the question, or perhaps the students weren’t giving the survey their full attention. So the following semester I re-administered the survey. At this point, I had an additional student from China in the class, but the other 15 students were the same students from the
previous semester. This time, prior to administering the survey I took additional time to explain the survey and the project I was working on more fully. I again conveyed to the students that while their participation was important to me, it wasn’t required, and it would not affect their grade if they chose to not participate. I gave them the option of not doing the survey and asked that if they did take it, they take their time in considering their answers. I would later realize that it would be highly unlikely for any student, particularly a first-year college student, to decline a teacher’s request to participate in such an activity. This realization would impact how I administered a future survey in that I would take steps to minimize the pressure a student might feel to participate.

All 16 students chose to participate and took the survey. This time, the responses to the survey accurately represented the number of foreign students I knew I had in my class. However, the results now showed significant changes in the other areas: the students who self-identify as local to the islands increased from 7 to 11, and the one student who had previously indicated he/she self-identified as Hawaiian obviously changed how he/she chose to self-identify as the results indicated that no students had selected Hawaiian as an answer (See Table 2 for an overview of the results from both semesters).
Table 2: Summary of Responses to Survey Question 1 (Fall 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F 2005 (197)</th>
<th>Sp 2006 (197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local to the islands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the continental US</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a country other than US</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 197 course is the Composition I stretch course, so the students are the same except for the addition of 1. The responses for both semesters thus represent the same set of students with the exception of 1.

I realized this result indicated a possible problem with the survey tool. However, the results to this question also prompted me to consider another possibility: what if the way my students self-identify is not static and singular, but rather fluid and multifarious. For example, the one student who had previously self-identified as Hawaiian in fall 2005 might also consider himself local to the islands. It also raises the question of how a student who has one parent from a foreign country and one from Hawai‘i or the continental United States might self-identify; or, how a student who came to Hawai‘i at a very young age might self-identify. I cannot speak for people in other locations, but many people in Hawai‘i descend from more than one ethnicity. As such, asking a question about a student’s ethnic background seemed less indicative of a student’s cultural influences than asking how a student self-identifies: I consider how a student self-identifies more important than his or her actual ethnic make-up. I did not, however,
consider that how a student self-identifies might change or even be in constant flux. This phenomenon may not be surprising, particularly to those scholars working in colonized locations, as is evidenced by the scholarship discussed in Chapter 2 by Bhabha and Hereniko; however, I was not expecting support for this scholarly work to result from this survey. I quickly realized that the more I asked for student input, the more I was likely to move into uncharted territory. Out of all the responses I entertained, I did not anticipate responses that suggested students might have a fluid perception in terms of their self-identification.

Responses to Question 2 similarly yielded results that I did not anticipate. Question 2 asks students: Out of all the readings we have read for this class, which did you like the best? There were no options supplied as possible answers on the survey, so students were free to respond with whatever answer they wanted to supply; I did, however, verbally remind students of readings as well as write the names and authors of the texts I had specifically assigned on the board. The decision to leave the answer to this question open-ended is a methodological choice; I did hope that by not providing a list of options students would recall text/s that they had strong responses to and their answers would thus more accurately reflect their reactions. But this methodological choice was productive in other ways too. Had I included a list of the readings we had done for the course on the survey, I would not have included some of the texts students listed as answers to this question. For example, I would not have included “Newspaper Articles” as an answer. We did spend one assignment examining current events, but I did not consider the reading we did for that assignment one of the assigned texts I was interested in assessing. However, that a student thought this was the best reading is, I believe, a
positive comment that reflects engagement with current issues and public discourse. In this way, the results to this question reaffirmed that I could not anticipate the scope of responses I would receive from students on any particular subject.

The responses to survey question 2 are detailed in Table 3 and include results from surveys administered during semester 2 for my stretch course in addition to survey results from the other Composition I courses I taught during this time, one each during Fall 2005 and Spring 2006. I do not provide the responses from the survey administered to the stretch course during the Fall 2005 semester because the students had not read the majority of the readings by the end of that semester; therefore, I assume that the answers they gave during the second administration of the survey provide a more accurate representation. If students listed more than one author/text in response to the question, I credited both authors. No student listed more than 2 authors/texts. Two students responded to this question with phrases such as “all readings with historical depth,” and “all readings from the portable anthology.” I classified such responses as an “Unquantifiable” answer. Overall, more students (8) indicated they liked Amy Tan’s “Mother Tongue” over any other reading, with the next closest choice being Sojourner Truth’s “Ain’t I a Woman,” with 5 selecting this reading. However, what is equally interesting as what the students indicated they liked is what they did not select. Relatively few students responded to this question with any of the readings by and about Native Hawaiians, which are all taken from a Native Hawaiian journal, ‘Ōiwi.
Table 3: Summary of Responses to Survey, Question 2 (Fall 2005)

| Question 2: Out of all the readings we have read for this class, which did you like the best?* |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                                   | Sp 2006 (197) | F 2005 (100)   | Sp 2006 (100)  | TOTAL          |
| Unquantifiable answer **                         | 0             | 2             | 0             | 2             |
| Frederick Douglass Excerpt from The Narrative of the Life... | 1             | 1             | 1             | 3             |
| Martin Luther King “I Have a Dream”             | 2             | 1             | Didn’t Read   | 3             |
| Amy Tan “Mother Tongue”                         | 3             | 3             | 2             | 8             |
| Malcolm X “Learning to Read”                    | 1             | Didn’t Read   | Didn’t Read   | 1             |
| Gloria Anzaldúa “How To Tame a Wild Tongue”     | 2             | 0             | 1             | 4             |
| Langston Hughes “Salvation”                     | 2             | 0             | 1             | 3             |
| Jonathan Swift A Modest Proposal                | 2             | 0             | 1             | 3             |
| Sojourner Truth Ain’t I A Woman?                | 2             | 0             | 3             | 5             |
| Thomas Jefferson The Declaration of Independence| 1             | 0             | Didn’t Read   | 1             |
| Abraham Lincoln “The Gettysburg Address”        | 0             | 0             | Didn’t Read   | 0             |
| Patricia Pi’ilani Ono Nakama “End of the Ohana Era”| 1             | 0             | 2             | 3             |
| “Testimony Regarding Tuition Waivers for Students of Hawaiian Ancestry as the University of Hawai’i ” | 1             | 0             | 0             | 1             |
| Sallie-Jo Keala-o-Ånuenue Bowman “Nā Koa: The Warriors” | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             |
| Walaka Kanamu Selection of Poems                | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             |
| Newspaper Article of Student’s Choice           | 0             | 0             | 0             | (1)           |

* If a student listed more than one author, I credited both; no student listed more than 2.
** Certain answers supplied by students made their responses unquantifiable. Answers considered “Unquantifiable” included: all reading with historical depth; all readings from the portable anthology.

At first, I correlated the relatively overwhelming choice of Tan to the unique language issues many of my students’ experience. Tan’s essay “Mother Tongue” details
her experiences growing up in a home where her mother did not speak Standard English. I do regularly have a number of foreign students who have some difficulty negotiating a home language with the Standard English of academia. Moreover, many of my students either speak or are familiar with Pidgin. As discussed in Chapter 3, the Pidgin language has often been used as a means to marginalize its speakers by the dominant class. Thus, when Tan talks about feeling inferior because of her inability to speak Standard English, feeling embarrassed by her mother’s “broken” English, then learning how to negotiate between Standard English and her home language, and finally recognizing that both inform her identity, it is understandable that many of my students can relate to such experiences. But this idea of being able to relate to the text resulting in liking it does not necessarily explain why my students generally did not respond well to texts about current and historical issues specific to Hawai‘i.

All the readings by an about Native Hawaiians were taken from ‘Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal (Volume 2). Many of these texts deal with experiences my students would, at the very least, be familiar with since they are in the news here and often talked about: “Testimony Regarding Tuition Waivers for Students of Hawaiian Ancestry at the University of Hawai‘i” is a collection of testimonies presented to the Hawai‘i State Legislature in support of Hawaiian students being granted tuition waivers to attend the university since the university sits on ceded lands; Patricia Nakama’s collection of autobiographical short stories cover a variety of topics ranging from how a community elder would teach a lesson to a child who was misbehaving to the discovery that deeds to Hawaiian lands had been often stolen by settlers; Sallie-Jo Bowman’s fictional story is set around the events that took place the night Hawaiian rebels tried to re-claim the
Hawaiian throne after the overthrow and imprisonment of Queen Liliʻuokalani.

Interesting to note that one of Bowman’s main characters is a Caucasian who fights with the Hawaiians in their effort; and Walaka Kanamu’s collection of poems talk about changes to the land through development and express the sentiment that it is time for Hawaiians to reassert their claims to govern. While the stories all deal directly with Hawaiian issues and the injustices Hawaiians have experienced, I would not call the tone of any of these texts overtly accusatory or angry from which students of non-Hawaiian ancestry might feel defensive. However, given the responses to the survey, I had to take into account that perhaps my perception was wrong: maybe the content alone, no matter how it is presented, elicited some kind of an emotional response from these students.

I thought the reason my students in general did not respond to these readings more positively had to do with a resistance to acknowledging oppression across racial lines. But the fact that, in general, my students seemed to like the stories where issues of racism between blacks and whites are foregrounded (such as in Douglass’s, Truth’s, and King’s) indicates that a blanket theory about race does not apply in this case. If students’ responses were indeed guided by a resistance to texts that deal with racial oppression, it is evident that the dynamic influencing this resistance is more location specific because the same reaction did not manifest in responses to texts that overtly deal with racism that is not historically tied to Hawai‘i.

A close examination of what my students were writing on further indicates that something else was going on. In my stretch course, students had to write one response to the assigned reading for each week for the first 6 weeks. During the first four weeks, we discussed only one reading each week; however, during week 5 we read and discussed 2
readings and during week 6 we watched and discussed 2 videos. For each of these two weeks, students could choose to write on either one or both of the readings or one or both of the videos respectively. Table 4 lists how many students wrote on each reading and video for each of week 5 and week 6.

**Table 4: Comparison of Response Paper Topics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 5: Two Readings</th>
<th># of Students who wrote on the reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg Address</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Both</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 6: Two Videos</th>
<th># of Students who wrote on the video</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act of War</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King’s I Have a Dream</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Both</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2006, Stretch 100 Course: 16 Students

During week 5, we discussed the *Declaration of Independence* and the “Gettysburg Address.” As Table 4 shows, students overwhelmingly engaged in discussions of both documents in their responses, with only three students out of 16 choosing to write on one of the readings exclusively. Arguably, it is relatively easy to engage both since the subject covered in each of the texts overlaps. During week 6 we watched Martin Luther King’s “I Have A Dream” in addition to a documentary entitled *Act of War*. In *Act of War*, three Native Hawaiian scholars narrate a historical account of the events leading up to the overthrow of the Hawaiian kingdom that contradicts much of what students have traditionally been taught about these events in primary school in Hawai‘i. In contrast to the previous week when most students wrote on both the readings, almost the same number of students that responded to both *The Declaration of Independence* and Lincoln’s address chose to write only on Martin Luther King’s speech.
By itself, these data representing the low number of students choosing to write on the video covering a Hawaiian subject might not be that significant. However, when coupled with the relatively negative responses in terms of “liking” texts by and about Native Hawaiians as indicated by the survey, a pattern seems to emerge. Again, because of the willingness to engage with King, it didn't seem as though issues of racism or inequality in general were uncomfortable for students. At this point, I decided to more closely examine the actual content of the writing in the student responses.

Looking at what students were writing indicated that students’ might be perceiving issues of racism as it affects African Americans as a relatively resolved issue, making it a safe issue to engage with. For example, in a response to “I Have a Dream,” one student wrote “While some racism still exists, for the most part the blacks have gained a lot of the inalienable rights that have been promised to them.” And another said, “his dream became [the] nations’ desire to improve society, his emotions became [the] nation’s pursuit for [a] better society, and his speech became [the] nation’s means to achieve freedom.” And finally, one student ended her paper with, “His determination and motivation moved the nation to end prejudice.” There were students who indicated through their writing that they acknowledged that racial inequities still exist and are in no way a small problem; however, I began to wonder how removed my students felt from these problems. As the demographic data presented in Chapter 3 indicates, we have a very small African American population in the islands: there is not even a category for African American in either the Hawai‘i State or University of Hawai‘i statistics. As I read through the responses again, I came across a student’s response to the reading that included testimonies to the state legislature arguing for tuition waivers for all Native
Hawaiians as compensation for the University of Hawai‘i standing on unpaid-for ceded lands. This student wrote: “After reading this compilation, I felt ashamed of the fact that I attend a school that does not know how to keep a promise.” This sentence struck home that the reasons my students were responding the way they did to the texts I was assigning in class were not only complex but deeply personal.

There are many reasons why my students could be reluctant to write about, claim to like, or simply not engage with Native Hawaiian texts in the same way they do other texts despite that these texts address issues current and/or specific to Hawai‘i. First, the nature of many of the issues involving Hawai‘i’s colonial past are underdiscussed in most high school courses. Thus, students may only know surface arguments and be unable to articulate what they think because they simply do not understand the complexity of a situation. Then, when presented with detailed information on a subject, like tuition waivers, students may be unable to reconcile previously held assumptions with the new information, realizing that any resolution to the problem is complex. Students may agree, for example, that Hawaiians have been treated unjustly. However, the prospect of granting Hawaiians tuition waivers based on their ethnicity might make the issue very personal all of a sudden and thus more complicated. During this semester, one student who often expressed her disdain for how Hawaiians have been treated very vocally disapproved of their being given tuition waivers to attend the university. In class she explained that she had to work two jobs to attend school and could not understand why other students should get to attend for free based on their ethnicity or wrongs suffered by previous generations.
Betram Bruce, focusing on technology’s dual potential to reproduce and disrupt social norms, which can be analogous to the work of the academy, argues that the necessity to talk about the socio-cultural implications of technology are often countered by a distinct discomfort to engage with issues that force individuals to examine the ways in which one’s actions do not match an individual’s abstract ideals. In “Speaking the Unspeakable about 21st Century Technologies,” Bruce writes, “we are uncomfortable talking about deeply-held values where there is a chance for serious conflict; we are frustrated addressing issues knowing in advance that there is no easy solution” (228). It is not difficult to see why a student working two jobs to pay for tuition might hold some resentment toward someone receiving a waiver based on his/her being Hawaiian, no matter how justifiable such waivers might be. Moreover, a student may experience discomfort when faced with recognizing her relative privilege compared to the community of indigenous people that can lay claim to the place she lives in, where her family may have prospered.

Much has been written about racial inequality being difficult to address in the classroom. Kim Case looks at white women teachers’ responses to a training course aimed at raising awareness of racial inequalities among students. She writes:

Rather than be fully engaged participants in classroom discussions, White women distanced themselves through strategies of silence, social disassociation, and separation from responsibility. They used these strategies in response to perceptions that they were being positioned as racist, directly implicated in institutional racism, or responsible for racial discrimination. (606)
When we talk about Native Hawaiians being displaced, it is likely difficult for a student who calls this place home not to feel she is in some way complicit in or being blamed for this displacement. However, I did see my students trying to negotiate these complex issues. For example, I was surprised to see several students who had stated in class that it is unfair to grant Hawaiians tuition waivers when they themselves work later express in their written responses that Hawaiians should get waivers. Did they change their answers because several outspoken students in class claimed this position? Did they think this is the position I held? Or did the difficult conversations in class result in students reexamining their positions on issues? I may never know the answer to this, but I can say within the context of this class, these expressed positions did change.

The discussion here demonstrates that while we as teachers may not account for specific location as much as we can or should in classroom practices, it is impossible for our students to do the same. I wanted to continue to look at resistance to critical pedagogy, but the interactions over these two semesters made me realize I wanted more student input. Not only did students tell me things I hadn't considered, but often their responses were nuanced and situated, which allowed for fuller analysis and interpretation. Recent work on research methodologies by scholars such as Gesa Kirsch and Tuhiwai Smith reinforced the idea that researchers should collaborate with my research subjects, my students, more fully. I took steps to do this in the class I would teach in the fall of 2006. That class, which I discuss below, eventually became the final steppingstone to the project I discuss in Chapters 5 and 6.
Preliminary Data Stage Two: Different Demographics, Different Data

In August 2006, I wrote to the University of Hawai‘i’s Institutional Review Board requesting that the exempt status I had been granted under my initial application be extended to cover a larger project, namely my dissertation. In the letter, I articulated the ways in which this larger project would differ from the parameters laid out in my original application (Appendix E). The most significant change noted in this request is that in addition to gathering data from the Composition I courses I teach (English 100), I wanted to include my 200 level composition courses in the cohort. The request, inclusive of all changes, was approved on September 1, 2006 via an email correspondence (Appendix F).

I then prepared to collect one additional set of preliminary data. These data, in combination with the data previously collected, would be used to inform the design of formal assignments that would both yield data for the research as well as meet the student learning requirements of the 100 and 200 level courses I was to teach in the spring of 2007. In short, I was looking to this class for insight to how I could include my students as researchers without putting an undue burden on them as students and, at the same time, meet course requirements.

If that wasn’t enough of a task, the class I was asked to teach added another twist to the dynamic. In the fall of 2006, I was unexpectedly asked to teach a Composition I course in which the majority of the students participated in the University of Hawai‘i’s College of Opportunities Manawa Kūpono Program. The program targets “at-risk” students from particular Hawai‘i high schools. According to the College of Opportunities website, the program
recruits individuals who may not meet the requirements for regular UHM admission, are academically under prepared, economically disadvantaged, represent a positive role model to communities underrepresented at the UHM, non-traditional, or in need of a structured college entry.

As part of their participation in the program, most of the students in the class had participated in a pre-college summer program together and were enrolled in several of their core classes together during their first semester of college. As a result, many of the students knew each other.

During the first week of class, I passed out the Consent Form and explained my research. This time, I asked students to indicate on the Consent Form whether they agreed to participate in the research or not and collected the forms. 100% of the students gave their consent to participate. I then administered the same survey I had administered to the 2005-2006 Composition I stretch course. As Table 5 demonstrates, 41% of the students in this class self-identify as Hawaiian according to their answers to Survey Question 1; an equal number of students self-identify as local to the islands; and 18% self-identify as coming from the continental US. None of the students in this class indicated that they were from a country other than the U.S. Teaching a class through this program that targeted “at-risk” Native Hawaiian students resulted in Hawaiian students being substantially represented demographically. In the over seven years I have taught at the University of Hawai‘i and at Kapi‘olani Community College, over 40 courses, this is the only time that has ever happened.
Table 5: Responses to Survey, Question 1 (Fall 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th><em>Local to the Islands</em></th>
<th>From the Continental US</th>
<th>From a Country Other than the US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Out of a total of 17 students (one student was absent the day the survey was administered)

In terms of the project I was working on with my students, as it looks at students’ resistance to certain texts and subjects, teaching this course provided a chance to sample a specific sub-set of students from Hawai‘i, namely Native Hawaiians. The sources of data gathered from this class were the survey tool and two freewrites. Similar to the data detailed in the previous section, the results provided interesting nuances to how interactions in a specific geographic location influence social behavior. Moreover, the data complicated this premise as it provided a strong indication that students of different ethnicity in the same location, with other demographic traits being fairly consistent, interact differently. This is another finding that is not necessarily surprising, but I now had a corpus of data that supports that premise.

In the fall of 2006, I had made some alterations to the readings we would be doing in class. Previously, readings by and about Native Hawaiians were taken from ‘Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal (Volume 2). The survey discussed in the previous section was administered during the fall 2005 and spring 2006 to students doing readings from this journal. In the fall 2006, I began to use ‘Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal (Volume 3) that had recently been released. Other readings in the class remained unchanged. The texts in this volume, like Volume 2, are entirely by and about Native Hawaiians;
however, for the purposes of this study it is important to note that the readings the students in the fall 2005 and spring 2006 and the students in the fall 2006 encountered differed. Thus, students had a different set of readings to draw from in their responses. The results of the two surveys are dramatically different, almost opposite. As the discussion that follows indicates, I suggest that this difference is not entirely due to the

exact content of the individual readings; however, that I changed course textbooks must be taken into account.

In preparation for this final stage of preliminary data collection, I revised the survey tool to include more demographic information. (See Appendix G for a copy of the revised survey.) At this point, I was unsure of the extent to which I would be including additional demographic information about my students in the final analysis, so in conversation with one of my committee members, I decided to collect additional information on students’ educational background. Conversely, this survey included fewer questions about the actual texts we read; basically students were only asked to list what reading they liked best (Question 8) and what reading they liked least (Question 9). Table 6 shows the results from Survey Question 8, which is comparable to Question 2 of the survey I had administered during the previous academic year:

*Out of all the readings we have read for this class, which did you like the best?*

As Table 6 illustrates, every student who self-identified as Hawaiian indicated that they specifically liked best one of the texts from the Native Hawaiian journal or they wrote that they liked anything from the ‘Ōiwi journal. These results contrast starkly with the previous year’s survey results. These results similarly correspond to the different
demographic make-up of the classes: I had only one student who self-identified as Hawaiian in the fall 2005–spring 2006 stretch course, and this student changed how he/she self-identified during the second half of the year. In the results of the survey administered to that class, only two students indicated they liked any text by or about Native Hawaiians from the ‘Ōiwi journal.

Table 6: Responses to Survey Question 8 by Self-Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readings Listed by Students</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Local to the Islands</th>
<th>From the Continental US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Tan “Mother Tongue”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Anzaldúa “How To Tame a Wild Tongue”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston Hughes “Salvation”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Selection from ‘Ōiwi’ A Native Hawaiian Journal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, every student in the fall 2006 class who self-identified as being from the continental US (while only 3) indicated they liked a story by a non-Hawaiian author, specifically Hughes and Anzaldúa. Another divergence between the results from the previous academic year’s survey and the one from fall 2006: a larger percentage of students who self-identified as being local to the islands indicated they liked a text by and about Native Hawaiians than previously.

That students self-identifying one way liked certain texts and students self-identifying another way did not generally like those same texts suggests that the texts students are drawn to are potentially tied to self-identification. As self-identification in this research, because of the way the survey question was written, is tied to geographical
location (as it is anywhere), it can also be suggested that engagement with and resistance to texts are tied to the social and political forces at work in a specific geographic location. To return to Rummel’s definition of social behavior as “the acts, actions, or practices of two or more people mutually oriented towards each other's selves, that is, any behavior that tries to affect or take account of each other's subjective experiences or intentions,” then what I assign and how students respond to assignments is a social behavior or interaction. In this way, overall, these results provide a material example of how location impacts classroom interactions, both on the teacher and students’ parts. For my part, location influenced the readings I chose to assign, and in terms of the students, location played a role in how those texts were received. Moreover, the phenomenon of there being a corresponding increase in students who do not self-identify as being Hawaiian indicating they like the same texts Hawaiian students do when there was a significant representation of Hawaiians in the class begs the question, how do the dynamics in the class affect students’ reception of certain texts? The results also invite the query: does ethnic identity play a role in positively receiving texts that either directly or indirectly address marginalization? These data suggests that a correlation can be made between how a student self-identifies and the way he engages with texts, even when students are operating within the same geographic location. These findings further influenced the scholarly questions guiding this project in terms of drawing connections between critical pedagogy practices and location.

As indicated by the several sets of data discussed thus far, my students continually provided insights that added important nuances to my understandings of the impact the sociopolitical forces tied to location have on the social behaviors produced within the
classroom. While I already realized I wanted to work with my students on my research, each stage of the research further cemented the realization that the culminating analysis in my project would alter significantly without their participation. Of course, such an approach aligns with current work by both indigenous and feminist scholars on research methodologies as well as scholarship in the field of ethnography that calls for the collaboration between researcher and research subjects in all stages of a project (Kirsch; Tuhiwai Smith). The data I had accumulated to this point offered material examples of how working with research subject within a collaborative frame impacted the resultant findings in significant ways.

In hopes of increasing the level of collaboration between me and my students, a goal during this next phase of my research was to determine if there was a way to get my students’ input on the importance of the project. As discussed in Chapter 1, for a project to fully conform to the tenets of Indigenous Theory according to Tuhiwai Smith and theories of collaboration as explained by Composition and Rhetoric scholars such as Gesa Kirsch, two theoretical frames that inform the methodology of this project, research participants must be included from the inception of the project. This means research subjects should be involved in the decision as to whether a project is worthy as well as have a voice in its design. In most cases, involving the research subjects, students, in a teacher research project in this way is challenging. As has been discussed earlier, a significant impediment to incorporating collaboration at this level is time. As a college teacher, I only have the same set of students for one sixteen-week period. The case in which I had the same set of students for a whole academic year, for the stretch Composition I course during the fall 2005 and spring 2006, was an anomaly in my
teaching experience. I did not thus see how I could incorporate the students from whom I would be gathering my primary data in the design phase of the project. Discussing the project and its worthiness, both in terms of its impact on teaching and on the students specifically, could be done, but not in time for a collaborative construction of design and then subsequent gathering of data. I thus came up with a method, albeit fraught with problems, meant to address this shortcoming in this project. I decided to ask students during the preliminary data collection stage for their reflections and opinions in terms of the importance and goals of the project.

The method through which I chose to gather this input was through two freewrites administered to my class during the fall 2006. The first freewrite asked the students to write in response to this question: “Is it important for a teacher to understand why students resist certain ideas/subjects? Why or why not”; and the second freewrite asked the students: “What makes something controversial?” The responses to the second freewrite did not, in general, yield any data that (at this time) seem specifically relevant to this dissertation or particularly interesting. Students almost entirely responded that controversial issues usually deal with a person’s values and morals, that such issues were personal in nature, and that there are at least two opposing sides. Values and morals can both be tied to cultural influences, which in turn is often tied to location, making such responses potentially relevant to this project; however, students’ responses to this prompt were mostly too general in nature to add to the data I had already collected.

In contrast, the responses to the first question were both relevant and interesting. First, I concede that the question itself is incredibly reductive. The project I wanted to co-
research with my students examines students’ resistance in the classroom. It seemed to me that the easiest way to see how students felt about this subject was to simply ask them if my understanding of why they resist something is important. Prior to assigning the freewrites, I briefly explained to them my thoughts that resistance reflected the social, political, cultural, and historical influences of a particular location. I noted that I did not think my students’ social behaviors in a classroom in Hawai‘i manifested or represented the same things as do students’ social behaviors in classrooms at different locations on the continent. My incorporating these freewrites during the preliminary data collection stage led to my both including these freewrites during the formal data collection stage as well as adding four additional freewrites connected in theme. These freewrites will be explained in the next chapter; here I want to address what students wrote in the freewrite in the fall of 2006.

Once again the data yielded results that I was not anticipating. I did expect students to mostly agree that it is important for a teacher to understand why a student resists a certain topic or idea; but I did not expect all of the students to respond that way. Students’ explanations of why it is important are even more interesting. Students responded that teachers need to understand students’ resistance in several ways. While the responses students gave are all related, I have broken them down into sub-categories. The categories and the corresponding number of responses are listed in Table 7. Several students, in their discussion, covered more than one of the topics; in such cases I indicated a response as addressing two or more categories. Therefore, the total number of responses in Table 7 exceed the number of students in the class. While the students and I did not jointly arrive at the idea for this project, on some level students indicated that they
thought that one of the goals of the research, understanding why students resist, is important to them as students.

**Table 7: Response Categories for Freewrite 1 (Fall 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So as not to offend students or make them uncomfortable</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So the teacher (and student) can modify his/her approach</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help them become more comfortable discussing the subject</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers need to not be biased</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to discuss such subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students overwhelmingly responded that they felt teachers should take care so as not to offend students. This response I found surprising. It seems that for such an overwhelming majority of students, 11 out of 16 or 69% (two students were absent the day the freewrite was assigned), to indicate that teachers should be careful not to offend students suggests that there is a chance that teachers, perhaps even regularly, offend students. I had not considered that students feeling personally offended might play a role in their resistance. As I will discuss more thoroughly in Chapter 6, many subjects that elicit strong reactions, like feeling offended, are tied to the social and political climate produced by the history of a particular place. Thus, the connection between location and what might be considered offensive is strong, further cementing the significance role location plays in social behaviors.

I collected one additional piece of data from this class that I would like to discuss here as the data potentially provide insight into another reason students might resist culturally sensitive texts. About three-quarters of the way through the semester, my writing classes work with visual rhetoric. During this section of the class, we usually
discuss media driven rhetoric in the form of advertisements and culturally located rhetoric in the form of Hawaiian artwork. The students were informed in the assignment sheet that I would be collecting data for my research during this assignment and were given the option to opt out of having data taken from their work included in my final data set (although the assignment itself was required). None of the students declined to participate.

After spending time with each form of visual rhetoric, students chose to write on one. In addition to doing a rhetorical analysis of the text they chose to write on, they were also asked to write a cover letter explaining their choice. There were two sets of directions for this part of the assignment depending on which visual text the student decided to work with. The directions were identical except for the order the words “Image Analysis” and “Advertisement Analysis” appear in the questions; the order depended upon which assignment sheet the student was working with. The directions for the cover letter on the Image Analysis assignment sheet (for the artwork) read:

In addition to the Analysis, you will include a 1-page cover letter (300 words) to me that addresses the following questions:

1) Why did you choose to write the Image Analysis rather than the Advertisement Analysis?

2) Did you decide to write on this assignment before our class discussion, or did you change your mind? In other words, did discussion in class influence your decision on which assignment to write on? How?

3) How is understanding Image in relation to the questions addressed in this assignment important? And, for whom is it important to understand these possible meanings of images?

4) Is the other assignment (the Advertisement Analysis) also important? If not, what makes this one more important?
And for the Advertisement Analysis:

In addition to the Analysis, you will include a 1-page cover letter (300 words) to me that addresses the following questions:

1) Why did you choose to write the Advertisement Analysis rather than the Image Analysis?

2) Did you decide to write on this assignment before our class discussion, or did you change your mind? In other words, did discussion in class influence your decision on which assignment to write on? How?

3) How is understanding Advertisements in relation to the questions addressed in this assignment important? And, for whom is it important to understand these possible meanings of advertisements?

4) Is the other assignment (the Image Analysis) also important? If not, what makes this one more important?

I changed the word order in the different assignment sheets because I did not want it to seem as though I were privileging one over the other.

Students overwhelmingly decided to write on Advertisements over the Hawaiian Artwork pictures: 14 vs. 4. Table 8 and Table 9 provide a categorization of the reasons students gave for choosing the Image Analysis and Advertisement Analysis respectively.

A significant number of students indicated that they chose to write on the advertisements (or conversely, did not choose to write on the artwork) because they did not have enough knowledge to write on the pictures. Not feeling informed could thus be a variable affecting students’ avoidance of certain texts.

Table 8: Reasons Composition I Students Chose Image Analysis, Fall 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th># of Students Indicating this Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew A Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I question whether students would be equally reluctant to write on a Pablo Picasso or Michelangelo painting, for example, even though they had no background in art analysis or knowledge of Spanish or Italian culture and history. At this juncture, I had no data to substantiate my suspicion, but I strongly felt that students would not be as hesitant to write on a painting that was not related to Hawaiian culture. In short, I suspected that the sociopolitical climate in which these students interact plays a role in their reluctance to explore their own knowledge in relation to these specific texts. For them, it seems to me, there was more at stake when writing on anything Hawaiian than there would be if writing on an artifact representing almost any western Anglo culture. There are numerous other scenarios that could provide some explanation for this behavior I observed. For example, students might resist writing on art of any kind, no matter the culture, or students might believe they will perform better on an advertisement analysis because they are most familiar with the text and assignment. However, taken in the context of other interactions I observed students having with Hawaiian texts in the classroom, particularly avoidance, it seems at least plausible that students’ relationship with the indigenous culture plays some role. Moreover, the consistency in these responses across all semesters and courses contributes to the credibility of the assumption.
Conclusion

Over the course of three semesters, from the fall of 2005 through the fall of 2006, I collected several data sets from different sets of students. Considering the range of classes and students, the consistency in theme of the data is quite remarkable. Issues with self-identification appeared both in the way students responded to the survey as well as in discussions following the administering of the survey. There is also consistency in students’ receptions of Hawaiian texts, which seems to parallel their self-identification as represented in the survey results. In all classes, whether with a significant representation of Hawaiian students or not, most students indicated they did not feel they knew enough about Hawaiian culture to write on it.

As discussed in the previous section, several different data sets acquired during the preliminary data collection phase of this project indicate that, in general, students chose to engage with texts written by and about Native Hawaiians and Native Hawaiian issues with significantly less frequency than they did texts written by and about people and issues representing other cultures present in the United States. The exception to this generalization is represented in the data taken from a class with a large number of Native Hawaiian students. This propensity is similarly demonstrated in comments students wrote on course evaluations for a Composition I course I taught during Fall 2007. One student who indicated he was “satisfied” with the course rather than “very satisfied” explained:

The reason why I was “satisfied” and not “very satisfied” was that I did not really enjoy the [‘Ōiwi] text. I thought that being an intro English class if you wanted to have different cultures in the readings there should have been more than just
Hawaiian. I felt like the text would be good in a Hawaiian Studies class but not as the main text in an English class.

What is noteworthy about this student’s comment is that the class did read texts from a variety of different cultures that exist in the United States, including African American and Asian American. Moreover, while there are parts of certain readings written in Hawaiian in the Ōiwi text, everything assigned to students to read was written in English, and the total number of texts assigned from the Ōiwi texts was about equal to the total number of texts by other authors from the United States. I also assigned A Modest Proposal in this class (as I frequently do), a text uniquely not American among the others, and the student did not indicate that the inclusion of that text was a problem.

All in all, what I learned through this preliminary data collection phase is that my students had so much to teach me. The chapters up to this point have suggested (via theory and via a narrative describing the evolution of my research and teaching) that location is a primary variable in how students learn and should thus similarly be taken into account in how we teach. Chapter 2 provided a theoretical discussion explaining the influence of location and situated the project in the scholarly conversations. The discussion in Chapter 3 demonstrated the specificity and uniqueness of one location, the site of this research, which began the work of illustrating that a theory of location that applies to one place does not translate to another, except in the abstract. And this chapter has offered specific examples of how location plays a distinct role in students’ subjectivity and their classroom social behaviors. One thing that became increasingly clear to me through this work up to this point is that location is multifarious. There are locations within locations. While Hawai‘i embodies a specific set of experiences and
ideologies, it is still impacted by the discourse of the larger location that is the United States. And within Hawai‘i, there are micro-spaces that cultivate more distinctions in their influences. In this complex context, my limited experience would never allow me to account for most of these influences. I needed my students for this. The next two chapters are the story of the work we did together.
Notes

1The title of the Consent Form reads “Agreement to Participate in…” While student did not have to indicate their expressed consent, a student’s request to not participate would be honored. During the preliminary data collection stage, no students made such a request.

2As will be discussed later, I took steps when administering a similar survey in Fall 2007 to alleviate some of my authority. However, as will become apparent in the discussion of the second survey, my students interactions with me after the survey was administered only further complicates traditional understandings of the perceived roles of teacher and students in the classroom and any methods employed to alleviate a teacher’s authority.

3Students do read at least one text written by a European author in my classes, notably Jonathan Swift’s *A Modest Proposal*; however, authors from Europe are not represented significantly enough to draw a generalization about the level of engagement students have with texts written by and about the different cultures of Europe.
CHAPTER 5
The Final Case Study

This project began with an examination of student resistance to critical pedagogy practices. Based on scholarship on the subject of resistance as well as location, I designed a teacher research project in which I enlisted my students as co-researchers. As discussed in the previous chapter, many of students’ social behaviors, which include resistance, can be linked to the place they are in and its corresponding social and political forces. As I progressed to this point in the project, it became increasingly clear that any conclusions about “resistance” specifically would be reductive and potentially problematically subjective. However, through this examination of resistance, my students and I were able to generate a significant amount of data on location and its relationship to a broader range of social behaviors, including those enacted in the classroom. Moreover, in the preliminary research to this point, it seemed that with the increasing involvement of students corresponded an increasing emergence of discussions and writing detailing students’ ideas on location-specific topics, such as those tied to Hawaiian claims to sovereignty and racism.

The sheer volume of what students were telling me implied that teacher research informed by critical pedagogy practices, including but not limited to working with students as co-researchers, elicited active participation by students. In other words, they didn’t seem to be resisting the critical pedagogy delivered in this context. Using the information I had acquired over the previous semesters, I initiated this final sequence of the project wherein I would continue to conduct research on resistance with my students
but that research formally became a vehicle through which to examine more specifically teacher research and its reception as a critical pedagogy practice by students. I say “formally” here because the work of the semesters discussed in the previous chapter already indicated that what students had to say had further ranging implications than a discussion of resistance could embody. The resultant premise guiding this dissertation is thus largely informed by how my students responded during the preliminary data stages: listening to what they said and reading what they wrote eventually enabled me to articulate the focus of this project in a way that more fully represents the work we did together.

In this chapter, I begin by restating the overarching thesis of this dissertation and the scholarly questions guiding the project. I then describe the two courses I taught during the Spring 2007 semester at the University of Hawai‘i and provide a demographic snapshot of the students in each of the courses who were both my co-researchers and from whom I collected data. I will close with an overview of the data gathered and an explanation of how these data were handled. The discussion of the courses will demonstrate that several of the assignments were designed specifically to facilitate students’ co-research on resistance. In addition, the explanation of course delivery and classroom practices will show how practices implemented in course delivery align with those recommended by Ira Shor as being practices that signify a critical pedagogy classroom. The methodology outlined in Chapter 1 of this dissertation continued to guide this project through this last phase of data collection and analysis, and the work of this chapter is to explain in detail the methods (informed by that methodology and designed to facilitate its goals) employed in the final case-study. Thus, the description of the writing
assignments, homework, and readings assigned in each of the courses throughout the semester works to illustrate how and the extent to which my students acted as co-researchers and the ways in which these courses were critical pedagogy classes in terms of form.

The Research Questions

The overarching thesis of this dissertation is that while working collaboratively with my students as co-researchers in a teacher research project grounded in a specific place relevant to the students’ lives, I observed a generally positive reception to critical pedagogy practices by the students, even when the focus of our collaborative research was on resistance to critical pedagogy that students often demonstrate. Furthermore, such a project informed by critical pedagogy results in classroom interactions (social behaviors) that yield rich information about students’ ideas, their lives in and out of the classroom, and their relationship with the place they are learning in. In order to support this argument, this dissertation is guided by the following scholarly questions:

1. How did students respond in writing and discussions to the practices and assignments delivered in courses designed within the context of a collaborative teacher research project by a teacher overtly committed to critical pedagogy?

2. What pedagogical and/or scholarly outcomes arose from working with students explicitly as co-researchers in a teacher research project investigating the relations between critical pedagogy, students’ social behaviors, and location?

3. What are the implications of these findings in terms of current scholarship on critical pedagogy and location?

As the thesis of this dissertation and corresponding research questions indicate,
considerable attention had to be given to how I would interact with my students so that “co-researcher” is an accurate representation of our relationship in the project. The following overview of the courses will work to more fully capture the role my students assumed as co-researchers.

Courses

During the Spring 2007 semester, I taught two courses at the University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa campus, Composition I and Composition II. I determined that I would conduct the final case study for my research for this dissertation in these two courses (provided I received consent from the students in the respective courses, which I did). Composition I is the required freshman writing course at the University of Hawai‘i, and the University’s 2006-2007 Course catalogue describes the course as:

The Introduction to the rhetorical, conceptual and stylistic demands of writing at the university level; instruction in composing process, search strategies, and writing from sources.

In the same catalogue, English 200: Composition II is described as:

Further study of rhetorical, conceptual and stylistic demands of writing; instruction develops the writing and research skills covered in Composition I.

As the respective descriptions indicate, the overarching objectives of these two courses are strikingly similar. Indeed, Composition II is meant to follow Composition I for those students who want more instruction on and practice in research writing. Taking this into consideration, I thought it appropriate to design the courses similarly with the differences being the quantity and level of writing I expected from the students in each course. Thus, for the Composition II course I would expect a greater volume of writing that also
demonstrated an increased sophistication in language use, style, and complexity of argument.

In the syllabi for each of the respective courses (Appendix H), I included the following language to inform the students about the research I was conducting in the course:

The work we do in this course will benefit both you as students and me as an instructor in several ways. First, as students, you will attain the course outcomes listed below (which we will discuss in more detail on the first day of class). Also, I hope that our study of rhetoric will further your understanding of the many ways our being members of several different communities impacts who we are.

My work in this class will have several implications for me as your teacher as well. First, in this course I am an instructor, so an obvious goal of mine is that the class is successful in that students attain the outcomes and learn the course content. I am also a researcher gathering data. I will thus benefit from the work we do in this class as much of it will be used in my research. On the first day of class, we will discuss what exactly this means, and I will ask for your participation in my research. You will of course have the option to decline, and your grade for this course will not be affected whether you decide to participate or not (I will discuss how grades will be determined below).

The syllabus also indicates one required text for the course: ‘Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal. Volume 3: Huliau. ‘Ōiwi, as explained in Chapter 4, is a journal written, edited, and published entirely by Native Hawaiians. It is the first of its kind since the 19th Century Hawaiian language newspapers in that the journal is entirely controlled by Hawaiian writers, editors, and publishers.

Both of the courses met each Tuesday and Thursday and each class lasted a period of one hour and fifteen minutes. The semester began on January 8, 2007, and lasted 16 weeks. The last day of instruction was May 2, 2007. The week following the last day of instruction is the official final examination period for the university. However, as both of
these courses are designated writing courses, I do not require a final exam for either course.

**Students**

After going over the syllabus on the first day of class, I passed out the same consent forms I had used in previous semesters. I asked students to indicate whether they agreed to participate in the research or not by writing “yes” or “no” on the consent form, writing their name, and returning the form to me. All students in the Composition I course agreed to participate. One student in Composition II indicated he did not want to participate. I learned later from UHM’s IRB that this step of securing assent from students was unnecessary because the research project itself was considered as having exempt status. However, I have honored the student who indicated he did not want to participate and have not used any material gathered from him in my analysis of qualitative data. There are data gathered from the classes that do not have names indicated, such as the survey. This student’s information is included in the calculation of that data (the student did have the option of not filling out the survey but chose to do so). My co-researchers/research-subjects represented in this phase of data collection totals 41: 20 students from the Composition I course and 21 students from the Composition II class. The responses to the survey administered to these two classes provides a fuller picture of the class’s demographics.

While preparing for this phase of data collection, I felt I did not need any more data on which specific texts students were choosing to engage with. I thus redesigned the survey one more time, eliminating any questions about texts (Appendix I). As Miles and Huberman explain, when administering a survey the implications of the responses are
complicated by the entire setting of the survey: physical as well as ideological contexts. Moreover, as Anderson notes, students are often more likely to acquiesce to a teacher, agreeing to participate and even providing answers that are perceived to coincide with what the teacher wants. In an effort to minimize my influence over the survey-taking context, I thus asked a colleague to administer the survey.

During the sixth week of class, on Tuesday, February 13, 2007, my students took the survey. Prior to my colleague’s arrival at the classroom, I briefly explained that she would be administering the survey, and while they took the survey I would leave the classroom. Students were informed that the data collected from the survey would be used in my dissertation. After administering the survey, my colleague collected the survey sheets and tallied the results. Students were informed that I would not see the actual sheets that their responses were on until after final grades were submitted at the end of the semester. It was my intention that this process would work to further ensure students of the anonymity of their responses. The responses to all questions are detailed below in Table 10 (Composition I) and Table 11 (Composition II).

Although all information gleaned from the survey tool will not be addressed in this dissertation, I include the results in their entirety because collectively the responses provide an interesting snapshot of my students. For example, the results illustrate the extent to which these students, although likely falling within the standard age of college students, are untraditional compared to many mainstream college students in other ways. A large number of students work, and this number increases from the Composition I course to the Composition II course, despite that so many live at home. This data may suggest that living at home does not ease the financial burden going to school poses on
these students. Moreover, a significant number of the total number of students, 16 out of 41, or almost 40%, speak another language at home. And, while the majority of students in both classes self-identify as being *local* to the islands, only 8% self-identify as Hawaiian.

These results parallel other statistical data that suggest that fewer Hawaiians are attaining a higher education despite their increasing numbers in the overall population (see Chapter 2). I did not ask students to specify their ethnicity other than Hawaiian, so I cannot say for certain that the class demographics exactly mirror that of the overall population of the state in general. However, as the university’s student demographic does largely parallel that of the state’s with the obvious exception being Hawaiian students, I speculate the overall demographics in these two classes were similar to the university’s demographics.
### Table 10: Survey Responses Composition I, Spring 2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Local to the islands</th>
<th>From the Continental U.S.</th>
<th>From a country other than the U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you self-identify? In other words, if someone were to ask you about your background, which of the following best matches your response?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Name and location of high school (students supplied specific names of high schools: I have broken the responses into 3 categories)</td>
<td>Public School in Hawai‘i</td>
<td>Private School in Hawai‘i</td>
<td>School on the Continental U.S.</td>
<td>9 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you work in addition to going to school? If so, how many hours per week?</td>
<td>Don’t work</td>
<td>1-10 hours</td>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>21-30 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you live in:</td>
<td>A dorm on campus</td>
<td>At home with family</td>
<td>In an off-campus apartment</td>
<td>7 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did either or both of your parents graduate from college?</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have any siblings who attended (or are attending) college?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you speak another language at home? If so, what is it?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Languages Listed: Greek, Ilocano, Japanese, Ponapeian, and Cantonese

* While there are 20 students enrolled in the class, only 19 were present on the day the survey was administered; therefore, there are only 19 responses to each question.
## Table 11: Survey Responses Composition II, Spring 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Local to the islands</th>
<th>From the Continental U.S.</th>
<th>From a country other than the U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you self-identify? In other words, if someone were to ask you about your background, which of the following best matches your response?*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Name and location of high school (students supplied specific names of high schools: I have broken the responses into 3 categories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you work in addition to going to school? If so, how many hours per week?**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you live in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did either or both of your parents graduate from college?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have any siblings who attended (or are attending) college?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you speak another language at home? If so, what is it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages Listed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (2), Japanese (3), Cantonese, Spanish, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Ilocano, Filipino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A total of 21 students took the survey; however, there are only 18 who selected one of the responses provided. One student did not respond; one circled both “local to the islands”; and “From a country other than the U.S.”, and another student wrote: “I would say I’m Chinese and China is Chinese but I’m local. Bad question.”

** One student responded to this question with “I help out.”
The Assignments

During the first week of class, students in both classes were informed that they would be expected to read the news and that we would begin each class with a 10-20 minute discussion of current events every day. This practice facilitates the goals of critical pedagogy in several ways. First, I acted as an initiator in this process, one of the hallmarks of a critical pedagogy class as defined by Shor (84). While I defined the scope of the activity, students brought to class current event topics of their choosing. Moreover, this activity works to get students involved in discussions about public discourse. Students could get their news from any source in any format: the Internet, TV, and/or print. I suggested as possible sources CNN, Times, Newsweek, Fox News, The Honolulu Advertiser, and The Star Bulletin (these last two were Hawai‘i’s main newspapers at the time). I recognize that many students are put off by this part of my class at first; however, past experience and responses in course evaluations over the years (including those from these two classes) indicate that many students cite this activity as one of the best parts of the class. I even welcome “entertainment” news involving celebrities and on sports. While at first such news can seem trivial to those of us interpellated by the traditional values of the academy, I have found such stories provide rich departure points for discussions on mainstream values, media representations, class, race, politics, etc.

Toward the middle of this semester, the shooting at Virginia Tech occurred. Both classes spent considerable amount of time discussing the shooting, what happened, teachers’ responsibilities, guns in the classroom, and an array of other connected topics. Current events were thus a main source of readings throughout the whole semester.

Another regular practice in both classes, and one that many teachers have long employed, involved us altering the traditional classroom seating arrangement. Shor
suggests that sitting in a circle as opposed to the more familiar rows of desks facing the teacher is one way to physically manifest the goals of critical pedagogy (119). In my Composition I course, sitting in a circle was relatively impossible as the class had been converted from an over-sized storage unit and was extremely narrow. I thus arranged the desks in one semi-circle row in back of a long table around which 5 students sat. In the Composition II course, we sat in circle almost every day. It became such a habit for students to rearrange the desks when they got to class that I often arrived to class having found that early students had already begun the rearranging. I didn’t, however, want to employ this sitting arrangement without explaining why—interrogating it as well as the “traditional” sitting arrangement. So in both cases we discussed the implication of each format and how the circle enabled a physical counter to positions of authority. I asked students questions like “why didn’t any of you come sit at the front of the classroom at this bigger desk?” and “why do you think your socialized behavior dictated you all sit in desks that face the bigger desk?” Students didn’t necessarily have answers to these questions, but they acknowledged that they enacted a behavior they didn’t recall ever being told was “right,” and, more importantly, most of them, until that point, had never questioned the sitting arrangement in the traditional classroom. In this way I reinforced to students that one of the ways that authority (or lack of authority) is assumed and bestowed is through the physical position one occupies.

The following is a brief overview of other work assigned in each of the courses. The work produced for these assignments became the data analyzed in the next chapter. In Chapter 6 the data that the assignments yielded is described within the context of the scholarly questions guiding the dissertation.
Assignment 1

While preparing for the final data collection, I felt I did not need any more data on which specific texts students were choosing to engage with. I now wanted to move my focus to the social behavior I was calling resistance. From my perspective, students largely resisted texts by and about Native Hawaiians. I now wanted to determine if 1) what I was calling resistance corresponded to how the students perceived it; and 2) what this resistance means from a student’s perspective. This first assignment was designed to do two things: 1) answer these questions, and 2) provide an avenue for students to participate as co-researchers by producing data on student resistance and then analyze that data.

This assignment (Appendix J), distributed to both classes during the first week of class, consisted of 10 individual writing assignments: 6 freewrites, 1 summary and response, 2 description papers, and 1 analysis paper. The assignment for both classes is identical despite that the courses are of different levels. In consultation with the then Director of Composition and Rhetoric in the English Department at UHM, I decided that using the same assignment was appropriate and could be designed to meet the expected course outcomes of the respective courses. The distinction between the levels of the courses would be determined in the writing produced by the students. I designed this assignment with the goal of getting students’ perspectives on resistance and with this dissertation’s research questions in mind. The description papers in particular asked students to provide a thick description of two events of their choosing that involved resistance. This exercise represents one way students fulfilled their role as co-researchers: for this assignment, students formally produced data that they determined would be relevant to the topic of student resistance. In the subsequent analysis paper, students
were asked to synthesize the data they had provided and formulate a hypothesis on the topic of student resistance. The requirements of Assignment 1, thus, introduced my students their role as co-researchers.

As will be discussed in Chapter 6, the assignment did indeed yield data that specifically addresses the scholarly questions of this dissertation. In other words, in addition to analyzing what resistance means, the assignment was designed to determine the extent to which the tenets of critical pedagogy are realized in a classroom where the students and teacher are co-researchers. By asking students to write on this topic, I hoped that I would find examples in their writing that either supported or disproved my claim that this model of teacher research is a critical pedagogy practice.

The assignment was broken up into three parts and the parts were meant to build upon each other as well as require students to write in different genres, a hallmark of both of the composition courses. The first half of the assignment asked the students to do three freewrites that were designed to 1) capture the ways in which what students perceived as resistance related to what I perceived as resistance; and 2) evoke response to the overall usefulness of the research project from the students’ perspective. As noted previously, the time constraints of the 16-week semester prohibited me from acquiring my students’ input on the usefulness and direction of the project before initial design. Asking students to comment on the “importance” of the overall topic of the project, however, allowed me to have some kind of information that represented their assessment of the project. The prompts for the freewrites, which were completed in class, are as follows:

1) What does it mean to resist something?
2) What does resistance look like? In other words, how do you know when someone is resisting?
3) Is it important for a teacher to understand why a student is resisting certain
text/discussion/activity? Why?

To get a better picture of the role location plays in students’ knowledge bases, the formal writing assignment in this section, the summary and response, asked students to examine how and where they acquired their opinions and feelings about a subject they feel passionate about:

1) Pick an issue you feel passionate about…really passionate. It can be on anything, sports, school, politics, smoking…anything, you just need to care about it.

2) Think about HOW you know what you know about this subject. Where did you get information on this subject? How did you form your opinion? Did you read something? Hear something? Experience something?

3) WITHOUT doing any research or reading on the issue, write a 2 page (600 words) SUMMARY of & RESPONSE to this issue. Describe the issue and the different viewpoints (summary). Then, discuss your opinion and what you think influenced your opinion (drawing from #2) (response).

The freewrites in the second part of the assignment were designed to elicit more specific examples of what resistance is, what influences it, and how it manifests. These freewrites are as follows:

1) What kinds of things influence someone to avoid talking about or doing something?

2) Do people resist different things in different situations? For example, might you resist talking about something with your parents that you would readily talk about with your friends or in school? What might you talk about with family but avoid elsewhere?

3) What kinds of topics are most likely to be avoided in school?³

The formal writing assignment in the second part asked students to describe in detail two specific events where they experienced resistance occurring: one in their private lives and one in an academic setting. Students were encouraged to include a “thick description” of the event. I hoped this part of the assignment would move the data from an abstract
discussion of resistance to very specific, detailed pictures of perceptions of resistance. Again, this work on the students’ part would help better illustrate whether, and if so how, I as the teacher limit my ideas about resistance. In addition, this fuller picture of resistance would also yield information of how the work of this project was important to my students, in this case, as research subjects.

The final part of this assignment asked students to synthesize and analyze the data they had produced. The directions for this part of the assignment are as follows:

Drawing from your written work produced for Parts I & II, write a 3 page analysis that addresses the issue of how, why, and when people avoid/resist certain issues. While the way each of you approach this paper will and should differ—in other words, your thesis statements will all be different—I want you to think about whether people behave differently in different situations, what influences their social behavior, and whether there is one dominant source that influences them more than others.

Students were required to include an overarching argument-driven thesis statement. This last part of the assignment not only fulfilled additional competencies of the course, such as analysis, citation (students were asked to cite their own work), and argument, it provided another source of data from which to examine students’ perceptions about resistance. Having several data sources addressing overlapping information would allow me to come closer to accurately interpreting the data. It goes without saying that it is relatively impossible to ensure complete accuracy when interpreting what someone writes or says, but asking students to write on the topic over a period of time in several different genres would increase the validity of any such interpretation. Gathering and cross-analyzing different genres of writing in such a manner correlates to triangulation. Many research scholars, notably Miles and Huberman, advocate triangulation as a means of strengthening the validity of qualitative research. Miles and Huberman also explain that
triangulation can be achieved several ways, including through a combination of methods and data sources. Having students write in different genres on different specific events yet with the same general focus, was one practice employed so as to attain a means of triangulation.

To ensure students were as candid in their work as possible considering the classroom context, it was necessary to minimize the focus on content in grading of this assignment. In class, we repeatedly discussed that they would not be graded on what they said, but rather how they said it and the extent to which they met the specific requirements of the assignment. We collaboratively designed a rubric (Appendix K) that both the students and I felt would allow me to assess their writing without inhibiting their freedom to express themselves in the assignment. Shor argues that students should participate in governance of the critical pedagogy class (176), and co-constructing a rubric is one way to facilitate collaborative governance. The students in both classes came up with remarkably similar rubrics. This phenomenon likely points to my own influence over the exercise of rubric formation, despite that I did not ask students to include any criteria specifically. Their familiarity as college students with the workings of institutions and the discipline of English as well as their understanding of what is expected of them and the “important” elements of writing probably also influenced this consistency. Students in the different classes came up with various words and phrases for certain criteria, but when I asked them to explain what they meant, I determined that they meant the same thing and encouraged students to approve the use a particular word so that the rubrics would be consistent. For example, some students offered proofreading as a criterion, others grammar. I suggested we use “Cosmetics” to encompass both of the
As this assignment demanded writing in four different genres, Summary, Response, Description, and Analysis, in both classes we spent considerable time talking about how to write in these different genres. We covered summary and response fairly quickly: these two genres make up the first writing assignments and this reflects that I consider them review exercises in genres most students have been exposed to in high school.4

Once we began with the two assignments that required thick description of two events, I incorporated more language associated with fieldwork and ethnography. I gave a very brief overview of the evolution of ethnography, highlighting the importance of the interpretive turn. We talked about the importance of trying to leave out subjective interpretations in thick description as well as to what extent leaving out subjective input is really possible. To convey that something a researcher might initially perceive as common knowledge might not be so simple, I told them the story of the wink that Geertz discusses in “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture.”

Finally, toward the end of Assignment 1, we began to discuss how to construct a thesis-driven essay, the requirement for the final paper in this assignment. I emphasized that their theses had to have an argument about resistance. In other words, they had to tell me they were going to discuss several ideas to show/argue/demonstrate some final summation about resistance based on the data they had gathered: students were told that their sources for this assignment would be made up of the freewrites, summary and response, and two thick descriptions they had already completed. There would be no outside sources. I didn’t want students to use outside sources because the primary
objective of this assignment was to determine what they thought about resistance. I thought that by limiting their material to what they had produced they would be more likely to express their own ideas. In addition, I simply felt that what I was asking them to do was complicated enough without requiring outside research. Similar to how I discuss citing in every other class I teach on writing, we talked about in-text citation, specifically how to reference your own work.

**Visual Image Analysis**

Like in the Fall 2006 course, students in both classes were asked to write an analytical essay on either a piece of Hawaiian art or an advertisement (Appendix L). This assignment was designed to facilitate students’ engagement with different genres of visual rhetorical artifacts. It was, however, assigned at different points in the semester in the two courses. In Composition I, this assignment was the second major assignment in the course, covering weeks 7-11. In Composition II, this assignment was the final assignment, covering weeks 13-16. Other than the time frame, this assignment, like the first assignment, was basically the same in the two courses.

In each class, we began this section discussing the artwork in ‘Ōiwi 3: A Native Hawaiian Journal: Huliau, the required text for the course. In addition to looking at the pictures and brainstorming as a class on the different possible interpretations and whether/how they represented Hawaiian culture, students were asked to read two pieces from ‘Ōiwi 3: a scholarly article entitled “Native Hawaiian Design: The Conveyance of Meaning through the Context of Culture” by the book’s graphic artist, Kamaka Kanekoa; and an overview with brief descriptions of several of the pictures provided by one of the artists, Anthony Kekona. Class discussions focused on the “story” the picture told and
what an individual might need to know in order to understand its meaning. We spent considerable time talking about how a picture could also hold strong meaning for an individual even though that person might not have extensive knowledge of the culture it represents.

During the second week, we discussed the WebPages for three companies: Guess, Abercrombie and Fitch, and Capital One. The discussions on the advertisements focused on how gender, race, and socioeconomic class are portrayed and targeted through an examination of the values that the ads exploited or reproduced. Students could then pick from either one of the pictures or one of the ads to write on. During weeks 3 and 4 of the assignment, students worked on their essays and had individual conferences with me.

As was the case in previous semesters, in addition to the essay, students were asked to write a cover letter that explained their choice to write on either Hawaiian artwork or advertisements. The prompts for cover letter are as follows:

1) Why did you choose to write the Image Analysis rather than the Advertisement Analysis or visa-versa?
2) Did you decide to write on this assignment before our class discussion, or did our discussion somehow change your mind? In other words, did discussion in class influence your decision on which assignment to write? How?
3) How is understanding Image/Advertisement in relation to the questions addressed in this assignment important? And, for whom is it important to understand these possible meanings of images/advertisements?
4) Is the other assignment also important? If not, what makes this one more important?

Like the fall 2006 course, the students in both the Composition I and Composition II course overwhelmingly chose to write on the Advertisement assignment over the Image analysis of Hawaiian Artwork. As a matter of fact, coincidentally, the exact same number of students in each class wrote on each assignment respectively: 14 on the
advertisement and 6 on the artwork. Unlike the Fall 2006 course, according to the survey, both of the classes had relatively few students who self-identify as Hawaiian: 2 and 1 respectively. However, a significant number of students in both classes self-identify as local to the islands, 9 and 13 respectively. Table 12 categorizes the reasons students in Composition I provided in their cover letters for choosing the Image Analysis and Table 13 distributes the reasons the students who wrote on the Advertisement gave for their choice. Tables 14 and 15 give the same information for the Composition II class. Among the 40 students, the answers have a significant amount of overlap. A large number of students in both classes, again the same exact number, indicated that they chose to write on the advertisements because of unfamiliarity with Hawaiian culture.

### Table 12: Reasons Composition I Students Chose Image Analysis, Spring 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th># of Students Indicating this Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liked the challenge/more to analyze</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in the culture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13: Reasons Composition I Students Chose Ad Analysis, Spring 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th># of Students Indicating this Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less familiar with Hawaiian culture/More familiar with ads</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationship to company</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More relevance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to observe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial content in ad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14: Reasons Composition II Students Chose Image Analysis, Spring 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th># of Students Indicating this Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important to understand/gain knowledge of Hawaiian culture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Interesting/complex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to students’ career (student is an artist)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Reasons Composition II Students Chose Ad Analysis, Spring 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th># of Students Indicating this Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less familiar with Hawaiian culture/More familiar</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to career</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interesting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More relevance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest in Hawaiian culture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students expressed their feeling of lack of knowledge in a variety of ways: “I still felt I was more knowledgeable in the advertisement assignment” (Comp.I); “I don’t really know much about Hawaiian culture” (Comp. I); “I had a better understanding of Advertisements over art influenced by Hawaiian culture” (Comp. I); “I had a lot more to say about [the advertisement]” (Comp. II); “I chose [the advertisement over the image] because of my unfamiliarity with the Hawaiian culture” (Comp. II); “I do not know much about what certain images mean in Hawaiian folklore” (Comp. II); “I felt I did not know the culture enough to make a really in-depth analysis of [the artwork]” (Comp. II). What makes these responses more interesting is that in class I repeatedly reiterated while someone with extensive knowledge of Hawaiian culture might write a paper that contextualizes the image within the particular cultural and historical situation of Hawai‘i, it did not prevent someone from doing a very strong and sensitive analysis of one of the pictures from a very individualized perspective. In other words, I tried to stress that the artwork was not only meant for a particular audience. Indeed, one student who is a graphic artist, obviously drawing from his own expertise and knowledge as an artist, wrote a strong critical analysis of the artwork discussing how the artist incorporated
traditional and modern techniques that represented the path he was helping to forge for modern art in Hawai‘i.

**The Education Essay**

For the third essay in the Composition I course, students were asked to write about their educational experience (Appendix M). In preparation for this essay, students read a story called “Homegrown” and “The Question,” a poem written in Pidgin by Noelle Kahanu. Both readings are in ‘Ōiwi 3: A Native Hawaiian Journal: Huliau. In addition, students were also asked to read Langston Hughes’s short story, “Salvation.” All three of these pieces include clear references to specific locations and the evolution of the respective themes are dependant on that location. Rather than having students write a form of literature analysis, this assignment was used to continue our collaborative research project. As the original premise about resistance included a supposition that the way it manifests is dependant on the location in which it occurs, I wanted to explore what students had to say (or didn’t have to say) about location. Using the readings as a departure point to think about how specific location impacts the characters in the stories in distinct ways, the assignment called for students to write according to this prompt:

A thesis driven paper on specific events—political concerns in Hawai‘i, required classes, classroom discussion, curriculum focus, ethnic make-up of the classroom, and community, etc.—that make your educational experience unlike what you think you would experience on the continent. Using specific illustrations of what and how, include in the paper a discussion of how you think these environmental factors influence your own social behavior in and out of school and ultimately affect the way you negotiate information. (Appendix M)

I realize now the language in this part of the directions is problematic. In the wording, “that make your educational experience unlike what you think you would experience on the continent,” there is clear assumption that the students unanimously
believe that their educational experience in Hawai‘i is different from what they would have on the continental U.S. Thus, although every student acknowledged that they do indeed believe their educational experience is different because of where they are, I can’t take that unanimous support of my assumption as an indication of anything other than the students wrote what they were asked to write. The essays produced in response to this prompt did include interesting commentaries on Hawai‘i and the United States in terms of commonplaces and stereotypes, all of which will be discussed at length in the next chapter; however, the wording I used in the prompt likely influenced students to set their educational experience up in a binary comparison to what they thought occurs within the continental U.S. In sum, while the wording of the prompt likely led them to articulate difference where they may not have otherwise, how they illustrated that difference is, I believe, still valuable in that students’ discussions revealed a lot about how they negotiate colonial narratives in Hawai‘i, like that of the “melting pot” and on being local.

**The Research Projects**

Both classes were assigned research projects that included producing a formal final paper and doing a 10-15 minute class presentation. As part of the learning objective in both of these courses is learning how to do research, the projects are broken up into parts that must be turned in for a grade. These “parts” include: a research proposal; a preliminary works cited page, properly formatted; 2-3 pages of notes from sources; a draft; peer group responses; and the final paper. This process is the same for both classes; however, the exact assignment differs between the two courses. I will explain each assignment briefly below as well as the readings that were discussed during the respective projects. In this section of both courses, I would consider the discussions and
readings part of what Shor calls “culturally censored” material in that we often discussed “political events not covered by the mass media [. . . so as to] disrupt the neat encirclement of thought in daily life” (122). In both classes, discussions often informed readings assigned and class conversations frequently involved perspectives on colonization as well as the Iraq and Afghanistan wars not often addressed in mainstream media.

In the Composition I course, during the final five weeks of the course, students were asked to write a 5-8 page paper on (almost) any topic of their choice (Appendix N). While the project demands some exploratory research, in the thesis-driven final paper the student must make some kind of argument. Students are asked to use a variety of sources including scholarly sources as well as at least one interview. Before the paper is due, each student presents his/her research to the class in a 10-15 minute presentation that includes some kind of visual aid. Most students chose to use PowerPoint for their presentation. During each student’s presentation, all his/her classmates wrote comments and questions about the presentation. At the end of his /her presentation, each student received approximately 19 sheets of comments, including one from me with the grade for the presentation. I strongly suggested that students use these comments as a guide as they do final revisions on their paper.

The week before this project began, I distributed an article supporting the Afghanistan War that included several different kinds of statistics and references to polls. We then discussed the problems with the information in terms of who these polled people represent and if there was missing information. For homework, students were asked to find a recent article that included numbers and/or statistics for support and critique it
within the context of this discussion (Appendix O). During the final five weeks of the course, I went over MLA citation, and the students took 3 short multiple-choice quizzes over a period of 2 weeks. I also discussed how to conduct interviews over the phone, in person, and via email as well as provided guidelines on constructing interview questions. In addition, we spent considerable time talking about how to write a research paper: the overall format, thesis, paragraph construction, development, organization, etc.

Topics that students chose to write on varied tremendously. Compared to other semesters, I believe there was slight increase in topics that deal with the larger society vs. those that relate specifically to the individual. Unfortunately, since I have kept no data on topics students wrote on in previous semesters, I cannot substantiate this perception beyond my own anecdotal reflections. Topics included: weight loss, religious tolerance, sports, body language, adoption from third world countries, legalization of marijuana, HPV, overpopulation in jails, tattoos, manifest destiny and white guilt, juvenile delinquents and rehabilitation, America’s obsession with plastic surgery, the drinking age vs. the enlistment age, and illegal immigration.

As mentioned above, the process of the research assignment for the Composition II class was the same as for the Composition I course, including the format for the presentations. However, as indicated in Appendix P, which includes the language on the assignment sheet distributed to the class, the Composition II students were asked to work in groups and write a minimum of 10 pages on a topic specifically related to Hawai‘i. I also tried something I had never done before: this project was assigned to cover weeks 7-12 rather than the final weeks of the course. A motivating factor behind this decision was that I know students are pressured at the end of the semester, and I thought perhaps I
would get better work if they did this big project when they weren’t dealing with the demands of other classes at the close of the semester. So as to invite my students’ input on class governance in terms of this assignment, I presented the class with this option and asked them what they thought. They overwhelmingly decided they would prefer to do their “big” project early; so, that’s what we did. Students’ reflections on the overall impact of assigning the research project at this point in this semester will be discussed more fully in Chapter 6. Briefly, it wasn’t so much the timing of the project that proved challenging but my asking them to work in groups.

As the Composition II course did not need as much guidance in terms of essay construction and MLA citation, I assigned several readings, and we watched excerpts from films. All the reading we did had some reference to controversial issues in Hawai‘i; however, I chose them following class discussions, and they were selected because they related to what we were discussing. For background, students read an excerpt from Cristina Bacchilega’s *Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place*. I also gave the students newspaper articles on the Rice v. Cayetano case (see Chapter 3) and the testimonies to the Hawai‘i State Legislature regarding tuition waivers for Native Hawaiians. In addition we watched *Mauna Kea: Temple Under Siege*, a film about the telescopes on Mauna Kea. A recurring topic in class during this time was blood quantum. My students had a lot of questions: who came up with the idea of blood quantum? How is it determined? What does it afford someone? What does it exclude someone from?

Another recurring topic was homelessness. I was impressed and moved at how concerned my students were about homelessness. Their constant return to this topic countered recent commonplaces that describe this generation as isolated and removed from social issues.
Students were told that they could make any issue relate to Hawai‘i as national and global issues do affect us. Despite this, all students chose topics very specific to Hawai‘i. The titles of their research papers included: Hawaiian Homelessness and Land Rights Struggles, Homelessness in Hawai‘i: Ideas for a Solution, Homelessness and State Services, Water Use in Hawai‘i, and Makua Valley as a Sacred Place.

Data

In this section, I summarize the volume of data collected over the course of the semester and how I handled the data. There were a total of twenty students in the Composition I class and twenty-one from whom I collected data in the Composition II class; thus the maximum possible formal pieces of writing I could collect for any assignment is 41. There were instances, as is indicated in the totals below, that some students did not turn work in or turn it in on time, so their work is not included in the corpus of data. After the semester ended, I scanned all formal student writing that I had collected from all students into the computer: Assignment 1 from both the Composition I and Composition II class (41 student packets made up of four writing assignments for each student, for a total of 164 assignments); the cover letter to the Image Analysis Assignment from both the Composition I and Composition II class (40 letters, 1 missing from the Composition II class); the Education Essay from the Composition I course only (20 essays); Group Research papers from the Composition II class (10 papers); and Research Proposals from the Composition I class (17 proposals). This resulted in over 600 pages of scanned data.

After it was scanned, the data was loaded into INVIVO software, a qualitative data analysis software that facilitates the sorting, categorization, and analysis of data. I
then coded and ran inquiries on the data. Much of the numerical as well as qualitative data represented in the following chapter was acquired from this process. Handwritten assignments, such as freewrites, I coded by hand. Each class was assigned six freewrites; however, I only coded the writing that was readable. This resulted in 17 freewrite packets from the Composition I course and 18 from the Composition II course, for a total of 210 freewrites. Finally, anonymous end-of-semester evaluations are also used as data. These evaluations were given on the last day of the semester to each class at the end of the class period. As is the practice in our department, I distributed the evaluations and requested a volunteer to collect the evaluations after all students had completed them and bring them to our department office. I then left the classroom. A total of 19 from the Composition I class and 18 evaluations were collected from the Composition II course.

Conclusion

In the previous pages, I have described the format of the courses I taught in the spring of 2007. I gave an overview of the courses I designed and the assignments I wrote to answer research questions I constructed. Reconciling the tremendous amount of authority I have over this project with my desire to enlist my students as co-researchers is largely realized through the methodology guiding this project. Informed by this methodology, several of the assignments were designed to specifically facilitate students’ roles as co-researchers (Assignment I), and other assignments (the freewrites) were designed to gather student input on the importance of the project.

The corpus of data gathered in the context of our work as co-researchers represent the discussions that occurred in the classroom and the written work students produced in response to these assignments. The next chapter, Chapter 6, will address the extent to
which these classroom interactions and writings demonstrate that students responded to my teacher research course design in ways that can be aligned with critical pedagogy. I will explain some of the interactions that took place during the course of the semester and the writing produced within the frame of this dissertation’s scholarly questions. Much of this work includes commentaries on sensitive subjects such as ethnicity and racism. Moreover, in this particular classroom scenario, there occurred moments when students asserted authority over their own learning. There is also material that points to the extent to which students have seemingly internalized and reproduce stereotypes and commonplaces that are grounded in the specific geographic location of the university. While the project may have worked on some level, or in some moments, to disrupt, counter, or otherwise, intervene in those commonplaces, I do not think that I was able to achieve these outcomes in the way I would ultimately hope for in this project. Collectively, the content of the data does, however, correspond in significant ways with the kinds of topics promoted in critical pedagogy, such race, gender, and socioeconomic class, and reaffirms that this teacher research model is a critical pedagogy.
Notes

I also collected data during this same semester from a hybrid Composition I course I was teaching at Kapiʻolani Community College. However, after considering all the variables influencing the students and my teaching in this course—it being taught half online, the students attending an institution with a slightly different demographic and academic objective than that of the university—I decided to not use the data collected from the class in the data sets represented in this section. However, as I have done elsewhere in this dissertation, I do refer to events that happened in my online classes when they corroborate or contradict findings indicted by the data collected from my UH courses in significant ways.

Appendix H includes the language on the syllabus for both the Composition I and Composition II courses. As is the case with several of the assignments (Assignment 1, The Visual Image Analysis, and the Research Project), the syllabus for the two courses is largely the same. The two differ in that the Composition I syllabus includes the UHM Written Communications Hallmarks for the course and the syllabus for the Composition II course includes the college’s description of the course. The syllabus in the appendix includes the language from both syllabi as indicated in bold.

I used the word “avoid” in these prompts to imply resistance. I realized later that my use of that particular word is leading and problematic. I do not, however, want to misrepresent what I asked student to write on; therefore I include the language used in the prompts exactly as it was given to the students.
Students often tell me that they have had assignments asking them to write in the genre of summary and response in high school. Moreover, these assignments appear early in popular Composition I texts, such as several of those by Allyn & Bacon.
CHAPTER 6
Research Subjects as Co-Researchers: Students Teach Me

My students and I began the semester co-researching student resistance. This research not only yielded rich information on a variety of subjects that go beyond resistance, but working together seemed to set a tone for interactions that continued throughout the semester. After inviting their input on research so early in the semester, many of the students continued to interact in ways that suggest collaborative involvement in a variety of aspects of the classes, including class management: for example, several offered constructive comments and suggestions on the content and delivery of assignments. As the course moved on, students continued to produce writing that included discussions on very complex, “located” issues, such as their education in Hawai‘i, perceptions on racism both in Hawai‘i and on the continental U.S., the extent my students have been interpellated by American dominant discourse, and the questioning of some of that discourse. Collectively these interactions indicate that a teacher research project that involves students as co-researchers and accounts for the specific place/s relevant to their lives facilitates the goals of critical pedagogy. In specific terms, working with students in this context in these courses resulted in students talking and writing about the discourses they engage. Moreover, this approach resulted in students locating themselves in relation to their home lives, communities, the state, and the university, which yielded commentaries that reveal what students seem to understand about the relationship between location and learning. In the following sections, I discuss these data in the context of the scholarly questions guiding this dissertation and outlined
in the preceding chapter: how students responded to a teacher-research project that is explicitly in service of critical pedagogy?; what outcomes arose from students’ involvement as co-researchers?; and what are the disciplinary implications of these findings? These questions guide how I discuss the data, but just as each question builds upon the previous, it would be reductive to answer each question individually. Instead, I have created sections in this chapter that identify themes that emerged in the writing and discussions, and within those themes I engage the questions.

**Resistance, Critical Pedagogy, & Location**

Collectively, the responses from the freewrites from Assignment 1 draw attention to some interesting findings on students’ perspectives about resistance that relate to education in general and critical pedagogy practices specifically. In this section, I will discuss the responses to the freewrites in the context of the classes’ research topic, resistance, and the implications in the context of the scholarship in the field on critical pedagogy and resistance. I will then extend this conversation to include analysis of students’ commentaries in terms of the impact of location on social behaviors such as resistance. Appendix Q lists the keywords and phrases taken from each of the freewrites produced by both the Composition I and Composition II courses. These lists, however, are only a departure point for the much more nuanced conversations that emerged in the freewrites; thus, in what follows I will often quote from these freewrites.

The responses to Freewrite #1 (*What does it mean to resist something?*) for example, possibly offer some insight into the disjuncture between the concept of resistance within the frame of critical pedagogy and resistance to critical pedagogy as noted in the scholarship. As discussed in Chapter 1, a goal for many critical pedagogy
practitioners is to empower students so as to facilitate their ability to resist hegemonic discourse and/or oppressive power structures. This kind of resistance suggests actions that are planned and thought out, perhaps even actions that are undertaken by a group of individuals. When Giroux and Freire are talking about resistance to oppressive forces as an end result of critical pedagogy, there is implication that there is forethought in regard to such resistance: students can identify what and why they are resisting and possibly even how they will resist. A 2005 rally at the University of Hawai‘i campus exemplifies this kind of resistance: students protested and conducted a sit-in at the university President’s office to protest the inclusion of a military-funded research program at the university. Many, if not all, of the students could explain, at least minimally, that the reason they were protesting was because accepting such funding had wider implications in terms of the authority the military and government would have over the school.

Resistance, in the context of critical pedagogy is thus largely a social action with the goal of social change (although individuals do benefit from such actions at some point). In the forty-one responses to Freewrite #1, while there were mentions of resistance to political or social agendas, the majority of students did not immediately associate resistance with such social and organized actions. Rather, most students explained resistance as an individual’s response rather than a collective movement or as public opposition. In other words, resistance, as explained in the answers to this freewrite, is mostly associated with the personal as opposed to the social. Even when students mentioned resistance to talking about controversial subjects such as religion, abortion, or sexuality, resistance was presented as manifesting because of personal feelings of discomfort or disagreement. For example, one student from the Composition I
course wrote, “Resistance is trying to protect yourself either physically, mentally, or even spiritually. An individual resists only to keep their own view point true for themselves personally.” A close read of this excerpt suggests that the student’s thinking is on track toward more social involvement in terms of resistance; it can easily be imagined how trying to protect oneself can evolve into a collective movement when a group of individuals are trying to protect themselves from the same thing. However, the repeated use of words like “personally” and “own” indicate that resistance is at least initially perceived as a social behavior tied to personal and even individualized experiences.

A response from a Composition II student similarly points to resistance being personal. Although the student makes no specific mention of public opposition, there does seem room for the idea of resistance to evolve toward such actions. The student writes:

Resistance can be defiance in the face of an authority figure trying to force opinions. Authority causing you to do something you would rather not. Resistance is an internal struggle to fight off those words we don’t want to hear. [. . .]

Resistance can be physical as well, but most likely the physical is a manifestation of the internal resistance.

Again, this response comes very close to addressing the kind of resistance advocated in critical pedagogy: resistance to oppressive authority. However, the repeated use of the word “internal” suggests that the resistance is still occurring on a private level. Perhaps these responses shed some light on what many critical pedagogues have noted as resistance to critical pedagogy practices, at least for these particular students. If, as these responses indicate, these students see resistance as a behavior that occurs mostly in their
personal interactions, maybe they are still defining their own roles in relation to larger social structures. The use of words that correlate to self, like “own,” “personal,” and “internal,” imply that resistance is an individualized and personal response; however, the examples both students use to explain the purpose resistance serves (self-preservation in one case and to counter oppressive authority in the other) point to these students also seeing resistance as occurring within larger social contexts.

Overall, most students represented resistance in ways that fall into the “personal” category. For example, one student wrote that resistance means to “not give into temptation.” Another student echoed this association between resistance and temptation saying that she “resists eating” when she’s hungry. Many students in the Composition I course also associated resisting with lack of knowledge (“The only thing I am resistant on is things I don’t know. I guess it is because I don’t like talking about things I do not know”; “I resist something if I do not know anything about the situation.”) Students in the Composition II course talked about resistance in terms of not accepting ideas that are uncomfortable or that the recipient did not agree with. In terms of this second group of responses, examples did include discussions of larger social issues such as abortion and gay rights.

Analyzing the responses holistically, a pattern did emerge. In general, more students discussed resistance in terms of something that happens to preserve or benefit the individual self. Like the responses described in the opening of this section, several responses explained this preservation of the self with examples that point to resistance falling within the social sphere. For example, students expressed resistance in terms of an internal response to any kind of force trying to change their minds on a social issue like
the war in Iraq. No one, however, associated resistance explicitly with a social movement; in other words, not one student discussed resistance in terms of showing up at a rally, holding signs, boycotting, or any other activity commonly associated with a public group protest. From our discussions in class I learned that almost every student had been taught in school about leaders like Ghandi and/or Martin Luther King and could discuss these men specifically in terms of “resistance”: they knew they were both associated with passive resistance and that their resistance involved large social issues. Yet in their writing I saw little evidence of perceiving resistance in terms of what many had obviously been taught it meant in school.

I interpret the overwhelming focus on resistance as a behavior associated with personal gain or preservation as a representation of these (mostly) young adults being in the process of locating themselves within a social sphere. Perhaps in the course of an individual transitioning into becoming a responsible adult capable of negotiating and resisting dominant discourse to benefit himself and his communities, the accent should be on the transitioning and not the resisting. The juxtaposition of terms that are very personal with concepts that are more social in the responses could imply that students have an understanding of social behaviors (like resistance) in terms of how they benefit one’s self, and this perception of the role of behavior (i.e., resistance) changes as students reposition themselves in increasingly larger social contexts. In short, critical pedagogues may not see students resisting dominant discourses in ways that critical pedagogy advocates simply because many are not. Not yet, anyway (a claim I will qualify shortly).

Responses to Freewrite #2 (What does resistance look like? In other words, how do you know when someone is resisting?) may offer further insight into the disjuncture
between what resistance means as a tenet of critical pedagogy and for my students. In comparison to other responses to this freewrite, a majority of students indicated that resistance took on what I, drawing from my students’ terminology, classify as a passive social behavior (most students used passive to represent resistance that is hard to “see” despite that they were familiar with passive resistance movements throughout history such as those led by Ghandi and Martin Luther King). Students overwhelmingly noted that aversion or avoidance (including averting one’s eyes) is a significant manifestation of resistance. Combined with silence, there were 21 mentions of these forms of passive resistance. Of the behaviors mentioned that I classified as active, verbal resistance was noted most by students, followed by violence, then crossing the arms. Notably, of these “active resistance” behaviors mentioned, two of the three are not overtly physical. Unquestionably, verbal resistance can be extremely effective, but students mostly indicated verbal resistance to mean verbal fighting that involves yelling and screaming. I was also intrigued by the very specific mention of pushing by several students as a form of resistance. I couldn’t help but wonder, when examined together with the comments by students about verbal resistance involving yelling and screaming, if many of them understood resistance within the context of the personal and involving physical confrontation, as in fights among family members or with boy/girl friends.

That students see resistance most commonly manifesting as avoidance rather than confrontation could be the result of a variety of phenomena. I’ll offer two conjectures. The first relates to the theory I presented above, that students, my students anyway, are changing in their perceptions of themselves from exclusively as individuals to individuals who are part of larger social network with rights and responsibilities to that social
structure. In other words, they are changing from people mostly concerned with their immediate lives into participants in larger social structures. Eric Ball and Alice Lai have similarly conjectured that “developmental readiness” may be one factor influencing reception of critical pedagogy (272), and this premise is also supported by several theories on developmental stages, most notably Erik Erikson’s. According to Erikson, these students would mostly be in the 5th (from puberty to 18-20: ego identity and role confusion) and 6th (ages 18-30 intimacy and isolation) stages of development. According to George Boeree, successful completion of stage five results in individuals formulating their ego identity, which results in “knowing who you are and how you fit in to the rest of society.” One of the outcomes of this stage is “that you have found a place in [your] community, a place that will allow you to contribute.” In stage six individuals acquire the ability to love, which “includes not only the love we find in a good marriage, but the love between friends and the love of one's neighbor, co-worker, and compatriot as well.”

Applying these stages of development to my students and using them as a frame in which to interpret their comments, they could be (somewhere) in the process of working out their ego identity, figuring out where they fit in the larger community and establishing social relationships. Thus, they may not be ready to challenge the hegemonic discourse that critical pedagogues (rightfully, I would argue) see as so threatening, but this does not mean that they never will. The social behaviors enacted in classrooms during the transitions that these young adults are going through might manifest in ways that are perceived by teachers as resisting their critical pedagogy practices. For example, in a more recent class, my students and I were discussing the civil union bill that is the focus of much political discussion in Hawai‘i. As a critical pedagogy teacher, I see
support of civil unions and gay marriage as a move toward securing equal rights for a marginalized group; however, in class at least five students verbally stated that they were against civil unions because they are Christian. Had I let these statements go uncommented on, I might have understood them within the context of students resisting my pedagogy in terms of its promotion of equality. But I didn’t leave the statements unanswered nor did I try to convince the students to change their minds. I instead countered by acknowledging the students’ position on the issues and then asked if their position means they would prevent someone from living his/her life in a way that they wanted to. In all five cases, the students paused for a few moments and then said no, they would not make laws to require someone else to live how they believe unless that person was “hurting” someone, and all agreed that being in a gay relationship in and of itself did not constitute the kind of “hurting” they were referring to.

Had I challenged the students by advocating gay rights and gay marriage, these exchanges may not have ended like this. My arguments may have won the students over, but they may have also alienated the students and resulted in resistance to further discussion on the matter. I don’t believe these students were resisting me as much as they were negotiating their personal beliefs by taking a stand on issues in ways that affect a larger group of people. Thus, perceived resistance may actually be the result of students not yet seeing their role in the world the same as some teachers expect them to.

My second conjecture more specifically relates to this group of students and where they are. It is important to remember that the students I am discussing are in a particular location with distinct cultural and social influences. The extent to which these social and cultural influences impact responses provided to these freewrites is difficult to
determine. However, students themselves indicated in their writing that home and culture strongly affect resistance and how it manifests. For example, one student wrote, “One of the main factors that result in resistance is the family that people are brought up in. Things such as religion, [economic] status, being a board member in a community, and values.” And another wrote, “[Resistance] has a lot to do with past experiences as well as the family you were bought up in.” Religion was also mentioned frequently by students, as is the case in this response: “One of these influences could be the morality of the situation . . . which could stem from parental guidance or religion.” This, then, begs the question, is the association of resistance with avoidance, aversion, and silence a by-product of cultural influences? While it is not uncommon in both private and public discourse communities to hear a very specific behavior like avoidance being associated with a particular culture/ethnicity (I myself have heard a version of this expressed by fellow faculty as well as family members), it is exceedingly difficult to operationalize such an association so as to determine its validity. However, an examination of students’ comments does suggest a general correlation between culture and social behavior and can work to illustrate the located perceptions and experiences that may play a role in guiding such behaviors.

The responses to Freewrite #4 (What kinds of things influence someone to avoid talking about or doing something?) indicate that a majority of students feel experiences in their private lives play a significant role in what and how they resist. The most common responses to this freewrite were Past experiences (33%), Values/morals/personal beliefs (25%), and Upbringing (25%). While “Past Experiences” probably does also include experiences in the academy, all three groups of responses also
encompass life outside the academy, which has a likelihood of involving family life on some level and subsequently place. While the phrases themselves can represent universal ideas, how they manifest is linked to location. Family, values, and how someone is raised are not a-located. At a most mundane level, what children do in their daily lives—how often they play outside, what activities they participate in, and whether they mostly eat rice, potatoes, or pasta—is affected by their culture and where they are. Values and beliefs are particularly tied to culture, which is most often associated with a specific ethnicity and/or location.

As discussed in Chapter 2, physical location impacts cultural practices. For example, while there are undoubtedly similarities between the Japanese culture Japanese Americans on the continent and in Hawai‘i experience, there are also differences. The phenomenon that many Japanese Americans on the continent are frequently grouped together with other Asians into an “Asian American” conglomerate alone influences how they experience their cultural identity. As noted in Chapter 3, that collective reference to all people Asian rarely occurs in Hawai‘i. This is just one example of how location has an impact on culture and identity. One student’s statement, which represents a sentiment expressed by many students, draws a strong correlation between culture and location through its implication that culture is a product of location. He wrote simply that “Hawai‘i has a unique cultural background”; however, his phrasing implies that culture is tied to place, not necessarily people. Another student highlighted several commonplaces about local culture that, while problematic (I offer an analysis of such statements in a later section), similarly cast culture in Hawai‘i as bound by geographic borders: “In contrast to the rest of the world, Hawai‘i is undeniably a special and distinctive place to
live in. The ethnic make-up, local customs, and knowledge of lifestyles and unique history of Hawai‘i allow the state’s residents to identify themselves as ‘local.’” These responses thus indicate that students themselves are aware that where they are impacts culture and, in turn, influences how they interact.  

Several students did complicate this homogenous and celebratory representation of culture in Hawai‘i with discussions of how located cultural influences impact negative social behaviors. One student begins with what appears to be the common “no place like Hawai‘i” discourse but problematizes that statement by stating corresponding repercussions:

In Hawai‘i, we experience a unique mixture of people and cultures creating a society that is unlike any other in the world. […] Despite, or perhaps because of, the fact that we are slightly isolated, the people of Hawai‘i contain many different and integrated cultural aspects that affect the way we think and act. The highly diverse population affects the way we develop stereotypes and discriminatory practices in places like the classroom, in public, or just in our work. Another student explains racism in Hawai‘i by distinguishing it from racism on the continent: “On the mainland ethnic groups like Hispanic or Mexican would be thought of as the lower rung of society. Their people working in the less desirable jobs. Here, we see this group as Filipinos. They are the ones that clean lawns and bathrooms.” These two excerpts give a different view of Hawai‘i, one seldom discussed but which students are obviously aware of.

Such commentaries are valuable in understanding the many forces at work in one place, how they influence students’ social behaviors, as well as how such forces might be
in conflict. In her article “The Politics of Place: Student Travelers and Pedagogical Maps,” speaking in the context of the discipline of composition and rhetoric, Julie Drew argues that “working within a politics of place for writing instruction is an ongoing project” but continues offering the following caveat:

What may be problematic, however, in our current thinking about the place of discursive learning is that students often exist for compositionists exclusively within the classroom, when the material reality of their lives, and the places they inhabit suggest that this is only a partial picture at best…[and] the places of discursive pedagogy are not only multiple, but in conflict… (60)

Student writing in the freewrites, description papers, and analysis papers completed for Assignment 1 overwhelmingly reflected an awareness of this multiplicity and conflict. Rarely, outside of scholarly work, is Hawaii’s acclaimed diversity discussed in terms of its corresponding discriminatory practices specifically as they relate to people of color being the victims of inequity. When such topics are broached, they are often framed in a “reverse racism” context wherein previously marginalized groups, particularly Hawaiians, are accused of racist practices, as has been the case with critiques of Kamehameha Schools admissions practices and interpretations of Sovereignty movements. Students’ discussions thus more fully capture distinctions between ethnic groups within Hawai‘i and how one group’s experiences might differ from what the same ethnic group experiences elsewhere. As such, students’ comments like these add depth and complicate the normed categories of race, gender, and ethnicity by nuancing them within located experiences.
The kind of “on-the-spot” writing a student produces in a freewrite is both revealing and problematic. It is problematic in that sometimes in a freewrite the writer doesn’t have the time to articulate what he wants to say so that it best represents his ideas, or the writer may not be invested in the exercise and just write anything; however, in my own experiences as a writer and teacher, freewrites also correlate loosely to a kind of free association exercise that potentially produces revealing insights. As the discussions on the previous pages show, when combined with samples from other writings these freewrites definitely point to the extent of my students’ awareness of the significance of family, culture, and place on who they are and how they interact.

To get a fuller picture of the role of family and home life according to the students, I now turn to what students wrote in formal writing exercises. One of the assignments in this corpus is the analysis essay for Assignment 1. It is important to note that this assignment asked students to revisit their own freewrites as well as the summary and response and descriptive papers and draw from those writings in their analysis. This exercise gave each student the opportunity to revisit the writing he did for previous assignments, which perhaps allowed him to reconsider his own responses to the freewrites and use only what he felt was a meaningful and accurate representation of what he wanted to convey.

**Family and the Myth of the Melting Pot**

Students were not asked to write about family, but the actual word “family” was mentioned 81 times and “mother” and/or “father” was mentioned 33 times in formal papers throughout the semester. As the first analysis papers for both Composition I and Composition II were on resistance and the second paper for the Composition I course was
the Education Essay, one could argue that these assignments lend themselves to students talking about family. However, the words “family,” “mother,” and or “father” were mentioned only 60 times in these assignments; the remaining 21 times, or 25%, that family was mentioned were in the visual and image analysis or in the context of the research projects. A number of students expressed that family is an important influence impacting how students interact at school. That students correlate family with school interaction is reflected in what one student wrote about a quiet classmate, “I concluded that it was the way he was brought up, probably had family issues.” Others said there are certain issues that should be kept within the family and that, contrary to topics appropriate to discuss in school, with family anything would be ok because family always accepts you. The sentiment of one student, “Family is one of the most important parts of someone’s life” was repeated by many others in the writing. Collectively, I do not find these comments all that striking. Students from any other place, such as California or New York, might similarly highlight family in their experiences. What I do find noteworthy is that many students in the Composition I course, 50%, made statements in the Education Essay about family that implied it is more significant for people in Hawai‘i in general than for their counterparts on the continental United States. And whether accurate or not, these perceptions, which I present on the following pages, are implicated in students’ subjectivities, social behaviors, and learning.

In discussions of family as well as in relation to other topics, students made some sweeping (and stereotypical) distinctions between life in Hawai‘i and within the continental United States. One of the distinctions implied in student writing is that family plays a more significant role for those living in Hawai‘i than for those on the continent.
and that friends are more frequently invited into the family fold. These comments were numerous despite that there was no indication in any of the writing that this assumption was based on actual experience in terms of the role family plays with individuals on the continent. Moreover, there was no evidence that students recognized that there is not one uniform role family plays for all individuals in the United States, or Hawai‘i for that matter. For example, one student wrote, “Family is another big part of Hawai‘i and the lifestyle here.” Another student wrote, “Since this is Hawai‘i, you have that feeling of family even with people you’re just beginning to know.” This last statement was echoed by another student who wrote, “In Hawai‘i, generally everyone you know is kind of your family.” Students cited the diversity in the population as aiding this familial feel: “[Hawai‘i] is a place of diversity, a place where locals can live as family.”

In addition to these comments, students also asserted that the diversity and tensions resulting from that diversity are minimal in Hawai‘i compared to what occurs on the continent, as exemplified in the comment, “The Hawai‘i lifestyle allows certain situations to be accepted whereas they would be uncomfortable or misunderstood on the mainland.” This student followed this comment with, “The religions and traditions in Hawai‘i are endlessly diverse and each one is accepted as readily as another.” The proximity between the two sentences suggests an implication that diversity in religion is more readily accepted in Hawai‘i. An African-American student born and raised in Hawai‘i distinguished the treatment she receives here from what she perceives she would experience on the continent:

Go to any college on the mainland and I guarantee there will be people who are considered a minority [. . .] Here [In Hawai‘i. . .] I do not have that problem;
people take me for who I am and they do not ostracize me because of where I come from or the color of my skin.

In these statements, students do not necessarily go as far as to state how they think (or know) they might be treated on the continent, the role family plays for individuals who reside there, or how that experience would differ from what they see as normed interactions in Hawai‘i. Nor is there any acknowledgement that the continental United States is a big place with diverse cultures too. The use of “here” and “in Hawai‘i” in these statements provides a sharp distinction from the unsaid “there” or “on the continent,” implying that what happens “here” is different from what happens “there.” Students who wrote statements like these seem to be positioning these ideas as relatively unique to Hawai‘i — this phenomenon is happening in Hawai‘i — which suggests it is not happening elsewhere or at least not regularly.

Several in-class transfer/out-of-state students reinforced that familial relations differ in Hawai‘i as well, thus validating their classmates’ perceptions. One such student commented, “I notice on the mainland, and with my family, that we are not as close as families in Hawai‘i. Mainlanders don’t eat dinner together, spend time together, or talk to each other like families here do.” This particular student had recently moved to Hawai‘i to attend UH. It is interesting to note how quickly he adopted this sweeping perception of Hawai‘i and the counter perception of families on the continent, even using the term mainland (which I will address shortly). The prevalence of statements like these make it seem as if there is a heightened sense of family in Hawai‘i, a perception that demands interrogation. It is not the work of this project to undertake an inquiry into the validity of such statements, but I venture to say that there are far too many variables to support such
a perception. Obviously, there is more than one kind of family on the continent, making it difficult to argue that family is not as important to individuals on or from the content. Moreover, these statements lack any evidence of a fundamental awareness that the continent itself is a huge geographic location that encompasses a vast number of distinct locations, cultures, and ideological frameworks. However, perception significantly impacts subjectivity, so students’ ideas about family cannot be dismissed merely because they may be inaccurate representations. Moreover, that the distinctions students articulated in terms of family are reliant on geographic borders further affirms that location impacts perceptions, which through its relationship with subjectivity, influences social behaviors.

Perhaps even more worrisome from a teacher’s point of view than this blanket essentializing of the continental United States is that such statements reproduce the discourse that sells Hawai‘i as an idyllic paradise free of problems. In the context of praising Hawai‘i’s attributes, my students did not demonstrate any acknowledgement of the disturbing realities in Hawai‘i that complicate this picture of family being welcoming, warm, providing support to individuals, and generally fun to be around. Many of these statements by students were followed with sentences depicting large families assembling at the beach or a designated home on the weekends to eat and have a good time. My personal experience confirms that such gatherings do occur, and maybe even occur frequently for some families. But there are other realities in Hawai‘i. For example, according to the Hawai‘i City and County website, Hawai‘i has the highest number of arrests involving crystal methamphetamine in the nation, and according to the Department of Health and Human Services there were over 1700 cases of confirmed
child abuse cases in Hawai‘i in 2008, not to mention the growing problem of homelessness in the state. Such issues do not by themselves contradict that family is important in Hawai‘i, but they do call into question the health of the family unit. All too frequently the problems mentioned above are connected, and combined they complicate the perception that the family unit in Hawai‘i is intact and healthy in general. This discourse that everyone is family and family is an important part of daily life works to promote the idea that “we all get along,” a problematic perception reproduced by another discourse that emerged in student writing.

A significant amount of student writing reproduced the mainstream discourse that Hawai‘i is a “melting pot” where an ethnically diverse population lives in harmony, which many students argued is unlike the continent. One student represented life in Hawai‘i with the statement, “We grow up with a classroom full of what the mainland calls ‘minority’ cultures. On their cultural holidays, the kids usually bring in something to share with the class….” And another student wrote, “The ethnic make-up of Hawai‘i allows Hawai‘i locals to identify with each other, allowing for a sense of fellowship and mutual coexistence.” I might argue that to some extent what these students say does happen, but this “kumbaya” representation is problematically reductive and, like the discourse on family that the students produced, belies complicating issues. For example, when I grew up and attended public school in Hawai‘i, a certain day of the school year was designated “kill haole day,” and December 7 (the anniversary of the Bombing of Pearl Harbor) was “slap Jap” day. My younger nieces and nephews have confirmed that these “days” are still talked about at school (although I could not confirm whether they result in any physical altercations as they did when I was in primary school). Moreover,
while Hawai‘i may experience a high level of inter-racial marriages, there are micro-
locations that are associated with specific ethnicities. On O‘ahu, for example, Kailua is
most commonly associated with Caucasians, Kalihi with Filipinos, Wai‘anae with
Hawaiians, Hawai‘i Kai with Caucasians and Japanese, to name a few of the location-
ethnicity relations. And, of course these areas also represent different levels of
socioeconomic privilege. To continue with the previous examples, Kailua and Hawai‘i
Kai are considered very wealthy areas whereas Kalihi and Waianae are low-income
areas; however, despite the reality, the melting pot discourse is prevalent, and it is a
powerful tool that works to keep people in their “place.”

In her article “Disrupting the ‘Melting Pot’: Racial Discourse in Hawai‘i and the
Naturalization of Haole,” Judy Rohrer explains how this idea of Hawai‘i being a melting
pot where all live in harmony has been used politically to promote a colonial agenda.
Rohrer asserts that this harmonious and democratic representation of Hawai‘i was “so
compelling [. . .] that it quickly became integrated into local discourse, political speeches,
novels and tourist propaganda” (1113). She goes on to explain that such discourse
perpetuates the narrative used to sell Hawai‘i and diminish colonizing violence. Rohrer
argues that Hawai‘i as melting pot suggests that there is no single ethnicity representing a
significant majority in the population, that there is a high rate of intermarriage, and the
discourse emphasizes the welcoming nature of the host culture; however, “while all these
claims have some basis, this discourse exaggerates and manipulates them while ignoring
complicating data” (1113-1114). The melting pot narrative works to mask power
structures that influence life in Hawai‘i, the disparity in socioeconomic privilege that is
often drawn along ethnic lines, and, probably the most problematic, the extent to which
Hawaiians have been disenfranchised in the place they can rightfully claim as theirs.

Not surprisingly, the term *local* becomes a vehicle through which this homogenizing of ethnicity and socioeconomic class also takes place in student writing. One student’s comment, for example, reinforced the perception that *local* equates to peace among all in the group: “Being knowledgeable about the lifestyle and history of Hawai‘i also plays an important role in locals’ inclination to identify themselves as locals and peacefully reside with other locals.” As discussed in Chapter 2, *local* is (as it is used here), at the very least, a problematic term in Hawai‘i. And, as the way these students use it demonstrates, it is often invoked to mask racial as well as socioeconomic inequality and contested claims to Hawai‘i as ancestral homeland. Speaking only in reference to Asian settlers in Hawai‘i, Candace Fujikane asserts, “Asian settler political power in Hawai‘i is concealed by evocations of ‘local’ solidarity.” Fujikane goes on to explain that *local*, like melting pot, narratives are often celebrated “as a corrective to both Hawai‘i’s colonial ‘past’ and the ‘divisiveness’ of Hawaiian nationalism” (“Introduction” 26).

Collectively, these examples highlight discursive practices that can be used to inform a critical pedagogy, particularly one that recognizes the significance of locating pedagogical practices. Themes such as the melting pot and *local* represent the colonizing discourse that has evolved in one location, Hawai‘i. The contexts in which students employ these terms can be used to initiate discussions on dominant discourse and the marginalizing effects of such narratives. In other words, because most students in Hawai‘i can relate on some level to using or hearing these terms, such conversations can be used as departure points to interrogate the reproductive nature of the dominant discourse in Hawai‘i, which correlates to one of the goals of critical pedagogy. Global
themes such as dominant discourse and marginalization thus take on “real-world” dimensions and are no longer abstract concepts that affect other people living different lives in places far from where my students find themselves. Assignments and practices that elicit the kind of writing my students produced through our work as co-researchers in the classroom can thus provide insight into how to locate critical pedagogy in students’ lived realities.

**Students on Diversity and Race**

Alongside students’ writing that reproduced the dominant discourse through terms like melting pot and *local* was discourse that complicates it. A closer examination of what students wrote potentially offers increased understanding of what students see as oppressive and marginalizing. Statements like, “the diversity at UH creates an environment that promotes equality amongst its students and encourages fairness in the classrooms” were peppered with stories of experiences that represent racial tensions in Hawai‘i. Students described racial comments made in classrooms and alluded to people experiencing racism in the general public. The more idyllic representation of Hawai‘i was definitively more prominent, but continued focus in the writing on place as well as the practice of asking students to write about incidences they personally witnessed resulted in examples that contrast sharply with the “Hawai‘i as harmonious paradise” discourse. How students wrote about racial tensions represent their lived experiences and as such give a critical pedagogy teacher information they can use in the classroom in discussions that involve race. Such place-specific experiences are likely to facilitate student engagement as the students themselves are invested in these experiences: these are experiences students chose to write about, and thus, on some level, represent what they see as
important to tell. In my case, asking students to tell me about their lives and experiences in the context of their being researchers provided location-specific content through which to implement a critical pedagogy.

One of the most striking and consistent commentaries in the essays students wrote for the Education Essay assignment involved discussion of race and diversity. Like the writing discussed above, students generally reproduced some version of the mainstream rhetoric that Hawai‘i is a melting pot. In these essays, students further emphasized Hawai‘i as being ethnically diverse and relatively free from racism. One student suggested that living in Hawai‘i allowed one to remain comparatively unharmed by racial problems: “I am not saying that just because Hawai‘i has a great mixture of race and culture that the entire state has no racial issues. It is a location that makes it the easiest place to live without fearing about racism.” However, close reading of these essays also reveals subtle references to racial tensions.

In the twenty papers written for this assignment, there were twenty-four references to Hawai‘i’s “ethnic diversity.” Students, even those who acknowledged never going to the continental United States, clearly asserted that Hawai‘i in general, and the University of Hawai‘i in particular, is much more racially diverse than schools on the continent. One student wrote:

I have lived in Hawai‘i my entire life, and ethnic diversity was never of much concern to me, at least until now. The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa is probably the only university with a decent representation of multiple ethnic groups. I sit in classes of at least 20 people and none of those classes have an ethnic group that is the “majority.”
While this student’s comment on the surface reflects a positive representation of the ethnic diversity at UHM, her use of the word “majority” may indicate more complexity than what is apparent in a cursory read. Perhaps it is true that in this student’s classes no one ethnic group represents a majority. I don’t sit in her classes, and, truthfully, I don’t doubt what she says. This students’ choice to use the word majority and not minority subtly provides a representation that potentially masks unequal ethnic representation, which could contradict the students’ main claim. If it is indeed accurate that there is no ethnic majority, that does not necessarily mean that there is no ethnic minority. The demographic statistics provided by the university (presented in Chapter 2) clearly reflect that Hawaiians are a minority at the university, and my own experience teaching affirms these statistics also represent ethnic make-up in the classroom. Focusing on there being no majority implies equal representation but allows the student to avoid accounting for under-representation or the absence of students of certain ethnicities. Ironically, the student who wrote the above excerpt is African American, a group sorely under-represented both at the university and in Hawai‘i in general (in Chapter 3 it was noted that there is not even a category for African American in the state’s or university’s demographic data).

Many students also differentiated Hawai‘i from the continent as is reflected in the following: “The ethnic make up of the classroom and taking certain classes that are required are a few things that you can’t experience anywhere else in the U.S.” In this particularly essay, there is no indication that the student ever attended school on the continent; instead, he cites two specific examples of his schooling in Hawai‘i to support
his statement. The student also makes several other comments in the essay that reproduce dominant discourse prevalent in Hawaiʻi that perpetuates stereotypes as well as Hawaiʻi’s child-like relationship to the parental United States. He comments on a common stereotype about Hawaiians, saying, “As a result, learning about Hawaiian history/culture, I began to respect and enjoy where I live because of the many past events that made this state unique. [...] I realized that Hawaiians were not what mainlaunderers portrayed them as unintelligent.” The student acknowledges that what he is learning in school has dispelled some of the common misconceptions about Hawaiians that “mainlanders” have. Without further inquiry into the students’ specific experience with “mainlanders,” it is impossible to determine whether he heard people from the continent make derogatory remarks about Hawaiians or he has heard that this is what people from the continent feel. Either way, Hawaiians being unintelligent is part of the dominant discourse that has worked to disenfranchise Hawaiians historically and facilitate colonization. In Chapter 3, I discuss how Hawaiians were portrayed as lazy for not wanting to work on the plantations. This “unintelligent” representation goes hand-in-hand with the narrative of Hawaiians being lazy, both of which have unfortunately withstood recent work by many scholars and activists to make known the practices and accomplishments of Hawaiians prior to and following western contact. While not repeated as often as they once were, both stereotypes endure as is apparent in this relatively young adult’s writing.

This student goes on to say that classrooms on the continent are mostly made-up of Caucasians and African Americans. This comment about the ethnic make-up of classrooms on the continent consisting only of Caucasians and African Americans
reflects a steady theme I have noticed in many of my classes: many of my students who have not attended school on the continent express that racial issues in the U.S. only involve African Americans and White Americans. In combination with other essentializing comments from other students, this comment demonstrates that students seem to have a very limited view of diversity and the racial issues that exists on the continent.

The student also refers to the continental U.S. as the “motherland” in his opening sentence of the essay. This use of “motherland” plays a significant role in the continuance of colonial discourse in the islands. Incorporating a term like “motherland” into everyday discourse works to sell colonization in the subtest of ways precisely because its use becomes so common that it often goes uninterrogated. Obviously, the existence of a “mother” implies that there is also a “child, and the understood relationship between mother and child—mother supplying care, direction, and even discipline and the child needing care and direction because she is unable to care for herself—is the narrative the colonizer tells itself about itself to exonerate oppressive, not to mention illegal, colonizing efforts. Care-taking and civilizing of the “native” has always been one of the primary validations for colonization, as is exemplified in Rudyard Kipling’s “White Man’s Burden,” published in 1899 to promote colonizing efforts in the Philippines. My student’s use of “motherland” in his work indicates that this is one of the most enduring narratives of the colonial expansion that continues to validate the United States’ colonization of the archipelago.

Once again, these examples of student writing illustrate some of the specific discourses students in this location are encountering. Understanding this sheds light on
why these students might not be as receptive of standard critical pedagogy topics that involve race, dominance, and oppression that do not incorporate experiences they can relate to; they may not be invested simply because the way in which such ideas are discussed is a-located, and incorporating themes without located examples reduces the important work of critical pedagogy to an abstraction rather than a reality. Students in these classrooms within this context of co-researching resistance thus produced rich information on particular experiences and discourse tied to one location. Their writing tells which narratives have endured and how they have changed.

Similar to the student’s inclusion of “motherland” discussed in the previous paragraph, throughout this collection of essays there are frequent references to the equally problematic terms “mainland” and “mainlanders.” The continental United States is often referred to as the “mainland” by many people in Hawai‘i, settlers and Hawaiians. Obviously, this idea that the continent is the “main” land is representative of a colonial mindset that literally positions Hawai‘i and subsequently Hawaiians as inferior in relation to the continent. Recently, Hawaiian scholars, including Haunani Kay Trask and Noenoe Silva, have spearheaded a push to refer to the continental U.S. as “the continent” rather than “the mainland.” This effort had been picked up by many non-indigenous scholars, including myself as indicated in the writing throughout this dissertation. However, saying the “continent” instead of the “mainland” in general conversation is often met with a kind of rolling of the eyes, and its use is associated with being disdainfully “P.C.” (politically correct). The frequency with which my students use the word “mainland,” 108 times in approximately 600 pages of assignments, suggests that the efforts to recast Hawai‘i as not being inferior to the continent have yet to take hold in their academic discourse. In class,
I employ “continent” with much more regularity than “mainland”; despite my use, the reasons for which I explain to my students, the influence of popular discourse seemingly dominates that of mine in the classroom in this particular instance.

Making it difficult sometimes to counter my students’ harmonious representation of Hawai‘i was that this picture was frequently reaffirmed by students from the continent. Several of these students had experiences that supported the perception that Hawai‘i’s diversity correlates to ethnic equality. A Filipino student in the Composition I class who grew up in Rancho Cucamonga wrote about the racism he experienced there and compared it to Hawai‘i in his essay. This student wrote:

In my hometown of Rancho Cucamonga, Californian, I was considered a minority and was often looked down upon. Rancho Cucamonga’s ethnic makeup is 90% high-middle class Caucasians. Being of Filipino ethnicity. I was seen as someone of lower status compared to the majority of the population.

The student goes on to write that the large Asian American population in Hawai‘i makes him feel more comfortable with who he is and has helped him grow as a student. This student definitely contradicts the idea that there is only black/white racism on the continent. However, he still looks at Asian as being part of one single group, a perception uncommon for those who have grown up in Hawai‘i and representative of a tendency to put people of color into singular essentializing groups. On the surface, this student’s experience does suggest that racial tensions in Hawai‘i are less of an issue than they are where he is from in California. However this idea of “less” and the corresponding use of “more” as it was used in terms of diversity in Hawai‘i is problematic. This and other students’ writings on race and diversity in general prompts me to assert that “less” and
“more” are inadequate frames to discuss such terms. As is apparent in the writing of another Filipino student who is from Hawai‘i, racial tensions do exist. And as I will explain below, they are not “less,” they merely manifest differently. These examples highlight that by discussing racism through comparisons of how it manifests in different locations one runs the risk of creating a binary, like “less” and “more,” that potentially minimizes racist discourse in one of the locations. This again reinforces why focusing on location in critical pedagogy is so essential.

As has been noted in several places throughout this dissertation, socioeconomic privilege in the islands often correlates with ethnicity, and different micro-locations in the islands are similarly associated with wealth or poverty. Students from Hawai‘i know this and comments that might go unnoticed by, say, a Filipino student from Rancho Cucamonga, for example, might be offensive to students from Hawai‘i. One student provides an example of such subtle racial commentary in her description of a course she was taking concurrently with mine. She wrote,

[The teacher] told the class how a supposedly ‘Filipino male landscaper’ was working on a house in Hawai‘i Kai and he ended up stealing. What I found insulting was when she made the cheeky comment. Her exact comment was “Don’t take this offensive, and you know I’m not being racist, but no offense, when is it that you have a Filipino landscaper in Hawai‘i Kai?” She then looked at me and everyone began to laugh. At that moment I was embarrassed. I was really insulted from her comment, even if she made that disclaimer.

What this student perceived, but seems not yet able to articulate here, is that the disclaimer plays a significant role in this racial commentary. This story not only reaffirms
the understanding that ethnicity and socioeconomic class are associated with particular places, it reproduces specific commentary about Filipinos in Hawai‘i that strongly contradicts the experiences of the Filipino student discussed above. Not only does this teacher’s story position Filipinos in a stereotypical job associated with low-income, it reproduces the narrative that people in such positions cannot be trusted because they are likely to steal. Moreover, there is clear indication in the teacher’s comment that Filipinos are out of place in the Caucasian and Japanese dominant Hawaiʻi Kai.

Perhaps the most problematic part of this story is when the student writes that the teacher looked at her and the class laughed, which points to a perception that Filipinos are a homogenous group, all behaving the same way and destined for the same lifestyle. Her disclaimer does not minimize her message so much as it affirms it. I can only speculate the extent to which the implications of this commentary would be understood by the Filipino student from the continent. Some of the references might be caught but perhaps not the full implications. This experience may not manifest racism the same way the student from the continent has experienced it, but it is representative of racist discourse nonetheless and as such gives a critical pedagogy teacher like myself an understanding of the discourse to which students are exposed. Moreover, reading about such experiences provides another level of understanding into the subjectivity a student may perform in my classroom. As Drew notes, our students do not leave the complexity of their lives and experiences at the classroom door. I can understand my students better and the kinds of teaching practices that are more likely to benefit them in their lives outside the academy if I know something about those experiences.
What the excerpts I discuss here show are how complicated issues of racism are for my students and the pervasiveness of colonial discourse. What became overwhelmingly apparent, though, as I read through the essays is that even students who wrote about racial problems they have witnessed or experienced still stated that Hawai‘i’s racial issues are “less severe” than those on the continent and the racial diversity helps them interact and talk more candidly about sensitive subjects in the classroom. A student wrote, “Students from Hawai‘i are more open to discussing issues relating to race, socio economic statuses, and personal problems than students from the mainland due to the environment of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.” Another student wrote, “It is also because of this diversity that students can have discussions about culture and religion without becoming offensive to one another.” These comments are striking when set against the backdrop of conversations I have heard among faculty that students in Hawai‘i tend to be less willing to engage in classroom discussions, and this tendency is often attributed to cultural influences. The students do not represent themselves that way.

The extensive commentaries on location, race, diversity, and ethnic equality, to cite just some of the topics covered by my students, provide a glimpse into the complexity of and conflict between the discourses these students interact with. Without a doubt, the nature of the assignments invited these kinds of commentaries, but I have assigned similar assignments and have never received such extensive attention to this many controversial subjects in student writing. I am not suggesting that such a scenario could not play out in a different classroom, but as I will more fully illustrate in the next section, my students’ role as co-researchers in this class did correspond to other social behaviors associated with critical pedagogy.
Co-Researching and Agency

As the previous discussion shows, the meaning of interactions are rarely if ever clear and distinct. As was suggested in the discussion of student writing on diversity in Hawai‘i, contradicting positions often emerged. The same conflict manifested in classroom discussions. At points during the semester my students seemed to claim agency in our discussions and demonstrate an incredible maturity in their efforts to exert more control over the learning environment. However, while such actions are aligned with the tenets of critical pedagogy, students sometimes correspondingly exhibited social behavior that illustrated just how complicit they were in terms of the dominant discourse. The first and perhaps most pronounced time this happened was with my Composition II course during a conversation following the administration of the survey at the beginning of the semester.

To administer the survey, I had enlisted the help of my colleague so as to minimize the impact of my own presence. Thus, I did not expect to discuss the survey when I returned to the class. And indeed after I returned following the administration of the survey to my Composition I class, I simply asked the students “how did it go?” They responded “fine,” and class resumed. This was not the case, however, in my Composition II class. After I returned to class and asked “how did it go,” several students erupted with comments about the survey, particularly in reference to the question: “How do you self-identify?” They challenged my construction of the question, mostly arguing that I should include more possible responses. Then one student began to explain to me that the idea of “self-identify” is problematic in that he, for example, self-identifies differently depending
on *where* he is. I prompted him to give specific examples of what he meant. He then told me that when in Hawai‘i (where he resides), he will tell people he is *local* and of Chinese descent. However, when on the continental United States, he would tell people he is Hawaiian.

I was quite surprised by this exchange for several reasons. First, I was very impressed and encouraged that this student (along with one or two others) was so willing to challenge me about the phrasing of the questions. It reinforced my position, which many teachers share, that students are not always and entirely passive recipients and completely vulnerable to teachers as authority figures in the classroom. I thoroughly enjoyed the exchange with these students. I believe the way the conversation developed reinforced to my students that I meant it when I insisted I considered them co-researchers on this project. Looking at *what* the student said, though, produced quite a different reaction from me. I was rather shocked that a student would tell someone he was Hawaiian when he simply isn’t. He countered that saying he is Hawaiian was like being born and raised in France but not being of French descent; one would still say he was French, “right?” he asked me. The student’s comments in this exchange are noteworthy for several reasons: First, this logic drew a correlation between France, an independent and sovereign nation, and Hawai‘i. The student did not associate his claiming to be Hawaiian with saying he is a Californian, he correlated his experience with those that occur in another location where ethnicity is tied to nation. With this statement the student suggests a stronger parallel between Hawai‘i and other nations than with other states in the United States. Second, the student knew claiming to be Hawaiian was contentious enough that he didn’t claim the same Hawaiian identity when in the islands. Adding
another layer of complexity to this exchange is that this same student later told me, not in an argumentative way at all, that he thought we discussed too much Hawaiian material in class. He explicitly stated that he wasn’t interested in any of that material and it belonged in a Hawaiian Studies course. It seemed, for this student anyway, claiming Hawaiian identity is a beneficial move in certain situations, but there is no investment in the culture that identity is associated with.

The survey was administered some six weeks into the semester and students’ participation in the research project began the first week of class. While I cannot explicitly claim that such an exchange wherein a student so openly discusses his self-identity is unique to a classroom where students have been enlisted as co-researchers, it is a noteworthy exchange that did occur in such a class within the particular dynamics of the relationship that had been established between me and my students as co-researchers. This candid discussion about fluid self-identification and subtle acknowledgement about how a social behavior that is unacceptable in one location provides a level of esteem in another represents a classroom dynamic that ultimately facilitates critical pedagogy practices. Such discussions provide departure points for further examinations of identity politics. Moreover, as this scenario involves issues my students encounter in their daily lives, it provides a context and specific examples within which to discuss the complexity of identity claiming.

Students challenged me in other contexts throughout the semester. One such exchange occurred at the end of the research project in the same class. I had assigned students to work in groups for this project, and when the project was over, I asked students how they felt about the timing of the project in terms of it being the second
major assignment in the class. I only asked about the timing. In general students felt that the project was fine; the timing was “ok.” Some students expressed that they really appreciated getting the project worth the most points out of the way before the pressure from other classes kicked in. Then several students began to explain that they felt it was, however, difficult working with partners so relatively early in the semester. They felt it would be easier to work alone; otherwise they would prefer that I assign such a big group project later in the semester. More students joined in this conversation, and I cannot completely recapture here the particular dynamic that surrounded this conversation except to associate it with images of a think tank. Students were turning in their chairs and looking at the person talking. They were offering me ideas, trying to find a good alternative, in a strikingly collegial tone. Both the physicality of this exchange—students looking at each other and not solely at me, the teacher—as well as their participation in an element of class governance are indicative of the behaviors associated with a critical pedagogy class (Shor).

The main suggestion was for me to assign several smaller classroom group projects to lead up to such a big project to give students more time to get to know each other. This suggestion is a sound classroom practice and represents an awareness of current accepted classroom practices in general, the trend to assign group class work, for example. This discussion reflects one of the moments in the class where my students collectively felt comfortable offering a critique of my practice. The conversation was cordial and took on a tone of professionals evaluating a project with no apparent negative intention. I left class that day thinking that they made really good points and that I would not use an assignment in that exact same way again. I did not feel, in any way, that they
questioned my ethos. Instead they gave me valuable input on a teaching practice. My co-researchers were collaborating with me now in different capacities. These students had actively engaged in their own learning: they were telling me what worked and what didn’t work in assignment delivery so that benefits of the assignment could be maximized. This particular instance demonstrates students acting in a way that benefits themselves and their respective community of learners. Unfortunately, there were far too few of these kinds of exchanges in these classes. In hindsight, I realize that I should not have just waited for such exchanges to occur; rather I should have created scenarios wherein students had opportunities to assert agency in the classroom.

**Conclusion**

This chapter details some of the interactions experienced and the writing produced in my classrooms where I conducted research with my students during the Spring 2007 semester. The dynamic created in this scenario resulted in material examples of how students can contribute to the development of content in a critical pedagogy course. The courses were based on the premise that I needed my students’ help in order to understand the classroom behavior scholars noted as “resistance.” I posited to my students that resistance was inextricably tied to location; thus, any co-research on the subject necessitated our talking and writing about our lives (to the extent appropriate in school), experiences, and where we live. The material students produced demonstrates the extent to which the practices implemented in this teacher research model correlate to critical pedagogy practices.

My students produced writing that provided valuable insights into location-specific colonial discourse that perpetuates marginalization of certain groups, particularly
Hawaiians, and stratifies society along ethnic and economic lines. Students also spoke of their own experiences of racism and how they perceived it in relation to racism on the continental United States. Although some of their depictions have no basis in actual experiences or any kind of supportable reality, it is their perceptions that influence their subjectivity and corresponding social behaviors. The work they produced in these classes highlights the importance of accounting for location in critical pedagogy. While the themes like dominant discourse and race are overarching, how they manifest in different locations is particular. The assignments designed in this teacher research model facilitated opportunities for students to engage with topics frequently associated with critical pedagogy such as race, gender, and ethnicity in ways that specifically relate to these students’ lives. Moreover, the agency students assumed as co-researchers seemed to carry over to other class activities and resulted in students involving themselves in discussions on course presentation and design.

What I realized as the semester progressed is that working in this way with students informed me how to better incorporate difficult subjects into the classroom in ways that are meaningful to my students. Moreover, it became clear to me that I cannot go from having a critical pedagogy philosophy and designing courses based on that philosophy directly to students recognizing and countering oppressive hegemonic discourse. That work demands smaller steps. Recognition of the dominant discourses students negotiate and the oppressive practices they experience is one significant step in that trajectory that I would not have been able to make in the same way without my students and explicit attention to their lived experiences in a particular space and time.
Notes

1My use of the word “immediately” here is significant because the exercise these responses are taken from are freewrites. The freewrites for this assignment are all listed on the assignment sheet that the students did have beforehand, and each freewrite was read out loud when we went over the assignment in class during the first week of class. In addition, students would be thinking about resistance because we were talking about it in class throughout the period of this assignment. However, the exercise is still a freewrite: students only have a limited amount of time to write their responses (in this case about 10 minutes for each freewrite) and no time to edit. In such a scenario, it is likely that the responses reflect a mostly initial reaction. Thus, it could be that had students had more time, their responses would have shifted from resistance in their personal lives to resistance in a social context.

2When assigning this freewrite in class, it was presented as part of our discussion of resistance; thus, even though the exact words used are “avoid talking about or doing something,” students demonstrated they associated avoid with resist in their writing. Most began the freewrite with a version of “The things that influence someone to avoid or resist,” substituting one word for the other or simply using both.

3 The number in parenthesis represents the percentage of students who gave a particular response out of 40 responses total. Many students gave more than one reason; therefore, the total of the corresponding percentages exceeds 100.

4 Terrorism and War were also mentioned in the responses, and I would argue that this definitely is representative of the United States being at war at the time of this research. It
would be interesting to see if students specifically mentioned terrorism or warfare in response to this kind of prompt when the country they live in is not at war and not using that kind of rhetoric in the media. The references to war and terrorism seem to directly relate to the temporal and physical location students were in when they responded to this freewrite.

5 For the purposes here, I consider formal writing any writing for which students had time to revise and edit.

6 “White Man’s Burden” was specifically written as an appeal to the United States to increase its colonizing efforts in its newly “won” territory of the Philippines; however, the poem reflects sentiments used to justify Euro-American expansionism throughout the Pacific and elsewhere.

7 Of course, another” level” of this analysis of student writings (which I discuss here within the micropolitical frames of race, gender, and socioeconomí class) would involve situating the discussion within the context of neoliberalism and globalization. As Giroux argues in his more recent work, the machinations of global capitalism inform discourses of race, gender, and socioeconomí class with the end goal of maintaining status quo in terms of privilege and oppression. An analysis in terms of neoliberalism and globalization, however, still demands examination of these micropolitical frames within the context of a particular place.

8 Here, as with other places throughout this dissertation, my assessment of a positive experience involves my own perceptions of what constitutes “appropriate” and “collegial” social behaviors: privileging such behavior is obviously an element of my
habitus. My biases do not nullify the analyses I offer, rather accounting for them
demonstrates another factor complexifying any analysis.
CHAPTER 7
Implications & Conclusion

The research I conducted with my students over the course of several semesters illustrates the pervasiveness of location-specific influences in terms of my students’ ways of thinking, speaking, writing, and learning. Nedra Reynolds’s discussion of locational influences and social behaviors casts these two variables as inextricable. She argues that identities are rooted in sociogeographical intersections and that these locations impact “habits, speech patterns, style and values” (*Geographies of Writing* 11). The work of this dissertation further complicates understandings of location as it is currently presented in the scholarship in that it illustrates the extent to which one macro-location is often comprised of many micro-locations all with distinct discourses and influences. In this project, I was able to capture the interplay between some of the many locations and corresponding discourses students negotiate in one place, Hawai‘i, and the impact they have on the social behaviors students enact in school. As such, this project provides a departure for future studies to employ similar models so as to explicate the micro-locations and social forces tied to a different geographic locations and their impact on student learning. Furthermore, this project demonstrates that by incorporating critical pedagogy practices in terms of course delivery in the context of a teacher research project wherein students were co-researchers, not only was critical pedagogy well-received, but students provided information, through their writing and discussion, on what it means to locate critical pedagogy practices.
Review and Reflection

To substantiate that any practice is a critical pedagogy practice necessitates an explication of what such praxis encompasses. The overview of critical pedagogy in Chapter 2 traces the development of critical pedagogy and its offshoot liberatory pedagogy from the Frankfurt school to the work of Paulo Freire and Henry Giroux. For most critical pedagogues, the most significant characteristic of critical pedagogy is facilitating students’ awareness of hegemonic and oppressive discourse with the goal that students will be able to negotiate and possibly resist such discourse for their own and their communities’ betterment. Ira Shor contributes to this definition of critical pedagogy by providing classroom practices that align with goals of the pedagogy. In much of the scholarship there are continued implications that in order to achieve these overarching principles of critical pedagogy, praxis must account for the location in which it is implemented (Durst; Ellsworth; Freire; Shor). Current scholarship in the field of Composition and Rhetoric continues this line of conversation with increasing focus as is exemplified in the 2006 anthology Relations, Locations, Positions: Composition Theory for Writing Teachers, which includes several articles that highlight why location impacts learning (Cushman; Mauk; Reynolds). Coinciding with this research emerged scholarship detailing students’ resistance to critical pedagogy: publications authored by practitioners in the field such as Susan Arroyo, Melanie Kill, and Karen Kopelson, for example, discuss why students might be resisting and offer ideas to counter such resistance. These conversations on location and resistance, however, should not be divorced from each other because resistance is a located social behavior and, as Mauk argues, “a thorough examination of practice necessarily involves an examination of social space—the material conditions that generate language and social conditions that give it meaning.”
To better illustrate how and why location influences social behaviors including resistance, this dissertation focuses on a specific place, Hawai‘i, to provide an example.

Tracing the history of Hawai‘i from pre-contact through the overthrow and corresponding colonization in Chapter 3 provides a foundation for understanding the social, cultural, and political context that residents and students negotiate both in and out of the classroom. As illustrated in the overview of the state’s and university’s demographics, while all students are not born and raised in Hawai‘i, the ethnic make-up of the state largely corresponds to that of the university. Moreover, my own teaching experience indicates that a majority of students in each of my classes are long-term residents of Hawai‘i. These two factors combined suggest that the majority of students in my classes are impacted, albeit in a variety of ways, by the social, cultural, and political forces at work in this place. Of course students who are relative newcomers to the state are also impacted, but they bring their experiences and epistemologies of other places; however, the discourses familiar and prominent for most students involve influences emerging from this place’s sociopolitical context. I position myself within this social and political context to elucidate how sociopolitical forces inform an individuals’ subjectivity and, ultimately, in my case, teaching philosophy. This discussion also draws attention to the impetus for my wanting to explore student resistance as a located phenomenon: the need to dispel common misrepresentations of Hawai‘i’s students as apathetic to and underprepared for mainstream college education. By situating, and perhaps explaining, my students’ perceived resistance within a sociopolitical context, I believed I could demonstrate that social behaviors in the classroom were complex reactions and responses informed by the forces tied to place.
Influenced by critical pedagogy theory that says that learning in the classroom should be interactional, a dynamic wherein students’ knowledge is valued and incorporated along with the teacher’s, the design of any project aimed at discussing students’ resistance had to involve students: the project had to include not only my observations of students but their observations of themselves. Chapter 4 describes the evolution of this project and how I increasingly incorporated students in as many phases of the research as was feasible in a 16-week course. Examining student resistance as a located social behavior in a teacher research project connected two current trains of scholarship in the field of critical pedagogy. In addition, the initiating act of asking students to work with me as co-researchers is informed by critical pedagogy that values the knowledge students bring to the classroom. In these ways the design of the project from the outset was based in critical pedagogy. The question then became, to what extent does this teacher research project realize the goals of critical pedagogy in terms of students’ reception?

Through the course of this project it became evident that articulating the connections between location and a specific social behavior, like resistance, is at best complex and relies on subjective interpretations difficult to qualify. However, that does not mean that our work on student resistance was not valuable. During the course of our research, students produced work that emphasizes location and its role in their learning. As such, they provided material examples of the theoretical work on location in the scholarship as it manifests in one location. Moreover, the extensive treatment in their writing of narratives informed by colonial discourse indicates that they were actively engaged with the principles of critical pedagogy that demand interrogation of dominant
discourse. Some students recognized these narratives as problematic, while others mostly wrote about them in ways that reproduce hegemony. However, this writing represents an early stage in realizing critical pedagogy’s ultimate goal of resisting hegemonic discourse: the identification of oppressive forces and discourses in a specific location. In these courses, my students began this work.

The work students produced as co-researchers in these classes similarly complexified the importance of and problem with articulating location. The more I asked students to tell me about resistance and place, the more I realized that even though I grew up in the same state, location is intricate, complex, and discrete. I could not anticipate my students’ reactions to my questions; I needed them to explain how things are for them because even though we share some similar experiences, “place” is fluid. Reynolds argues that “it is easy to take space and time for granted because they are such an obvious part of our everyday existence. […] However, it is important to challenge the idea of a single and objective sense of time and space, against which we attempt to measure the diversity of human conceptions and perceptions” (“Composition’s Imagined Geographies” 234). Her statement may seem obvious to me when applied to global universalisms that ignore overt boundaries, like those between South America and the United States or even between California and Hawai‘i, but what my students’ work during this preliminary phase highlighted was the distinctness in micro-locations within the state, even within communities.

We did not organize any rallies or protests in these courses, two outcomes that might more clearly indicate the realization of the goals of critical pedagogy, particularly its liberatory strain. However, what did happen is that students began to negotiate
material manifestations of the issues tied to critical pedagogy that affect their lives. Students’ accounts of life in Hawai‘i compared to their representation of life on the continent and the almost casual way they reproduce narratives tied to colonial discourse that depicts Hawai‘i as idyllic and a melting pot can become located content in a critical pedagogy course. Moreover, embedded within these student discussions are occasional examples of the kinds of racism and oppression they experience, which provides another departure point through which to locate course content. In other words, the writing opportunities provided to students through the assignments in these courses resulted in students telling me how to locate my critical pedagogy practices. Correspondingly, it facilitated students explaining their own understandings of location and discursive practices: the course provided an avenue to introduce both students and the teacher to material realities that manifest the topics many critical pedagogues work to address.

**Pedagogical Implications and Further Research**

Through their work as co-researchers examining student resistance, students produced a body of work that depicts many of the discursive spaces they negotiate. In this way, through our work as co-researchers, students began to articulate the oppressive discourses at work in their lives, an early step in realizing the goals of critical pedagogy. In addition, the data produced by students support Jonathan Mauk’s claim that “students are not necessarily situated in a single, coherent place” (205), in that it provided examples of the many places students do inhabit. The student work produced in these courses thus complicates locations in terms of how the students experience them, and, as such, facilitates the naming of social injustices that they experience. Ellen Cushman writes, “understanding a politics of location in our research is absolutely critical to creating
socially just knowledge” (359). This dissertation illustrates how incorporating student voices into the defining of the politics of a place provides an alternative and valuable perspective as to how all groups in one location are not having the same experiences in terms of equity and justice. The scenario (as conveyed by a student) of the teacher who discussed a Filipino landscaper in Hawai‘i Kai (Chapter 6) is an example of this: the caveat the teacher offered to dismiss her off-handed “joke” did not nearly address the complicated reaction my Filipino student had to its stereotypical undertone. Moreover, the teacher’s story and how it was received emphasizes a pervasive inequity in terms of employment in Hawai‘i that results in certain jobs and locations being associated with people of a particular ethnicity.

Several studies involving collaborating with students as co-researchers have yielded successful outcomes (Henry; Gattenhof and Radvan; Smiles; Yonezawa and Jones); however, few projects have been carried out at the university level, with Jim Henry’s being a notable exception. This project thus contributes to the current research in that it provides another example of such research. Further research would similarly work to provide material examples of and distinctions between locations through the implementation of teacher research projects that focus on the social, political, cultural, and historical dynamics at work in a specific location. Such a project could extend the work of this study by incorporating the information students provide about their experiences in a particular location and move that into discussions that ask students to interrogate the discourses they note as informing their social behaviors. Such an undertaking would be challenging considering the limited time frame of semesters at universities; however, considering that my particular project was exploratory in terms of
what could be accomplished in a single semester, a project based on this model could be more efficiently implemented.

I conjecture that the model of this project, in which the students and teacher acted as co-researchers, was a significant factor that facilitated the production of the kind of information discussed here. Assignment One, which yielded the above example about the landscaper in Hawai‘i Kai, asked students to describe classroom events that they felt represented resistance. Participating in producing allowed students to pick the situations that they wanted to represent. Of course, one could argue that some students chose events they found easiest to write about. However, the inclusion of discussions like the ones canvassed in Chapter 6 indicates that students also chose examples that are relevant to their lives. Incorporating these examples into classroom content would be a “next step” in such a project. As example, a selection of the thick descriptions could be assembled into a reading packet for students. Discussions and responses to the packet would help to delineate which narratives are isolated events and which are broadly applicable to the students at a particular university. This information could be used to discuss critical pedagogy topics such as racism and social and economic mobility in ways that students recognize.

A practice like this could also address one shortcoming of this project: the relatively few examples of classroom interactions wherein students assumed agency. With such a reading packet, students could be assigned different entries and asked to present an analysis of them to the class so as to teach the class. Such an exercise would provide another co-researcher activity in that a student would be conducting analysis. In addition, it constitutes one way the teacher could create opportunities to redistribute
authority in the classroom in favor of the students. What I suggest here is a rather specific practice, but there are likely numerous ways that the writings students produced could be then turned into assignments for analysis and or discussions in the classroom, all of which have the potential implication of creating additional avenues through which students can collaborate in the research process as well as assume more authority over the project.

**Conclusion**

As critical pedagogues, many of us see ourselves as being “on the side” of students: we want to empower them; we want them to leave our classes able to identify and confront oppression and hegemony; and we want to give them the tools to negotiate their worlds knowledgably in ways that help them succeed. However, as has been argued by scholars such as Russell Durst and Patricia Bizzell, critical pedagogy needs to be critically interrogated. We need to constantly ask ourselves what does it means for students in a particular location to succeed? What kinds of knowledge do they need to be successful? What kinds of oppression are they or their community members experiencing? All of which are subsumed within the most important question: what does their world look like?

Part of the work of this dissertation has been to demonstrate how the answers to these questions are not universal, but extremely specific and variable depending on where the students are. But the work I have done in this project represents only one “next step.” Similar examinations in other locations will help to elucidate, through concrete examples of the kind I have provided here, the different and distinct discourses students negotiate, which can inform the kinds of “tools” they need in their negotiations. As Elizabeth
Ellsworth has argued, we cannot empower students if we don’t name the oppressive forces at work where they live and learn. The project I have modeled here represents one way to undertake such naming. While a necessary step, such naming is an early step in the project of critical pedagogy. Furthering this project would entail moving from naming the oppressive forces to disrupting, countering, or otherwise, intervening in them. This project suggests that collaborating with students is one way these objectives of critical pedagogy can be realized.
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Consent Form for Questionnaire/Interviews

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN
The research project entitled:

There is a Text in this Class and I Like it:
Locating Place in the Writing Classroom
By
Georganne Nordstrom
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
English Department
1733 Donaghho Rd. Kuy 316
Honolulu, HI 96822
(808) 956-7558

The purpose of this research project is to determine whether certain texts impact student learning differently; and, if so, how these texts impact student learning of writing in particular. I am conducting surveys in hopes of gaining a better understanding of how students perceive the effectiveness of certain texts in the classroom. In addition, in specific cases where classroom discussion has focused on the applicability and effectiveness of certain texts, I might record classroom conversations. I will also conduct follow-up interviews with certain students. The interviews will be conducted orally, via email, and using audiotape. In the case of email correspondence, the email will be secured on my personal (non-networked) computer and deleted upon completion of this project. Where audiotape is used to conduct the interviews, the tapes will be kept and secured in a locked desk. In the case of online classes, where all class discussions are logged online, I will inform students of the particular parts I would like to use, if any, and the classroom logs will be kept on a secure server with all other classroom logs. Upon completion of this research, the audio tapes and classroom logs will be erased. By agreeing to participate in this project, you understand the information you provide in the survey and/or interview will likely be used in the research write-up. Every effort will be made to maintain confidentiality, and to this end, in the written material fictitious names will be used to refer to student responses.

If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, University of Hawai‘i, 2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96822. Phone: (808) 956-5007.
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Survey Administered in Fall 2005 & Spring 2006

Are you under the age of 18? Yes No

If yes, please stop here and do not answer any further questions.

If you are age 18 or older, please continue.

1. How do you self-identify? In other words, if someone were to ask you about your background, which of the following best matches your response?
   1. Hawaiian
   2. local to the islands
   3. from the continental US
   4. from a country other than the US

2. Out of all the readings we have read for this class, which did you like the best?

3. In one or 2 sentences, explain why you liked this reading best.

4. Do you think any of the readings we have read for this class has positively affected your writing? In other words, have any of the readings helped you to write better?

5. If you answered yes to number 4, which reading or readings do you think helped you with your writing the most?

6. If you answered yes to number 4 and 5, in 1 or 2 sentences, explain how you think the reading helped your writing.

7. Do you think any particular reading resulted in better class discussion? Which one(s) and Why?

8. Which texts would you recommend I keep on the syllabus for future classes?

9. Which ones should definitely be dropped?
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CHS Memorandum

MEMORANDUM
October 19, 2005

TO: Georganne Nordstrom
    Principal Investigator
    English Department

FROM: William H. Dendel
    Executive Secretary

SUBJECT: CHS #13987: “There is a Text in this Class and I Like It: Locating Place in the Writing Classroom”

Your project identified above was reviewed and has been determined to be exempt from Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations, 45 CFR Part 46. Specifically, the authority for this exemption is section 46.101(b)(2). Your certificate of exemption (Optional Form 310) is enclosed. This certificate is your record of CHS review of this study and will be effective as of the date shown on the certificate.

An exempt status signifies that you will not be required to submit renewal applications for full Committee review as long as that portion of your project involving human subjects remains unchanged. If, during the course of your project, you intend to make changes which may significantly affect the human subjects involved, you should contact this office for guidance prior to implementing these changes.

Any unanticipated problems related to your use of human subjects in this project must be promptly reported to the CHS through this office. This is required so that the CHS can institute or update protective measures for human subjects as may be necessary. In addition, under the University’s Assurance with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the University must report certain situations to the federal government. Examples of these reportable situations include deaths, injuries, adverse reactions or unforeseen risks to human subjects. These reports must be made regardless of the source funding or exempt status of your project.

University policy requires you to maintain as an essential part of your project records, any documents pertaining to the use of humans as subjects in your research. This includes any information or materials conveyed to, and received from, the subjects, as well as any executed consent forms, data and analysis results. These records must be maintained for at least three years after project completion or termination. If this is a funded project, you should be aware that these records are subject to inspection and review by authorized representatives of the University, State and Federal governments.

Please notify this office when your project is completed. We may ask that you provide information regarding your experiences with human subjects and with the CHS review process. Upon notification, we will close our files pertaining to your project. Any subsequent reactivation of the project will require a new CHS application.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or require assistance. I will be happy to assist you in any way I can.

Thank you for your cooperation and efforts throughout this review process. I wish you success in this endeavor.
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Protection of Human Subjects Assurance Identification/IRB Certification/Declaration of Exemption

Protection of Human Subjects
Assurance Identification/IRB Certification/Declaration of Exemption
(Common Rule)

Institutional Review Board (IRB) review and approval to the Department or Agency in accordance with the Common Rule.

1. Request Type
   [ ] ORIGINAL
   [ ] CONTINUATION
   [X] EXEMPTION
   [ ] OTHER

2. Type of Mechanism
   [ ] GRANT
   [ ] CONTRACT
   [ ] FELLOWSHIP
   [ ] COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT
   [ ] OTHER

3. Name of Federal Department or Agency and, if known, Application or Proposal Identification No.

4. Title of Application or Activity
   “There is a Text in this Class and I Like It: Locating Place in the Writing Classroom”
   Name: Georganne Nondorf

5. Name of Principal Investigator, Program Director, Fellow, or Other

6. Assurance Status of this Project (Respond to one of the following)
   [X] This Assurance, on file with Department of Health and Human Services, covers this activity:
      Assurance Identification No.: F-3026 , the expiration date: September 23, 2008
      IRB Registration No.: J0RG0000169

   [ ] This Assurance, on file with (agency/department) , covers this activity.
      Assurance No.: the expiration date: IRB Registration/identification No.: if applicable

   [ ] No assurance has been filed for this institution. This institution declares that it will provide an Assurance and Certification of IRB review and approval upon request.

   [X] Exemption Status: Human subjects are involved, but this activity qualifies for exemption under Section 101(b), paragraph 2.

7. Certification of IRB Review (Respond to one of the following if you have an Assurance on file)
   [ ] This activity has been reviewed and approved by the IRB in accordance with the Common Rule and any other governing regulations.
   By: Expired IRB Review (date)

   [ ] This activity contains multiple projects, some of which have not been reviewed. The IRB has granted approval on condition that all projects covered by the Common Rule will be reviewed and approved before they are initiated and that appropriate further certification will be submitted.

8. CHS #13987

9. The official signing below certifies that the information provided above is correct and that, as required, future reviews will be performed until study closure and certification will be provided.

10. Name and Address of Institution
    University of Hawaii at Manoa
    2444 Dole Street, Bachman Hall
    Honolulu, HI 96822

11. Phone No. (with area code) (808) 956-5007
12. Fax No. (with area code) (808) 539-3054
13. Email: dendle@hawaii.edu
14. Name of Official
    William H. Dendle
15. Title
    Compliance Officer

16. Signature
    [Signature]

17. Date
    October 19, 2005

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average less than an hour per response. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: OS Reports Clearance Officer, Room 503 206 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20251. Do not return the completed form to this address.
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Request to Extend Exempt Status to Cover Dissertation

August 29, 2006

William H. Dendle
Executive Secretary
Committee on Human Studies
University of Hawai‘i

Subject: CHS #13987 – “There is a Text in this Class and I like It: Locating Place in the Writing Classroom”

Dear Mr. Dendle,

On October 19, 2005 I received a Declaration of Exemption for the above referenced project on which I was working. While in the application I submitted did not specify an end-date to the project, I will be expanding on the research already conducted and this project will become my dissertation. I am thus requesting that this Declaration of Exemption be extended to cover the work/research I will do for my dissertation. This would mean that the project would most likely terminate sometime in 2008.

I have read through my application, and the data I will collect from student interactions will not change in any significant ways. I will still be gathering data from students in my English 100 classes at KCC and UHM. The following is a list of questions I have regarding extending the above referenced exemption to include future research:

1. I would like, if possible, to add my English 200 class to the list of courses (197 & 100) from which I would be gathering data. However, if that is not possible, I will work around that.

2. Another aspect of the project that will change is the title. I would thus ask that the above be recognized only as a working title.

3. As my research progresses I may decide it necessary to alter the survey questions slightly, but the questions would still mostly focus on reactions students have to certain texts discussed in the classroom (both readings and public issues). In this case, would I need to submit each revision to the committee for review?

4. The last issue that I am concerned about is a line in my Supplemental Document #4.C. I state: “I will not collect any data that refers to students’ social behaviors outside of the classroom….” While the later part of this statement remains valid (“or that will put the student at risk….”), I realize that having student comment on their attitudes toward certain texts necessarily involves them talking about their experiences outside the classroom. This extension of conversation to include personal experience may not be significant in light of the exemption, but I want to make sure that articulation of this particular type of data to include reflection of personal experience does not result in any invalidation of my application.

I am enclosing a copy of my application along with your cover letter and the Declaration of Exemption for your convenience. Please contact me at georgann@Hawai‘i.edu or 956-7558 or 261-7660 if you need any additional information from me.

I look forward to hearing from you on the status of extending the Declaration of Exemption to cover my dissertation research and the questions I have regarding this exemption.

Thank you for your time.

Aloha,

Georganne Nordstrom
PhD. Candidate (ABD), University of Hawai‘i
English Department, Kuykendall 316
808-956-7558
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Request for Extension Approval

Georganne - we received your update on your Writing Classroom project. The changes to the project that you are proposing do not alter the exempt status of the project and need no further review. Thank you for keeping us informed about the progress of your research.

Bill Dendale
APPENDIX G
Survey Administered in Fall 2006

Are you under the age of 18? Yes No

If yes, please stop here and do not answer any further questions.

If you are age 18 or older, please continue.

1. How do you self-identify? In other words, if someone were to ask you about your background, which of the following best matches your response?

5. Hawaiian
6. Local to the islands
7. From the continental US
8. From a country other than the US

2. Name and location of high school:

3. Do you work in addition to going to school? If so, how many hours per week?

4. Do you live in:

1. A dorm on campus
2. At home with family
3. In an off-campus apartment

5. Did either or both of your parents graduate from college?

6. Do you have any siblings who attended (or are attending) college?

7. Do you speak another language at home? If so, what is it?

8. So far, what reading have you liked most in this class? Briefly (in one sentence) explain why?

9. What reading have you liked the least? Briefly (in one sentence) explain why?
APPENDIX H
Course Syllabus

Composition I & Composition II
Spring 2007
Meeting Times: T, Th (the courses met at different
times on the same day; the respective syllabus
indicates the specific times)
Location: Kuykendall

Georganne Nordstrom
Office: Kuykendall 316
Phone: 956-7558
Email: georgann@Hawai‘i.edu
Office Hours: T-Th 12:15-1:15 and by appointment

From the Rhetoric of Home to Writing in the Classroom

In both Syllabi:
Aristotle defined rhetoric as the way language is used to persuade; in modern times, the definition of
rhetoric has expanded—many believe that rhetoric is how we understand the world and our place in it. In
this course we will be working to understand all the levels rhetoric works on—how it works in casual
conversations, writing, and speech acts and how it informs our opinions and views. In Hawai‘i in particular,
many of us belong to several different communities, each with its own kind of rhetoric. We will be looking
at how the rhetoric of one community (home for example) affects the way we negotiate ourselves in
another (at schools for example).

The work we do in this course will benefit both you as students and me as an instructor in several ways.
First, as students, you will attain the course outcomes listed below (which we will discuss in more detail on
the first day of class). Also, I hope that our study of rhetoric will further your understanding of the many
ways our being members of several different communities impacts who we are.

My work in this class will have several implications for me as your teacher as well. First, in this course I
am an instructor, so an obvious goal of mine is that the class is successful in that students attain the
outcomes and learn the course content. I am also a researcher gathering data. I will thus benefit from the
work we do in this class as much of it will be used in my research. On the first day of class, we will discuss
what exactly this means, and I will ask for your participation in my research. You will of course have the
option to decline, and your grade for this course will not be affected whether you decide to participate or
not (I will discuss how grades will be determined below).

Writing Assignments and Grading Scheme:

Included in the Composition I Course Syllabus:
English 100 is a foundations course which fulfills the Written Communication Foundation Requirement for
degrees at UH- Mānoa. To satisfy the Written Communication Requirement, a course will:

A. introduce students to different forms of college-level writing, including, but not limited to, academic
discourse, and guide them in writing for different purposes and audiences

B. provide students with guided practice of writing processes—planning, drafting, critiquing, revising, and
editing—making effective use of written and oral feedback from the faculty instructor and from peers

C. require at least 5000 words of finished prose—equivalent to approximately 20 typewritten pages
D. help students develop information literacy by teaching search strategies, critical evaluation of
information and sources, and effective selection of information for specific purposes and audiences; teach
appropriate ways to incorporate such information, acknowledge sources and provide citations
E. help students read texts and make use of a variety of sources in expressing their own ideas, perspectives, and/or opinions in writing

**Included in the Composition II Course Syllabus:**
The UHM Course Catalogue description of Composition II reads: Further study of rhetorical, conceptual, and stylistic demands of writing; instruction develops the writing and research skills covered in Composition I.

**The Remainder is in both Syllabi:**
The assignments for this class will be designed to meet these hallmarks as well as the course theme as outlined in the introduction. There will 3 writing sequences in this course, Getting Started (Papers: 1 Summary & Response, 2 Descriptions, and 1 Analysis), Analyzing and Interpreting Text (print & multimedia) (Papers: 2 Analysis). We will conclude the semester with a Research project that will entail writing a 5-8 page Argument. Each writing assignment will result in one final draft. Final papers will vary in length from 1-2 to 5-8 pages. Most papers will go through a peer group response workshop and revisions—which are required components of the assignments.

NOTE: I may not provide written feedback on preliminary drafts; however, there will be opportunities to conference with me for all writing assignments. At these meetings, we can discuss drafts, ideas, etc. Each of these papers will be graded on a rubric that we collectively decide upon. As I am collecting data for research, I want you to understand that your grade will in NO WAY be connected to the content of what you write. Thus, we will decide upon a set criteria for grading, and you will know in advance what you need to do in order to receive an A, B, C, etc, for any assignment. A paper that meets all the criteria set out in the rubric will earn a grade of B; to attain an A, you will exceed the criteria in a way that is predetermined by you and me when designing the rubric.

**Texts:**
‘Otwi 3: A Native Hawaiian Journal: Huliau

**Additional Requirements:**
We will also frequently do freewrites in class. I will expect you to keep all your freewrites in some kind of binder (you may want to get a composition book specifically for this exercise).

**Grading:**
The point break down for each assignment is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Sequence 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Sequence 2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paper &amp; Presentation</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes &amp; Timed Essay</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and Participation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every assignment must be completed and turned in order to pass this course, and all the parts of a writing sequence must be completed and turned in for credit. Late papers will not be accepted unless specific arrangements have been made between the student and the instructor.

Your participation points will be based on your attendance, punctuality, preparation and participation in class.

We will be using a +/- grading system in this class, and final grades will be based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>93-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87.5-89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incompletes:
The following policy will be followed in regard to Incomplete (I) grades:
A student who cannot complete some part of the work for a course due to prolonged illness of the student
or because of some serious circumstances beyond the student’s control, may receive an incomplete grade.
A student must initiate the request for an incomplete grade by contacting the instructor BEFORE the last
class meeting to determine the steps for completing the work.

Attendance:
Much of our work will be facilitated through class discussions. Therefore, attendance is required. More
than 3 absences will lower your course grade by 1 letter grade; more than 6 absences will result in failure of
the course. Excessive tardiness (more than 4) will have a negative impact on your participation points.

Plagiarism:
The University of Hawai‘i’s Student Conduct Code states:
Plagiarism includes but is not limited to submitting, in fulfillment of an academic requirement, and
document that has been copied in whole or in part from another individual’s work without attributing that
borrowed portion to the individual; [either] neglecting to identify as a quotation another’s idea and
particular phrasing that was not assimilated into the students; language and style or paraphrasing a passage
sp that the reader is misled as to the source; submitting the same written or oral materials in more than one
course without obtaining authorizations from instructor’s involved (6).
We will discuss plagiarism in class and proper documentation styles. However, passing off another’s work
as your own for credit, or using a paper written for another class will not be tolerated. The first incidence
will result in a zero for that assignment and the second will result in failure of the class.

More On Student Conduct & Class Participation:
Appropriate student conduct as defined by the University of Hawai‘i Student Conduct Code will be
expected of students at all times. While I expect students to be able to share their ideas freely in class, this
should only be done in a manner that is respectful to all students in the class.
If you feel you need reasonable accommodations because of the impact of a disability, please 1) contact the
KOKUA Program (V/T) at 956-7511 or 956-7612 in room 013 of the QLCSS; 2) speak with me privately
to discuss your specific needs. I will be happy to work with you and the KOKUA Program to meet your
access needs related to your documented disability.
APPENDIX I

Survey Administered in Spring 2007

Georganne Nordstrom
Survey

Are you under the age of 18? Yes No

If yes, please stop here and do not answer any further questions.

If you are age 18 or older, please continue.

1. How do you self-identify? In other words, if someone were to ask you about your background, which of the following best matches your response?

   1. Hawaiian
   2. local to the islands
   3. from the continental US
   4. from a country other than the US

2. Name and location of high school:

3. Do you work in addition to going to school? If so, how many hours per week?

4. Do you live in:

   1. A dorm on campus
   2. At home with family
   3. In an off-campus apartment

5. Did either or both of your parents graduate from college?

6. Do you have any siblings who attended (or are attending) college?

6. Do you speak another language at home? If so, what is it?
APPENDIX J

Writing Assignment 1: The Rhetoric of You

Assignment 1: The Rhetoric of You

Assignment 1 will take us through the first 6 weeks of class. The assignment details and due dates follow. For an “overview” of what is happening and when, see the Course Calendar.

The objective of this assignment is to gain a better understanding of all the elements that influence our beliefs and opinions. You will be looking at isolated incidents in both your private (out of school) and public lives (in school) and conduct an analysis of those situations. There will be several written components to this assignment, including freewrites, summary & response, descriptive writing, and analysis. Each part of the assignment is explained below. On the final due date, you will assemble ALL the written components into one packet. All freewrites will be together in chronological order at the beginning of the packet and the assignments explained below will follow in the order they are assigned.

Assignment 1 will be worth 20 points; the packet will be graded as a whole (rubric to be decided in class).

Writing Assignment 1:

Part I: Week 1 & 2

Freewrites (in class):
4) What does it mean to resist something?
5) What does resistance look like? In other words, how do you know when someone is resisting?
6) Is it important for a teacher to understand why a student is resisting certain text/discussion/activity? Why

Assignment:
4) Pick an issue you feel passionate about…really passionate. It can be on anything, sports, school, politics, smoking…anything, you just need to care about it.
5) Think about HOW you know what you know about this subject. Where did you get information on this subject? How did you form your opinion? Did you read something? Hear something? Experience something?
6) WITHOUT doing any research or reading on the issue, write a 2 page (600 words) SUMMARY of & RESPONSE to this issue. Describe the issue and the different viewpoints (summary). Then, discuss your opinion and what you think influenced your opinion (drawing from #2) (response).

In class in addition to talking about the assignment, we will discuss Summary & Response.
Summary & Response 1 due Thursday, January 18 in class.

Part II: Week 3 & 4

Freewrites (in class):
4) What kinds of things influence someone to avoid talking about or doing something?
5) Do people resist different things in different situations? For example, might you resist talking about something with your parents that you would readily talk about with your friends or in school? What might you talk about with family but avoid elsewhere?
6) What kinds of topics are most likely to be avoided in school?
Assignment:

1) Describe in detail a specific discussion that occurred in your private life (out of school) where someone resisted the other group members in some way. The subject being discussed does not however have to be private—in fact it should only be something appropriate to share with your classmates. Be very specific: What was being discussed or talked about? How do you know the person was resisting? What did the person do?

2) Do the same as for number 1, only describe a discussion that occurred in a classroom at school.

Each of these descriptions should be 1-2 pages in length (between 300-600 words).

In class, in addition to talking about the assignment, we will also discuss the idea of thick description.
Description 1 due Thursday, January 25 in class.
Description 2 due Thursday, February 1 in class.

Part III: Weeks 5&6

Analysis

You have now conducted research on your own community—you have spent some time examining events that human beings engage in and documented the events you witnessed as well as some of your thoughts about those events. Using the summary & response and descriptions as your data, you are going to analyze what that data means.

This writing assignment will be the culmination of the work we have done thus far. Drawing from your written work produced for Parts I & II, write a 3-page analysis that addresses the issue of how, why, and when people avoid/resist certain issues. While the way each of you approach this paper will and should differ—in other words, your thesis statements will all be different—I want you to think about whether people behave differently in different situations, what influences their social behavior, and is there one dominant source that influences them more than others.

Your paper should include DIRECT and SPECIFIC reference to your summary and descriptions; In other words, you need to draw from what you wrote in those papers to support the claims you make in the analysis. And, of course, your analysis can and should include things you didn’t think of before.

During week 4&5 we will talk about this assignment in class as well as thesis statements, paragraph construction, topic sentences and essay format in general.

Draft of Analysis paper due for peer group responses on Thursday, February 8

Assignment 1 with 6 Freewrites, 2 Descriptions, Analysis Draft and Final Paper DUE Thursday, February 15.
APPENDIX K

Rubric for Assignment 1

Assignment 1 TITLE: _______________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>S&amp;R</th>
<th>Desc 1</th>
<th>Desc 2</th>
<th>Anal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completeness: 5 pts

Followed Assignment: 5 pts

Support & Detail: 5 pts n/a

Cosmetics: 3 pts n/a

Thesis: 2 pts n/a n/a n/a n/a

Total Points

NOTE: DO NOT STAPLE ANYTHING TOGETHER – USE PAPERCLIPS—THANKS😊

Additional comments:
APPENDIX L

Visual Image Analysis Assignment

Visual Image Analysis

For this writing sequence, which will take us through the end of the semester, we will be looking at the rhetorical nature of visual images. The sequence will be in 2 parts. Week 13 we will look at the pictures by Anthony Kekona and during week 14 we will examine Advertisements.

Analyzing a text rhetorically asks you to consider several things, including:
1) Who is the audience?
2) What is the point or argument being made (or stor[ies] being told)?
3) What does the author of the text assume the audience knows or believes? How does what you already know aid in your understanding the message?
4) How is the author conveying (or persuading) a certain idea or concept (through either words or images)?

To answer these questions for the different texts, there will be more specific questions on Assignment sheets tailored for the genre (genre means type or category).

You will pick one of the “texts” (either the Kekona Images or the Advertisements) and write a 3-4-page essay. There will be a specific assignment sheet for each writing task – in other words, there are two assignment sheets, you will use the one that corresponds to the text you chose to write on.

In addition to the Analysis, you will include a 1-page cover letter (300 words) to me that addresses the following questions:

5) Why did you choose to write the Image Analysis rather than the Advertisement Analysis or visa-versa?
6) Did you decide to write on this assignment before our class discussion, or did our discussion somehow change your mind? In other words, did discussion in class influence your decision on which assignment to write? How?
7) How is understanding Image/Advertisement in relation to the questions addressed in this assignment important? And, for whom is it important to understand these possible meanings of images/Advertisements?
8) Is the other assignment also important? If not, what makes this one more important?

Timeline:

1) April 17: Discuss Assignment
2) April 19: Discussion of Kekona’s artwork and the corresponding assignment sheet
3) April 24: Discuss Advertisements (Guess, A&F, and Capitol One) and the corresponding assignment sheet
4) April 26: Bring draft to class for peer group work.
5) May 1: Final paper due

This paper will be worth 20 points.
Image Analysis

Reading from Oiwi:
Kamaka Kanekoa pgs 8-11
Anthony Kekona pg. 80
Images in Oiwi pgs. 81-85.

If you chose to do this assignment, you will write a 2-page image analysis (a mini-essay if you will). In this paper you will work with one of the images in OIWI. As you know from working with advertisements – there is much more going on in an image than is at first readily identifiable. For this assignment you need to pay close attention to DETAILS and to the article written by Kamaka Kanekoa (see reading assignment for specific pages) for criteria on how to analyze the images in OIWI.

How Do I Do That? Your goal is to present a critical analysis; so, in your paper you will need to engage the following questions. You should first answer all the questions, then combine them into essay form (intro, body, conclusion) with an argument. You will need a thesis statement…whether it be that the image you analyze is making a statement of some kind, is promoting certain values, or is saying something about the history and current situation in Hawai‘i.

PROCESS & QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:
* Summarize the content of the image. Literally, what is in them? How are they laid out? What do you see first? What’s there, but hard to see—in other words, what’s subtly included?
* What audience were these images created for? What kind of publication did they run in, and who’s the audience? Who reads this publication, and how do you know?
* Now, analyze this image. Consider questions or ideas like these:
  * How does the image include Kamaka’s concept of pono (balance between opposites)?
  * What effects does color have?
  * What about references to nature? What symbols from nature are included in the ad? What meanings do these images have? Do they make a statement?
  * How, exactly, does the ad appeal to its target audience? For example, what might the reader need to know for the image to have “full” meaning?
  * What is the Kaona of the image? Remember Kaona means layers of meaning – and usually there are at least 2 meanings, but sometimes more. So, what is the meaning at the surface of the image? What other meanings might there be for those who know a little more about the society and/or history?
  * What is the significance of the meaning of the image and it being in this particular book (OIWI)?

Draft due for in-class workshopping: TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2007
Final Due: TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2007
Advertisement Analysis

URLs:
http://www.guess.com/
http://www.abercrombie.com/
http://www.capitalone.com/

If you chose to do this assignment, you will work with an advertisement at one of the websites that were assigned (guess, A&F, Capitol One) and do an in-depth analysis of the written and visual content in the ad. As will be discussed in class – there is much more going on in an advertisement than is at first readily identifiable. For this assignment you need to pay close attention to DETAILS.

How Do I Do That? Your goal is to present a critical analysis; so, in your paper you will need to engage the following questions. You should first answer all the questions, then combine them into essay form (intro, body, conclusion) with an argument (thesis). You will need a thesis statement...whether is be that your ad is promoting certain values, saying something about the consumer of the product, or even saying something about the trends in our society.

We will discuss exactly what critical analysis means, the following questions, as well as tips for writing an essay in class.

PROCESS & QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:
* Summarize the content of the ads. Literally, what do you see in them? How are they laid out? What do you see first? What is there, but hard to see—in other words, what is subtly included?
* What audience were these ads created for? What kind of publication did they run in, and who is the audiences for each? Who reads this publication, and how do you know?
* Now, analyze this ad. Consider questions or ideas like these:
  * What types of appeals are being used here to persuade: Pathos (sentimental appeals, scare tactics)? Ethos (celebrity testimony, appeal to authority)? Logos (facts and figures, logical explanation)? Bandwagon (everybody else is doing it)? Are these appeals the major part of the ad, or are they secondary to some other technique?
  * In this ad, what “does the talking”? Does the picture, rather than text, sell the product?
  * What types of images are used in the ad? Do we see the actual product, or does the company use some other image to sell the product? Why are those images used? What effect are they intended to have on the audience? How do the colors work here? The language? The design style?
  * Do these images symbolize anything—the Marlboro Man, for example, is a solitary cowboy who comes with a horse, some mountains, and a beautiful setting. What does he represent, and how does that help sell smokes?
  * How, exactly, does the ad appeal to its target audience? For example, if the ad appears in a magazine for skaters, what types of images/text/symbols does it use to appeal to that particular audience? If it appears in Maxim, how does it make the product especially appealing to dudes? Feel free to speculate here—or do a little research with your own test audience—about whether or not the ad “works” for that particular demographic.

In addition, for your paper, I would like you to address at least one of the following considerations (think of one of these topics as providing the overarching theme of your paper):
* How is gender portrayed in your ads? Do the ads put either gender in a negative light, depict gender-based power relationships, conform to or oppose traditional notions of masculinity and femininity? Why is gender portrayed this way?
* How is race portrayed in your ads? Is the ad multiracial, or is it a racial monoculture? Are there any power dynamics here, and how does race figure into those? Why is race portrayed that way?
* How is class portrayed here? What classes are represented, and how? What classes are missing, and what does that mean?
* What cultural values does this ad normalize? (i.e., Patriotism, individuality, freedom, conspicuous consumerism, marriage, family, rebellion?) How does it sell us that view of “normal”?
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Education Essay

Assignment 2, Essay 2

For this assignment, we will be discussing very location specific readings (2 from Oiwi and Salvation from L. Hughes) –

Rather than writing on the texts specifically, I want you to think about how each of the writings is informed and shaped by the specific location the characters negotiate (both in time and geographical).

You will write a 2-3 page thesis driven paper on specific events— political concerns in Hawaii, required classes, classroom discussion, curriculum focus, ethnic make-up of the classroom and community etc.— that make your educational experience unlike what you think you would experience on the continent. Using specific illustrations of what and how, include in the paper a discussion of how you think these environmental factors influence your own behavior in and out of school and ultimately affect the way you negotiate information.

In this paper, I am really looking for a demonstration that you can construct an essay with a clear thesis, topic sentences, specific and detailed support, and discussion of how that detailed example supports your claims.

What you need to think of when writing:

Does my thesis have a “so what”; in other words, I will discuss x, y, and z is not enough, you need to include “to show/argue” or something to that effect for the thesis to be considered adequate.

You need to have a Topic Sentence for each point. It should begin the paragraph, and it should not be a statement of fact. For this paper, a good topic sentence might state how a specific event (your support) affects your experience/opinion/behavior.

You need to have a specific example (discuss a specific political issue, or classroom event, or requirement that prompts you to make the topic statement you do).

EXPLAIN!

This paper is worth 10 points, and the rubric for grading follows:

Thesis (construction of and applicability): 2 points
Topic Sentences: 1.5 points
Detailed/Clear support for each point: 1.5 points
Explanation of each point: 1.5 points
Overall cohesiveness: 1 point
Cosmetics: 1 point
Complexity of argument: 1.5 points

DUE: TUESDAY APRIL 10
APPENDIX N

Research Project Assignment: Composition I

Assignment 4: Research Paper (5-8 pages). This is a research paper; however, it is not an exploratory paper. In other words, you will not just do research and tell me all that you have found on a topic. You will, as we have been working toward with every assignment this semester, take a position on the topic. This paper, as such, will be thesis driven. Your position does not have to be for or against something (although it can be); you can advocate that one way of doing something is better than another for example. And, in supporting your position, research on the topic is necessary. We will talk more about what this all means in class.

We will be working on this project the last 5 weeks of class. The final paper will need to have at least 5 sources, one of which must be an interview. Only 2 of your sources can come from the Internet, and they must be run by me. You will also be presenting your research to the class in a 10 min. presentation (more on this below).

Here are the parts of this assignment and their respective due dates:

1. 1 page Research Proposal. Include in the proposal:
   1. Why you are interested in the topic; in other words, what made you want to pick this topic.
   2. Where you think you will find information (what kinds of sources…be as specific as you can).
   3. Do you know who or what kind of person you might interview (if you have no idea yet, write that)
   4. What do you think your position on this topic will be (This is very likely to change somewhat before the end)
   5. DUE Thursday, April 12 (you will also take a quiz (same format as the last one) on MLA citation Thursday to prepare you for the next part).

2. Source paper: this will just be a list of all your sources so far (at least 4) in proper MLA format. DUE Tuesday, April 17.

3. 2-3 page Evaluation of your findings and your initial position on the topic. Discuss how your sources either reinforce your stance, or are causing you to re-think your original assessment. In short, this is your notes so far. It can be informal, but it must refer to your sources. DUE Thursday, April 19.

4. conduct more research, focus points you will use in paper. Refine your thesis. I will also have responded to your proposals by now, so you will have some feedback from me.

5. develop a 4-5 (1200 – 1500 words) page rough Draft, DUE Tuesday, April 24.

6. Final Paper (1500-2400 words), DUE Friday, May 4

7. 1 brief process letter (1-2 paragraphs) due with final draft (May 4). In this paper, include the following:
   1. a paragraph describing your research process for this project AND your thinking process, and how two interacted—what did you do and how your feelings about the subject changed.
   2. How do you feel about writing now as compared to the beginning of the semester?
   3. Do you think your writing has improved? How?
   4. Have you learned anything? What?
   5. What grade do you think you deserve for this paper? For the course? Why?

This assignment will consist of 5 parts. The final paper will be turned in with a process letter. In other words, your letter to me will tell how your research changed or solidified your original stance and how you feel about the paper and the topic. At this point, I will also ask you to tell me in the letter the grade you think you deserve for this paper as well as the semester.
Research Paper Presentations:

1. Each presentation should be about 10-15 minutes long as a PowerPoint, overhead, or poster board presentation.
2. Your presentation should give an overview of your research including: (in no particular order): A brief intro (what brought you to this topic)
   i. Your thesis statement
   ii. A general discussion of your points
   iii. The process you went through
   iv. What your sources are -- what were useful and what were not and why
   v. And one choice quote from one of your sources
2. I recommend doing one slide for each of the above points, but you can adjust this.
3. You can add information, but make sure you don’t go over the 10-15 minutes.
4. Creativity will also be a component of evaluation (we will discuss this in class).

Make sure you include all of these items, as that is what your presentations will be graded on. Practice beforehand.
Be Creative.

Note: do not just cut and paste from your paper…there will be too much text on the slides; summarize so the audience can get at the main point without reading a lot.

Presentations will be scheduled for that last three meetings of the semester: April 24, 26 & May 1.

Preliminary work (proposal, source paper, eval, draft, p/g responses): 5 points
The paper: 20 points.
The presentation: 10 points.
Total: 35 points
APPENDIX O

Homework on Statistics

Assignment for the week of March 19

1) Find a recent (within the last 3 months) news article (online is fine) that discusses polling or statistics.

2) Write a short (1-page) critique of the information presented. In this critique you will discuss the ways the information presented in the article is misleading. You can put your information in bullet form or write in paragraph form. I am not as interested in your sentence level construction for this assignment as I am in your ability to critically think about information presented to you.

3) Obviously, you will want to pick an article that gives you enough information to write a one-page critique on.

4) Things to consider:
   a. How many people were polled?
   b. What population are those polled supposed to represent? Is it a fair representation?
   c. Does the article tell you how those polled were chosen?
   d. Are there vague uses of pronouns (they, for example)
   e. Is the information presented in a way to make the numbers look larger?
   f. Often, missing information can provide major contradictions to statistics or polls; is there missing information that allows the reader to be misled?
   g. What is the source of the poll? Who authorized it? It is an impartial party?

This mini-project will be due Thursday, March 22, and will be worth 5 points (taking the place of the timed exam). (think 300 words = 1 page)
APPENDIX P

Research Project Assignment: Composition II

Assignment 2: Research & Controversy

For this assignment you will work in groups of 2. Each group will produce research paper and class presentation on a controversial topic directly related to Hawai’i. While the topics are fairly wide open—and we will discuss several controversial issues in class—the issue must be specifically relevant to Hawai’i and its citizens. You will pick an issue, conduct research on the opposing views surrounding this issue, and ultimately frame an argument around the information you have uncovered. Your argument (thesis) can go in a variety of directions, including in favor of one side over another, directed at uncovering why exactly the issue is so controversial or complicated, or what is preventing the two sides from “hearing” each other (of course these are just some ideas—you are encouraged to find the argument that best speaks to your interests and fits your topic).

While a significant part of this paper is exploratory, the ultimate product will not be exploratory research; in other words, your paper will not consist entirely of defining the parts of an issue—you must have a framing argument: i.e., while a paper like this might discuss the causes and results of cancer, for example, that would only be one part (of course, however, cancer is not an issue that relates specifically to Hawai’i unless you are looking at how it effects a specific local population)).

Requirements:
PAPER:
10 pages—12-point double spaced font.
Number pages
Include Creative Title
Minimum of 5 sources, one of which must be an interview

The “Parts” or Process of the assignment are the same as for Composition I (see Appendix N)

Research Paper Presentations: (same as for Composition I, see Appendix N)

Points:
Preliminary work: 5 points
Final Paper: 20 points
Presentation: 10 points
Total: 35 points
APPENDIX Q

Keyword Phrases Taken from Freewrites 1-6

FW 1: What does it mean to resist something?:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Resistance Manifests</th>
<th>What/Why Individual’s Resist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical (16)</td>
<td>To temptation/desire (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many shapes &amp; forms (9)</td>
<td>To oppose (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological (9)</td>
<td>Because of knowledge/lack of knowledge (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awkward/Avoidance 6</td>
<td>Because of disagreement (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal (6)</td>
<td>Because of religion (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non/violent (4)</td>
<td>Because of internal conflict (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional (4)</td>
<td>Moral (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/situation dependant (4)</td>
<td>Ethical (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive or negative (3)</td>
<td>The war (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence (3)</td>
<td>Politics (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of action (3)</td>
<td>Because of self-preservation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/active (2)</td>
<td>To avoid consequences (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obvious &amp; Subtle (2)</td>
<td>Because of fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not conforming (2)</td>
<td>Because something is unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be unwilling</td>
<td>Not open to other pov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>Toward aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>To Oppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Because of discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Self-doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnipresent</td>
<td>Spiritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadening of the mind</td>
<td>Extremely variable influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatred</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability/Unwillingness</td>
<td>Controversial subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To distance one’s self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of responses that included that word/phrase or concept and/or related term. Many students’ responses included more than one keyword/phrase, so, in many cases, the total number of responses indicated on these summaries of the freewrites exceeds the number of students.
FW 2: What does resistance look like? In other words, how do you know when someone is resisting?

MANY different ways (majority of students responded)
Can be misunderstood, hidden or overt
Holds you back like friction
Passive vs. aggressive
Verbal vs. non-verbal
Violent vs. non-violent depends on physical contact
Equal to the force it is resisting
Not being open or receptive
Big or small
Non-compliance
Reflects self-confidence
Mention of Ghandi

Reasons:
Embarrassment
Disrespect
Fear
Hate
Cultural
Religion
Personal
Temptation

1st Form: Active = easy to identify:
Verbal (12)
Violent (8)
Crossing arms (5)
Warfare (4)
Pushing (4)
Fight (3)
Physical (3)
Physical contact (2)
Protest (2)
Walking away (2)
Not civil
Force
Stern look
Leaning forward
Defiant/defensive
Terrorism

2nd Form: Passive = non-violent
Avoid confrontation/Aversion (14)
Silence (7)
Ignoring (7)
Body language (6)
Crying (3)
Tension/hesitation (2)

3rd form: internal (neither passive or active)
FW 3: Is it important for a teacher to understand why a student is resisting certain text/discussion/activity? Why?

Yes: 29

Reasons:
Resistance can prevent further learning (12)
So the teacher doesn’t force the student/be respectful (6)
Students resist because of lack of information (3)
Legal reasons (2)
Understanding prevents teachers from forming wrong conclusion as to reason for social behavior/what is offensive to student (3)
So he/she can alter material/create comfortable learning environment (7)
Cultural implications
Important to recognize but not understand (2)

In some cases: 4

Reasons:
If it affects students grade
Prevents misunderstanding
Students may resist because they feel different from majority (in such case teacher doesn’t need to understand)

No: 2

Reasons
Teachers should be concerned with increasing comfort zone not understanding why a student is not comfortable
It might be personal and college students are adults
FW 4: What kinds of things influence someone to avoid talking about or doing something?

Past experiences (13)  
Values/morals/personal beliefs (10)  
Upbringing (9)  
To avoid discomfort/confrontation (9)  
Consequences (8)  
Fear/ of change/ other’s responses (7)  
Knowledge/lack of knowledge (5)  
Media (3)  
Culture (ie: Being Asian vs. American) (3)  
Many things (3)  
Friends (3)  
Shy/embarrassed (3)  
Socioeconomic class  
When there is no clear solution  
Discourse  
Societal norms  
Laziness  
Instinct  
Trust  
The law

Topics avoided:  
Religion (5)  
Politics (3)  
Sex/sexuality  
Drugs  
The war  
Race
FW 5: Do people resist different things in different situations? For example, might you resist talking about something with your parents that you would readily talk about with your friends or in school? What might you talk about with family but avoid elsewhere?

Everyone responded yes.

Directly referenced what they would speak about with friends vs. family but those two groups were in the questions
Being forced in an oppressive situation (2)
Comfort level with information, not situation (2)
Other influential factors:
Informal vs. formal setting
Public vs. private
Conservative vs. liberal
Obligations

Topics mentions:
Sex, health, language-use, partying, family problems, lack of knowledge, religion, politics, passing judgment, feeling “outsider”, being gay, other’s reactions, trust
FW 6: What kinds of topics are most likely to be avoided in school?

(Are avoided vs. should be avoided seems to have been addressed despite the question did not ask the later.)

Personal opinions (7)
Sexuality (particularly homosexuality) (6)
Politics (6)
Controversial (5)
Sex (4)
Cultural (4)
Racism (3)/especially in Hawai‘i (2)
Cause legal trouble (2)
Abortion 2()
Anything ok as long as done appropriately (2)
Depends on location (2)
Ethnicity (2)
Anti-Americanism
Topics of a personal nature
No unified solution
War in Iraq
Drugs
Irrelevant to course
Politically incorrect
Abuse
Native Hawaiian “status quo”
Those that create cultural clashes
money

reasons:
fear of being wrong
judged (specifically of being a racist)
heated argument
avoid confrontation
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