
June 2023

Taboo Issue 22.2: Summer 2023

Kenneth Varner

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas, phdkenny@gmail.com

David Carlson

Arizona State University, david.l.carlson@asu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/taboo>

Repository Citation

Varner, K., & Carlson, D. (2023). Taboo Issue 22.2: Summer 2023. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 22 (2). Retrieved from <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/taboo/vol22/iss2/6>

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Article in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

TABOO

Volume 21 Number 3, Summer 2023



Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education

Volume 21, Number 3, Summer 2023

Editors in Chief:

Kenneth J. Fasching-Varner, *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*
David Lee Carlson, *Arizona State University*

Editorial Assistants:

Andromeda Hightower, *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*
Timothy Wells, *Arizona State University*

Founding & Executive Editor:

Shirley R. Steinberg, *University of Calgary*

Honorary Editorial Board:

Russell Bishop, *University of Waikato, Aotearoa, New Zealand*
Ramón Flecha, *Universitat de Barcelona*
Henry A. Giroux, *McMaster University*
Ivor Goodson, *University of Brighton, United Kingdom*
Aaron Gresson, *Pennsylvania State University*
Rhonda Hammer, *University of California, Los Angeles*
Douglas Kellner, *University of California, Los Angeles*
Ann Milne, *Kia Aroha College, Auckland, New Zealand*
Christine Quail, *McMaster University*
William Reynolds, *Georgia Southern University*
Birgit Richard, *Goethe University, Frankfurt*
John Smyth, *Federation University of Australia*
Leila Villaverde, *University of North Carolina at Greensboro*

Board Members, In Memorium:

Eelco Buitenhuis, *University of the West of Scotland*
Brenda Jenkins, *City University of New York Graduate Center*
Joe L. Kincheloe, *McGill University (Founding Editor)*
Pepi Leistyna, *University of Massachusetts Boston*

Publisher:

Alan H. Jones, Caddo Gap Press
3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275
San Francisco, California 94118 USA
415-666-3012
alanhjones@caddogap.com
www.caddogap.com

ISSN 1080-5400

© 2023 by Caddo Gap Press.



Table of Contents

Changing Seasons Lie Ahead: A (Brief) Editorial Introduction	3
<i>Kenneth Varner & David Lee Carlson</i>	
Uplifting the Cultural and Ethical Desires of a Student of Color: Phenomenological Explorations of Marginalized Desires in Teacher Education	6
<i>Younkyung Hong</i>	
Detect Misconceptions, Construct Competence-Aligned Pedagogical Practice, and Use Instructional Strategies That Decenter Speech as a Means to Include Autistic Students	26
<i>Chelsea P. Tracy-Bronson & Sara Scribner</i>	
Not All Doctoral Journeys Are Paved With Gold	55
<i>Derek E. Failkiewicz</i>	
Can Subaltern, Multilingual, and Multidialectical Bodies Feel? An Aspirational Call for Undoing the Coloniality of Affects in English Learning and Teaching	69
<i>Jihea Maddamsetti</i>	
Editors and Editorial Board	frontmatter
Guidelines for Authors	91

Subscription Form for *Taboo* 93



Changing Seasons Lie Ahead

A (Brief) Editorial Introduction

Kenneth Varner & David Lee Carlson

This is our last editorial introduction as editors. Since taking over *Taboo* we have worked hard to create a sharper edge and thoughtful production of *Taboo*. We modernized the journal bringing it fully online with platforms meant to support its success and we published fantastic pieces, a majority from up-and-coming scholars. We are proud of this work, particularly through the Trump era which sought to weaken criticality and the edge that we felt was important for this journal. Our time as editors should have ended a while ago and then COVID hit—we maintained our editorship to provide consistency, even though we were longer in the role than we wanted to be. We wanted to see the last four pieces to their completion and with this issue we end our time. We will, as has been our practice, congregate the abstracts to make it easier for you to look through your interests, and before we do we leave you with this Haiku by P.M Richter which characterizes our thoughts as our season comes to an end.

Changing Seasons

autumn winds whisper
turning over a new leaf
requires letting go

In solidarity,

—Kenny Varner & David Carlson

Kenneth Varner is a professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. David Lee Carlson is a professor of qualitative inquiry in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona. Email addresses: kenneth.varner@unlv.edu & david.l.carlson@asu.edu

© 2023 by Caddo Gap Press.

Article 1**Uplifting the Cultural and Ethical Desires of a Student of Color:
An Intercultural Phenomenological Exploration
of Marginalized Desires in Teacher Education***Youngkyung Hong*

Abstract: This study engages in the intercultural phenomenological analysis of discovering and naming marginalized and undervalued desires in a teacher education space. Based on Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) conceptualization of desire, the author challenges the understanding of desire as an absence or a lack. The author focuses on an Asian American female student's story that has the power and potential to provoke awareness and prompt further examination and discussion about the complex realities of preservice teachers' learning practices. This study highlights the value of adjusting the understanding of "what is manifested" in a phenomenological study to "what is not manifested" to discover and name desires that were not prioritized and valued in teacher education. By taking this route, this study prompts a critical dialogue about the issues of teacher education in which, though preservice teachers of color's cultural and ethical desires are the strong foundation and drive in their education, relationships, and lives, their expressions have been rather suppressed.

Article 2**Detect Misconceptions, Construct Competence-Aligned
Pedagogical Practices, and Use Instructional Strategies
that Decenter Speech as a Means to Include Autistic Students***Chelsea P. Tracy-Bronson & Sara Scribner*

Abstract: In this conceptual practice-based article, the authors establish the need to examine inclusive-oriented pedagogical strategies to support individuals with autism. The authors believe that educators who use critical reflection can detect many of the common misconceptions about autism, learn how to re-frame these understandings, and consider alternative ways to support these students within inclusive classrooms. This article provides innovative pedagogical approaches for competence-aligned instruction, cultivating a web of communication access, bolstering social interaction, and supporting changes in the environment and with sensory experiences. The authors also described ways to decenter speech to create a classroom that values dynamic engagement, divergent ways of thinking, and shift the hierarchical expectation toward thinking and honoring multiple methods of expression. The purpose of the article is to re-frame common misconceptions and provide pedagogical strategies that center autistic individuals within inclusive classrooms.

Article 3

Not All Doctoral Journeys Are Paved with Gold

Derek E. Fialkiewicz

Abstract: This article is a reflection on the journey through the process of the author's doctoral studies. Published dissertations or research articles are very neat and tidy with no mention of any adversity or struggle. Hence why many doctoral students feel stressed, anxiety, or like quitting when obstacles or roadblocks are encountered. The author's doctoral program took much longer than anticipated, and the resulting dissertation veered far from its original proposal. What began as a mixed-methods study with a possible 1,400 surveys and 20 interview participants was morphed into a qualitative case study with one participant. There were many contributing factors, most uncontrollable and unforeseen and some unprecedented. In the end, the author overcame the obstacles and persevered successfully completing my dissertation and doctoral program, but the struggles were worth documenting for others. Hopefully, current doctoral students and researchers can use this article as an anecdote when facing resistance along their pathway.

Article 4

Can Subaltern, Multilingual and Multidialectal Bodies Feel? An Aspirational Call for Undoing the Coloniality of Affects in English Learning and Teaching

Jiheia Maddamsetti

Abstract: When Spivak (1988/2010) provocatively raised the question "Can the subaltern speak?" and concluded that they cannot, she did not mean that the subaltern literally or physically cannot speak. She meant that Western/Eurocentric/White ways of knowing and languaging produce colonial, epistemic violence that silences subaltern bodies. In this conceptual paper, I pose a related question: "Can subaltern, multilingual and multidialectal bodies feel?" Little attention has been paid to understanding the affect of multilingual and multidialectal students during English Learning and Teaching (ELT). As a teacher educator/researcher positioned within ELT in the white settler context of the U.S., the author reaches a conclusion similar to that reached by Spivak. When dominant ELT research and practice rejects the languaging and affective experiences of multilingual and multidialectal students, those students are treated as subaltern bodies that cannot speak or feel. Here, the author asks how subaltern, multilingual and multidialectal bodies can speak and feel in learning English. The author argues that the (de) coloniality of affects must be a key conceptual framework for teaching English to multilingual and multidialectal students.

Uplifting the Cultural and Ethical Desires of a Student of Color

Phenomenological Exploration of Marginalized Desires in Teacher Education

Younkyung Hong

Abstract

In this study, I engage in the intercultural phenomenological analysis of discovering and naming marginalized and undervalued desires in a teacher education space. Based on Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) conceptualization of desire, I challenge the understanding of desire as an absence or a lack. I focus on an Asian American female student's story that has the power and potential to provoke awareness and prompt further examination and discussion about the complex realities of preservice teachers' learning practices. This study highlights the value of adjusting the understanding of "what is manifested" in a phenomenological study to "what is not manifested" to discover and name desires that were not prioritized and valued in teacher education. By taking this route, this study prompts a critical dialogue about the issues of teacher education in which, though preservice teachers of color's cultural and ethical desires are the strong foundation and drive in their education, relationships, and lives, their expressions have been rather suppressed.

Introduction

Teacher educators have raised concerns about the "overwhelming presence of whiteness" (Sleeter, 2001) in U.S. teacher education programs, which seldom support students of color in building immune systems for the oppression and exclusivity prevalent in institutional and social systems and values (Jackson et al.,

Younkyung Hong is an assistant professor in the Department of Elementary Education in Teachers College at Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana. Email address: yhong@bsu.edu

© 2023 by Caddo Gap Press.

2021; Kohli, 2014). Despite efforts to recruit and retain more students of color and students from different backgrounds, U.S. teacher education curricula still heavily focus on white female prospective teachers being more aware of their positionality and issues of race and racism (Cheruvu et al., 2015; Philip, 2014). Teacher education structured for white teachers does not “sufficiently address their [students of color’s] unique needs as teachers of color,” while white students are likely to attain “increased awareness of whiteness and its intersection with their identity and role as teacher” (Philip, 2014, p. 236). It is an ironic expectation on preservice teachers of color that teacher education encourages them to become empowering educators for their own communities and other communities of color, while teacher education provides identical educational experiences for both preservice teachers of color and white preservice teachers. Within the current teacher education system and practice, there is little room for preservice teachers of color to address their needs and claim their desires. This means that preservice teachers of color may downplay their identities, perspectives, and values in the teacher education classroom (Pham, 2018).

In this study, I engage in the intercultural phenomenological analysis of discovering and naming desires that are often marginalized and overlooked in U.S. teacher education. Based on Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) conceptualization of desire, I challenge the understanding of desire as an absence or a lack, or its common association with sexual and corporal interest. Tuck (2010) elaborates on Deleuze and Guattari’s desire: “desire is not an absence—not something that is blocked or missing, so therefore wanting. It is not a hole, not a gap, not a lacking, but an exponentially growing assemblage” (p. 639). From this perspective, desire can be perceived rather as potential and possibility. A story pivoted on a female student of color, Choua, will introduce the discussion of multiple desires I have come to notice in a justice-oriented educational space. Specifically, what I intend in this study is a two-fold process: first, looking at desires as generative forces and flows. Second, finding and discovering multiple desires, especially marginalized and undervalued desires, in the teacher education space and naming them. Considering the multiplicity of desire, I acknowledge that a researcher cannot highlight every desire in one paper. As I zoom in to certain desires and their manifested relationships, other desires and other aspects of desires inevitably remain unnoticed and not discussed. In this study, I aim to provide a clearer description of normalized dominant desires and undervalued desires in the teacher education space.

Theoretical Frameworks

Third World Feminism

It was difficult to decide on a title for this section—whether I would choose “Women of Color in Feminism” or “Third World Feminism”. If I were to follow Sauvy’s¹ commonly known definition of “Third World,” then I am not quite a

Third World woman as a South Korean woman because South Korea would not be considered such due to its political and economic alliance with the U.S. Considering the politics of using the term “Third World,” Minh-ha (1989) explains, “Whether ‘Third World’ sounds negative or positive also depends on who uses it. Coming from you Westerners, the word can hardly mean the same as when it comes from Us members of the Third World” (p. 97-98). Then, she further articulates that naming people and countries as Third World can be an empowering tool that promotes solidarity amongst those people. Minh-ha (1989) writes,

“Third World” now refers to more than the geographically and economically determined nations of the “South” (versus “North”) [. . .] there no longer exists such a thing as a unified unaligned Third World bloc [. . .] What is at stake is not only the hegemony of Western cultures, but also their identity as unified cultures. (p. 98)

Based on this insight, I carefully situate my work with Third World feminism as it is still critical for me to be mindful of other people’s differences and any dominant aspects in my positionality as I seek solidarity with other Third World feminists and their works. By utilizing Third World feminism, this study attends to disrupting coloniality, whiteness, and Western/Eurocentric ideologies and logic in feminism.

Lugones (2014) points out that the development of feminisms has not explicitly addressed different social categories—such as race, gender, class, and heterosexuality—with which women of color are associated in how they are racialized and oppressed within specific contexts and power relations. This tendency is also observable in the rising discourse of global feminism and sisterhood, which seems to address various women’s oppressions in the world. Instead, this “global” discourse allows white feminists to avoid confronting women of color’s and Third World women’s inequality issues by emphasizing the common victimhood experience “as woman,” despite that women of color’s struggles are intertwined with global whiteness, of which any white woman cannot be free from responsibility (de Jong, 2013; Lorde, 1984/2007). Scholars have argued that the monolithic discourse on gender invalidates and silences women of color’s oppression because there is little space for various languages to articulate the complex state and condition of being a woman of color in specific contexts (Anzaldúa, 1987; hooks, 1981/2014; Lorde, 1984/2007). This discourse is rooted in the analogies between sex inequality and racial discrimination which still reproduce and perpetuate a limited and distorted understanding of gender (May, 2015; Lugones, 2007, 2014). In this regard, scholars have urged us to reconstruct the homogeneous understanding of gender which is centered around white and masculine norms as it erases a multiplicity of genders in various cultures and races (May, 2015; Lugones, 2014). Lugones (2007, 2010) suggests this work include unraveling functions and the arrangement of gender systems before colonization and modernization, as Western/European forces—such as capitalism—have confined the concept of gender and its functions.

(Re)Writing Her/His-story

The majority of institutionalized ideas and stories have been shaped into theories and histories which were (re)written and documented from androcentric and white supremacist perspectives, and schools have played the role of transmitting this knowledge and these experiences in the name of education (Villegas, 2007). Stories voiced by women and/or people of color were denigrated as “difficult to understand” and “not valid” by men and/or white people, and this pattern has been a vital part of constructing conventions and canons in the U.S. (Minh-ha, 1989). Minh-ha (1989) observes the male-biased culture and systems of academia (in this bias, male is inclusive of all males, but mainly white males), and she provides discussion of anthropological research and understanding man. She articulates that “Anthropology, like all these sciences of man, is, therefore, male-biased not only because ‘we who are ourselves men study men’, but also because it is gender blind in its pretensions to science” (p. 105). Likewise, the problems of androcentric culture and systems are not only rooted in the fact that male researchers conduct research with their male-biased perspectives, but also it is built upon the traditions which have been oblivious to the dynamics of gender systems and roles and how they operate in the context in which they are studied (Grande, 2018; Sunseri, 2000).

Women scholars have noted that many women had to learn and become familiar with dominant languages and modes of being (e.g., Mason & Ngo, 2019; Minh-ha, 1989; Lorde, 1984/2007; Lugones, 2014). Lorde (1984/2007) shares that people “had to become familiar with the language and manners of the oppressor, even sometimes adapting them for some illusion of protection” (p. 114). However, this process does not stay limited to performing languages and manners; the institutionalization shapes people’s “cognitive modality” (p. 79), so it is likely that people have embodied and internalized the dominant values and perspectives while engaging in intellectual works (Lugones, 2014). Thus, transforming institutions into equitable and inclusive groundings requires unlearning patriarchal and white supremacist languages and values while engaging in issues of gender, race, and educational systems (Asher, 2019; Keddie, 2006). The paths paved by a number of women in the world who have relentlessly worked toward rejecting patriarchal and white supremacist institutionalized language imply the need for establishing new systems, operative norms, and cultures (Mason & Ngo, 2019; Minh-ha, 1989). In other words, our work must envision a radical renewal of the basic infrastructure in intellectual spaces (Mason & Ngo, 2019; Spivak, 1978). Mason and Ngo (2019) emphasize that we are likely to be occupied by dominant institutional power if our work remains at surface level “diversity discourses” (p. 17).

Therefore, instead of adding women to the existing history, it is crucial to rewrite the current stories with women’s voices and from women’s perspectives. This work challenges various ideas and values which have been universally construct-

ed and accepted by men (Spivak, 1978). Spivak (1978) exemplifies this process through re-reading Marx and Freud theories in her article “Feminism and Critical Theory.” In her re-reading of Freud’s understanding of normality and health, she troubles Freud’s notion of pain as abnormality in that it does not account for how pain operates differently for men and women (Spivak, 1978). The rereading and rewriting of canonical literature enable people to cultivate new awareness because they alter patriarchal and homogenous understandings of humans, concepts, and systems (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Minh-ha, 1989; Spivak, 1978). Feminist scholars have shared the pleasure of restoring undiscovered and invalidated women’s stories and customs, despite that this mission may take much energy, time, and courage to trace them due to dominant cultures and powers (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Minh-ha, 1989). As scholars have emphasized, this work is not only important in research and institutional education but also is a critical grounding for the reconceptualization of women in legal systems, social movements, workplaces, and many other sectors of society (Cho et al., 2013; Crenshaw, 1991; Spivak, 1978).

Philosophical Perspective and Methodology

Intercultural Post-intentional Phenomenology

Post-intentional phenomenology (Vagle, 2018), which grounds this research, is one of the emerging branches of phenomenological approaches. Post-intentional phenomenology opens generative spaces to explore how a researcher is intentionally related to a phenomenon through conceptual dialogues with various philosophies, theories, and ideas. As post-intentional phenomenology is inspired by post-structuralism and post-qualitative inquiry, it disrupts rigid hierarchies and structures which have been constructed as conventions in qualitative research. This empowers researchers to explore and initiate discussions about phenomena, especially those which have been restricted by research traditions and procedures that researchers were expected to follow. Post-intentional phenomenology also acknowledges the impossibility of tracing the beginning and end of each intentionality. In this regard, post-intentional phenomenology encourages a researcher to jump right into the middle of the intentionalities and focus on how a phenomenon is becoming and being rather than expecting clear and linear features of intentional relationships. This aspect of post-intentional phenomenology also allows researchers to start a phenomenological exploration with less burden of understanding the history of phenomenology in the conventional way of tracing its genealogy from Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology.

Based on Lau’s (2016) work on intercultural phenomenology drawing on Czech philosopher Jan Patočka, I (Hong, 2019) have developed a philosophical and conceptual dialogue with a hope to produce and provoke insight into reading and developing post-intentional phenomenology as intercultural philosophical inquiry. The conversation started with the review and discussion of intercultural

phenomenology based on the understanding that mere comparison of non-European philosophy with European philosophy and identification of common ideas from the comparison hardly overcome the Eurocentric disposition and its role as a philosophical benchmark of validity. The review and discussion of intercultural phenomenology developed by Lau (2016) imply that the intercultural understanding of phenomenology calls for a renewal of ontological and epistemological viewpoints in phenomenology. Patocka's phenomenology not only buttresses a non-egocentric approach to post-intentional phenomenology by pointing out the pitfall of the egocentric worldview that conventional phenomenology has not overcome, but it also paves a way to acknowledging and further articulating the plurality of the lifeworld. Furthermore, it directly challenges the egocentric tendency prevalent in academia and raises our awareness of egocentric calls which reduce a human to a being that controls the world with their power. Based on this philosophical understanding of phenomenology, I take up intercultural post-intentional phenomenology to pay explicit attention to the plurality of the lifeworld and to take this approach as a political inquiry disrupting a Eurocentric and exclusive attitude in human research and teacher education practice.

Methods

Post-intentional phenomenology allows other methodological approaches to join the researcher's exploration of a phenomenon. Vagle (2018) states that "the practice of a post-intentional philosophy is to remain open, flexible, and contemplative in our thinking, acting and decision making" (p. 135-136), meaning that this research methodology encourages a researcher to distance themselves from dichotomous thinking and practice. For my phenomenological exploration, I employ discourse analysis and narrative inquiry to better understand preservice teachers' lived experience, which is embedded in their interviews and written assignments, and to include the students' and my own embodied knowledge, which often has not been much articulated or theorized. Discourse analysis provides a theoretical lens to understand language resources that students bring to the course as well as allows recognition of the multiple dimensions that their verbal and textual discourses represent (Bakhtin, 1981; Gee, 2014). I also call upon the capacity of narrative inquiry to focus on validating and generating questions from individual people's experiences and understanding the stories on various levels (Clandinin & Huber, 2010).

Context for Data Collection

The context for data collection in this study is an introductory elementary teacher education course at a midwestern research university. The course focuses on understanding various aspects of elementary schools, elementary teaching, and the role of the teacher, which include the social contexts influencing students and

their families, as well as educational policies. The university can be considered a predominantly white institution as over 64% of the enrolled students in fall 2019 were white, while 0.27% were American Indian, 10.92% were Asian, 5.95% were Black, 4.83% were Hispanic, 7.36% were international, and 4.41% were multi-racial (UMN Office of Institutional Research, 2019).

Study Participants

Participants for this study consist of the students in the course, 10 students enrolled in Elementary Education 110 (EDU110). The course consisted of two Asian American students, one Hispanic student, five white students, two international students and an instructor, and one student who identified as multiracial.

Researcher Positionality

To describe my identity within the language and categorization commonly used in academia, particularly in the United States, I identify as a middle-class, heterosexual woman from South Korea. I consider myself an educational researcher, teacher educator, and former classroom teacher. In this research project, I was an instructor of the course and also an observer and researcher conducting this study. Regarding the purpose of this study, I am another participant while holding greater institutional power in the course.

Data Sources

Vagle (2018) suggests researchers who study a phenomenon “find the best way to study [the] vibration” (p. 86) of a phenomenon. Keeping this suggestion in mind, I chose interviews, observations, field notes, and course artifacts as data sources.

Post-reflexion. Post-intentional phenomenology considers the researcher an important part of the study regarding how the phenomenon is manifested to the researcher and how they capture the productions. I implemented post-reflexion beginning with the very first step and continuing with every process of this study. Following Vagle’s (2018) suggestion for this process, I included sections such as connect/disconnect, assumptions of normality, bottom lines, and moments in which I am shocked (p. 154).

Phenomenological Materials. I gathered materials produced during the course: course artifacts include students’ reflective journals and video recordings of the classroom to capture multifaceted classroom interactions (Rymes, 2016). I conducted semi-structured interviews during the following semester of this course, transcribed the audio-recorded interview data using an online transcription service, and reviewed and revised the transcriptions for accuracy.



Data Analysis: Exploration of the Phenomenon

I employed a “whole-part-whole” analysis method throughout this study that consists of holistic readings, line-by-line readings, and subsequent readings (Vagle, 2018, p. 110). In the subsequent reading process, a cross-analysis across participants and materials, I revisited reflexive notebooks, interview recordings and transcripts, field notes, and post-reflexion materials and organized them by tentative themes I named “entrances” to the phenomenon.

I chose a narrative approach—storytelling method—as a way to situate myself and the reader in a phenomenological discussion. This approach helped me illustrate phenomenological examples (van Manen, 2016) with rich descriptions of the meanings through the participants’ lived experiences and reflections (Wang & Geale, 2015). Even though achieving truth and reality based on factual data and experiences is not an object of narrative inquiry, I feel obligated to acknowledge and take responsibility for fictional aspects of stories, as they were told and retold throughout various stages in the research process. In this respect, I decided to refer to my participants represented in the stories as characters; their utterances, interactions, and other performances illustrated in the stories correspond with phenomenological materials shared by participants and those I collected. However, I made some changes to the structure of factual components as I wrote the narratives, and it was an intentional choice to construct plots negotiating different temporal locales and spatiality present in the lived experiences (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). This change is relevant to what Connelly and Clandinin (1990) describe about story and restory:

We restory earlier experiences as we reflect on later experiences so the stories and their meaning shift and change over time. As we engage in a reflective research process, our stories are often restoried and changed as we, as teachers and/or researchers, “give back” to each other ways of seeing our stories. (p. 9)

Choua’s story opens up the analysis of cultural and ethical desires that have been marginalized and undervalued in teacher education. The story is followed by the analysis of the story; through this structure, I aim to provide an in-depth discussion for the story and analysis.

Choua’s Story: “You don’t always have to gain something back”

Choua is a Hmong American female student. She was in the college of education but had not declared her major when she was taking this course. Choua was interested in resources and programs that support students who may not get enough support from home as well as creating a caring learning environment.

Choua is a good listener, but she does not share her stories much during class. During the interview, Choua shares her ambivalent feelings about sharing her stories in classes, especially when it comes to her cultural background:

At first, I thought that they are really interested in my cultural background. But sometimes they keep asking me questions that make me think, “Do you really not know anything about this?” I’m like, “Are you really interested in learning about my cultural background?”

She considers it a positive change that people are willing to learn about other cultures, and she wants people to know about her cultural background and experiences. However, Choua also feels frustrated and upset when others try to comprehend her culture from their standpoints and judge her cultural practices and customs:

It’s difficult to explain my culture to others. I also worry about whether I’m correctly representing my culture, you know. Also, I do not always agree with my culture. We also clash in my community, and there are people who do not practice traditional things anymore.

When I ask her what motivates her to be a teacher, she shares in a determined voice, “I really like focusing on giving to the community. It’s like taking your time and doing nice things or volunteering for stuff, even though it doesn’t really benefit you.” Choua considers giving back to the community to be the main motive in her teacher education: “I know some people don’t do that. Why do you think, it’s like, if you give, [you] need something back? You don’t always need to get something back.” She is calm, but the melancholy in her voice is still noticeable as she continues, “I feel like people don’t care about that anymore. It’s like everything you do, [you] have to get something back, and it sucks. You don’t have to gain back. I want to change that mindset in education.” When Choua adds that something we potentially gain back from giving might be hidden or invisible at the moment, it reminds me of my grandmother who asks me to do good things for other people without thinking of gaining something from the actions. I ask what might influence and motivate her to be this kind of person, and Choua shares that her religious beliefs are an important basis of her moral values: “I practice shamanism, so I believe in spirits and all that. Being a shaman pushes me to really cherish my family because that’s what we’re all about is family. Even when someone dies, we go visit them.”

Mapping Desires

If I had not interviewed her for this project, I would have remembered and interpreted Choua as a student who did not show much interest in developing her learning and engagement in racial and cultural issues in education. Based on my limited understanding of Choua and relying on the given information in her paper, my first reading of this reflection made me wonder why she did not have much to say about racism and inequality in the current public school system as a student of color (Kohli, 2009; Kohli & Pizarro, 2016). Her viewpoint on students of color’s efforts in their schooling conveyed in this assignment, as well as in other assignments, also concerned me that Choua believed the myth of meritocracy (Delpit,

2012). During the semester, as an instructor, I focused on encouraging her to reflect and elaborate more on racial and cultural issues in education and society. My comments on her assignments were centered around asking Choua to address more about critical issues we discussed in class as well as correcting some of the words she used, such as “colored people” instead of “people of color.” Admittedly, my own teaching philosophy and understanding of what critical engagement could and should be in teacher education were the basis of this pedagogical approach with Choua.

The story above, constructed on Choua’s narrative shared in the interview, opens up multiple desires she did not explicitly express during the teacher education coursework. My reading of phenomenological materials produced by Choua completely shifted after I completed this interview with her. With the mixed feelings of surprise, gladness, and regret that I experienced during and after the interview, Choua’s desires conveyed in her narrative started manifesting to me. I was surprised to encounter her enthusiastic presence in engaging in a conversation about topics of culture and race which contrasted with her minimal articulation during the semester.

Zembylas’s (2007) pedagogy of desire provides valuable insight into understanding multiple desires in an institutional space, such as a teacher education classroom, and how different desires are valued or suppressed in the space. Zembylas (2007) develops the pedagogy of desire based on Deleuze and Guattari’s sociopolitical notion that desire is a generative force and flow that “is continuous and is always becoming” (p. 336). As Zembylas (2007) evaluates, this pedagogy enables us to examine various norms and assumptions in teacher education and to map “new landscapes of possibility for political resistance and transformation of oneself and one’s world without being confined in repressive discourse” (p. 335). With this approach, I aim to interrogate Choua’s desires as a “historical practice” (Zembylas, 2007, p. 338) that is intertwined with other desires, social powers, and relations in teacher education.

Cultural Desire

Tuck’s (2010) understanding of desire based on Indigenous knowledge systems broadens our viewpoint that desire is not only sociopolitical but also generational. Tuck (2010) introduces,

Desire, for my part, accumulates wisdom, picking up flashes of self-understanding and world-understanding along the way of a life. This wisdom is assembled not just across a lifetime, but across generations, so that my desire is linked, rhizomatically, to my past and my future. (p. 645)

With this, we can start looking at Choua’s desire as a sociopolitical and generational desire that maintains links to the past and the future of herself, her community, and broader society (Tuck, 2010, p. 645).

Choua's desire generated an action of bringing in Hmong culture to the teacher education space with a hope of making the culture properly acknowledged, appreciated, and shared in society—not through the “white supremacist gaze” (hooks, 1995, p. 62). Based on Tuck's (2010) elaboration, I interpret that Choua's desire was fueled by inherited wisdoms and power from her ancestors and community that resist white supremacist and racist desires against her culture. The university system was where Choua found it challenging to pursue the desire, not only because of the oppressive desires and forces that tried to subjugate her desire, but also because there were so few people of color on campus that she could unite in pursuing her desire. This difficulty is illustrated at the end of the first part of the story, in which Choua encountered a dilemma in explaining her culture to others. As an insider to her own culture, Choua was aware of the multiplicity and multi-dimensions of Hmong culture and her experiences as a Hmong (hooks, 1995).

As Alvaré (2017) states, essentialized assumptions are often projected onto people of color and their cultures. Choua indicated during the interview that she “agrees with some of the things in [her] cultural background, and there are some things that [she does not] agree with.” This implies she holds a complicated stance and viewpoints on Hmong culture. The fact that Choua practiced a cultural custom in her family does not mean that she agrees with the custom; at the same time, maintaining a critical stance on cultural practices should not be simply viewed as Choua hating her culture. Due to the complexity and multiplicity of which Choua was conscious, she was cautious about the possibilities of misrepresenting her culture to other people. This understanding demands a nuanced interpretation of Choua's desire to promote a better recognition and understanding of Hmong culture to more people. The desire is not simply to have people learn and know about Hmong culture; it also wishes for her culture not to be “essentialized nor exoticized” by individual people and society.

Related to what Alvaré (2017) articulates about cultural representation and understanding, the white supremacist desire and power reinforce inaccurate and exclusive understandings of the ordinary features of other cultures and desires of their communities (Alvaré, 2017). Based on this insight, I returned to Choua's assignments and reread to find her cultural desires conveyed in her writings, as I had previously missed the connotations. I realized that my expectation of a well-articulated discussion and reflection on her racial, social, and cultural identities and experiences was not very different from the essentialized understanding of culture. I kept looking for critical discussions on culture that addressed unique cultural practices and customs, struggles, and pain that people of color and their communities experience (Watkins & Noble, 2019). Due to this limited understanding and approach, the ordinary cultural experiences and insights that reveal Choua's desires slipped past my eyes. For example, during the semester, I concluded that she had not deeply considered the cultural and racial issues of students and classroom interactions when she was preparing her school visit assignment

through a reflexive notebook assignment. However, as I reread her assignment with new awareness, I was able to recognize that Choua succinctly expressed her observational foci relevant to her desires linked to her culture and community. Choua wrote,

Because I am a minority, I understand that other students struggle and would not be all the same level. I can see the determined young ones who are eager to learn and help their fellow classmates. [. . .] Coming from a big family and the oldest, I can see that a lot of kids would want to be in charge of many things. They are very caring children but would like to be [in] charge of groups and people.

As we can see, what she was interested in observing for her school visit assignment was different from many dominant narratives in teacher education, such as how students of color are treated differently by their teachers or how racism is enacted in the classroom. Choua also did not use much vocabulary explicitly indicating that she was addressing the issues of race and culture, other than the word “minority”. However, if we acknowledge her relationship with her culture and community and broaden our understanding of culture and cultural practice, this excerpt can be read as a composite of Choua’s various desires associated with her cultural practices tied to her roles and viewpoints as a family member, a community member, a future educator, and a former K-12 student in local schools (Paik et al., 2014). In other words, her insider view and experiences with family, community, and educational backgrounds enabled her to notice these aspects in education that might not be discernible to others. Based on this ground, her desires generated the forces for her actions; the assignment is one of the actions that the desires produced.

Ethical Desire

The second part of the story introduces the reader to Choua’s axiological orientation. Wilson (2008) highlights that our knowledge and social practices cannot be separated from our relationships to this world. These relationships include one’s spirituality that is “[the] internal sense of connection to the universe” (Wilson, 2008, p. 90). From this viewpoint, one’s spiritual beliefs—not limited to religious background—are an important basis to understand one’s values, motivations, and needs. Prima (2014) reviews the idea that understanding students’ axiological orientations enables identifying value-based priorities in school settings. Meanwhile, teachers can develop a “philosophical-pedagogical strategy” (p. 13) which differentiates instructions and the division of educational resources that support individual students’ growth in embracing values and motivations they cherish (Prima, 2014).

In the given circumstances, Choua’s response about her axiological orientation she shared during the interview offers an additional lens to better recognize her desires that were somewhat hidden previously. When Choua disclosed her

ethical values and her practice of shamanism that explain how this background influenced her to do good deeds, additional dimensions of her desire started to reveal themselves. The interview uncovers that Choua's ethical desire that motivated her to take time and actions for other people was not driven by an egocentric or materialistic desire to gain something back by doing. This contrasts with individualistic and capitalistic desires which represent the dominant U.S. ideologies that focus on accumulation of material wealth for one's own sake (Miller & Josephs, 2009).

In our conversation, Choua talked about how what we can see and know immediately are not all that exist in this world, including people's connections with other beings, both human and non-human. This perspective is quite different from the dominant ideologies in the U.S. that prioritize graspable causality and are confined to an individualistic worldview. By doing good things and helping the community, Choua does not mean that she intends the potential beneficiaries of the actions to be people in her own community. Choua elaborated:

Why do you think, it's like, if I give, I need something back, but you don't always need something back? You always get more knowledge from other people. Especially, you should not just only help your own community, your own cultural background, but should help everyone who are not in your culture background. I feel like people don't care about that anymore. It's like everything you do is to get something back, and it sucks. You don't have to gain [anything] back.

In his comparison of dominant U.S. values and "some other traditional countries' values", Kohls (1984) juxtaposed the U.S.'s individualism with some other countries' value of "group's welfare". While his analysis is not completely invalid, Kohls (1984) failed to grasp the ontological and epistemological perspectives of many other ethnic and cultural groups different from his own. As discussed earlier, Choua's desire is rather opposite to individualism, but this does not mean that she prioritized her own cultural group's welfare. As we see in the excerpt above, Choua did not limit the scope of her actions and responsibility to her own community. Even though she did not elaborate further on her "hidden motivation" (Interview, January 29, 2020), this response tells us that we cannot recognize her ethical desire properly if our perspective is confined to a "single life world" (Lau, 2016).

Irreconcilable Desire

Choua indicated during the interview that her spiritual background—shamanism—influences her to cherish her family even more. She explained,

I'm shaman, and that's why I believe in spirits and all that. Being a shaman really pushed me to cherish my family, because we're all about family. Even when someone dies, we go visit them and attend a funeral. We do a lot of things as a family, like gatherings. (Interview, January 29, 2020)

This quote displays Choua's perspective on familial relationships, that a family does not just consist of relationships established based on blood relation, mar-

riage, and partnership in the present life; the connections transcend the present life as they are still interconnected through spiritual power and relationships. Her family, especially her parents, has a huge impact on her different desires, from cultural and ethical desires—as discussed earlier—to academic achievement. Choua cherishes her family, and what her family members pursue in their lives cannot be separate from her, especially if directly related to her. According to Choua, her parents put a great deal of emphasis on their children's education and having a better life through education. Her parents believe a public school education can give their children more opportunities to succeed in society which “they did not get when they were younger” (Personal Reflection, September 12, 2019).

Public education—from elementary to high school—was a space where Choua's desire for academic achievement was prioritized and supported. Choua acknowledges that her schools often taught content that did not really matter to her, and teachers failed to help her engage in the topics (Reflexive Notebook, October 15, 2019). Still, they provided practical support for Choua's desire, which was entering a good university and making her parents proud of her. I consider this to be why Choua mainly remembers public education as an empowering space.

Meanwhile, Choua felt she was losing a close connection with her parents as she pursued the desire of academic achievement that made her parents happy and felt rewarding. She shared that a gap between her parents and herself had already begun even before Choua entered college, and it was related to homework. Although her parents were willing to help with assignments and understanding topics learned in school as much as they could, she started to feel that academic topics were not something that could be discussed at home:

I shouldn't be saying that because even though they don't have higher education, they might still have something valuable to say about it and how they feel about [the topics]. But I just choose not to [discuss schoolwork] because...I don't know. Maybe it's not what we can discuss, and there's other things we can discuss.

Choua recalled that, as she started thinking that she could not ask her parents for help with homework, it caused a disconnection between her and her parents. When she was describing her judgement that her parents could not help her with homework, she described this reality as “weird.” Then, she added, “I know I can have less burden [if they help], but they can't really help me.”

Within the current education system, her parents can be perceived as not smart enough, while their lived experiences are denigrated as invalid by the dominant perspective (Grande, 2018; Minh-ha, 1989). As if she were aware of this, Choua made her point clearly by articulating that she respects her parents, and they are the ones who want to and do help her to be at a better place. Choua also validated her parents' insights and knowledge in that they know much more than she does, and she is still growing by learning from them. The conflicting desires in this situation can be better identified with the understanding of the represented

and valued knowledge in school education. This provides a critical point that the gap between Choua and her parents was not caused by their desires conflicting with each other. Even if they attempt to narrow the gap through making the effort at an individual level to improve their communication approach, the gap cannot be closed because it is most impacted by the structural issue of education that does not value knowledge that matters to students.

Choua's point that her parents "might still have something valuable to say about it and how they feel about [the topics]" reveals that Choua might have come to know that her parents' perspectives and feelings about the topics are different from what the school expected their students to know, including in this teacher education program. Here, Foucault's (1971) perspective of how knowledge production and representation are exclusive to people who hold the power, and vice versa, is helpful to understand the relation between knowledge and the desire of white upper-to-middle class dominant culture. MacGilchrist et al. (2017) argue that the knowledge represented in school curriculum implies the message of which knowledge is considered necessary to maintain and increase the power of the socially dominant. This is not only a matter of what content is introduced and how much space the content takes up, but also which perspectives and emotions are validated in the curriculum. From this viewpoint, the problem that widened the gap between Choua and her parents regarding homework was not caused by the parents' lack of knowledge and insights on what she learned in school. As Choua assumed, her parents may have knowledge and insights on topics that were addressed in school, even if they might not be familiar with all of them. To be specific, it is a twofold issue of the school curriculum that was produced by the socially dominant's desire: first, the topics and themes in school curriculum are exclusive to the dominant; secondly, even if curriculum topics are inclusive to a wider range of people, the perspectives and interpretations reflected in textbooks and pedagogy are still usually skewed toward white upper-to-middle class emotions and perspectives (Hudson, 2003; Kanu, 2005).

Implication and Conclusion

I started this study with contemplations and questions about why teacher education's confidence and enthusiasm toward preparing future teachers to become socially just educators often overlook the experiences and needs of students of color in teacher education. I had assumed that common teacher education approaches focusing on educating white teachers perpetuate the problems related to the gap between theory and practice of culturally responsive and relevant pedagogy in teacher education. Knowing the urgency of disrupting white privilege and supremacy in the majority teaching force in the U.S., I came to admit that teacher education must prioritize the needs of teaching white teachers to be critically conscious of their positionality and their students' diverse backgrounds. However,

the current teacher education approach that only attends to the single lifeworld of white preservice teachers needs to be challenged and complicated after successfully launching its role to inspire white teachers to be on board with and invested in becoming equitable and inclusive teachers. If teacher education does not pay attention to the plurality of the lifeworld of preservice teachers, justice-orientated teacher education would ironically recenter whiteness in the teacher education space. To better understand and initiate critical dialogue about the complexity of preservice teachers of color's learning and practice in a teacher education program, I have looked at a student of color's cultural and ethical desires through Choua's story.

During this study, I had to adjust my understanding of "what is manifested" in a phenomenological study, because Choua's desires were "manifested vaguely" compared to other desires that manifested more vividly. However, these vague manifestations motivated me to focus on Choua's desires that were not prioritized in teacher education. Philosophically and methodologically, intercultural phenomenology guided me to acknowledge and articulate the plurality of lifeworld that Choua brings into the teacher education space. I interpreted Choua's cultural and ethical desires as the strong foundation and drive in her education, relationships, and life, while their expressions were rather suppressed in teacher education. I focused on the ironic expectation of preservice teachers of color to become empowering educators for their own communities and other communities of color, while teacher education provides identical educational experiences for both white preservice teachers and preservice teachers of color. There was little room for Choua to claim her desires and no safe space to unpack her cultural and ethical desires tied to her cultural and axiological beliefs that are very different from the dominant Western-centric and Christian viewpoint.

This study has implications for justice-oriented teacher education practice. I suggest teacher education be mindful that teaching approaches foster inclusive and diverse classes that celebrate different cultures tied to students' diverse ontological, epistemological, and axiological beliefs. It is important not to allow the approaches to produce ironic outcomes that result in non-dominant cultural traditions and perspectives becoming hyper visible and further otherized by the efforts. As I pointed out in this study, white Christians rarely receive requests to explain their insider backgrounds and perspectives in the U.S. On the other hand, people frequently ask people of color and non-Christians to translate and explain their cultures and spiritual beliefs with little hesitance as it is an expected job for people with non-dominant backgrounds. I argue that the teacher education space needs to be a space where translating and explaining cultures is properly appreciated and should not be taken for granted as the labor that many people of color and other people with non-dominant backgrounds endure. Meanwhile, I encourage teacher educators to reimagine inclusive and diverse teaching and classrooms where students collaboratively reflect on and discuss

how their own and their peers' different cultural and ethical perspectives shape their teaching and learning practices.

It is also important to acknowledge that the information and understanding revealed to teacher educators are always limited and partial, and students navigate and negotiate much broader and more complicated areas and relationships than those addressed in a course. My study reveals that students' performances and responses in a course are already framed by the context and expectations of the course. What we see in teacher education courses is just a fragment of students' multifaceted positions, relationships, and interests. Each student goes through their own process with learned knowledge in teacher education courses in relation to a variety of aspects in their lives. My students mentioned several times during the interviews that they often felt disconnected and conflicted with their families, friends, and other loved ones as they attempted to have a conversation about the topics and also tried to pursue the approaches and values encouraged in college.

Considering the process as inevitable but valuable to become an equitable and inclusive teacher, it is imperative to properly respond to the dilemmas and confusion that students encounter. I propose teacher education programs treat these struggles as practical and realistic issues that should be discussed in teacher education courses. These concerns should not be left as big questions mainly discussed on a philosophical and theoretical level or only in a retrospective and reflective manner. A teacher education program needs to be a safe and generative space for preservice students to process different and conflicting values and relationships in their lives, such as within families and communities. In that process, one possible teacher educator role would be guiding them to pose questions that matter to them and discuss the questions individually and together with other students who may be going through similar processes.

Note

¹ The term "Third World" was coined in 1952 by the French demographer and historian Alfred Sauvy in an article, "Three Worlds, One Planet," published in *L'Observateur*, a French weekly of socialist orientation. According to Solarz (2012), "Third World" is often used as a synonym for the underdeveloped world. In addition to this connotation, Sauvy also "assigned a political-international meaning to the concept in that he associated the idea of the Third World with the Cold War. From this perspective, the Third World was undoubtedly both a field on which inter-bloc rivalry played out and an obstacle on the road to the peaceful coexistence of the two blocs, and even the root cause of many disasters within the boundaries of each of these two worlds individually and as the world system as a whole" (Solarz, 2012, p. 1563).

References

Alvaré, B. T. (2017). "Do they think we live in huts?"—Cultural essentialism and the challenges of facilitating professional development in cross-cultural settings. *Ethnogra-*

- phy and Education*, 12(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2015.1109466>
- Anzaldúa, G. E. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new Mestiza*. Aunt Lute Books.
- Asher, N. (2019). Beyond dualisms: Interdependence and possibilities in education today. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 34(2), 1–13. <https://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/view/asher.pdf>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Cheruvu, R., Souto-Manning, M., Lencl, T., & Chin-Calubaquib, M. (2015). Race, isolation, and exclusion: What early childhood teacher educators need to know about the experiences of pre-service teachers of color. *The Urban Review*, 47(2), 237–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-014-0291-8>
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 785–810. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669608>
- Clandinin, D. J., & Huber, J. (2010). Narrative inquiry. In P. Peterson, E. Baker & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd ed., pp. 436–441). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01387-7>
- Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Polity Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X019005002>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- de Jong, S. (2013). Intersectional global citizenship: Gendered and racialized renderings. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 1(3), 402–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2013.816245>
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Delpit, L. D. (2012). *Multiplication is for White people: Raising expectations for other people's children*. The New Press. <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10528005>
- Foucault, M. (1971). Orders of discourse. *Social Science Information*, 10(2), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/053901847101000201>
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Grande, S. (2018). Refusing the university. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Toward what justice?: Describing diverse dreams of justice in education* (pp. 47–65). Routledge.
- Hong, Y. (2019). Post-intentional phenomenology as ethical and transformative Inquiry and Practice: Through intercultural phenomenological dialogue. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 19(2), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20797222.2019.1693106>
- hooks, b. (1995). *Art on my mind: Visual politics*. The New Press: Distributed by W.W. Norton.
- Hudson, A. H. (2003). Multicultural education and the postcolonial turn. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(2), 381–401. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2003.1.2.13>
- Jackson, T. O., Kazembe, L. D., & Morgan, L. (2021). Internalized racism and the pursuit of cultural relevancy: Decolonizing practices for critical consciousness with preservice teachers of color. *Theory Into Practice*, 60(3), 291–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2021.1911577>
- Kanu, Y. (2005). Tensions and dilemmas of cross-cultural transfer of knowledge:

- Post-structural/postcolonial reflections on an innovative teacher education in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 25(5), 493–513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2005.01.002>
- Keddie, A. (2006). Gender and schooling: Frameworks for transformative social justice. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 27(3), 399–415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300600838850>
- Kohli, R. (2009). Critical race reflections: Valuing the experiences of teachers of color in teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(2), 235–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320902995491>
- Kohli, R. (2014). Unpacking internalized racism: Teachers of color striving for racially just classrooms. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 17(3), 367–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2013.832935>
- Kohli, R., & Pizarro, M. (2016). Fighting to educate our own: Teachers of color, relational accountability, and the struggle for racial justice. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 49(1), 72–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2015.1121457>
- Kohls, L. R. (1984). *The values Americans live by*. Meridian House International.
- Lau, K. Y. (2016). *Phenomenology and intercultural understanding: Toward a new cultural flesh*. Springer.
- Lorde, A. (2007). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches* (Original work published 1984). Crossing Press.
- Lugones, M. (2007). Heterosexualism and the colonial/modern gender system. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 22(1), 186–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2007.tb01156.x>
- Lugones, M. (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 25(4), 742–759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01137.x>
- Lugones, M. (2014). Radical multiculturalism and women of color feminisms. *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, 13(1), 68–80. <https://jcr.org/archives/13.1/lugones.pdf>
- Macgilchrist, F., Ahlrichs, J., Mielke, P., & Richtera, R. (2017). Memory practices and colonial discourse: On text trajectories and lines of flight. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 14(4), 341–361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2017.1325382>
- Mason, A. M., & Ngo, B. (2019). Teacher education for cultural and linguistic diversity in the United States. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of education* (pp. 1–23). Oxford University Press.
- May, V. M. (2015). *Pursuing intersectionality, unsettling dominant imaginaries*. Routledge.
- Miller, A. E., & Josephs, L. (2009). Whiteness as pathological narcissism. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 45(1), 93–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00107530.2009.10745989>
- Minh-ha, T. T. (1989). *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Indiana University Press.
- Paik, S. J., Kula, S., Saito, L. E., Rahman, Z., & Witenstein, M. A. (2014). Historical perspectives on diverse Asian American communities: Immigration, incorporation, and education. *Teachers College Record*, 116(8), 1–45. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279317402_Historical_Perspectives_on_Diverse_Asian_American_Communities_Immigration_Incorporation_and_Education
- Pham, J. H. (2018). New programmatic possibilities: (Re)positioning preservice teachers of color as experts in their own learning. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 45(4), 51–71. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26762168>
- Philip, T. M. (2014). Asian American as a political–racial identity: Implications for teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 17(2), 219–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13>

613324.2012.674024

- Prima, R. (2014). Value orientations in professional training of teacher-educators. *Rozprawy Społeczne*, 4(VIII), 13–15. http://rozprawy-spoleczne.pswbp.pl/pdf/rs_nr_4_art_2.pdf
- Rymes, B. (2016). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487101052002002>
- Solarz, M. W. (2012). “Third World”: The 60th anniversary of a concept that changed history. *Third World Quarterly*, 33(9), 1561–1573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2012.720828>
- Spivak, G. C. (1978). Feminism and critical theory. *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 1(3), 241–246. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-0685\(78\)90170-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-0685(78)90170-7)
- Sunseri, L. (2000). Moving beyond the feminism versus nationalism dichotomy: An anti-colonial feminist perspective on aboriginal liberation struggles. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 20(2), 143–148. <https://cws.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cws/article/view/7621>
- Tuck, E. (2010). Breaking up with Deleuze: Desire and valuing the irreconcilable. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(5), 635–650. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2010.500633>
- UMN Office of Institutional Research. (2019). *Enrollments*. Enrollments | Institutional Data and Research. Retrieved May 1, 2023, from <https://idr.umn.edu/reports-by-topic-enrollment/enrollments>
- Vagle, M. D. (2018). *Crafting phenomenological research* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- van Manen, M. (2016). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing*. Routledge.
- Villegas, A. M. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 370–380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107308419>
- Wang, C. C., & Geale, S. K. (2015). The power of story: Narrative inquiry as a methodology in nursing research. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 2(2), 195–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2015.04.014>
- Watkins, M., & Noble, G. (2019). Lazy multiculturalism: Cultural essentialism and the persistence of the multicultural day in Australian schools. *Ethnography and Education*, 14(3), 295–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2019.1581821>
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing.
- Zembylas, M. (2007). Risks and pleasures: A Deleuzo Guattarian pedagogy of desire in education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(3), 331–347. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701243602>

Detect Misconceptions, Construct Competence-Aligned Pedagogical Practices, and Use Instructional Strategies That Decenter Speech As a Means to Include Autistic Students

Chelsea P. Tracy-Bronson & Sara Scribner

Abstract

In this conceptual practice-based article, we establish the need to examine inclusive-oriented pedagogical strategies to support individuals with autism. We believe that educators who use critical reflection can detect many of the common misconceptions about autism, learn how to re-frame these understandings, and consider alternative ways to support these students within inclusive classrooms. This article provides innovative pedagogical approaches for competence-aligned instruction, cultivating a web of communication access, bolstering social interaction, and supporting changes in the environment and with sensory experiences. We also described ways to decenter speech to create a classroom that values dynamic engagement, divergent ways of thinking, and shift the hierarchical expectation toward thinking and honoring multiple methods of expression. The purpose of the article is to re-frame common misconceptions and provide pedagogical strategies that center autistic individuals within inclusive classrooms.

Chelsea P. Tracy-Bronson is an associate professor in the School of Education at Stockton University, Galloway, New Jersey. Sara Scribner is an assistant professor of special education at Plymouth State University, Plymouth, New Hampshire. Email addresses: chelsea.tracy-bronson@stockton.edu & sara.l.scribner@gmail.com

© 2023 by Caddo Gap Press.

Introduction

A default educational practice is to create a separate program for students with autism.¹ This was the case for Mia's school. In kindergarten, she paced around the classroom while the teacher held morning meetings, read aloud, and provided reading and math instruction. She scribbled on the endless worksheets provided, not being able to handwrite letters and numbers. Eventually Mia was provided with Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) that allowed her to express written thoughts using an electronic device, but nonetheless, early in the school year, the teacher presented a case to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team to change her placement to the autism program, down the hall. Consistent push-back was required to keep her in the general education classroom. Her general education, special education teacher, and paraprofessional were provided with strategies and tips on how to include Mia, support her communication, help her demonstrate her competence, and engage her in active learning. By fourth-grade she developed the ability to type with the intent of communicating, but sadly finding her voice through typing has not been enough. Because of the way her body moves, the way she responds to academic tasks, the way her voice makes sounds to provide sensory input, the way she likes to select complex activist-oriented topics for the personal narrative writing unit of study, and how she uses her AAC device to respond to math questions, the school continues to question, be uncertain, and not understand how to include Mia. The reality is that Mia is physically included, because of the persistent support of her parents, but her educational team continues to perpetuate misconceptions, question her competence despite Mia repeatedly providing evidence of this, and continually trying to change her placement from the general education classroom.

Easton is a high school student in a co-taught History and Physics classroom. At the beginning of the year, he sat in the back of the classroom, at a table with a paraprofessional on one side and his special education teacher on the other. Although modifications were made to the History and Physics content, Easton had zero interactions with peers in the classroom because of this back-table inclusion; this caused a version of alternative teaching (Friend, 2021) which had a deleterious impact on peer interaction through physical segregation from the class. Upon learning how to facilitate social interactions, provide visual supports before physical supports, developing modifications that lead to independence in academic task completion, and increasing assistive technology, Easton's team learned innovative pedagogical practices that lead to constructive inclusion, authentic belonging that transcended the History and Physics classroom to his extracurricular sporting activity—swimming team, and real content learning.

Mia and Easton need inclusive educators who are willing to learn, who understand that disability is part of human diversity, and are willing to examine their own instructional practices that might unknowingly exclude certain learners.

Inclusive education needs teachers who are educational detectives (Biklen, 2020) willing to figure out, problem solve, construct innovative competence-aligned pedagogical practices (Biklen & Kliever, 2006), and cultivate a sense of authentic belonging (Schnorr, 1990) in the classroom for students like Mia and Easton. This article is specifically for all the teachers educating Mia, Easton, other autistic students, and any student at the margins of what is considered the norms on the continuum of human diversity.

Often, when we think about special education and inclusive education, we can acknowledge that there has been progress made to include students with disabilities in general education. In fact, of all students ages 6 through 21 who are served by the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), according to the U.S. Department of Education (2022, p. 57), 64.8% are included in the general education classroom 80% or more of the school day, which is the closest measure that exists in our federal data collection to mark an inclusive learning opportunity. That data point means that almost two out of three students identified to receive special education supports and services within our public schools are in a general education setting for the vast majority of their day.

However, when we look more closely at the category of autism, as one of the federal categories that students can qualify under to receive special education services and supports, the number of students who are in the general education classroom for 80% or more of the school day drop down to 39.8% (Department of Education, 2022, p. 57). Out of the 14 federal categories, including developmental delay for students to qualify under up to age nine, it is also important to note that the category of autism has the fourth highest percentage of students who have access to general education 40% of their school day or less, behind intellectual disability, multiple disabilities and deaf-blindness. In fact, almost the same percentage of students who qualify for special education under the category of autism (33.5%) are in general education for 40% of the day or less as students who have access to 80% or more of the day (Department of Education, 2022, p. 57).

As is evident from the federal data, students with a disability label of autism have significantly less access to general education than their peers who qualify for services and supports under other IDEA categories of disability. There are other equity issues that are also important to name and consider in relation to disability and autism at large. It has been documented that when a White student and a student of color qualify for special education services under the same category, students of color receive more restrictive (i.e., less inclusive) special education placements (Fierros & Conroy, 2002). The severity of segregation is increased when disability intersects with race (Artiles et al., 2002; Artiles et al., 2011; White et al., 2019). Using autism as an example category, this means that if there was a white student and a student of color who qualified under the category, the white student would be more likely to be placed in an inclusive setting with access to general education curriculum and peers. Furthermore, White et al. (2019) found

that students with autism who live in higher-income or in areas that border higher-income areas are more likely to experience high-inclusion placements (p. 12).

Furthermore, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004) mandates that students with disabilities have a free appropriate public education (FAPE). The appropriateness of the public education that students with autism should receive is often debated. Students with autism need to be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE), meaning the educational setting they would attend if they did not have disability, alongside students without disabilities. Removal from the general education setting should only occur when supplemental supports and services have been tried, their effectiveness documented, and they do not support the individual. However, when the supplemental supports and services are tried, they often provide the modifications, accommodations, environmental changes, and materials students with autism need in order to thrive in the general education classroom, constituting this as their LRE.

According to IDEA (2004), (i) Autism means a developmental disability significantly affecting verbal and nonverbal communication and social interaction, generally evident before age three, that adversely affects a child's educational performance. Other characteristics often associated with autism are engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements, resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines, and unusual responses to sensory experiences. (ii) Autism does not apply if a child's educational performance is adversely affected primarily because the child has an emotional disturbance.

When a student is classified as having an educational disability under IDEA (2004), it requires special education and related services to be delivered to the student by the district. These needed services are provided by certified educational, therapy, and related service professionals and are intended to support a student to work toward their individualized goals within the Individualized Education Program (IEP), with appropriate accommodations, modifications, and supplemental supports and services. However, the definition of autism within IDEA (2004) inherently creates over-generalization and misconceptions about the autistic experience. Understanding the discourse within the definition of autism in IDEA provides a basis for analyzing the types of supports and misconceptions that run rampant in public schools. This analysis allows for re-framing the autistic experience from a reflective stance based on what we know from autistic stories and accounts and present pedagogical strategies.

Research around inclusive practices have taken place for more than 30 years. To date, the research shows that inclusive education benefits students with and without disabilities academically and socially (Baker et al., 1994; Cole et al., 2004; Fisher & Meyer, 2002; Freeman & Alkin, 2000; Fryxell & Kennedy, 1995; Hunt & Goetz, 1997; McDonnell et al., 2001; Waldron & McLeskey, 1998). More specifically, students with disabilities academically outperform, or at least perform as well as, students with disabilities placed in segregated classrooms or re-

source room classrooms in both ELA and Math (Cole et al., 2004; Freeman & Alkin, 2000; Rea et al., 2002; Salend & Garrick Duhaney, 2007; Waldron & McLeskey, 1998). Research shows that time spent in general education classrooms learning grade-level content positively correlates with increased math and reading outcomes for all students with disabilities (Cole et al., 2004; Cosier et al., 2013). Included students are less likely to have discipline referrals, experience social and emotional benefits from being part of the classroom community and social circle, are more likely to have competitive employment after leaving the public education system, and are more likely to live independently (Marder et al., 2003; Wagner et al., 1993; Wiener & Tardif, 2004). Furthermore, the breadth of research shows that students without disabilities experience neutral, at worst, or positive benefits from inclusive classrooms, both in terms of their academic skills and their social-emotional development (Hehir et al., 2016). That said, we often see a range of lived experiences labeled as “inclusion” within public schools. We are going to ask readers to consider the differences between what we are calling physical inclusion, partial inclusion, and true inclusion and belonging.

Physical inclusion (Kavale, 2002) is the type of inclusion where physical space is simply made for students with disabilities within general education classrooms. In these sorts of “inclusive” experiences, students often still receive an elevated level of separate instruction, have limited authentic interactions with peers, and are simply allowed to be in the general education classroom without truly being a part of it. We believe that simply being in the room is not enough. The next type of inclusion we often see in schools is what we are calling partial inclusion, where students are more than just in the classroom, engaging in some components of the day with their same-aged peers. Students who experience partial inclusion often still receive separate instruction across their school day, generally at times touted to be “at their level.” When we talk true inclusion and belonging, this is a classroom space where all students are truly valued as contributing members of the classroom community. Students with disabilities are seen as assets and contributors, and are an essential part of everything happening within the general education classroom. While any inclusion is better than segregated learning, true inclusion and belonging should be the real aim of inclusion done right.

Thinking about the lived experiences of students with autism and their educational placements within our public schools, the aim within this article to push-back on some of the long-held beliefs about students with autism and offer some strategies to create inclusive environments, or classrooms with true inclusion, caring community, and belonging (Sapon-Shevin, 2010), that welcome and support students with autism, in hopes that as we know better, we can do better and create more equitable learning opportunities for students who qualify for special education under this label.

Reframing Common Beliefs About Autism

With the IDEA definition in mind, reframing common beliefs about autism allows for re-thinking and reflection based on the autistic experience from what is known from first-person accounts. From listening to this autistic narrative grounded in lived experience, supportive pedagogical strategies are outlined. In this section, common misconceptions are named and re-framed.

Competence

Individuals with autism do have differences in the ways that they communicate. The IDEA definition states, “Autism means a developmental disability significantly affecting verbal and nonverbal communication...that adversely affects a child’s educational performance” (IDEA, 2004, Sec. 300.8 [c][1]). A surface level reading of the definition indicates that autistic individuals have a developmental disability, this impacts communication, and in turn affects performance in the classroom. Oftentimes this reference to development disability is connoted to smartness, intellect, and ability to perform grade-level classwork. In schools, this understanding is seen in the ways that individuals with autism are inadvertently deemed as incompetent, placed in segregated settings, and are required to compliantly complete behaviorist tasks numerous times to show their competence of content. Inclusive educators have to push back against these pieces of the definition and use what we know about the autistic experience to reframe how to teach and support in school settings.

Examining the normative ways in which schools are set-up allows us to name the hegemonic norms present. What are the normative ways of doing things, performing in school, being a student in a classroom? This includes using voice through talking to respond to questions, using handwriting to fill in worksheets, typing fast responses, sitting in a certain way and keeping the body still, and complying to behavioral expectations. These are the general normed ways of doing school within the public school system. However, we must examine who the school systematically leaves out when these are the normed principles that the school culture follows. For autistic individuals, as well as other students at the margins, the system unknowingly centers the portions of their being that are most difficult (e.g., speech, keeping bodies still) and asks them to show competence in these ways. The hegemonic norms are used to evaluate educational performance and become coded as competence. Autistic students’ competence is questioned when performing in ways that differ from the hegemonic norms.

We call for centering a different way of sharing, knowing, doing, and performing in the school setting and need to think through how to shift pedagogical practices in the classroom. Competence is the ability to do something successfully. The problem is that this measure of capability is often assessed based on hegemonic norms. Thus, if that norm is difficult for an autistic individual, they

are deemed as incompetent. How can teachers shift focus away from re-generating the hegemonic norms to construct classrooms that presume competence? As Biklen (2020) states, “Teachers adopt a presuming-competence orientation where they define the student as someone who wants to learn and engage, thus putting themselves in the role of educational detectives, discovering ways to organize instruction that maximizes heterogeneous student-to-student interaction” (p. 1). Intentional actions stemming from a presumption of competence cultivates inclusive pedagogy.

Individuals with autism (and their peers) can hear everything said. Too often teachers, related service providers, and paraprofessionals hold conversations on the side about specific students, while students are in close proximity. Inclusive educators ensure what school professionals and other students say in the classroom communicates a respectful, disability conscious, and community-oriented context that allows the autistic individual to feel a sense of authentic belonging.

It is understandable that sometimes a conversation about implementation of an accommodation or modification needs to take place. These conversations should be done swiftly and respectfully with the goal to continue with the learning experience. The conversations about a specific student are better discussed during a private meeting, during a time when the students are not present. Professionals working with autistic students should be sure not to speak in front of students as if they are not there.

The authors of this article are educators who have a vast array of experiences in inclusive education as teachers, advocates, facilitators, and researchers. The purpose of this conceptual, practice-based article is to improve pedagogical strategies used in inclusive classrooms through the connection of theory to practice. It is through this praxis that equitable and excellent inclusive schools for all learners is possible. In the following sections, pedagogical strategies that inclusive educators can use are outlined, drawing on the inclusive experiences and expertise, along with a critical disability studies in education theoretical perspective (Ferguson & Nusbaum, 2012; Goodley et al., 2019) that centers the lived experiences of individuals with disabilities as full members of school communities. These explicit strategies work to bridge inclusive education theory into applicable practice. Next, Table 1 outlines competence-aligned instructional practices and provides descriptions of how these promote competence.

Verbal and Nonverbal Communication

Inclusive educators need to be sure the student has a reliable method to communicate. For many nonspeaking individuals, this might begin with a picture system that allows the student to touch multiple pictures to communicate a statement, directive, or question. Do not assume a picture system will be sufficient for an autistic student’s communication needs. Also support the student to type words.

Table 1
Employ Competence-Aligned Instructional Practices to Construct Competence

<i>Competence-Aligned Instructional Practice</i>	<i>Description of Constructing Competence</i>
Be a grade-level content master	<p>Design learning experiences that align to grade-level content standards</p> <p>Unpack the content standards to develop understanding of the previous grade level and next grade level in order to provide differentiated learning experiences</p> <p>Brainstorm at least 10 different ways that students can demonstrate their understanding of that standard, offering varied ways of knowing content</p> <p>Identify criteria for success for each of those different ways of knowing</p> <p>Intentionally use multiple ways of assessing the knowledge of a particular standard</p>
Design learning experiences, not activities	<p>Learning experiences directly connect to grade-level content standards, whereas activities might be rote skills or trials of repeating low level tasks</p>
Provide refreshed, engaging content that evolves over time	<p>Ensure the learning experiences evolve in content as the unit progresses, allowing the student to gain mastery over units of study that are appropriate to that grade-level</p> <p>Remember that the aim is for students to be developing skills and content knowledge.</p> <p>Avoid repeating the same activity (reading passage, worksheet, etc.) so that the student is able to continually apply the skills to new and exciting curriculum and experiences</p>
Multiple modalities for engaging in content	<p>Design multiple modalities for accessing content as a means to bolster student engagement that take into account diverse teaching input styles, learning styles</p>
Constructing Space for Choice Making	<p>Pre-plan choices in how students can engage in the content and demonstrate their learning</p> <p>This instructional decision signals that students can construct their own learning plan and an overall value of competence</p>
Bringing in Strengths and Interest	<p>Interest is essential for engagement</p> <p>Forefront content and materials that value and further construct interests and strengths</p> <p>This constructs an environment that the student will learn the content, simultaneously while staying attuned to their preferred interest</p>

(continued on next page)

<i>Competence-Aligned Instructional Practice</i>	<i>Description of Constructing Competence</i>
Ask questions that are grade-level content related as a formative assessment tool	<p>Think about the purpose of your questioning and ask questions to assess deeper understanding about the content being studied</p> <p>Ensure questions are aligned with the grade-level content and within the current unit of study</p> <p>Be sure that the questions lead to further content understanding, ongoing teaching and learning to improve the student's achievement of instructional outcomes</p> <p>Based on the question responses, adapt instruction, provide feedback to individual learning needs</p>
Treat students and talk to students at their biological age	<p>Use the same language and actions toward autistic students that you do with students in that same general education grade-level</p> <p>Do not hold hands walking down the hallway, if that is not what you do with, for example, other eighth grade students</p>
Allow students to fail and make their own decisions	<p>Allow autistic students to make and execute a plan, then learn from the logical consequences of that decision</p>
Allow for problem solving	<p>Provide wait time that allows autistic students to think about what went wrong, figure out how to fix that issue, and implement a new action to fix the problem</p>
Lessen intrusive adult support Use the minimal amount of adult support	<p>Do not allow a teacher or paraprofessional to provide close physical or verbal support all the time</p> <p>Provide the support needed, then fade the physical presence and the need to verbally signal every action needed</p> <p>Use the least intrusive support needed and constantly work to lessen the amount of adult support needed to develop independence</p>
Normalize high expectations for all, especially for those at the margins	<p>Too often in education, the phrase "set high expectations" is translated in practice as high expectations for most of the school community while students continue to be placed in autistic programs and classrooms that are segregation-based and where access to grade-level content \ and peers is minimal</p> <p>Constructing competence must begin with the underlying dispositional belief that inclusive educators have the skills and pedagogical strategies required to establish a culture of high expectations for all, especially autistic students, right within the inclusive classroom</p>

Overtime, the student will develop the ability to type a sentence and multiple sentences.

Honor a variety of communication types in the classroom. Nonspeaking individuals might communicate using a range of devices, support systems, or styles. Think of communication as a web of connected strings that are associated by the goal of communication. Ask the student how they would like to communicate in certain situations. Ask, “Would you like me to give you choices? Would you like to type? Would you like to use words?” Let the student know you will figure it out together. If you give choices to the student, always have the option of “Something else” since the choices are selected and determined by you. When typing with a student, ask if they would like to touch the iPad screen to indicate letters selected or use the wireless keyboard. The purpose is to see autistic students as multi-modal communicators who can decide which type of communication method works best for them in given circumstances (e.g., academic tasks, moments of frustration, when making material selections). Position yourself as a problem solver, alongside the autistic student, and construct opportunities for communication.

Present multiple opportunities for communicative responses. Integrate communication options throughout the day, for wants, needs, connection to peers, and academics. Sometimes communication involves offering options using post-it notes or index cards. Offer multiple choices. Ask who the student wants to work with or which content group they prefer. Engage the student in multiple communication cycles throughout the day. Often the focus becomes on what the student wants to eat or emotions. Based on what neurodiverse individuals have shared, there is much more to communicate, connections with classmates to initiate, and information on the content being studied to engage in. Go beyond surface level questions. Ask content rich questions that signal you value the autistic student’s learning and honor their competence.

Communication for autistic students is often diametrically placed into categories of someone who speaks or someone who types. Reject this notion. Instead, re-frame this binary to view communication as a motor planning event that requires intentional thought, a plan, and execution; this coordinated sequence is needed to provide a thought. In some situations, there might be environmental stimuli that impact the sequence. Thus, honor an autistic student’s ability to decide how to communicate in particular circumstances. The goal is that communication is authentic, expressive, and nuanced. Table 2 provides innovative ideas for creating a web of communication opportunities and provides a description of each.

Social Interaction

One of the common narratives about students with autism in schools is that they do not desire social connection and prefer to be alone. This belief about autism is also tied to the IDEA definition, which begins with “Autism means

Table 2
Strategies to Create a Web of Communication Opportunities

<i>Web of Communication Opportunities</i>	<i>Description</i>
Provide multiple methods and choices in what to communicate about	This two-prong instructional decision means to use different communicative materials at various points in the school day with multiple conversation and subject areas.
Provide multiple methods and choices in how to communicate	<p>Too often teachers only ask basic questions to autistic students (e.g., snack choice or movement break choice).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Talk about real stuff, meaning the conversational subjects that grade-level neurodiverse peers are interested in! ◆ Talk about the content in the grade-level classroom unit of study (e.g., types of cells, types of rocks, or the civil war). ◆ These real conversational and content questions and discussion points provide interesting topics that students will actually want to communicate about. <p>Too often if an autistic student is beginning their communicative journey, they will only be given four PECS cards or an app on the iPad that only contain pictures/images.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Sometimes use these, but do not only use these. ◆ Give students the choice about which content group they would like to work on for the energy unit of study (e.g., light, sound, or heat group). Ask the student to type the word on the iPad app. Begin by asking the student to type the first letter, then the word when given two to three choices. This develops the expectation and sends the message of competence to the student as they learn to type.
Honor the communicative intent	Whether the student makes a selection from three choices, types the first letter when given three choices, or types the entire word when given choices, honor their communication by following through on their decision. This lets students know that their communication is wanted, valued, and will be used to provide their desires.
Intentionally create communication interactions with peers	<p>Invite an autistic student to share their typed letter, word, or sentence with a peer.</p> <p>Go beyond that also. Invite a classmate to ask a question and wait for the response. The classmates might also type a question to the student. Create class system for pen pals. Peer involvement and interaction is critical to belonging and creating a safe classroom space where multiple types of communication styles are welcome and valued.</p>

(continued on next page)

<i>Web of Communication Opportunities</i>	<i>Description</i>
Use varied materials	<p>Have multiple materials for communication available and use each throughout the school day</p> <p>Use both high- and low- tech options</p> <p>Use post-it notes, index cards, pictures, letters, words, sentences to provide options and choices</p> <p>Ask the student to indicate their choice by typing the first letter. Eventually build up to typing the word, then a sentence. Move in and through asking the student to communicate in these ways, so it becomes a natural part of the student's school day.</p> <p>Use a label marker that has buttons similar to a keyboard to have the student type a letter or word. Then print it and add it to the recording sheet. This is an especially helpful support instead of handwriting.</p> <p>Affix choices on the wall and have the student walk to their choice. This gets the communication off the AAC device to the physical space. This also incorporates whole body, rather than the arm and finger to type.</p> <p>Provide choices in materials (e.g., type of art supply, type of marker, type of paper) so the student gets in the habit of making decisions.</p>
Communication Web	<p>The goal is that autistic students are provided this web of opportunities to communicate within the classroom. Do not simply use one of these strategies. Do not only listen to spoken words or typed words. Honor and listen to all communication and intentionally build a web of communication options for the student. The purpose is to have all these pedagogical materials and strategies in your inclusive teaching toolbox to use in different contexts, times of the day, subject areas, and conversation types. Your job is to construct a web of opportunities that allow students to communicate.</p>

a developmental disability significantly affecting... social interaction, generally evident before age three, that adversely affects a child's educational performance” (IDEA, 2004, Sec. 300.8 [c][1]). What this really means is that students with autism are read as not meeting those societal accepted milestones that have become our normed ways of thinking about and seeing social development. For many students with autism, their perceived social deficits are linked to other differences in how they navigate their world, including their communication skills, interests, and sensory-motor experiences. For example, by age three, children are expected to be able to engage in more interactive play, demonstrate cooperation and turn-taking skills, and engage in more imaginative and fantasy based play (Malik & Marwaha, 2022). These are the hegemonic norms constructed by what society values or holds to be true within a certain age range and classroom. But when we

stop and think about how we would measure each of those milestones, we quickly see that we might gauge interaction, cooperation, and turn-taking by how much talking we see a young child having with another, or look for spoken language as evidence of imaginative or fantasy based play. If young children are not saying and explaining it, we do not know for sure that they are engaging in it.

Many individuals with autism who have been able to access reliable means of communication push-back on the idea that they do not want social connection. For example, Rubin (2013) shared in a presentation for the Autism Society of America,

Having friends is the best part of my life. I really can't express to you how wonderful it is to have real friends who respect me in spite of my autism. I know they would be kind to me if I couldn't communicate, but they certainly wouldn't be friends.

It is essential to know that friendship is critical for connection. Students with disabilities are eager for friendship, to feel connection, and know that peers want to get to know them. Therefore, it is our job as educators to reimagine what social connection and interaction can look like and support students in making connections in new ways, that decenter hegemonic and neurotypical ways of thinking about making social connections to create a socially inclusive environment for all members of the classroom space.

As asked in the section above connected to competence, we need to be challenging how we see students as being able to demonstrate social skills and forge connection. Are we using spoken language as our evidence that students are making connections or attempting to forge friendships? Are we seeing a deficit in a child who opts out of "fun" that their peers are participating in because it is a sensory nightmare for their particular sensory system? Are we leaving space for specific, special interests to be brought into the classroom and used as a way to make connections with other peers who might also be interested, or shutting those interests down and telling students there is no room for them in school?

Are we modeling what we want our students to do? Teachers need to demonstrate interactions with the student. This includes verbal interactions, as well as using nonverbal cues and interactions. This modeling will show other students how to ask questions, invite the autistic student to be a partner or group member, include a student in a circle, and find similarities and differences with the student. How are interactions gauged and read by others? A student responding to a statement or question by handing an object to someone, moving closer to the group, glancing quickly, initiating typing, etc. are all interactions that indicate interaction. How can gauging interactions go beyond a spoken verbal statement?

In one high school classroom, a student was provided a laminated sheet with four conversation strategies. This was a resource guide that the speech and language pathologist worked on with him in previous sessions. In the science class-

room, the teacher noticed that the student's group would often get off task because the student wanted to have conversations with peers. When the student saw the laminated sheet, he said "No, not using" and proceeded to put the laminated sheet in the trash can. Later upon brainstorming other support strategies with the educational team, the most useful idea was to ask the student. Sometimes, we forget to ask the most important person, the student, what support would be most helpful. After having this conversation, it was decided the student needed to know at the beginning of the learning experience what type of conversation was permissible. During the lab, conversation about the mice and the associated lab activities were acceptable. Then at the beginning of class and end of class, the student knew any type of conversation was appropriate. This clear conversational expectation was all the support the student needed. The teacher found that this was helpful for other students in the classroom also.

Invite peers to provide natural support throughout the day. If a student is needing assistance with navigating to the correct document in Google classroom, say to the class, "Be sure that everyone at your table has the correct document on their screen. If a friend needs assistance, help them navigate to it." If a student does not transition well to the carpet area, tell the class, "Walk over, elbow to elbow, with your buddy and have a seat on the carpet." This will allow the student who needs support with transitions to connect with a peer as they are reminded to move to the carpet area. In these examples, notice how the paraprofessional does not need to provide direct assistance to the student with a disability. Notice how the teacher makes a statement to the entire class. The support mechanism might be intended for a specific student, but the teacher invites all students in the class to perform the action. Facilitating this type of classroom assistance also helps students to connect with one another. Natural supports provide a less intrusive support mechanism to assist the student's specific need. We recommend educators provide natural supports compared to unnatural supports that cause stigmatization for autistic students, as outlined in Table 3.

Repetitive Activities & Stereotyped Movements

Differences in body movements sometimes causes a misconception that continues to run rampant in the field of education that students with autism have less than average intellectual abilities (Hilton et al., 2012; Moran et al., 2013; Paton et al., 2012). Since bodies move differently, flap, jump, freeze or do not produce audible and reliable speech, that autistic students should be learning only functional skills. School districts often create separate autism programs or classrooms, sometimes citing function skill instruction and other times using behavior as the justification. For Cayden, he had learned coin values in elementary, middle, and now the beginning of his high school years. In school, he repeatedly was forced to show compliance as he demonstrates competence of money values. This was a

Table 3
Provide Natural Social Supports, as Opposed to Unnatural Supports

<i>Natural Social Supports</i>	<i>Unnatural Social Supports</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Intentionally design partnerships for each lesson during the day ◆ Ensure that partnerships frequently change ◆ Ensure that the autistic student is seen as bringing strengths to the partnership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Pair the autistic student with a paraprofessional ◆ Pair the autistic student with the same classmate repeatedly ◆ Call a specific classmate “the helper” for the autistic student
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Creating space in the classroom for students to share and connect over their interests (cultivate authentic friendship) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Calling the 1:1 and other adults the student’s “friend” ◆ Adults in the classroom should all be referred to in the same way ◆ Forced Peer “Buddies”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Be sure that autistic students are sitting next to grade-level neurotypical peers ◆ Be sure there is not a chair for the paraprofessional at the table. Instead the aide should provide support as needed, then physically fade support continuously 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Back-table inclusion ◆ A separate chair at the table or spot at the table for the paraprofessional
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Be sure the student is in line with other students, with classmates before and after. If pacing is an issue, let classmates know they can say, “Let’s speed up so we don’t get too far behind” or other neutral phrasing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Holding hands with the aide ◆ Walking separately from the class, with the aide in the hallway
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Have all students transition to other school building spaces together ◆ If timing or lining up becomes an issue, ask the autistic student to unlock the classroom door, ring the bell to signal it is time to line up, or in some other way, take on a leadership role for the transition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Having the autistic student walk in the hallway before/after the class or transition without other classmates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Find ways for all classmates to check in with peers sitting next to them about materials needed, which page to begin on, etc. ◆ Create a culture of utilizing natural supports for all students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Ask the one peer sitting next to the student with autism to provide support in flipping to a certain page or getting out a particular material
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ If lining up or transitioning to one classroom space to another is a challenge, ask students to move from the carpet to their desks, for example, with a partner. This support will extend to the entire class, but particularly support an autistic student who needs support with the motor planning required for moving or transiting in the classroom. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Have the paraprofessional go tell the autistic student that it is time to go back to the desk area ◆ Have a student go tell the autistic student to go to the desk area

student who carried his own wallet, deposited checks and withdrew money from his own banking account, and worked at a coffee shop interacting with customers paying for their purchases. Autistic students are asked to repeatedly show their understanding of the same skill, instead of being taught meaningful content. For Willow, she is in an autistic program where her on task behavior and responses are monitored and data is documented in five minute increments. Her body often flaps, jumps, and moves around. She also types to communicate and when her anxiety increases, it makes it hard to get her thoughts out. In this instance, there is a hyper-focus on her behavior and collecting data on this. Time would be better spent with her educators teaching her ways to self-monitor her feelings of anxiousness, and use regulation strategies to help her body feel safe and comforted. Instead the over-reliance on behavior compliance and collecting data makes Willow feel unwelcomed.

Repetitive body movements are not indicative of academic learning potential or ability to follow classroom guidelines. Accepting differences in body presence and movement in the classroom are critical for autistic students feeling safe and welcome in classroom spaces. Oftentimes the opposite causes increased anxiety. In Table 4, we provide ideas around self-regulation and ways to honor this need within the context of the inclusive classroom.

Environmental Change or Daily Routines

So often, descriptions of autistic students include commentary around their “resistance,” “struggles,” or “challenges” to changes in their environment or daily routines. These conversations often focus on the ways in which students pose a challenge, or stress, for others around them because of their extreme reactions to any changes in those norms. What we often fail to name, for students with autism and within schools at large, is that we rely on power structures where the adults make the plans for the day and students are expected to comply and follow along with whatever is asked of them. Part of these norms are that changes can also be made by adults at any point in time and the students will follow along and go with the flow of any routine or schedule changes. Furthermore, school has been built from the neurotypical perspective and ways of knowing and doing since its inception. Many students with autism talk about school as a place of extreme sensory experiences, which we will be reframing next below, as a place of rules and expectations that do not make sense to autistic students and their neurodiverse ways of being and engaging, and as a place where they cannot be their true selves. When so much about school is not designed with neurodiverse ways of being at the center, the routines in the environment and schedule become unpredictable sensory experiences. Sue Rubin, a woman with autism explained, “I need routine in my life. It is something I can depend and rely on in this crazy life” (Biklen, 2005, p. 102). Educators are quick to name an autistic student’s resistance or

Table 4
Honor Self-regulation in the Inclusive General Education Classroom

<i>Self-regulation Strategies</i>	<i>Honoring this need within the context of the Inclusive General Education Classroom</i>
Be sure not to interpret these body movements as “misbehavior.” Re-frame and combat this misconception by thinking about the purpose each provides.	As an inclusive educator, think about how to honor these body needs within the context of the general education classroom space and re-reflect on these questions:
Autistic students engage in these repetitive activities and body movements as a means to provide sensory input, self-regulation, and proprioceptive input	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What might this body movement mean? ◆ How could this work? What can this look like in the classroom?
Jumping up and down	<p>Reframing prevents these from being a stigmatizing support, and creates space for these to be empowering.</p> <p>Understand that this might be a way for the autistic student to feel grounded, feel where their body is in space</p>
Rocking, stimming with fingers or hands, touching/rubbing a certain material back and forth	Understand that this might be a way for the autistic student to keep up with the neurotypical expectations of the classroom and this is their way to self-regulate
Walking around the classroom	<p>Understand that it is difficult to keep their body still and still follow along with the lesson</p> <p>Allow the student to pace in the designated area of the classroom</p> <p>Add the option for the student to use a standing desk</p> <p>Add a tape track on the floor so that the student has a specific route around the classroom to walk, without deterring from classmates’ learning.</p>
Any repetitive or stereotypical body movement	<p>Honor it by saying, “Here’s the spot to go when you do that.” Find and prepare a location in the classroom that allows for the student to do that movement without causing learning disturbance for classmates.</p> <p>Suggest timeframes to self-regulate, then invite back to the learning segment of the classroom, “Let’s start with three minutes, then self-assess to see if you are feeling more regulated and ready to come back to the learning experience.”</p> <p>Build that movement in for the whole class and classroom space, “How do I fit this into the classroom routine? Into the classroom space?”</p> <p>Is there a way that the self-regulation need can be open for others in the classroom also?</p>

extreme reactions to changes in the environment or the routine. However, it is also important to name the lack of supports provided to help the student plan for and anticipate those changes to the very things that are predictable, and therefore, comfortable, in an otherwise often uncomfortable environment.

Recently, during a middle school classroom visit, there was an assembly in the afternoon that would take place instead of art, Drake's favorite class. At the middle school level, Drake's team provided a written schedule in his homeroom class that they reviewed each morning before students left to go about their day, so the change was mentioned there, before 8:00 in the morning. By the time the assembly, and what should have been art class, came around at 1:00 in the afternoon, no one else had mentioned the change to Drake. He packed up his belongings at the end of science and began walking excitedly down the hall to the art room. He was intercepted by the art teacher, also on her way to the assembly, who told him that class was canceled and that they could walk back to the auditorium together. Upon this news, Drake froze in the hallway. After about 30 seconds, he threw his backpack and sat down on the floor, tears visible in his eyes. The art teacher reached out a hand to try and help him up, to which he yelled, "Leave me alone." As more adults were called to come support, Drake kept asking them, "Why didn't anyone tell me about this? This is a bad surprise."

This is just one example of a student, in this case a middle school-aged student, who could be framed as having a strong negative reaction to a change in the routine, but what we see is a student who was not properly prepared for that change in routine. While there was one schedule up on the board first thing in the morning, Drake did not have a schedule with him, where he could revisit the upcoming change and prepare for it across the day, there were no supports around what he might do if he was disappointed about this change, and there were no frequent reminders from those around him across the day about him having to miss his favorite class. So often, educators need to be asking "How could I better prepare a student for this upcoming change to the physical environment (like changing of desks) or the daily routine so that they are ready to anticipate and navigate that change?" instead of seeing the deficit as being within the student. In Table 5, we offer ideas to support a student with autism during changes that commonly occur at school.

Sensory Experiences and Sensory Overload

Many individuals with autism have different sensory experiences than their neurotypical peers (Jasmin et al., 2008; Robledo et al., 2012; Tomchek & Dunn, 2007). Students with autism might be more sensitive to sensory experiences than some, or less sensitive to sensory experiences, and it can vary depending on the experiences, the sense, and so on. For example, a student with autism might be highly sensitive to light, but almost not seem to register certain sounds. They

Table 5
Supporting During Changes

<i>Common Changes</i>	<i>How might we support an autistic student in that change?</i>
Change in seat	◆ Ask the student first. “How are you feeling about the change?”
Change in daily or weekly schedule	◆ Create an age-appropriate social story with realistic photos and grade-level language.
Fire drill	◆ Film a video to explain the change so the student can view in advance and at home.
Change in bus routine	◆ Create cartoon conversations or stick figure conversations to help the student visualize what was supposed to happen and given the change, what will now happen.
Addition of school-wide event (musical, performance, school guest)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Add steps on different colored post-it notes to sequentially depict the change. You might even have one set of post-it notes for the old routine and another for the changed routine. ◆ Use a first-then board to show and discuss a quick change that will happen. ◆ Verbally discuss the changes with the student through story telling. ◆ Act out what the student can expect with the change. ◆ Make a checklist that the student can use while going through the newly changed routine. ◆ Repeat the supports throughout the day so that the student is reminded more than once of the change prior to it occurring

might really need sensory input to feel where their body is in space, such as a weighted vest or blanket, while they simultaneously struggle with the feeling of blue jeans on their skin. What this often means is that what educators see as “behavior” is often a student with autism struggling with a sensory experience that those around them are failing to recognize from their neurotypical perspective. Take, for example, the kindergartener who is constantly taking off their clothing. While the adults around them are conducting a Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) and writing a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) for the following reasons: (a) removing clothing is a very inappropriate behavior while in a school building, (b) what the student might actually be struggling with is the sensory experience of the clothing (how it feels on their body, the strong smells from the detergent

or softener used to wash them, the overwhelming feeling of heat produced from certain fabrics), (c) or, any other number of components. When we, as inclusive educators, are able to start considering the sensory experiences within any moment instead of seeing all reactions to those experiences as behavior, we are able to begin to start problem-solving, from the student's perspective, which will allow us to find solutions that work for them and support their sensory needs, as opposed to behavior interventions that force compliance and, often times, for them to continue to experience extreme sensory reactions.

When we think about high school, chemistry is one class that is a typical requirement for all graduating students to participate in. One such autistic high schooler, named Jonathan, was assigned to take a chemistry lab as he worked towards his high school diploma. He was assigned to a co-taught chemistry class, where the general education chemistry teacher co-taught each session with a special education teacher, and his success was anticipated due to the layers of support provided, including visual supports and differentiated instruction. Jonathan very quickly started running from the classroom, remaining about five to 10 minutes before making a hasty exit. The general education teacher saw this action through the lens of behavior, and Jonathan found himself receiving consequences for missed class time. Upon further investigation, when the teachers were able to step back and ask him questions, it was discovered that he was in fact running from the classroom because the smells of the chemicals was, as he put it, "lighting the hairs of his nose on fire." Jonathan found the scents associated with the chemistry classroom and labs to be so uncomfortable that he was unable to remain in the room. Once the sensory discomfort was realized, the team was able to problem solve ways for Jonathan to engage, both wearing a specific mask to reduce the smells (which they also made available to all students and others joined him in wearing) and, when it worked out, having him and other peers work in a different classroom with less of a chemistry odor to it.

Inclusive educators need to think about the sensory profile and needs of a student. Do the lights impact the student? What about the noise in the classroom, in the lunchroom, and at recess? Does the gymnasium echo? What environmental conditions are not conducive to the student's learning? Understanding the sensory impact the environment has for an autistic individual is imperative because it might disrupt thinking, cause students to become fixated or perseverate on the issue, or make them show with their body and behavior that something feels completely off in their internal system. This sensory overload for an autistic individual is caused by the environment, and any body movements or behavior can be attributed to the physical space. Instead of asking the student to change, inquire into what elements in the environment or physical space need to change. Position the need to change on the environment. Ask the student about the sensory elements in the classroom to determine what needs to change or be adjusted. Close watching and monitoring of the student can provide clues as to the sensory needs in a

particular environment. Obtain additional information about their sensory needs from their parents, or from a related service provider. In Table 6, sensory needs and associated supports are provided.

Decentering Speech Invites Students into the Academic Learning

Communication is often a barrier to access the academic conversations of a learning experience. For so many students with autism, as was previously discussed, their competence is questioned because of misconceptions about the ways they communicate, move through space, interact with those around them, and so on. For many autistic students, they are presumed incompetent until they have been able to prove otherwise in ways that the adults in schools are able to recog-

Table 6
Supporting Sensory Needs

<i>Sensory Needs</i>	<i>Strategies to Support Proactively and in the Moment</i>
With any new apparent sensory input	Ask the student how the sensory stimuli is impacting them. Listen to how the student describes it.
Lights	If an autistic student is hypersensitive to a certain light (e.g., LED lights, intense lights, blue light, or fluorescent lights) in a classroom, replace the problematic lighting with plug in lamps with dim or soft color lights. Use natural light in the classroom as much as possible. In an environment that already has a lot of stimuli, it might be a challenge to process. Notice keeping eyes closed, turning the lights off, or otherwise shielding eyes that can cause too much visual stimulus. For some, certain color lights are calming. Ask the student and use their suggestion to create a calming classroom environment.
Noise	If there is a buzzing or background noise present in the classroom that an autistic person can hear, it can cause difficulty in processing or focusing on academic tasks. Once you have asked the student, work with the custodial staff to limit these noises. Maybe it is the air, heating, or light system in the classroom. Sometimes background music supports calmness and centering with classrooms where you cannot change the permanent systems.
Smells	For some individuals, certain smells in perfumes, laundry detergent, or hair care products can be triggering. If this is the case, limiting perfume or other high-smelling products in the classroom is helpful.
Hyposensitivity	Some students might need more stimulation from the environment, so might jump, rock, make noises. Knowing that these movements or sounds allow them needed sensory input is critical.

nize. Even then, many must prove repeatedly and only after multiple instances of demonstration is competence and access provided, often on a conditional basis. Speech is the standard of sharing intellect in schools, as it is the method to demonstrate smartness, prove competence, and respond to an academic question and task (Leonardo & Broderick, 2011). What we mean by this is that so much of teaching and learning in schools relies on students being able to respond verbally to questions, raise their hand and share a thought, engage in a verbal retelling of a story, and so forth. Speaking, and writing, are central to how students show their intelligence and whether teachers see students as competent, or not. In this next section we are asking inclusive educators to consider: how can educators decenter speech as the primary method of showing competence?

In order to center autistic students' belonging in inclusive classrooms, we must position speech as neutral. Communicating in one specific way over another is not a priority, it just is neutral. When we shift to this mindset, we send the explicit message of acceptance through neutrality.

If we want to shift to classrooms of true inclusion and belonging, we need to start thinking broadly about how we can remove spoken language as required capital in classrooms for students to be seen as competent, capable learners and, therefore, be given access to high-quality, engaging instruction, their peers, and all of the other key components that general education offers. In speech-dominated classrooms, there are several pedagogical changes that can be made to support autistic individuals' access to the lesson. These strategies help autistic individuals move from minimal participation to intellectual contributions. We offer ideas in Table 7, although our list is surely not all-encompassing. As you consider these strategies, we also challenge you to develop other ideas for how you could take speech out of the center of your instruction and assessment to allow for more expansive ways for students to show you the knowledge and skills they hold.

Each of the pedagogical strategies in Table 7 allow autistic individuals to engage in a classroom learning environment that decenters speech, allowing contributions from typed or otherwise created messages to be valued. This instructional planning cultivates an equitable inclusive environment because it levels the classroom playing field to allow written, or otherwise created (such as in the gallery walk example) thoughts from both neurodiverse and neurotypical students. When we leave speech at the center and allow it to be the means through which students show their knowledge, we will always leave out some students, including students with autism. Next, we consider the reasons and rationale for constructing an inclusive classroom that decenters speech.

Reasons and Rationale for Decentering Speech

In the aforementioned Table 7, a variety of strategies for how to decenter speech in the classroom were discussed, but educators might find themselves

Table 7
Decentering Speech in Inclusive Classrooms

<i>Pedagogical Strategy</i>	<i>Potential Materials or Technology Ideas to Implement</i>	<i>Pedagogical Purpose</i>
Chat via typing messages	Google Chat Zoom Chat	Real-time chat features allow students to type messages, thoughts, responses, and questions during lessons.
Collaborative web platform that creates virtual bulletin boards	Padlet	Real-time collaborative web platform to create, upload, organize, and share content, text, images, and links on a virtual board.
Paired Pass the Brainstorm	Index Card	In partnerships, students discuss via typed or spoken communication, then record a joint idea on the index card. Once complete, the index card is passed to the next partnership. This partnership adds to, agrees, or disagrees with the previous thought.
Gallery Walk	Large Paper Collage Materials Writing Utensils	Students create, such as through a collage, to demonstrate their thinking and learning. Students then can walk through and think about their take-aways from others' creations in relation to the content.
Graffiti Brainstorm	Poster Paper/ Whiteboard/ Chalkboard/etc. Writing Utensils	Students can add words and images related to focal content in order to share their thinking and learning, without having to share aloud.
Word Cloud, Concept Map, Graphic Organizer	Popplet Coggle MindMeister Mindmup	Students create a mind map connecting main ideas, thoughts, and critical thinking points to collaboratively develop a deeper understanding of the content. Students add key words, phrases, and short statements to bubbles to create a mind map.

wondering, when spoken language is such a normed part of our learning processes, how removing spoken language across the classroom experience could add to the community and learning environment. Next, we will talk about how removing speech as core currency within the classroom creates a more equitable and inclusive learning environment for all.

Creating a Culture of Expansive Language in the Classroom: Speech is the primary mode of language expression in the classroom. When we widen the circle to encompass language as being critical and recognize language as broad and beyond speech, it allows students to participate in the learning in varied ways—both through written language, non-speaking modes like body actions or movements, and speech. It allows language to be expressed in whatever means necessary given that student's needs.

Changing the Dynamic of Engagement in the Classroom: When we decenter speech within our classrooms, we are shifting the ways that students can engage: with one another, with their teacher(s), and with the curriculum. Speech systematically leaves some students out, in particular students with autism for whom speech is not the most reliable means of communication, so moving it out of the center within classroom norms allows for varied modes of engagement, which creates a more truly inclusive learning environment for all students.

Centering Active Learning, in Multiple Modalities: So many of our classroom norms require listening, reading and speaking, which often leads to one person speaking at a time in the classroom while all other members of the community passively listen. When classrooms move away from relying on speech, educators are able to create new ways for students to simultaneously engage in ways that are authentic, bring in a variety of modalities for engagement, and create active learning opportunities for all members of the inclusive classroom.

Changes the Power Dynamic: Speech has been central to schooling. As discussed throughout this article, speech has also become a culturally normed way for students to be able to demonstrate their abilities and competence within the classroom. However, for some students spoken language will never be the way they best demonstrate what they know or otherwise express themselves. When we decenter speech from our classroom norms, we are shifting the power dynamics within a classroom, allowing for a wider range of students to be seen as competent contributors to the learning and the district community.

Altering the Communication Hierarchy: Spoken explanations are highly valued within our educational systems. When we decenter speech

across our classroom practices, we upset the traditional hierarchy of what is valued within student responses. Instead of requiring students to explain their thinking verbally, we now allow for and value multiple modes of expression. This shift removes verbal speech as required capital within a classroom and alters that traditional hierarchy of communication modes.

Valuing Writing in More Robust Ways: Within many of our public education norms, we expect students to engage in independent writing tasks, often as a component of more assessment based classroom practices, such as on their homework, during individual work in the classroom, or as a check for understanding. We are not as good at valuing writing during the learning process. In other words, we often do not have students engage in robust writing experiences while they are engaging with content, processing learning, or collaborating with others. When we work to decenter speech in our classrooms, we invite in more varied opportunities for students to write across all components of the learning process. Further, acknowledging a range of writing styles, such as typing, handwriting, filling in a blank space with a word bank, and labeling. Allowing space for varied communicative actions recognizes and values students writing an initial letter, a word, a sentence, a string of sentences, and handwriting. In other words, honoring the communicative intent of the student and creating the web of communication opportunities that allow that student to participate is vital in creating competence-aligned inclusive schools.

Valuing Divergent Ways of Thinking and Showing Knowledge: When we decenter speech as required currency within the classroom, we simply create space for (neuro)divergent ways of being, thinking, and showing knowledge. This pedagogical shift aims to remove neurotypical, long accepted and expected ways of engaging and showing knowledge as the normed center, which leaves educators and classrooms open for all of the creative and outside-the-box ways students might demonstrate these things.

Discussion

District data across the United States indicates that students with autism are far less likely to be included in general education, even at the physical inclusion level, than many of their peers who qualify for special education under other IDEA disability categories, and that students of color with autism are even less likely to be included than their white peers (U.S. Department of Education, 2021). This is a contemporary social justice issue that educational systems need to be collaborating around; teachers have the potential to directly combat these sys-

tematic issues by implementing pedagogical strategies that intentionally create inclusion, access to communicative opportunities, and facilitate demonstration of competence in educational environments. In order to move away from physical or partial inclusion to a place where autistic students experience authentic inclusion and belonging, it is the job of educators to challenge their own assumptions about the competence of these students and to change their teaching practices to allow for a more diverse student body to successfully engage with content and demonstrate their learning.

Across this article, we first discussed many of the common misconceptions about autism and offered suggestions about how to reframe some of our understandings, as well as new pedagogical approaches, to support educators in seeing their students with autism in a new way and to consider new ways to use their strengths within general education. Our aim is that these sections allow for readers to think back to an autistic student that they know and reconsider the meaning behind some of their actions or consider a different way they might have supported that student in the classroom. Furthermore, we have challenged educators to begin to think about how to remove speech as the central currency of a classroom and provided some ideas for other ways students could engage and participate in active learning, spoken language free.

It is important to note that we have centered the experience of autistic students across this article, but the beauty of inclusive educational practices is that they also allow us to reach a broader range of students within the classroom. When done well, with clear pedagogical commitments at its core, inclusive education benefits all. Educators who begin to implement strategies included across the sections here will also see their positive impact on other students with a range of needs within the classroom, some expected and others not. For example, as we include more visuals and provide non-spoken ways for students to demonstrate their thinking and learning, we are also supporting students who are learning English. We allow a student with an information processing disorder the time needed to develop a thought and write it on the graffiti brainstorm chart paper. Approaching the classroom through critical educational inquiry, notice which practices stigmatize certain learners and who benefits from these, with a new goal of reimagining how instructional practices can be altered to fit all learners. Inclusive education requires educators who construct learning experiences that honor divergent communication, ways of being, and demonstrating competence.

Note

¹ Across this article, the authors have intentionally decided to use both person-first (i.e., student with autism) and identity-first (i.e., autistic student) language. In many public schools across the U.S., identity-first language is utilized by professionals with negative connotations and in ways that reduce a student simply to their disability label, so many inclusion-oriented educators advocate for person-first language. Person-first language has long been argued a

more respectful way to talk about individuals with disability labels, but autistic and other disabled advocates push back against this discourse, as their disability is a part of their identity. We advocate to use identity-first language when that is how the individual or group being mentioned prefers; in other words, always respect the preference of the person being discussed. As such, both have been used and modeled within this manuscript.

References

- Artiles, A. J., Harry, B., Reschly, D. J., & Chinn, P. C. (2002). Over-identification of students of color in special education: A critical overview. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 4, 3-10. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327892MCP0401_2
- Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., Waitoller, F. R., & Luckinbeal, C. (2011). Inclusive education and the interlocking of ability and race in the U.S.: Notes for an educational equity research program. In A. J. Artiles, E. B. Kozleski, & F. R. Waitoller (Eds.), *Inclusive Education: Examining Equity on Five Continents* (pp. 45-68). Harvard Education Press.
- Baker, E. T., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1994). The effects of inclusion on learning. *Educational Leadership*, 52(4), 33-35.
- Biklen, D. P. (2005). *Autism and the myth of the person alone*. New York University Press.
- Biklen, D. P. (2020). Presuming competence, bellowing, and the promise of inclusion: The US experiences. *Prospects*, 49, 233-247. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09510-0>
- Biklen, D. P., & Kliever, C. (2006). Constructing competence: Autism, voice, and the 'disordered' body. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10(2-3), 169-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110600578208>
- Cole, C. M., Waldron, N., Majd, M., & Hasazi, S. (2004). Academic progress of students across inclusive and traditional settings. *Mental Retardation*, 42(2), 136-144. [https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765\(2004\)42<136:APOSAI>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765(2004)42<136:APOSAI>2.0.CO;2)
- Cosier, M., Causton-Theoharis, J., & Theoharis, G. (2013). Does access matter? Time in general education and achievement for students with disabilities. *Remedial & Special Education*, 34(6), 323-332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932513485>
- Department of Education, U. S. (2022). *Forty-third Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2021*. Washington, D.C.
- Ferguson, P. M., & Nusbaum, E. (2012). Disability studies: What is it and what difference does it make? *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 37(2), 70-80. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/154079691203700202>
- Fierros, E. G., & Conroy, J. (2002). Double Jeopardy: An Exploration of Restrictiveness and Race in Special Education. In D. Losen & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Racial Inequity in Special Education*. Harvard Education Press.
- Fisher, M., & Meyer, L. (2002). Development and social competence after two years for students enrolled in inclusive and self-contained educational programs. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 27(3), 165-174. <https://doi.org/10.2511/rpsd.27.3.165>
- Freeman, S., & Alkin, M. (2000). Academic and social attainments of children with mental retardation in general education and special education settings. *Remedial & Special Education*, 21(1), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074193250002100>
- Friend, M. B., W.D. (2021). *Including students with special needs: A practical guide for*

- classroom teachers* (8th edition ed.). Pearson.
- Fryxell, D., & Kennedy, C. H. (1995). Placement along the continuum of services and its impact on students' social relationships. *Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 20(4), 259-269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15407969960200040>
- Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., KLiddiard, K., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2019). Provocations for critical disability studies. *Disability & Society*, 34(6), 972-997. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1566889>
- Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). *A Summary of The Evidence on Inclusive Education*. A. Associates.
- Hilton, C. L., Zhang, Y., Whilte, M. R., Klohr, C. L., & Constantino, J. (2012). Motor impairment in sibling pairs concordant and discordant for autism spectrum disorders. *Autism*, 16(4), 430-441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361311423018>
- Hunt, P., & Goetz, L. (1997). Research on inclusive education programs, practices, and outcomes for students with severe disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*, 31(1), 3-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002246699703100102>
- Jasmin, E., Couture, M., McKinley, P., Reid, G., Fombonne, E., & Gisel, E. (2008). Sensori-motor and daily living skills of preschool children with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 39(2), 231-2341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-008-0617-z>
- Kavale, K. A. (2002). Mainstreaming to full inclusion: from orthogenesis to pathogenesis of an idea. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education*, 49(2), 201-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/103491220141776>
- Leonardo, Z., & Broderick, A. A. (2011). Smartness as property: A critical exploration of intersections between whiteness and disability studies. *Teachers College Record*, 113(10), 2206-2232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681111130100>
- Malik, F., & Marwaha, R. (2022). *Developmental States of Social Emotional Development in Children*. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30521240/>
- Marder, C., Wagner, M., & Sumi, C. (2003). *The Social Adjustment of Youth with Disabilities* (The Achievements of Youth with Disabilities During Secondary School: A Report From the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2), Issue. S. International.
- McDonnell, J., Mathot-Bucker, C., Thorson, N., & Fister, S. (2001). Supporting the inclusion of students with moderate and severe disabilities in junior high school general education classes: The effects of class-wide peer tutoring, multi-element curriculum and accommodations. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 24(2), 141-160.
- Moran, M. F., Foley, J. T., Parker, M. E., & Weiss, M. J. (2013). Two-legged hopping in autism spectrum disorders. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 7(14), 301-308. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2013.00014>
- Paton, B., Hohwy, J., & Enticott, P. G. (2012). The rubber hand illusion reveals proprioceptive and sensorimotor differences in autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 42(9), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-011-1430-7>
- Rea, P., McLaughlin, V., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2002). Outcomes for students with learning disabilities in inclusive and pullout programs. *Exceptional Children*, 68(2), 203-223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290206800204>
- Robledo, J., Donnellan, A. M., & Strandt-Conroy, K. (2012). An exploration of sensory and movement differences from the perspective of individuals with autism. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 6, 107. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2012.00107>
- Rubin, S. (2013). *Facilitated Communication-The Key to Success for a Non-verbal Person*

- with Autism. <https://sites.google.com/site/suerubin696/platform>
- Salend, S., & Garrick Duhaney, L. (2007). Research related to inclusion and program effectiveness. In J. McLeskey (Ed.), *Reflections on inclusion: Classic articles that shaped our thinking* (pp. 127-159). Council for Exceptional Children.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (2010). *Because we can change the world: A practical guide to building cooperative, inclusive classroom communities*. Corwin.
- Schnorr, R. F. (1990). "Peter? He comes and goes...": First graders' perspectives on a part-time mainstream student. *The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 1(4), 231-240.
- Tomchek, S. D., & Dunn, W. (2007). Sensory processing in children with and without autism: A comparative study using the short sensory profile. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 31(2), 190-200. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.61.2.190>
- Wagner, M., Blackorby, J., Cameto, R., & CNewman, L. (1993). *What Makes a Difference? Influences on Postschool Outcomes of Youth with Disabilities. The Third Comprehensive Report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students*. S. International. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED365085>
- Waldron, N., & McLeskey, J. (1998). The effects of an inclusive school program on students with mild and severe learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 64(2), 395-405. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402998064003>
- White, J. M., Li, S., Ashby, C., Ferri, B., Wang, Q., Bern, P., & Cosier, M. (2019). Same as it ever was: The nexus of race, ability, and place in one urban school district. *Educational Studies*, 55(4), 453-472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2019.1630130>
- Wiener, J., & Tardif, C. Y. (2004). Social and emotional functioning of children with learning disabilities: Does special education placement make a difference? *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 19(1), 20-32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2004.00086.x>

Not All Doctoral Journeys Are Paved With Gold

Derek E. Failkiewicz

Abstract

This article is a reflection on the journey through the process of my doctoral studies. Published dissertations or research articles are very neat and tidy with no mention of any adversity or struggle. Hence why many doctoral students feel stressed, anxiety, or like quitting when obstacles or roadblocks are encountered. My doctoral program took much longer than anticipated, and my resulting dissertation veered far from my original proposal. What began as a mixed-methods study with a possible 1,400 surveys and 20 interview participants was morphed into a qualitative case study with one participant. There were many contributing factors, most uncontrollable and unforeseen and some unprecedented. In the end, I overcame the obstacles and persevered successfully completing my dissertation and doctoral program, but the struggles were worth documenting for others. Hopefully, current doctoral students and researchers can use this article as an anecdote when facing resistance along their pathway.

Introduction

Murphy's Law states that if anything can go wrong, it will. The expedition leading to my dissertation was an illustration of Murphy's Law. I imagine we all have the best of intentions when writing our dissertation proposals to design and implement the perfect study that will positively affect our field of study. Along the road I also imagine we all encounter bumps and potholes, but our final publications are written to demonstrate a flawless study, a so-called tidy package. When examining the scholarly literature, I found few if any pieces that catalogued and

Derek E. Failkiewicz is superintendent of the Corbett School District, Corbett, Oregon. Email address: derek@failkiewicz.com

© 2023 by Caddo Gap Press.

documented the frustrations, tears shed, sleepless nights, and overwhelming stress as the struggles were overcome. The exercise of demonstrating and documenting the results of one's empirical work often sacrifices providing the more raw and personal insights about the process that, ironically, could assist emerging scholars in understanding that despite the tidy appearance of the package, the work is fraught with complexities. As doctoral candidates face adversity during the dissertation process, it is easy to feel as though you are doing something wrong or not worthy of completing the dissertation.

This article is part of my dissertation. While completing a multi-article approach, it became clear that my proposed study faced a myriad of challenges and complexities. Instead of presenting the tidy package, I used this article to peel back the layers of the clean and sterile process of reporting research to reveal and explore the realities that I, like so many others, experienced. The experience narrated in this article is intended to inform any reader of the struggles, stress, potholes, frustrations, and mistakes that are common to the process, but often not articulated formally. This article serves as an anecdote for those engaged in and struggling toward an appropriate account of their work, but do not see models in the literature for navigating what they experience.

In the culmination of my journey towards a doctoral degree in mathematics education, I concentrated my dissertation on the perceptions and understandings of formative feedback in mathematics of students enrolled in grade 8 Pre-Algebra of a large comprehensive school district with urban and suburban communities. As a former high school mathematics teacher, my passion lies in improving student learning in mathematics. At an early age children learn mathematics is difficult, boring, abstract, and negative. Children develop a fear of mathematics before allowing themselves the opportunity to acquire a love for it. Matute (1995) noted many Americans develop a sense of learned helplessness with regards to mathematics; they believe they have no control over their mathematical ability.

The early stages of this research study were focused on using Electronic Student Response Systems (ESRS) to provide immediate feedback to students in mathematics classes. These technologies offer students immediate feedback allowing them to become self-regulated learners by being active participants in the learning process (Moratelli & DeJarnette, 2014). Teachers can quickly and easily gather and store student achievement data without having to grade and enter them manually. These data can be instantly accessed, analyzed, and compared with relevant prior data to find student learning trends. Students appreciate the immediate feedback from the ESRS and find them helpful in learning content (Milner-Bolotin et al., 2010). Teachers and students feel the instant feedback of ESRS yields greater student participation and mental engagement (Wash, 2012).

As I became immersed in the research around ESRS and feedback, I realized the timing, frequency, and quality of formative feedback outweighed the medium of the feedback. Students crave feedback statements focused on ways to make im-

provements, and the opportunity to apply that feedback to increase performance (Pollack, 2007). The quality of feedback given to learners has a significant impact on the quality of learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

I served as a principal of a magnet middle school with a focus on STEM and project-based learning prior to my current role of a district superintendent. My passion for improving student learning in mathematics remains but with a new emphasis on student self-efficacy and building life-long learners, hence, the concentration on middle school students' perceptions of their experiences of formative assessment feedback provided by teachers in mathematics.

During my career of over 25 years in education, I have seen many variations of secondary gradebooks and grading policies. They all had one thing in common—a certain percentage of each student's final grade was based on a combination of summative and formative grades. The summative grades included tests, quizzes, and projects. The formative grades included homework, classwork, review material, and compliance assignments (forms signed by guardians). Formative assessment grades ranged from 10% to 50% of the student's final grade depending on the teacher, class, or school. Students tend to focus solely on the numeric grade on an assignment, rather than the feedback provided (Irons, 2008). Grades cause added stress on students by increasing the competition for obtaining higher marks and turn learning into an extrinsically motivated process.

During my time as a middle school principal, I established a fair and equitable grading system that fostered a student's intrinsic motivation to learn. As I studied research on the topic, it became clear that a formative assessment system based on feedback with no numeric or letter grade attached was the most effective way for students to learn (Butler, 1988; Nyquist, 2003; 2017). As a student-centered educator, I became obsessed with how middle school students perceived a formative assessment system focused only on feedback with no grades attached. Studies that focused on the perception of middle school students enrolled in a large comprehensive school district with urban and suburban communities with respect to formative feedback were scarcely existent.

I spent over a year designing a mixed methods study to include a comparison of survey and interview data. The survey focused on student perceptions of feedback in mathematics and student attitudes toward mathematics and would potentially be completed by over 1,000 students. The students who completed the survey would be narrowed to 20 interview participants. These aspirations appeared attainable within a reasonable timeline, until the COVID-19 global pandemic moved schools into a fully online structure and altered the instructional pedagogy. Additionally, the methods of disseminating and attaining information were transformed from face-to-face to completely online. The complexity of navigating the numerous rounds of revisions through the university and school district IRB processes inhibited my ability to move the project forward in a timely manner. Several outside forces worked in concert and affected this

study shifting from an ideal methodological composition to a study based on negotiated compromise.

Problem Statement

Mental health of students has recently become an important and publicized public health issue. Though studies have focused on the mental well-being of students in grades K–12 and undergraduates, the research on the mental health of postgraduate students is lacking. A gap exists in the research with regards to the level of emotional and academic stress experienced by doctoral students and this was my interest.

Anticipated Methodology

The initial purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions and understandings with respect to formative feedback of grade 8 Pre-Algebra students in a large comprehensive school district with urban and suburban communities. Wiliam (2018) proposed that the most effective formative feedback can be determined when the perceptions of the recipients of the feedback are taken into consideration.

Given the research question “What are the perceptions and understandings of students enrolled in Grade 8 Pre-Algebra of a large comprehensive school district with urban and suburban communities with respect to formative feedback?” the intent of this study was to initially identify four middle schools in a large comprehensive school district with urban and suburban communities. Two dichotomous sets of two comparable schools each would be generated to obtain a heterogenous cross-section of the population of the large comprehensive school district.

Two of the schools, School Y and School Z, had been deemed *have not met the state’s standard for performance* and the other two schools, School A and School B, had been deemed *superior*, based on the designation framework for schools in that state. The proficiency rates on the state’s summative assessment in math and reading are amongst the highest in the state at Schools A and B, whereas the proficiency rates at schools Y and Z in math and reading are amongst the lowest. The percentage of students attending Schools A and B who were designated as English Language Learners (ELL), Black, Hispanic, qualified for Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL), or Special Education were under the state average, based on 2019 demographic data; the percentage of students attending Schools Y and Z who were designated as ELL, Black, Hispanic, FRL, or Special Education exceeded the state average.

Three Pre-Algebra teachers at each of the four schools were asked to email an explanation of the study, a link to a short online demographic survey, and a consent form to each of the parents/guardians of their approximately 1,400 Pre-Algebra students. Questions included in the demographic survey asked the

student's age, gender, ethnicity, email address, highest education level of each parent/guardian, number of minor children in the household, and household income level. The rationale behind and duration of the research, the data gathering and analysis processes, any potential risks or advantages to the student, confidentiality practices, and the fact that the student involvement was entirely voluntary and could be concluded at any time were fully explained in the consent letter.

None of the students were contacted until the parent/guardian consent forms were received. I then emailed a survey measuring perceptions of mathematics and formative feedback to each of the students whose parents/guardians consented to their participation in the study. Based on a combination of the demographics and perceptions surveys, a 20-student demographic representative sample of the school district, including 10 students from each of two of the schools (either A or B and either Y or Z), were selected to participate in the interview process.

The student survey contained two sections—student perception of feedback in mathematics and student attitudes toward mathematics. The first section was comprised of eleven questions utilized by Van der Kleij (2019), which he modified from Havnes et al. (2012). Van der Kleij included both math and English Language Arts students when conducting the survey; I focused only on mathematics. The response choices included 4 = True, 3 = Nearly true, 2 = True only to some extent, 1 = Untrue. The second section included 15 questions from the Attitudes Towards Mathematics Inventory (ATMI) initially developed by Tapia (1996); Tapia initially designed 40 questions, which Lim and Chapman (2013) condensed after analysis of the performance of the items in a comprehensive study presented redundancy in the outcomes of certain items. The ATMI items were divided into four classifications of enjoyment, motivation, self-confidence, and value. After several iterations, Lim and Chapman (2013) suggested utilizing five items each from self-confidence, value, and enjoyment in the short ATMI. The short ATMI questions were used as the basis for an empirical journal article.

The primary qualitative data source resulted from a series of semi structured interviews (Bernard & Ryan, 2010); Bernard and Ryan (2010) recommended using semi structured interviews with minors. An interview guide was the basis for a set of similar questions asked of each participant. The participants were allowed to communicate their accounts through their responses. The initial interviews lasted for about 30 minutes including general questions regarding the students' background and comprehension of assessments and feedback. The questions included:

- What is your family structure?
- What are your past experiences in school?
- What are your past experiences in mathematics?
- What are your hobbies?
- What are your current experiences in school?
- What are your current experiences in mathematics?
- How would you define formative feedback?

What are your current experiences with formative feedback?

What are your past experiences with formative feedback?

When the initial interviews concluded, the interviews were summarized and indexed in a spreadsheet. The second, more focused set of semi structured interview questions provided a deeper comprehension of the students' perceptions of formative feedback utilizing the indexed summaries from the initial interview as a basis. Some of the second interview questions included: "Describe an experience in math class where formative feedback made you feel happy" and "Describe an experience in math class where formative feedback made you feel upset or sad."

The recordings of the second set of interviews were summarized and indexed minute by minute like the first set. The summaries of both interviews were sent to the respective participants allowing them an opportunity to review and modify the summaries, if needed. A third clarifying interview would be scheduled if a participant requested a substantial modification to the summaries.

Roadblocks

Rocky Beginning

This long and winding road began in August 2009 when I enrolled in my first doctoral class. I was working full-time as a high school administrator with two young boys ages eight and six at home. Completion of my Ph.D. in mathematics education was anticipated to occur by May 2015. As a single father with a full-time job that required at least 60 hours per week, I struggled to successfully complete more than one class per semester. One year into my program, I was forced to take a leave of absence for a year to focus on a court battle to retain custody of my children, which left me one year behind schedule. Completing multiple summer courses allowed me to conclude my required coursework in May 2016. I was ready for my Qualifying Examination.

Living in a popular tourist city had some benefits, one of which is a plethora of cheap hotel rooms. When a large assignment or paper was due, I made it a practice throughout my doctoral program to take a day or two off from work, reserve a hotel room, and lock myself away while I completed the assignment. The strict, tight timeframe for completing the Qualification Exam questions lent itself to a few days of isolation in a local hotel. After submitting my responses a few days early, I was ready to defend. My topic was student perception of the use of Electronic Student Response Systems (ESRS) to provide immediate feedback to students in mathematics classes. The committee approved my Qualifying Exam without any edits, moving me forward into the proposal phase in June 2016.

During a qualitative analysis class, I completed a small phenomenological study interviewing two students at my school regarding their perceptions of ESRS use in their math class. ESRS (clickers) were just becoming popular in my school district and many principals were considering investing considerable funds into

multiple classroom sets of clickers. A teacher at my school was quite proficient with the use of clickers in his mathematics classroom and was a resource for novice ESRS teachers. I quickly had a draft proposal ready to share with my committee chairs for feedback. I proposed a phenomenological study focused on student perception of ESRS in mathematics class with the population based in my teachers' classes. Data from multiple interviews of various students would be compared with classroom observation data. These findings would help inform principals and districts whether they should invest money in ESRS for their mathematics classrooms.

During my first proposal meeting with both of my committee chairs, they provided positive feedback on ways I could rework the introduction to improve its ability to grab the reader's attention. A few other small tweaks were discussed to improve the flow and readability. As the next meeting approached a few weeks later, I was confident that my proposal was ready for defense and that I would be interviewing students soon. Everything came to a screeching halt when one of my committee chairs announced he was struggling accepting phenomenology as a viable methodology. He questioned student interviews as a valid data source because children will tell you anything they think you want to hear. He also questioned perception as scholarly enough for a dissertation. One argument was if someone perceives the moon to be made of cheese, does that mean it really is? And who cares? I left that meeting completely defeated, knowing my passion lay with student perception of ESRS use in mathematics, but my committee chair made it clear he was not going to support that study as a dissertation.

The next three and a half years were spent figuratively trying to fit a square peg into a round hole. I continued attempting to convince my chair of the validity, viability, and worthiness of phenomenology as a dissertation methodology. He continually attempted to find additional data sources like teacher perception, assessment scores, and surveys to offset the student interview data. Spans of multiple months passed without looking at the proposal. The frustration caused me to force it out of my conscious thought, though it weighed on my subconscious. Every few months I considered an adaptation to my proposal, amended my document, met with my chairs, only to ultimately face the same result.

The university placed me on probation in the Fall of 2019 with a required proposal defense by May 2020 and dissertation defense by May 2021. The pressure had exponentially increased. A compromise had been struck among my chairs and me regarding the methodology of the study. I was ready to move forward toward a defense. The study vaguely resembled my original proposal, but I was one step closer to defending. Over the years, clickers had lost their luster and other online forms of ESRS had come into prominence. I realized the mode of feedback was much less important than the quality of the feedback. Therefore, the focus of the study shifted to formative feedback, not necessarily using ESRS.

Change of Committee Chair

In February 2020 I received an email from my primary committee chair stating he was taking a leave of absence and would no longer be able to chair my committee given the tight timelines to which I needed to adhere. The university required my committee chair be a member of the Mathematics Education Department. My secondary chair was no longer technically in the Mathematics Education Department, and the other two members of the department had full caseloads and could not take another doctoral student; I was flabbergasted. Over ten years of work and thousands of dollars would be wasted because one person was taking a leave of absence. There were only three options available: (1) walk away without a degree, (2) find a new chair in the Teaching and Learning Department, switch from a Ph.D. to an Ed.D. and complete the program, or (3) take one more course and finish with an Ed.S. Though not ideal, Option 2 was the least offensive option to me. The Graduate Director of the Teaching and Learning Department agreed to be my committee chair and to assist me through the process of transferring from a Ph.D. to an Ed.D. He also facilitated the development of a new committee. By May 2020 I was officially an Ed.D. student, and by June 2020, I had defended my proposal and advanced to doctoral candidacy.

IRB

The next few months were spent preparing the methodology for the IRB process. I did not anticipate the level of detail the IRB committee required when children were involved in a study. I applied to the school district IRB only to learn that university IRB approval was necessary prior to applying for school district IRB approval. For weeks I answered each of the university IRB questions, completed each of the forms, and created ancillary documents including parent letters, student letters, online consent and assent forms, online demographic surveys, online student perception surveys, etc. A month after submitting, the university IRB returned a list of 26 sections requiring edits. Working with my committee, we amended the initial proposal and addressed the 26 sections. Hours were spent determining the actual meaning behind some of the edit requests, including a robust explanation of how the data from the demographic surveys would be stored and secured, informing all potential participants that the interviews would be recorded, and the reading level of the student forms.

Weeks later a new document arrived from the university IRB requesting 22 more edits be made to the application. Many questions revolved around the idea that I was potentially surveying up to 1,400 students, but only interviewing 20 of them. They did not understand what would happen with the survey data. They also still questioned the security of a Google drive in the Cloud. Again, hours were spent updating the application form with the information we thought they were requesting.

Over a month passed before a third document from the university IRB arrived, requesting 19 more edits to the application. They still questioned the security of a Google drive in the Cloud. They also requested a script for the interviews, even though by design semi structured interviews do not have a script since the interviewer adapts based on the participants' responses. Additionally, I sought to access student data such as email address, math grades, ethnicity, and gender from the school district Student Information Services. The university IRB pushed back extensively so I included that information in the parent demographic survey instead.

After nearly four months, the university IRB application was approved and the school district IRB application could be submitted. This process was more streamlined, possibly due to the extensive revision process completed for the university IRB approval. After only one set of revisions, the school district IRB application was approved within two weeks of the initial application.

COVID-19 Pandemic

These struggles paled in comparison to the worldwide crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic at this time. The Las Vegas Strip was closed for nearly three months, the first extended closure in the Strip's history. Entire cities were quarantined for months with only essential businesses such as grocery stores, delivery food, and health care facilities allowed to remain open. Teachers conducted classes remotely from home using virtual meeting platforms. Throughout the 2020-21 school year, many school districts remained in a virtual learning environment and students and teachers remained at home. In the participating school district, all meetings were restricted to a virtual platform and information was disseminated only through email or video.

These inconveniences paled in comparison to the suffering, loss of life, loss of jobs, and added stress caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. When families were worried about a sick loved one, putting food on the table, ensuring their children were participating in classes, childcare, paying rent, they were not spending time and energy on an email from one of their child's teachers regarding a dissertation study. Nearly a year later, many of the families in the participating school district have not recovered fully and have many of the same worries.

Actual Methodology

The roadblocks mentioned caused a significant number of pivots during this process. Each pivot brought added stress and frustration followed by a new hope. Ultimately, the methodology submitted in my original proposal was amended to the methodology explained in Table 1.

The beginning phases of the anticipated methodology progressed smoothly. Four middle schools with the appropriate demographics and designations were identified and their principals agreed to allow the study to occur with their staff

and students. A description of the study was emailed to the Pre-Algebra teachers at each school requesting their participation in forwarding the parent consent email to the parents of their Pre-Algebra students. After four follow-up emails, nine of the 12 teachers responded confirming their participation in the study and acknowledging that they would forward my email to the parents of their Pre-Algebra students. Since student and parent identifying and contact information cannot be provided to the researcher by the institution, I needed to trust that the teachers sent my email to the parents; this also prevented me from sending reminders to the parents. Two weeks later, eight out of a possible 1000 parents responded offering consent for their child to participate in the study.

The parental consent form included a request for the student's email address that allowed me to directly contact the students of the parents who responded. A description of the study, link to an assent form, and link to the surveys were included in the email to the eight students. After two weeks, three students responded, and two of the three completed the online surveys and assented to participate in the study.

Initial interviews were scheduled with the two participants. Each interview lasted about 30 minutes and focused on gaining background information about the participants. Questions regarding the participants' definition and thoughts of formative feedback and scheduling of the second interviews concluded the initial interviews. One of the participants did not show for the second interview; multiple attempts through email to reschedule went unanswered. Therefore, after beginning with the possibility of close to 1,400 participants, only one student complet-

Table 1
Comparison of Anticipated and Actual Methodologies Anticipated Methodology

<i>Anticipated Methodology</i>	<i>Actual Methodology</i>	<i>Roadblock</i>
Four Middle Schools	Two Middle Schools	Only received parent responses from two middle schools
Twelve Pre-Algebra teachers would forward my email to all parents of their Pre-Algebra students.	Nine Pre-Algebra teachers responded confirming they would forward my email to all of the parents of their Pre-Algebra students.	I did not meet with the Pre-Algebra teachers in person or virtually to explain the why behind and the benefits of the study.
Use student survey and demographic data to select 20 student interview participants.	One student participated in the interviews.	Only one of the two students who assented participated in both interviews.
The third journal article would focus on quantitative survey data.	The third journal article was a reflection of my doctoral journey.	Only two students completed the survey.

ed each of the components of the study. A robust mixed-methods study including up to 1,400 surveys and 20 interviews transformed into a case study exploring one student's perceptions of formative feedback in mathematics.

References

- Bernard, H. R., & Ryan, G. W. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Black, P. J., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139-148.
- Butler, R. (1988) Enhancing and undermining intrinsic motivation: The effects of task-involving and ego-involving evaluation on interest and performance. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 58, 1-14.
- Havnes, A., Smith, K., Dysthe, O., & Ludvigsen, K. (2012). Formative assessment and feedback: Making learning visible. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 38, 21-27.
- Irons, A. (2008). *Enhancing learning through formative assessment and feedback*. Routledge.
- Lim, S. Y., & Chapman, E. (2013). Development of a short form of the attitudes toward mathematics inventory. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 82(1), 145-164.
- Matute, H. (1995). Human reactions to uncontrollable outcomes: Further evidence for superstitions rather than helplessness. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 45B(2), 142-157.
- Milner-Bolotin, M., Antimirova, T., & Petrov, A. (2010). Clickers beyond the first-year Science classroom. *Journal Of College Science Teaching*, 40(2), 14-18.
- Moratelli, K., & DeJarnette, N. K. (2014). Clickers to the rescue: Technology integration helps boost literacy scores. *Reading Teacher*, 67(8), 586-593.
- Nyquist, J. B. (2003). *The benefits of reconstruing feedback as a larger system of formative assessment: A meta-anaylsis* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Vanderbilt University.
- Pollock, J. E. (2007). *Improving student learning one teacher at a time*. ASCD.
- Tapia, M. (1996, November). *The attitudes toward mathematics inventory*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Chattanooga, TN.
- Van der Kleij, F. M. (2019). Comparison of teacher and student perceptions of formative assessment feedback practices and association with individual student characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 175-189.
- Wash, P. D. (2012). The power of a Mouse!. *SRATE Journal*, 21(2), 39-46.

Can Subaltern, Multilingual, and Multidialectal Bodies Feel?

An Aspirational Call for Undoing the Coloniality of Affects in English Learning and teaching

Jihea Maddamsetti

Abstract

When Spivak (1988/2010) provocatively raised the question “Can the subaltern speak?” and concluded that they cannot, she did not mean that the subaltern literally or physically cannot speak. She meant that Western/Eurocentric/White ways of knowing and languaging produce colonial, epistemic violence that silences subaltern bodies. In this conceptual paper, I pose a related question: “Can subaltern, multilingual and multidialectal bodies feel?” Little attention has been paid to understanding the affect of multilingual and multidialectal students during English Learning and Teaching (ELT). As a teacher educator/researcher positioned within ELT in the white settler context of the U.S., I reach a conclusion similar to that reached by Spivak. When dominant ELT research and practice rejects the languaging and affective experiences of multilingual and multidialectal students, those students are treated as subaltern bodies that cannot speak or feel. Here, I ask how subaltern, multilingual and multidialectal bodies can speak and feel in learning English. I argue that the (de)coloniality of affects must be a key conceptual framework for teaching English to multilingual and multidialectal students.

Introduction

When Spivak (1988/2010) provocatively raised the question “Can the subaltern¹ speak?” and concluded that they cannot, she did not mean that the subaltern

Jihea Maddamsetti is an assistant professor in the Department of Teaching & Learning of the Darden College of Education and Professional Studies at Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia. Email address: jmaddams@odu.edu

© 2023 by Caddo Gap Press.

literally or physically cannot speak. She meant that Western/Eurocentric/White ways of knowing and languaging produce colonial, *epistemic violence* that silences subaltern bodies.

In this conceptual paper, I² pose a related question: “Can subaltern, multilingual and multidialectal³ bodies feel?” Little attention has been paid to understanding the *affect* of multilingual and multidialectal students during English Learning and Teaching (ELT)⁴. As a teacher educator/researcher positioned within ELT in the white settler context of the U.S., I reach a conclusion similar to that reached by Spivak. When dominant ELT research and practice rejects the languaging and affective experiences of multilingual and multidialectal students, those students are treated as subaltern bodies that cannot speak or feel.

Here, I ask how subaltern, multilingual and multidialectal bodies *can* speak *and* feel in learning English. I argue that the (de)coloniality of affects must be a key conceptual framework for teaching English to multilingual and multidialectal students.

Why (De)coloniality of Affects in ELT?

“Affect” can be broadly understood as embodied, relational, situated, and dynamic intensities, capacities, or encounters that circulate and do things (Seigworth & Gregg, 2010). Massumi (2002) distinguished affect from emotion. That is, while affect is an ontological capacity of bodies to act or be acted on by other bodies, emotion manifests affect through language, rationale, and consciousness (e.g., describing oneself as happy or sad). This view of affect, however, largely disregards how, within a colonialist and white supremacist system, racialized and subjugated bodies are not granted the same capacity to affect and be affected (Thiel & Dernikos, 2020; Zembylas, 2021).

By contrast, Ahmed (2012) conceptualized affect as the economy (e.g., racialized and gendered) through which “affect does not reside in an object or sign, but is an effect of the circulation between objects and signs: the more signs circulate, the affective they become” (p. 45). In this view, affective economies work in and through exclusionary logic by which affect, not just circulate between bodies. Affect thus “sticks” to particular bodies (e.g., fear and suspicion around racialized, gendered, linguicized, queer, im/migrant, low-paid, and dis/abled bodies) and, accordingly, preserve extant, unequal power relations among bodies, objects, and ideas (e.g., border control and de facto school segregation. Ahmed (2004, 2012) argued that affect and emotions are indistinguishable because both are expressed and felt bodily in ways that lead to action.

In this light, close attention to racialized and colonizing aspects of affects enables us to foreground bodies and affects that have long been backgrounded, silenced, censored, disavowed, and erased in dominant social and institutional practices, such as multilingual and multidialectal bodies in dominant lan-

guage education and research. Indeed, although women ofColor⁵ feminists may (e.g., Ahmed, 2004, 2014) or may not (e.g., Wynter, 2003) identify themselves as critical affect scholars, they nonetheless considered colonial, white supremacist, cis-hetero-patriarchal, and capitalist neoliberal ways of knowing, being, doing, and feeling as affective, embodied, and ontological forces. For instance, this literature critique that Western/Eurocentric/White ontological, epistemic, and affective ideal has long upheld a mind/body distinction, privileged disembodied and universalized praxis by autonomous Western/White/Eurocentric knowing-, acting-, and feeling subjects with the “scientific” or “rational” mind, and prioritized Western/Eurocentric/White intellectual *and* emotional equilibrium (Ahmed, 2004, 2014; Wynter, 2003). This literature, thus, challenges us to radically reconsider and transform the ontological, epistemic, and affective foundations that have shaped institutional and structural injustices against Indigenous, Black, Brown, and many other intersectionally minoritized peoples.

The decolonial critique of ahistorical, depoliticized, and ethnocentric approaches to affect runs parallels to anti-racist, decolonial, and culturally sustaining educational scholarship that urges us to disrupt the dominant, oppressive educational ethos that discipline and surveil intersectionally minoritized students into Western/Eurocentric/White ways of being, knowing, acting, and feeling that are dissonant from their lived, embodied experiences (Tuck & Yang, 2012; 2014). Of these approaches, educational scholarship on decolonial affects has taken the role of *refusal* seriously as an affective and embodied act of saying enough or no to the hegemonic coloniality of teaching and learning (e.g., Thiel & Dernikos, 2020; Truman et al., 2020; Zembylas, 2021). Refusal can take various shapes in classrooms and beyond because our bodies think, feel, (re)member, and act in relation to other human and more-than-human bodies (e.g., texts, sounds, media, and nature) (ibid.).

Nevertheless, limited attention has been paid to what roles of (de)coloniality of affects may come into play in multilingual and multidialectal classrooms and what decolonial theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical practice need to be cultivated in the field of ELT. This limited attention stands in contrast with a surge of the field’s interest in language teacher emotion and language learner emotion from cognitive (Gregersen, Mercer, & MacIntyre, 2021), sociocultural (Wolff & De Costa, 2017), and poststructuralist perspectives (Benesch, 2018). Some notable exceptions have considered affects in teaching and learning English as discursive and racially constructed. These studies have (a) discussed the link between intersecting global forces (white supremacy, capitalism, and neoliberalism) and ‘non-native’ and ‘non-white’ English speakers’ feelings of inferiority, frustration, anxiety, and desire towards English; (b) examined the connection among teacher affects, identities, and pedagogical stances and moves; (c) emphasized the agentive power of intersectionally minoritized teachers’ affects in naming and challenging unequal power relations in multilingual and multidialectal class-

rooms (e.g., Maddamsetti, 2021; Park, 2022; Song, 2018). Still, while racialized and colonial aspects of affects are addressed in this literature, they are rarely foregrounded as focal, decolonial praxis in working with and for multilingual and multidialectal students.

Structure of the Article

I began by situating the coloniality of teaching and learning English at the onto-epistemological and affective levels because, in the colonial matrix of power, intellectual and affective economies are intertwined in what follows. I then highlight the issues of “why,” “who,” “how,” and “what” of (de)coloniality of affects in ELT research and practice. I conclude by arguing that educators and teacher educators working with multilingual and multidialectal students need to directly address the affective and embodied workings of colonial power in teaching and learning English.

Framing the Issue:

Coloniality in Ways of Knowing, Be(com)ing-with, and Feeling English

Colonialism refers to diverse modes of domination of a nation and people (e.g., white settlers’ political and economic domination and repatriation of land, labor, sovereignty, culture, language, beliefs, identities, and resources in the U.S., Canada, and South Africa) (Mignolo, 2007; Wa Thiong’o, 2009; Sousa Santos & Meneses, 2020). Coloniality is defined as the pervasive effects of colonialism, in concert with intersecting global forces (e.g., neoliberalism, capitalism, and White supremacy), in the contemporary context, even without the overt presence of colonial regime and control (ibid.).

Although the coloniality of English has taken different shapes across various geographical contexts, I consider ELT in multilingual and multidialectal classrooms has been long tied to onto-epistemological (entangled ways of being and knowing) and affective (ways of feeling) aspects of coloniality in this section.

Coloniality at the Onto-epistemological Level and its Link to English Learning and Teaching

Coloniality can take many different social and institutional shapes, such as what counts as “legitimate” or “rigorous” schooling, education, and research. Such coloniality, in turn, demands indigenous and other subaltern and minoritized groups to accept and internalize the subjectivities of the “colonial matrix of power” in symbolic and discursive ways (Mignolo, 2007). For example, Paris (2019) noted “education as a space of erasure” (p. 219) in which intersectionally minoritized students are asked to acquire dominant language, cultural norms, and knowledge while often being positioned as “at risk,” “inner-city residents,” or “free and

reduced lunch status”—all of which violently ignore, obfuscate, or negate minoritized students’ complex intersectional identities and agency.

Relatedly, at the onto-epistemological level, Western/White/Eurocentric ways of knowing and speaking the English language and their associated subjectivities have long been privileged over others (Flores, 2013; Flores & Rosa, 2015, 2022). Such colonial hegemony of English is rooted in oppressive, colonial logics that construct Western/White/Eurocentric modes of knowing and being as *superior*, *modern*, and *universal* while positioning “non-dominant”, “non-white”, or “non-native” ways of knowing and being as *inferior*, *uncivilized*, and *erasable*. Due to colonial co-construction of race and language, being perceived as linguistic Other is often synonymous with being perceived as racial Other. In this regard, when Spivak (1988/2010) questioned whether the ‘subaltern can speak’, she highlighted that it is not that the subaltern cannot speak or is not speaking. Rather, it is who is listening to them and how they are being listened to—or silenced, subjugated, and disenfranchised by Western/White/Eurocentric epistemologies (e.g., about language, self, belonging, and success). Following this line of thinking, Flores and Rosa (2015) described “white listening subjects” as racialized language ideologies (also known as raciolinguistic ideologies) that position the English languaging practices of racialized minoritized individuals as “inappropriate” or “non-academic” to those of privileged white individuals, even though their linguistic practices are identical. This raciolinguistic ideology also propagates the globally dominant ideology of “native-speakerism” (Holliday, 2005), which posits the white listening/speaking subjects as authentic citizens, and ideal and authoritative models for teaching and learning English. What must be highlighted here is that these racialized language ideologies ultimately uphold intersecting and ongoing systems of colonialism and white supremacy. Seen this way, the violence of coloniality moves beyond the tangible, material and physical violence (e.g., enslavement, genocide, and dispossession of land). It entails *epistemic violence* (Spivak, 1988/2010) and its related ontology of becoming, through which the subaltern Other come to understand what they must know and what they would never fully be(come) in relation to Western/White/Eurocentric ways of knowing and being. In so doing, such epistemic violence in teaching and learning English positions Indigenous, Black, Brown, and other minoritized bodies as sub-human or less-than-human, and disenfranchises, negates, and endangers Other ways of knowing and being (Flores, 2013; Flores & Rosa, 2015, 2022).

One prime example of such onto-epistemic violence is legislative institutionalization of “standard English-only” language policies in white settler colonialist contexts (e.g., the U.S., Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) as necessary for educating and uniting all people (Flores, 2013). Such language policies not only valorize monolingualism in English: they impose Western/White/Eurocentric norms and practices at the local/classroom and structural/institutional levels in order to (re)produce colonial subjects who relate to a singular nation-state/colo-

nial governmentality. In the context of Global South, scholars have also critiqued how onto-epistemic violence is manifested through uncritical, ahistorical, and apolitical approaches to teaching standardized English varieties (e.g., “standard American/British English”) and applying Western/Eurocentric/White-washed English-teaching curriculum, instruction, and assessment to the local contexts (Kubota, 2022; Motha & Lin, 2014; Park, 2022). Across academic institutions in the context of Global North and Global South, this onto-epistemic violence becomes embodied through knowledge production systems or “intellectual economies,” in which Western/Eurocentric/White rules govern or monopolize what theory, methods, praxis, and communicative modes are more ‘scholarly’ and ‘legitimate’ than others.

Coloniality at the Affective Level and its Link to English Learning and Teaching

The colonial power matrix does not simply populate “intellectual economies” but also promotes and sustains “affective economies”. According to Ahmed (2004, 2012), “affective economies” refers to how affects are circulated and mobilized to produce particular affective responses to certain bodies, relations, things, spaces, and ideas, and their consequentiality (e.g., in material and political terms). For instance, affective economies steeped in the complex colonized and racialized history of the U.S. repeatedly circulate fears of crime and terrorism about racially minoritized bodies, and yield tangible material consequences, including de facto segregation of neighborhoods and schools, and border control policies and practices. Ahmed (2004, 2012) also points out the ways in which colonial and racialized affective economies prioritize, universalize, and humanize white feeling subjects (e.g., white guilt, fragility, and benevolence), in order to naturalize power differentials through affects, and protect its embedded whiteness. Ahmed also points out the flip side: colonial and racialized affective economies frame the structural forces at play in one’s affective and embodied realities as individual pathologies—they posit intersectionally minoritized people’s affective responses to systemic injustices as ‘over-reacting,’ ‘confrontational,’ or ‘overly political.’ Zembylas (2018) further noted how such affective economies justify state-sanctioned surveillance and violence over minoritized bodies, and enable affective consumptions among well-meaning white liberals, such as solicitation of celebratory and empathetic approaches to diversity and inclusion without effecting changes at the institutional level. To speak English ‘proficiently’ and ‘appropriately’ also demands us to think, act, and feel in ways that conform to a hegemonic notion of proficiency and appropriateness. In this vein, colonial, affective economies of ELT do not merely circulate English language as abstract ideals, but regulate what emotions, whose emotions, and what kinds of emotional expressions are considered to be ‘proper’ and ‘professional’ in teaching and learning English.

For example, the superiority, authority, and desirability of the racialized “native” English-speakers are underpinned by naturalizing “non-native” English-speakers’ feelings of inferiority, insecurity, and alienation towards their indigenous languages and cultures (Motha & Lin, 2014; Park, 2022; Song, 2018). Fanon (1963/2008) reminds us that being colonized is a process in which our bodies literally become physically, onto-epistemologically, *and* affectively controlled by others. For Fanon (1963/2008), feelings of desire, fears, anxieties, paranoia, and insecurities that colonized subjects experience with respect to the perceived proficiency of colonizers’ language are both processes and instruments that perpetuate colonial domination and subjugation. Fanon’s observation is situated in the context of French Caribbean colonialism; however, it still resonates with subaltern Others who must learn how to speak, behave, *and* feel in accordance with hegemonic norms and expectations in public institutional spaces (Maddamsetti, 2021; Zembylas, 2018, 2021). Motha and Lin (2014) further suggest that in this age of globalization, the coloniality of the English language has worked in concert with intersecting global forces (e.g., neoliberalism, capitalism, and white supremacy), and instrumentalized English as objects of *desire* that colonialsubjects must pursue:

[At] the center of every English language learning moment lies desire: desire for the language; for the identities represented by particular accents and varieties of English; for capital, power, and images that are associated with English; for what is believed to lie beyond the doors that English unlocks. (p. 146)

Treating English as an affective object—as a desired commodity—assumes that one’s proficiency of speaking hegemonic English can help one to attain cultural modernity, social and economic mobility, and equality with one’s culturally and socioeconomically ‘superior’ western/white counterparts. At the same time, the implication of desiring English is that colonialsubjects must be *obedient* to colonial episteme (e.g., disembodied rationality) and unequal, affective relations therein, to eliminate all vestiges of boorishness (Mignolo, 2007; see also, Motha & Lin, 2014).

Indeed, previous studies have suggested that a hegemony of English and its embedded, dominant ways of knowing is being perpetuated by imposing (English-only) monolingualism onto language-minoritized students’ bodies, by the disciplining and silencing of their bodies, and by dismissing their affective and (dis)embodied realities (Park, 2022; Petrie & Darragh, 2020). For instance, examining the impact of neorealism and coloniality on South Korean students’ English learning, Park (2022) illustrated that English language learners in (neo/post-) colonial contexts are positioned as human capital who must ceaselessly invest in self-improvement projects, including speaking academic or ‘good’ English, to enhance their marketability.

Similarly, Petrie and Darragh (2020) showcased that desiring English in southwestern Nicaragua is valorized for cultural and economic advancement

through tourism policies, educational curriculum, and social media. Extant literature has also documented colonial and (post/neo-) colonial contexts where one hegemonic variety of English (e.g., “American English”) dominates in public and professional life, and in which teachers, who do not look or sound like ‘native (Western/Eurocentric/White) speakers’, often undergo a range of difficult emotions—such as anxiety, frustration, insecurity, vulnerability, and self-censorship—and face challenges in establishing authority, regardless of their linguistic knowledge and pedagogic competence (e.g., Song, 2018).

These examples highlight a key point about the colonial affects that permeates teaching and learning English: they are meant to maintain a colonial legacy and mentality by linking human worth and capital with a ‘good’ command of dominant colonial language, while rejecting the linguistic legitimacy of racialized colonial subjects. Conversely, it is equally pivotal to remember that racially and linguistically minoritized teachers and students can agentively name, unpack, and disrupt such colonial affects and associated language ideologies. A bulk of literature provides possibilities for using discourses (e.g., written, spoken, and/or signed, critical reflection and [counter-]storytelling) and engaging in collaborative learning across diverse contexts, professional relationships, and time as a powerful means to foster their agency to act against power structures (Park, 2022; Petrie & Darragh, 2020; Song, 2018; Wolff & De Costa, 2018).

What Is at Stake?

Most literature that has addressed coloniality of ELT at the onto-epistemological and affective levels tends to consider the body as a discursive construction of “multiple forms and locations of discourse, *discursive* performance, politics, values, and the ‘everyday’—both past and present—that emanate from the history of colonialism” (Madison, 2005, p. 46, italics added for emphasis). In this view, the body is something that can be controlled, disciplined, and legislated by power-laden discourses, or something that can conceptually and materially represent or enact agency against such power structures. This discursive view of the body privileges discursive aspects of affects and, however unwittingly, may reinscribe colonizing Western/Eurocentric ontology of separation—separations between human bodies, separations between one’s body and the world (e.g., land, spirits, and nature), and separations from one’s mother tongue (Wynter, 2003).

Yet, for Indigenous, Black, Brown, and many other minoritized, multilingual and multidialectal groups in the context of settler-colonization and post-/neo-colonization, the relational self and the whole body—and its links with emotions/affects, memories, languages, histories, and lands—have been vital, and notions of ontologies, epistemologies, and axiologies have always been intertwined (e.g., Anzaldúa, 2015; Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991; Dillard, 2012; Minha, 1989; Wynter, 2003). In this respect, women of Color feminist scholars have

asserted the necessity of challenging human- and linguistic exceptionalism when accounting for the coloniality of affects. At the same time, they have underlined the significance of countering the assumptions of the universality of human subject, body, and affect, because such assumptions have invented who and what constitute ‘the human’ and, thereby, dehumanize, ignore, criminalize, and erase indigenous, Black, Brown, and many other multilingual and multidialectical subaltern subjects, bodies, and affects from the very category of ‘the human’ (ibid.).

Accordingly, it is imperative to engage in a decolonial reading of affect and explore how colonization, racialization, and other intersectional forms of oppression have shaped affective norms and practices of teaching and learning English.

A Note on Researcher Positionality

I am a Korean immigrant woman. My own experiences at the intersection of privilege (e.g., a highly educated, cis-, middle-class, abled body) and marginalization (e.g., a body that has been subject to racism, linguicism, xenophobia, and deportation court proceedings) across different racial, linguistic and cultural contexts push me to think about the coloniality of languages and guide my work as a teacher educator/researcher in multilingual and multidialectical classrooms.

As much as I desire to disrupt the coloniality of affects in the ELT field, I acknowledge that the conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical scope of this paper is inherently limited. While I propose that the decolonial option of affects in ELT research and practice is urgent, I also stay cautious about desires for “securities with alternative perspectives... [that may] instrumentalize, essentialize, and romanticize these alternatives as the mythical opposite of whatever is perceived to have caused the interruption of previous ontological securities” (Shahjahan et al., 2017, p. 16).

1. Rethinking Affects in ELT Research and Practice Through a Decolonial Lens

I understand that decolonial, affective approaches to ELT research and practices seek *to refuse* (Tuck & Yang, 2012, 2014) or *delink* (Mignolo, 2007) from Western/Eurocentric/White assumptions about universal, neutral, anthropocentric, and logocentric concept of the human capacity (or legitimacy) to affect and be affected by teaching and learning English. Such approaches also entail power-laden, embodied and affective *subjectivities* (self and other) who engage in meaning- and identity-making practices in a *particular context* (e.g., social, cultural, material, political, and historical) *via* various ELT materials and activities. In other words, the “why”, the “who”, the “how”, and the “what” of ELT influence decolonizing affective approaches to ELT research and practices. It is important to note, however, that these elements are intertwined with one another. The separation of these components is problematic, especially from a decolonial standpoint.

Here, I explore four aspects of decolonial perspectives that can account for the (de)coloniality of affects and can foster alternate connections to affects, bodies, spaces, and things in ELT research and practice. These four aspects include: (a) refusing affectively and linguistically Othered ways (or the “why”); (b) rethinking Self and Other in (dis)embodying affects (or the “who”); (c) rethinking methodologies of (de-/re-)constructing affects (or the “how”); and (d) rethinking material and affective encounters (or the “what”).

4-1. Issues of the “Why”: Refusing Affectively and Linguistically Othered Ways

Fostering such affective modes of refusal requires rethinking multilingual and multidialectal students’ languaging bodies and affects in relation to interlocking power structures (Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991) and issues of (de)humanization (Wynter, 2003). As such, I consider affective modes of refusal as embodied intersectional and humanizing experiences in what follows.

A decolonial pedagogical framework purposefully seeks to undo or delink from the unequal power relations inherent to the colonial episteme and affect (Mignolo, 2007; Wa Thiong’o, 2009). The concept of refusal, in particular, aims to recenter and reclaim alternative (e.g., Indigenous) sovereignty, practices, and lifeworlds within and against oppressive, colonial logics. According to Tuck and Yang (2014), refusal, as a concept and means, allows for rejecting the onto-epistemologies of the White Gaze and its disembodied emphasis on knowledge production and practice, which collect “[damage-centered] stories of pain and humiliation” as a determining feature of (re)presenting those deemed disposable (p. 812). Thus, one must actively resist “trading in pain and humiliation, and supply a rationale for blocking the settler colonial gaze that wants those stories” (ibid.). Tuck and Yang (2014) noted that decolonial refusal, however, is not just saying no “but a redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned. Unlike settler colonial configuration of knowledge that is particularly exasperated and resentful of limits, a methodology of refusal regards limits on knowledge as productive, as indeed a good thing” (p. 239).

To this end, a decolonial pedagogical framework calls for a purposeful shift away from a deracialized, ahistorical, apolitical, and universalized view of languages, discourses, and practices toward an intersectional, historic, politicized, and holistic view that re-centers the affective and embodied realities of minoritized peoples, including multilingual and multidialectal students. In this sense, refusals call out subaltern subjectification—the processes of how colonial subjects are formed in colonizing discourse, relations, time, and space and how they are onto-epistemologically and affectively (re)presented. In doing so, refusal of colonial subjectification enables us to turn back the racist, colonialist, and imperialist White Gaze and its embedded “colonial modalities of knowing persons as [disposable] bodies” (Tuck & Yang, 2014, p. 817).

More recent studies (Park, 2022; Truman et al., 2020; Zembylas, 2021) have called for more affective and embodied perspectives on decolonial refusal. Zembylas (2021) outlined three affective modes of decolonial refusal. These modes include (a) refusal as social and affiliative in enabling alternative forms of relationality and community; (b) refusal as distinguished from resistance which may oversimplify power relations in anthropocentric and binary terms (superior Self versus inferior Other); and (c) refusal as hopeful and willful for contesting Western/Eurocentric/White humanist futurity of colonization. Park (2022) and Truman et al. (2020) further underline the importance of affective modes of refusal (e.g., silences and pushbacks). These can reframe and deepen our understanding of multilingual and multidialectical bodies who refuse to speak “correctly”, write “correctly”, and behave “correctly”, as defined by dominant languaging and literacy practices. In this regard, Park (2022) notes that affective modes of decolonial refusal in multilingual and multidialectical classrooms can provide “alternative instances of feeling, thinking, and experiencing” beyond westernized, eurocentric, and white-washed, colonial subjectivities (p. 5).

4-2. Issues of the “Who”: Rethinking Self and Other in (Dis)embodying Affects

Decolonial framings of affects require us to consider our relational, collective, and coalitional ways of being and becoming in the world, as “I am because we are” in contrast to “I think, therefore I am” (Dillard & Neal, 2020). Concurrently, we must ask: who are “we” in contesting colonial affects in teaching and learning English with and for multilingual and multi-dialectical students? Whose worldviews and subjectivities do we choose to align in that process?

Western/Eurocentric/White colonialism has normalized a worldview in which the world is ontologically separated from a series of forces that are always already divided and in opposition with each other, such as self | other, mind | body, subject | object, native | non-native, civilized | primitive, theory | practice—thereby, reifying a Cartesian dualism (Wynter, 2003).

Within this colonial logic, being viewed as ‘articulate’ in using English is a supposed compliment for demonstrating particular ways of thinking, being, feeling, and acting ‘appropriately’ in and through the whitestream world. In this colonial structure, learning English for multilingual and multi-dialectical students is about accepting and internalizing particular felt and embodied subjectivities of ‘appropriateness’ and ‘correctness’ (Flores, 2013; Flores & Rosa, 2022). These include that accepting that those who cannot and do not speak and write ‘correctly’ will invite and deserve poor treatment in the classroom and beyond; that feelings of indignation, humiliation, anxiety, and rejection from the whitestream world are an inevitable part of becoming ‘appropriate’ English users; and that multilingual and multi-dialectical peoples are individually responsible for using

‘correct’ and ‘appropriate’ English in public and institutional, whitestreamspaces. Yet, embodying the attributes of ‘appropriateness’ and ‘correctness’ lies at the root of the colonial project, which has long justified physical, embodied, affective, and material violence towards those who are seen as the subaltern Other.

While the work of Black, Brown, Indigenous, and Asian women of Color feminist scholars may (e.g., Ahmed and King) or may not (e.g., Anzaldúa, Minh-ha, and Wynter) view themselves as affect theorists, their work nevertheless addresses racialization and intersecting forces (e.g., gendered, linguicized, and classed) as ontological, embodied, and affective issues with possibilities to challenge white supremacist colonial legacies (King et al., 2020, p. 13; see also Thiel & Dernikos, 2020). In what follows, I turn to women of color feminist perspectives on enframements of intersectionality, (de)humanization, and agency to think through ways to challenge (dis)embodied white gaze on subjectivities and affects in working with multilingual and multi-dialectal students.

Considering Intersectional, Colonial Subjects as Affectively Racialized and (Dis)embodied

Being disenfranchised, endangered, and, ultimately, colonized is about our bodies being physically, discursively, and affectively governed by others. That is to say, those who govern the body consider the subjugated body as ridden with savagery, irrationality, and disorder. In so doing, when the body is seen, heard, read, and felt as the Other, that body evokes (or is imposed upon) certain affective responses, such as suspicion, disgust, anxiety, and fear (Fanon, 1963/2008). In this colonial logic, those who identify with the subaltern body are made to accept that their embodied, affective, and spiritual relations to other human bodies and nature must be disciplined to indicate the civilized, cultured, and palatable body. In this light, women of Color feminists have conceptualized the body as not just physical/material and sensory flesh. Rather, the body is a site of struggle where systemic positionings of power, privilege, dominance, and subjugation (e.g., raced, gendered, linguistic, classed, and dis/abled) are inscribed on that flesh (e.g., Anzaldúa, 2015; Minh-ha, 1989). The body is also a site of resistance, resilience, and social action where one explores their lived, embodied experiences and affective realities to re-envision what counts as knowledge and what it means to be with other bodies (both human and otherwise) (ibid.). In this regard, women of Color feminists proposed the notion of intersectionality—i.e., how the interconnected social identities (e.g., race, gender, language, and class) intersect in the (re)production of and resistance against oppression and subjugation (Combahee River Collective, 1977/1982; Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991). In this view, intersectionality is not merely discursively constructed and, thereby, abstracted from the body. Instead, intersectionality is evoked through the flesh-and-blood body and negotiated within everyday power-laden interactions, actions, and affectivities.

Critical language studies have increasingly emphasized the embodied and enfolded nature of English languaging practices. In particular, the intersectionality of race and language—also known as “native-speakerism” (Holliday, 2005) and “raciolinguistic ideologies” (Flores & Rosa, 2015)—plays a vital role because it involves disciplining and policing a “speaking” body into a specific kind of discourse (e.g., “American English”) while leaving non-whitestream ways of speaking and being are left to feel incorrect, unprofessional, and undesirable. In this view, due to the racist and colonialist construction of ‘native speaker’, racialized, multilingual and multi-dialectal bodies’ languaging practices are likely to be perceived as linguistically, culturally, and cognitively deficient, regardless of their objective English proficiency. Indeed, studies taking an intersectional approach to race and language have considered how the subaltern-speaking body is daily met with the white gaze through the ears, the mouth, the eyes, and the hands (e.g., Maddamsetti, 2021, Kavah, 2023). In so doing, echoing Flores and Rosa (2015), this literature has problematized that it is “white listening subjects” who have silenced and pathologized silences of subaltern speaking subjects—even when the subaltern *can* and *do* speak and feel and act against distress, anxiety, and (self-)doubt.

The enduring and expansive nature of the colonial legacy extends across the globe. As such, decolonization through the lens of intersectionality also requires considering racialization of ‘non-native’ and/or ‘non-white’ bodies in conjunction with global forces (e.g., capitalism, neoliberalism, and white supremacy). At the same time, we must remember that intersectionality was conceptualized based on the U.S. racial and its intersecting power dynamics. For instance, Global Southern and transnational feminists have critiqued terms like ‘women of Color’ and ‘peoples of Color’ signal U.S.-specific racial (dis)embodiment and intersectional subjectivities because they may not apply to different contexts around the globe (e.g., Dillard, 2012; Minh-ha, 1989). Seen this way, framing (de)colonial subjectivities of English through U.S. racial tensions and asserting universalized (de)colonial subjecthood and affects is deeply problematic.

I turn to the work of Wynter (2003, 2015) who fiercely endeavored to retheorize ‘the human’ and ‘humanness’ toward a more expansive anti-racist, feminist, and decolonial vision in the following section.

Reconsidering ‘Humanness’ and Affects With(in) Human and More-than-human Relations

As much as it is significant to recenter and humanize embodied and affective realities of multilingual and multi-dialectal students in colonial settings, it is also necessary to locate and unpack the colonial logic of humanism. I turn to decolonial feminist scholar Wynter (2003, 2015), who viewed that the ontology of humanity is deeply rooted in Western/Eurocentric/White onto-epistemological assumptions, which are often universalizing, reductive, essentialist, binary, and

non-relational. This colonial logic imposes western/white/eurocentric, masculine-centered, cis-hetero-patriarchal, Christian, able-bodied, male subjects as the template for what it means to be the most Human/Man. In this onto-epistemological logic, those who do not fit that template are viewed and treated as less than human. Wynter (2003, 2015) asserted that this way of being and knowing worldwide has been—and still is—guiding principles of commodification, dispossession, categorization, and violence in the historical and contemporary context of colonialism. Specifically, Wynter (2003, 2015) traced the ‘genres’ of Man, or the liberal humanist and colonialist project, in two ways—i.e., Man 1 and Man 2. For Wynter, while Man 1 refers to the rational and autonomous human making decisions without theoretical binds in the eighteenth century, Man 2 refers to the ‘scientifically literate’ man based on the Darwinian view of natural selection and a capitalist upsurge in the nineteenth century. Wynter (2003) described that this “Man’s overrepresentation as the human”—or the overrepresentation of whiteness as humanness—has been guiding principles for justifying Western/Eurocentric/White colonialism, the trans-Atlantic slave trade, cis-hetero-patriarchal relations, the promotion of secular or modernscience, and fascist movements. Wynter (2015), thus, calls for the “radical reconstruction and decolonization of what it means to be human” (p. 4).

Educational institutions and, by extension, teaching and learning the English language in and through these spaces have been shaped by this overrepresentation of Man as *the* human. For this reason, following Wynter’s (2003, 2015) view, language and literacy scholars have critiqued the normative, colonial, and white linguistic underpinning of who counts as a ‘literate’ subject and what counts as an ‘appropriate’ languaging and literacy practice. For example, according to Truman et al. (2020), while languaging and literacy practices that are “white and rational, schooled and sensible” are recognized as legitimate and competent, those that are “found on walks, scratched on bedsteads, stuffed under furniture, or enacted in gesture, sound, and drawing” (p. 226) are not. Further developing Wynter’s (2003, 2015) framework from a decolonial and anti-racist affective perspective, Truman et al. (2020) argued that processes of humanization and dehumanization in teaching and learning English in multilingual and multidialectal classrooms are affective—entrenched in colonial condition and conditioning of how one senses oneself and relates with others. In Truman et al.’s (2020) account, the capacity for some to feel humane towards their languages and languaging rests upon colonial conditions and conditioning that others are left to feel their alienation and inhumanity towards their ways of being, knowing, and languaging (see also, Snaza, 2019). Domínguez (2021) also called this condition(ing) “colonial, *affective geographies*—landscapes of socio-emotional intensity and constraint” in which multilingual and multidialectal students must work to discipline or discard non-Man ways of being, knowing, and languaging (p. 552, italics original). In this sense, seeing multilingual and multidialectal bodies and subjectivities as ratio-

nal and disembodied, as opposed to affective and embodied, is a way of anchoring and maintaining these languaging bodies within the Western/Eurocentric/White modes of humanization and normalizing its unavoidable, dehumanizing effects on them.

Alternatively, decolonizing methodologies can enable us to refuse the abjection of multilingual and multidialectical bodies from the very category of the human, while simultaneously recentering and reclaiming alternate ontologies. To this end, I discuss how researchers and teacher educators can deploy decolonizing approaches in working with multilingual and multidialectical students in the following section.

Issues of the “How”:

Rethinking Methodologies of (De-/Re-)Constructing Affects

In this section, I consider two prominent researchers’ roles in analyzing (de)colonial affects in ELT research and practice through a decolonial lens: (a) speaking and acting from the locus of enunciation and (b) counter-storytelling through decolonizing memory work.

Speaking and Acting from the Locus of Enunciation

Decolonial projects call us to recognize and de-center power relations inherent between researchers and participants in research processes in ways that question whether and how researchers utilize uneven power hierarchies to define, categorize, and disenfranchise marginalized populations in the name of research. Indeed, King (2017) aptly contended that we “need to consider whose back or through whose blood a theory developed and then circulated while hiding its own violence” (p. 170). In this light, it is crucial to unpack our own “locus of enunciation”—i.e., the point from where (the geopolitical dimension of knowledge production) and by whom and for whom (the body-political aspect of knowledge production) the subject speaks, and knowledge is being articulated (Mignolo, 2007).

Attending critically and affectively to reflexivity is crucial to examining one’s locus of enunciation and considering (de)colonial purposefulness, interpretation, and consequentiality of research (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Sousa Santos & Meneses, 2020). Reflexivity requires researchers to explicitly attend to how power structures situate how researchers themselves and participants think, say, feel, and do in the research process. From a decolonial standpoint, reflexivity further demands researchers to address what is left said, said differently, or unsaid, and thus who and what is being silenced, marginalized, and colonized—or contesting against coloniality in the research process.

Discourses (spoken, written, and/or signed language) are often used to reflexively explain or justify how we exist within and apart from colonial power relations. However, the embodied and relational aspects of affects provide con-

siderable insight into how researchers and participants affectively reflect in the research process (e.g., deliberate silences and refusals to perform) (e.g., Park, 2022; Truman et al., 2020). In this respect, reflexivity in decolonial projects must be critical and affective; it allows for critically interrogating researchers' colonial language, epistemological assumptions, and positioning in the research (Zembylas, 2018, 2021). It also allows for affectively questioning Western/Eurocentric/White and cis-hetero-patriarchal approaches, which undervalue knowledge that is embodied, relational, local, affective, or spiritual.

Partaking in critical and affective reflexivity in decolonial projects, however, moves past "confessions of privilege" (Lockard, 2016, p. 2), as if mentioning once that researchers identify with dominant bodies (e.g., white, middle-class, standardized English-speaking, cis-hetero-normative, or abled) would resolve colonial past and ongoing practices in and through research. Our bodies are both affective and ideological sites, so frictions, fissures, cracks, and ruptures exist, especially those who refuse hegemonic, colonial logic (Anzaldúa, 2015; Minha, 1989; Combahee River Collective, 1977/1982; Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991). As such, critical and affective reflexivity is also about sitting with the vulnerability, humility, and discomfort that comes with these tensions—e.g., of having to work with and across borders and spaces within which our knowing and not-knowing, be(com)ing, doing, and feeling concerning decolonial projects are always incomplete, partial, contradictory and subject to change in each fleeting moment of research.

While turning the critical affective and reflexive gaze on us as decolonial researchers, Patel (2015) highlights three aspects that we must be "response-able" to (or able to respond to and act for): learning, knowledge, and context. Response-ability to learning refers to collapsing the colonized "known" into the decolonized "unknown" and exploring multiple venues to understand, embody, and expand decolonized unknowns. In so doing, response-ability to learning demands moving beyond the colonial framing of knowledge 'acquisition' and 'ownership' as the end goal of learning. Response-ability to knowledge refers to enabling reciprocal, respectful, and embodied relationship within the knowledge production process. Response-ability to context extends beyond addressing colonialism's historical and contemporary legacy to consider the relationship between different bodies (human and otherwise) in (trans)forming the basis of being, knowing, and doing.

Counter-storytelling Through Decolonizing Memory Work

Decolonizing methodology highlights the importance of naming and countering the onto-epistemological and affective oppression reinforced by colonial legacies of institutional racism and knowledge systems (Tuck & Yang, 2012, 2014). One approach is using counter-storytelling as decolonial praxis—where alternate ways of knowing, feeling, and be(com)ing come through re-membering, re-envi-

sioning, and doing (Delgado-Bernal et al., 2017; Solórzano & Delgado-Bernal, 2001). Here, counter-storytelling is akin to *testimonio* rooted in Latin American narrativetraditions and critical race theory (CRT)—they are told by people whose experiences with oppressive systems are distorted, censored, or erased by dominant storylines as well as by dominant modes of storytelling (ibid.). Counter-storytelling concerns not just naming and resisting majoritarian/master stories of modernity and civilization. It is also about fully centering subaltern perspectives and acts of resistance, resiliency, and survivance when confronted with the genocidal, colonialist, and imperialist forms of violence. In other words, counter-storytelling re-centers the embodied (or enfolded), intuitive, spiritual, axiological, and cosmological knowing of subaltern communities in unmasking oppressive, interlocking systems of power. In doing so, counter-storytelling allows for casting a different light on silences, “reclaiming authority to narrate,” and building solidarity across shared struggles across minoritized communities (Delgado-Bernal et al., 2017, p. 365). In this vein, counter-storytelling can serve as an alternative pedagogic means to legitimize other(ed) bodies and their embodied knowledge in ways that cultivate healing, hope, love, resistance, and resilience, especially among marginalized students in the classroom.

The colonial past seems to be a closed case; remembering, however, reopens it. In this light, an act of (re)membering—i.e., both remembering and re-membering—is integral to engaging in counter-storytelling as decolonial praxis (e.g., Dillard, 2012; Wa Thiong’o, 2009; Zavala, 2016). According to Wa Thiong’o (2009), whereas remembering is a process of recalling or recollecting past events, people, and relations, re-membering is an intentional decolonizing act to put the bodies (of knowledge), memories, and things back together that have been dismembered by a colonial matrix of power, domination, and subjugation. According to Dillard (2012), the act of re-membering allows for our “radical response to our individual and collective fragmentation at the cultural, spiritual, *and* material levels, a response to the false division created between mind, body, and spirit” (p. 17, emphasis original). In this way, (re)membering is not just about recalling forgotten or erased ancestral memories. It also calls on stories of ancestral wisdom, resistance, and resilience—what got them through tough times? What stories will help them heal and flourish?. In so doing, (re)membering enables us to respond to the demands of the present context, reclaim what it means to be a human in relation to people, histories, and land, and reimagine what a “desirable” future means.

At the same time, what must be highlighted in that process is how colonial legacies and violence, which have obliterated subjugated body (of knowledge), time, and place, *haunt* us across body, time, and place (e.g., Dixon-Román, 2019). (Re)membering can, thus, serve to surface one’s enduring sense of trauma, loss, and shame. According to Yoon (2019), such haunted trauma narratives show three characteristics: distortion of the future as it has always and already been colonized by Western/Eurocentric/White and anthropocentric imaginary; repetitively revis-

iting of past experiences in the present; and the “senses that are presences and forces at play that are not empirically evidence” (p. 424). To put it differently, while (re)membering can unburden the mind, body, and soul from such haunting pain, we must not forget that such modes of (re)membering against dominant stories of division are affectively charged, embodied processes. In this respect, Yoon (2019) and other scholars have cautioned against romanticizing or intellectualizing (re)membering as a counter-storytelling process for ‘empowering’ or ‘empowered’ individuals. Instead, they have argued for shifting away from the Western/Eurocentric/White ethical and political positions that focus on individual integrity and autonomy towards those of collective accountability, with an emphasis on reciprocal relationships and local priorities (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Sousa Santos & Meneses, 2020).

Overall, refusal in methodological spaces requires researchers to ‘resist the urge to study people (and their “social problems”) and to study instead *their relationships with institutions and power*’ (Tuck & Yang, 2014, p. 813, italics added for emphasis). In other words, refusal concerns sharing the benefit of institutional practices (e.g., scholarly research) with indigenous and many other subjugated communities rather than over- or under-recruiting and objectifying these communities through Western/Eurocentric/White methodological approaches. Refusal in methodological terms is also related to challenging dominant, Western/Eurocentric/White notions of methodologies, such as linear and categorical construction or representation of the data and abstraction via rational, anthropocentric, and logocentric discourses. Concurrently, as Dixon-Román (2019) suggested, “empiricism is always-already haunted by power and empire” (p. 276). Therefore, when engaging in (de)colonial affects in ELT research and practice, we (researchers and teacher educators) must ask “how our actions, our research agendas, the knowledge we contribute, can undo coloniality and create spaces for ways of being in relation that are not about individualism, ranking, and status” (p. 73).

4-4. Issues of the “What”: Rethinking Material and Affective Encounters

In contrast to the Western/Eurocentric/White assumption about human-only agency and humanness as universal, individual autonomy, many Indigenous, Black, Brown, and many globalSouth feminist traditions stress our ways of being, knowing, doing, and feeling have never been separated (Anzaldúa, 2015; Minh-ha, 1989; Combahee River Collective, 1977/1982; Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991; Wynter, 2002, 2015). These ontological traditions consider more-than-human bodies (e.g., land, borders, language, histories, and spirit/soul) as agentic and always-already entangled with our human bodies. To put it differently, we exist as a whole of our mind (knowing), body (doing), and soul (being). We are also embodied or enfolded through the material, affective, and reciprocal relations be-

tween humans (e.g., peers, families, teachers, and local and global communities) and more-than-humans (e.g., land, borders, language, knowledge, histories, and spirit/soul) (ibid.). Likewise, in this ontology, languaging and literacy practices are not seen as pre-given, static, and numerable entity that can be defined and categorized, but instead as an “always-becoming process that is worked and reworked in interaction with race, gender, class, the media, professional role, in the continuous creation of new subjectivities” (Flores, 2013, p. 284).

This relational and holistic ontology allows for recentering alternative and ancestral knowledge systems that consider our entangled relationship with one another, the material world, and nature and for reclaiming a fuller, rather than partialized, trajectory of humanity. This ontological orientation contrasts with humanist, colonial, white/settler ontology that posits human exceptionalism and regards peoples, knowledge, and land as capital, property, or asset to invest and claim ownership. In this vein, Sundberg (2014) asserted that decolonization means “[exposing] the ontological violence authorized by eurocentric epistemologies both in scholarship and everyday life” (p. 34).

Accordingly, in decolonizing affective approaches to ELT research and practice, there is a need to explore how multilingual and multidialectal bodies and actions are produced alongside an inquiry into how more-than-human bodies are produced and foster anti-racist and decolonial aims. In response, language and literacy studies have increasingly turned towards creative materials and experimental practices that encourage us to (re)think both human and more-than-human bodies and affectively saturated moments as co-participants in fostering otherwise ways of languaging, feeling, and becoming human—beyond the humanist, colonialist, and white supremacist premise of Man/Human (Wynner, 2003, 2012). Such materials and methodology include community mapping (Corntassel & Hardbarger, 2019; Varga, Agosto, & Maguregui, 2021), theater performance projects and workshops (Caldas, 2017; Domínguez, 2021), photo-voice-based counter-narrative (Cahill et al., 2019), poetry and creating writing practices (Dutta, 2022; Ohito, 2022), and affects and effects of the evolving technologies on ELT curricula and multilingual and multidialectal students’ language learning (Zhang, 2022).

In a qualitative study with Cherokee youth and community members in Oklahoma in the U.S., Corntassel and Hardbarger (2019), for example, demonstrated that community-engaged arts projects through photovoice and community mapping could allow for (re)membering their (dis)embodied affects and effects of colonialization on their lands, language, mind/body/spirit, waters and cultivate healing and resistance that is attentive to ancestral knowledge, place, and history. Varga, Agosto, and Maguregui (2021) further added that using community mapping as material, esthetic, and place-based articulation of racism and white supremacy—or what Varga, Agosto, and Maguregui call “counter-cartographies”—could allow for (re)membering (dis)embodied, material, and affective sources of violence and

injustice, as well as cultivating space of healing and resilience among educators, teacher educators, and multilingual and multidialectal students. Moreover, Caldas (2017) and Domínguez (2021) showed how Boalian theater—i.e., interactional role-plays where participants dramatize and reenact (real or imagined) conflicts and envisage possible responses to them—could serve as an affective and embodied means for preservice teachers to explore epistemically disobedient and affectively ambitious practices with multilingual and multidialectal students within and across school-community boundaries. Ohito (2022) showed how diverse forms of matter (e.g., comic strips, violently marked human fleshy body, texts, public space, histories, literacy pedagogies) could work together to produce an alternate understanding of languaging and literacy practices, as opposed to those efficient, rational, and still, within her work literacy preservice teachers. In so doing, Ohito highlighted the importance of thinking through issues of (dis)embodiment and feeling in working with multilingual/multidialectal students.

Implications and Conclusion

While an emerging body of ELT scholars have asserted decolonial refusal as, foremost, an intellectual framework and an ethico-political methodology and pedagogy, I have argued that affective possibilities of refusal remain largely backgrounded. To this end, I have proposed an onto-epistemological *and* affective re-orientation of subjectivities, methodologies, and materials in decolonizing affects in ELT research and practice. I further sketch out key concepts and questions that can prompt reflection and guide conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical shifts in unsettling the colonality of affects in ELT research and practice (See Table 1).

Colonialism and the enduring colonality have been successful by reducing the full humanity of Others—such as multilingual and multidialectal students from Black, Brown, Indigenous, and many other subjugated communities in different contexts. The historical, material, affective, and (dis)embodied relations of colonality have further served as foundations for those subaltern bodies' subjectivities and feelings to get obliterated.

In a nutshell, it is not enough to say that including diverse voices and bodies matter. We must actively engage in the decolonial project of affects by ensuring that ELT research and practice enable multilingual and multidialectal bodies to *be*, *act*, and *feel* in humanizing ways against colonial obedience and violence. This work requires our attention and commitment to exploring what theories-methodologies-praxis of refusal might look like, sound like and feel like if they were (re)imagined and (re)structured to recenter and sustain the languaging practices and affective and embodied realities of multilingual and multidialectal students. In this regard, my call for undoing the colonality of affects in ELT research and practice must not be read as a viable prescription but as a *cri de coeur* to rethink the justification we provide for teaching and writing about multilingual and mul-

Table I
Key Concepts and Questions to Guide Affective Approaches
to ELT Research and Practice Through a Decolonial Lens

<i>Concepts</i>	<i>Questions that can strengthen conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical stances in ELT research and practice</i>
Issues of the “Why”: Refusing Affectively and Linguistically Othered Ways	<p>Refuse ahistorical, depoliticized, and deracialized framings of affects and emotions in ELT research and practice.</p> <p>Why should ELT research and practice engage in the affective project of decolonization? Why is it significant and necessary to reject linguistic and affective Othering to support multilingual and multidialectal students’ languaging practices as “always becoming process”?</p>
Issues of the “Who”: Rethinking Self and Other in (Dis)embodying Affects	<p>Engage in intersectional analyses to disrupt (onto-)epistemic and affective violence against multilingual and multidialectal bodies.</p> <p>In what ways does intersectionality play a role in shaping the listening and speaking subjectivities? In what ways have the listening and speaking subjectivities been historically and affectively positioned within the intersectional, colonial systems of power in this ELT context? What affective conditions are communicated or embodied through such subjectivities? How do we reinforce or challenge (onto-)epistemic and affective assumptions that standardized English is more ‘correct’ than other languages and dialects? How can we learn more about the role of our students’ intersectionality in shaping their affective (dis)investment in particular languages and dialects?</p> <p>By decentering dominant Western/Eurocentric/White onto-epistemologies in ELT, embrace Other(ed) and localized ways of knowing, meaning-and identity-making, and feeling.</p> <p>Who is making the language curriculum and policies, and whose worldviews and interests are they serving? How can we see multilingual and multidialectal students’ languaging practices more dynamically and fluidly? How might we encourage affective, embodied, and even spiritual, rather than prescriptive, aspects of languaging practices? How can we disrupt Western/Eurocentric/White onto-epistemological assumptions about ‘appropriate’ English speaking, reading, and writing in multilingual and multidialectal classrooms?</p>

(continued on next page)

86 Can Subaltern, Multilingual, and Multidialectal Bodies Feel?

<i>Concepts</i>	<i>Questions that can strengthen conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical stances in ELT research and practice</i>
Issues of the “How”: Rethinking Methodologies of (De-/Re-)Constructing Affects	Support counter-storytelling and (re)membering in ELT research and practice. What counter-storytelling and (re)membering opportunities can we provide for multilingual and multidialectal students to draw on their affective and embodied experiences with multiple languages and dialects in English speaking, reading, and writing? How can we resist disciplinary and neoliberal pressures to ignore the affective and embodied experiences of multilingual and multidialectal students and recognize the complex work these students engage in becoming bi-/multi-literate? Engender resistance/resilience, hope, and healing when ELT stakeholders share counter-stories. How can we (researchers) see ELT stakeholders from multilingual and multidialectal backgrounds as more than ‘data’? What would the resistant/resilient, hopeful, and healing relationship between researchers and participants look like, sound like, and feel like during and after the research process? What resistant/resilient, hopeful, and healing opportunities can we provide for multilingual and multidialectal students to <i>be, act, and feel</i> onto-epistemologically and affectively disobedient against the colonial logic of languaging?
Issues of the “What”: Rethinking Material and Affective Encounters	Engage multilingual and multidialectal students in languaging practices through our material and affective interactions and actions. How can we arrange material, affective, and embodied components in ELT curriculum and pedagogy to honor, sustain, and localize multilingualism and multidialectism? What pushbacks or tensions, if any, do we anticipate from various stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, parents, colleagues, and/or students) in doing so? How might we address them?

tidialectal bodies. This rethinking can provide opportunities to reform our deformed selves and affects within and against a colonial matrix of power.

Notes

¹ Here, the term subaltern refers to “all groups that are excluded from the hegemonic power structure” (Kumaravadivelu, 2016, p. 76).

² In this article, I use “I” to assert my commitment to the knowledge and arguments being made here and make clear its associated strengths and limitations to the reader. At the same time, I use “we” to refer to myself and multiple stakeholders in order to question

whether and how all of us are implicated, unwittingly or wittingly, in replicating anaffective logic of coloniality in working with multilingual and multidialectal bodies.

³ I use the term multilingual and multidialectal students, rather than English language learners (ELLs), to align with the languaging and translanguaging perspectives (e.g., Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Wei, 2014) that understand their language use as a fluid, situated, and dynamic process and position their identity positionings from Black, Brown, Indigenous, and many other subjugated communities as strengths for becoming bi-/multiliterate.

⁴ The field of ELT is also known as Teaching English to Speakers of Others (TESOL) and applied linguistics.

⁵ I use the term *intersectionally minoritized students or communities* instead of a *minority* or *non-White* because issues of race and racism intersect with other social constructs such as gender, sexuality, class, languages, and im/migration status (e.g., Maddamsetti et al., 2018; Maddamsetti, 2020, 2021). In a similar vein, I capitalize on the term *Color* to center socio-historical, cultural, and political marginalization and racialization (Kohli, 2014).

References

- Anzaldúa G. (2015). *Light in the dark/Luz en lo oscuro: Rewriting identity, spirituality, reality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2004). Affective economies. *Social Text*, 22(2), 117–139.
- Ahmed, S. (2012). *The cultural politics of emotion*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Benesch, S. (2018). Emotions as agency: Feeling rules, emotion labor, and English language teachers' decision-making. *System*, 79(1), 60–69.
- Cahill, C., Alberto Quijada Cerecer, D., Reyna Rivarola, A. R., Hernández Zamudio, J., & Alvarez Gutiérrez, L. (2019). 'Caution, we have power': Resisting the 'school-to-sweatshop pipeline' through participatory artistic praxes and critical care. *Gender and Education*, 31(5), 576-589.
- Caldas, B. (2017). Shifting discourses in teacher education: Performing the advocate bilingual teacher. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 118(4), 190-201.
- Collins, P. H. (1990/2009). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Combahee River Collective (1982). A black feminist statement. In C. Moraga, & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back. Writings by radical women of color* (pp. 210–218). Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press (Original work published 1977).
- Cornthassel, J., & Hardbarger, T. (2019). Educate to perpetuate: Land-based pedagogies and community resurgence. *International Review of Education*, 65, 87-116
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299.
- Flores, N. (2013). Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual education in the United States. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 10(4), 263-287.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2022). Undoing competence: Coloniality, homogeneity, and the overrepresentation of whiteness in applied linguistics. *Language Learning*.
- Motha, S., & Lin, A. (2014). "Non coercive rearrangements": Theorizing desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 331-359.
- Delgado-Bernal, D., Burciaga, R., & Carmona, J. F. (Eds.). (2017). *Chicana/Latina testimonios as pedagogical, methodological, and activist approaches to social justice*.

- Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Dixon-Román, E. (2019). Empiricism, affect, and haunting. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 53(3), 275-277.
- Dillard, C. B. (2012). *Learning to (re)member the things we've learned to forget: Endarkened feminisms, spirituality, and the sacred nature of research and teaching*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Dillard, C. B., & Neal, A. (2020). I am because we are:(Re) membering Ubuntu in the pedagogy of Black women teachers from Africa to America and back again. *Theory Into Practice*, 59(4), 370-378.
- Domínguez, M. (2021). Cultivating epistemic disobedience: Exploring the possibilities of a decolonial practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 72(5), 551-563.
- Dutta, U. (2022). Reimagining the politics of belonging through counterstorytelling: A decolonial praxis of refusal and desire. *Qualitative Inquiry*.
- Fanon, F. (1963/2008). *Black skin, white masks*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Gregersen, T., Mercer, S., & MacIntyre, P. (2021). Language teacher perspectives on stress and coping. *Foreign Language Annals*, 1-19.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT journal*, 60(4), 385-387.
- Kaveh, Y. M. (2023). Re-orienting to language users: humanizing orientations in language planning as praxis. *Language Policy*, 22(1), 1-23.
- King, T., Navarro, J., & Smith, A. (2020). *Otherwise worlds: Against settler colonialism and anti-Blackness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- King, T. L. (2017). Humans involved: Lurking in the lines of posthumanist flight. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 3(1), 162-185.
- Kohli, R. (2014). Unpacking internalized racism: Teachers of color striving for racially just classrooms. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 17(3), 367-387.
- Kubota, R. (2022). Decolonizing second language writing: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 66-85.
- Lockard, C. A. (2016). Unhappy confessions: The temptation of admitting to white privilege. *Feminist Philosophy Quarterly*, 2(2).
- Maddamsetti, J. (2020). Cultivating culturally relevant and sustaining pedagogy through field experiences: Discourses of elementary preservice teachers of color. *The New Educator*, 16(4), 352-375.
- Maddamsetti, J. (2021). Exploring an elementary ESL teacher's emotions and advocacy identity. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 15(3), 235-252.
- Maddamsetti, J., Flennaugh, T. K., & Rosaen, C. L. (2018). Who should teach? A Chinese teacher candidate's understandings of a good teacher and racialized experiences. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(2), 148-168.
- Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Methods, ethics, and performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural studies*, 21(2-3), 449-514.
- Motha, S. (2020). Is an antiracist and decolonizing applied linguistics possible?. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40, 128-133.
- Ohito, E. O. (2022). "I'm very hurt":(Un) justly reading the Black female body as text in

- a racial literacy learning assemblage. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 57(2), 609-627.
- Park, J. S. Y. (2022). On saying “enough”: Decolonizing subjectivities in English language learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 115, 102009.
- Patel, L. (2015). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. New York: Routledge.
- Petrie, G. M., & Darragh, J. J. (2018). Desiring English in Southwestern Nicaragua. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 48(4), 454-474.
- Spivak, G. (1988/2010). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Basingstoke, England: Macmillan Education.
- Shahjahan, R. A., Blanco Ramirez, G., & Andreotti, V. D. O. (2017). Attempting to imagine the unimaginable: A decolonial reading of global university rankings. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(S1), S51-S73.
- Seigworth, G. J., & Gregg, M. (2010). An inventory of shimmers. In M. Gregg & G. J. Seigworth (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 2–25). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Solorzano, D. G., & Bernal, D. D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, 36(3), 308-342.
- Song, J. (2018). Critical approaches to emotions of non-native English speaking teachers. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 41(4), 453–467.
- de Sousa Santos, B., & Meneses, M. P. (2020). Epistemologies of the South—Giving voice to the diversity of the South. *Knowledges Born in the Struggle: Constructing the Epistemologies of the Global South*.
- Snaza, N. (2019). Curriculum against the state: Sylvia Wynter, the human, and futures of curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 49(1), 129-148.
- Sundberg, J. (2014). Decolonizing posthumanist geographies. *Cultural geographies*, 21(1), 33- 47.
- Thiel, J. J., & Dernikos, B. P. (2020). Refusals, re-turns, and retheorizations of affective literacies: A thrice-told data tale. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 52(4), 482-506.
- Truman, S. E., Hackett, A., Pahl, K., McLean Davies, L., & Escott, H. (2021). The capaciousness of no: Affective refusals as literacy practices. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(2), 223- 236.
- Tuck E., Yang K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1).
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). Unbecoming claims: Pedagogies of refusal in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 811-818.
- Varga, B. A., Agosto, V., & Maguregui, J. (2021). Material counter-c art ographies:(Un) mapping (in) justice, spatial wounding, and abstract reticulations. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 34(9), 830-842.
- Wa Thiong’o, N. (2009). *Something torn and new: An African renaissance*. New York, NY: Basic Civitas Books.
- Wolff, D., & De Costa, P. I. (2017). Expanding the language teacher identity landscape: An investigation of the emotions and strategies of a NNEST. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(S1), 76-90.
- Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the colonality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation—An argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 3(3), 257–337. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2004.0015>

90 Can Subaltern, Multilingual, and Multidialectal Bodies Feel?

- Yoon, I. H. (2019). Haunted trauma narratives of inclusion, race, and disability in a school community. *Educational Studies*, 55(4), 420-435.
- Zavala, M. (2016). Decolonial methodologies in education. *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory*, 1-6.
- Zembylas, M. (2022). Sylvia Wynter, racialized affects, and minor feelings: unsettling the coloniality of the affects in curriculum and pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 54(3), 336-350.

Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education Guidelines for Authors

Incoming Editors

Cynthia McDermott, Antioch University
Erin Mikulec, Illinois State University
Renee Desmarchelier, University of Southern Queensland
Shirley R. Steinberg, University of Calgary

Founding and Managing Editor:
Shirley R. Steinberg, University of Calgary

Vision

Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education is an academic forum for the transdisciplinary study of the critical pedagogical implications and relationships within education. *Taboo* was founded on the notion of radical contextualization, encouraging students and scholars to draw from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives to question current approaches in schools, systems, and in higher education. Drawing upon a variety of contextualizing disciplines and critical theoretical ways of knowing including cultural studies, curriculum theorizing, critical race theory, political economy, feminist studies, the social foundations of education, critical pedagogy, interculturalism, queer theory, historiography, symbolic interactionism, literary theory, as examples. Beyond simply articulating critical perspectives we seek contributions willing to speak the unspoken and/or the irreconcilable. We hope to foster discussions across and through different disciplines including explorations into how dialogue and discourse operate throughout and within different educational times/spaces/places. The journal encourages a wide range of contributions from who work within these general areas, expanding methodological practices. *Taboo* seeks provocative and controversial submissions.

Journal Issues

Thematic Issues: *Taboo* was first published in 1995 and in 2025, we will celebrate its 30th year. To lead up to that milestone, *Taboo* will produce thematic issues until 2025. This unique model will invite multiple editors to spearhead each issue. Assisted by *Taboo's* editorial collective and assistants, each issue will be a *deep dive* within a theme. To suggest a thematic issue please send the name(s) and affiliations of the proposed issue, the topic/theme of the issue, a draft of the call for manuscripts, a tentative timeline, and CVs of the guest editor(s). Editors must ensure that all articles in the special issue go through a blind-peer review process. Editors will be asked to submit final manuscripts with peer reviews to the editors on the negotiated deadline. The entire special issues or specific manuscripts of the special issue may also go through an additional peer-review and/or editorial review process with *Taboo* prior to publication. Authors can expect to receive a decision in one month. Upon approval of the issue, one of the *Taboo* editors will be assigned to work with the thematic issue team.

Articles and Essays: *Taboo* accepts *traditional* academic articles as well as differently conceived submissions. We invite thoughtful, provocative, and well-researched articles, we also encourage authors to play with form and content. Articles will go through a double-blind peer-review process. Articles should be from 3000-7000 words (including references).

Diatribes: *Taboo* accepts opinion pieces. Diatribes are designed to be thoughtful and passionate pieces that utilize research in a provocative manner. They will go through a double-blind peer-review process and should be between 1000-1500 words.

Submitting a Thematic Issue Proposal:

We are now actively looking for submissions for these issues

1. Send a cover-letter with your manuscript and address the following items:
 - a. Issue Editor(s) email, addresses, affiliations
 - b. Proposed thematic issue and short description.
 - c. Justification for issue theme and how it links to *Taboo*'s vision
 - d. Indicate month and year of proposed issue:

Fall	2023
Spring	2024
Fall	2024
Spring	2025
Fall	2025
 - e. Indicate the research will comply with the rules and regulations of the ethics review board of your lead editors' institution (if appropriate)
 - f. Indicate that the articles for the issue will be written specifically for the issue
 - g. Submissions for *Taboo* thematic issues should be sent to:
SubmissionstoTaboo@gmail.com

Preparation for *Taboo*

Style: *Taboo* publishes articles that adhere to the guidelines of the *American Psychological Association (7th edition)*. However, articles from other style guides may be used for single articles.

Acceptance: Before publication of the issue, author(s) of each article will be asked to transfer copyright of the article to *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*. The transfer will ensure the widest possible dissemination of information. *Taboo* has an acceptance rate of 15%.

Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education is published electronically by Caddo Gap Press. The annual subscription rate for individuals is \$50 US and for institutions is \$100 US; for addresses outside the United States add \$30 per year. Single issues are available for \$30 each. Subscriptions orders should be addressed and payable to Caddo Gap Press, 3145 Geary Boulevard PMB 275, San Francisco, California 94118, USA.

ISSN 1080-5400

Copyright 2023 by Caddo Gap Press. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from Caddo Gap Press.

Publisher:

Alan H. Jones

Caddo Gap Press

3145 Geary Boulevard PMB 275, San Francisco, California 94118, USA

E-mail: alanhjones@caddogap.com; Website: www.caddogap.com

Taboo

The Journal of Culture and Education

Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education is an academic forum featuring the critical theoretical and pedagogical constructs that focus on the relationship between education and its sociocultural context. Grounded on the notion of “radical contextualization,” *Taboo* presents compelling and controversial pieces from a wide range of contributors.

Taboo began as a publication of Peter Lang Publishing, with two issues published each year in 1995, 1996, and 1997. *Taboo* has since been acquired by Caddo Gap Press, which renewed publication of the journal with the Spring-Summer 2000 issue.

Taboo is published quarterly in electronic format and posted to the journal’s website. For those wishing to receive the PDFs of each issue the annual subscription rate is \$50 for individuals and \$100 for institutions and libraries. Issues are sent via email or mailed in PDF format on disk. For those who read the journal on the website Caddo Gap Press encourages contributions to assist with the costs of publication.

Taboo Subscription Form

- YES. Please enter my annual subscription for **Taboo** (\$50 for individuals; \$100 for institutions; add \$30 outside the United States for mailed PDFs):

Name _____

Address _____

Email Address _____

Check enclosed (Payable to Caddo Gap Press)
Mail this form with check to address below

Caddo Gap Press

3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275, San Francisco, CA 94118, USA
Telephone 415/666-3012; E-mail info@caddogap.com