



HEGEMONY, EDUCATORS' CRITICAL AWARENESS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING

ESTUDIANTE

Andrés Robles Barrantes

APROBADO POR

Firmado por JUAN PABLO ZÚÑIGA VARGAS (FIRMA)
PERSONA FÍSICA, CPF-04-0182-0569.
Fecha declarada: 25/09/2021 01:27 p. m.

Tutor del TFG
M.Ed. Juan Pablo Vargas Zúñiga

RITA MARIA
ARGUEDAS
VIQUEZ
(FIRMA)
M.Ed. Rita Arguedas Viquez
Coordinadora
Maestría en Educación, CIDE

Firmado digitalmente por RITA
MARIA ARGUEDAS VIQUEZ (FIRMA)
Fecha: 2021.09.27 18:30:44 -06'00'



Universidad Nacional
Centro de Investigación y Docencia en Educación (CIDE)
División de Educología (DE)
Sistema de Estudios de Posgrado
Maestría en Educación con Énfasis en Aprendizaje del Inglés

Final Essay
Hegemony, Educators' Critical Awareness and Language Teaching

Andrés Ariel Robles Barrantes

June, 2021

Hegemony, Educators' Critical Awareness and Language Teaching

Introduction

The hegemonic powers behind the education system have reduced the role of the teacher to a technician who limits his or her performance to a transitional behavior and a discipline regulator. We are lower to obedient professionals who follow the rules; teachers are not supposed to question our faculties and just do what we are asked to do. In the case of language educators, we should teach our students the numbers or colors in English, how to use the verbs, and to identify different idiomatic expressions. We have to teach listening, speaking, reading, and writing. We should not get involved in the analysis of our contexts, ask our students to transform our society or challenge the systematic difficulties faced in their everyday lives.

If we check the official and institutional discourse, it is not part of our job to get involved in aspects that are not established in the curriculum. However, we should be critically aware of the political role that we play in our classrooms and classes. Critical awareness represents a Freirean concept in which the participants, students and teachers, are capable of understanding the realities behind our behaviors and identify the opportunities to transform the oppressive boundaries in education. This essay is going to analyze the education system and how we as EFL educators can articulate emancipatory processes taking into account critical awareness as a pedagogical basis.

How can we assume our role as educators without taking into account the systematic and hegemonic influence in our teaching praxis? This may be one of the necessary questions to answer in this academic paper since it is not often a debatable topic that we discuss in our professional talks as teachers or professors. Somehow, as previously mentioned, our professional life has been reduced to the achievement of goals established in the curriculum of our subjects; we come to classes to perform what is required and make our students conquer what is considered essential.

We should think about essentiality. Are most of the topics that we cover in

our classes essential for our students, communities, society, or context? If the answer is negative, why are we teaching those topics in our classes? To arrive at an answer and make this long story a little shorter, it would be mandatory to define what hegemony means and how it influences our daily life in the education system. Kumaravadivelu (2016) stated that “hegemony is political, economic, social, cultural, linguistic, or ideological control exercised by one group or nation over another” (p. 76). Going back to the previous questions and taking into account this author’s insight, we can perceive that there is a hegemonic control that influences the curriculum that we have to administer during classes.

In our roles as educators, we rarely question ourselves about the topics we are teaching to know if they are appealing to the population we are working with or if they are just somebody else’s agenda. When there is no coherence between what we are teaching and the needs of our students and their social context, it may mean that our teaching praxis has been limited to achieve hegemonic purposes of the education system and the groups of power pulling the strings behind it.

This drives us to the necessary understanding that we are part of an education structure, in which the education system is not just an institution that organizes and directs a specific field; in other words; it is not just the representation of teachers’ working place. The scope of the education system goes beyond these statements. Accordingly, we should consider a) that there is an undeniable political and ideological influence in all what the education system regulates and encourages; b) that political influence represents the interests of specific groups of power and dominant classes; and c) that those interests are materialized in the education policies, curriculum, and programs that teachers and professors have to implement in their classes.

However, educators do not often approach this topic and ignore those influences behind their roles. Concerning this issue, Giroux (2001) remarked that “schools, in these perspectives, are seen merely as instructional sites. That they are also cultural and political sites is ignored, as is the notion that they represent arenas of contestation and struggle among differentially empowered cultural and economic groups” (p. 3). As educators, we need to take into account how these systematic

influences affect, limit, and shape our teaching praxis.

To critically analyze the education system and our role as part of it, we need to meticulously consider every aspect of the official discourse in the field. This represents a process of deconstruction of our education practices in the classes and outside them. Why is it necessary? Well, education is a social good that has political interests which means that they have effects in our societies and communities. As Gee (2011) explained, “social goods are anything some people in a society want and value” (p. 5). Therefore, we can infer that the dominant classes have a strong interest in what education can achieve or not in our contexts.

This same author also mentioned that “it is not just about contending political parties...it is about how to distribute social goods in a society: who gets what in terms of money, status, power, and acceptance on a variety of different terms...” (Gee, 2011, p. 7). All these aspects are involved in the education system; they require teachers to work on their capacities to understand the importance behind their profession and the influences that may limit their practice. Considering this context, the purpose of this essay is to situate the necessity of critical awareness as the core to identify the hegemonic influences in our teaching praxis.

Education and its political role

If we want to understand our role as educators, it is mandatory for this analysis to consider the implications of the education system. In Latin America, the influences of the first steps taken in standardized education were brought from European methodologies after colonization. It is well known that groups of power with specific interests developed the structured model of education that has been administered in the region.

For instance, the catholic church used education as a platform to spread Christianity and the Spanish Crown's view during the colonization period. Dussel (1981) remarked this issue by stating that “the Church became the primary organism responsible for and committed to the perpetuation of the Hispanic world view primarily because the ecclesiastics controlled the universities, the secondary and primary schools, and the printing and distribution of literature” (p. 43). This relation between the catholic church and education was based on the fact that “the vast

majority of the intellectual elites in Latin America were priests” (Dussel, 1981, p. 43). This means that since the beginning of the formal system, there was a strong influence of an ideological perspective and its specific attainments.

As we can clearly consider in the previous example, an ideological role is present in the education scope. Before coming into the analysis of this matter, it would be necessary to go further. First, we should consider the education system as an ideological institution. This means that the economic vision that rules a society shapes all the perspectives and approaches of each institution in that specific context. In this sense, there are two elements that go hand by hand: the practical implications (the political role) and the doctrinal elements (the ideological role). The success of a socio-economic system depends on these two fundamental components, they are mutually related, and one has implications on the other. Based on this reflection, it is possible to state that institutions such as the church, family, mass media, education, and others represent some of the ideological referents of the system.

If we take back the example of the role of education in colonialism, we may find how it was used to support the official discourse of the colonizers. Abu-Shomar (2013) presented the fact that “during the era of colonialism, colonial educational institutions were used to augment the perceived legitimacy and propriety of colonial rule and to help maintain its power” (p. 265). As it is possible to conclude, education was used as an ideological control with political implications in the framework of the post-colonial society, this happens since “education is a crucial ideological apparatus through which certain values are held as the best or truest” (Abu-Shomar, 2013, p. 265). Those values are not necessarily constructed on justice, fairness, equality, or truth; they are mostly formulated on particular interests from the agenda of what the groups of power consider necessary.

Even though Abu-Shomar (2013) described a different scene and context, his explanation represents the same reality as the events that took place in a country as Costa Rica at the beginning of its education model. In our case, the control of the Catholic church in the system started with the Spanish colonialism in the XVI century and survived until the 1900s when liberalism as a political movement took over to

generate a separation between education and religious control over the system (Martinez, 2016). Here, we can devise once again how education had a remarkable importance in the political debate of the different elite representations and social movements.

As illustrated previously, this influence presented in the discussion has political effects because it contributes to the way society is conceived. In the case of the education system, this ideological control has the task of strengthening the hegemonic power that is exerted on the curriculum, the official discourse, and all the social agents involved in the teaching-learning community. It can be identified as the ideological hegemony; Giroux (2001) pointed regarding this matter that “instead of being exercised primarily through the use of physical force (the army and police), the power of the ruling classes was now reproduced through a form of ideological hegemony” (p. 23), meaning that a subtle domination substituted the direct practices of war that were implemented in the past.

The particular interest called hegemony comes and goes as an invisible line of power that appears in the everyday practices in schools, high schools, and universities. He also explained that “it was established primarily through the rule of consent, and mediated via cultural institutions such as schools, family, mass media, churches, etc.” (Giroux, 2001, p. 23). This hegemony appears in all the educational contexts, in most of the cases, without teachers and learners realizing its presence. It may occur under the radar, undistinguished, as if it were something insignificant, but its political implications have determinant repercussions in our societies.

Under these circumstances, we can state that education has a political essence. From a Freirean perspective, education goes beyond pedagogical methodologies, subjects, and evaluations. Giroux (2010) stated that “for Freire, pedagogy is not a method or an *a priori* technique to be imposed on all students but a political and moral practice that provides the knowledge, skills, and social relations” (p. 7169). Taking into account the examples previously presented and our own teaching experience, we can visualize the political reality behind the teaching praxis. Since there is a traditional approach of pedagogy that represents the interests of groups of power, we should consider other influences in the teaching-learning

context. For instance, critical pedagogy materializes a necessity for the emancipation of our communities and their cultures

Critical pedagogy and emancipation

Critical pedagogy constitutes an alternative approach for education. In its main core, it symbolizes a contrast to the traditional methodologies and perspectives. To understand the significant implications that critical education may have in our social contexts, it is fundamental to explore the limits of traditional pedagogy. When we analyze this traditional line, we need to consider that its influences on the education system have raised a social structure fully dominated by conservative ideologies, corporate interests, and a technical training to answer the demands of the market. In other words, it represents a method defined by the market-driven control of the neoliberal capitalism. In the previous section of this essay, we could lead to the conclusion that the control of dominant elites on education has been evident since the beginning of the Latin American system. The Costa Rican context was not different. A clear political interest is still alive and it does not seem to vanish soon. This drives us to the question: Are we teachers and professors aware of this reality?

Before delving into the meaning of critical pedagogy, we need to deconstruct what we understand as the traditional approach of education. First, there is a clear perspective of pedagogy as a disciplinary training. Giroux (2010) described this issue by saying that education is “now subordinated to the narrow regime of teaching to the test coupled with an often harsh system of disciplinary control, both of which mutually reinforce each other” (p. 715). In this sense, teachers and professors are mostly linked to teach this discipline through the imposition of certain practices that students must follow to be considered successful. In the Costa Rican reality, if we analyze high school education, we can identify examples such as the way students are asked to wear their uniform in a specific style or how they should remain quiet during the lessons and obey what their teacher asks them to do.

This discipline answers the requirements of the market. It is very common to find in classes a constant phrase used by teachers or professors: You should do this because when you are working, it is going to be necessary for you. Then, students

have to obey their teacher the same way that they have to execute what a boss says. Just to consider some examples, students should always be on time, they have to be quiet and respectful, and they should ask for permission if they need to go to the bathroom or outside the class. All these disciplinary practices have little to do with educational purposes, but they have an important repercussion on the way future obedient workers (also citizens) will behave later on.

This perspective of traditional education not only shapes the behavior of the “perfect” workers but also defines the political profile that the average citizen may have. To achieve this goal, universities have been reduced to institutions that just care about market employees and an obedient population, the same as the rest of the education system. Giroux (2014) remarked that “critical thought, knowledge, dialogue, and dissent are increasingly perceived with suspicion by the new corporate university that now defines faculty as entrepreneurs, students as customers, and education as a mode of training” (p. 30). In other words, considering education as a practice of social transformation and freedom is a challenge to the whole system behind the education process.

What is happening in universities? This problem also affects higher education since it “mimics this logic by reducing its public vision to the interests of capital and redefining itself largely as a credentializing factory for students and a Petri dish for downsizing academic labor” (Giroux, p. 2016, 2010). The results of this control define the actions of students/teachers and influence the social behaviour of the citizens. There are two more aspects that define the core of traditional education: teaching for memorization and evaluation processes.

A correlation among discipline, memorization, and evaluation is fundamental to state the basis of the traditional pedagogy. Under this approach, teaching is limited to memorizing what students require to pass the exam. This memorization process does not represent an act of constructing knowledge (Freire, 1985, p. 75). It is just the process of repeating certain patterns that are going to be measured with a specific evaluation in which the correct answer is the one previously given by the teacher or professor. Students do not have the possibility of finding their own ways

to contrast ideas and raise new knowledge. Education is narrowed to students repeating information and teachers/professors grading their performance.

It is in this reality where critical pedagogy attains a fundamental purpose as an alternative approach to the tamer system of education that we face in our institutions. It represents a challenging and political position against the hegemonic influences that dominate the system. Giroux (2010) remarked on the Freirean conception of pedagogy by saying that it considers “both the recognition that human life is conditioned, not determined, and the crucial necessity of not only reading the world critically but also intervening in the larger social order as part of the responsibility of an informed citizenry” (p. 716). This interpretation of pedagogy goes beyond the conservative ideologies that control teaching-learning processes. It requires teachers and professors to have a strong political and ideological understanding of pedagogy to transform their praxis which means taking their practices further than just a technical role.

Critical pedagogy represents an emancipatory act. It is an achievement of freedom that can transform the reality of injustice faced in different contexts. This means that critical pedagogy “attempts to understand how power works through the production, distribution, and consumption of knowledge within particular institutional contexts and seeks to constitute students as informed subjects and social agents” (Giroux, 2010, p. 717). This represents a change in terms of the role that students have not only in our classes but also in their daily lives. In this perspective, students are not considered as just receivers of knowledge, they have the freedom to understand their context and transform all those aspects that affect their social and personal reality. Students are seen as active participants who have their own voices and ideas that should be considered in the learning-teaching process.

Critical Awareness, the Role of the Educator and Power Relations

So far we have analyzed in this article the political role that education has and what the traditional and the critical perspectives of pedagogy represent. Now, it is corresponding to take into account the role of the educator in this context. As we

can conclude, teachers and professors have a huge impact in the teaching-learning process. We are the ones who face the reality of the system and its repercussions in the different contexts that it covers. Our roles are limited by a certain set of guidelines established in the curriculums and policies that embodied the expectancy of the education system. In most cases, we do not even realize what we are doing or the reasons behind our teaching praxis.

Before going further, we need to identify the power relations involved in our teaching-learning processes. Power relations appear in the different expressions of our society. Human relations and organization requires constant interaction among people, how we organize our everyday practices or develop our duties is influenced by the presence of multiple relations of power that most of the time go unseen or without our attention. They are present in most of the choices people make. Choices that are also influenced by the ideologies constructed with norms and values as integral aspects of the identity that each person has (Avenant, April, and Peters, 2015).

In this case, as educators, we cannot avoid the ideological influences that we have, we should acknowledge them and understand that an educational process is a space of open dialogue with all the participants of the class and their ideological perspectives as well. For Sarra (2005), power can be considered as something that is not a property but a dynamic based on a reciprocal relationship where multiple power relations constantly adapt and change while facing differences or conflicts (As cited in Avenant, April and Peters, 2015, p. 222). According to this statement, it is possible to conceive power not just as practice to use over others. Burns' theory indicates that power could be in the relations of groups to achieve common goals (Tatone, 2017, p. 33). This means that power relations are determined in the dynamics that people have in all the social groups where more than a person interacts. By considering this assumption, we can conclude that the teaching process is based on power relations that interfere in our teaching praxis.

It is not possible to deny that there is a hegemonic administration of power that shelters all the pedagogical processes under the education system which is a structure of power where the states materialize their goals. In most of the cases,

those education systems are dominated by the elites in power. In other words, the social class that rules the state. This upper class defines the education system, they establish the objectives and goals of the education, and, as it is expected, these objectives would never go against the interests and privileges of their social class (Freire, 1985, p. 138).

The objectives and goals are part of the status quo defined in the curriculums and education policies. Through the administration of the pedagogical curriculums, teachers need to prove that they could accomplish what was stated in their official guidelines. A systematic control is taking care of what educators do in the classrooms. This hegemonic influence delimits the different relations of power in the system. Consequently, teachers are seen as the ones who dominate the class, and students are reduced to a lethargic position. Teachers do what the curriculum allows them to practice, and students do what the teachers let them do. In this context, educators' critical awareness is mandatory to perceive the dominant influence of the hegemonic interests that limit their roles as teachers or professors. This is the capacity that educators can develop to break any oppressive chains and work to improve the quality of life that lower and working classes face.

According to this analysis, the education arena represents a space constructed by power relations and hegemonic influences that educators should identify. Ball (1994) considers that to analyze this phenomenon, it is necessary to take into account the effects of market forces controlling the educational institutions (p.108). This can be seen in "The relationship of schools to 'consumers', the priorities of school organization and the ethics of impression management are all affected by the market context" (Ball, 1994, pp. 109-110). To support this statement, several cases of these influences are represented in the behavior of educators while teaching.

We can find an example in the way that discipline is implemented in a class, students should behave similar to working in a company even though both scenarios are completely different. As educators, we need to understand that this influence of the market in the learning process can affect the purpose of education which means that education should never work just for the requirements of the market.

This analysis takes us to the question: How is this discipline implemented in the class? The hegemonic forces that control the education system define what is correct or not. It is a social structure where power is imposed by all the disciplinary instruments to regulate the social behavior in a teaching class. Those instruments are applied against the students who do not adapt to the rule. The ones who do not behave the way that they should do it. The discipline is administered by the teachers who represent the authoritarian position of the education model (Gramsci, 1967). To have the control of a class and achieve the necessary discipline in a group, different expressions of violence are used as a way to domesticate the learners. As Chomsky (2004) mentions "Violence is indeed a powerful instrument of control" (p. 34). In our experience, we can identify several examples of this violent dominance in our teaching praxis.

In many situations, educators exercise a violent domination from our position of power without knowing what we are doing. As a student, I remember the way my teachers forced me to ask them for permission to go to the bathroom whenever I needed. This happened even at the university level. In other words, to allow students to use their own bodies, teachers forced us to ask for permission. This can be seen as an alienation of the learners' integrity. A strong message of dominance hides behind these practices: students cannot do anything without permission, not even deciding what to do with their own bodies. Now, in my role as a professor, I always clarify on the first day of the course that, in my classes, students can go to the bathroom whenever they consider necessary. I do it as a way to distribute the power that we have under our control and a rebellion to that perspective of discipline.

There is another meaningful experience for the purpose of this academic essay that we can analyze. When I was in high school, I used to take a French class in which students should buy a book to follow the contents of the program. The teacher was the one in charge of selling the book. We were allowed just to buy the original version of it, but one of my classmates, a young girl, did not have the money to buy the book. So she made a photocopy version of it. When she came to the class with her photocopies, the French teacher realized that the girl was using them. She walked slowly to the student's desk, took the photocopies, and threw them in the

wastebasket. Then, she said “photocopies are not allowed in my classes”. It is clear that this teacher was teaching from her position of privilege, she did not care about the socioeconomic difficulties of her students. She used the power in her role and administered it to achieve the discipline that she wanted in the class. This example may look radical, but it also represents what many teachers do.

At the university level, before classes begin, we send anthologies to start our courses. Students should have them ready the first day of classes to follow the lesson. Those anthologies may be expensive and students have to buy from three to six depending on the number of courses that they are taking. We do not ask our students to know if they have the necessary money to buy them. We teach from our position of privilege as well. “They should have them”; “They should be responsible and have discipline if they want to survive in the university system” that is what we say to ourselves. I did it one time. I sent the anthology to a photocopy place and told my students to go and buy them. The day of classes came, I was teaching, I could see some people who did not have the material. I did not pay attention to it. Then, at the end of the class, an indigenous student came to me and told me “professor I do not have money to buy the anthology, and the scholarship has not arrived yet”. Now, I question my own praxis: Am I different from the French teacher from my high school experience?

Language Educators and Critical Awareness

The discussions previously stated can lead us to the understanding of the different roles that we have as educators and the importance of being aware of those responsibilities that we have in a classroom. Language teaching does not escape from this reality. It is also part of the education system and it follows patterns that result in political implications. For example, teaching a language as English corresponds to a political decision. Are English as an International Language (EIL) teachers aware of our responsibilities? In most cases, teachers and professors do not analyze the reasons behind their acts. It is in this context where EIL educators’

critical awareness may give a better understanding of the responsibility that teaching a language has. The critical awareness in the process of teaching-learning a language should gravitate towards accent and cultural identity and the concept of linguistic imperialism.

Language teachers should know how to deal with the colonialistic influences presented in the norms that structure the “correct” form of speaking a language such as English. In other words, the tendency of forcing students to find what is called a “native-like” accent while speaking the language. Kumaravadivelu (2016) stated that “the dominant power defines and imposes particular linguistic expressions intended to create a specific conception of the world that suits them” (p. 77). This means that hegemonic forces behind teaching impose what is considered correct or not when using the language. This same author explained that we have an “idealized version of who a native speaker is or what constitutes native speaker competence. And yet, these terms have a firm hold on the knowledge systems dictating several aspects of English language learning and teaching” (Kumaravadivelu, 2016, p. 77). In other words, the construction of the concept native speaker represents more a political position than a communicative aspect of the language.

If we consider our daily praxis as EIL teachers and professors, we may find many examples of how this hegemonic influence is represented in our classes. For instance, the way we correct our students’ pronunciation even though they enhance communication just because the word or phrase was not pronounced with a “native-like” accent. This is a very common practice in our English courses. We forget that the accent that we have when speaking another language is part of our cultural identity. By imposing these assessment processes, we also legitimate the fact that native speakers are the most accurate people to teach a language. However, once again, Kumaravadivelu (2016) explained that “who can teach pronunciation better is a moot point, particularly in a profession that claims to celebrate World Englishes that focus on intelligibility rather than accent” (p. 81). This is a challenge that language educators should understand and the only way to know it and do something about it is by being critically aware of what this means.

These everyday practices can have even serious consequences to our culture and context since language can be used as a medium of control. It is of relevant importance to internalize the concept of linguistic imperialism which “leads to the promotion of certain languages and language varieties and the stigmatization of others, as the prestigious language becomes the norm by which other languages derive their status” (Canagarajah & Ben Said, 2011, p. 390). Taking into account the implications of this phenomenon, it is possible to perceive how we as EIL educators may unconsciously favor this hegemonic influence and affect our own cultural and social identity. There is no doubt that we are part of the educational system and that our roles represent specific interests that we need to identify, understand, and transform when necessary.

Final Conclusions

The following insights represent the conclusions of this reflective essay. This is just a step forward to a critical view of the education system and our roles as educators. This opens up an opportunity for future debates and discussions in the pedagogical field that should be analyzed by all the participants of the teaching-learning process. Here some arguable reflexions:

- The education system embodies an ideological and political discourse that represents the interests of the dominant classes that are ruling the society. These elites instrumentalize the system to achieve their own goals and objectives maintaining the privileges that they hold. Educators should have a clear perspective of this reality to identify the repercussions of their praxis and what they do everyday in classes. Educators' critical awareness is the way to identify the roles that we have in our classes. In other words, it is a political perception to have the possibility of doing what we consider necessary or not in the teaching-learning processes under our control.

- By analyzing the role of power relations in our teaching praxis as professors, we can state that the way education is conceived in the official and systematic structures represents the requirements of the socio-economic classes that have ruled the states for years. In this context, the influence of the market in the education field is undeniable. To transform this reality, a high level of compromise and effort is

required. Those teachers who consider it mandatory to have dialogic spaces in their classes have a challenge ahead to deal with. It means to work on a pedagogical process that brings opportunities for students to have the possibility of making decisions on their own learning progression. To prepare classes where students' knowledge is considered valid and meaningful.

-Educators should place themselves in resistance against those dominant influences of the status quo and start transforming their realities to enhance a pedagogical process where students have a stronger perspective of their position and importance not just in the education system but also in society in general and their communities. Educators should be the ones drawing on the table.

-Educators have the challenge of constructing a new perspective of power and its influence in education. Deacon (2006) states that "whilst domination can be avoided or minimized by counteracting practices of power and by practices of liberty" (p. 184). We have the chance of opening spaces of dialogue where the voices of our students can have an active position in the teaching/learning process since "relations of power...are inextricably intertwined with pedagogical effects of guilt, obligation and verification, and assumptions about degrees of ignorance, dependence on others, legitimate compulsion, and achievement" (Deacon, 2006, p. 184). Changing these hegemonic dynamics in the classes represent a necessary progress to a pedagogy of freedom. A pedagogy that conceives each person in the learning process as one who can contribute to the discussion, learning, and acquisition of knowledge.

-Language teachers should find emancipatory practices that can contribute to the strengthening of the cultural identity that students in a class share. It is an effort to avoid any vestige of linguistic imperialism. We cannot avoid that languages can have political and ideological implications as explained by Canagarajah and Ben Said (2011), "when ideologies find expression in language, we call them discourses" (p. 389). It is necessary to democratize those discourses, they should inclusively represent the values or the cultural identity shared in the class and not just the imposition of a specific accent or variation of the language.

References

- Abu-Shomar, A. (2013). The politics of education and critical pedagogy: Considerations from the English Literary Tradition in Post Colonial Academic Contexts. *Postcolonial Directions in Education*, 2(2), 263-313.
- Avenant, P., April, K., & Peters, K. (2015). Power relations and complex organisational development. *International Journal of Complexity in Leadership and Management*, 3(3), 218-240. 10.1504/IJCLM.2016.080320
- Ball, S. (1994). *Education reform –a critical and post-structural approach*. Open University Press.

- Canagarajah, S., & Ben Said, S. (2011). Linguistic Imperialism. *Editorial: J. Simpson (ed), The Routledge*, 2 (2), 348-400.
- Chomsky, N. (2004). *The Dilemmas of Dominance*. Argentina: CLACSO.
- Deacon, R. (2006). Michel Foucault on education: a preliminary theoretical overview. *South African Journal of Education*, 26 (2), 177-187.
- Dussel, E. (1981): *A history of the church in Latin America : colonialism to liberation (1492-1979)*. WM. B. Erdmans Publishing.
- Freire, P. (1985). *La naturaleza política de la educación: Cultura, poder y liberación*. Barcelona: Centro de Publicaciones del Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia y Ediciones Paidós Ibérica, S.A.
- Gee, J. (2011). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. United States: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education*. Bergin & Garvey, United States of America.
- Giroux, H. (2010). Rethinking education as the practice of freedom. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8 (6). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2010.8.6.715>
- Giroux, H. (2012). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Haymarket Books, United States of America.
- Gramsci, A. (1967). *La formación de los intelectuales*. Editorial Grijalbo, S. A, México.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The Decolonial Option in English Teaching: Can the Subaltern Act? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50 (1), 66-85. 10.1002/tesq.202
- Martínez, B. (2016). *Cronología de la educación costarricense*. Editorial Digital-Imprenta Nacional, Costa Rica.
- Tatone, G. (2017). Power relations within groups through the lived experiences of elected officials. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, Vol. 10(1), 30-52

DECLARACIÓN JURADA

Yo, Andrés Ariel Robles Barrantes, cédula de identidad 114770155, estudiante de la Universidad Nacional, declaro bajo fe de juramento y consciente de las responsabilidades penales de este acto, que soy autor intelectual del Trabajo Final de Graduación Titulado **"Hegemony, Educators' Critical Awareness and Language Teaching"**, para optar por el grado de Maestría en Educación con énfasis en Aprendizaje del Inglés.

ANDRES ARIEL
ROBLES
BARRANTES
(FIRMA)

Firmado digitalmente por
ANDRES ARIEL ROBLES
BARRANTES (FIRMA)
Fecha: 2021.09.17
19:54:00 -06'00'

Firma

Pérez Zeledón, a los 17 días del mes de Septiembre del año 2021.

Refrendo

Los abajo firmantes avalamos el Trabajo de Graduación del estudiante Andrés Robles Barrantes, cédula 1 1477 0155, que lleva como título **Hegemony, Educators' Critical Awareness and Language Teaching**, dado que cumple con las disposiciones vigentes y la calidad académica requerida por el posgrado.

Firmado por JUAN PABLO ZÚÑIGA VARGAS (FIRMA)
PERSONA FÍSICA, CPF-04-0182-0569.
Fecha declarada: 22/09/2021 03:53 p. m.

M.Ed. Juan Pablo Zúñiga Vargas
Tutor
Maestría en Educación con énfasis en Aprendizaje del Inglés

RITA MARIA
ARGUEDAS
VIQUEZ
(FIRMA)

Firmado digitalmente
por RITA MARIA
ARGUEDAS VIQUEZ
(FIRMA)

Fecha: 2021.09.23
08:24:51 -06'00'

M. Ed Rita Arguedas Víquez
Coordinadora
Maestría en Educación