IMPLEMENTING A CRITICAL LITERACY PROGRAM IN A CLASS OF
STUDENTS WITH EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE

A research report submitted to the
Yale-Lynn Hall Teacher Action Research Prize Committee

by

Jennifer Marie Knight

San Francisco, California

February 5, 2010

Abstract (Executive Summary)

The results of this study lend evidence to the number of ways in which a critical literacy program is beneficial to the social/emotional growth of students with severe emotional disturbance. The outcomes for these particular students emphasize that current curricula are not adequately meeting their academic and social/emotional needs. The researcher could find no documentation in the available literature of a critical literacy framework being used with students with emotional disturbance, despite the evidence that it has benefitted students both academically and socially/emotionally in general education classrooms. Due to the limitations inherent in merging two previously unrelated fields, there are a number of recommendations for further research educators may conduct to test the theories presented in this study. For the purposes of this study, the researcher conducted qualitative research using methods consistent with the qualitative and naturalist paradigms. The results demonstrated that a critical literacy program is beneficial to students with emotional disturbances.

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to discover the social/emotional and behavioral effects of a critical literacy program on students with emotional disturbance using qualitative methods. This was not an academic intervention study, in that, although some students may have improved their reading and writing, academic improvement was not the focus of the study. This introductory section will place the study in the context of the current research relevant to critical literacy and students with emotional disturbance. The next section will discuss the methods used in this study and briefly describe the participants, setting, and data collection and analysis procedures. The third section will describe the results of the intervention, specifically how the students demonstrated changes in their affect, in their relationship with their peers and with staff members, in their ability or inability to regulate their emotions, and in their feelings about learning and school. The final section will discuss and interpret the results and give implications and recommendations for further research.

Critical literacy is largely theoretical and subjective (Chafel, Flint, Hammel, & Pomeroy, 2007; Duffy, 2008; Heffernan & Lewison, 2005; Lewison, Leland, & Harste, 2008; Paugh, Carey, King-Jackson, & Russell, 2007; Stevens & Bean, 2007; Vasquez, 2007), meaning that it will likely look different in each classroom where it is practiced. However, there are numerous critical literacy strategies that researchers have put into practice in public schools across the United Sates, giving instructors many options which can be tailored and

altered to meet the needs of their particular students. Teachers "often introduce realistic children's literature to foster sustained and meaningful conversations with children about issues affecting…society" (Chafel, et. al, 2007). Through these conversations, children may come up with their own innovative ways to learn and use language, transcending the classroom and stretching out into the world around them, be it the school or community. Behrman (2006) reviewed thirty-six articles that specifically addressed critical literacy classroom practices. He discovered that "traditional classroom texts need to be supplemented by other works of fiction, nonfiction, film, or popular culture…[that] may allow students to confront social issues glossed over or avoided by traditional texts" (p.492). In the same vein as supplemental texts, reading about multiple perspectives on the same topic can help students see subjects, people, or things from many different angles. Lewison, Leland, and Harste (2008) demonstrated how reading from multiple perspectives can lead to students understanding the words and actions of different people they come into contact with, looking critically at where that person is coming from. Another important aspect of critical literacy instruction is allowing students choices and autonomy in their learning. Paugh, Carey, King-Jackson, & Russell (2007) found that although students were initially unsure of what to do when given more choices and autonomy, they quickly became accustomed to the new structure and excellent work was done as the traditional teacher-student hierarchy shifted and all became co-learners.

There is no documentation in the available literature of a critical literacy program being implemented in a classroom of students with emotional disturbances. Rather, the literature on students with emotional disturbances highlights the poor outcomes for these students in the arenas of academic success and social and emotional health (Bradley, Doolittle, & Bartolotta, 2008; Conroy, Stichter, Daunic, & Haydon, 2008). This, and other research shows that children with emotional disturbances are more likely than all other students, those with disabilities or not, to "drop out of school, receive school suspensions and expulsions, fail one or more courses, not graduate, and have difficulties socially integrating at school" (Reddy & Richardson, 2006, p.379). Research on best practices for day treatment facilities highlights the need for programs that include the following two cornerstones: One, "provision of coursework and educational activities relevant to students' real-world experiences and goals that include a variety of nontraditional curriculum," and two, "provision of effective programming that facilitates students' social, emotional, and behavioral growth" (Hughes & Adera, 2006, p. 27). This points to the importance of having a curriculum that addresses both the academic and social/emotional needs of students with emotional disturbance.

The notions around these poor outcomes led to the discovery that there is a pedagogy that is currently working, albeit with students in general education classrooms, that benefits students academically and socially/emotionally (Chafel, Flint, Hammel, & Pomeroy, 2007; Duffy, 2008; Lewison, Leland, & Harste, 2008; Paugh, Carey, King-Jackson, & Russell, 2007; Stevens & Bean, 2007; Vasquez, 2007). Researchers have discovered that students in critical literacy programs are not only making academic gains but are also getting along better with one another (Stribling, 2008), are learning and using acceptable behaviors (Comber, Thompson, & Wells, 2001), and are learning to act as voices in their communities (Morrell, 2002). It is part of the goal of this study to contribute to the body of knowledge about methods and curricula that work with students with serious emotional disturbances.

Method

The participants were the nine students in a special day class in a day treatment facility in Oakland, CA. The students are 9-11 years old and in Special Education. Each has social/emotional and behavioral needs, and at the small school the students receive the support of therapists, mental health professionals, intervention specialists, and special education teachers. Their diagnoses vary somewhat, although they overlap in many aspects. Three students have a principal diagnosis and one student has a secondary diagnosis of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Two students have a principal diagnosis of Reactive Attachment Disorder of Infancy or Early Childhood. Two students have a principal diagnosis of Major Depressive Disorder. One student has a principal diagnosis of Bipolar Disorder, and one student has a principal diagnosis of Separation Anxiety Disorder. Four students have a secondary diagnosis of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD).

The study was conducted in a classroom that is part of a day treatment program in a small school specifically for elementary students with severe emotional disturbances. The school exists as collaboration between a county mental health agency and the local school district. There is a very clear line between the jobs of the school and mental health staff however, and there is little to no overlap between therapeutic social/emotional/behavioral work and academic work.

A qualitative study was conducted using methods consistent with the qualitative and naturalist paradigms. A naturalistic investigation, one in which "the inquirer imposes no a priori units on the outcome" (Guba & Lincoln, 1985, p. 8) was chosen due to the perceived absence of research dealing with both students with emotional disturbance and critical literacy. The study was embarked on in a holistic manner, without

any expectations for what the outcome might be. This is grounded in the notion that there are multiple

constructed realities that must be observed before an understanding of the subject matter can reveal itself

(Guba & Lincoln, 1985). Qualitative research, as described by Corbin and Strauss (1990), "can refer to

research about persons' lives, stories, behavior, but also about organizational functioning, social movements,

or interactional relationships" (p. 17). A qualitative design was selected because little is now known about

students with emotional disturbance in a critical literacy context. Qualitative methods "can be used to

uncover and understand what lies behind any phenomenon about which little is yet known" (Corbin &

Strauss, 1990, p. 19). In qualitative research, interviews and observations are the most commonly employed

methods, and were the sources from which most of the data emerged in this study. It was the purpose of this

investigation to build theory that "not only can be used to explain that reality but provides a framework for

action" (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, p. 22).

Detailed qualitative data analysis was performed with the notes from the field journal, the work the

students generated during the study, and the students' answers to the interview questions. First, the data

were organized. The data were then read and analyzed for themes. Notes were made about the themes in the

right margin of the field journal and interview transcriptions. As the themes emerged from the data margin

notes and memos, categories were developed from the themes. For each category a code, tag or label was

assigned. The data were then read again and coded in the left margin of the field journal and interview

transcriptions. The data were triangulated by asking the interns and instructional assistants (who were

present during critical literacy time) to confirm or deny implications, and by asking the students for

clarification during interviews.

The study was introduced to students prior to the start of the critical literacy program. An assent

was received from students to participate in the program, and a letter was sent home to parents to be signed

giving their parental consent. Each student received thirty minutes of critical literacy instruction per school

day for eight weeks as part of the regular language arts block. This took place mid-late morning during

regular school hours.

The first two weeks were spent introducing the critical literacy program. For the first two days, in an

informal seminar discussion format, the students were encouraged to discuss things of importance to them

and to think about social issues in the classroom, school, or community that they may not like—and of which

they were critical. After the initial discussions, a worksheet was created to help the students further develop

their ideas. On one side the students were asked to list ten things they really like. On the other side the students were asked, "If I could change ten things about my life or about my neighborhood they would be…" Completing the worksheet took most of the students three class periods, although some required more time. The student's responses were analyzed carefully, and it was noted where there were overlapping answers.

Based on the student responses, five "invitations" were selected from the book *Creating Critical Classrooms: K-8 Reading and Writing with an Edge* by Lewison, Leland and Harste (2008), in which are more than twenty invitations are available for educators to choose from. The authors explain that "Each invitation is based on a particular social issue such as name-calling or consumerism…we wrote the invitations for use as whole-class activities, but each one is followed by a learning center extension that was designed for students to do in small groups…" (Lewison, Leland & Harste, 2008, p. 159). Each invitation in the book has six sections: rationale, materials, getting started, learning center extension, learning center materials, and taking action. The five invitations themselves, as well as the books and materials used in them, were chosen from the twenty to include topics of interest to the student as well as to deal with some of the issues the students brought up on their "If I could change…" worksheet from the first week of the curriculum.

Two class periods were designed for each invitation to get the students involved and drawn into the subject material. These "getting started" classes began with a short book, chapter, or activity related to the social issue followed by an interactive student-directed/teacher-facilitated activity that engaged the students in critically thinking about the issue. After each introductory session, the materials for that invitation were placed in a colorful issue-themed box, along with the directions, which were explicitly elucidated to the students. The boxes also contained directions for "taking action," if the students wished to go further with the activity and earn extra credit.

After the introduction the invitations were placed in a part of the classroom designated as the invitation center. In each invitation, along with the materials and center directions, were ideas for extending the social issue to the lives and worlds of the students. There were books, plays, pictures, materials, and ideas in each. Each day during invitation time, for the remaining five weeks of the program, the students would choose an invitation to work with in pairs or groups. Some invitations would only take a few days; others could take weeks. Students had the option of taking action following their engagement in the invitation center. They were able to decide how far they want to take the issue, with the researcher/teacher/facilitator always close by to offer suggestions and insight, acting as a co-learner in the educational process.

The first invitation selected was called "Digging Deeper into Texts through Drama" (Lewison, Leland, & Harste, 2008, p. 161). To generate student interest, a book called *Your Move* by Eve Bunting (1998) was employed. This book centers on a ten-year-old boy who struggles with neighborhood gangs, peer pressure, and taking care of his younger brother while his mother works at night. The activity involved the students putting their bodies into poses and making facial expressions that reflected the tensions between what the characters were thinking and feeling. The invitation began with the students getting into a pair or small group and picking one of the books from the box to work with. In addition to *Your Move,* three other high-interest books that the class had recently read were selected: *My Man Blue* by Nikki Grimes (1999), *Willy the Wimp* by Anthony Brown (1984), and *White Socks Only* by Evelyn Coleman (1996). The students were to take turns reading the book out loud and then have a discussion about what the characters were thinking and feeling. Then they were to each pick a character to represent and create a tableau, or still picture, that captured their group's understanding of the story. They also completed a writing assignment in conjunction with the more active tableaux, answering a number of questions to focus their ideas.

The remaining four invitations involved reading and writing from multiple perspectives, analyzing name calling and bullying in literature and in life, reading and writing multiview books, and analyzing and designing political cartoons (Lewison, Leland, & Harste, 2008). There was diversity in the invitations so that students who were more kinesthetic, artistic, or experiential would be able to find activities that appealed to their intelligences, developed their reading and writing skills, and allowed them to work on their emotional and behavioral issues.

After the eight weeks, each student was interviewed to see how the program affected him or her emotionally. At the conclusion of the study, participants were de-briefed and had the opportunity to ask questions and give input about the program.

<div align="center">Results</div>

The results of the study demonstrated that a critical literacy program could benefit students with emotional disturbance in a number of ways. As the data were analyzed, themes emerged that highlighted changes in student affects and an increase in the positive interactions among peers and between students and staff members. The data also revealed that the students demonstrated an increased ability to regulate their emotions and displayed more optimistic feelings about school and their own learning.

Many of the students became very engaged in their work during critical literacy time. An example of this was one day about halfway through the program. Two of the students had started an invitation a few days prior that involved writing their own multiview book that dealt with an issue they both felt was important to them. On the day in question, Warren (not his real name; all names have been changed) came into class first thing in the morning with very upbeat expression on his face and was happily talking to one of the interns in the classroom. The intern in the classroom asked, "Why are you so happy today with that grin on your face?" Warren answered, "Because I'm writing this story and can't wait to work more on it!" She asked, "What's the story about?" and he answered, "Well…it's about violence in the community…but…it's more 'bout how some kids help one violent kid, a bully, you know, that jumps people and stuff." This was a student who, before the critical literacy program began, almost always arrived to school angry and negative, and who had been a bully at his last few schools. And although Warren would complete most of his academic work before the curriculum began, it did not have a noticeable effect on his emotions, either positive or negative. Rather, he would generally succumb to the emotions he had brought with him from home and use emotions such as anger to cause disruptions and get out of class.

Another student, Paulina, became engaged with some of the characters in the books that were part of the invitations, and used her connection with the characters to brighten her affect. For example, she was drawn to the little girl who is the main character in *White Socks Only* (Coleman, 1996). The field notes revealed that on three separate occasions, when Paulina was displaying a sad or depressed affect, she would pick up the book and take it with her to the reading corner to look through. After a little while she would be back to her upbeat self, displaying a more positive and happy affect in her facial expressions, actions, and interactions.

The interactions among peers were perhaps one of the most noticeable changes reflected in the field notes. Students perceptibly worked harder at getting along with their peers during critical literacy class periods. An example occurred during the very first session of independent work time, after all the boxes had been introduced. Two students raced to the political cartoon box and the other two raced toward the tableaux invitation. The two students who wanted to work with the tableaux invitation often did not speak to each other. When they did interact, it usually involved bickering or picking at each other. One of the students, Devon, had set his sights on working with *Your Move* (Bunting, 1998), a story he really connected with. The other student, Paulina, had set her sights on *White Socks Only* (Coleman, 1996), given that she had

connected with the main character in that story. A major argument was expected, given the normal classroom dynamics, but the students were given space to try to work it out. "I've been wanting to do *Your Move*…" Devon trailed off. "I REALLY want to do *White Socks Only*," Paulina pleaded. Devon conceded, with a surprising quickness, "Well…we could do your book first and then do it with mine…" Paulina said, "Yeah, okay! I like your book too..." They asked permission (which was happily given), and went to work. They worked well together and completed the whole activity for each book before moving on to a new invitation.

Each of the students had different things they were dealing with at home during the eight-week curriculum, and it is one of the main goals of the day treatment center to teach these students appropriate ways to deal with the emotions that arise from being in such emotionally trying circumstances. In class, students brought a great deal of their lives into the academic space. This was evident right away from their responses to the initial worksheet that was given on day three of the critical literacy curriculum. In answering the question about they would change about their lives or neighborhood, many of their responses were related to friendships, or lack thereof. They stated, "I wish I had more friends," "I wish I could have a nice friend at school," "People could be nicer to each other and to me," and "I wish I was popular." These students each revealed verbally, in subsequent class periods, thing such as, "I had no friends at my old school" and "I was a bully before." Although the students never came right out and verbalized how it felt to see that many of their classmates had experienced similar situations, their relationships with those students steadily improved over the course of the eight weeks.

It was not uncommon at the day treatment school to hear a student say, "I can't do that, I'm stupid" or "I can't spell" or "I hate school." They rarely read or did anything academic for pleasure, and many of them did not have books of much print in their homes, which only reinforced their negative feelings about learning. They also came to the day treatment program after at least one, if not more, failures in other schools. These failures can fuel many of their negative feelings about school. On the "what I would change about my life or neighborhood" worksheets, over half mentioned things dealing with their perceived intelligence or academic abilities. They responded with things such as, "I wish I could be famous for math work and reading," "I wish I could read and write better," "I wish I was a genius," and "I wish I could learn more and that there was more learning time in school." Clearly the students, underneath the outer layer of hatred for reading and learning in general, truly wanted to learn.

On day two of week five of the critical literacy program, students came into the classroom after getting off the busses. Normally in the morning, as they shook off whatever had happened that morning at home or on the bus and tried to get settled, they would try to pick fights, sulk in silence, color, or take a time out. However, by the time morning meeting started, Tony, Kevin, and Devon were sitting in the reading area, each engrossed in their own comic book or comparing characters quietly with each other. Warren was working on a story he was writing for one of the critical literacy invitations. In an interview with Omar near the end of the curriculum, he was asked to describe himself as a reader. He replied, "I see myself as smart. People see me reading a whole book and they say, 'Oooo, he is so smart!'" A few students, including Omar, Warren, and Eric, were having problems on the bus coming to school, and initiated the idea of bringing a book to look at to distract them. Clearly, something in the usual classroom dynamic had shifted as students took more initiative in their own learning.

The student's responses in the final interview, after the critical literacy program was over revealed more positive feelings about school and learning. Devon shared, "I thought I wouldn't learn to read good, ever. But I just needed to find somethin' I liked…and it helped…and when I read with Paulina and listening to her helped and she helped me when I read too…" Warren summed up his feelings about writing this way, "That spell check thing you showed us on the laptops helped me be a better writer…like I wanted to write but didn't write before 'cause I would get stuck on words every second…that I couldn't spell you know…yeah, I can write stories now, maybe I'll be writer when I get older…" Eric focused on a story he wrote toward the end of the curriculum about bullying, noting, "I don't think I have to be a bully anymore…well before…I would be worried a lot and think I had to try to be bad and sometimes I still am but I don't have to be I don't think…I can choose and maybe I'll get some friends or something now I don't know…"

Discussion

The students became engaged with the material within the first two weeks, setting the tone for steadily improving behavior and near-perfect attendance that lasted throughout the curriculum. The exceptions to this were students who were reading more than three grade levels below, including the two students with a primary diagnosis of Reactive Attachment Disorder. These students missed a great deal of school due to unhealthy family relationships, and their attendance and performance continued to be poor throughout the curriculum, and they were unaffected by it in any way. The rest of the students, however, took their time with the invitations and put a good deal of energy, thought, and care into their work, truly

investing in the activities and taking ownership and pride in their work. They worked extremely hard, pushing through feelings of frustration when they arose, and were able to get to three invitations each during the course of the curriculum. They each grew emotionally in a number of ways, displaying brighter affects, getting along better with each other and with the school staff, regulating their emotions, and demonstrating more positive feelings about their learning.

The emotional changes in the students during the eight weeks of this study can be attributed to the critical literacy program, as outlined in the preceding paragraphs and in the Results section. However, only focusing on the thirty minutes of daily critical literacy instruction does not take into account the rich and multifaceted lives of the students, both in school and at home. Other factors in the student's worlds that may have worked in conjunction with or hindered the critical literacy program in having a greater or less positive emotional affects was the school schedule and environment and the academic abilities of the students.

This study supported and built on the work by other scholars in the field who found that critical literacy programs benefit students in general education academically and emotionally. Further research should be conducted to determine if a critical literacy program would benefit students with emotional disturbance academically, as well as emotionally. Researchers may also want to focus on the specific factors of critical literacy that are important for emotional growth in students with emotional disturbance in an attempt to pinpoint exactly which classroom strategies produce which kind of emotional result. Studies may also be conducted with students in special education who have other disabilities to see how the programs affect them academically and emotionally. In addition, researchers may want to conduct a series of quantitative or mixed methods studies in the area of critical literacy, as there are very few to support the improvements shown by the qualitative studies. It is also suggested that a longer study, similar to this one, be conducted to see what the effects of a critical literacy program would be over a longer period of time.

REFERENCES

Behrman, E. (2006, March 1). Teaching about Language, Power, and Text: A Review of Classroom Practices

That Support Critical Literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(6), 490-498. (ERIC

Document Reproduction Service No. EJ737953) Retrieved November 2, 2008, from ERIC database.

Bradley, R., Doolittle, J., & Bartolotta, R. (2008, March 1). Building on the Data and Adding to the Discussion:

The Experiences and Outcomes of Students with Emotional Disturbance. *Journal of Behavioral

Education*, 17(1), 4-23. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ787437). Retrieved September

21, 2008, from ERIC database.

Browne, A. (1984). *Willy the Wimp.* London: Walker Books.

Bunting, E. (1998). *Your Move*. Orlando: Harcourt, Inc.

Chafel, J. A., Flint, A. S., Hammel, J., & Pomeroy, K. H. (2007). Young Children, Social Issues, and Critical

Literacy: Stories of Teachers and Researchers. *YC Young Children*, 62(1), 73-81. Retrieved September

1, 2008, from ProQuest Education Journals database. (Document ID: 1204311421).

Coleman, E. (1996). *White Socks Only*. Morton Grove, Illinois: Albert Whitman & Company.

Comber, B., Thomson, P., & Wells, M. (2001, January 1). Critical Literacy Finds a Place: Writing and Social

Action in a Low-Income Australian Grade 2/3 Classroom. *Elementary School Journal*, 101(4), 451-64.

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ631481) Retrieved November 2, 2008, from ERIC

database.

Conroy, M., Stichter, J., Daunic, A., & Haydon, T. (2008, January 1). Classroom-Based Research in the Field of

Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Methodological Issues and Future Research Directions. *Journal

of Special Education*, 41(4), 209-222. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ796829).

Retrieved September 21, 2008, from ERIC database.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. C. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques.*

Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crafton, L. K., Brennan, M., & Silvers, P. (2007). Critical Inquiry and Multiliteracies in a First-Grade Classroom.

Language Arts, 84(6), 510-518. Retrieved October 1, 2008, from ProQuest Education Journals

database. (Document ID: 1312332341).

Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (2003). *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Duffy, J. (2008, January 1). Teaching for Critical Literacy and Racial Justice. *Democracy & Education,* 17(3), 38-45. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ803014). Retrieved October 1, 2008, from ERIC database.

Duncan-Andrade, J. M. R., & Morrell, E. (2008). *The Art of Critical Pedagogy: Possibilities for Moving from Theory to Practice in Urban Schools*. New York: Peter Lang.

Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Giroux, H. A. (2006). *America on the Edge: Henry Giroux on Politics, Culture, and Education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Goodman, G. S. (1999). *Alternatives in Education: Critical Pedagogy for Disaffected Youth*. New York: Peter Lang.

Grimes, N. (1999). *My Man Blue*. New York: Puffin Books.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Heffernan, L., & Lewison, M. (2005, November 1). What's Lunch Got to Do with It? Critical Literacy and the Discourse of the Lunchroom. *Language Arts*, 83(2), 107-117. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ751804) Retrieved November 2, 2008, from ERIC database.

Hughes, A., & Adera, B. (2006, September 1). Education and Day Treatment Opportunities in Schools: Strategies that Work. *Preventing School Failure*, 51(1), 26-30. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ773682) Retrieved April 27, 2009, from ERIC database.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Critical Pedagogy Primer*. New York: Peter Lang.

Lewison, M., Leland, C., & Harste, J. C. (2008). *Creating Critical Classrooms: K-8 Reading and Writing with an Edge*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McLaren, P. (2003). *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Morrell, E. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of popular culture: Literacy development among urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,* 46(1), 72-77. Retrieved September 1, 2008, from ProQuest Education Journals database. (Document ID: 169055711).

Paugh, P., Carey, J., King-Jackson, V., & Russell, S. (2007). Negotiating the Literacy Block: Constructing Spaces for Critical Literacy in a High-Stakes Setting. *Language Arts,* 85(1), 31-42. Retrieved September 1, 2008, from ProQuest Education Journals database. (Document ID: 1347515381).

Reddy, L.A., & Richardson, L. (2006). School-Based Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children with

      Emotional Disturbance. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 29 (2), 379-404. Retrieved November 28,

      2008, from ProQuest Education Journals database.

Stribling, S. M. (2008). Using Critical Literacy Practices in the Classroom. *New England Reading Association*

      Journal, 44(1), 34-38,73. Retrieved November 2, 2008, from ProQuest Education Journals database.

      (Document ID: 1564216111).

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social change*. Chicago: University Of Chicago

      Press.

Stevens, L. P. & Bean, T. W. (2007). *Critical Literacy: Context, Research, and Practice in the K-12 Classroom.*

      Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Van Sluys, K., Lewison, M., & Flint, A. (2006). Researching Critical Literacy: A Critical Study of Analysis of

      Classroom Discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(2), 197-233. Retrieved September 12, 2008,

      doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3802_4

Vasquez, V. (2007). Using the Everyday to Engage in Critical Literacy with Young Children. *New England*

      Reading Association Journal, 43(2), 6-11,97-98. Retrieved September 1, 2008, from ProQuest

      Education Journals database. (Document ID: 1490385841).