

Promoting Students’ Trajectories of Agentive, Reflective, and Peace-Making-Languaging in TEFL Classes... and Beyond

Kirk R. Johnson, Chiba Institute of Technology, Chiba, Japan

Tim M. Murphey, Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Japan

Abstract

We wish to promote the idea that students who feel they have a trajectory of agency are generally more willing to act on behalf of positive emotions with altruism and caring, using a peace language approach (Oxford et al, this volume) or what we prefer to call “peace languaging”. Agency usually is started by giving learners choices and some control over their own education and lives, which in turns shows respect for them as actors in the world. Feelings of agency seem to appear more quickly when students are given time to reflect together and make their own choices. While Kirk looks in detail at the language of peace with his students, giving them the agency to collaborate, create, and decide on meanings and examples by themselves, Tim seemed to holistically boost his first year students’ agency through wider choices of topic and approach. Our research shows that to create classrooms displaying peace and concern for the well-being of others that reflective acts of agency have the potential to be major game changers resulting in classroom cultures and students concerned with the language of peace, defined both finely and holistically.

Keywords: peace linguistics, peace education, agency, reflective journaling

Introduction

The underpinning principles of peace education (PE) have evolved and expanded over the past few decades. Spanning this time, the efforts of Reardon (1988), Toh and Floresca-Cawagas (1997), Hicks (2006) and many others, have created a theoretical and pragmatic space for peace education that is holistic, dynamic and intersectional. Peace education is also probably best understood as needing flexibility with a myriad of approaches to be broadly successful. In a peace research workshop with participants that had experienced episodes of communal

violence in different contexts, Shapiro (2015) found no single method or approach worked universally, which is the same for language education. Contextual diversity might be problematic for social scientists hoping to find data-driven solutions, but an acceptance of this reality might be necessary for PE to develop and flourish not only as a reconciler of past pains but also a potential preventer of future inequities and strife.

Educators in the field of language acquisition also have a role to play in the exploration of critical literacies as students acquire new ways to communicate and comprehend in the target language (TL). Language learners are not disembodied from the realities of the world around them just because they are developing new language skills to interact with. As Reagan and Osborn (2002) advance in their call for a critical pedagogy in foreign language education, the study of a foreign language can work as a democratizing and empowering tool. They also state that teaching is by nature a form of social activism. So there is no reason why our students can practice shopping for new clothes yet be denied the chance to contemplate how *fast fashion* thrives off of cheap labor, abuses workers, and participates in destructive environmental practices (Whitehead, 2014). The students at our school in Japan generally have numerous first hand experiences as consumers of *fast fashion*. However, depending on one's educational setting, it is possible that some students might have had personal experience of the production side of the process. Furthering the rationale for a critical pedagogy, second language learners (L2), given proper support and scaffolding, should engage in languaging experiences (Swain, 2006) that promote harmony and esteem as well as those that uncover why certain expressions might alternatively foster prospects for conflict and discord (Gomes de Matos, 2014).

Peace linguistics as outlined by Crystal (2008, p. 355) is “an approach in which linguistic principles, methods, findings, and applications were seen as a means of promoting peace and human rights at a global level.” Gomes de Matos (2014, p. 417) added structure to the term in stating that there is a dual challenge in applying peace linguistics: “to identify states of agreement, harmony, communicative dignity, communicative peace and also identify states of disagreement and disharmony such as communicative conflict, discord, contention and dissension.” Instituting those core values and markers in our classrooms, with our learners, we prefer the term ‘peace language’ or ‘peace languaging’ to peace linguistics (see

Curtis, 2017 and Curtis & Tarawhiti, this volume, for more on peace linguistics). Swain (2006) defined ‘*linguaging*’ as “the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language” (p. 98) as an essential part of the teaching and learning of second/foreign languages. We (Johnson and Murphey) would like to take the idea of *linguaging* and to define ‘*peace linguaging*’ as *linguaging* with others to explore our thoughts and feelings in order to help create a more just and restorative world. By doing so, we see ‘*peace linguaging*’ as one way of bringing together language education and peace education.

Unfortunately, opportunities to address peace while studying language acquisition are rare and more than likely a byproduct of a particular teacher’s lessons. One of our concerns for our students is a seeming lack of reflective and agentive structures built into their scholastic opportunities. Focusing on reflective and agentive opportunities, we decided to look at our project as a possible thread that would link from students in their 1st year to their 4th and final year. The output, anecdotes and analyses found in this paper emanate from an undergraduate English program at a private Japanese university. There are, of course, a range of English abilities within our student population but there are some standardizing factors. First is the required course work that all English majors must fulfill. Additionally, students need to have exceeded the score of 480 on the TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) to enter Kirk’s content-based course. For this project, Tim highlights activities in his Freshman seminar class that fit well within the field of *peace linguaging* with a focus on critical investigations. Kirk focuses specifically on building a culture for peace with a closer examination of semantic meaning. Through these exemplars, we hope that practitioners and others might find our approaches useful and find ways to further develop these ideas. bell hooks (2003) postulates that democratic educators need to challenge structural power dynamics and to understand that learning and knowledge are not placed in Cartesian boxes to be handed out, but instead flow into and from the class setting with our students. In other words, students need to be respected as individuals with critical awareness capabilities and given opportunities to be agentive with their learning. In the context of this project we view agentive opportunities to include not only several choices for investigation within a set of given options, but also prospects for students to construct multiple, meaningful interpretations, as well as some possibilities to shape the progress of the coursework. The belief that this learning is

not relegated strictly to class times highlights the “and beyond” in the title of this paper. We will show how one of our class projects in this paper has morphed into a reflective community peace project that has been running for two years by now.

Tim’s Voice: Creating a Culture of Agency for Peace – (Freshman Academic English 101)

My first year university seminar class began as a group of diverse 19 year-old individuals in 2017, seemingly somewhat overwhelmed by the new university world. I taught them about and through languaging in the first semester. Then in the second semester challenged them with a book called *Inspiring Solutions* (Spiri, 2014) that treated them as adults who could change the world. Students first presented chosen chapters in pairs for the first 14 classes. For the last 14 classes, individuals presented on their own issues of choice and explored solutions. The meta-level message was, “Yes, we and our cultures are doing some pretty bad things to our planet and to each other. Yet we are not without hope and just need to learn ways to do the right things.” I believe this created a culture of dialogue and agency in the classroom directed toward a more “peace-making” way of living.

An example: Two young women who were unaware of FGM (Female Genital Mutilation) chose that chapter in *Inspiring Solutions* and showed a short trailer of the documentary movie *Desert Flower* (2009) which tells the life story of Waris Dirie who suffered from FGM as a child and still went on to become a world famous model and a special ambassador for the UN. By the end of the trailer, the class was in tears (see Appendix 1 for comments from students taken from their action logs). For example, one student wrote: “I told my mother the story of *Desert Flower*. It is sad and we need to talk about it to change it!” At a minimum, students in this class expressed both comprehension and empathy with the subject in the movie. The student comment above also underlies the need for visibility and dialoguing to make change a possibility.

For the single presentations, students mixed local and global issues and the students with the lowest levels of English seemed to shine the most with their new sense of agency to change the world. Language limitations did not restrict their ability to connect with local or global problems nor prevent investigative actions on the issues. Examples of topics the students generated include: poverty in Japan, gender inequality, fake news, troubles with North Korea, human trafficking, and

global warming. These topics first had a depressing effect on my students, as they would have on anyone; however, I realized later that by presenting them, not merely as threats but things that we could possibly correct, gave them a sense of agency and created a culture of hope among the students. It is important to note that the students were given free rein to criticize all parts of their world and to propose systemic changes. This freedom and agency seemed liberating to many of them and they embraced the opportunity.

The students seem to change from appearing to think of themselves as helpless and child-like to active agents who could express their aspirations for a better world. This to me is peace-making with one's self, to see that one is not totally at the mercy of the world, but that one can speak up and inform people and possibly affect some change for the better. Or in the words of James Baldwin, "Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced" (Grellety et al. & Peck, 2016, concluding words). The students dared to face these problems and talk about them with not only classmates but with friends and family out of class, as I could see in their reflective action logs. As they tried convincing their classmates, they found that they were convincing themselves that they could in fact do something. They did not have to remain silent. By informing others in class using a foreign language that they thought they could not speak well (and others out of class, probably mostly in Japanese), they gained a sense of agency that made them stand tall and allowed them for at least a few moments to make for a more peaceful, just-full, hopeful, and altruistic world.

In the last class I showed the freshmen a video "Student Voice 2" (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C9CYaUhqEdw>) that my class made in 2010, about how students objected to the idea that they had to pay two universities to study abroad. We made a petition, which all of them signed, and asked the administration to change their policies to make studying abroad fairer. We need to acknowledge that we are forming classroom cultures all the time and that some activities will give the students agency and hope, while others may simply resign them to helplessness. Teachers can greatly influence the classroom cultures they create, especially when they are willing to give choices to students, spur their agency, and show there is hope for a more peaceful and just world.

In retrospect I think I was unconsciously modeling what Bass and Elmendorf (2012) articulated as the four core elements of social pedagogies (according to

Dubreil & Thorne, 2017), which in our minds creates “invitational dialogic peace languageing” social pedagogies:

1. Take into account the audience: “the representation of knowledge for an authentic audience is absolutely central to the construction of knowledge in a course” (p. 2);
2. Strive to build a sense of intellectual community through collaboration and engagement with multiple perspectives;
3. Help students “deepen their reflection, build links across courses and semesters, and bridge curricular and co-curricular learning” (p.2) and
4. Cultivate self-reflection

Tim and Kirk’s Exploratory Dialogue 1

We would argue that #1 above gives respect to students which also builds rapport so that they can feel safe enough in the classroom to explore ideas on the perimeter and build a class community (#2, the building of an intellectual community). Repeating these often enough (#3) over time encourages them to approach #4 (self reflection) with greater openness and intrapersonal peace.

The freshmen students’ self-reflections were encouraged through active learning in class as well as action logging (Murphey, 1993). In the action logs, students describe out of class phone discussions to share and teach others about the concepts from class, and also add further reflections. In short, they “enact” what they study in class. Dubreil and Thorne (2017, p. 2) hold that “in the case of L2 education, this means expanding the scope of what learners do by couching the language learning experiences in contexts and communities outside of the academy.” By bringing these “communities outside of the academy” and their problems into the classroom, the students’ potentially narcissistic tendencies seemed to us, as their teachers, to fade into the background as they struggled to understand greater problems than their own and find solutions for them. Students wrote in their action logs of their deep conversations with parents and friends about the array of problems discussed in class, but with hope and the feelings that they had choices to initiate change in at least some small ways. Attending and listening to others’ problems, even when they are not proximal, stimulates empathy, which gives a meaningful desire to understand and help if possible. Our own small troubles seem to disappear in the face of problems bigger than ourselves. This is part of the peace of altruism,

the forgetting of the self, the taking of purposeful action, which aids critical dialogue and powerful collaborations.

Kirk's Voice - Building a Culture of Peace – (Content-based learning for third- and fourth-year students)

In my course for third- and fourth-year students, by explicitly focusing on (PAAL) peace, altruism, activism, and love, (Johnson, Johnson, & Murphey, 2017), the hope was also to be implicitly developing language building strategies and techniques. The fact that the terms, 'peace' and 'love' may seem simple and omnipresent in our lives is partly what makes them so important to explore. We applied PAAL via two methods: one would ask students to analyze and categorize their collective written output, while a later class focused on expressing understandings of PAAL via creative artwork.

In the class focused on written output, 26 students explicitly interacted with PAAL in three stages. The caveat in the structure of this exploration was that the students would not just provide their own definitions and understanding but also cooperatively work together to clarify, categorize, and expand the collective ideas generated in class.

Students worked through three mandatory stages and one voluntary survey.

Stage 1 – Individual free writing – Totaling 40 minutes of class time

Stage 2 – Collaborative analysis and expansion of ideas – A full 90-minute class period

Stage 3 – Open forum reflective writing – Follow-up writing was logged on a Moodle forum where all students could read comments and dialogue if desired.

Stage 4 – Voluntary feedback survey – Students provided feedback to the teacher about the activities and elaborated about the choices they made in previous three stages.

Working alone in the first stage, students were officially given 30 minutes to write freely with the freedom to choose which terms to engage with. Ten additional minutes were given for students to reread and make changes if needed. Their writings were adjusted minimally to address/correct larger language issues and to reduce replicated ideas before being returned in the next stage.

In the second stage, students in small groups collaboratively investigated the understandings of PAAL they previously generated. In doing this, students engaged in critical participatory looping (CPL). CPL gives students an opportunity to contemplate, explore and analyze the complexities of their own creations “looped” back to them, which has been shown to have a positive impact on class cohesiveness (Murphey & Falout, 2010). One 90-minute class period was set aside for this stage, but it turned out to be somewhat insufficient as only two of the seven groups categorized all four terms. The groups tended to spend most of their time organizing the meanings of ‘peace’ and ‘love’, quite likely because these were extensively written about in stage 1. An exemplar for the concept ‘love’ can be found in Appendix 2.

Wrapping up stage 2, groups negotiated a class template of themes within each term. For peace, seven main themes were identified: contentment in daily life; a sense of justice or fairness; having security or safety; having opportunities; positive relationships; healthy natural environment; and absences of negatives, which of course included lack of war or violence but also the absence of bullying, workplace discrimination, and harassment (Johnson et al., 2017).

In regards to understandings of ‘love’, students organized their writings into six themes: romantic; loved ones (family, friends, pets); social/societal; happiness; feeling/emotion (beyond happiness); and negatives (obsession, jealousy, loss). Within that last category, the students articulated that ‘love’ might also bring sorrow and even negative or irrational actions (Johnson et al., 2017). As one student wrote in stage 1, “Love sounds good and beautiful to me, but I realized it’s sometimes sad... To love something is not always easy.”

Kirk’s View - Stage 2 CPL and Student Generated Analysis

At the start on this stage, most students struggled to find their voice and agency. Fear of offending workmates might have held them back at first; however, once the proverbial ice was broken, they quickly realized that they possessed the tools necessary to navigate this activity and many students passionately engaged in languageing that took their individual musings on peace and love a step further by organizing and even expanding meanings. As one student wrote in her follow-up journal about this group work stage, “We talked about ‘love’ deeply too long, but I was able to listen to the story and experiences I’ve never had so I was sur-

prised. It was great for me to rethink about ‘love’. In addition, ... there are many genre of ‘love’, for example shape of love, same sex love, jealous and connections to peace.”

In the stage 3 reflective forum, comments mostly elucidated new understandings acquired and the interesting nature of the conversations. As one student wrote, “The word peace is a nice word, but it is an extremely big thing. Through this class, I found that peace is not only no war and no guns, but also connected to family and friends...I think I should study harder and need to broaden my view. To get knowledge will help me.”

PAAL in the Form of Creative Artwork

The following semester, students expressed their ideas of PAAL via drawings. How would this different mode of communication compare in terms of linguistic and critical output? Students were given almost the same amount of time as those who participated in the writing of PAAL, i.e., 30 minutes plus about five minutes to make adjustments. Similarly, they were again allowed the freedom to interact or not with each term but the activity actually developed in real time. Students were first asked to draw their meanings of ‘peace’ and of ‘love’. After about 10 minutes, the class was told that they could add words to compliment their artwork for explanation. After another 10 minutes, the ideas of activism and altruism were added and students were informed they could draw or write as they pleased.

Peace and Love

Not surprisingly, most students spent the majority of their energies creating expressive and sometimes cryptic drawings. Of the 28 students who participated in this activity, 17 choose to support their artwork only by listing key words or short phrases. Eight wrote a full sentence but only three students in the class supported their drawings with two or more full sentences. For the task of an informal presentation, most students seemed confident in their spoken abilities that key words were enough for them to accomplish the task. Most likely, the students just felt their expressive drawings spoke for themselves as all the students could successfully explain their ideas underpinning PAAL in their illustrations. Perhaps most of us have heard the axiom that a ‘picture is worth a thousand words’. While there is no space or necessity for a deeper analysis here, a few interesting findings merit

mentioning. In regards to peace, 15 of 28 students included a contrasting image of war icons and people in harmony. A common theme showed half of the planet with bombs, fallen bodies and destruction; while on the other side people stood arms linked in harmony with birds, trees and the Sun in the background.



(Photo by Kirk Johnson)

One student expressed her understandings of peace in four images: sleeping peacefully, eating happily, walking to school, and studying hard.



(Photo by Kirk Johnson)

With her words she wrote simply, “If war starts, we cannot sleep, eat, go to school, study and more. Peace is living safely.” Her drawings highlighted the ex-

istence of life-sustaining and enhancing privileges while her words in one sentence expressed how armed conflict can take all of those things away.

Comparing Writing and Drawing Output

For the group that focused only on writing, an absence of war was often noted but was seldom the featured part of their definitions of peace. Unfortunately, the reasons for this cannot be completely known, but it may be that the students assumed that peace, by definition, meant the absence of war (see Galtung, 1969). Still, both written and artistic output showed that students understood a difference between the concepts of negative peace and positive peace. Of the six major thematic strands of peace organized by the previous class, all of them were present multiple times in the following classes' drawing. As for the seven themes of love generated in the first activity, only the theme expressing the sorrows that might come with love (i.e. jealous, loss, etc.) was not represented in artwork.

There was considerable overlap in the drawings, especially for peace and love. However, there was a marked difference in the group discussions. While students were asked to express their meanings of PAAL, in the written activity their output was looped back into the class for collective interpretation, categorization and expansion. While students' drawings, it still provided students with the agency of creating meanings, students did not engage in cooperative negotiation for developing additional meanings after that. This is unfortunate because this collective agency might be advantageous for deeper understandings and a sense of ownership in creating something bigger than the "self."

Kirk and Tim's Exploratory Dialogue #2: Different Approaches to Activism and Altruism

In the first incarnation of PAAL, activism and altruism did not receive much attention from the students in the stage 1 individual writing exercise. With a lack of comments to loop back into the second stage for group consideration, agency and growth of understanding with these terms were sorely lacking. However, this might have been more of a time management problem than a lack of interest and importance. Thirty minutes was not enough time for most students to handle all four terms sufficiently. It is worth noting that in the stage 3 forum reflections, a number of students still acknowledged that all four terms worked in conjunction

with each other, or were essentially part of each other. This student comment sums it up, “By doing this activity, I realized they all are connected each other. Peace needs love. Altruism needs activism in order to make country peaceful.” This shows a clear understanding of the intersectionality of the concepts (Johnson & Murphey, in press).

In the class that used artwork as a medium, every student (28) drew a depiction of activism and all but one drew an understanding of altruism. Somewhat surprisingly, seeing that activism and altruism were not addressed by most students in the writing-only group, the accompanying written output for drawings of activism and altruism were richer and more descriptive as well. Given the restrictive time allotted, artwork provided a favorable framework around which students could then structure linguistic output.

Student languaging (Swain, 2006), we believe, can be enhanced through comparing personal symbolic peace with public and personal peace icons that students can draw, which may speak to different personal and social abilities, strategies, and propensities among a group of people. But both personal and public seem recommendable for the release and creation of socio-emotional dialogue and expansive learning, which is learning that develops richly through various fields and domains and processes (Sannino & Ellis, 2014). It is through such exploratory activities that we learn how to create and how to language and dialogue deeper as we position our identities. By giving students agency to create meaning, we found that a number of our students made stronger connections, or identified with the issues and thus acted on them beyond the classroom (Johnson & Murphey, in press).

And Beyond... Three Peace Walls

The “and Beyond” in the title of this paper really has two facets. Through our class activities, such as Tim’s action logging, we hope that students understand that they have a voice and the ability to partake in positive changes. Teaching peace languaging may be viewed as unsuccessful if what is studied is confined to a compartmentalized classroom discussion only. bell hooks (2003) states that too often formal education is seen by the learner as a subject separated from daily life. So our goals as educators should be to help transcend the false bifurcation of learning as well as to promote student agency in understanding and creating positive peace in their life choices.

The second part of the, “and beyond” was a humble attempt to circulate ideas of peace outside the class through a “peace wall” at our last two yearly school festivals, and once more at the JALT 2017 national teachers’ conference in Tsukuba, Japan. This was a move from standard academic exchanges in the classroom to experiential interactions with peers and community members. The peace wall project has two sources of inspiration. One was a similar project by Rebecca Oxford (2013) at a school event focusing on the meaning of ‘peace’. The second source of inspiration was experiential precedence from a few years ago, when students studying about landmines in Kirk’s class formed an extracurricular club that lasted four years, involved more than a dozen student volunteers, generated a collaborative relationship with a national NGO, and resulted in eight public displays and fundraisers.

We have found that people do want to engage with positive peace actions, but those opportunities and spaces need to be created. The peace wall projects to date have used two formats to get participants to interact and express their ideas. The first was getting participants to write their understanding of one of the terms in PAAL, in the spirit of our classroom activities. For the second incarnation of the peace wall at our school festival, we posed the question, what is your one step to peace? Responses have exposed a rich array of thoughts (Johnson et al., 2017). Ultimately though, the objective of these projects has been all about building connections. At one level, we wanted to “turn on” the neural connections people might have about peace and what we need to do to get closer to such realities. The first step in deconstructing a culture of war and conflict is considering that another world is possible, and preferable. Participants would generally not just write their own thoughts but also take time to interact with the musings of others already placed on the wall. In doing this, visitors, young and old, would often create conversation with our student staff to share an anecdote, ask a question or such. To date, these exploratory actions have garnered over 400 messages and brought together 15 student volunteers, created intergroup collaborations and even jumped over the university barrier. As the underlying aim was to enhance interactions over the concepts of peace, we feel this extended learning project has been quite successful with more opportunities still to come.



(Photo by Kirk Johnson)

Final Dialogue

We see peace languageing as embedded in peace pedagogies that in turn are a vital part of social pedagogies (Dubreil & Thorne, 2017). Tim’s freshman class started in the domain of social pedagogies and many of their topics created a need for peace and the facing of violence. However, it was through the violence of several topics (FGM, landmines, human trafficking, etc.) that students showed the most courage to create peace and to authentically search for solutions.

Kirk’s third- and fourth-year students were introduced to peace language first, and then through analysis created tools and understandings for peace education and more effective social pedagogies. Then through our “beyond” activities, at least a small portion of Kirk’s students were able to observe and encourage peace making at events at least on a small scale, and thus broadening our social networks of concern for peace. As one student volunteer, who participated in all three peace wall activities to date, stated, “I took your class last year and I could learn a lot of things I had never thought in my life as problems, or what is peace? I wanted people to think about these themes but in a fun and easy way.” Similarly, other volunteers also expressed the desire to work together and share the concepts of peace with others in our surrounding communities (Johnson & Murphey, in press).

We have not sought to explicate ‘peace’, nor to define its presence in linguistics, but rather we have sought to show peace-making and understanding as activities in our classes. That said, we see peace languaging as a platform in which learners can engage, contemplate and interact for non-violent and also non-hegemonic understandings in our world. It should be something that is consistently shown and demonstrated by teachers’ behaviors, something discussed by all students, explored by everyone, linguistically and non verbally, socially, and whole-heartedly. Peace languaging is not an end or a goal, but rather the way or path for learning.

In writing this piece we seem to have convinced ourselves (if not our readers) that stimulating authentic peace in societies and classrooms goes hand-in-hand with creating respect and agency for others as well. Through our activities highlighted in this paper we are not claiming long-term structural change in our students or even short term. As Harris (2008) noted in his review of peace education evaluations, such findings are quite difficult to ascertain even in conditions that allow for quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Separating variables and linking causation creates a quandary in peace research. Our projects and the qualitative analyses up to date are not able to make such claims. However, via student journal feedback, activities, PAAL questionnaires, drawings, and some unstructured interviews, we can state that a majority of our students expressed a belief that new viewpoints were gained, that their English language abilities were up to the tasks to allow for critical reflection, and that they felt a trajectory of agency in the development of the learning tasks (Johnson et al., 2017).

Think peace, be the peace, take the path of peace! For us, this means that peace will not simply occur by itself, but rather we need to give it attention in our classes, to foster its development, and to construct its well-being through engaging with it in multiple ways in our daily lives. We find these to be important steps that can be further developed. We believe that peace languaging begins with a peaceful classroom and a teacher’s message of respectfulness toward students that create an environment where students can be allowed to peacefully explore their feelings and cognitions about their ways of being in the world, their ways of languaging the world into existence. We have found a few paths that have worked well for us, but we know there are many routes and ‘dead ends’ along the way. We hope peace languaging with exploratory dialogue and art will be cultivated in more language classes, not only as a way to learn second/foreign lan-

guages more effectively, but also as a way to find our best selves and then to contribute in some way to the creation of a better world.

References

- Bass, R & Elmendorf, H. (2012). Designing for difficulty: Social pedagogies as a framework for course design. Retrieved from <https://blogs.commonsgorgetown.edu/bassr/social-pedagogies/>
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Curtis, A. (2017). Whatever happened to peace (linguistics)? *The English Connection* 21 (3), 23-24.
- Dubreil, S. & Thorne, S. L. (2017). Social pedagogies and entwining language with the world. In S. Dubreil & S. L. Thorne (Eds.), *Engaging the world: Social pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 1-11). Boston, MA: Cengage.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191.
- Grellety, R., Peck, H. & Peck, R. (Producers) & Peck, R. (Director). (2016). *I am not your Negro*. [Motion Picture]. United States: Magnolia Pictures.
- Gomes de Matos, F. (2014). Peace linguistics for language teachers. *DELTA Documentação de Estudos em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada* 30(2), 415-424.
- Harris, I. (2008). The promises and pitfalls of peace education evaluation. In J. Lin, E. Brantmeier, & C. Bruhn (Eds.) *Transforming education for peace* (pp. 245-264). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Hicks, D. (2006). *Lessons for the future: The missing dimension in education*. BC, Canada: Trafford Publishing.
- hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, K., & Murphey, T. (in press). Identifying and identifying with: A critical look into student interaction with peace, activism, altruism and love in a Japanese university setting. Submitted to *Readings in Language Studies* (Published by the International Society for Language Studies).
- Johnson, K., Johnson, T., & Murphey, T. (2017). Becoming actively altruistic for love and peace. Kanda University of International Studies: *Research Institute of Language Studies and Language Education*, 28, 91-121. <http://id.nii.ac.jp/1092/00001509/>

- Murphey, T. (1993). Why don't teachers learn what learners learn? Taking the guesswork out with action logging. *English Teaching Forum* 31 (1), 6-10.
- Murphey, T., & Falout, J. (2010). Critical participatory looping: Dialogic member checking with whole classes. *TESOL Quarterly* 44 (4), 811-821.
- Oxford, R. (2013). *The language of peace: Communicating to create harmony*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Reagan, T., & Osborn, T. (2002). *The foreign language educator in society: Toward a critical pedagogy*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers
- Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Parrish, T., & Oxford, R. (2013). The people's peace. In R. Oxford (Ed.) *The language of peace: Communicating to create* (pp. 329-354). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
- Sannino, A., & Ellis, V. (Eds.). (2014). *Learning and collective creativity: Activity- theoretical and sociocultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Shapiro, S. (2015) Towards a critical pedagogy of peace education. *Kultura–Spoleczenstwo–Edukacja nr 1 (7)* 7-20.
- Spiri, J. (2014). *Content-based English: Inspiring Solutions*. Shiga, Japan: Global Stories Press
- Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95-108). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Toh, S., & Floresca-Cawagas, V. (1997). Towards a people-centered education: possibilities and struggles in the Philippines. *International Review of Education* 43 (5-6), 527-45.
- Whitehead, S. (August 19, 2014). 5 Truths the fast fashion industry doesn't want you to know. Huffpost. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/shannon-whitehead/5-truths-the-fast-fashion_b_5690575.html

About the Authors

Kirk Richard Johnson, M.A., has been teaching in Japan at the tertiary level for the past 16 years. His research interests focus on the intersections of peace education, media literacy and second language pedagogy.

Tim Murphey: (PhD, Université de Neuchâtel, Switzerland) TESOL's Professional Development in Language Education series editor; co-author with Zoltan Dörnyei of Group Dynamics in the Language Classroom (CUP), author of Music and Song (OUP), Language Hungry! (Helbling), The Tale that Wags (Perceptia), Teaching in Pursuit of Wow! (Abax), and co-editor Meaningful Action (CUP)

Appendix 1

Murphey's Freshman Class Newsletter #5 (done each week based on comments and reflections from their written action logs. Later in class students take turn reading and shadowing the lines, and then discuss (read, shadow & discuss):

FALLFreshSem5 Newsletter #5 Oct 13, 2017 comments from Action Logs:

1. I taught the speed dictation (How do you learn) to my mom. She said it is good but a little bit strange!
2. I did not know there was such a thing as FGM, such a strange and painful culture.
3. I really agree with the words of "How do you learn?" Teaching what we learn makes the info hot!
4. PPPP and YYYYY gave a brave presentation. They did well. So we respect them.
5. I told my mother the story of "Desert Flower." It is sad and we need to talk about it to change it!
6. As a woman I want to support the end of FGM. I am looking for more information on the Internet.
7. I did not know so much about Gandhi before this class. He fought discrimination without violence.
8. While surveying women's discrimination, we were surprised that there is such terrible discrimination in the world and we should tell people about it.
9. Today's presentation was very good because I was given the chance to think about another country's women. I live safely, but in the world, some women encounter dangerous situations. Actually watching the video, I felt sad. But I was glad to watch it because I could know some people who live in different countries help her and give hope. She got a job as a model. And now she works for the UN.

Appendix 2

The chart below shows how one group in stage 2 generalized output from stage 1 into themes and then added summarized support for the term, love. The class would later negotiate these into six overriding themes (Johnson, et al. 2017).

Group 5 – (Student A, B, and C)	Summarized supporting examples
Lover=partner (romance) (8*)	Boyfriend, girlfriend wife and husband Take care of each other, support each other, Protect each other People always want to make their lover happy Falling in love with someone Marriage
Family (9*)	Unconditional love Family’s love is kind of trust. People trust their family more than anything. Father plays with children Mother cooks for family
Society (1*)	Donation (arrow) the love to help someone. Volunteer activity Community (PTA, club) People who love the same artist and gather in a community (concert) I am a member of a yosakoi team. I really respect my teammates. I think that is love.
Happiness (1*)	Happiness comes from love I think. When I feel love from family or friends, I will be happy.
Hobbies (3*)	Something that you love to do. Example – go on a gaming binge Fun club Crazy to do something
Pets (2*)	Animals always understand the feelings of people. When we are sad, they will stay with us. Part of the family Play together
Children (1*)	All parents love their children and think about them first. Always protect their children from society. Taking care of children in kindergarten is also a part of this love for children.

* These numbers represent the number of examples or specific themes this group of students categorized within that generalized theme.