Faculty Perspectives on Critical Pedagogy and Social Justice

by

Daniel John Boudon

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2015 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Eric Margolis, Chair
Mary Romero
Jennifer Sandlin

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2015

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to gain a greater understanding of the interpretations and attitudes of higher education faculty in education programs teaching critical pedagogy, social justice, student empowerment and related concepts I conducted interviews with twenty faculty members in education programs in the New York City area. It is a study looking at the philosophies and conceptions of faculty and the relationship between those philosophies and their actions in the classroom. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed for trends and patterns. The nature of the questions focused on various aspects of critical pedagogy and allowed for an easy transition to preliminary categories based on the interview questions. The data was reviewed again for similarities and trends, and then again for comparison between the three identified perspectives: Professionalization Perspective, Democratic Student Development Perspective, and Critical Action Perspective.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

The purpose of this study is to delve deeper into faculty perspectives on critical

pedagogy, social justice and related topics and the relationship between those

perspectives and their classroom practices. As an area of academic study, social justice

in education falls into a relatively undefined category, where scholars and educators

loosely agree on various methods and goals but there are few definitive volumes or texts

devoted to social justice in education (Brueing, 2011; Giroux, 2007, 1992). Scholars

engaged in social justice within the realm of education concentrated their efforts on

pedagogy and practice, based on the theories provided by Paulo Freire (1970, 1985, 1994,

1998), Freire's works are based on classic critical theory derived from works by Friedrich

Hegel, Karl Marx and John Dewey (Gadotti, 1994; McLaren, 2007; Kincheloe, 2007;

Weiner, 2007).

Contemporary authors such as Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, and James Banks

have provided extensive discussions on the need for critical pedagogy in the classroom;

however, there has been little discussion of what this means to instructors in the

classrooms. Mary Breuing (2011) and Beatriz Ruiz and Juan-Miguel Fernandez-Boa

(2005) conducted qualitative studies with physical education teachers showing that there

are varied and contradictory interpretations of critical pedagogy held by instructors which

can lead to oppressive classroom practices. Practically speaking, my study attempts to

situate social justice as the instructors' interpretation of critical pedagogy in theory and

1

practice in their classroom settings. This study bridges the gap between theoretical understandings of critical pedagogy and social justice and actual classroom practices.

Background on the Problem

There are great numbers of theorists and works dedicated to the philosophical practice of critical pedagogy. Dialectical theory, micro and macro analysis (Giroux, 1979), the social construction of knowledge, hegemony and ideology are among the major concepts of critical pedagogy. (McLaren, 2003) In order to understand critical pedagogy it is important to understand its theoretical background in the Frankfurt school's critique of positivism, the importance of history and the role of culture as a social product (Adorno, 1973; Horkheimer, 1972; Marcuse, 1964). Seehwa Cho (2010) builds on the important influence of Marx and the Frankfurt school in her analysis of critical pedagogy as a political project, focusing on the shift away from economic oppression towards cultural recognition. Cho identifies three main projects within critical pedagogy 1) the project of Experience, 2) the project of Anti-system, and 3) the project of Inclusion. In addition to the three projects, Cho identifies three politics that affect the projects: culturalist, self/identity and grassroots politics. Cho discusses and explores the philosophical underpinnings of critical pedagogy, but do not address the actual practice of it with the educational faculty who ideally should not just be using it but teaching it future teachers.

Social justice is addressed with an accepted philosophical freedom by the academy, which allows the term to remain undefined and used for limitless purposes. John Dewey has a great effect on both critical pedagogy and the perceptions of social

justice in American education.   Dewey's philosophical work was in many ways "a homegrown alternative to Marxism" (Moreno & Frey, 1985, p. 23).   In <u>Liberalism and Social Action</u> (1935), Dewey made a clear argument for the communal control of resources but placed the emphasis not on class struggle but rather on intellectual and scientific development for needed social change.   Dewey's influence is notable when comparing critical pedagogy and democratic education. Critical pedagogy seeks a justice oriented society (Freire, 1970), while democratic education has a goal of greater participation (Dewey, 1916). Brent Edwards (2009) believes that even though critical pedagogy and democratic education have different goals, these two approaches can be reconciled and combined with positive results for education. While there have been attempts at reconciling definitions of social justice and democratic education with the practice of critical pedagogy, the literature does not address how practicing faculty interpret these concepts and if they apply them in their classrooms.

Statement of the Problem

There is a gap in the knowledge pertaining to how critical pedagogy and social justice are interpreted by faculty in institutions of higher education. The major premise of this study is that the practice of critical pedagogy is for some faculty the practice of social justice. While there is extensive background on the philosophical interpretations of critical pedagogy, there is little research on how faculty interpretations of critical pedagogy affect their classroom practices. Social justice has multiple definitions and finds itself attached to education programs with no clear purpose. This study seeks to uncover the connection between social justice and critical pedagogy in faculty

interpretations and how those interpretations affect their classroom practice. The minor premise of this study is that while educators have conceptions of social justice and critical pedagogy they may not be able to translate those conceptions into classroom practices.

Purpose of the Study

In order to address the problem I used a qualitative research design and grounded theory methods to collect data in the form of interviews and observations with faculty employed in education programs in the New York City area. The faculty were chosen using a combination of criterion and convenience sampling, as I needed faculty who were involved in teaching education courses to be able to compare perspectives, and I needed to interview faculty located in a reasonable travel distance in order to be able to observe them teaching a lesson. The site(s) chosen for this study include various teacher education programs in colleges and universities in the New York City area. All of these departments make specific mention of social justice and student empowerment in their websites and mission statements.

Significance of the Study

This study has the potential to be significant to the field of critical pedagogy, social justice and qualitative methodology. The interpretation of critical pedagogy and social justice by practicing faculty in education programs is a relatively unstudied area within the critical pedagogy and social justice literatures (Brueing, 2011). It seems the college classroom may be the most exciting place to test teaching methods based on the concepts of critical pedagogy. My methods of observation and interview analysis may serve as a guide and/or example to other scholars planning to conduct similar qualitative

4

research. Additionally, my research may be the starting point for further studies on faculty interpretations of critical pedagogy, which would greatly increase the limited generalizability of this study.

Personal/Position Statement

I am an educator and I believe in the transformative power of education; I believe it is the medium by which social injustice can be alleviated. I have spent my adult life working within education to empower students to know the world around them and their place in it and the power they could wield. I have spent my academic life studying what makes an empowering educator and most recently with my dissertation research I am studying what conceptions teacher educators hold on critical pedagogy, student empowerment and how those conceptions may relate to their classroom.

Coming from a family of New York Teamsters whose labor assisted in the raising of the skyline that is visible today, as well as landmarks that are no longer with us, I was raised to understand the power of the community and the strength of solidarity. I was the first member of my family to ever attend college and my parent's dream for me to be a businessman or a lawyer followed me to school. My parent's dreams were dashed when my sociology professor assigned America: Who Stole the Dream? by Donald Bartlett and James Steele (1996). With that course a never before seen perspective was thrust upon me and suddenly everything in the world was suspect and needed investigation. I knew then that I wanted to do two things: 1) learn more about the many different ways the world can be seen and 2) to wake up people as I had been awakened.

I completed my bachelor's degree and was accepted into a Foundations of Education master's degree program. Foundations of Education combined my interest in critical theory with my excitement of the prospect of teaching. The choice of programs and schools was made much simpler when a graduate assistantship was offered by administrators who I had worked with as an undergraduate student leader. While I would have preferred an academic assistantship, working as the Coordinator of the Ambassador Program (a small office which scheduled and administered prospective student visits and tours to the campus) in the admissions office provided greater compensation including food and board as well as an additional education in the business side of higher education.

While my master's program introduced me to critical thinkers such as Paulo Freire, John Dewey and bell hooks who were challenging traditional education paradigms, my assistantship was introducing me to guidance counselors from the Long Island schools who would be treated to "information sessions" at the university featuring open bars and weekend visits to the school complete with concerts, gifts, high value raffles (and again open bars). Everything in admissions was about appearance over substance and worse than that it was about commodification of students, the buying of clients wholesale. The schools invited to these events helped to solidify the ideas of inequity and unequal access that had been exemplified in the stories by Jean Anyon and Jonathan Kozol. I wrote my master's thesis on the social and cultural reproduction in the schools based on the theories of Pierre Bourdieu.

For a brief time after I completed my Foundations program, I participated in a Sociology PhD program, but found out after I had arrived that while it was not exclusively a quantitative program, it was very difficult to find anyone there doing any qualitative research. There was also a strong culture of pure research, which derided anyone who attempted to assert the idea that science could be used to benefit society, with a phrase they called "manning the barricades." Faculty would use this term almost on a daily basis in classes to describe the foolishness and implied lunacy of those in social science who engage in any activism. While the program was less academically stimulating than I'd hoped it did allow me my first teaching opportunities both as a graduate assistant as an adjunct.

This was my opportunity to do everything right in the classroom. I would expose everyone to all the myths and lies of the world; I would use all the techniques in the Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education (Banks & Banks, 2003) and apply all the theories of critical pedagogy. It was not that easy. Teaching is a skill that must be practiced, it requires preparation and reflection as well as realistic evaluation of what is effective and what is expected. While it may seem like an empowering idea to do away with exams and have students create portfolios, you must consider your students abilities to do so and perhaps more importantly you must consider your department's policy on exams. Many departments require two exams a semester; some even have standardized exams that must be administered in each course. It was an exciting, tumultuous, and glorious disaster. The students did fine on their mandated exams and from the teacher evaluations the students all had a wonderful time and thought I was "a fun dude." Unfortunately, that was not the validation I had been looking for.

7

My earliest teaching experiences left me questioning higher education and my role in it. I knew now that it was more than a desire to teach, it was the academy itself that had drawn me in. This institution, which has been touted as the great equalizer with all its facets and various perspectives, was what I wanted to study. I withdrew from my program and applied to the Ph.D. Program in Education Leadership and Policy Studies focusing in Foundations at Arizona State University. This program revitalized my spirits and opened my eyes to new interpretations of critical educational theory, public education systems in the southwest and new perspectives on the highly politicized nature of schooling today with a curriculum including the works of David Berliner, Gene Glass, Samuel Bowles & Herbert Gintis. More importantly to my development as an academic, the program featured multiple courses on qualitative research methods and design which gave me the ability to conduct my first real research project, my dissertation "Faculty interpretations of Critical Pedagogy and Student Empowerment."

It's been just over ten years since I taught my first class and since then I have never stopped. I have worked consistently as an adjunct instructor in education and sociology teaching nearly every class available at one time or another all the while reflecting and refining my practice and honing my skills. Over these years and through my teaching experiences, I developed the ideas and questions that would form the basis for my dissertation research. These ideas are that education is important, education is not necessarily schooling, and educators must have some philosophy on education whether they realize it or not and most importantly I have learned that I am an educator and I believe in the transformative power of education; I believe it is the medium by which social injustice can be alleviated.

Theoretical Standpoint

This research fits with my philosophical and theoretical background. I have spent a great deal of time on reflexive exercises designed to better define my understanding of critical pedagogy and the definition of social justice and how it applies to my practice of teaching. I have been an adjunct instructor for the past ten years, teaching courses in sociology and education at various private and public colleges. During this time I have always strove to expose my students to critical perspectives on society and life that they may never have considered, with the hopes this learning experience would carry over into my students' lives and affect those they know, creating a domino effect of exposure. Theoretically, I have always considered myself a critical theorist, ascribing to the Marxist conception that history is moved forward through class conflict and that individuals have agency. The critical thinking and practice towards empowerment that I engage in (or attempt to engage in) is Freire inspired critical pedagogy.

Conceptual Context

This study will follow a critical framework; in my interests and my work I have always been a critical theorist having been influenced by the work of the early Marx. Appropriately enough, those authors whose work most closely aligns with the teaching of social justice in higher education adhere strongly to critical theory. The Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire, 1970), was based in part on classical critical constructs such as false consciousness and class consciousness. Freire believed critical pedagogy would enable an end to the ongoing cycle of oppression, revolution, oppression. He outlined those practices necessary for a socially just classroom and more importantly discusses those

practices that are oppressive and counterproductive to an equitable classroom. In addition to Freire, scholars including Peter McLaren, Christine Sleeter and James Banks offer both goals and methods of critical pedagogy as the practice of social justice, while Gloria Ladson-Billings provides a background in culturally relevant teaching practices and critical race theory.

Primary Research Questions

After reviewing various texts on critical pedagogical practices, I was left with many questions about how critical pedagogy and social justice within the classroom actually occur. The phenomenon for this study exists within faculty interpretations of critical pedagogy and social justice and their actions in the classroom. How do faculty interpret the meaning and purpose of critical pedagogy? Who are their influences in the field? What are the teaching methods of the faculty whom are involved in education courses, and how do they interpret their students' reactions to them? How do faculty involved in these programs define social justice; to them is it a set of goals, practices or both? Do faculty members definitions of social justice have an effect on their classroom methods, their choice of materials and their view of students. How do faculty measure their rates in terms of success in teaching social justice? How do they define 'successes? These questions will be essential in establishing the faculty perspective towards teaching, critical pedagogy, social justice and their students.

Research Design

By using the methods of grounded theory I diminished the possibility of bias based on preconceived theories or ideas. I entered the research without initial categories

in order to cut down on the possibility of "trash can research."   While I do not believe

trash can research was a problem, I have included a strong personal statement to explain

my interest and background with critical pedagogy. I have worked as an adjunct

instructor for the past ten years in sociology and education departments around the

country, working at both private and public institutions. During this time I attempted to

engage in socially just teaching, using methods adapted from critical pedagogy proposed

by Paulo Freire (1970). While this statement speaks to my interest in how social justice

is taught and received, it also explains the possibility of bias as an instructor who has

attempted socially just teaching himself.

In order to answer my research questions I interviewed faculty and observed

classrooms in teacher education programs where critical pedagogy could be used or

taught. I conducted interviews with faculty from the schools and classroom observations.

In order to open the study to as many instructor interviews as possible, I employed some

snowball sampling, where I asked those I interviewed for recommendations of other

faculty engaging in critical pedagogical practices or teaching for social justice.

In qualitative research there is a danger that data will be invalidated by a lack of

contradictory evidence. It would have been very easy for me to simply select participants

who practiced critical pedagogy and then rave about their performance. In order to show

that my findings are valid I engaged in confirming and disconfirming sampling,

interviewing and observing faculty who do not identify themselves as critical pedagogues

in order to show evidence that my findings are supported.

I consulted subjects throughout the interviews using member checking in order to maintain that I understood their meanings and intentions. It was my goal to get the most accurate information and give my respondents the most opportunities throughout the interview to make their meanings clear.

Theoretical Framework

This research fits in with my philosophical and theoretical background. I have spent a great deal of time on reflexive exercises designed to better define my understanding of critical pedagogy and the definition of social justice and how it applies to my practice of teaching. Patti Lather and Elizabeth Ellsworth provide a powerful critique of the possible oppressive effects of critical pedagogy on already marginalized students.

My conception begins with the faculty, as the primary instrument of instruction, their beliefs and actions will be key to understanding the phenomenon of using critical pedagogy. In particular it will be necessary to understand their attitudes and understanding of the concept of critical pedagogy and social justice as a curriculum, a set of goals, and actual practices. This understanding will make it possible to analyze the teaching practices witnessed in the classroom. There are several concepts that should be present in the "socially just" classroom, in particular these concepts are: Critical pedagogical practices, does the teacher engage in subject centered learning?, are the students treated as colleagues or peers in discussion?, does the course engage in problem solving?; Culturally relevant teaching practices (Hooks, 2009), does the teacher engage in a study that is relevant to these particular students' lives?, does the course engage them

12

personally?; Critical Anti-Racist Multiculturalism (Hooks, 1994, 2009), does the course

seek to uncover and expose unpleasant truths about institutional injustices with in our

society and the world both presently and in the past?; and finally Youth Development

Framework (Ginwright, Noguera & Cammarota, 2006), does the teacher encourage the

formation of student ideals and values that foster agency and commitment to change

through action? These practices present in the "justice" classroom should lead to the

development of consciousness which should lead to action. Mentoring (Cammarota &

Fine, 2008) is the construct that bridges this development to the students. It is often

discussed that the relationship between teacher and student cannot be one of a power

hierarchy, but rather should be that of a partnership, where the faculty works hand in

hand with the student to develop their ideas and understanding.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Scope

It is assumed in this study that participants are volunteering based on their interest

in higher education. I assume that participants answered questions honestly and

represented themselves in their classrooms in an authentic manner. This study was

limited by the possibility that respondents may have altered their responses to please me

or support my suspected view of critical pedagogy and social justice. I do not believe

this to be the case, primarily because the number of folks who didn't identify with critical

pedagogy or action oriented social justice. The scope of this study was twenty faculty

members of education departments in New York City colleges and universities.

Definitions of Terms

After carefully reviewing the data, I identified three classifications of faculty in education programs based on their interviews and observations. The first category is the Professionalization perspective (PP) - these educators see the purpose of teacher education classes as necessary for the professional development of future teachers. These participants approach their classroom with a formal authority or demonstrator style of teaching. They do not practice and are less familiar with critical pedagogy. The second category is the Democratic Student Development (DSD) perspective. These participants see the student and their personal development as the focal point of education. They have a student-centered approach in their classrooms characterized by high levels of interaction and activities. They are aware of the methods and goals of critical pedagogy but do not consider themselves critical pedagogues and if they do, they are less likely to include action as part of their practice or definitions. The final category is the Critical Action Perspective (CAP). These teachers strongly believe that education can and should provide students with the tools to develop consciousness and engage in action to improve not just their conditions, but all conditions. They strive for student input on topics and assignments in an egalitarian classroom. Most of them identify as critical pedagogues or engage in most practices including an emphasis on action.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature is heavy on theory and light on classroom teacher practice. This review literature on critical pedagogy and social justice is designed to both review and expose the gaps in the literature that lead to my research questions. While you can find clear and consistent definitions for critical pedagogy and near limitless variations on the definition of social justice, the literature is lacking investigation into how actual classroom practitioners interpret and apply these concepts. While there are articles on why we should use critical pedagogy, there are few that tell us how, and even fewer that document it. The theoretical influences on critical pedagogy have been explored, but there is little data on who the faculty consider to be their influences to be in the classroom. There has even been research into how critical pedagogy and social justice have evolved academically in the changing political climates of the last few decades. There has been little research into what critical pedagogy and social justice looks or feels like to an educator with a room full of students. After reviewing the literature I will conclude this chapter with my research questions.

It is necessary to discuss the major concepts of critical pedagogy including (McLaren, 2003): dialectical theory, micro and macro analysis (Giroux, 1979), the social construction of knowledge, hegemony and ideology. To understand critical pedagogy it is important to understand its theoretical background based in the Frankfurt schools

critique of positivism, the importance of history and role of culture as a social product (Adorno, 1973; Horkheimer, 1972; Marcuse, 1964).

Major Concepts of Critical Pedagogy

Peter McLaren, (2003) takes a look at the major concepts of critical pedagogy and provides educators with a framework for reviewing critical pedagogical research. Dialectical theory proposes that individuals and society are interconnected and any analysis of either must include both as both the individual and the society are created by and the creator of the other. In educational analysis dialectical theory allows researchers to view educational settings as places of simultaneous liberation and oppression (McLaren, 2003). It is important to state from the beginning that the critical educator is never neutral and is always working towards positive social change. McLaren (2003) draws on Henry Giroux's (1979) concept of macro and micro objectives in education. Macro objectives give students the ability to connect the basic curriculum to the larger world giving them a social and political context for what is being studied; Giroux calls this "directive knowledge." Micro objectives in education focus on specific pieces of information such as names and dates and is concerned with the manipulation of data; Giroux calls this "productive knowledge."

The social construction of knowledge refers to the idea that knowledge is never neutral but rather the result of complex relationships carried out in particular situations and governed by the presence of power in interactions. "Critical pedagogy asks how and why knowledge gets constructed the way it does, and how and why some constructions of reality are legitimated and celebrated by the dominant culture while others clearly are

16

not" (McLaren, 2003, p.72). These questions led me to Habermas' (1972, 1974) forms of knowledge: technical knowledge which is based in natural science and can be quantified; practical knowledge which helps to understand social situations and the world around us; and emancipatory knowledge which exposes the role of power and inequality in social relationships.

Hegemony is the way that those in power elicit consent from the masses. Without using force, those in power are able to control the subordinate classes because the subordinate classes hold the values and beliefs that the dominant class should be in power. According to Peter McLaren, (2003, p 77) "hegemony is a cultural encasement of meanings, a prison-house of language and ideas, which is "freely" entered into by both dominators and dominated;" the dominant group creates a worldview justifying their power and explaining the subordinates' failures as their personal responsibility. There is some resistance to hegemony often in pop culture, subculture and schools themselves. Hegemony is supported by ideology; the framework that people use to explain the world and their interactions in it. Ideology allows for the justification of situations through selectively choosing the way in which it is framed. Ideology also allows for small forms of resistance that don't actually challenge the oppressive structures of society (McLaren, 2003).

Theoretical Foundation (the Frankfurt School)

Henry Giroux (2003) posits that critical theory has two meanings, first that it is a legacy of the "Frankfurt school." As a legacy it is not a fully fleshed out philosophy, but rather a loose set of shared ideas by a group of scholars influenced by the growing power

17

of capitalism and the ideas of radical human freedom developed by Marcuse, Horkheimer, and Adorno. The Frankfurt school thinkers recognized that social structures like consumption and distribution were historically based and dependent on social relationships. Constructing their theories in the time of fascism, the failure of Marxism and the rise of modern capitalism, the theorists of the Frankfurt school recognized that Marxist theory had based itself in absolutes and failed to develop a self-critique. This led to theoretical movement away from economics and to cultural structures.   The second meaning is a "self-conscious critique" which leads to an ideology of freedom. Critical theory is both a set of philosophical theories and a critical process.

In the view of the Frankfurt school, positivism is the end of the age of Enlightenment (Giroux, 2003; Friedman, 1981). According to Marcuse (1964), "positivism is a struggle against all metaphysics, transcendentalisms and idealisms, as obscurantist and regressive modes of thought" (in Giroux, 2003, p.33). Positivism separates knowledge from critique and is itself separated from the context in which it works. The notion that positivism only produces facts is ignorant to the system that decides what facts to collect and how to categorize them. Positivists are unable to explain the context in which any of these facts exist; Giroux (2003) explains that "the notions of intentionality and historical context are dissolved within the confines of a limiting quantifying methodology" (p.35).

The Frankfurt school posits that all theory is based in relationships and must be understood in the context of those relationships. It is necessary for all theory to recognize the bias in its interests and reflect on those. Simply having adequate methodology

doesn't necessarily guarantee fact or truth (Giroux, 2003; Horkheimer, 1972). Theory

must be critiqued in order to expose its strengths and weaknesses. According to the

Frankfurt school all theory is intended to create a world without injustice, critical theory

then becomes the precursor to social change and freedom. The Frankfurt school doesn't

reject empirical research itself; it rejects the absolutism that accompanies it. Adorno

(1973) cautions that theory and practice should remain separate so they don't meld

together and become the biased product they were trying to avoid.

The Frankfurt school recognized that culture is not a neutral concept but a

creation of the relationships at a particular moment in time. With the changes in the

economy and the technological developments of the time culture became a product. This

new hegemonic control was different from previous authority models which maintained

themselves through violence; control was now maintained through ideas and values

pushed on the masses (Giroux, 2003; Gramsci, 1971). Schools would have a role in

defining and reinforcing this ideological management control as a center of cultural

production. The Frankfurt school challenges the classic positivist notions of knowledge

as disconnected facts and offers a view of knowledge as the result of active critical

inquiry on the relationships of dominance and oppression in specific historical context

(Giroux, 2003). History is of specific importance to critical pedagogy as it provides a

link between the positivist facts and the opportunity to critique and reevaluate the second

nature of history. The second nature of history refers to the ideas and concepts that have

become so ingrained in culture that they remain unquestioned or critiqued. While

Adorno, Marcuse and Horkheimer focused on the overwhelming power of culture to

promote oppressive structures on the masses, Giroux (2003) points out that there is a

19

paradox in this relationship of culture and human agency; "the overwhelming and one-sided nature of mass culture as a dominating force, on the one hand, and their relentless insistence on the need for critique, negativity and critical mediation on the other" (p.53). When people create both freedom and oppression, they have the ability to unmake the oppressive structures of culture and replace with the structures that enable freedom.

Giroux's (2003) analysis of the Frankfurt school explains the need for self-critique in any theoretical approach in order to strengthen it and keep it relevant. The Frankfurt's school critiques of positivism describes the need for the separation of theory and practice as well the need for self-critique among those scientists who believe they produce facts and nothing else. No research exists in isolation from the cultural, societal and contextual factors that influence its definition, design and implications. The Frankfurt school emphasized the reading of history through its relationship with culture. The linking of the two allows for a greater critique of both as well as the opportunity to recognize human agency within the production of both culture and history. Within that agency lies the ability to produce the positive social change sought by critical pedagogues.

Critical Pedagogy as a Political Project

Critical pedagogy coincides with the politics of the new left as a result of the shift from economic injustice to cultural oppression. Historically, critical pedagogues have recognized the relationship between knowledge and power and the reality that knowledge is never neutral (Freire, 1970, 1974). When studying this relationship "critical pedagogy aims to construct alternative or counter-hegemonic forms of knowledge, and therefore

20

power" (Cho, 2010 p.311). Prior to the rise of critical pedagogy, curriculum studies focused on the best ways to deliver knowledge, but critical pedagogy brought new questions about the knowledge itself, specifically whose knowledge?; for whose benefit?; and at whose expense (Apple, 1979; Cho, 2010)? On the teaching side critical pedagogy seeks to transform the culture of schooling from oppressive to emancipatory. Unlike neo-Marxist theory which made economic determinism seem all powerful, (Bowles & Gintis, 1976) critical pedagogy focuses on the power of teachers and students to work in harmony to change social inequalities from within schools (Freire, 1970; hooks 1994; Shor, 1992). In this distancing, critical pedagogues began to focus more on culture, particularly in the classroom and neglect the greater economic influence of macro interactions (Cho, 2006, 2010).

The foremost political influence on critical pedagogy is culturalist politics. Several authors actually use the term culture politics or politics of culture in their definition of critical pedagogy (McLaren, 1995; Darder et al., 2003) while others make culture a central focus of critical pedagogy and its goals. Cho (2010) makes the point that culture has been a main component of critical pedagogy since the early 1970's when Antonio Gramsci (1971) and Louis Althusser (1971) re-interpreted classic Marxist theory to include hegemonies influence over media and all communication with ideological management. With the working class now immersed in pro-capitalist ideology in most facets of their lives, it became necessary for critical pedagogues to focus on the whole system rather than just the oppressive realities of capitalism.

The politics of self/identity become apparent in critical pedagogy when you recognize the significance of experience. It is in the lived experiences where individuals are able to discover themselves and their worlds, this discovery gives them power and agency. Cho (2010) argues that the emphasis on agency is a result of the shifting politics following world war two, where there is an evident split between the "old left" and the "new left" politics. The old left focused on economics while the new left focuses on freedom. This shift occurs because making drastic changes to the structure of society seems less possible and for many folks less desirable.

> It seemed sensible, even if by default, to accept the inevitable immorality of society, in that whatever new social structure was built, it would likely induce more violence and end up developing into another form of totalitarian authority" (Cho, 2010, p. 319).

With such difficulty challenging the state, it makes sense that the theoretical shift would begin to focus on the individual.

The politics of grassroots and non-hierarchal authority structures are visible throughout critical pedagogy. In the classroom where critical pedagogues attempt to remove any structures of authority and replace them with dialogue (Cho, 2006; Freire, 1970). Cho (2010) argues that this is again because of politics and the abandonment of the search for systemic solutions. "We are told the only viable option left is grassroots democracy. Along with the abandonment of the system, including the State, the individual and local struggles have become the main site of social change" (p. 319). Disappointment in the established national socialist and communist parties led to grassroots local social movements as the preferred site for social change.

Cho's (2010) study of the politics behind critical pedagogy leads to several conclusions. Critical pedagogy does an excellent job of explaining cultural issues, but is lacking in macro structural analysis, particularly in schools. The new grassroots politics is effective for local efficacy and individual empowerment, but this may come at the expense of macro politics and greater social change. The shifting focus on the local leaves the greater public and state undefended from those who would see it eliminated. In the end it may be to our detriment to focus on critical pedagogy locally when we may benefit from looking globally. Critical pedagogy is almost by nature idealistic, but it is important that our research include realistic practices and projects that can actually foster and create social change.

What do the Journal Articles Say about Social Justice?

Grant and Agosto (2008) conducted a review of four journals covering twenty-one years of publication from 1985 to 2006 finding thirty-nine articles featuring the use of "social justice" in the title or abstract beginning in 1991. The reason for the surge in use of the term in the 90's is because of the controversy over the use of multiculturalism which encouraged folks to use "social justice" (North, 2008). Only two of the articles offer definitions of social justice, while the others imply meanings or give descriptions but never fully define the term. The articles identify seven areas of concentration within the social justice literature:

(1) Critical pedagogy

(2) Community and collaboration

(3) Reflection

(4) Social (critical) consciousness,

(5) Social change and change agents,

(6) Culture and identity

(7) Analysis of power (Grant & Agosto, 2008, p. 188).

In critical pedagogy teachers are taught to reflect on their actions and work towards an understanding of social justice and its practice in the classroom. The goal is to use critical pedagogical practice to challenge inequality in the classroom. One issue in critical pedagogy is the difficulty of transitioning from theory to practice as few authors offer advice on how to practice critical pedagogy in the classroom. Another concern is the way in which critical pedagogy is called for without specific reference to which theoretical background is informing the pedagogy. Depending on which background is used, the specific goals and focus will vary making the general discussion of critical pedagogy confusing (Grant & Agosto, 2008; McLaren & Fischman, 1998; Nieto, 2000).

The terms community and collaboration are used in many articles to define places or spaces where folks can learn and act. It is often thought of as a virtual space where school and the community overlap and the teacher plays the vital role of bringing parents, students and community members together for social change. The individual fighting injustice must be replaced with the community fighting. The idea of collaborative support where relationships are of mutual benefit is particularly noted as a necessity for teachers. The notion of unequal power relationships in the community and the effect this can have on organizing for social justice is not discussed (Grant & Agosto, 2008; McLaren & Fischman, 1998; Nieto, 2000; Wenger 1998).

24

Reflection is considered an expected teacher practice and is believed to be beneficial. The observers in a teacher's classroom encourage teachers to more fully reflect on their practices and encourage their professional development. The possible oversight in the literature is that reflection is almost taken for granted in respect to the assumption that all the authors assume it is going to be done correctly and with the ideals of social justice in mind (Grant & Agosto, 2008; Morrell, 2003). Teachers engaging in reflective practice without a philosophical framework in social justice may not be benefiting from the practice.

The articles discuss the role of social consciousness, referring to Paulo Freire's (1970/1974/2000) ideas of developing class-consciousness, or an understanding of our relationship to and place in the world around us. The expectation is that teachers with social consciousness will focus on content that exposes and challenges injustice. The obstacle for teachers is keeping resistant students engaged so that they may benefit and develop consciousness of their own (Jennings, 1995). Most of this research focuses on post-secondary schools and does not include research on the effects of teachers with high social consciousness on their students (Grant & Agosto, 2008).

Many articles suggest that teachers try to see themselves as agents of social change, encouraging them to participate and take on projects in the communities in which they live and teach. Everyone exists within the system and no one is truly neutral making their everyday teaching an action for change or support of the existing inequality. Teachers in this literature are responsible for helping their students see themselves as social agents able to transform themselves and their society. Extant research pays little

attention to student resistance and it doesn't relate being a social change agent with any particular forms of knowledge or skills making it difficult to identify or train educators to be agents of social change (Grant & Agosto, 2008).

According to Grant and Agosto's (2008) findings it is in the concepts of culture and identity that social justice and multiculturalism come together with some authors using the terms interchangeably or stating the goal of multiculturalism to be social justice. The method of social reconstruction can be used by teachers themselves to develop their own positionality as well as to be aware of the positionality of their students and communities. The issue in culture and identity is that in many cases it takes place in isolation from economic injustice, making it seem as if recognition is the solution without redistribution (Fraser, 1997, McLaren & Fischman, 1998).

Several articles discuss the relationships between teachers and power. Teachers who are able to understand this relationship are better able to shift their discussions from the micro to the macro that is they are able to move from focusing on individual problems to communal or societal issues. Additionally teachers who understand the power inherent in teacher student relationships are less likely to abuse that power (Cooper, 2003; Grant & Agosto).

Five Core Practices for Robust Social Justice

Carl Grant (2012) presents five core practices necessary for the preparation of students that will result in a socially just society. Grant argues that social justice education must be about more than jobs, but about flourishing lives. These lives will

26

include (1) self-assessment, (2) critical questioning, (3) practicing democracy, (4) social action, and (5) criteria for adjudication.

Self-assessment or self-reflection is one of the most significant practices in education. To know oneself and to understand your place in society is essential to understanding your students and their place in the world. Parker Palmer (2007) argues, "Knowing myself is as crucial to good teaching as knowing my students and my subject. In fact, knowing my students and my subject depends heavily on self-knowledge" (p. 2). Grant advocates an even deeper critical reflection that gets at the very core of why we believe what we believe, this reflection or "Socratic Self Examination" gives us insight into how we come to internalize some beliefs while rejecting others (Nussbaum, 1997; West, 2004). "A robust social justice education must encourage teachers and students to move beyond self-reflections that mainly challenge surface level beliefs and ideas, such as personal beliefs or values and ideas that are only a small part of a much bigger whole" (Grant, 2012, p. 921). Students must be able to think critically about their beliefs and actions in the world and how they affect others.

The second practice for social justice according to Grant (2012) is critical questioning. The deep, well-thought-out, questions that inspire discussion and debate about the world around us and our place in that world. The dominant powers allow questions to be asked and provide answers that reinforce their place in society and maintain the status quo. True critical questioning occurs when these answers are rejected. Critical questioning is made up of further inquiry that goes past truth and looks towards who puts forth these ideas and how do they benefit by doing so. It questions

how the value of knowledge is determined and whose knowledge is valued? (Grant,

2012, p. 923) The difficult part for teachers is connecting the curriculum to student's

everyday lives while remaining within the ever-tightening state and federal guidelines.

Teachers must find a way to make certain that students are examining their educational

and life choices and examining where those options came from and where they lead to.

This allows students to question the world around them while determining their place in

it.

The third core practice for social justice is the practice of democracy (Grant,

2012). What does the practice of democracy look like? Is it electoral participation?

Freedom? Consumerism? The schools themselves are not democratic institutions as the

power and authority begins at the top and flows down. Students must understand that the

practice of democracy is a complex action that requires active engagement and

maintenance.

> To practice democracy also means that you learn about how the practice of
> democracy can be made to work for you or against you and that it is important
> that you understand the differences as well as know what you can do to influence
> an outcome that befits those who are marginalized. In addition, to practice
> democracy means that you encourage a pluralistic democracy, that you challenge
> the notion of democracy being defined through employment and consumerism,
> and that you develop a critical awareness about what you are reading, seeing, and
> hearing in the media (Grant, 2012, p. 925).

This understanding of democracy comes from an awareness of the history of democratic

struggles.

The fourth core principle for social justice is the encouragement of social action.

"Social action is individual or group behavior that involves interaction with other

individuals or groups, especially organized action toward social reform" (Grant, 2012,

p.926). Social action is necessary by marginalized groups to fight against the oppression that is pushed upon them. Social action is "a method of struggle that says you can use moral means to gain moral ends" (King, 1963). Social action is needed to foster open dialogue from and among groups in society (e.g., faith, civil right, feminist communities, teachers), and it is needed to give voice to those who are opposed to poverty and sexism. (Grant, 2012 p. 927)

The fifth principle for social justice is the ability to adjudicate our actions. We must have a way to say what is wrong or right or at the very least which is more or less just (Walker, 2003).   There must be accountability to those of us involved in social justice to show if we are engaging in these core practices and even more simply are we doing our jobs for social justice. Grant (2012) speaks of the three equalities based on the work of Miller (1999): equality of rules or opportunity; equality of status or the equality of being accepted; and equality of outcome or redistributive equality. Any one of these three equalities alone is not enough to make effective social change; the other two must be present. There are many examples of policy attempts to address one of the inequalities knowing that alone it will not alter the dominant social structures.

Summary of Review

This review of critical pedagogy and the social justice leads directly to my research questions. While the literature provides many definitions for critical pedagogy and social justice, few of the works actually consult the teachers in the classrooms to find out their interpretations of these concepts.   I discussed what social justice actually means and found that despite the variations on the definitions and goals (Gerwitz, 1998;

29

Sturman 1997) of social justice, there are many commonalities including the influence of

John Rawls (Nussbaum, 2001) and his inclusion of social capital and Smith's (1994)

explanation of the "social" in social justice as necessary to explain how the unequal

distribution of resources is facilitated. Many authors are building on the work of others,

where Fraser (1997) reconciles the differences between redistribution and recognition

with the "perspective dualist" approach where the two are looked as intersecting

phenomena. Melanie Walker contributed the concept of the "bivalent" approach, as

Fraser (1997) combined redistribution and recognition, educators must view the macro

and micro structures that foster inequality. Connie North (2006) builds on Walker's

(2003) "bivalent approach" to make a strong argument for social action that addresses

both micro and macro level change supported by the arguments of Jean Anyon (2005).

Grant and Agosto's (2008) journal article showed a clear link between social

justice and critical pedagogy as defined by Paulo Freire (1971, 1975). The overwhelming

use of "critical pedagogy", "critical consciousness" and the use of "reflection" show both

the influence of critical pedagogy on social justice, but also the use of critical

methodology by social justice activists and educators. This is reassuring as my research

proposal associates very closely the relationship between social justice education and

critical pedagogical methods.

The final section on core practices for "robust" social justice, which analyzes Carl

Grants' address to the AERA in 2010 as the Social Justice Award lecture. Grant argues

that social justice education must be about more than jobs, but about great flourishing

lives. These lives will include (1) self-assessment, (2) critical questioning, (3) practicing

democracy, (4) social action, and (5) criteria for adjudication. We must be advocates for

social justice in our classrooms and agents of social change in our communities. The

continuous practice of living the "robust" socially just life will create the social change

that so many of us are looking for.

Thus much of the social justice literature focuses on the differences in definitions,

but all of them share in common the goal of educating for a better society, whether or not

they advocate for it through study, or communal activity or social protest. I see great

room for research in the synthesis of these theories wherein we may find an even more

powerful way to reach folks and encourage social improvement and equality. But as I

call for unification, I remember it is important to always be critical in our reflections of

our own practices for not only does it improve our work but as Connie North reminds us

of our purpose as social justice educators:

> To avoid the substitution of one oppressive discourse for another, we ought to
> continue questioning, theorizing, and expanding our knowledge claims about, and
> actions for, social justice. Just as important, if not more so, we need to examine
> critically the consequences of our good intentions, practices, and policies to
> ensure that they do more good than harm to ourselves, others, and the surrounding
> environment (North, 2008, p. 1201).

While it is important for academics to continue to engage in this critical reflection, I

believe it is important for us to look into the actual classrooms where we suggest critical

pedagogy be used and social justice be taught.

Research Questions

After reviewing various texts on critical pedagogy and social justice, I was left

with many questions about how critical pedagogy and social justice within the classroom

actually occur. The phenomenon of my study exists within the faculty interpretations of

critical pedagogy and the effects that has in the classroom; it is in this space that social justice occurs or does not, and as such there are two sets of research questions that will guide the study initially, one for interpretations and one for practices:

My research questions for interpretations:

- How do faculty interpret the meaning and purpose of critical pedagogy?

- Who are their influences in the field?

- How do faculty involved in these programs define social justice; to them is it a set of goals, practices or both?

- Does the way each faculty member defines social justice have an effect on their classroom methods, their choice of materials and their view of students. These questions will be essential in establishing faculty perspectives towards teaching, critical pedagogy, social justice and their students.

My research questions for practice:

- What are the teaching methods of the faculty whom are involved in education courses and how do they interpret their students' reactions to them? How do students react to the methods used in the instruction?

- Is there acceptance or resistance to the subject matter and/or to the methods of teaching?

- Do student's ideological standings affect the faculty's chosen teaching methods?

- How does the faculty measure their rates in terms of success in teaching social justice?

- How do the faculty define success?

This study will add to the discussion on critical pedagogy, its interpretation by faculty and the perceived reaction by their students. In particular there have been few studies into the methods used in courses that claim social justice components in university programs. This study will contribute both in the content of its findings and the methodology used to obtain those findings. As a researcher I find myself situated both as an insider and outsider. The site(s) chosen for this study include various teacher education programs in colleges and universities in the New York City area. All of these departments make specific mention of social justice and student empowerment in their websites and mission statements. As an educator and a researcher I have been involved in social justice education for several years now, giving me an insider's view of what it's like to teach critical pedagogy and social justice concepts such as privilege and false consciousness as well as experiencing resistance from my students. I am or have been employed as an instructor at some of the campuses giving me greater access and a familiarity with the attitudes and atmosphere, as well as some of the faculty involved in the programs. While I am familiar with some faculty participants, I have never met the majority of them, nor have I ever taken a course with any of them before this study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Introduction

This study seeks to uncover the connection between social justice and critical pedagogy in faculty interpretations and how those interpretations affect their classroom practice. The minor premise of this study is that while educators have conceptions of social justice based on critical pedagogy they may not be able to translate those conceptions into classroom practices. The unit of study will be explained, followed by an explanation of my working design and research design, which explains my choice of qualitative methods and informed grounded theory. There will be a brief discussion on the backgrounds of grounded theory and informed grounded theory. I will explain my interview techniques of descriptive questions and road mapping as well as my role as unobtrusive observer in classroom observations. I justify my use of microanalysis and explain the benefits of reflexive memo writing. My target audience is composed of: educators for social justice, educators in general, and the qualitative research community. As this study takes place in the academy concerning educational practices with adults, it has been approved with exempt status by the IRB at Arizona State University. My personal context is that of a novice researcher gaining the skills to conduct competent qualitative studies. I will discuss the validation of this project and my preference for "authenticity" over validity in qualitative study. Authenticity is particularly important as I intend to produce a narrative report that will allow for the greater transmission of my results. Finally, the importance of my study and its intended value to myself and the academic community will be discussed.

Unit of Study

The unit of study for this research project will be the instructor and the classroom. Instructors were selected based on their employment in education programs in the local colleges and universities. They were contacted through my ASU student email and made aware of the project and encouraged their participation. Additional instructors were solicited through word of mouth, snowball sampling. Classroom observations of the faculty following the interviews allowed for comparison between their ideology and their actions.

This study is based on a process design, as I interviewed faculty and observed as a non-participant the faculty methods in the classroom and their interactions with students. This project is appropriate for qualitative study because of the explanatory nature of the questions. The best way to understand the how's and why's of critical pedagogy in terms of faculty interpretation and classroom practice is through in depth interviews and intense observation with those participating.

Working Design

In order to understand the phenomenon and answer the proposed research questions, I used the following working design. Specifically, I seek to answer the question if critical pedagogy and social justice are practiced and how they are interpreted by faculty and practiced in the classroom on the university level. I hope to gain information on if and how a broad philosophy such as critical pedagogy is adopted by faculty in education programs and if it is actually enacted by instructors who claim to engage in critical pedagogy in classrooms and how students exposed to critical pedagogy and social justice react to it. In order to discuss and answer this question it was necessary

35

to collect qualitative data in the form of interviews with faculty actively using critical pedagogical practices and teaching courses in a program with an emphasis on social justice. Additionally classroom observations were performed in order to gain an understanding of the relationship between attitudes towards critical pedagogy and classroom practices.

For this study qualitative methods are ideal for several reasons provided by Guba and Lincoln (1994): first, since context is essential to understanding the interactions that take place during teaching; second, human behavior cannot be understood without reference to meaning or purpose; thirdly I am not engaging in hypothesis testing, rather I am looking to "discover" information about the process of teaching social justice. If I were to enter into this study using quantitative methods based on a preconceived theory and hypothesis, the objectivity of my study would be threatened by the "theory ladenness of facts" and the "value ladenness of facts" (Guba and Lincoln, 1994) wherein the interrelations between my preordained ideas and conceptions would unduly influence my results so that any data gained would support my initial beliefs.

In order to understand how critical pedagogy is understood, I used the methods associated with grounded theory for this study. "Grounded theory methods consist of flexible strategies for collecting and analyzing data that can help ethnographers to conduct efficient fieldwork and create astute analyses" (Charmaz & Mitchell, 2001, p.160). While I have already mentioned that I entered the field with a critical conception of the socially just classroom, grounded theory methods are ideal for developing a theoretical framework based on the initial findings of the study. This allows for a natural

progression where the research is able to develop into its own truth, rather than fulfilling preconceived prophesies. While research and analysis for this study will be rigorous, I agree with Charmaz & Mitchell (2001), that "methods are only a means, not an end. Our subjects' worlds and our renderings of them take precedence over methods and measures" (p.161). It is necessary that the actual findings of this study be recognized and displayed over any preconceived analysis I may have had.

There are five strategies for conducting research based on grounded theory methods. I will use these strategies as the basis for my study "variants of grounded theory include the following strategies: (1) Simultaneous data-collection and analysis; (2) Pursuit of emergent themes through early data analysis; (3) Discovery of basic social processes within the data; (4) Inductive construction of abstract categories that explain and synthesize these processes; and (5) Integration of categories into a theoretical framework that specifies causes, conditions and consequences of the process(es)" (Charmaz & Mitchell, 2001, p.160).

Background on Grounded Theory Methods

Qualitative researchers need a methodology that allows them to understand a phenomenon from the perspective of those experiencing it (Woodgate, 2000). "The grounded theorist aims to generate theory that describes basic psychosocial phenomena and to understand how human beings use social interaction to define their reality (Chenitz & Swanson, 1986; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Hutchinson, 1986)" (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2011, p. 3). Grounded theory is ideal for not only understanding what is happening in a social context, but why it is happening (Aldiabat and Le Navenec, 2011; Morse et al,

2001). According to Glaser (1992, 2004) grounded theory is based in the philosophy of symbolic interactionism where individuals make sense of and direct the world they live in. It is important to note that symbolic interactionist theory does not guide the analysis of grounded theory, it only informs the method.

Informed Grounded Theory

This research project will be using grounded theory methods, but with an informed perspective based in social justice and critical pedagogy. Robert Thornberg (2012) argues that there may be advantages to using an informed grounded theory rather than staying away from the literature until later in the study. The classic grounded theory developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) created an alternative to quantitative methods where theories would be proven through research. Grounded theory was an attempt to avoid "grand theory" and purely empirical description. In the original grounded theory, theory would be developed based on the findings (inductive) and the literature review would be conducted based on those findings. The two strongest arguments for delaying the literature review are to keep the researcher open to all possibilities and to avoid the contamination or the forcing of data to fit with the preconceived theory. Additionally, it is impossible to know which literature is relevant until the project begins and therefore it is more time effective to conduct the literature review later (Glasser, 1998; Thornberg, 2012).

According to Thornberg (2012) the first problem with delaying the literature review is the counterintuitive nature of researchers being unable to conduct studies in their area of expertise. Additionally after the first study is completed, the researcher will

38

undoubtedly have read the literature and will then be informed if they are interested in conducting further studies in that field. Avoiding the literature can also be an excuse for "lazy ignorance" of the literature or that the conducting of literature reviews is "easy" (Morse, 1994). In terms of professional research it is necessary to include literature reviews in applications for funding. Possibly the most damaging aspect of delaying the literature review is the loss of previous knowledge. A researcher may think they've made a great discovery, when in reality it's an already established concept in the field (Lempert, 2007). Thornberg (2012) brings attention to the fact that Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) argued that the literature can be a benefit as long as the researcher doesn't let it block their openness to creativity. Letting the fear of possible contamination keep a researcher from the advantages of reading the literature is an extreme position (Dunne, 2011). Researchers can also engage in "bracketing" what they have read, allowing them access to the literature while suspending judgement (Moustakas, 1994).

Thornberg (2012) defines informed grounded theory as "a product of a research process as well as to the research process itself, in which both the process and the product have been thoroughly grounded in data by GT methods while being informed by existing research literature and theoretical frameworks" (p.8). Informed grounded theory is about adding literature review strategies to the existing grounded theory methods. Thornberg (2012) describes these as the following data sensitizing principle: Researchers must practice theoretical agnosticism (Henwood & Pidgeon, 2003), that is to treat all the known theories as provisional and approach them from a critical viewpoint. Theoretical pluralism is the practice of qualified relativism (Thayer-Bacon, 2003) or the taking of multiple theories (complementary and contrasting) and synthesizing a discussion that

allows for a greater view of the field than any one theory could give. Theoretical sampling of literature is an ongoing literature throughout the project where a researcher can continue gaining insight into the field until their sampling no longer yields any new information or becomes saturated (Charmaz, 2006). Thornberg (2012) recommends "staying grounded" and remembering that all findings must be based in data not the literature that is helping us identify the data. Thornberg (2012) advocated Charmaz's (2006) concept of theoretical playfulness, where the researcher is encouraged to try new an interesting ideas that may lead to breakthroughs. Finally, Thornberg (2012) recommends developing ideas through memoing (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) that includes a constant reflection process where the researcher is able to insure they are not becoming weighted down by the literature.

Research Design

By using the methods of grounded theory I am hoping to eliminate the possibility of bias based on preconceived theories or ideas. Since I will be entering the research without initial categories I will be cutting down on the possibility of "trash can research." Trash can research refers to entering a field with preconceived categories and then simply filling the categories with responses that justify the initial theories.

As this study is specific in the occupation of those I must study, I will use criterion sampling. According to Susan Morrow and Mary Smith (2000), "One type of criterion sampling is theory based or operational construct sampling, in which participants are selected on the basis that they can best illustrate the construct under investigation" (208). In order to answer my research question I will interview faculty

and observe classrooms in teacher education programs where critical pedagogy is being used or taught in socially just courses. I will be conducting interviews with faculty and students from the schools and possibly conducting classroom observations. In order to open the study to as many instructor interviews as possible, I will employ snowball sampling, where I will ask those I interview for recommendations of other faculty engaging in critical pedagogical practices or teaching for social justice. As these instructors are employed at institutions with commitments to social justice and critical pedagogy they have been very willing to participate in this study.

In terms of student response to critical pedagogy, I engaged in mixed purposeful sampling, where I will interview those students in the classrooms I am able to observe, so as to compare data with their instructors. In some ways this was a convenience sample, since I was limited to the students from the observable classes and those willing to be interviewed. For the purpose of this study, I believe criterion and convenience sampling gave me the proper representation to study the faculty interpretations of critical pedagogy and it's relation to classroom practices.

In qualitative research there is a danger that data will be invalidated by a lack of contradictory evidence. Researchers could easily select the evidence that supports their claims while ignoring any evidence to the contrary. "What serves as more genuine support is that no evidence can be found to disprove the account that is being given; it is up to the person giving the interpretation to convince the rest of us that such negative evidence has been sought vigorously" (Philips & Burbules, 2000, p.80). In order to show that my findings are valid I will engage in confirming and disconfirming sampling

41

interviewing and observing faculty who do not engage in critical pedagogy to show evidence that my initial findings are supported.

I consulted subjects throughout the interviews in order to maintain that I understood their meanings and intentions. It was my goal to get the most accurate information and give my respondents the most opportunities throughout the interview to make their meanings clear. While I respect my respondents and appreciate their participation I did not give them the opportunity to edit or change their accounts; however, I did allow them to review the transcript of the interview and gave them the opportunity to address any issues they may have with the transcript. This allowed them to make additions or changes to the dialogue, while preserving the initial text. In order to limit the introduction of bias into my analysis I did not allow the review of my manuscript by my subjects. Since the subjects are partially made up of academic instructors, it would be inappropriate to allow them to see a manuscript where their students had commented on their classroom instruction.

Interviews

I gained consent for interviews through consent forms which stipulated the intent of the study, the confidentiality of the interview, and the right to review the interview transcript. All interviews were to be kept confidential, names and biographical data would be immediately coded and kept only by me. In order to establish rapport I engaged in the four part rapport process established by James Spradley (1979). In the initial meeting there was apprehension and uncertainty, followed by exploration where the subject and I learned what each other expects. After expectations were made clear

there was cooperation where mutual trust was formed and finally participation where the subjects became assertive and exposed me to new information. For me, the exploration stage was the most critical, where I made repeated explanations and restated what informants said.

In order to elicit information, I relied on Holt, Rinehart, & Winston's (1979) method of descriptive questions. The right question would stimulate a long and detailed response. I engaged in grand tour questions which simulated "walking through" a cultural scene. There were four different types of grand tour questions: typical, specific, guided and task-related. Based on the responses from the grand tour, I followed up with mini-tour questions where I asked more specific information. Additionally, once rapport was established I relied heavily upon example and experience questions, where I asked more specifically for examples of how instructors use critical pedagogy or define social justice.

When engaging in the interviews I took on a variety of roles, as Kleinman (1980) points out the researcher can take many forms in different situations when dealing with the subjects. I was both an insider as an academic engaged in research, and an outsider as a graduate student switching roles in a continuum (Smith, 2000). At some points it was necessary for me to adopt a very scholarly role when dealing with faculty in order to establish my commitment. At other times I had to be naïve in order to elicit information. When engaging with students I presented myself as a student working on a research project, not unlike the work they engage in their classes. Interviews were recorded using

a digital tape recorder to allow for a full line by line transcript. Additionally I made notes to guide my questions and the transcripts.

While observing the classroom, I took on the role of the unobtrusive observer, maintaining a non-participatory status for the most part. My goal was to observe social justice being taught naturally in the classroom, but I needed to acknowledge my presence. According to Webb et. al (1966), there is no such thing as the unobtrusive observer, there is no way my presence cannot effect the data in some way, unless I could be completely concealed. I attempted to minimize my involvement to minimize my effect. Within the classroom I took detailed notes, using information from the interviews to guide my observations. Following the observations I immediately made memos based on the notes. The combination of interviews and observations allowed me insight both into what the instructors were saying and what they are doing in terms of critical pedagogy and social justice teaching. I was able to see the distance between philosophy and practice.

Other Sources of Data

In addition to interviews and observations, I collected course syllabi from the instructors in order to guide my analysis of the interviews and observations. In general the syllabi were used to help develop questions for the interviews and comparison for the observations so they are mainly referred to as part of the interview and observation findings.

Interviews were conducted in person, by phone and in once case via skype for approximately sixty to ninety minutes. Subjects received a brief questionnaire about their ideas and interpretations of critical pedagogy in order to prepare them for the interview.

Depending on the results of the interviews and availability of faculty. Observations were then conducted with six of the faculty participants.

Data Analysis

The ideal method for analysis for this type of interview and observational research is a microanalysis process (Kirkpatrick, 2001; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) where line by line detailed coding is necessary to create categories. The reason this method is appropriate is because of the basis for the study in grounded theory, as I entered the study with limited theoretical framework, it would make no sense to analyze the data based on conversational analysis, narrative etc. until a full theoretical framework can be established. Once the microanalysis of the study was complete, it was possible to reanalyze the source transcripts for narrative analysis. Narrative analysis in this study refers to the analysis of the stories shared by the faculty in their interviews. The categories created from the microanalysis of the interviews allowed for general categories during the classroom observations. Three types of note taking took place during interviews and observations: field, code, and theoretical. These varied notes made for easier transition to memos (Kaskaloglu (2008); Strauss & Corbin, 1998). During the entire interview and observation process, memos were written after each interview and observation so that comparisons can be made between the categories from coding and the categories in the memos. It is essential to microanalysis that the questions asked during the interviews were detailed and can lead to theoretical integration within the memos. This theoretical integration of coding with the memos will be the basis for writing the ethnography. "In grounded theory writing, researchers' analytic treatment of theoretical

categories takes precedence over narrative. This emphasis strengthens theory-building, or at least the appearance of it, but readability suffers" (Charmaz & Mitchell, 2001, p.170). While readability may suffer it is the ideal method of writing for grounded theory.

The detailed note taking and analysis combined with diligent memo writing insured that data collection was precise and complete. Since I was the only person coding, there was no question of intercoder reliability. As this study is based in semi-grounded theory, the threat of trash can research is limited, but the detailed coding, notes and memos will show how the categories developed organically based on the interviews and then informed the observations.

IRB

This study fell into the exempt category as it takes place in established educational settings, involving normal educational practices, "such as: i: research on regular and special educational instructional strategies, or ii: research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods." Additionally my study poses "minimal" risk to subjects. Since all subjects are over the age eighteen (18), I avoided any risk to sensitive populations. See appendix A.

Validation

In terms of validity for this study I will be defining them in terms of social or critical realism. This form of validity asks the question, "Does the knowledge produced

by the study allow the community to construct a better map of the domain of the phenomenon, a better map or model that leads the community to the next set of actions and purposes?" (Smith, 2009) Ironically, even though my phenomenon is social justice, I will not be using the critical epistemology; it does not seem realistic for this study of individual research designed specifically for my dissertation, to be a forum for communal praxis allowing for other voices to be heard within this study.

   While I would rather not use the term validity for this qualitative study, and perhaps my committee would let me use a more appropriate terminology, of authenticity, it is likely that down the line when explaining my research I will be engaged in debates and discussions with quantitative researchers and will have to use validity to defend my work. I will focus on validity as established by my readers through plausibility and credibility. My foremost source for validity will be using Patti Lathers categories of validity: triangulation, face validity, construct validity and catalytic validity (Lather, 1986). Additionally, my committee was able to monitor my research, my methods and my progress to insure my results are not biased or mistaken. I will allow my participants to review transcripts of interviews for accuracy and to allow for the clarification of ideas. In addition, I hope that my methods will appear transparent and the effects of my study on the social justice community will be viewed as fair and accurate. Transparent methods that yield fair and accurate results should be enough to deem my study as reliable. Reliability is referred to as the absence of error, but more appropriate for my qualitative study, I will refer to my reliability as the dependability of my methods and the accuracy of my findings.

Writing a Narrative

Hendry, (2010) asserts the narrative is perhaps the oldest form of inquiry and is an advantageous method of writing in the academic sciences. By using narrative descriptions in our writing researchers are able to reach a wider audience and encourage greater cross discipline interaction. Holley and Colyar (2009) offer several ways of structuring data in order to create a narrative text: the creation of a story which is guided by the question the research is attempting to answer and the using of subjects as characters who will guide the audience through the analysis using their voices to illuminate the points being made. A key point for writers to be aware of is focalization. According to Holley and Colyar (2009) this is where the author must make choices on where to focus the story and which subjects to give voice to. Coulter (2009) defends the value of narrative and reminds the audience that there is a level of storytelling in narrative data analysis, but that is no different than any other researcher that reviews and weighs data, looks for contradicting evidence and eventually makes a decision on what their findings are. Coulter (2009) also warns the researcher to be sure the voice of the subject remains authentic and warns against the boring nature of moral or thematic narrative where the data becomes repetitive and predictable to the audience.

Logistics

Data was collected over two semesters with a third semester for analysis and presentation. The first semester I conducted preliminary interviews with faculty. This gave me an opportunity to start collecting data while piloting questions and refining ideas for the classroom observations that will followed in the fall. All the while I was analyzing the data and refining my research questions. I concluded my field research in

the second semester and began full analysis of my data in the third. The most important

resource necessary for this study was the time to conduct the observations and interviews.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction to Categories

The nature of the questions focused on various aspects of critical pedagogy allowing for an easier transition to preliminary categories based on the interview questions. Afterwards, I reviewed the data again for similarities and trends, and then again for comparison between the three main identified perspectives (professionalization, democratic student development and critical action).

1) Professionalization perspective (PP) - these educators see the purpose of teacher education classes as necessary for the professional development of future teachers. These participants approach their classroom with a formal authority or demonstrator style of teaching.

2) Democratic Student Development (DSD) perspective- these participants see the student and their personal development as the focal point of education. They have a student centered approach in their classrooms characterized by high levels of interaction and activities.

3) Critical Action Perspective (CAP) - these teachers strongly believe that education can and should provide students with the tools to develop consciousness and engage in action to improve not just their conditions, but all conditions. They strive for student input on topics and assignments in an egalitarian classroom.

I identified the three main perspectives and categorized the participants based on the total findings of the study. The three perspectives matched up closely to the teaching styles of executive, facilitator and liberator (Fenstermacher & Solstis, 2004) at least in the interviews. I observed that the actual classroom teaching styles deviated to various degrees from their practitioner descriptions. These deviations will be discussed further in the section on classroom practices and teaching challenges. Based on the results of this sample of New York City educators it is clear that there are three distinctly different interpretations of critical pedagogy, social justice and how teacher education courses should be taught based on what they believe the purpose of education and schooling to be. I conducted interviews in convenience order based on when respondents were available. I began with questions based on teaching philosophies and definitions and transitioned to questions based on practice, classroom management and assignments, administrative influence on attitudes toward social action and ended with descriptions of the best and worst experiences with teaching with critical pedagogy.

The Participants

The participants to the study are collected below and introduced through a series of vignettes using pseudonyms.

Name	Self-Described Philosophy	Category	Years Teaching	Tenure	Gender/Age/ Ethnicity
Allison	Democratic Facilitator	DSD	2	no	F/30+/White
Brooke	Social justice	DSD	30	yes	F/60+/White
Jane	Critical Democratic	DSD	10	yes	F/40+/White
Sydney	Critical Pedagogue	CAP	25	no	F/40+/White
Kimberly	Purpose Centered based in Reflection	DSD	14	no	F/40+/White
Michael	Pure knowledge	DSD	40	no	M/60+/White
Jo	Critical Democratic	CAP	12	yes	F/40+/White
Peter	Professionalization	PP	25	yes	M/50+/White
Megan	Critical Constructivist	CAP	4	no	F/30+/White
Matt	Professionalization	PP	9	yes	M/40+/White
Jake	Democratic Facilitator	DSD	35+	No	M/60+/Black
Billy	Critical Pedagogue	CAP	22	No	M/50+/White
Amanda	Professionalization	PP	20	yes	F/50+/White
Samantha	Professionalization	PP	27	yes	F/50+/White
Taylor	Critical Pedagogue	CAP	16	yes	F/40+/Hispanic
Lexi	Democratic Facilitator	DSD	17	yes	F/50+/White
Jennifer	Critical Pedagogue	CAP	5	no	F/30+/Black
Kyle	Professionalization	PP	8	no	M/30+/White
Craig	Critical Pedagogue	CAP	18	yes	M/ 50+/White
Richard	Critical Anti-Racist Multiculturalist	DSD	10	no	M/30+/Black

Allison is a new professor in her early thirties who has been teaching primarily methods and educational psychology classes for the past two years. Prior to her post-secondary teaching, Allison taught at both public and private primary schools for ten years. When she began teaching on the primary level she wanted to empower students and with experience she realized she wanted to be a part of students empowering themselves. She spent some time teaching at an alternative school for social justice with dynamic leadership and for a while it all seemed to be happening, multiculturalism was popular, critical pedagogy was a part of discussions on classroom practice and suddenly the neoliberals and Mayor Bloomberg swooped down and put an end to that. The reality of teaching in the age of NCLB and teacher accountability made her reassess the gap between what she'd like to do and what she had to do. In the end she didn't feel empowered. The school ended up being closed down and maybe that was for the best. The idea was so good on paper, they were going to direct their own learning and move away from the standard curriculum. As time went on the original leaders moved on and the new people didn't have the motivation or understanding of critical pedagogy and social justice. Before you knew it nothing was happening, the students weren't producing, the teachers and students weren't engaged, and it just broke down. She explained the reality is that in NYC, so many of the students come to the table with such limited skills and without the necessary skillset so much time has to be spent teaching kids how to read and the basics and you can't do what you want to do because you can't spend the time until they have the skills. Allison thinks that now with the core and standardized testing you won't be able to find a school doing social justice, unless it's specifically designed for that. In her teaching now, Allison tries to balance between

preparing students for the neoliberal workforce and keeping student's critically engaged because Allison believes it is critical pedagogy that lets you find the students that everyone has written off.

Brooke has been teaching for over forty years, with just over thirty years on the college level. She is an accomplished researcher and author who has on more than one occasion clashed with publishers and political offices over the use of the term social justice. Brooke had written a piece for the state on child development and they objected to using the term and rejected the piece. Another time she had written a textbook with a colleague and the publisher asked that they remove the term social justice. The publisher explained that the term was politically fraught and that conservatives would object to it. Brooke thinks people object because social justice is viewed as leftist and at the time it was in a rather conservative area and they would have had to approve it. She explained that Americans would never admit to opposing democracy or fairness, but for some reason social justice strikes a chord. Brooke bases her teaching on a balance of focusing on the child and a rich curriculum with a social justice component of looking beyond the classroom to the world.

Jane is a teaching veteran of twenty years at the collegiate level teaching a variety of educational leadership courses. She believes in raising student's political and social consciousness through the use of technology and social media. Jane believes that it is particularly important that the material engage students personally and directly at less prestigious universities where students are less likely to enter with critical skills and more likely to be focused on job placement. As a quantitative researcher, Jane believes that

students in more profession based programs respond to numbers and data more than they do to theory. Students need inequality proven to them before they can understand the need for critical pedagogy.

Sydney is a critical feminist pedagogue who has been teaching for approximately twenty-five years. The product of immigrants, her mother dropped out of school and her father abandoned them leading Sydney to see education and schooling as opportunity. Despite being born in New York, she began her collegiate teaching career in the south where she faced tremendous resistance to her critical theories and her general teaching style. Influenced by Paulo Freire, bell hooks, Audrey Lorde and Patricia Hill Collins, she begins her courses by asking students to "check their privilege" at the door in order to focus on raising consciousness and the intersectionality of oppression. While education was an opportunity for her, Sydney recognizes that the market has changed so that degrees aren't worth as much and an undergraduate or graduate degree can leave a student asking "do you want fries with that."

Kimberly has been teaching for fourteen years, often covering writing and inter-disciplinary classes. She is an advocate for democratic education influenced by John Dewey's early work on passive vs. active education. She believes strongly in praxis, the relationship between theory and action. While many educators have become pessimistic about critical pedagogy and social justice, Kimberly believes that academia is always twenty years behind and we'll be seeing a greater shift towards socially conscious education in the near future. Kimberly relies heavily on technology in her classes and reflective practices, sharing lesson plans, materials and personal reflections through

websites and blogs of her creation. Her classes are purpose centered and cumulatively designed to bring students to consciousness and action.

Michael has been teaching educational philosophy courses for close to forty years. Michael believes that education is only for the pursuit of knowledge, and that it shouldn't have a purpose but rather be free to go anywhere it wants. He describes his philosophy as "eclectic" using a combination of Socratic dialogue along with standardized tests and close readings. Michael is planning to retire as soon as possible because education has become very bureaucratic, very assessment oriented and very scary. According to Michael, whenever there's a problem they look to education as the panacea. In 1910, it was Horace Mann trying to solve class conflict with school. In the 1960's we tried to solve racism with integration and the problem today? Global competition. Michael doesn't believe that education increases equality, he thinks it increases inequality, because that's the way the system has been set up with so many tiers and different types of colleges. "I don't think it has the social effect we wish it could." Michael feels that as kids enter college, they've already made up their mind about their ideology and religious beliefs; they're not going to be influenced by liberal professors, rather they gravitate to people who agree with them, so they graduate more polarized then when they enter. Michael spends much of his class time debunking myths on education and in general, but feels that in the end employers care far more about where students went to school than what they learned there.

Jo is a post-Marxist deconstructionist whose been teaching cultural courses for twelve years. In the past she has given serious thought to social justice and education even

considering specializing in social justice in graduate school. She found that it quickly became problematic as the literature and definition for social justice are very loosely defined. The advantage of fuzzy definitions is the allowance of more freedom, but the disadvantage is that scholars are unable to talk as a group. Jo felt that critical pedagogy also suffers from fuzziness, while it is easily agreed that critical pedagogy involves incorporating different notions of oppression and critical stances, she believes that good teachers do this, but may not call it critical pedagogy. Jo related a story from graduate school where they had no class on race and education which prompted her to attempt a study to look across the country at different programs and see which programs carried the course. Some had it, some did not. The difficulty was that there was no universal standpoint for comparison. Critical pedagogy and social justice are the same way, but she could not imagine educators admitting that they didn't look at things critically. Jo has no problem taking a critical stance from start to finish in her teaching because the systems default is that there's nothing to criticize leaving a balanced class weighted heavily in the status quo.

Peter was born in the mid-west and served as an active member of the military after college and before graduate school. He has been teaching for twenty-five years and considers himself to be practitioner focused on training students for the work force and careers. Considering his formal education to be more "old school" he had always done what he was told until he got to his PhD program where his instructors were much more liberal. Peter had never considered social justice further than his own perspective of what is right, but now the state of education requires teachers to consider are you just going to do what you're told or are you going to do what's right? Peter experienced a great

epiphany towards his stance on teaching when the towers fell on 9/11 and war followed in Iraq. Having been a life-long conservative Republican, he now found himself protesting outside Wall Street as part of the Occupy movement, which fizzled out and left him feeling disempowered. He thought of his daughters who were growing up in the age of social media where the masses are so easily led down the avenues of public opinion and he considered what type of teachers he'd want them to have. Even so, Peter believes that educators have to strike a balance as the enforcers of social norms and that the decision of who a teacher will be is best left to the students themselves.

Megan is a self-described critical constructivist professor of early childhood education with four years' experience. She recounted a recent episode where the core curriculum was debated, but the two questions that were never asked were "what is the purpose of schooling" and "what does it mean to be educated." Megan explained that these questions only come up with certain thinkers and that the discourse on philosophy is often overshadowed by accountability, middle states and all the captured data. But what does this data mean? At the same time these questions need to be asked the leadership is under tremendous pressure to bring in students and fill up the classrooms. With online schools and all that competition, the big conversations get harder to have. For Megan the purpose of schooling is to open minds and hearts through the development of critical habits. She rarely uses textbooks and believes in applying Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences to her classroom to provide students with opportunities to stretch their skills. For Megan teaching is all about reaching the individual student.

Matt didn't come directly from school into teaching; he first held jobs in marketing and advertising and even though he wanted to go into teaching he was unwilling to make the sacrifice of moving across the country. At the time he was married with a child in the middle of the tech boom where everyone was hiring and the money was good. He wasn't convinced that happiness was tied up with a job. After several years he felt such alienation in business that it didn't feel like his coworkers were even speaking the same language. Matt had to get back to the classroom, at first as an adjunct just to do something and then shortly after he returned to academia full time and that was nine years ago. Matt believes there is a performance aspect to teaching that is similar to acting. In reality, teaching takes more than just a mind for academia and knowledge, it's a desire to share that knowledge with others and that's what great public speakers and teachers do.

Jake has over fifty years of teaching experience, with over thirty years in higher education. Though he began teaching in graduate school, he considers his first real teaching experience to be in the peace corp. In Nigeria it was a full teaching life where he built the school, taught and lived for two years and at the end was completely changed. He spent another ten years teaching at prep schools and then earned his doctorate. While earning his doctorate an advisor pointed him in the direction of a small school that was hiring. When he asked why he should go, his advisor said it was small, but they're trying to do the right thing. He spent eight years teaching there, but then left to work with abused and neglected adolescents. After several years he returned to academia and higher education. He could have had a traditional academic life, but Jake never wanted

that. In grad school he never looked forward to a life of writing articles; he wanted to engage, it was the 1960's and in many ways Jake is still a 1960's idealist.

Billy comes from the former soviet bloc and has been teaching in the U.S. for twenty-two years. Billy considers himself a classic theorist with a teaching philosophy directly influenced by the works of Paulo Freire. Billy makes a clear distinction between the purposes of education and schooling where schooling is education according to common assumption, but education is a vaguer term which starts at home and wherever you are you are educating yourself. Schooling implies a much more structured way in precise settings with precise purpose with methods for gauging the assimilation of knowledge. Billy teaches from a liberating standpoint and believes that the methods of critical pedagogy are now common place and the norm among academics with those practicing the banking method being the exception now.

Amanda has been teaching for twenty years in early childhood education. She has a teaching philosophy that focuses on the professionalization of her students. She describes her teaching style as the formal authority approach where the classes are instructor centered. She spent almost a decade teaching in primary school before she switched to the front lines of teacher education to have a greater effect on the future teachers of America.

Samantha is a professor in curriculum and instruction and has been for almost 27 years. Originally from the West Coast, she spent a brief period as a primary school instructor before feeling the overwhelmingly restrictive nature of the public school was too much. While Samantha considers herself an authoritarian instructor who does more modeling

than delegating, she believes that higher education gives her the freedom to allow students to develop their own models of instruction in a challenging academic environment.

Taylor is critical pedagogue teaching foundations of education for approximately sixteen years. The daughter of Mexican immigrants, Taylor struggled in the traditional southwestern public education system and later attended college on an athletic scholarship. While she did well in school, she never got over the disaffecting and isolating experiences of her youth and continued into graduate school pursuing the tools to be a better educator than those she experienced. While in the beginning of her career she initially described herself as a multiculturalist, she later came to the conclusion that multiculturalism settles for acceptance in an unfair system. She is striving for equitable treatment of all people in a system that doesn't oppress anyone. Stopping short of calling herself radical, Taylor focuses her teaching on giving students the opportunities to develop their own consciousness and recognize what they can do as future educators.

Lexi has been teaching for seven years in primary instruction and seventeen in higher education in curriculum and instruction and early childhood education. Influenced by the works of John Dewey, Lexi considers her philosophy to focus on democratic education. She describes her teaching style as a facilitator which involves activities and placing more responsibility on the students. According to Lexi, the classroom represents a microcosm of society where teachers have the opportunity to model the democratic practices that should be mirrored in the outside world. By having students take

responsibility for their own learning they become empowered and ideally take this into their classrooms and their communities.

Jennifer is a New York City native and a product of the New York City public schools, colleges and universities. While she is quick to say that by no means did she experience the oppression that so many urban school students experience, she was always aware of it coming from an academic family that was active in community organizing. Jennifer cites Paulo Freire and Jean Anyon whom she studied with among her top influences. She classifies herself as a critical pedagogue, because she engages in "liberatory" education, but explained that to her critical pedagogy is an ongoing endeavor that is a work in progress. When she began teaching she thought she had it all figured out, but it wasn't long before she felt her teaching style was always under construction. Jennifer takes the reflective aspects of critical pedagogy very seriously and attempts to put her philosophy into practice in her classroom.

Kyle originally comes from New England and has been teaching a variety of courses in higher education for the past eight years. His teaching philosophy is centered on student professionalization and describes his teaching style as a demonstrator, meaning he describes and demonstrates the steps for student mastery of a subject and then in turn creates situations for his students to demonstrate his mastery to him.

Craig is a critical pedagogue who has been teaching for almost thirty years, nearly twenty of them in higher education. Coming from working class roots Craig was taught to value and honor teachers when he was a child. However, at that time working hard in school promised a successful future. Now that promise is gone and students are having a

hard time establishing themselves and what are teachers supposed to be doing? Craig developed his teaching philosophy in the 1990's and has always liked to use the "scaffolding" metaphor of Richard Brosio. He describes developing teaching with critical pedagogy is like constructing a building. You need tools, a strong foundation, cement, and more than that you need a purpose. The difference between critical pedagogy and so many other philosophies of empowerment is that critical pedagogy has the goal of social transformation and Craig believes that critical pedagogy is about teaching students to transform their world and when they're teachers to do the same.

Richard is a critical anti-racist multiculturalist influenced by the works of bell hooks and Gloria Ladson-Billings. Richard focuses his teaching consciousness raising and cultural awareness. According to Richard there are too many teachers in diverse classrooms with no knowledge or understanding of where students come from or how to connect to them. It's too often thought of as a black-white dynamic, but it's really much more complex than that with the U.S. education system being so diverse and the growing misperception that the U.S. is post-racial it's more important now than ever before. As an academic of color Richard feels it's essential for his students to develop the critical thinking skills that will keep them from oppressing their future students.

Defining Participants Teaching Philosophy

A teaching philosophy refers to the approach, methods, style and goals that an instructor takes with them into the classroom (Brophy & Good, 1986). There are countless styles of teaching and associated philosophies and it is often difficult to gauge the effects a teaching philosophy may have on student outcomes (Brown, 2008). While

63

each participant's teaching philosophy varied throughout the interviews and although there was some overlap between them, there were three main themes (professionalization, democratic student development and critical action perspective) that allowed for the teaching philosophies to differentiate themselves from each other. This served as a basis for comparing and contrasting the statements, views and teaching practices in relation to teaching, critical pedagogy and social justice.

The gap between what educators would like to do and what they're expected to do was a significant part of their explanations on teaching philosophy, with even those participants who clearly believed in the professional preparation expressing concern over administrative overreach. The most common thread I found in the respondents teaching philosophies was the development of student's abilities through course instruction. Nine of the twenty participants reported teaching this way and in the final evaluation I categorized them as DSD's. Allison, one of the newest teachers to the professoriate, put it simply as "my students all the time, I strive to meet my students where they are, not just academically but to engage them." Michael who described himself as at the end of his academic career explained his philosophy as "Eclectic, I do have some progressive aspects, I do use the Socratic method a lot to generate discussion. But, I also use standardized tests and close reading of texts." While Michael approached his teaching with an authoritarian style, his goal in the classroom was solely for students to master theoretical and philosophical concepts. Jake, another seasoned faculty member with over fifty years of teaching experience was hesitant to claim a teaching philosophy but then described his through a story relating the power that teachers have over students:

I don't think I believed in teaching philosophies, they make me suspicious. I believe one thing and I'll tell you a story and I learned more from this encounter than I ever did from philosophies. I was an undergraduate, French major, spunky, rebellious and I had this old guy, was an expert in Flaubert and he had the highest degree and awards from France. People would say 'you have Dr. Dimmers, you know there are only two people in the US with his credentials'. When I had him he had Alzheimer's and could hardly remember a thing. You had to write a paper every two weeks and I'm reading the novel and I hadn't read a lot, the only thing I really knew was DH Lawrence and he's dark, innuendos and such, so I write this paper about I know this stuff and that stuff and when he goes to give the papers back, he doesn't hand me mine. He says I'd like to see you in my office and all my friends say 'I told you not to write that shit'. So he takes me into his office and he's an old guy and he's eating his lunch. He say's bah, bah bah and he says I'd like you to explain this paper, so I go on and say bah bah bah and he says, "I don't agree with a word you've said and I think you are totally wrong, but I'm going to give you an A on this paper because you have something very rare, you have flair" and at that point suddenly I realized that teaching is all about helping other people find their voices. If I have a teaching philosophy, then that's what it is. It's not about the teacher, it's all about the student. He could've so shot me down, but he sees the larger picture. I keep up on methods and pedagogy, but I think that's what it's all about underneath it all helping a student find their own voice and become who they are as a person.

Skepticism over defining a specific philosophy was also shared by faculty whose

philosophy focused on consciousness raising, as Sydney a native New Yorker with

national teaching experience said "I don't like putting labels on things because it gets you

stuck in a rubric and that often limits your options and an educator always wants as many

options as possible." While almost every faculty member interviewed at some point

during the interview indicated a desire for their students to be more aware of the world

around them, seven respondents focused on social consciousness or raising awareness in

their teaching philosophies. Taylor explained:

I would say it's very much a critical feminist pedagogy. I utilize a lot of consciousness raising and I'm always asking students to check their privilege. Having students able to identify their privilege and even being aware that being able to have the conversation is a privilege in itself, take for example the girls in Nigeria, the privilege of being able to go to school without violence or threats to their life. I think the traditional student is so obtuse and unaware of their own

county. I want students to understand the other, and even if you don't agree with it understanding it is the goal.

Many respondents are concerned that students are becoming increasingly isolated and insulated from the world around them. Jane, a quantitative researcher and twenty-year teaching veteran based her teaching philosophy on using social media to create a wider spectrum of awareness and understanding in the world.   This understanding could then be more easily applied to the subject matter in the course. Using social media was particularly important because the students were "less academically serious" and more focused on employment.

> At less prestigious colleges, where students are not necessarily academically serious but getting a college degree to improve their employment prospects, which are my students. They are not really going to respond to material that doesn't connect to their lives. You know they will learn it and take the tests but they won't be engaged to things that are unfolding. A good example I used a while back was the Steubenville rape case which had really been broken on social media and it became a way for students to get connect and get involved in thinking about how does a situation like that occur and what role did the culture of the school play in it? The important thing is making a connection between the world the students live in and the material.

Many of the participants in all three classifications made comments on the effects of student ability on their teaching practices. Many of the educators were facing classrooms with students of various ability levels and goals and this had a direct effect on the way faculty approached their teaching, in most cases the effect was to shift away from loftier ideals toward more basic skills.

Some of the faculty respondent's philosophies were built on a professional intent to prepare students for the work force. Five respondents responded in this manner, Peter simply described his philosophy as "I've always been much more practitioner oriented. I've always been about my students being able to get into the work force and have a

66

career." Amanda and Samantha went on to clarify their focus on professional preparation as a "tug of war" where educators often feel as if they are being challenged on what they should be teaching. As Matt, an educator who comes with a diverse background working in the business community before joining academia put it:

> Are we teaching skills or are we teaching the arts. I think folks who haven't been in classrooms in a long time who are making the policies are trying to satisfy the market by emphasizing on skills and then in a secondary fashion to satisfy teachers by focusing on content. I mean what skills do you get from reading Marx and Rousseau? I'm sorry buddy but you get no skills not in the way they use the word "skills", there's no checklist or lesson plan requirements that those are going to go on neatly.

Jo a DSD with a strong interest in social justice and raising student consciousness clarified her philosophy and explained that while professional preparation may be looming in the background, the day to day teaching takes a much more critical approach:

> There's a bit of a split in the field, one part is about getting in to the field, what are the qualifications. The other side is looking at teaching in society, what does it mean to be a teacher in society. In a democracy. To have a decentralized education system, to me that's more of a critical look versus what it means to have a job. I teach more from a perspective of what it means to society. But to do one doesn't mean you neglect the other. They overlap. It's about your approach when you create your syllabus. But I always feel like the day to day things you're going to learn when you get the job. I don't feel like that's my job, but I do feel like it's my job to teach them about the significance of education.

All the respondents' philosophies included some level of student development, with the professionalization focusing clearly on their student's future careers. DSD's and CAP's had the most overlap when it came to teaching philosophies with both consistently mentioning raising consciousness and awareness as a purpose. While at the end of the study, I concluded that seven participants held a critical action perspective (CAP), only Craig and Jennifer mentioned students taking action as a component of their teaching philosophy. It would seem that while action is a central component to critical pedagogy,

67

the majority of respondents including those I categorized as CAPs focused on conscious raising over action in their teaching philosophy.

Academic Influences

After I discussed teaching philosophies with the participants, I asked them to describe their academic influences in terms of authors, or particular works that they considered to be influential to their practices. When it came to academic influences, the participants mentioned a wide range with limited repetition or generalizability. The influences that were most commonly repeated were among the CAPs who five out of the seven named Paulo Freire and four of them named Karl Marx. Freire was also cited by two of the DSDs and Marx was cited by one of the educators for professionalization. John Dewey was the most shared influence among the DSD's and the CAP's being mentioned by three participants in each category. In some cases the link between influences and teaching philosophy was clear as Sydney who cited Conrad and Schneider, mentioned showing their students that "reality is constructed for and by us." As well as Allison citing Kozol and Anyon stating her philosophy included helping students become aware of the different functions and disparities in public schooling. In other cases where the teaching philosophy was more focused on professional development it was more difficult to see a clear link between philosophy and theoretical influence in Peter's case there was simply no clear answer given and in Matt's case the philosophy was simply preparing students to be "solid educators" and his influences were limited to "classical philosophers." Jane was most influenced by quantitative studies of

the 1990's, citing the power of numbers to illustrate what was really happening in society.

> The Quantitative may be better for students who are more practically oriented, they're more responsive to data on salary differentials, than feminist perspectives on power. Data is more effective than abstract theories. Because of the practical basis of the students. At more elite schools folks are more interested in theory, but here students need to have things proven to them.

It's very possible that influences were easier to connect to the teaching philosophies of the CAP's and DSD's because of the greater prevalence of reflective practices used by them. Those reflective practices help instructors think deeply about where their perspectives come from. As I will discuss later in the findings on reflection, the PP's were less likely to engage in reflective practices and have therefore given less thought in recent years to their philosophies and influences making it harder for them to articulate clear answers for this study.

On the Purpose of Schooling and Education

While the distinction between schooling and education was clearly articulated by almost all respondents I was surprised to learn that almost the same number of respondents felt that higher education was becoming more bureaucratic and constricting because of the increasing influence of common core and core standards. The distinction between schooling and education is a major philosophical component of critical pedagogy. Among critical scholars, schooling is normally viewed as an institution for the socialization of young people, while education is considered more of a process of learning and internalizing ideas.

When I asked Billy an educator from the former Soviet Bloc whose been teaching in the United States for the past twenty-two years to talk about schooling and education, he replied by asking me a question:

> That is a good question, is there a difference? There is and there is not, schooling is education according to common assumption, but yes education is a vaguer term and starts at home and wherever you are you are educating yourself. Schooling implies a much more structured way in precise settings with precise purpose with methods for gauging the assimilation of knowledge.

When I asked about the purpose of schooling nearly every (17 out of 20) respondent made some distinction between the purpose of schooling and education. The CAP's in most cases cited Paulo Freire or explained it their own way using concepts popularized by his work. Kimberly explained that, "The purpose of school is to get a piece of paper to get a job and to teach people very basic skills in following rules and telling people what institutions want. The purpose of education is getting people to think independently and getting people to solve problems for themselves in the real world." Many respondents were frustrated with the oppositional way in which society and educators view the purpose of schooling. Megan sought to clarify like the others, "According to me or society. For me the purpose of education is to open minds and sometimes hearts. For society, I don't think that would be the answer." She went on to explain that the interest of the academic system is on getting greater enrollment and less on what educators are teaching or students are learning. Sydney made no distinction at all and was able to answer the question with one word "opportunity." She went on to explain that: "I was a product of immigrants, my mother dropped out of school, my father abandoned us. I went to school and opportunity was easy, now I think the market has changed so that degrees aren't worth as much. Sydney clarified that education does more than provide

credentials; it also takes you from being acted upon to acting. It allows for the development of agency and that's "where we go from having reality constructed for us to by us." Schooling as the development of agency is related to the work of Anthony Giddens. Michael also made no clear distinction between education and schooling but implied the necessity for pureness of learning.

> It's just for knowledge, I tend to dislike the socialization part, the ritual, convocations and dressing up in funny suits. I tend to think of it as a place for ideas. As for purpose centered education, I understand why they came up with it, but for me education shouldn't have a purpose, it should go anywhere it wants for its own sakes. I'm a liberal arts guy in the sense that education should be free of intended applications.

Michael went on to explain that the political motivations behind educational policies were having a negative effect on students and educators.

It was agreed upon by nearly all the participants that administrative issues were becoming a larger part of their daily responsibilities and this was having an effect on their classrooms. Being a part of or being influenced by discussions on the common core or core curriculums were mentioned specifically by sixteen respondents. All of those respondents indicated that the discussions were based on the perspective of the administration rather than the perspective of the faculty. Richard, a self-described critical anti-racist multiculturalist described the focus on standards as encroaching on academic freedom, not by limiting what faculty could say, but by weighting them down in requirements. "It's insidious, you can teach what you want however you want to, as long as every class covers the same things in the same way." The sentiment that most participants expressed was that the standardization of the curriculum was happening no matter how they felt. Peter, a PP clarified that at his institution so many of the courses

were taught by adjuncts that it would eventually become necessary to outline every class session so adjuncts could "just follow the script."

Defining Critical Pedagogy

When analyzing the definitions of critical pedagogy I found similar results with the unidentified educators that Breuing did with faculty who identified themselves as critical pedagogues. I had two educators (Peter and Matt) who were unsure of how to define critical pedagogy. "Other than critical thinking I wouldn't know" and "I've never really been sure about critical pedagogy, I know it's a way of teaching, but I'm not familiar with how it's done." Both of these educators used teaching philosophies that focused on professionalization of students. While more DSD's and CAP's were more capable of forming definitions for critical pedagogy, none of them were able to hit upon all the principles and few of them articulated the relationship to action.

An interesting distinction was that the DSD educators focused on how they use critical pedagogy in their classroom in order to explain what they believed critical pedagogy meant. Most DSD's were able to hit upon principles, 1, 3 and 5 which cover consciousness and awareness but didn't connect to 2 and 4 which are more about transformative humanity and action. Allison defined critical pedagogy as "in class it's taking a close and careful look, keeping ideas about marginalized populations and abuse of power in mind all the time." She explained they try to always use an open mind in their classrooms. Jo had a similar explanation:

> I think critical pedagogy is incorporating into your class different notions of oppression. Incorporating critical stances. Instead of saying something like this

72

is, it would be what is the history or how did we get here. I think good teachers do this, but may not call it critical pedagogy.

She added that the difficulty in having unified explanations of critical pedagogy resulted in many different names for similar teaching methods. Jo relayed a story of doing graduate research looking for courses in race and education. What she found was that there were no clear correlations between any of the schools and their classes. Some had them and some did not. "What the problem was is that it was difficult to look at it from that specific standpoint, and it's the same problem with critical pedagogy." Being difficult to define may actually be the intention of critical pedagogy.

When I asked Jake how he would define critical pedagogy, he replied, "I wouldn't." While he didn't consider himself a critical pedagogue he had a very clear understanding of it and a very real critique of those who consider themselves critical pedagogues, which in many ways became the defining difference between those characterized as DSD's and CAPs in this study. Jake, explained that "critical pedagogy is supposed to be about empowerment and empowerment in the 60's was about 'black power' and that meant actually doing something." The main difference between those who this study characterized as DSD's and CAPs hinged on whether or not the participants actually provided their students with the skills and guidance to take action. Jake explained that action could and should be scary, but that doesn't matter because faculty are much more focused on their careers now than they were in the past. "Faculty are very good at writing papers, but not very good at the real world. Academia is a very self-indulgent thing, a self-focused place." Jake admitted that he wasn't as involved in

73

social action as he was in the past, but that doesn't change that in order to be truly

engaged in critical pedagogy there must be a component of action.

Some of the more confident definitions of critical pedagogy were linked to the

CAP educators who cited Freire among their influences. Sydney explained that critical

pedagogy is best explained in a metaphor comparing it to an onion.

> It sounds simplistic, it's like the blooming onion, it's just an onion, but when it's blooming you can see the multiple layers of things, but it's still connected at its core. It's looking at race, class, gender, religion, everything and it's all one experience, when it's critical it's not critiquing something it's when you're looking at the multiple layers of experience inter connected with one another.

Several participants included references to the banking method, explaining that critical

pedagogy "turns our traditional learning system on its head" (Taylor) by encouraging

students to take control of their learning and do away with the hierarchy of the teacher

student, master apprentice relationship. "By filling the students with knowledge they

become vessels" (Jennifer). Billy's definition expanded on the banking metaphor and

added that the teacher will learn from this environment as well, "when the hierarchy is

abandoned the teacher is free to learn from the student; so critical pedagogy is just

pedagogy that thinks about that two way street of communication." By doing this in the

classroom the idea is that this will break down the hierarchy in society. Craig influenced

by the work of Peter McLaren, defined critical pedagogy as "not just presenting

information but taking sides, it's about being overtly political." In a similar vein Megan

cited Marx in her definition, "a Marxist based interpretation of a class based society

where the laws are applied unfairly." She explained that the question for educators is

how do we practice in this system? "For me it's almost like when I teach, I ask the students do you know why you're here."

While some of the professionalization perspectives were unable to define critical pedagogy, three of them had very clear definitions of critical pedagogy.   Amanda linked critical pedagogy directly to Paulo Freire. "Are you talking about Paulo Freire? When I began he was really big, praxis and all that." She along with Samantha included connections to the examination of teaching itself in their definitions. Samantha explained:

> It wasn't very long ago that teaching was teaching was teaching. You were the expert; you were in front of the room. That's what I experienced in school; everyone who taught me was straight out of the 1950's. You would give your spiel and the students would absorb it and the students had to be resourceful and the students were expected to be inquisitive and go and find out because it would be embarrassing if you didn't know something. I think there was a bit of distance as well.

She went on to explain that students today seem somewhat more reluctant to find things on their own. One of the challenges of attempting critical pedagogy is that students have such access to easy answers with the internet it's more difficult to have them reflect on the meanings associated with the things they're learning.

Other statements related critical pedagogy to "opening minds", "using multiple resources to approach the subject matter", "not using textbooks." Lexi, a DSD explained that textbooks had a standardizing effect on the classroom and limits where the class can go with discussions and assignments. "I hate textbooks. But sometimes I'm forced to use them if it's a standardized course. It's about exposing them to different authors, giving them different opportunities to show what they know. I try to make assignments that let

them stretch their skills a little bit." Some of the comments related to Howard Gardner and multiple intelligences. Gardner (1991) claimed that students all learn in different ways and that attempting to teach all students in the same manner may not work in the same way for all students. By attempting to teach students in different ways Gardner (1991) suggests that students will have more opportunities to show their knowledge and ability. Sydney explained, "It's about making them uncomfortable sometimes, they don't like ambiguity. Having multiple ways of meeting objectives lets me set high standards for everybody, while giving them different opportunities to showcase what they know."

A third of the respondents included or alluded to empowerment in their definitions of critical pedagogy. "It's all about empowerment" (Taylor). "Empowerment is probably the part that's most popular today from those ideas" (Jake) and "It is meant to be empowering" (Jo). The difficulty according to Billy who teaches "The Pedagogy of the Oppressed" in his classes is being empowering without being oppressive to the students who may have dissenting opinions of the work being taught. It is about the need to liberate by and through knowledge. "It allows the student to challenge you and be part of a critical conversation." In these challenges the teacher has an important decision to make, is there going to be real critical discussions and challenges or a façade of equality where the student appears to have the same standing as the professor but really does not. These critiques of critical pedagogy in practice are brought up in Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989), "Why doesn't this Feel Empowering" where the discussion of teachers distributing power to students for the appearance of equality is discussed. In addition to the reality of challenges in critical pedagogy the instructor must be conscious of their

76

perspective on resistant students. "Looking down on student for dissenting is also oppressive" (Billy).

While most of the respondents were able to articulate some form of understanding of the meaning of critical pedagogy, only Craig, Jennifer and Taylor were able to hit upon all five principles described by Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa. While there was a clear consensus that consciousness and liberatory educational techniques were intended for social improvement, no respondents stated so in their definitions of critical pedagogy, though later on in the discussion when asked if democratic education and critical pedagogy should encourage social action most respondents did answer in the affirmative.

Defining Social Justice

One of the most difficult aspects of teaching for social justice is defining exactly what that means. Many educators take it for granted that participating in critical pedagogy is an act of social justice, but it's the assumption that leaves so many educators unclear on what injustice they're actually challenging. When I asked respondents about social justice there was near universal agreement that it was not an easy concept to define. This could be characterized as a "wicked problem" meaning a social issue that's impossible to solve for a number of reasons, but most relevant to this study, that it's characterized by incomplete and contradictory information and the necessity of large numbers of people to change their minds (Rittel, 1973; Rittel & Webber, 1973).

Before a definition can be explored, I would like to note that several respondents mentioned facing resistance to using the term "social justice" as it has become highly politicized. In my own teaching experience I have also had a knee jerk reaction from

students upon hearing social justice. My personal experience is that students believe that social justice is about redistribution and that when educators talk about social justice along with concepts like equity and equality what they hear is that someone is going to try and take their stuff away. Megan, a CAP relayed the exchange over recently updating the mission statement of their program and whether to include the term social justice or not. The dissenting voices focused on what's become the "divisive" and "radical" nature of the term and while it was agreed upon that social justice would be a "value" it was not included in the final statement.

Brooke a DSD relayed two similar stories about the resistance she has faced in using the term social justice. First after authoring a piece of writing for the state office on education and they objected to the use of the term and removed it from the publication. The second incident occurred when they had co-authored a textbook with a colleague and the publisher objected to the term social justice. "I received a call and they said we have a small problem with you using the term social justice. The publisher told me that as a firm they had agreed that the term was politically fraught and that conservatives would object to it." The authors accepted this and broadened their descriptions of the term social justice to include fairness, teaching for democracy, giving voice, sensitivity, using multiple perspectives, and standing against injustice. When I asked why this term had become so divisive Brooke explained, "I think people object because 'social justice' is viewed as leftist and at the time it was in a rather conservative area and they would have to approve it. I don't think Americans would admit to opposing democracy or fairness, but for some reason social justice strikes a chord." It's unsettling for a government office to disapprove of the term, but in today's polarized political context it's not incredibly

surprising. For a publisher to tell an author that certain words could not be used, when discussing social justice seems Orwellian. It would seem from the interview that after a career of facing these and similar challenges over social justice Brooke was somewhat worn down.

I define social justice as the pursuit of equitable human authenticity, meaning that just society would not only allow but encourage all people to live full authentic lives unencumbered by oppressive economic, social and political structures. Essentially I believe social justice is achieved when no one's will is acted upon by outside forces. While I have been working on my definition for some time, a good portion of the participants had not been prepared to discuss it; particularly those educators in the PP category who in some cases had very limited responses. Peter described it as "a relatively new as a concept" and Matt said "That's a tough one." Amanda called it "A vague concept" and Samantha said, "It's too hard to define but I'd like to think you know social justice when you see it." The PP's were not the only ones who had trouble putting their definitions into words. Michael a senior faculty member explained his *"suspicion"* of words and quibbling over definitions comparing social justice to Plato's virtue, equating social justice as the right action at the right time. There are almost as many variations on the definitions and goals of social justice as there are authors who use the term in their work (Gerwitz, 1998; Sturman 1997). Jo, a CAP shared her own experience in considering a specialization in social justice in order to bring a broader viewpoint into their work and department. Attempting to do this quickly became "problematic" as the definition and specific canon were difficult to uncover. The advantage of less defined canon allows for social justice to be more inclusive.

I think it's the difficulty of all these things, trying to figure out what goes in the canon, everyone agrees on a few things and then everyone argues over everything else. There may be some advantages to having it fuzzy, allowing for more freedom, but the disadvantage is being unable to talk about it as a group.

What was clear among respondents was that "equality" and challenging "inequality" are strongly related to faculty interpretations of social justice with two-thirds of faculty using those words in their definitions. It was made clear that social justice and equality was meant to be inclusive and for all, not just covering certain groups at certain historical moments.

Overall the CAP's most often related their definitions through inclusion and economics. Sydney, a product of immigrants herself defined social justice as "where we create equity for all groups. Not just the group at this time. You can't open one door without opening it for everyone." Three respondents explained social justice as an "awareness" of and protective stance towards the "most vulnerable" populations. Four educators defined social justice in primarily economic terms, explaining the issues of the economy having a social effect on the way in which people live. Billy described the economic injustice of our system:

Economic disparity is due to the circumstances of the system not the individual and the system does not help to break that cycle it only reinforces it. This system creates a disenfranchised group of people. If you think the individual should do something about the situation you don't understand that they can't because they are not empowered and cannot see the difference between where they are and where they need to be. Economics is the big problem, racial discrimination is part of it as well but capitalism has embedded economic discrimination into itself, but so do socialist systems. So social justice would be where everyone is assisted by the system they live in and given the tools to their escape captivity.

Craig identified economic disparity as the root of social injustice, explaining that the legal definition of justice is much more defined and clear to people. This makes social

80

justice the place for all the other inequalities to be addressed through the redistribution of

wealth and the acknowledgement of labor.

> I don't think there's any way around that (economic redistribution) if we want to
> reduce inequality…And there used to be something known as the dignity of labor
> that would be nice if we still believed in that too.   I see it as something that goes
> beyond equality of opportunity and implies equality in certain meaningful ways,
> in housing, education, environment, political representation. It has to have a little
> more teeth than what's written in the declaration of independence or constitution.
> Its socialism, essentially its democratic socialism. Politically that's what it would
> go towards.

On the other hand one Brooke was very clear that her definition did not include any

redistribution. "If you teach children about, not necessarily leveling the playing field, but

treating all people equally, they will eventually grow into a citizenry that will respect and

treat people fairly and help those who need it." Several educators' explanations included

their actual classroom practices as part of the definition. "I always emphasize working in

the community on social projects or church projects" (Kimberly).   Megan, a critical

pedagogue described her interpretation of social justice as helping each student reach

their own personal potential. She described an exercise she used with her students called

the "muletta" or luggage. Every student brings a piece of luggage into the classroom and

the instructors job is to open that luggage and see the knowledge inside that will help

students and bring that knowledge out. However, sometimes the instructor will have to

put that knowledge inside in cases where the students don't have already have it.

Educators cannot be selective everyone must be empowered.

> I have to give everyone the keys to the gatekeeper and some students don't know
> how to navigate in the academic system and some students just do because of
> their upbringing, cultural capital. A lot of kids here are not upper middleclass; so
> social justice is about giving each student those tools.

81

While teaching directly is part of it, sometimes it is what educator's model to the students or the connections that are made with the student, or just making them honor their heritage and not be ashamed. Collectively the teacher becomes the embodiment of social justice for the student.

The Relationship between Critical Pedagogy and Social Justice

Brent Edwards (2009) explains that both critical pedagogy and democratic education use similar methods to achieve the goal of social justice, which is improving the social conditions in which people are living. Many critical theorists consider critical pedagogy and social justice to be so inter-related that the terms for some have become interchangeable and without question critical pedagogy is the means to achieve social justice (Simmons, 2013; Smyth, 2011). In this study, when asked about the relationship between critical pedagogy and social justice, every respondent answered that there is definitely a relationship between the two, when asked to explain the relationship the answers were more varied. Most of the CAP answers focused on critical pedagogy as the means to achieve social justice, while the DSD's were more likely to be skeptical of critical pedagogy as direct pre-cursor to social justice. The PP's who were less familiar with the terminology primarily gave a theoretical explanation without connecting it to their classroom experience.

Craig, Jennifer and Taylor said that they use the terms critical pedagogy and social justice inter-changeably because they represent the same goals. According to Craig, "critical pedagogy is social justice; when I describe my teaching goals or my interests I use both terms, sometimes social justice is the easier one for people outside

education to understand." Jennifer explained that the very nature of engaging in the techniques of critical pedagogy is an act of liberation for the educator and the student that leaves both of them in a better state. In the way the concepts are interconnected, Taylor stated that "you can't have one without the other" but that it's not just wanting social change or trying to use critical techniques. Billy saw the relationship as one preceding the other. "An educator has to develop critical habits in order to enact social justice" and these habits must be transferred through modeling and mentorship to the students. The great challenge is that many students are unable to understand what that really means. Sydney said, "We can show students that injustice exists, but for them to understand how that injustice came to be is the hardest part." Many respondents shared their opinion that students today are more sheltered and isolated than in years past, and they increasingly associate injustice with the "poor decisions" of other people and feel the responsibility for social justice lies with those who are suffering.

In their explanations, the educator's categorized as DSD's made it clear that there is no direct cause and effect relationship that can be observed. Kimberly clarified that, "Critical pedagogy could lead to social justice, or it could lead to oppression; we hope that it's building towards justice, but there are so many factors that go into each situation and we don't know what the effect will be or when the effect will happen." Critical pedagogical techniques may evoke a delayed response in students, where the awakening doesn't take place in the classroom, but may happen at any point in time after the critical interaction. Michael explained that the relationship between the two concepts may only exist in the sphere of educational study. "I think in education, there is a relationship, but that doesn't mean that critical pedagogy has a relationship to social justice in all aspects."

Injustice takes many forms and rectifying injustice may take just as many if not more forms to make a positive change. Many educators believe that critical pedagogy is an effective way to pursue social justice, but there may be other areas where the relationship between the two does not exist.

On Empowerment

Empowerment is a major component of critical pedagogy and a heavily debated one as well. In particular the idea that educators should be calling for political action and encouraging students in class may lead to confusion and rather than empower, actually oppress the students by imposing political views on them when the students have not had the opportunity to decide for themselves what is just. Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989) brought to light the critique that the goals of critical pedagogy are political but often unspoken and the power in empowerment is loaned out by the faculty. Empowerment was one area of this study where the three groups really overlapped. It seems that all three groups wanted their students to have greater control over their lives and their futures. The CAP's and DSD's were most similar with the PP's making minor variations in theme based empowering students towards the workforce.

When discussing empowerment, most educators focused on providing the skills and ability to see the world around them critically. Allison a young faculty member and DSD, described empowerment as "being aware of what's going on around you and thinking critically about the world and seeing the world for what it really is and not as the world is presented to you." Sydney a CAP, explained that empowerment is related not just to awareness but to the credentials gained through the development of knowledge.

84

> Knowledge is empowerment. A degree is important because it's imbued with knowledge. If I'm just teaching you skills what I am doing just creating another proletariat another person ready to serve. You're empowered because you can't be bullshitted, well you can always be bullshitted. But it would be harder. Once you have these ideas and see these things in action you will remember and the seed is planted to search out more information and will be harder to take advantage of you. It gives meaning beyond the utilitarian concerns.

The theme of student efficacy was continued by five educators (both CAPs and DSD's) who made it clear that empowerment is not something that can be given, but rather it's something students most develop themselves with the assistance of educators. Jane described the process below:

> There's a lot of talk about power and it's very important. There are different types of power, and power over people is something we as educators have to be especially aware of. It's presumptuous to think you have power to give people, but as a teacher you do have power over people and it would be disingenuous to think you don't, but it's power that you can use to let people use power themselves, essentially to empower themselves in the situations you help create.

Ironically Taylor's explanation included the analogy that empowerment is like an investment, recalling the Freire's banking concept of education. But rather than investing specific knowledge in the students, with empowerment you're investing your time and assistance to develop skills in students that will pay off when they "have the knowledge and resources and ability to make change in their own lives."

Some responses varied on the theme of empowerment by not defining it but placing it in their practices. Craig a CAP, described his teaching as, "You teach towards social justice then empowerment is the vehicle. If at the core of your pedagogy is social justice, you only have one thing to do and that is empower your population." Another very honest response came from Peter a tenured PP, who explained that that he really tries to empower students, but he chooses where and when to really focus those efforts.

"Do I empower them? I really try to, particularly my seniors. I want them to make good life decisions and know how to do that…" In some cases because of the demands of the courses and the ability of the students, empowerment is not a realistic option. "… My freshman not so much, I really lecture with them a lot and hope that giving them a strong base will give them a background for when they become more critical." Kimberly would not put empowerment into a definition but rather described it as a series of words: "freedom", "agency", "ownership."

There were four respondents who in the course of discussing empowerment expressed concerns that students were becoming "too empowered" in the sense that their entitlement and confidence might be growing past their critical skills. Matt's goal was for them to be empowered in the workforce and have the ability to advance in their careers. He went to explain that "there's a lot of pop discussion of students today, not academic, that these students are too empowered. This is the overconfident generation." There's less of a need today to make students aware of their rights particularly as students. An example was given by Craig who had an incident with students attempting to override classroom decisions by going to the department chairpersons and deans. While it doesn't happen often, students threatening and seeking to challenge classroom instructors may be a result of what he called "customer service education." This idea of educational institutions "re-branding" themselves with business models (Margolis, 2013) to service students as "customers who are always right." Peter a tenured PP explained that he hadn't really considered empowerment for the first part of his career, but gave it more focus because of changes in his personal life.

I think the epiphany for me, because I come from the old school where we just lecture and students listen, but for me when my daughters started to become older and I wanted them to make adult decisions and growing up in an academic family they know dad doesn't have all the answers. It's interesting to observe them, because they respect you for your knowledge but they know you don't know everything, so you don't always have to listen to the person in the front. I think all our children are changing that way by becoming more empowered.

Peter started focusing more on creating assignments and a classroom structure that led to student consciousness and empowerment but emphasized that the confidence and empowerment we are seeing may be an illusion as they may seem more knowledgeable but are lacking the critical skills to make sense of the world and their place in it. The growing influence of social media has made it more difficult for educators to straddle the line between activist and educator in the classroom. Those educators sticking to the development of critical skills in the classroom as Liston and Zeichner (1987) suggest leaving their students at the mercy of oppressive social forces with considerably more influence in the age of social media.

Reflection: As an Educator and in the Classroom

Reflection is one of the most important aspects of critical pedagogy as it's the basis for educators to evaluate both their perspectives and their teaching practices. It allows for change, improvement and action and evaluation. Without reflection it's not possible for faculty to gauge what's happening in their classrooms. The problem is that reflection is almost taken for granted in respect that those who encourage it assume it is going to be done correctly and with the ideals of social justice in mind (Grant & Agosto, 2008; Morrell, 2003). I found that participants engaging in reflective practice without a

philosophical framework in social justice may not be benefiting from the practice. Megan echoed Ellsworth's (1989) concerns:

> Reflection always feels like a vague term. I ask them questions and I have reflective paper assignments and my goal is for them to give their opinions and develop their own arguments on a position, but the paper is still an assignment I've given and it's written for me to read, even if I don't read it, I still control the parameters of the assignment, so I don't know how empowering reflection is for students.

There is a certain disconnect in assigning reflection to students that speaks to the critiques of critical pedagogy as oppressive to certain groups, particularly when you consider the idea of faculty reading and judging reflections that should be for students own personal development. It's unlikely that these assignments would empower unless there was some level of anonymity.

The biggest surprise I found when discussing reflection was that most of the respondents thought of reflection as something for their students to do rather than for them to engage in. In the cases where faculty were reflexive it was much more of a general reflection on classroom assignments less focused on refining their perspectives. Nearly half of my respondents (all of the PP's and four of the DSD's) did not engage in any personal critical reflection based on their teaching practices. Those respondents with teaching philosophies based on professionalization had the least experience not just with personal reflection but with their assignments for their students.

Matt offered an explanation, "I try to reflect on stuff and I try to encourage my students to think a little deeper." When asked if there were any particular ways or methods in which this reflection was guided he replied, "Not really." Kyle used reflective methods as a way to gauge the student's feelings towards the class and

assignments. "I ask students to give me reflections based on our assignments or what we're doing. I ask them to list what's most important to them to be learning, what they are most interested in." Several DSD faculty limited their reflection to student feedback using described reflective assignments as a way for students to relate the material to themselves. By asking reflective questions about readings students come to understand assignments as more than just notes and according to Lexi, "are able to evaluate and come to their own understandings of what it means and what is true to them." In most of these cases the reflective assignments show a clear goal of students developing their own interpretation of the material and their experience. Brooke described a loosely reflective assignment:

> There are assignments, maybe this is an example, if they do classroom observations, they write up their experience, it's like a journal but it's not ongoing, it's more about comparing experiences. Where they tell me what they think, like a personal account, it's not right or wrong, but going through the exercise to get a greater understanding of what's happening.

On the other hand, the reflective assignments show a goal of students developing the skills to interpret and judge material on their own. Jane described how she has students reflect:

> Anytime I use a film, or a narrative, or a personal reading. I have a pattern I use, I say first you have to describe the phenomenon, tell me everything that is happening so I understand the situation. Then I ask them to give me numbers, because often people will speak from myth or opinion. I ask them to find the numbers or data, give me research, so that I know you've found something more than just anecdotal stories. Then I say "do you have an explanation?" Then I say "can you give me a judgment?" This is where they reflect on their own morality and articulate where they come from and how they see the world, but now it's based on research...hopefully, I have had students write up reactions with facts and figures and then ignore them in the judgment.

89

These responses may meet the criteria for students to know themselves as Parker (2007) recommends, but they would not meet the call for deep critical reflection guided by the goal for social transformation (Grant, 2012) or the need for educators to use reflection to counter the increasingly oppressive politicized climate of schools (McLaren, 1999).

The faculty members who did participate in personal critical reflection were primarily CAPS who had also built in reflection based assignments for their students. Some based the assignments on the more practical, assigning students to write reflections on their own work in order to be able to better self-evaluate their own practices. Jo explained that "Teachers need to be highly reflective on their own work. And it's practical because I've seen teachers teach a lesson and they thinks it's fabulous, but it's not. So I've seen a total disconnect."

When the respondents discussed their own participation in critical reflection there answers varied between professional reflection based on their classroom practice and deep critical reflection more in line with what Grant (2012) was looking for. Jane explained how she were "constantly" altering assignments to see which is more effective or how students react. But they made clear that "effectiveness" is very hard to ascertain:

> I don't do any quantitative analysis on my assignments, but I am always reassessing what I'm doing and what assignments I'm giving, if it doesn't seem like its working then I will change it, and change it again. Then other times I think it's great, but if students don't like it then I will get rid of it or change it. I don't do it formally, but you can feel it and students will say things. Sometimes its hard work, but other times it's just not working as an assignment.

A unique example of critical reflection guided by a purpose for social transformation was offered by Sydney who is very familiar with the goals of critical pedagogy. She explained that her personal reflection was often part of the classroom itself. By using

personal stories and developing an authentic dialogue she developed relationships with

her students that encouraged both her students and herself to share and reflect as group

(Freire, 1985, 1993, 1994, 1998; Shor, 1980, 1992).

> I use a lot of personal stories. A lot. Students remember stories and connect to
> them. I think if you want to truly reflect on your practice you can think about it or
> write about and try to see what's happening and decide if you're encouraging
> transformation, but I like to actually reflect with my students. I like to tell
> personal stories from the classroom, sometimes historically and sometimes at the
> moment when it's happening. I think young teachers need to see the process and
> participate in it. They relate and connect to personal stories on a level that regular
> classroom discussion just cannot achieve. At urban colleges the deep reflection of
> experiences is important to them and I've learned a tremendous amount from their
> stories as well. The use of stories creates a greater connection most of the time.
> But very often student stories will counter what we would consider social justice
> based on what they've seen and lived through, and that's one of the challenges of
> dialogue.

Kimberly also shared her reflection process with their students, but has taken their

personal reflection into the digital age by sharing their reflections with the internet.

"Sometimes I write, I often tweet, part of that is a little showing off." She described

sharing her successes and failures through social media, which their students have access

too. "It's exciting when a student responds to something you've posted." Though

admittedly students don't respond as much as she'd like. Kimberly also created a blog on

effective and ineffective lesson plans. "I do it by running through the narrative of a class,

through problems which could be behavioral, lack of interest, etc. I'm constantly

thinking why did this happen, how can I make this not happen again, or happen again."

Actual reflection should be challenging and several educators described it as an

emotional process. Allison shared:

> Of course, I wear my emotions on my sleeve, I go home and think about what I
> did what I said. You know students hang on our every word. You know Paulo

91

Freire said it very well, just dismissing a student with a look can be the most dehumanizing experience. I think to myself all the time, late at night, weekends, you know "what did I do?" Probably more than I need to and sometimes I need to say it's fine it's okay, and it's exhausting and it wears you down and I think that's who we are and who we should be. How do I do it, I don't do it by reading the student evaluations, I don't think that helps me.

While reflection can become overwhelming when guided by the principle that it's not just to simply improve your practice but to lead to social improvement, it's important to note that engaging in critical pedagogy is an ongoing pursuit. Craig explained that, "Students get intimidated by the idea of critical reflection when we talk about it transforming them, but I try to explain that that is a goal we hope to achieve by engaging in the process." I personally find that reflection is most effective when the purpose is explained and students are given the anonymity to reflect honestly. By emphasizing the importance of the process, I have students create their own reflection journals that belong to them, but I ask that they produce position statements every few weeks to share with the class that detail their philosophy and goals.

Authentic Dialogue

Any discussion of social justice must pay attention to dialogue which should embody the development of consciousness and empowerment. If we are engaging in critical pedagogy we must be able to share honest open dialogue with our students. To do this educators must be able to situate themselves in the roles of oppressor and oppressed. There are two problems with dialogue. One is that individuals often believe that engaging in critical pedagogy involves as little as asking questions and allowing participation from students. The second more sinister problem with dialogue is it isn't as empowering for those who have experienced oppression and marginalization (Burbules,

92

2000). Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989) claimed that while dialogue should allow for equal interaction between teacher and student there is nothing in the methods of critical pedagogy that places students and teachers on the same level.

Despite the potential problems with dialogue all the participants in this study said that they engaged in some form of dialogue with their students. The majority of respondents in this study seemed to have a clearer understanding that the purpose of critical dialogue is more than question and answer. Still, four of them, including those who focused their philosophies on professionalization, explained it as a basic asking and answering of questions where students can interact and engage more if they want to, but it's not necessarily encouraged. Matt explained that sometimes there is a delicate balance that has to be maintained. "I like when students ask questions and when we can have discussions as a group, but in general it's my show and I have information that has to be delivered. Open discussions can end up taking too long and going nowhere." Samantha explained that dialogue was about giving opportunities to ask questions and allow for different perspectives to be viewed, but they were concerned with discussions becoming hostile or "turning student off" to the class.

Twelve respondents who engaged in more critical dialogue, that is dialogue guided by with the goals of critical pedagogy, expressed concerns about creating safe spaces for dialogue to occur. Billy explained that,

> It's very easy to have a dialogue, you say something and someone responds, that's dialogue, but what we want to happen is transformation. We want enlightenment in our dialogue, but for that to happen everyone has to feel safe.

Several respondents encouraged critical dialogue through modeling proper behavior.

Sydney said:

> I think I'm particularly good at this because I have a laid back style, I don't have a million notes. I encourage folks to have different opinions and think about what other folks' perspectives are. I'll take on the others voice if it's not present to try to make discussions more interesting.

This works well for many instructors, but normally comes from confidence and years of experience.

The way participants created safe spaces in their classrooms varied somewhat, but five (representing both DSD's and CAP's) had very clear rules for discussion established at the beginning of the semester. Brooke explained, "I put it in writing that there's a commitment in this classroom to respect what everyone says, and its' everyone's responsibility to make sure everyone is respected." Sydney made the rules of discussion with the students at the beginning of class so that everyone had a part in designing how discussions would take place. "By using the students input to set the parameters for discussion they feel like they've had a part in its creation and that gives them ownership and a reason to see that our discussions function well." When the rules are done they are placed on the class webpage as a reminder to all. Positive reinforcement was also mentioned as an important part of facilitating dialogue. By acknowledging what is productive in student comments it helps offset the possible dangers of the open forum. Allison shared that, "Students may groan or eye roll and people from different generations tend to elaborate their thought process and younger students aren't used to it, so I do a lot of summarizing and pulling out the important parts." The development of

safe spaces allows for students to be vulnerable and it's important for instructors to insure

that the dialogue doesn't end up harming students. Kimberly shared:

> By setting up ground rules in the beginning of class. Whatever is said in class, stays in class. Nothing said in class should ever be used against other students and I clearly tell students if I or anyone shares personal things that, that is not required, but if you want to share that stays in class. And when a student does share something very personal I thank them for sharing that. I think everyone has a story and every story may be a little bit different, but everyone wants to be heard and when they're heard we're creating this connection. And I make it clear and if it's going awry you shut it down immediately.

But how do instructors know when something is "going awry" or when the dialogue is no

longer empowering but becoming oppressive? The instructors all seemed to have

different thresholds. "I have really one rule and that's refrain from using words that

makes folks uncomfortable" (Brooke). I'm not sure how Brooke is able to gauge what

language is acceptable or not to all students. She explained that the goal of dialogue to

voice differing opinions, but that it has to be done in a way that doesn't directly hurt

another student. On the other end of the spectrum, Jane (DSD) felt that dialogue is meant

to be open and unhindered:

> I don't believe in trigger warnings or things like that, I think it's absurd. Things are going to make people uncomfortable and they should be prepared for that. I don't really feel that students would attack other students or put other students down, but I like to see student's go back and forth and take on issues, and I will take on unpopular stances to strengthen discussion. I don't like the idea that students have to be treated like precious little hot house flowers. I think coddling students won't prepare them for the real world.

It was expressed by several respondents that teaching in the northeast allowed for more

open discussions than would be possible in other regions of the country. Billy said, "My

experience in teaching in NY is that people have a greater tendency to say what they want

than outside of NY." While several respondents made note that students are much more

95

"open minded" than in the past generations, discussions were still plagued with hate speech. Sydney shared, "When I began teaching it was all about race, now that's not so popular, unless it's veiled, but there's still plenty of harmful things rearing their heads in class." Homophobia, Islamophobia and misogyny were the three issues that ruined many previously successful classroom discussions.

> Homophobia is rampant; it's much more socially acceptable to say homophobic comments than racist comments. Anti-Islamic, there's a lot as well. There's an entrenchment with the students who were here during 9/11 and they have to be reminded that Islamophobia is the same as saying a racial slur.

While these dialogues may seem detrimental to student well being, there is the catharsis that comes out of these challenges. She shared, "I have had a number of students come out in my classes, primarily women, and it's empowering to claim your identity in front of the group and to stand up to negative comments." It was clear that Sydney never intended for the dialogue to produce those results out of negativity, but that is the reason why dialogue must be allowed to continue. Brooke agreed that it's almost always better for dialogue to continue than to be stopped. "Normally I or someone else will ask a question in a way that keeps the conversation going, rather than shutting down the conversation." Dialogue can't be silenced because we don't like where it's going, if we're going to engage in critical discussions for the purpose of empowerment we have to be prepared for where they may go and how to deal with it. Megan offered another way to diffuse tense class discussions. "Humor is great for breaking things down. Through the years I've developed a lot of very funny examples to dispel racism, sexism and homophobia. Sometimes when things get to heavy we have to lighten them up."

Kimberly explained that hate speech is an opportunity to show what academia is capable of.

> Sometimes racist, prejudicial comments are much harder to deal with, but ignoring it is not a solution. I do a lot of breaking things down to simple language and if it's appropriate I try to get people to have a conversation on what those prejudicial ideas are based on. If it's not appropriate or takes us off topic sometimes I invoke an analogy to get them to think about the comment they made. If that's not appropriate I try to invoke an experiment, study. An example, I had a student who said all people who wear pink shirts are gay and I have friends who are gay and they wear pink shirts. I swear that is exactly what came out of their mouth. And that's an opportunity to talk about methodology, or logic. But it's important to acknowledge it, because there are lot of inappropriate comments, particularly with Muslim Americans. Just not acceptable comments. Analogies and correcting misinformation. Prejudice is an idea or belief and discrimination being an action and a student said it's like mind to heart to hand.

While I agree that continuing dialogue in the face of oppression is essential to empowerment and critical pedagogy I am often concerned with the way in which certain language may affect the students in the room. Not those engaged in the discussion, but those on the sidelines whose right to existence may be challenged by the speech of an insensitive discussion. I was very surprised that more respondents weren't concerned with maintaining safe spaces while having authentic dialogue with students.

Resistance

It is agreed that critical pedagogy is intended to challenge traditional beliefs held by teachers. While it is the goal that critical pedagogy will inspire resistance against inequality, in teacher education programs it is not uncommon for educators to face resistance from their students in situations where issues of power and privilege are discussed (Bonilla-Silva, 2000). The most surprising discovery in this section was the

97

implications of violence towards female faculty engaging in critical pedagogy while male faculty faced no resistance of that nature.

More than half of the female respondents attributed the resistance they faced partially to sexism. "The resistance may not be to the message but to the messenger." Sydney described a situation early in her career teaching at southern universities where she received threatening and harassing voicemails. "That's partially a cultural thing" and to deal with it adjustments both to her demeanor and to the presentation of material were able to change students attitudes towards her teaching. Brooke casually described resistance in class as minimal, but acknowledged that "I have gotten a little resistance from male older students that borders on violence." Interestingly, almost half of the female respondents who mentioned sexism in their responses described the levels of resistance as generally rare. Allison explained, "Resistance, not so much, but when I have, it has normally been an older male student, so I see the sexism." Jennifer attributed resistance to her age. "Yes, I get resistance over everything, assignments, why they have to study. I think in the beginning I got a lot of resistance that older professors don't get." The female respondents were also more likely to mention their teacher evaluations in response to resistance. Jo shared her experience, "Yeah, definitely, in my evaluations folks will say I'm too opinionated or if you don't agree with her you'll hate this class." The male respondents made no mention of their teacher evaluations at any point in the interviews.

Unsurprisingly the male faculty made no mention of gender in their comments on resistance and none mentioned any type of harassment or intimidation. Billy said, "I've

never had disciplinary problems, never anything that was disturbing." Male practitioners seemed less concerned with student resistance than their female counterparts. Michael shared, "Sometimes they'll go off and it's very hard to bring them back. But I prefer that to a classroom with them just sitting there vapidly. I want them to make it their own." Matt mentioned the difficulty of dealing with student athletes, "sometimes I get like five athletes in a class and some of these folks do not have college level skills and they were resistant and I could not reach them because the basic skills were not there." There was less concern with reaching resistant students among the male faculty with one equating catering to resistant students with paternalism. Peter a PP explained, "I try to minimalize my paternal aspects. Some folks are into the paternal aspects, why didn't you do the homework? I can't do that, if I want to make sure the reading is done I give quizzes. I give quizzes and the amount of students doing the reading goes up." Kyle explained that resistance is an expected part of teaching, and that there really wasn't much that could be done about it because in the end it's about "identification":

> I relate it to Kenneth Burke and identification. There are things that can't be compacted in a neat little package. I think if students can identify with you then you get more patience and then more communication. I called it theatrics before, but I think I should call it identification. I wish I knew more about pedagogy. Teaching is personality driven and it's messy. When someone is a bureaucrat or boxy, how does that work in teaching. At a certain point there is no more explaining. There is a warmth that must come across; there is a "you" that must come across. In teaching since so much of it is presentation that must be a big part of it.

The challenge with "identification" is that it is not something that can easily be taught, but depends heavily on the demographics of the instructor and the students. Kyle continued to explain his perspective on students and future teachers:

99

How do you tell teachers in k-12 they have to identify more with their students? It's the same as any mentors, the best ones are going to be the one who will have a beer and share with you and empathize with the stress and expectations you put on yourself. Obviously, that's going to be different for k-12, but it's the same principle. How do you tell someone that's your job? If they want to go home at 5:00pm that's their right. But at the end of the day it's a relationship skill.

It would seem that in some cases the solution to resistance is the development of closer relationships between faculty and students. Identification would be easier for students if teachers adopted a mentor approach to them where there would be greater levels of collaboration.

Race was left relatively unmentioned in the discussion. Brooke, whose teaching demographic tended to be more working class explained that they don't get much resistance towards race because of their teaching location. "Not really, when you talk about poverty with people who live in poverty and they get it. You talk about marginalization with people who come and tell you after class that they're undocumented. People get excited, people know more than I do." Taylor explained that when you're working in city colleges, "a lot of students are here to help, they lived a lot of it." A different explanation of the lack of resistance on race is because of the push for politically correct speech.

In this study I found that all but one teacher faced some forms of resistance in their classroom. Amanda a PP, with almost two decades of experience, never noticed any resistance. "Do I ever have an experience we're resistance makes it difficult to teach, not yet, but I know it happens and I know it will happen." Most respondents made it clear that there was no definite way to know what reaction a topic or theory would provoke. Megan shared, "It's always the last place you expect. You think this is going to be a

100

rough subject to teach and everyone's fine and there are subjects when you can't imagine having resistance and then it blows up at the end."

The most common resistance discussed was not critical, but based in students lack of desire to do work. Discerning critical student resistance, resistance based in false consciousness and resistance to work was a concern for the CAP faculty who felt it was important to distinguish between the two forms of resistance. Megan said, "It depends on what is genuine resistance. There's genuine resistance and then there's inertia. Resistant to doing work yes. More often than not, especially in first year students. I have encountered that a lot." In those cases the instructors more often than not explained assignments but made no adjustments. "In terms of resistance to ideas, or the way I am framing things, they may be resistant to that frame." In those cases it's important to allow for dialogue and discussion to allow for the resistance to be "channeled" into something positive.

Jennifer explained that students hate the ambiguity of critical pedagogy and problem posing teaching. "They want everything in a box with a little ribbon on it and I tell them in the end if you have more questions than answers when you've finished then we've done a good job." This type of student reaction was the norm, but this educator considered the lack of critical resistance to be based on their ignorance of their right to resist. While it is clear students want to resist by their body language or by the questions they ask, students are unable to put those feelings into action.

> I don't know if these students know how to enact that or know what that means. I don't think they know how or what it is. I don't think they've ever been given an academic environment where it's safe to resist. It's not their fault that they don't

101

know how, I think they've inherited this K-12 environment that everything they've ever been taught is how to please the teacher. And if you fit into that color between the lines then you're good. Even in college in a lot of cases I think if you give the teacher exactly what they want then they get good grades.

This socialization to "please" the teacher is representative of Freire's banking metaphor and it comes with a price. "I have students that I'm not impressed with and I think how did you get a scholarship? I read their work it's not that good, but if you know how to check off the boxes to give the teacher what they want that's what matters now." Students are unable to critically think or perform in any type resistant way. This was consistent with several other responses that explained that "students are not curious" and that students "aren't interested in engaging" in the classroom or outside in anything that doesn't fit into the standard curriculum. Jake expressed his frustration with student apathy, "Certain things they don't want to talk about. It's hard to get them to do things. I talk about union rights and they feel positively about it, but you say would you attend a demonstration, and no one wants to go." Michael, attributed their lack of critical resistance to an obsession with grades:

> I think a lot of students are just not curious. Almost as if they're intimidated by the system. Students like to make statements, they're afraid of asking questions. They're obsessed with fairness and anything that seems preferential. They're obsessed with grades almost to the detriment of everything else.

Craig attributed this resistance to critical thinking to the "commodification of schooling." The idea that the production of schooling is driven by accumulation, but rather than the accumulation of knowledge or even wealth, it's driven by the accumulation of grades which (falsely) become the embodiment of education (Willis, 2009).

Several respondents saw resistance as an opportunity to expand their students understanding of the subject matter. Resistance was said to be inspired by a variety of

topics with several noting religious topics such as evolution, creation and varied practices of faith. Michael shared, "In education it's particularly important because there are all sorts of issues with homosexuality, contraception, cloning, and all the stuff in the technological future which worries them." Perhaps fueled by religious beliefs other respondents noted an increase in resistance to academia and science in general. "Our students have some sort of paranoia about science and the establishment." Jane explained that some students don't trust any of the numbers or results that don't fit within their belief framework and instead have "tunnel vision" that allows them to see only what supports their beliefs. Kimberly, uses to benefit the classroom and if done properly gauge how well the students are understanding empowerment.

> I think resistance is a great indicator that the students have understood and embodied the concept of purpose centered education. I get a lot of what does this have to do with my CA, or the class or my career or my life. So now my reaction is to get excited about the course material and the assignment and tell them the rationale for the work. And if your lesson plans are good they will understand why they have to do this. So I see resistance as way to better explain things.

Matt a PP, had faced some resistance when teaching Marx and decided to alter the assignment from a lecture to a class debate. This allowed the students to put their ideas and critiques into a productive format. "I broke them into groups and asked them write an introductory statement to a presentation. I told them I don't care if you hate or love Marxism, but I want you to back up whatever you say." The instructor then let them debate in an organized fashion. "Sometimes when you let students voice their resistance it puts the emphasis on them to think about their position while you (the instructor) don't have to take on an adversarial stance."

Sexuality and gender were the top issues cited to cause resistance in students. According to Jo, "Whenever you apply a theory you can expect some resistance, but when you speak about sexuality, forget about it, the classroom can just explode sometimes." Lexi, described a lesson plan on gender fluidity designed to expose future teachers to the possible diversity they may face in their future classrooms.

> I showed a documentary, it dealt with transgender and that was the biggest push back ever. It seems like violating gender norms in anyway really upsets students. You can talk about gay marriage or homosexuality and that's okay but as long as you don't violate gender norms, but if you touch on that in any way students get very upset. The feminism isn't even as bad because the consensus is no one wants to be a feminist so it never even gets to discussion. I had students walk out of the documentary.

It would seem from the interviews that the major issues in student resistance today focus on sexism, sexuality, and Islamophobia. Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg (2006) discussed "the traditional Western tendency to promote its own moral, political, and cultural superiority whenever it has to deal with Muslim societies" (p.35). This led to great difficulties in the critical classroom, particularly those in New York City. Kincheloe and Steinberg (2006) recommend combating this resistance with a discussion of "anti-imperialism" and a "literacy of power" where students and teachers can understand the historical, economic and political implications of the past conflicts with the Middle East. While there are suggestions for dealing with the more traditional forms of oppression (McLaren, 1997, Kanpol & McLaren, 1995) and recommendations for gauging oppressive critical pedagogy (Ellsworth, 1997; 1989) there is little literature dealing with the sometimes violent and intimidating resistance faced by women teaching critical pedagogy.

Praxis: The Relationship between Theory and Action

Critical pedagogy provides us with a way in which students and people can empower themselves and transform the world through education. Most scholars consider there to be four main parts to critical pedagogy: dialogue, critique, counter hegemony and praxis (Braa & Callero, 2006). It is the last part, praxis that is often the most problematic to study. According to Braa and Callero (2006) praxis is not just about action in the sense of community service or internships, rather is must be guided by a goal of change, merely "advancing individual learning objectives" (p.359) is not enough. Praxis is "the action and reflection of men and women upon their world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1970, p.79). It is only through this conscious evaluation of one's self and the world that an individual can truly gain knowledge. I've always felt that you can "learn anything", but to really "know something" it has to be internalized. Educators are being called upon by critical pedagogy to completely alter the traditional views of teaching, in every manner, and to adopt a humanizing method, which will value all interactions.

There is more to praxis than merely evaluating yourself and your beliefs, it's necessary to reflect on aspects of your life and especially everything that's a part of teaching. "Politics also resides in the discourse of the classroom, in the way teachers and students talk to each other, in the questions and statements from the teachers about the themes being studied, in the freedom students feel when questioning the curriculum, in the silences typically surrounding unorthodox questions and issues in traditional classrooms" (McLaren, 1993, p.27). Everything is political, there are no actions free from influence, and it's essential that teachers recognize this when they engage a

classroom. The concept of "conscientizmo", or "learning to perceive socioeconomic and political contradictions and injustices that can be acted upon in order to better our life conditions" (Brosio, 2000, p.206), is directly related to the reflective elements in praxis. "If humankind produce social reality (which in the inversion of praxis turns back upon them and conditions them), then transforming that reality is a historical task, a task for humanity." (Freire, 1970, p.51) The other part of praxis is turning that reflection and theory into transformative action.

When I asked the participants if there was a relationship between theory and action the respondents followed the pattern that developed based on their teaching philosophy categorization. The CAP's expressed the definitive need for theory to culminate in action, while the DSD's recognized the value in theory culminating in action, they didn't find it necessary. The PP's recognized the academic relationship between theory and action, but did not incorporate into their classrooms. While most everyone explained that there "should" be a relationship between theory and action, it was not always possible or appropriate to do so based on their teaching philosophies.

Most PP respondents had very simple responses and expressed that praxis wasn't a necessary part of their teaching and looked at the concept in a more academic sense. Amanda explained that she thinks there should be a relationship because "you have to understand data can only get you so far. I don't think it really applies to my teaching, but I think you have to have theory to apply data." Matt answered very honestly that he didn't consider the relationship between theory and action very often. "Sure, why not. Have I thought deeply about that? No. Do I think theory is worth studying? Yes. Should

it result in action? Yes. Are people who study theory more likely to take action?

Probably." The PP's recognized that understanding and approaching theory is very

important but didn't make a real connection to action in their responses. Interestingly

they recognized praxis more as a theoretical concept than as an actionable practice.

Several of the DSD respondents took the approach that action based praxis was

not necessarily the right thing for their classrooms or education. Michael who had

previously stated that he believed the purpose of schooling to be solely for the

development of knowledge felt that the mixing of theory and action changed them.

> There doesn't have to be (a relationship between theory and action) because you
> could be purely ivory tower which is great. Both theory and action if you try to
> combine them change. The theory must be grounded in practicality and the action
> must be informed by theory. We try, we really try to that, but again its purpose
> centered, if you think education is for something then theory and action make
> sense. I recently read Gramsci prison notebooks where he talks about education
> and its purpose centered but has a place for speculation. The problem with the
> empirical approach is that there is always a theory behind it.

Another explanation for ignoring praxis is that the role of the educator is to build a

foundation that will allow others to take action in the future. Jane stated that "I

understand the position that if it's really not about action what are you doing. I get that,

but I think that right now and my opinion could change, but I feel like theory for theory's

sake is completely appropriate." Jane's ivory tower approach was common among the

DSD's who were clear on the meaning and intention of praxis but did not use it in their

professional capacity. Allison recognized the difficulty of actually acting on our

reflective observations. She made it very clear that it is not always functional to

incorporate critical pedagogy into the classroom.

I think there's a big distance between theory and action. Lots of things are fine in theory but not in action. There are some fine points of critical pedagogy, I would love to let my students choose what they should learn or ask what they'd like to learn and that sounds great in theory. But the truth is young people tend to take the thing that they already know or are interested in and to make informed citizenry they need to learn about other things, even the hierarchy we want them to change. And the reality is we need to train them for this neo liberal workforce and how to thrive in it. And that makes me part of the problem and it's something I struggle with. How do you teach to question authority and work within it?

These very concerns are discussed by Giroux (1988) and Barry Kanpol (1998) when considering the challenge to be a transformative agent in an institution designed to maintain the status quo. While they would claim the fine line that educators must walk should bend towards liberation that is often easier said than done in teacher education classroom.

Despite the honest and dissenting opinions on the role of praxis for teacher educators, there were still over a third of respondents who felt that there should be a clear relationship and representation of praxis in their classrooms. Billy explained it clearly that praxis is "the implementation of theory which is your action, then your evaluate or reflect on that action which continues to keep you conscious, you develop new theory and do it again, until you achieve the change you want." The most interesting answer came from Craig, a CAP senior tenured professor who explained that theory and action are intimately connected. "This is going to sound very risqué, but I once heard it said that theory without action is like sex without an orgasm, without the two together there is no point."

Should Faculty Teaching Encourage Students to Take Action?

When speaking of critical pedagogy and social justice, it's been established in this study that a major component is action. While effective teachers can have a variety of strategies and goals in the classroom if transformation is not among them then they're not meeting the criteria for practicing critical pedagogy. I asked the participants if they believed that education classes and their teaching should encourage students to take action. I didn't define action in the initial question in order to allow the participants the opportunity to decide what action meant to them. Nearly every one responded in the affirmative declaring that education courses and faculty should encourage students to take action. The consensus among participants was that action could be anything students do to improve their conditions or the conditions around them. Even with that, some participants expressed disappointment and frustration with themselves and others for not being more active in their encouragement. Five out of the seven CAP's claimed to encourage action as a part of their regular teaching practices. Some of the DSD's were honest in admitting that even though they felt that they should be encouraging action that most of them were not actually doing so in their day to day teaching. The PP's were more split than the other categories in whether or not they should personally be encouraging action.

Most of the CAP's and DSD's believe they encourage action through making students aware of the issues in the world and of the options students have for getting involved. Jane explained that when students feel powerless it's important to allow for political discussions to take place, these discussions usually lead to voting and civic

responsibility. Both Jo and Jane expressed concerns that encouraging action depends on what type of institution you're teaching at and where students are headed.

> Are you teaching students headed to graduate school or into PhD programs or are you teaching students that are going right into the field? I think people in different locations have different ways of approaching that. (Jo)

Sydney, a CAP mentioned that it's very important for educators to know their audience to choose their methods, but I'm concerned that Jane and Jo (in light of Jane's comments about student talent and ability) may consider action something reserved for elite academies.

The CAP's were less concerned with influencing their students towards a particular direction and more concerned that their encouragement was actually leading towards action. While most CAP's encouraged students to engage on a regular basis, they worried it wasn't having an effect or more specifically that the student's efforts weren't having an effect. Craig explained that providing a space for students to explore issues that are important to them is the first part and "definitely the easier of the two." The second part is guiding students towards action that is effective, but that's difficult since "truly effective action is harder to determine." The CAPs acknowledged spending more time explicitly discussing what action could be taken effectively and what consequences that action might have. According to Billy:

> Sometimes it's about discussing what action is not with my students. A lot of times students will consider themselves activists because they're interested in it or talk about it with friends. I don't think that's transformative, I think that's good conversation. I ask my students what do you really want to do, what are you willing to do to make the society you want to live in and what risks will that pose to you personally to your careers?

So many times educators are happy just to have a socially conscious conversation in our classrooms that we may lose track of the greater goals attached to critical pedagogy that call for action. In the case of the CAP educators perhaps because of their greater use of reflection or theoretical backgrounds they're able to maintain the action purpose in their classroom instruction.

The choice to not actively encourage students to take action for the DSD's was a complex decision based on three factors: undue influence, past attempts and administrative influence. Allison's experience is representative of many participant's experiences. She explained that while educators should be encouraging students to action, they shouldn't be steering them towards which causes are just. The perception of influencing students can cause negative reactions among students, parents and administration. Allison clarified:

> I think this is where the anger comes in, because these programs are very liberal and I am very liberal but as much as I want to share my opinions and my values I don't want to instill those values on someone else. I think we should find common things that everyone should agree on. But what can we all agree on?

Wanting students to think for themselves was easily the most common explanation for why participants didn't actively encourage action. It is certainly important to allow students to choose their own paths towards action, especially in light of criticism by Ellsworth and Lather. What I found interesting was that in several cases this concern was followed with an example of how in the past the participant's encouragement was met with challenges. Allison shared how she had developed an anti-bullying program to defend gay rights, but it made people uncomfortable. "Students were getting a lot out of it, but it was also alienating people." During the program and after she had several

111

discussions with colleagues about the program, most were "positive but cautionary" and as a new faculty member at the time she chose to pursue other areas of interest rather than continue the anti-bullying program. While it's easy to be disappointed in Allison's decision, Brooke an educator with over forty years of experience explains that "A college is a political place, and I know people who are on bad terms with the university because of their action." Brooke refrains from action and instead focus' her efforts on keeping students "informed."

Those participants with the professionalization perspective were less likely to encourage their students to engage in action in their classrooms, but this is more because of their focus on the curriculum than not wanting to promote change. The PP's in general described their classrooms as much more regimented in terms of time and normally focused discussion on the specific topic at hand. Peter expressed concern over students potentially harming their future careers by engaging in action or protests. Matt on the other hand was very happy to see his students participating in the Occupy movement. "Students were actually going down and they came back and wanted to tell me about and I was very proud." While Matt did not regularly engage in promoting transformation, he felt it should be a part of the classroom in some way. "Even if it's just looking at the other side at the very minimum that would be nice." Matt and the other PP's also expressed similar reservations to the DSD's about influencing student's direction towards justice or injustice.

On Protest

As I discussed how and if faculty should encourage student action the conversation moved to protest. In recent years New York City has been host to many protest movements throughout the city, including Occupy Wall Street, Fast Food Workers Living Wage Campaign, Stop & Frisk and recently the Black Lives Matter campaign. These are just a few of the protest movements in NYC that have seen intense local and national coverage and have found their way into most classrooms. While believing that protest is an essential part of democracy and should be a part of the social action that critical pedagogy produces, I've been very hesitant to encourage students to actually attend. Reports of violence and mass arrests during the Occupy movement have made me and other faculty think twice before telling students to go out and get involved. I do encourage students to get involved when there is a movement in place that addresses their social concerns, but I also warn them of the potential dangers that may accompany protest movements. The Occupy movement was mentioned by nearly every respondent at some point during the interview, and almost half of the respondents representing all three perspectives participated in some way, though that did not necessarily translate to their classrooms.

I asked the participants if educators should encourage students to protest. The CAP's all responded in the positive, with several of them finding ways to incorporate protest into their classes in some fashion, most creating extra credit assignments. Sydney had a history of involving her students in protests. She recounted an event when she was teaching in the mid-west and found the Ku Klux Klan was going to hold a rally. She

113

offered an extra credit assignment asking students to attend in whatever capacity they felt

comfortable: observer, protester, participant etc. "I wanted students to see there are

opportunities to do things and let people know when they're doing something wrong, that

they can stand up and say it's unacceptable." Extra credit was not the only way to

incorporate protest into the classroom. Billy created an assignment he called "Protesting

or Complaining" in order to get students to recognize the options they had when they

were upset about something whether it was related to their program, course work or

society. He explained, "Students do a lot of talking when they're angry, but they don't

focus it. So when they complain I try to direct them in a way they can do something

about it." Billy would make a chart on his wall and when students would complain or

talk about an issue that concerned them, he would have them put it on the chart. The

chart had four columns, one with the students name, the complaint, and larger column for

solutions. In the solution column the class would discuss what actions they could take.

In the fourth column students who tried any of the solutions would share the result.

Admittedly, the chart didn't send students to the street, but there are many forms of

protest and the chart was effective in informing students of their options.

Michael and Kimberly were the only two DSD's to incorporate protest into their

classes in the form of participation through extra credit. Kimberly was excited about her

experience, "it was really great, more than half of my class came and we walked through

Zucotti Park and some of my students interviewed protestors." Michael on the other

hand found his students were very apathetic about attending:

> It's funny the students don't want to go. They're afraid of them. As a child of the
> 60's we marched on the pentagon, but these students I have to bring my

attendance sheets and say okay if you want to sign then meet me at Occupy Wall street. I think it's an essential part of education. They're not used to protest, to political thinking. I think they might have been afraid of the police, they're mostly African American. But just the attitude around social protests may have been enough to turn them away. It could be a sense of powerlessness, there's nothing I can do.

Student apathy was mentioned by some DSD's but the decision to not encourage protest was based on the perception of faculty over reach. The DSD's have a reasonable concern that encouraging students towards any specific action is not the appropriate role for educators. While most of them were very clear that students should be made aware of what's happening or consciousness raising, they felt that any action should be left entirely to the discretion of the student. The educators in the professionalization bracket did not encourage protest in their classrooms at all. While two PP's did participate themselves in the Occupy movement, there was very little discussion of the protests in their classrooms.

Administrative Point of View

I've purposely left out the faculty names in this section because it could be construed as representing criticism of employing institutions. I asked the participants if they felt any pressure from the administration to either encouraging or discouraging faculty from encouraging action or protest. This response varied depending on the participant's home institution. It would seem that administration in all schools are very supportive of protesting cuts to state/city aid, going so far as to pay for transportation and hotels to and from Albany in some cases to encourage student and faculty protest. The administration of religious institutions are very supportive of social action aimed at equality and service, providing support structures and places for students to intern or assist those in need. While administration can be supportive to some causes, some

respondents from religious institutions mentioned that other causes such as marriage equality, or woman's reproductive rights receive little support and are not often approached through the campus.

Overall participants described administrative attitudes as more about the people in charge at any given moment in time than a general approval or disapproval of activism and social protest. Interestingly though five of the DSD's said that they believed social action and protest was becoming more frowned upon by administrations and educators in general and they believed it would become harder in the future for educators to participate or encourage their students to participate in protests. This was attributed to the increasingly businesslike nature of academia, one of them explained "the main purpose of the administration is to bring students and in and then focus on getting them jobs when they get out, any other content isn't a priority for them." Another participant made frightening prediction:

> Schools are very much like business now and view students like clients. With many schools viewing critical pedagogy as alienating, I think it's going to be much harder in the future. And maybe one day you won't be able to teach anything but facts or things that don't take students out of their comfort zones.

As more schools have more adjuncts and fewer full-time faculty there is no doubt that universities and colleges have moved to economic driven model that favors administration over faculty. With the job market for young faculty seeking full time employment looking so bleak, it seems unlikely they would risk future employment by engaging in any activity that may be "frowned upon" by administration. The surprising observation is that administration doesn't disapprove of certain actions because they

116

disagree with the cause, but more likely because they distract from the agreed upon curriculum and could potentially lower student enrollment and profits.

Critical Pedagogy and Democracy

I asked all the participants if there was a relationship between critical pedagogy and democracy. I was not surprised that all of the CAP's and DSD's responded affirmatively, but I was surprised that all of the PP's did as well. Most respondents articulated that at a minimum critical pedagogy "will make a more informed citizen and they will participate more and be more democratic." (Allison) Jane suggested that critical pedagogy would be more important than ever in the future because with the rise of online education and remote classrooms most "faculty will give assignments and students will type responses, which will really limit the potential for critical discussions." Jo interpreted the relationship between critical pedagogy and democracy as one of academic freedom, where faculty are free to talk about protest, action and criticism openly with their students without fear of sanctions. The most passionate response to this question came from Kyle a PP who stated, "This is what we've lost in education, this is why it's so hard for young people to do anything." Those educators with the professionalization perspective echoed their counterpart's responses on the importance of critical pedagogy to democracy even though they don't practice it themselves.

Critical Pedagogy and Capitalism

I asked the participants if there was a relationship between critical pedagogy and capitalism. The CAPs universally felt that there was an oppositional relationship between critical pedagogy, where one is essentially the solution to the problems caused

117

by the other. Sydney explained that students need to understand that "capitalism is not the be-all and end-all" and that critical pedagogy provides other ways of thinking about problems see what's at the root of it. Craig took it a step further by calling capitalism a social illness which expresses its symptoms through poverty, inequality and discrimination. The DSD's recognized a relationship between capitalism and critical pedagogy, but related them as a system of "checks and balances." Lexi believed that critical pedagogy will create an informed citizenry that will be able to keep the scope and power of capitalism in check. The DSD's perspective is that there is a conflict in challenging capitalism when so many of the students are committed to capitalism. Brooke brings a "democratic approach" to capitalism where she tries to emphasize shared resources but doesn't "confront capitalism." The PP's academically acknowledged the relationship between the two concepts, but as the PP's don't engage in critical pedagogy they had no reference point to discuss how it relates to their teaching practice.

Mentoring

I asked the participants how they approached their relationship with their student's in regards to mentoring. Critical pedagogy and social justice literature recommends that teachers approach education from a standpoint of collaboration rather than one of instruction. The idea is that by working together there is a collaboration of ideas rather than competition. The respondents generally approached the question in two phases, addressing the classroom and the individual student. It was agreed by all that class wide collaboration was not a realistic goal. Megan a CAP, whose small school requires faculty carry a four to five class per semester teaching load explained, "I can have up to a hundred and fifty students a semester, normally it doesn't go quite that high,

118

but how could anyone mentor that many students?" The size of the class itself can also

effect a participants approach to student relationships. Kimberly a DSD, whose full time

position had relatively small to moderate class sizes also taught at a school with the

increasingly more common twenty-five to thirty-five student class size. She expressed

her disappointment in not being able to give her students the attention they deserve. "I

gave a scantron, I hate myself, but what am I going to do read thirty essays every time I

give an assignment." Representing the PP's, Peter recognized the difficulties of reaching

students in light of class size, but was less concerned. "I think if you have solid lesson

plans and try to keep track of your students, most of them will get what they need from

the course." When it came to actual individual students all three perspectives generally

took the same approach which included them selecting who they believed to be talented

students and approaching them for further study, internship etc. The reverse, where

students would approach them for guidance was also a common way for all participants

to develop mentoring relationships with students. It was also for some of them a way to

gauge their success in teaching.

Measuring Success in Critical Pedagogy and Social Justice

Is this working? Everyone involved in education (or any endeavor) should really

be asking themselves this question. Since critical pedagogy involves action, and social

justice requires transformation, it may seem like success or failure should be easily

formulated. Is there action/change? Educators are not charged with leading revolutions,

rather they are charged with transmitting information to students. For those who consider

critical pedagogy (CAPs) and democratic consciousness (DSDs) part of that transmission,

they're not measuring change/action, but are measuring students understanding and

engaging in change/action. Essentially I'm asking, are CAPs and DSDs empowering students? The short answer is, they are not sure.

Participants felt that there is often a delayed reaction to critical pedagogy or consciousness raising. Sydney explained, "A lot of times these ideas rattle around in their heads for years and then suddenly it clicks, and if you're lucky somebody gives you a call or sends an email." Sydney has received several calls through the years, as did other CAPs and DSDs. The most common way to measure for CAPs was through reflection and review of how they felt about their lessons and their student reactions. If faculty didn't keep up with reflection, it could be very easy to fall into less empowering or even oppressive ways of teaching.

It may be easier to know when things aren't working then when they are. According to Taylor, "If you're getting shitty papers and having boring classes, it's not working." Both CAP's and DSD's expressed agreement that at the very least they could tell by evaluating their students work that they understood the concepts. Evaluating the effectiveness of critical pedagogy or promoting social justice in a classroom isn't something that can measured easily because it requires the complex evaluation of student reactions and feelings. Richard, described that difficulty:

> You never know what's really going on in a student's mind. They can never say a word in your class for any number of reasons, but inside they may be exploding with emotion. They may hate my class or love it. They might go home and do something to change their life or the world. We don't always get to see that, which is frustrating, but that's part of our job. We put teachers in classrooms and we hope we did something, even if it's small to make them better educators and better people.

Some participants mentioned students who created social organizations at their schools or online through or with their encouragement. It's hard to judge if that should be attributed

to classroom practice or individual mentorship. In general the CAP's and the DSD's considered themselves successful in raising student awareness and consciousness, but questioned the actual amount of empowerment they were able to really help create.

Assignments

While conducting interviews with the twenty respondents I asked if it would be possible for them to provide me with a description of an assignment they use semi-frequently that they would consider to be empowering or representative of the goals of critical pedagogy and social justice. While not every respondent was able to provide an assignment, I was able to collect approximately twelve activities that these educators use in their classrooms. Influenced by the studies of teaching in the classroom by Ira Shor (1987, 1992) and bell hooks (1994) and Carl Grant's (2010) call for social justice to have a process for adjudication, I created a simple checklist for judging an assignment based on eight characteristics of critical pedagogy.

A. Does the student have input on the assignment? (Do the students have any opportunities to change any aspects?)

B. Does it raise consciousness? (Will the students be more aware of the social, economic and political realities of the world after the assignment?)

C. Does it empower? (Will the students recognize new possibilities for change in their lives or their communities?)

D. Is there Dialogue? (Does the assignment provide space for equitable interaction between parties?)

121

E. Does it humanize the other? (Does the assignment bring awareness to alternative perspectives previously ignored?)

F. Is there reflection? (Does the assignment provide a space for students to look back at their work or perspectives from a critical perspective?)

G. Is there action? (Does the assignment promote activity towards transformation?)

H. Is there praxis? (Does the assignment represent the full process of consciousness, theory, action, reflection, action?)

I then evaluated each assignment based on this scale. Some respondents in each category either did not want to share their assignments or did not have any assignments that they felt were empowering. The CAP's were the most forthcoming with their assignments with all but one sharing with the group. Jennifer declined because she felt her assignments "were still in progress", but she would be happy to share them when they're ready in the future. The CAP's assignments as expected were all empowering, but it was clear that several of them missed opportunities to encourage their students to take their analysis to the next level and engage (at least speculatively) in action. An interesting comparison can be seen in Billy and Craig's different approaches towards using Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed in the classroom. While fewer DSD's shared assignments their average score was 6/8 as compared to the CAP's 5.6/8. This is surprising considering the CAP's in general express a greater commitment to action then the DSD's. There are obviously limitations to the conclusions that can be drawn considering not all of the participants were able or willing to participate in this portion of

the study, but it can be said that action in the classroom is not by any means an exclusive characteristic to the CAPs. Only one participant from the professionalization perspective shared an assignment. Most said they wouldn't describe their assignments as empowering, but Matt made the argument that any research project done well is empowering. I agree with him on that point, but while a research project may be individually empowering it is not likely to lead to social transformation. The individual assignment and scoring are discussed below.

Critical Action Perspective Assignments

Sydney, a critical feminist assigns "the Crucible as Islamophobia" for one of her classes. The students do a critical analysis comparing Arthur Miller's take on the Red Scare to current fear and hate mongering in the U.S. and around the globe. The assignment includes a pre and post discussion and reaction paper. The assignment is clearly designed to raise consciousness, empower (at least certain) students and humanize. There is built in reflection and dialogue in the pre- and post-discussion. The assignment does not offer student input or lead to action which means it does not meet the criteria for praxis.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
	X	X	X	X	X		

Score 5/8

Jo, a post-Marxist deconstructionist, assigns "Intersectionality and Education Journal." The students keep an active journal of all possible ways that race, class, gender, ability, religion, sexuality, etc. intersect with their everyday lives in relation to education.   Jo asks them to consider was there small things like was there a bag check at your school? How long were you under camera? Did you see graffiti? Or homeless people? They

123

keep this journal for a month and share their experience with the class upon completion. The assignment is designed to raise consciousness, empower students and humanize. There is reflection in the journaling and dialogue in the post assignment discussion. The assignment does not offer student input or lead to action which means it does not meet the criteria for praxis.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
	X	X	X	X	X		

Score 5/8

Megan is a critical constructivist who offered "the Muletta" or baggage assignment which she discussed as part of her teaching philosophy. Students are asked to first analyze their own baggage. Then students are asked to analyze the baggage that some of their students (in observations) are carrying and discuss how they will reach those students. While this assignment does not include student input, it hits every other category on the simple scale. Praxis is created because of the self-reflection influencing the following action.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Score 7/8

Billy, a critical pedagogue from the former Soviet Bloc offered Paulo Freire's <u>Pedagogy of the Oppressed</u>. The text is covered as part of the class and includes class discussion and reflective assignments. This was a difficult assignment to score because the use of Freire's seminal work would seem like an empowering assignment. The problem is that Billy's assignment is academic and does not actively pursue most of the goals the work prescribes. It does raise consciousness, include reflection and offer dialogue, but I can't

determine if it empowers and it does not directly offer input, humanize, and encourage action or praxis.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
	X		X		X		

Score 3/8

Craig, a tenured professor with almost two decades also offered the Pedagogy of the Oppressed but not as a part of the standard curriculum. Craig uses it as an optional assignment where students will live blog their comments and reactions. There is no specified length or focus; the blog is a textual representation of all the students' thoughts and reactions while reading the text. The students who participate in the assignment are asked to read each other's blog and begin a dialogue about what each sees as the others main points in the text. The student's then lead a class discussion about their interpretations of the text for the students who did not participate. The class discussion they lead is titled "Are their Practical Applications for Critical Pedagogy." While the assignment is not lengthy, Craig assures the students it's not difficult because all they're really doing is talking about a book with classmates. This assignment compared to Billy's displays a much greater emphasis on the characteristics of critical pedagogy. Craig's assignment maintains the potential for praxis but falls short by not allowing for student input.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
	X	X	X	X	X	X	?

Score 6/8

Taylor, a foundations instructor offered "Critical Fairy Tales." This assignment has her students developing and writing their own children's books designed to enlighten and empower young people. The students undertake this project over the course of an entire

125

semester and throughout the process they engage in all eight of the scales characteristics eventually putting the stories together for publication.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Score 8/8

Democratic Student Development Assignments

Allison, a relatively new faculty member uses her student's field work requirement to promote social justice. She provides a list of events including community meetings and rallies for her students to attend. Students can add events to the list. In an interesting juxtaposition Allison is encouraging action while missing out on the usually easier characteristics of reflection and dialogue.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
X	X	X				X	

Score 4/8

Brooke, a forty year teaching veteran who described herself as an educator for social justice was somewhat disappointed to admit that she didn't really have any empowering assignments. She described one assignment where the students write a general statement and explain their positions on social justice and critical pedagogy. This assignment meets the reflection and consciousness criteria, but may fall short of actually empowering students.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
	X	?			X		

Score 2/8

Jane, a quantitative researcher brings a series of guest speakers to her classroom to discuss issues of social justice. Students do background reading on the speakers and prepare questions for them to answer. The goal is for students to see people from outside

126

of academia engaged in action to serve as a model for the students to ideally emulate. Students help choose future speakers. Jane's program meets six out the eight criteria and has the potential to reach the other two.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
X	X	X	X	X	X		

Score 6/8

Kimberly who believes in purpose centered education offered her "modeling an interview" assignment. Inspired by the plays of Ann Deveare Smith, Kimberly has her students conduct interviews with someone of their choice who represents a social issue important to them. They transcribe the interviews and turn the transcript into a monologue that is then performed in class and discussed as a group. "You can always tell if something has empowered students it will be good." This assignment meets seven out of the eight criteria and could potentially lead to praxis.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Score 7/8

Michael, a senior theorist towards the end of his career explained he does a lot of projects with films attempting to deconstruct race. He had no specific requirements towards the assignment besides viewing and a reaction paper. While this assignment like many others has great potential it doesn't meet much of the critical pedagogy criteria.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
	X	X		X			

Score 3/8

Jake, another senior educator requires his students to participate in a "Community Action Project." This is essentially an action research project where students identify a problem in the community, conduct background research, develop a plan and carry it out and write up their whole experience. This project hits all eight of the simple scale criteria.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Score 8/8

Professionalization Perspective Assignment

Matt who comes to education with a background in business explained he didn't have a particular exercise that he described as empowering but put forth a standard research paper as an example. While a paper had the potential to be many things in this analysis it only meets two of the criteria.

Input	Consciousness	Empower	Dialogue	Humanize	Reflection	Action	Praxis
	X	X					

Score 2/8

Classroom Observations

In order to further my understanding of the ways in which the faculty in the three identified perspectives (CAP, DSD, and PP) interpret and engage in social justice I followed up the interviews by doing six classroom observations. I observed one class with two participants from each perspective. I behaved as a non-participant observer recording the sessions and taking copious notes. I then transcribed the recordings and reviewed them looking for trends and patterns based on the findings from the interviews. My initial purpose was to see the relationship between the participant's statements on critical pedagogy and social justice and their actual classroom behaviors. In order to get

the most representation from the observations I chose the participants who I felt most exemplified the characteristics of their categorization. I chose Megan and Sydney from the CAP's, Jake and Jane from the DSD's and Matt and Peter from the PP's. In general I found that the respondents represented themselves accurately in the interviews and conducted their classes in the manner one would expect from a CAP, DSD or PP.

I will briefly compare and contrast the instructors within their categories and then with each other. I would like to note that though it was not an intended study point, I think the most significant factor in these classroom interactions was based on class size. I don't believe it reflects on the instructors but it seemed that those instructors with smaller classes were able to engage their students in a much more personal manner that possibly allowed the students to see their faculty as less of an instructor and more of a mentor capacity.

Though it was certainly not intentional it seemed that within each category the instructors had opposite personalities. Megan in her early forties composed herself very seriously in front of the room. She had good rapport with the students and they appeared at ease but attentive. Sydney on the other hand in her early fifties was a ball of humorous energy. She had stated that she used humor in her classes to alleviate tension and in fact she did often use self-deprecating humor which the students really seemed drawn too. Students were very comfortable and mocked themselves as well. I related very much to Sydney's teaching style and use of humor. I think educators committed to social justice and critical pedagogy can get caught up in the negative side of injustice and lose track of the hopeful aspects we should be promoting to our students. I often warn my students

129

that I like to joke around in class because otherwise things will get very bleak very fast.

Both Megan and Sydney encouraged heavy dialogue and critical discussion, directing

students to engage with each communication flowed more like an all channel system than

the wheel where most instructors must echo every comment for a response. Megan had

nearly twice as many students as Sydney and the disadvantage was evident when you

consider that Sydney could move around the room while teaching to directly engage a

speaking student. Megan on the other hand would not have been able to move past the

front row of her crowded room.

Jake and Jane representing the democratic student developers also had contrasting

personalities. Jane, a quantitative researcher appeared more serious than Jake, who it's

hard to say this objectively, but appears to his students (and me) like a cross between Nat

King Cole and Samuel L. Jackson. With over fifty years of teaching experience, he

enters his classroom, in a tan suit, top coat, scarf and fedora and emanates the experience

of a man who has done everything in education from building schools in the peace corps,

to starting a college program for women of color, to leaving higher education to work

with abused teens and then back to higher education again. Both participants had good

rapport with the students and engaged in dialogue with their students. Jane used the

wheel model of communication in her classroom, clarifying and repeating student's

statements back to the class for others to pick up the conversation thread. I have found

the development all channel communication to be nearly impossible in my classrooms.

Though I quite literally ask my students to talk directly to each other, they always address

their comments back to me. These classes were also mismatched in size with Jane having

about thirty students and Jake having twelve. Jake didn't need to move around the room

in order to interact with his students; he sat his class in a tight circle barely an arm's length from the furthest student.

Matt and Peter were the most similar pair, both white males in their fifties, both lecturers with classes of about twenty-five students. I would describe neither as cold, but both men had little rapport with their classes. Peter began class speaking to one of his students, an athlete who was hoping for an addition onto the gymnasium next year. I'm happy for them building bigger a gymnasium, but I'm confident that means there will continue to be no new full time faculty positions for adjuncts like myself. Matt began class right away going straight into lecture and only stopping periodically to ask students surface questions and return to the lecture. Peter's questions were slightly more engaging to his students, but neither was attempting to foster a dialogue. While students didn't seem to be enjoying themselves as much in Sydney or Jakes class, they seemed reasonably attentive for undergraduates and no one expressed any noticeable concerns or attitudes.

In comparing the observations of the CAPs, DSD's and PP's together, the results followed closely to those already covered in the interviews. I would say in addition to the class size effects, the most noteworthy finding is the overwhelming similarity between the DSD's and the CAP's with the main distinction being based mainly on the intention of action. While the CAP's kept critical pedagogy's intention of action in the center of their teaching, some of the DSD's were just as likely to encourage student action, while not making it a centerpiece of their philosophy. It should also be noted that

based on the findings of the assignment analysis it may be just as likely that the DSD's

may be teaching their classes closer to those in the professionalization perspective.

Conclusions

While reviewing the findings and analysis it would seem that the main difference

between the CAP's and the DSD's is action. Whereas the CAP's are more inclined to

encourage their students to action, the DSD's are more likely to focus on consciousness

raising. The PP's have a limited understanding of the concepts of critical pedagogy and

social justice, but that doesn't mean the PP's are less academic or rigorous; on the

contrary, it seems they are highly focused on seeing their students successfully employed.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Conclusions

In order to gain a greater understanding of the interpretations and attitudes of higher education faculty in education programs towards critical pedagogy and related concepts, I conducted interviews with twenty faculty members at colleges in the New York City area. This study has helped bridge the gap in the knowledge pertaining to how critical pedagogy and social justice are interpreted by faculty in institutions of higher education. The major premise of this study is that the practice of critical pedagogy is for some faculty the practice of social justice. While there is extensive background on the philosophical interpretations of critical pedagogy, there is little research on how faculty interpretations of critical pedagogy affect their classroom practices. Social justice has multiple definitions and finds itself attached to education programs with no clear purpose. This study has uncovered the connection between social justice and critical pedagogy in faculty interpretations and how those interpretations effect their classroom practice.

As this study comes to an end I have come to several conclusions on faculty interpretations of critical pedagogy in education departments. I now know that faculty of education can be categorized into three perspectives based on their teaching philosophies, style and interpretation of critical pedagogy and social justice. Most educators will be represented by the professionalization, democratic student development or critical action perspective. Professionalization perspective (PP) represents educators who see the purpose of teacher education classes as necessary for the professional development of

future teachers. These participants approach their classroom with a formal authority or demonstrator style of teaching. Democratic Student Development (DSD) perspective represents educators who see the student and their personal development as the focal point of education. They have a student centered approach in their classrooms characterized by high levels of interaction and activities. Critical Action Perspective (CAP) - represents teachers who strongly believe that education can and should provide students with the tools to develop consciousness and engage in action to improve not just their conditions, but all conditions. They strive for student input on topics and assignments in an egalitarian classroom. Based on the findings, the three perspectives matched up closely to the teaching styles of executive, facilitator and liberator (Fenstermacher & Solstis, 2004).

Faculty who are classified as CAP's are able to articulate their direct academic influences on their teaching philosophy and practice more clearly than those who are identified as DSD's or those who claim to teach social justice without critical pedagogy. Social justice is seen by most educators as a goal rather than a practice, with the exception of a few CAPs who believe that SJ and CP are the same thing. Critical pedagogy is defined theoretically by CAP's and as a practice by DSD's and it's relatively unclear to PP's. Most educators regardless of categorization are not engaging in critical reflection and see it has a student practice.

Dialogue and safe spaces are less likely to be threatened by racism and more likely to be threatened by Islamophobia and sexism. While in the past critical pedagogues have been concerned with resistance to theories and perspectives, it seems

134

students are no longer capable of political resistance to liberal polices; instead the new concern is vociferous complaints about assignments and the threat of complaints to our supervisors. When actual resistance does occur it is likely to be directed at female faculty by male students and may be accompanied by intimidation and threats of violence.

Action is the defining difference between most educators in education. CAPs believe it is an essential part of an educator's job to encourage and engage in action while DSD's believe that the decision for action should be left up to the students without the influence of educators. The professionalization perspective had no real viewpoint on action that does not result in student's professional development. The irony of this is that more than half of participants of this study participated in protests during the last few years, but only a quarter of them would encourage their students to engage in social action. Even more disappointing -- all of the respondents across the board felt that critical pedagogy has a positive relationship to democracy, but only seven of them try to practice it regularly in their classrooms.

All educators are concerned with the commercialization and McDonaldization of higher education, but those who teach for social justice are most concerned with the loss of academic freedom and autonomy as the common core curriculum threatens to homogenize the spaces where critical pedagogy is practiced. Social justice is being similarly threatened and quietly eliminated from mission statements, textbooks and program definitions as it's been deemed too polarizing.

Recommendations

While I have learned a great deal about the way faculty interpret critical pedagogy and social justice I am left with many more questions and would like to propose the following recommendations for further research: A continuation of this study with a much larger sample size would be able to yield more generalizable results. I would be very interested to see the perspectives on critical pedagogy compared by institution. I believe a city, state, or national survey would be very well received by faculty interested in critical pedagogy and social justice. I believe an institutional comparative study would be very appealing to potential graduate and undergraduate students applying to programs in education.

I would like to conduct or see a study focusing on student interpretations of critical pedagogy and social justice as well as their reactions to classroom methodology. While I was able to observe students in classrooms, I was unable to do the in-depth interviews that I did with faculty to get at their understandings. This could help bridge the gap between faculty perspectives and student perspectives.

Additionally, I noticed a number of trends that I would like to see pursued further by others or myself. I found the number of faculty participating in protests to be fascinating and I would like to know if this trend extends further or if it's more of New York City phenomenon. Many participants made reference to the events of 9/11 in so many various ways that it was not possible to put them into a category for this study. I would like to pursue or see the effects of those events from the perspective of teaching

faculty, particularly those in New York City as compared to other parts of the country and the world.

Additional Literature Review

Some additional literature was reviewed as the participant's referenced works and phenomena that were not covered in the primary review. Howard Gardner and his theory of multiple intelligences (1983) were cited by several participants in reference to how they attempt various methods to reach students. George Ritzer's concept of "McDonaldization" (1993) was referenced in response to discussions about the commodification and the growing entitlement of students. My review lead me to an analysis by Eric Margolis (2013) of the "New American University" which provided context for participant responses on the growing class sizes, shrinking academic freedoms and the rise of permanent adjuncts.

Afterword

Conducting this study was the most interesting, challenging and exciting undertaking I have ever done. The opportunity to meet and talk to so many interesting and talented educators was extraordinary. I learned so much about myself and my teaching practices from studying others that I look at critical pedagogy and my teaching in a whole new light. After spending so many years studying critical pedagogy and social justice, it gives me great pleasure to make this small contribution to the literature. As I come to the end of this study I find myself very excited about the prospects of starting the next one. I hope that I along with others will be able to continue this line of questioning into the future.

REFERENCES

Adams, M., Bell, L., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A Sourcebook.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Adorno, T. (1973). *Negative Dialectics*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.

Adorno, T., & Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.

Althusser, L. (1971*). Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays.* New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Althusser, L. (2008). *On Ideology (Radical Thinkers)*. New York, NY: Verso. An Interview with Paul Willis. Commodification, Resistance and Reproduction Interviewed by Roberta Sassatelli and Marco Sant Santoro European Journal of Social Theory 12(2): 265–289.

Anderson, D., & Major, R. (2001). *Dewey, Democracy, and Citizenship*. The Clearing House, 75(2) pp. 104-107.

Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto Schooling: A Political Economy of Urban Educational Reform*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Anyon, J. (2005). *Radical Possibilities: Public Policy, Urban Education, and a New Social Movement.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Apple, M., & Beane, J. (2007). *Democratic Schools*, *Second Edition: Lessons in Powerful Education.* New York, NY: Heinemann.

Apple, M. (2012). *Can Education Change Society*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Banks, J. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions and practice. In. Banks, J.A & Banks, C.A.M (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. (pp. 3–24). New York: Macmillan.

Barry, B. (2005). *Why social justice matters*. Cambridge, MA: Policy Press.

Bell, L. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L.A.

Bell, L. & Griffin, P. (eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 3–15). New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In Richardson, J. (Ed.), *Hand book of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). Practical reason. Social Justice, Education and Schooling: Some Philosophical Issues. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Braa, D. & Callero, P. Critical Pedagogy and Classroom Praxis. Teaching Sociology. 34(4), 357-367: American Sociological Association.

Brosio, R. (2000). *Philosophical Scaffolding for the Construction of Critical Democratic Education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Bruing, M. (2011). Problematizing Critical Pedagogy. *Journal of Critical Pedagogy*. (pp. 2-23), New York, NY.

Burbules, N. (2000). *Revolutionary Pedagogies*. New York, NY: Routledge 2000.

Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (2008). *Revolutionizing Education: Youth Participatory Action Research in Motion (Critical Youth Studies)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Charmaz, K., & Mitchell, R. (2001). Grounded Theory in Ethnography. In Atkinson et al, (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cho, S. (2010). Politics of Critical Pedagogy and New Social Movements. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(3), 310-325.

Clark, J. (2006). Social Justice and Education: New and Continuing Themes. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54 (3), 272-287.

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.

Coleman, J. (1992). Some points on choice in education. *Sociology of Education*, 65(4), 260-262.

Cooper, C. (2003). The detrimental impact of teacher bias: lessons learned from the standpoint of African American mother. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 101–116.

Cremin, L. (1961). *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876–1957*. New York, NY: Alfred Knopf.

Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2003). Towards a sociology of just practices: an analysis of plural conceptions of justice. In Vincent, C. (Ed.), *Education and Identity* (pp.15 29). London: Routledge Falmer.

Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. (2003). Critical Pedagogy: An introduction, In: Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres. R (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *The current status of teaching and teacher development in the United States*. New York, NY: Teachers College.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Inequality and access to knowledge. In Banks, J. A.; &

Banks, M. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 465–483). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2002). Learning to teach for social justice. In Darling-Hammond, L., French, J., & Garcia-Lopez, S. (Eds.), *Learning to teach for social justice* (pp. 1–7). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). New standards and old inequalities: School reform and the education of African American students. In King, J.E. (Ed.), *Black education: A transformative research and action agenda for the new century* (pp.197–224). Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.

Darling-Hammond, L., French, J., & Garcia-Lopez, S. (Eds.). (2002). Learning to teach for social justice. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J., & Dewey, E. (1915). Schools of Tomorrow. In Boydston, J.A. (Ed.), *The collected works of John Dewey: Vol. 8. John Dewey: The middle works* (pp. 205–404). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1939). *Freedom and Culture*. New York, NY: Capricorn.

Dika, S., & Singh, K. (2002). Applications of Social Capital in Educational Literature: A Critical Synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(1), 31-60.

Edwards, B. (2010). Critical Pedagogy and Democratic Education: Possibilities for Cross -Pollination. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 42(3), 221-242.

Fallace, T. (2011). Tracing John Dewey's Influence on Progressive Education, 1903-1951: Toward a Received Dewey. *Teachers College Record*, 113(3), 463-492.

Farr, J. (2004). Social Capital: A Conceptual History. *Political Theory*, 32(1), 6-33.

Farrell, J. (1950). Dewey in Mexico. In Hook, S. (Ed.), *John Dewey: Philosopher of Science and Freedom* (pp. 351-377). New York, NY: Dial Press.

Finkel, D., & Arney, W. (1995). *Educating for Freedom: The Paradox of Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972–1977.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Fraser, N. (1997). Justice Interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical exchange. New York, NY: Verso**.**

Fredrickson, P., & Ross, D. Socialism and American Liberalism: Academic Social Thought in the 1880s *Perspectives in American History 11, 5-79.*

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: culture, power, and liberation*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope. Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield.

Friedman, G. (1981). The Political Philosophy of the Frankfort School. New York, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gabriel, S. L., & Smithson, I. (1990). Gender in the classroom: Power and pedagogy. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Gardner, Howard (1983; 1993) *Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences,* New York: Basic Books

Gewirtz, S. (1998). Conceptualizing social justice in education: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Education Policy*, 13(4), 469-484.

Ginwright, S., Noguera, P., & Cammarota, J. (2006). *Beyond Resistance! Youth Activism and Community Change: New Democratic Possibilities for Practice and Policy for America's youth.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. (2001). *Theory and Resistance in Education: Towards a Pedagogy for the Opposition, Revised and Expanded Edition*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Giroux, H. (2003). Critical Theory and Educational Practice. In Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*. New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Giroux, H. (2004a). Cultural Studies, Public Pedagogy, and the Responsibility of Intellectuals. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 1, 59–79.

Giroux, H. (2004c). Pedagogy, Film, and the Responsibility of Intellectuals: A response. *Cinema Journal,* 43, 119–126.

Giroux, H. (2004e). *The Terror of Neoliberalism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Giroux, H. (2007). Democracy, Education and the Politics of Critical Pedagogy. In McLaren, P., & Kincheloe, J. (Eds.) *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* Peter Lang. Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986).

Goodlad, J. (2002) *A place called school*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gore, J. (1993). The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gore, J. (2003). What we can do for you! What can "we" do for "you"?: struggling over empowerment in critical and feminist pedagogy. In Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. (Eds.) *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (pp. 331-348). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Grant, C. (2012). Cultivating Flourishing Lives: A Robust Social Justice Vision of Education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(5) 5, 910–934.

Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (2007). Doing multicultural education for achievement and equity. New York, NY: Routledge.

Grant, C., & Agosto, V. (2008). Teacher Capacity and Social Justice in Teacher Education. *Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Faculty Publications.* Paper 5.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Greenbaum, F. (1967). John Dewey Views Karl Marx. *Social Science*, 42(4), 195-204.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). London: Sage.

Hoftstadter, R. (1963). *Anti-intellectualism in American Life*. New York, NY: Vintage Book.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

hooks, b. (2009). *Teaching Critical Thinking: Practical Wisdom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Critical Theory*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.

Kanpol, B. (1999). *Critical pedagogy: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Kanpol, B., & McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical multiculturalism: Uncommon voices in a common struggle*. Westport, Conn: Bergin & Garvey.

Kanpol, B. & McLaren, P. (1999). *Critical Multiculturalism: Uncommon Voices in a Common Struggle.* Praeger.

Kaskaloglu, E. *Methods Chapter: From public to charter: The case of gifted students*. Introduction to Qualitative Methods, Dr. Margolis. ASU, Fall 2008.

Kincheloe, Joe L. & Steinberg, Shirley R. An Ideology of Miseducation: Countering the Pedagogy of Empire Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies February 2006 6(1) pp 33-51.

King, J. E. (2004). Culture-centered knowledge: Black studies, curriculum transformation, and social action. In Banks, C.A., & Banks, C.A. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* 2, pp. 349–378.

King, M. (1963). Letter from Birmingham Jail. Retrieved from http://www.africa. upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html.

Kirkpatrick, D. *Methods Chapter "Study of factors that impact technology integration into the high school math curriculum*. Introduction to Qualitative Methods, Dr. Margolis. ASU, Fall 2008.

Kleinman, S. (1980). Learning the ropes as fieldwork analysis. In Shaffir, Stebbins, & Turowetz, A. (Eds.). *Fieldwork Experience.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Knight, T., & Pearl, A. (2000). Democratic Education and Critical Pedagogy. *The Urban Review*, 32(2), 197–226.

Kozol, J. (2001). Ordinary Resurrections: Children in the Years of Hope. Broadway Books.

Kozol, J. (2006). *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America*. New York, NY: Broadway Books.

Kozol, J. (2012). *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*. New York, NY: Broadway Books.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. Theory into Practice, 34(3), 159–165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Education Research Journal,* 32(3), 465–491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). New directions in multicultural education: Complexities, boundaries, and critical race theory. In Banks, J.A., & Banks, C.A.M (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education, second edition* (pp. 50–65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3–12.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with the postmodern. NewYork, NY: Routledge.

Lee, C. (2005). The state of knowledge about the education of African Americans. In King, J.E. (Ed.), Black education: A transformative research and action agenda for the new century (pp. 45–72). Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Reflective teacher education and moral deliberation. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(6), 2-8.

Love, B. (2004). Brown plus 50 counter-storytelling: A critical race theory analysis of the "Majoritarian achievement gap" story. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 37(3), 227–246.

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Margolis, E. (2013). "The Changing Hidden Curricula: A Personal Recollection" in Contemporary Colleges & Universities: A Reader edited by Joseph L. Devitis, Peter Lang Publishers, 2013 pp 242-262.

Marx, K. (1956). *Selected writings in sociology & social philosophy*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Marx, K. (1964). *The German ideology*. Moscow, USSR: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K. (1971). *Birth of the communist manifesto*. New York, NY: International Publishers.

Marx, K. (1973). *Grundrisse*. New York, NY: Random House.

McLaren, P. (1993). *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter*. New York, NY: Routledge.

McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture.* New York, NY: Routledge.

McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary Multiculturalism: Pedagogies of Dissent for the New Millennium.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire and the pedagogy of revolution*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

McLaren, P. (2000). White Terror and Oppositional Agency: Towards a Critical Multiculturalism. In Duarte & Smith (Eds*.). Foundational Perspectives in Multicultural Education* (pp213-242). New York, NY: Longman.

McLaren, P. (2003). Critical Pedagogy: A Look at the Major Concepts. in: Darder, A. ; Baltodano, M. & Torres, R. (Eds), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader.* New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

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

McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2000). Reconsidering Marx in post-Marxist time: A Requiem for Postmodernism? *Educational Researcher*, 29(3), 25-33.

McLaren, P. & Farahmandpur, R. (2001). Class, Cultism, and Multiculturalism: A Notebook On Forging a Revolutionary Politics. *Multicultural Education*, 8(3) pp. 5–11.

Michelli, N., & Keiser, D. (2005) Teacher education for democracy and social justice. New York, NY: Routledge.

Miller, D. (1999). Principles of social justice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Miller, J. (1963). Introduction of Martin Luther King (Speech Transcription. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University Libraries. http://www.wmich.edu/~ulib/archives/mlk/ transcription.html.

Moreno, J., & Frey, R. (1985). Dewey's Critique of Marxism. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 26(1), pp. 21-34.

Morrell, E. (2003). Legitimate peripheral participation as professional development: lessons from a summer institute. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 89–99.

Nieto, S. (1999). Critical multicultural education and students' perspectives. In May, S. (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 191–215). London: Falmer.

Nieto, S. (2002). Affirmation, solidarity and critique: Moving beyond tolerance in education. In Lee, E., Menkart, D., & Okazawa-Rey, M (Eds.), *Beyond heroes and holidays: A practical guide to K-12 anti-racist, multicultural education and staff development*. Washington, DC: Teaching for Change.

Nieto, S. (2004).Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education (4th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

North, C. (2006). More than Words? Delving into the Substantive Meaning(s) of "Social Justice" in Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), pp. 507-535.

North, C. (2008). What is all this talk about "social justice"? Mapping the terrain of education's latest catch phrase. *Teachers College Record*.

North, C. (2009). The Promise and Perils of Developing Democratic Literacy for Social Justice. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39, 39(4), pp. 555-579.

Novak, M. (2000). Defining social justice. *First Things*, 108, 11–13.

Nussbaum, M. (1997). Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2000). Women and Human Development. The Capabilities Approach.
Cambridge, MA, Cambridge University Press.

Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (2003). Teaching to change the world (2nd ed.).
New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Palmer, P. (2007). The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.
San Francisco, CA.

Rittel, H. "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning." Policy Sciences, 1973: 155-
169.

Rittel, H., & Webber, M. (1984). "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning," pp. 155–
169. Policy Sciences, Vol. 4, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Inc.,
Amsterdam, 1973. [Reprinted in N. Cross (ed.), Developments in Design
Methodology, J. Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1984, pp. 135–144.

Ritzer, G. (1993). The McDonaldization of society: An investigation into the changing
character of contemporary social life. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge.

Ruiz, B., & Fernandez-Balboa, J.(2005). Physical Education Teacher Educators' Personal
Perspectives Regarding their Practice of Critical Pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching
in Physical Education, 24*(3), 243-264.

Sandlin, J.; Burdick, J.; Norris, T. & Hoechsmann, M. (2012). Erosion and Experience:
Education for Democracy in a Consumer Society. *Review of Research in
Education*, 36, pp. 139-168.

Sandlin, J.; O'Malley, M; & Burdick, J. (2011). Mapping the Complexity of Public
Pedagogy Scholarship: 1894–2010. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(3), pp.
338-375.

Garret, H., & Segal, A. (2013). (Re) considerations of Ignorance and Resistance in
Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(4).

Shor, I. (1992a). *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration.*
Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Shor, I. (1992b). *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago,
IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Smith, D. (1994). *Geography and social justice*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Smyth, J. (2011). Critical Pedagogy for Social Justice. Continuum USA.

Steinberg, S., & Kirylo, J. (Eds.). (2013). Critical Pedagogy of Resistance: 34 Pedagogues We Need to Know. Rotterdam, NLD: Sense Publishers. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.comGarrett, H. James.

Sturman, A. (1997). Social justice in education. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Stewart, J. (2007). Teaching Resistance: An Exercise in Critical Pedagogy. *Radical Pedagogy,* 9(1).

Tye, B. (2000). *Hard truths: Uncovering the deep structure of schooling*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Walker, M. (2003). Framing social justice in education: What does the "capabilities" approach Offer? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 51(2), pp. 168-187.

Weiner, E. (2007). Critical Pedagogy and the Crisis of Imagination. In McLaren, P. & Kincheloe, J. (eds.) *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* Peter Lang.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of practice: learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

West, C. (2004). Democracy matters: Winning the fight against imperialism. New York, NY: Penguin.

Westbrook, R. (1992). Source Schools for Industrial Democrats: The Social Origins of John Dewey's Philosophy of Education. *American Journal of Education*, 100(4), 401-419.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237–269.

Young, I.. (1990). Justice and the politics of difference. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

EXEMPTION GRANTED

Eric Margolis
Human Communications, Hugh Downs School of
480/965-0131
ERIC.MARGOLIS@asu.edu

Dear Eric Margolis:

On 12/17/2013 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Study of Interpretations and Attitudes Towards Critical Pedagogy and its Relationship with Social Justice.
Investigator:	Eric Margolis
IRB ID:	STUDY00000435
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Margolis Consent Revised.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Application for Exempt Status- Boudon 2013.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • Interview questions, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • focus group questions, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • IRB Recruitment Email Boudon 2013.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials;

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal

Regulations 45CFR46 (2) Tests, surveys, interviews, or observation on 12/17/2013.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc:
    Daniel Boudon