

Teaching Sociology

Volume 36 Number 1

January 2008

SPECIAL ISSUE

LESSONS LEARNED AT THE 2007 ASA ANNUAL MEETINGS: INSIGHTS FROM THE TEACHING-RELATED WORKSHOPS

Inquiry-Guided Learning in Sociology

Maxine P. Atkinson and Andrea N. Hunt

Information Literacy: The Partnership of Sociology Faculty and Social Science Librarians

Patti Caravello, Edward Kain, Triveni Kuchi, Susan Macicak, and Gregory Weiss

Using ICPSR Resources to Teach Sociology

Lynette F. Hoelter, Felicia B. LeClere, Rachael E. Barlow, Amy M. Pienta, and James W. McNally

Critical Pedagogy in the Sociology Classroom: Challenges and Concerns

Catherine Fobes and Peter Kaufman

Learning to Teach Online

Marisol Clark-Ibáñez and Linda Scott

Facilitating Active Student Engagement and Dynamic Learning in Theory, Research Methods, and Statistics

Ginger Macheski, Kathleen S. Lowney, Jan Buhrmann, and Melanie E.L. Bush

Teaching Transgender

Tre Wentling, Kristen Schilt, Elroi Windsor, and Betsy Lucal

Teaching Work and Family to Undergraduate Students: Catalyzing Pedagogical, Curricular, and Programmatic Innovations

Stephen Sweet, Joshua Mumm, Marcie Pitt-Catsoupes, and Judith Casey

Teaching the Sociology of Gender and Work

Patti Giuffre, Cynthia Anderson, and Sharon Bird

Improving Pedagogy through Action Learning and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Cheryl Albers

How to Do the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Liz Grauerholz and John F. Zipp



An Official Journal of the American Sociological Association

TEACHING SOCIOLOGY

www.lemoyne.edu/ts/tsmain.html

Volume 36, Number 1

January 2008

SPECIAL ISSUE

LESSONS LEARNED AT THE 2007 ASA ANNUAL MEETINGS: INSIGHTS FROM THE TEACHING-RELATED WORKSHOPS

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

GUIDELINES FOR PAPERS SUBMITTED TO *TEACHING SOCIOLOGY*

CALL FOR PAPERS

COMMENT FROM THE EDITOR

Inquiry-Guided Learning in Sociology.	Maxine P. Atkinson andAndrea N. Hunt	1
Information Literacy: The Partnership of Sociology Faculty and Social Science Librarians.	Patti Caravello, Edward Kain,Triveni Kuchi, Susan Macicak, and Gregory Weiss	8
Using ICPSR Resources to Teach Sociology.	Lynette F. Hoelter, Felicia B. LeClere, Rachael E. Barlow, Amy M. Pienta, and James W. McNally	17
Critical Pedagogy in the Sociology Classroom: Challenges and Concerns. Catherine Fobes and Peter Kaufman	26
Learning to Teach Online.	Marisol Clark-Ibáñez and Linda Scott	34
Facilitating Active Student Engagement and Dynamic Learning in Theory, Research Methods, and Statistics.	Ginger Macheski, Kathleen S. Lowney,Jan Buhrmann, and Melanie E.L. Bush	42
Teaching Transgender.	Tre Wentling, Kristen Schilt,Elroi Windsor, and Betsy Lucal	49
Teaching Work and Family to Undergraduate Students: Catalyzing Pedagogical, Curricular, and Programmatic Innovations.	Stephen Sweet, Joshua Mumm, Marcie Pitt-Catsouphes, and Judith Casey	58
Teaching the Sociology of Gender and Work.	Patti Giuffre,Cynthia Anderson, and Sharon Bird	66
Improving Pedagogy through Action Learning and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Cheryl Albers	79
How to Do the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.	Liz Grauerholz and John F. Zipp	87

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

STATEMENT OF ASA POLICY ON MULTIPLE SUBMISSION

“Submission of manuscripts to a professional journal clearly implies commitment to publish in that journal. The competition for journal space requires a great deal of time and effort on the part of editorial readers whose main compensation for this service is the opportunity to read papers prior to publication and the gratification associated with discharge of professional obligations. For these reasons, the ASA regards submission of a manuscript to a professional journal while that paper is under review by another journal as unacceptable.”

Section II.B4, ASA Code of Ethics

MANUSCRIPT PROCESSING FEE

A processing fee of \$25.00 is required for each paper submitted, except reviews. (Fees are waived for student members of the ASA and associate editors of *Teaching Sociology*.) This practice reflects a policy of the ASA Council and Committee on Publications. A check or money order payable to the American Sociological Association should accompany each submission. The fee must be paid in order to initiate manuscript processing. Manuscripts that are revisions of papers previously declined by *Teaching Sociology*, but not revisions of manuscripts for which the previous outcome was a request to revise and resubmit, will be assessed an additional \$25.00.

MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION AND PROCESSING

- Formats: *Teaching Sociology* publishes several types of papers. Generally an *article* is about 25 pages long, is analytical and/or empirical, and is based on appropriate literature. A *note* is usually less than 15 pages long, contains a brief literature review, and describes a specific idea, strategy, or technique. Applications are typically 20 pages in length and are solicited by the editor. *Teaching Sociology* does not accept unsolicited applications manuscripts. *Conversations* should be no longer than eight pages (about 2,000 words) and are meant to encourage lively, thoughtful, and controversial discussion. For more information on these formats, see the “Guidelines for Papers Submitted to *Teaching Sociology*.”
- Email one (1) electronic copy of the manuscript to TS@mail.ucf.edu. Include an email address for acknowledgment of manuscript receipt and regular mailing address for correspondence.
- Manuscripts are reviewed anonymously. Authors’ names, affiliations, and other identifying material such as acknowledgments or personal references should be placed on the title page only, or on other separate pages preceding the text. It is the *authors’ responsibility* to remove all identifying information before submitting a manuscript.
- All papers should include an abstract of no more than 150 words on a separate page.
- Manuscripts must be typed, *double-spaced* (including footnotes, biography, acknowledgments, abstracts, references, indented material, and tables), and paginated. Place footnotes at the end of the manuscript. Margins should be at least one-inch wide all around.
- Type each table and figure on a separate page. Figures must be prepared professionally. Place acknowledgments, credits, grant numbers, corresponding address, and e-mail on the title page and mark with an asterisk. If you include this information, place an asterisk after the title.
- Manuscripts accepted for publication are subject to copyediting.
- Clarify all symbols with notes in the margins of the manuscript. Circle these and all other explanatory notes not intended for printing.
- Three kinds of footnotes are possible, each serving a different purpose:
 - A. *Content footnotes*: Content footnotes are explanations or amplifications of the text. Because they are distracting to readers, an author should include important information in the text and omit irrelevant information. Content footnotes generally will not be allowed.

Rather than footnoting long or complicated material, such as proofs or derivations unnecessary to the text, consider 1) stating in a short footnote that the material is available from the author, 2) depositing the material in a national retrieval center and including an appropriate footnote, or 3) adding an appendix. If you use an appendix, the reference in the text should read “(see Appendix for complete derivation)”.

Number the text footnotes consecutively throughout the article with superscript Arabic numerals. If you mention a footnote later in the text, return to it with a parenthetical note (“see Footnote 3”) rather than repeating the superscript number.
 - B. *Reference footnotes*: Use footnotes for reference only to cite material of limited availability. Acceptable reference footnotes include 1) legal citations, which should follow the footnote style of “A Uniform System of Citation” (Harvard Law Review Association 1967), 2) copyright permission footnotes, 3) unpublished works, and 4) works in progress.
 - C. *Table footnotes*: Table footnotes are appended only to a specific table. Footnotes to a table should be lettered consecutively within each table with superscript lowercase letters.

REFERENCE FORMAT

IN-TEXT CITATIONS

- Identify each source at the appropriate point in the text by the last name of the author or authors, year of publication, and pagination (if needed). Examples:
Glaser and Strauss (1969) discussed the importance....
Declining enrollments pose a threat to the faculty (Huber 1985:375-82).
Merton (1940, 1945) argues....
- In the first in-text citation of items with four or more names, use the first author's last name plus the words "et al." List all names only when "et al." would cause confusion. In citations with three or fewer authors, all authors' last names should be listed the first time the reference is cited.
- When two authors in your reference list have the same last name, use identifying initial, as in in (J. Smith 1990).
- For institutional authorship, supply minimum identification from the beginning of the reference item, as in (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1986:123).
- When you cite more than one source, alphabetize citations within parentheses, as follows:
...issues that both faculty and students are expected to address (DeMartini 1983; Lynch and Smith 1985; Rippertoe 1977).
- Ampersand (&) should not be used as a substitute for "and" in citations and reference.
- Names of racial/ethnic groups that represent geographical locations or linguistic groups should be capitalized—for example, Hispanic, Asian, African American, Appalachian, Caucasian.

REFERENCE LIST

- In a section headed REFERENCES, list all items alphabetically by author. If you include more than one item by any author, list those items in chronological order.
- The reference section must include all sources cited in the text. Name every author in each source; "et al." is not acceptable.
- Use authors' first names, not first initials.
- Most page references should be elided (pp. 132-48, pp. 1002-11, pp. 1054-82; except for pp. 102-106, 1101-1108, and the like).
- List publisher's name as concisely as possible without loss of clarity, as in "Wiley" for "John A. Wiley and Sons."
- If the item has been accepted for publication but is still unpublished, use "forthcoming" where the year would normally appear; otherwise use "unpublished."
- Type the first line of each reference item flush to the left margin. Indent any subsequent lines .12 inch.
- Double-space the references.
- Do not insert a space after a colon connected with an issue number. Example of correct form: *Changes* 19 (2):200-32.

Examples of correct *Teaching Sociology* reference format:

Journal article with single author:

Nelson, Craig E. 2003. "Doing It: Examples of Several of the Different Genres of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning." *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 14(2/3):85-94.

Journal article with two authors:

Mauksch, Hans O. and Carla B. Howery. 1986. "Social Change for Teaching: The Case of One Disciplinary Association." *Teaching Sociology* 14(1):73-82.

Journal article with three or more authors:

Persell, Caroline Hodges, Kathryn M. Pfeiffer, and Ali Syed. 2007. "What Should Students Understand After Taking Introduction to Sociology?" *Teaching Sociology* 35(4):300-14.

Book references:

Brown, Charles, ed. 1985. *The Joys of Teaching*. Springfield, IL: Freewheeling Press.

_____. 1989. *Writing Programs in American Universities*. 8th ed. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Brown, Charles and Lois Dorsi. Forthcoming. *The Suburban Campus*. Vol. 2. Washington, DC: Bourgeois.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Item in edited volume:

Dynes, Russell and Irwin Deutscher. 1983. "Perspectives on Applied Educational Programs." Pp. 295-311 in *Applied Sociology*, edited by Howard E. Freeman, Russell Dynes, Peter H. Rossi, and William F. Whyte. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Electronic sources:

Brown, L. David and Rajesh Tandon. 1983. "Ideology and Political Economy in Inquiry: Action Research and Participatory Research." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. Retrieved March 1, 2003 (<http://www.outeru-university.org/slmonograp.html>).

HEADS AND SUBHEADS

- First-level heads are capitalized, bolded, and centered.
- Second-level heads are italicized, bolded, and placed flush with left-hand margin.
- Third-level heads are italicized, bolded, and indented .12 inch at the beginning of the paragraph. Capitalize first letter only; end with period. Example:
Morality. Within the literature of sociology, social reality is often derived from morality, and social meanings are described as reflexive and moral, serving private and collective ends.

OTHER DETAILS

- Spell out all numbers through nine. Express numbers 10 and up as numerals.
- Spell out all ordinals through ninth. After 10th, express as ordinals (e.g., 10th, 20th).
- Spell out "percent." Always use a numeral with "percent" even if it is a number below 10, as in "3 percent."
- Avoid biased language. For example, use first-year or lower-level students rather than freshmen.
- Copies of the *ASA Style Guide* are available at cost from the editorial office and the ASA.

GUIDELINES FOR PAPERS SUBMITTED TO *TEACHING SOCIOLOGY*

Teaching Sociology publishes several types of papers. The basic distinction is between articles and notes. Generally, articles are longer than notes, more analytical, contain an extensive literature review and data analysis. Notes are shorter (usually 15 pages or less), contain a shorter literature review, and present and assess a teaching technique. The distinction reflects the dual purposes of the journal: 1) to provide a forum for analyzing the teaching of sociology, and 2) as a forum for the exchange of specific teaching ideas.

Articles are evaluated using some combination of the following criteria:

1. How useful and original are the ideas presented?
2. How thoroughly does the author consider implications for the teaching of sociology?
3. How well developed is the basic analytical point?
4. Is there sociological theory and/or analysis?
5. How thoroughly and accurately does the author ground the paper in the literature?
 - Are there articles in *Teaching Sociology* that the author should cite?
 - Does the paper tie into the larger literature on pedagogy?
6. How extensively does the author extend previous ideas and bring some intellectual closure to the topic?
7. In an empirical study, how sound is the methodology and how accurately do the presented results reflect the data? If applicable, how is student success measured and is there evidence that demonstrates that learning outcomes were achieved?
8. How well written is the paper?
 - How well integrated is the paper?
 - How well organized is the paper?

Notes are evaluated using some combination of the following criteria:

1. How useful, original, and transferable is the technique, strategy, or idea?
 - Does the paper discuss the types of classes and institutions where the technique can be used?
2. How cogently are the ideas and implications presented?
3. Is the description sufficiently detailed so a reader could easily employ it?
4. Does the paper say more than "I tried this and I liked it"?
5. Is there a brief literature review?
6. Does the author address potential difficulties with the technique and suggest possible solutions?
7. Is qualitative or quantitative outcome data reported?
8. How well written is the paper?
 - How well integrated is the paper?
 - How well organized is the paper?

GUIDELINES FOR PAPERS SUBMITTED TO *TEACHING SOCIOLOGY* FOR THE CONVERSATION SECTION

Teaching Sociology publishes brief comments, arguments, conversations, interviews, and responses related to a wide variety of issues in teaching sociology. The purpose of the Conversation section is to stimulate lively, thoughtful, topical, and controversial discussion. The Conversation section serves as a forum for an on-going exchange of ideas, arguments, responses, and commentary on issues that present the teacher of sociology with formidable challenges, dilemmas, and problems. Submissions to the Conversation section are refereed.

Conversations are evaluated using some combination of the following criteria:

1. How useful and original are the author's ideas, arguments, and/or commentary?
2. How relevant are the author's ideas, arguments, and/or commentary to issues in teaching sociology?
3. How well do the author's ideas and arguments contribute to an on-going dialogue on issues and dilemmas related to teaching sociology?
4. How thoroughly does the author consider implications for the teaching of sociology?
5. How cogently are the ideas and implications presented?
6. How well developed is the author's basic point/argument?
7. How well written is the paper?
 - How well integrated is the paper?
 - How well organized is the paper?

APPLICATION PAPERS IN *TEACHING SOCIOLOGY*

Teaching Sociology occasionally publishes applications of current research. The purpose of application papers is to make sociological research more accessible to undergraduate students by providing instructors with pedagogical tools for incorporating current research in their undergraduate courses. Application papers present learning activities, discussion questions, and other student-centered learning techniques that can be used in a variety of undergraduate courses. Applications are solicited by the editor.

CALL FOR PAPERS

CALL FOR PAPERS SPECIAL ISSUE OF *TEACHING SOCIOLOGY*

50 Years of C. Wright Mills and The Sociological Imagination: The Significance for Teaching and Learning Sociology

This issue will commemorate the 50th anniversary of the publication of C. Wright Mills's *The Sociological Imagination* by exploring its meaning for teaching and learning sociology. The core ideas and lessons of Mills are most likely one of the first perspectives to which sociology students are exposed and his work has been a foundation to how and why countless sociologists teach in the discipline. We invite submissions of reflective essays discussing the past, present, and future meaning and significance of Mills for sociological pedagogy as well as empirical research on innovative methods and activities for incorporating this perspective into the classroom and achieving desired learning objectives. Submissions should be sent to Liz Grauerholz, Editor, and Stephen J. Scanlan, Guest Editor, *Teaching Sociology*, Department of Sociology, University of Central Florida, Howard Phillips Hall 403, Orlando, FL 32816-1360. Questions can be directed to the editor or guest editor at grauer@mail.ucf.edu or scanlans@ohio.edu. Deadline for submissions is April 1, 2008.

COMMENT FROM THE EDITOR

IF YOU ARE LOOKING for evidence that teaching occupies a central role in our discipline, you do not have to look further than the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association. Each year, dozens of teaching-related workshops, papers and often thematic sessions are presented at the meetings, from a wide range of scholars. In fact, there are far too many for any one person to attend. Each year, I leave the meetings wishing that I had the time to attend more of the workshops since this is one of the key places where we share innovative ideas about our teaching and gain inspiration for the year to come. Unlike papers, which may appear in print, workshop materials are seldom shared in a broader forum so that much of what goes on in these workshops is limited to those fortunate enough to attend. It is this fact that prompted me to devote a special issue to "Lessons Learned at the American Sociological Association Annual Meetings" so that this valuable knowledge can extend beyond the meetings and have broader application.

Shortly after returning from ASA I in-

vited workshop organizers to submit manuscripts that summarized the major topics and challenges presented in their workshop. About half did so. These submissions were peer-reviewed. What is contained in this issue is a sampling of papers that were accepted for publication and represent the rich variety of teaching-related workshops conducted at the ASA meetings. Some of the workshops concern general issues related to teaching, others focus on teaching specific courses, and some concern faculty development.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Nancy Greenwood, Jay Howard, and David Yamane for serving as peer-reviewers for the workshop papers. These colleagues graciously agreed to review multiple manuscripts in a very short period of time in order to get this issue ready to go to press. My thanks also go to the authors, who worked under tight deadlines as well. I hope you enjoy the fruits of their labor.

Liz Grauerholz
University of Central Florida

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY IN THE SOCIOLOGY CLASSROOM: CHALLENGES AND CONCERNS*

Although critical pedagogy has been discussed in the Teaching Sociology literature for nearly twenty years, dialogues about the difficulties in practicing and implementing critical pedagogical strategies in everyday classroom life are less common. In this note, we discuss a predominant theme of our workshop: challenges and concerns that may arise when one attempts to do critical pedagogy. We focus on both challenges and potential solutions for learners, instructors, and institutions of higher education. Understanding what some of these obstacles are and how they manifest in institutions of higher learning goes a long way in devising strategies to assuage their deleterious effects.

CATHERINE FOBES

Alma College

PETER KAUFMAN

SUNY New Paltz

ALTHOUGH IT IS BY NO MEANS part of the teaching canon, critical pedagogy has had a steady, albeit modest, presence in the sociology classroom. As evidenced in the pages of *Teaching Sociology*, instructors have been discussing and employing critical pedagogical strategies for nearly twenty years (Ballard 1998; Braa and Callero 2006; Fobes 2005; Gaianguet 1998; Gimenez 1998; Hardy 1989; Jakubowski and Burman 2004; Kaufman 2001; Long 1998; Solorzano 1989; Stoecker et al 1993; Sweet 1998a, 1998b). In addition to this body of literature, the ASA has published two editions of a resource manual titled *Critical Pedagogy in the Sociology Classroom* (Kaufman 2002, 2006). The publication of the second edition of this resource manual was the impetus for our teaching workshop at the 2007 ASA meeting in New York City.

To some extent, it is difficult to distinguish critical pedagogy from other forms of active learning. For example, McKinney et al (2004) recommend that sociology departments incorporate diverse pedagogies to

stimulate student engagement. Although they specifically mention cooperative/collaborative learning and problem-based learning, and they suggest a movement away from traditional lecturing to a more student-centered classroom, they never make mention of critical pedagogy. Nevertheless, the techniques they discuss can be viewed as integral parts of the critical pedagogical classroom. For the purpose of this note, as well as for our workshop, we offer the following main points of critical pedagogy based largely on the work of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (for a fuller understanding of critical pedagogy see Freire 1970, 1998, among his other works; Darder, Baltodano, Torres 2003; Wink 2005; and the citations listed above):

- Encourages the eradication of the teacher-student contradiction whereby the teacher teaches and the students are taught; the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing; the teacher talks and the students listen; and the teacher is the subject and the students are mere objects.
- Promotes a problem-posing dialogue (instead of a banking/lecturing style) that emanates from the lived experiences (generative themes) of the learners.
- Fosters epistemological curiosity in both teachers and learners.

*Please address all correspondence to Catherine Fobes, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Alma College, 614 West Superior Street, Alma, MI 48801-1599; email: fobes@alma.edu.

- Strives for praxis: reflection and action of the social world in order to transform it.

The distinguishing feature of critical pedagogy is that it is both a form of practice and a form of action. Critical pedagogy does not only tell us how to teach and learn—much less what to teach and learn; rather, it also implores us to use our teaching and learning to effect positive social change. This joining together of process, content, and outcome makes critical pedagogy uniquely problematic for both learners and teachers. Since there are many examples of how to bring critical pedagogy into the sociology classroom (again, see citations noted above), we will discuss a predominant theme of our workshop: challenges and concerns that may arise when one attempts to do critical pedagogy. We focus specifically on matters related to learners, instructors, and institutions of higher education. Although we present these in three separate sections we certainly recognize and allude to the fact that they are in no way mutually exclusive. Furthermore, we acknowledge that our brief discussion of these challenges merely scratches the surface and does not represent a comprehensive account of the issues or possible solutions.

Challenges Concerning Learners

Recovering Students' Voices. Critical pedagogues posit that teaching and learning occur relationally through the reciprocal exchange of teacher-student discourses. Such an approach mandates that as instructors we construct learning opportunities that honor students' voices, many of which have been squelched by the banking system of education. In respecting what students know, we can help them link knowledge from the curriculum with the concrete reality of their everyday lives, and facilitate adventurous curiosity, risk-taking, and openness to the new (Freire 1998). The main challenge we face is re-socializing students to accept these learning experiences. We find that especially in the beginning of the semester, students may feel uncomfortable with dis-

covering and/or recovering their own voices, asking questions, and tolerating ambiguity and uncertainty. Initially, many students are more comfortable with the traditional model of compulsory note taking and the regurgitation of "facts." Yet our experience is that students adapt quickly. As testament, instructors have documented how critical pedagogy can help students find a comfort zone while exploring a wide variety of topics ranging from homophobia (Little and Marx 2006) to hip hop culture (Hill and Ramsaran 2006). Recovering students' voices helps bring them into the fold as co-learners and co-teachers.

Resistance to Professors' Political Agendas. As stated earlier, a distinguishing feature of critical pedagogy is that it is both a form of practice and a form of action; it beseeches us to use our teaching and learning to work towards a more equitable society. In so doing it is not a value-neutral approach to teaching; it is decidedly on the left of the political spectrum. But what if students do not see themselves as scholar change agents? And what if they do not share our progressive social and political orientations? Although we may try to frame critical pedagogical assignments by encouraging students to work towards eradicating social inequalities and promoting social justice, some students may hold conservative perspectives that are at odds with our views. As a result, some students may voice reservations, even resistance, about being required to work for social change—much less progressive social change. A number of workshop participants shared stories of student opposition to this type of action-based learning (see Shor 1996 for a full account of student resistance to critical pedagogy). We feel that the best way to address such concerns is to dialogue with students about the purpose and obligation of education. Through problem posing questions we would ask students to consider the function and rational for being in school. Do they hope to use their education to transform their social reality (such as through getting a job)? Does the knowledge they gain

through schooling make them act differently—to other people, to other social institutions, or to themselves? Questions such as these may help students recognize that education is an inherently active endeavor and that by pursuing a college degree they are implicitly acting as agents of change.

Free-Rider Problem. Because critical pedagogy engages students cooperatively, assignments frequently involve group work. In nearly any group work project the possibility of the “free-rider” problem exists. Free-riders are students who benefit from group grades without doing their fair share of the work. This topic provoked lively discussion in the workshop and several possibilities for addressing the free-rider challenge emerged. First, we suggest faculty meet frequently with groups outside of scheduled class time, in place of one or two class sessions throughout the semester. By meeting semi-regularly with groups, the instructor can facilitate their progress by suggestion or direct intervention (Yamane 1996). A second possibility is to raise the free-rider issue with the class at the outset and explain that benefiting from another’s work while contributing little of their own is at odds with a project intended to make the world a more equitable place. An extension of this suggestion is to allow the class to determine the parameters of what constitutes a free rider as well as any sanctions that they deem necessary. Further, individual students in each group can be required to keep a “work log” detailing the time put into the projects as well as their accomplishments (see Fobes and Hefferan 2007). Some instructors also build in peer grading as another mechanism to deter free-riders. Finally, setting up groups according to compatible schedules and shared interests, as well as strengthening the internal organization of groups with students assuming roles such as discussion leader, reporter and meeting coordinator may also decrease the possibility of free-riding (Yamane 1996). Ultimately we believe the benefits of cooperative and collaborative assignments outweigh the risk of the free-rider problem.

Challenges Concerning Instructors

De-centering Authority. One of the most difficult and paradoxical tasks facing the critical pedagogue is breaking down the teacher-student contradiction. How do we invite students to be co-teachers if we (instructors) begin from a position of intellectual authority? How do we encourage students to take control of their education if they know (and we know) that we are still the gatekeepers of the course? How do we allow students (through their generative themes) to establish the curriculum of the course when there is a discipline-specific body of knowledge we feel compelled (or are required) to cover? And how do we de-center authority when we are working to gain authority if, for example, we are a new, non-white, female teacher? To begin answering these questions requires that we reflect on our own position in the classroom as both teacher and learner. Although we certainly have some degree of institutional and intellectual authority, we can still approach the classroom as a space to both share and, where appropriate, negate some of this authority.

Bickel (2006) offers an example of “democratizing the classroom” whereby students, through debate and dialogue, decided the subjects they covered, the amount of reading assigned per week, the due dates and page lengths for paper assignments, and the attendance policy. As Bickel discovered, by inviting students to assume co-ownership of the classroom, instructors may actually find themselves gaining more respect, and paradoxically, more authority among the students. Furthermore, eliminating the contradictions between students and teachers does not mean that teachers no longer teach; rather, it suggests that “both the teacher and the students know that open, curious questioning, whether in speaking or listening, is what grounds them mutually” (Freire 1998:81). In other words, the goal is not to abdicate our responsibilities or to deny and conceal our knowledge but to create a genuine space for students to contribute to the curriculum: “to teach is not to transfer

knowledge but to create the possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge” (Freire 1998:30).

Grading and Assessment. Once we decide to de-center some of our authority we are likely to feel somewhat hypocritical when it comes time to grade and evaluate students. It may seem as if all of our hard work to lessen the teacher-student contradictions is for naught as the wall between students and teacher is quickly re-established when grades are assigned. Equally complicated is figuring out what methods of assessment should be used. If the goals of critical pedagogy are to promote dialogue and encourage students to name their world so that they can change their world, how do we evaluate such objectives within the context of the substantive course content? These issues are not easily resolved and they connect with some of the institutional issues we discuss below.

Having students participate in the construction and selection of evaluative measures is one way to address this challenge. For example, Fobes and Hefferan (2007) asked students to create a grading rubric in class for praxis project assignments. While Fobes stood at the blackboard writing down students’ criteria for an “A” paper and an “A” PowerPoint presentation, Hefferan took notes and typed up the rubric for distribution to the entire class. Another approach is to re-evaluate pedagogical goals and objectives and create alternative means to assess student learning. For instance, in their class on community organizing, Braa and Collero (2006) adopted an alternative four-point evaluation policy, collectively defined by students through dialogue and consensus. One of the benefits of Braa and Collero’s model is that “it promotes dialogue and assessment without jeopardizing the group solidarity so critical to community power” (p. 10). For many of us, our methods of instruction and evaluation mirror the educational practices that we experienced when we were objectified students. Instead of relying on the same demeaning, irrelevant, and unimaginative techniques used by

many of our teachers, we should tap into our creativity to transform the means through which grades are determined and assigned.

Modeling and Maintaining Epistemological Curiosity. We believe that one of the great misconceptions about discussion-based (problem posing) teaching is that it is easier and less labor-intensive than the lecturing (banking) approach. While it is true that different teaching styles may suit different people, there is no denying the immeasurable energy required to be a critical pedagogue. And the number one ingredient that simultaneously fuels and drains our energy is epistemological curiosity. Freire (1998) argues that epistemological curiosity—the endless questioning, the awareness of our “unfinishedness,” the capacity for the beginner’s mind—is a crucial component of critical pedagogy. If we hope that students are engaged with the course material and with the outside world, then we need to demonstrate what such engagement looks like. We cannot rest on our laurels and rely on what worked well in the past. We need to constantly create and recreate the course based on the students in the classroom, the state of current affairs, and our own development as human beings. If we truly want to be co-learners and co-teachers with students, if we want to mesh their lived experiences with our disciplinary expertise, if we want to construct a classroom environment that legitimizes their voices, and if we want to create avenues for them to explore the possibilities of being agents of change, then we need to do a lot of creative, critical, and challenging work to ensure that these goals are achieved. Franzosi (2006) offers an illuminating account of the kind of reflective and resourceful work one must do in order to become a critical pedagogue.

Institutional Challenges

Mundane, Bureaucratized Practices. Historically the institution of higher education has operated by establishing mundane, bureaucratized practices that may function to discourage critical pedagogy (Sweet 1998).

As Mauksch (1986:42) points out, "Class size, classroom arrangements, and support facilities for teaching activities are based on institutional policies and practice, rarely on teacher demands or teacher influence." For example, classrooms may be physically arranged such that chairs are set in rows, and are sometimes immovable. Often classrooms are not conducive to discussion with little or no space for small group work. The few classrooms that are conducive to discussion or that do have movable chairs may be highly sought after and therefore available only on a competitive basis. Also, some instructors may have texts and curriculums chosen for them, especially part-timers or in departments where, for example, an introductory text is chosen for all sections. Centralized control of book orders, filled prior to class meeting dates, may deter students' input into grass-roots curriculum development (Sweet 1998). All of these institutional impediments may constrain an instructor's capability to implement a critical pedagogical framework.

As with many of the preceding challenges, crafting solutions to these bureaucratized practices requires time, energy, and creativity on the part of instructors. Mauksch (1986:48) recommends shifting power from hierarchical, administrative structures to peer initiatives, emphasizing collegial concern with improving instruction, and cultivating "an environment of appreciation." More specifically, Gaian-guest (1998:125) suggests finding colleagues from different disciplines in our home institutions who share similar pedagogical approaches and then working towards one area of institutional change "that has a likelihood of success." Although it may be difficult to totally free ourselves from the institutional iron cage, these suggestions of reaching out to like-minded colleagues strengthens our social capital and ensures that we will have a cadre of supportive peers with whom to face these challenges.

Institutional Vulnerabilities of Instructors. One of the consequences of the in-

creasing bureaucratization of teaching combined with the dehumanization of the banking system is that critical pedagogues are susceptible to institutional forces. One area of vulnerability is instructor assessment. Standardized teaching evaluations, based on "measurable universalistic and replicable criteria" may lack indicators designed to assess the effectiveness of key elements of critical pedagogy such as creativity and innovation (Mauksch 1986:46; Sweet 1998). Further, the tension between teaching, research, and service may be heightened for the critical pedagogue. As stated earlier, long hours in labor-intensive preparation and teaching combined with obligations to attend to and support student social action projects outside of class may leave less time to devote to scholarship, which, depending on the college or university, is likely to be increasingly valued in hiring, tenure and promotion decisions (Marchant and Newman 1994). We also found workshop participants, part-time or untenured, who were concerned about the repercussions of practicing critical pedagogy for their careers. For example, when it comes time for reappointment and promotion, how do traditionally-oriented colleagues react to a critical pedagogical teaching portfolio? Might instructors be labeled as "troublemakers" for using "subversive" teaching techniques? What if students want to protest social problems on campus that jeopardize the college or university's reputation?

The institutional risks of practicing critical pedagogy became acutely evident to Kaufman one semester when his students were engaged in a critical pedagogical project based on censored news stories (Kaufman 2001). For the praxis component of their project, one group of students made a mini-documentary simulating their censored story: "CIA Kidnaps Suspects for Overseas Torture and Execution." In their dramatization of this story, the students used fake blood (ketchup) and toy guns; unfortunately, a passerby thought the props were real. The campus police were called to the scene, drew their guns (because they

assumed the students were armed), arrested them, and charged them with criminal nuisance and disorderly conduct. Kaufman found it particularly difficult to advocate for these students because he was untenured at the time and he was concerned about how some administrators would react when they learned about the story that the students were enacting. Despite Kaufman's letters and phone calls to campus administrators in which he suggested that the students should be applauded for their creativity, enthusiasm, and level of engagement, neither the administration nor the campus police would step in to drop the charges and the students were forced to appear in court. In the end, the town judge recognized the innocence of the students' actions and said their records would be clear after six months of probation. For critical pedagogues, the incident serves as a cautionary tale of institutional vulnerabilities potentially faced when utilizing transformative educational practices.

Pressure to Stay Inside the Institutional Box. As already described, many professors (including several workshop participants) feel pressure to conform to institutional regulations and constraints. At the same time, we believe that it is an illusion to think that if we were free of our home institutional constraints, all would be well. One of the ironies of critical pedagogy is that if we take our role of professor-as-learner seriously, *the lack of* institutional structure—such as a classroom, hallways, and office—may be daunting, especially at first. Something as simple as spending unstructured time with students in protests or in traveling can be disconcerting, in part because we are taking risks of vulnerability by stepping outside of the institutional box. For example, in a critical pedagogical approach to a travel-study course in Peru, Fobes (2006) reflects on how unsettled she was within the first twelve hours of the trip, long before reaching Peruvian soil:

[Traveling with students is] not like the classroom, hallway, or office where I have control over how long I [interact with students]. I'm

used to enacting front-stage behavior with students and backstage, only as I am comfortable. Here [on the airplane and in the airports], students can observe and become privy to [my] backstage behavior: brushing my hair and teeth, reading my meditation book, listening to my CDs, watching/seeing me eat. It's unnerving. I want to run and hide and we haven't been together 12 hours! (PP. 10-11)

As in the case of Fobes, we might not even recognize the extent to which the institutional box controls us and provides us with security until we begin to step outside of it. However, Freire (1998:51-4) calls us to expose who we are anyway—as unfinished human beings. No wonder critical pedagogy is unsettling! It is unsettling—for students, teachers, and institutions of higher education. That is precisely the point.

CONCLUSION

One of the underlying themes of critical pedagogy is that education is much more than just the transmission of knowledge. Instead of merely inculcating students with “objective” and “value-neutral” facts, figures, and theories, we must recognize that “education as a specifically human experience, is a form of intervention in the world” (Freire 1998:90-1). To paraphrase C. Wright Mills, education as intervention is both the *task* and the *promise* of critical pedagogy (and, we would argue, of sociology). For those of us who attempt to bring critical pedagogy into the sociology classroom, the challenges and concerns are many. Understanding what some of these obstacles are and how they are manifested in institutions of higher learning goes a long way in devising strategies to assuage their deleterious effects. In both the workshop and in this paper, we identified some of the major issues of fusing together sociology and critical pedagogy. Although there are many more issues than the ones we discussed, and although we offered only cursory solutions to some of these challenges, we hope that more instructors will be encouraged to consider critical pedagogy as a

dynamic paradigm for teaching, learning, and intervening in the world.

REFERENCES

- Ballard, Chet. 1998. "I Tried Radical Pedagogy Once, But I Did Not Inhale. Response to 'Practicing Radical Pedagogy: Balancing Ideals with Institutional Constraints.'" *Teaching Sociology* 26(2):121-12.
- Bickel, Christopher. 2006. "Cultivating Orchids: Promoting Democracy in the Classroom." Pp. 93-107 in *Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom*, edited by P. Kaufman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Braa, Dean and Peter Callero. 2006. "Critical Pedagogy and Classroom Praxis." *Teaching Sociology* 34(4):357-69.
- Darder, Antonia, Marta Baltodano, and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2003. *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Fobes, Catherine. 2005. "Taking a Critical Pedagogical Look at Travel-Study Abroad: 'A Classroom with a View' in Cusco, Peru." *Teaching Sociology* 33(2):181-94.
- _____. 2006. "Practicing Critical Pedagogy in Travel Study Abroad: Teacher-As-Learner in Cusco, Peru." Pp. 7-13 in *Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom*, edited by P. Kaufman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Fobes, Catherine and Tara Hefferan. 2007. "Practicing Critical Pedagogy in Teaching Gender and International Development." Paper presented at the North Central Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL. April 4-6, 2007.
- Franzosi, Roberto. 2006. "Pedagogical Philosophy." Pp. 14-9 in *Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom*, edited by P. Kaufman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- _____. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, Paulo. 1998. *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic Courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gaianguest, Kathryn. 1998. "Radical Pedagogy Is Social Change in Action. Response to 'Practicing Radical Pedagogy: Balancing Ideals with Institutional Constraints.'" *Teaching Sociology* 26(2):123-6.
- Jimenez, Martha. 1998. "The Radical Pedagogy Mystique: A View from the Trenches. Response to 'Practicing Radical Pedagogy: Balancing Ideals with Institutional Constraints.'" *Teaching Sociology* 26(2):116-20.
- Hardy, Tim. 1989. "Toward a Critical Pedagogy in Sociology through the Use of Drama." *Teaching Sociology* 17(2):226-31.
- Hill, Simona and Dave Ramsaran. 2006. "Listening with the Third Ear: An Exercise in Demystifying Hip Hop Culture, Power, and Pedagogy." Pp. 153-7 in *Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom*, edited by P. Kaufman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Jakubowski, Lisa M. and Patrick Burman. 2004. "Teaching Community Development: A Case Study in Community-Based Learning." *Teaching Sociology* 32(2):160-76.
- Kaufman, Peter. 2001. "All the News Not Fit to Print: Using Censored Stories as an Exercise in Critical Pedagogy." *Teaching Sociology* 29(1):80-7.
- _____. 2002. *Critical Pedagogy in the Sociology Classroom*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- _____. 2006. *Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom*, 2nd ed. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Little, Patricia and Marcia Marx. 2006. "Teaching About Homophobia and Heterosexism." Pp. 174-8 in *Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom*, edited by P. Kaufman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Long, David. 1998. "A Radical Teacher's Dilemma. Response to 'Practicing Radical Pedagogy: Balancing Ideals with Institutional Constraints.'" *Teaching Sociology* 26(2):112-5.
- Marchant, Gregory and Isadore Newman. 1994. "Faculty Activities and Rewards: Views from Education Administrators in the USA." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 19:14-152.
- Mauksch, Hans O. 1986. "Teaching Within Institutional Values and Structures." *Teaching Sociology* 1(1):40-9.
- McKinney, Kathleen, Carla B. Howery, Kerry J. Strand, Edward L. Kain, and Catherine White Berheide. 2004. *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Shor, Ira. 1996. *When Students Have Power: Negotiating Authority in a Critical Pedagogy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Solorzano, Daniel. 1989. "Teaching and Social Change: Reflections on a Freirean Approach in a College Classroom." *Teaching Sociology* 17(2):218-25.
- Stoecker, Randy, Mary Schmidbauer, Joan Mullin, and Michelle Young. 1993. "Integrating Writing and the Teaching Assistant to Enhance Critical Pedagogy." *Teaching Sociology* 21(4):332-40.
- Sweet, Stephen. 1998a. "Practicing Radical Pedagogy: Balancing Ideals with Institutional Constraints." *Teaching Sociology* 26(2):100-11.
- _____. 1998b. "Reassessing Radical Pedagogy." *Teaching Sociology* 26(2):127-9.
- Wink, Joan. 2005. *Critical Pedagogy: Notes*

from the Real World. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Yamane, David. 1996. "Collaboration and its Discontents: Steps Toward Overcoming Barriers to Successful Group Projects." *Teaching Sociology* 24(4):378-83.

Catherine Fobes is an associate professor of sociology at Alma College in Michigan. She teaches in the areas of complex organizations, methods of social research, gender, and family.

Peter Kaufman is an associate professor of sociology at the State University of New York at New Paltz. In addition to his interest in critical pedagogy, he is currently studying athletes who engage in social and political activism.