

May 2014

Beyond the Neoliberal Imaginary: Investigating the Role of Critical Pedagogy in Higher Education

Melanie M. Mazier

The University Western Ontario

Supervisor

Dr. Goli Rezai-Rashti

The University of Western Ontario

Graduate Program in Education

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Master of Education

© Melanie M. Mazier 2014

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>



Part of the [International and Comparative Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mazier, Melanie M., "Beyond the Neoliberal Imaginary: Investigating the Role of Critical Pedagogy in Higher Education" (2014).

Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 2034.

<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/2034>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact tadam@uwo.ca, wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

Beyond the Neoliberal Imaginary:
Investigating the Role of Critical Pedagogy in Higher Education

(Thesis format: Monograph)

by

Melanie Lawrence-Mazier

Graduate Program in Education

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
Western University of Canada
London, Ontario, Canada

© Melanie Lawrence-Mazier 2014

Abstract

This thesis uses the qualitative case study approach to investigate the lived experience of three faculty members in higher education who identify themselves as critical pedagogues during an era of neoliberal restructuring. This research explores what the possibilities are for enacting critical pedagogies within a neoliberal climate of educational restructuring in higher education. Existing literature struggles to define neoliberalism as a result of globalization; further, present neoliberalization is penetrating all levels of social life and informing what many now accept as everyday thinking. Each of the faculty members selected for this research speaks to these struggles, while providing rich accounts of how neoliberalism challenges and concerns them; both, philosophically and pedagogically. This research highlights how at the start of the 21st Century a very compelling discourse on higher education is beginning to take place that seeks to inform how universities critically approach education and global education. This discourse reveals the concerns and potential for links in global higher education and future labour opportunities that are being created through the increasing mobility of people, markets, and knowledge. It also emphasizes the dire need for new ways in understanding how we envision higher education and global relations that are increasingly framed by neoliberal globalization. This discussion also brought to light how neoliberal trends have embedded themselves to such a degree in education it has created a mystique that might actually be a crisis of conscience; not politics, not economics.

Keywords: Higher education, neoliberalism, critical pedagogy, democracy, cosmopolitanism, global education, social justice and equity.

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my children Connor and Jack. From the moment you became a twinkle in God's eye, I realized there would be much to learn and much that you would teach me.

Acknowledgements

In many ways this thesis feels like it has been a lifetime in making, for it has been a lifetime of lived experiences that have provided the catalyst for this journey. I came to higher education later than most, and while I questioned this path when beginning it is a path I now fully embrace as home. Thus, I have many to thank. From my earliest days, I thank my family, all seven. I thank my Mother Louise Lawrence, a pioneer of modern day perseverance and deeply rooted love, she filled our home with books, music, and at times chaos. My Mother, borrowing from William Shakespeare, to this day reminds me to be *truthful to self* and always to dream. I thank each of my six siblings: Guy, Kathleen, Heather, Scott, Blair, and Shelley. Each of you has in untold ways contributed to who I am. I also would like to acknowledge those I have come to remember as my “Toronto Crew”, for being the first to show me that family is a chosen term; and, the importance of Other. I learned much from you and the world literally shrunk and exploded all at once. Thank you for the travels we shared.

I want to acknowledge my steadfast friends, my anchors and my parachutes: Maureen and Dave Williams, I love you and I know in my heart that each milestone I have accomplished these past years I did so because of your insurmountable love and faith. Kate Cummins you will never acknowledge your part in my journey and for this reason and many more, I love you. Yvonne and Frank Vanderkuyl, Lisa and Kerby Waud, I love each of you and will never be quite capable of expressing to you what your friendship and love has come to mean in mine and my children’s lives.

My mentor’s: While I have been most fortunate to have several scholars who inspired my learning, while simultaneously challenging my understanding, there are a few I hope to have in my life always. I met my first mentor just as I began this journey more than six years ago, Dr. Kim Luton, thank you for being demanding as an educator and in taking a leap in faith. Dr. Goli Rezai-Rashti, my Thesis Supervisor, whom I met at the start of my graduate program, I am unbelievably honoured and humbled by your immense professional experience, guidance, and encouragement. You are both such inspiration. While I did not have the opportunity to study with my Committee Chair, Dr. Wayne Martino, you are exceptional and I am most fortunate to learn from you also.

Once again to my children, Connor and Jack, your love and support these past years have been my greatest gift and inspiration. Every sleepless hour I have given to this journey is in hope that one day you will fully understand that education *is* liberation. I love you.

Finally, I would like to thank my research participant’s, each of whom truly provided such richness to my study; and, whose honesty, passion, and candor will be an inspiration to me always.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Chapter 1/	
Introduction	1
Structure of Thesis	2
Research Questions	4
Context	5
Rationale	7
Purpose	9
Conceptual Framework	10
Summary	16
Chapter 2/	
The Literature Review- Introduction	17
The Enterprise of Higher Education: Quality Assurance, Hybridity, and the Neoliberal Agenda	18
Language of Possibility: Beyond the Neoliberal Imaginary	23
Democracy & Education	24
Challenges & Transformations	27

Summary	29
Chapter 3/	
Methodology: Background	31
Data Collection	32
Data Analysis	33
Strengths & Limitations of case study research	34
Summary	34
Chapter 4/	
Findings: Introduction	36
Participants	38
The Neoliberal Mystique	39
Quality Assurance & the Audit Culture	48
Transgressing: Global Education, Neoliberalism & Critical Pedagogy	58
Summary	75
Chapter 5/	
Conclusion	77
Limitations	81
Implications & Future Research	81
Summary	85

References	87
Appendix A: Letter of Information	96
Appendix B: Consent Form	99
Appendix C: Interview Protocol	100
Appendix D: Ethics Approval	101
Curriculum Vitae	102

Chapter 1/

Introduction

Globalization and systems of neoliberal accountability are influencing every aspect of social life, including education. Higher education, traditionally an enterprise to foster deeper knowledge, creativity, and critical thinking, is increasingly challenged as the purpose of higher education has become connected to economic productivity and for creating citizens for a knowledge economy.

The need for becoming aware of the perpetuated ideology of neoliberalism has become paramount to the challenges of critical pedagogy, as it forces neoliberalism and globalization, each, to be wholly reflexive of position and context. Critical educators are advocating for change and the significance of challenging neoliberalism becomes our quest for the direction of an alternative logic; one that challenges the conservative neoliberal imaginary, treasures the narratives of *all* people as originally promised through democracy, and critically examines both how and for whom quality education is organized (Smith, Ryoo, and McLaren, 2009). Thus, critical pedagogy, as elaborated by critical theorists such as Freire, McLaren and Giroux, is relevant to all people and all nations seeking an alternative to the stranglehold neoliberal capitalism possesses over the organization and purpose of higher education.

Structure of Thesis

The thesis will be divided into five chapters. Chapter one, beginning with this introduction, will provide the reader with my research questions, context of my research, rationale, purpose, and conceptual framework as advanced by critical pedagogues Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren and others, before concluding with a chapter summary. It becomes important at this point to distinguish and define two principle terms that will be threaded throughout this thesis: critical pedagogy and critical thinking.

Peter McLaren (1995) argues how critical pedagogy challenges the traditional perspective and hierarchical role of the teacher- student, creates an anesthetized society where the dynamics of power, economics, and history are represented in a Western, Eurocentric, and androcentric manner, a manner that maintains the ideologies of the status quo and no longer should be endorsed (McLaren, 1995). More specifically, when speaking to the challenges of critical pedagogy, McLaren (1989), suggests:

The challenge of critical pedagogy does not reside solely in the logical consistency or the empirical verification of its theories; rather, it resides in the moral choice put before us as teachers and citizens, a choice that American philosopher John Dewey suggested is the distinction between education as a function of society and society as a function of education. We need to examine that choice: do we want our schools to create a passive, risk-free citizenry, or a politicized citizenry capable of fighting for various forms of public life and informed by a concern for equality and social justice?"(McLaren, 1989, p.158).

Henry Giroux (2010), suggests, "Critical pedagogy, unlike dominant modes of teaching, insists that one of the fundamental tasks of educators is to make sure that the future points the way to a more socially just world, a world in which the discourses of critique and possibility in conjunction with the values of reason, freedom and equality function to alter, as part of a broader democratic project, the grounds upon which life is

lived” (2010, p.10). Paulo Freire (1970/2011), defines critical thinking as the “plentitude of praxis”(p.131), this is to mean, that critical thinking is experienced through action, action that is informed through critical reflection which establishes a manner of thinking that directs one from an innocent form of “knowledge reality” to a deeper level, a level that empowers one to begin to discern the “*causes* of reality” (p.131).

Chapter two is a synthesis of the literature reviewed regarding the discourses surrounding the massification of higher education, neoliberalism, and the gap in existing research. Massification of higher education, in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) document, *World Conference on Higher Education 2009, Final Report* (2009), is understood as the accelerated growth of those engaging in higher education globally. This growth is said to coordinate with the intensification of globalization, the prolific spread of technology, and the increase of a diversified world society. More specifically this chapter focuses on the themes that emerged regarding the phenomenon of neoliberal measures of quality assurance and accountability in higher education, hybridity in higher education (higher education operating in different spaces), and the possibility for a critical-democratic education. Before concluding with a chapter summary, both the challenges and transformations for critical pedagogy and the possibility of a democratic neoliberalism in higher education are explored.

Chapter three provides my methodology and analysis. As a form of qualitative research I have chosen case study methodology as conceptualized by Robert Stake (1995) and Robert Yin (2003). I will discuss my data collection and data analysis as it is informed through my conceptual framework, before concluding with a brief discussion

regarding the strengths and limitations of case study research. Chapter four will contain the findings, where a discussion of the case will elaborate on the themes revealed through semi-structured interviews with three faculty members from a large university located in South-Western Ontario, Canada. Chapter five, the conclusion, will provide a summary of the thesis and outline the implications of the research.

Research Questions

In this thesis, the main objective is to investigate the possibilities for enacting critical pedagogies within a neoliberal climate of educational restructuring in higher education. I will investigate this while seeking the experience of three faculty members in higher education, who are sympathetic to the principles of critical pedagogy and practice dialogical teaching and learning in higher education. The research will focus on how they reconcile neoliberal efficiencies and competencies with the importance of critical pedagogy and critical thinking. I will investigate these questions by exploring the writings of Paulo Freire and other contemporary critical pedagogues. Methodologically, I will use qualitative research in the form of the case study; as, the qualitative case study and a “small sample of open-ended interviews adds depth, detail, and meaning at a very personal level of experience” (Patton, 2002, p.17).

Research Questions:

- 1) What are the possibilities for enacting critical pedagogies within a neoliberal climate of educational restructuring in higher education?
- 2) How has neoliberalism shaped the experience of three faculty members in higher education, who are sympathetic to the principles of critical pedagogy and practice

dialogical teaching and learning in higher education, while reconciling neoliberal efficiencies and competencies with a commitment to such an approach?

- 3) What is the possibility of critical pedagogy in the context of neoliberal restructuring of higher education; and, how is critical pedagogy of increasing importance at the start of the Twenty-First Century?

Context

As a result of the intensification of globalization, discourses recognizing the merits of diversity in and outside of education are increasing (Rizvi and Lingard, 2000). However, the debate with regard to a hierarchy in curriculum and standardization in education appears to simultaneously captivate and paralyze us within the neoliberal imaginary. Neoliberalism creates changes to methods of quality assurance and accountability in higher education, and in so doing leads to “the obsession with what Lyotard calls ‘performativity’ - everything to be translated into easily measured outcomes” (Mayo, 2009, p. 96). This creates a hierarchy in curriculum as measurable outcomes force institutions of higher education to place an economic premium on what is deemed optimum while eliminating that which is deemed un-necessary (Mayo, 2009).

Worldwide, institutions of higher education continue to advocate science and professional curriculums over the value of the humanities. In an economic climate where we have become inundated with media messages on the importance of quality education for the growth of knowledge based societies, where creative thinking is being espoused for its importance in research and development, and becoming an entrepreneur is not only esteemed but valued, many systems of education continue to debate the significance of a liberal-arts education over the usefulness of a vocational education (Postiglione, 2013).

Historically, it was during the period of prolific industrialization in the early 1900s that the power of the church would become eclipsed and many developed societies would observe the explosion of the bureaucratization of education. In the aftermath of World War II, mass education became the shared experience of many in the developed world. No longer would basic education be used to maintain the privilege of a few; nor, would the function of education be used solely for that which Emil Durkheim posited as an instrument to impart moral guidance. Thus, replacing both the tradition of privilege and the moral guidance of religion becomes economics (Davies and Guppy, 2010).

Currently, the intensification of globalization is the driving force in contemporary times for the massification of higher education and the structural change of the university as experienced worldwide. Shifting from industrial economies to knowledge economies becomes the key to a nation's growth and sustainability; hence, access to higher education becomes significant to goals for both individual and state well being (UNESCO, IIEP Newsletter, 2007). Diversity as a result of globalization is experienced politically, economically, and culturally; thus, access to higher education in a globalized world creates challenges as access causes institutions of higher education to redefine traditional and often times hierarchically based notions of who the learner is, and necessitates transformation for who the learner is becoming.

The issues of access to higher education are many. Within a neoliberal climate of educational restructuring, the purpose of higher education as a system for democratization is questioned and replaced by economic productivity. This change has created significant debate and these debates highlight the tensions between the value, growth, and enrichment higher education imparts, while challenging concepts that

knowledge skills alone lead to the creation of “active citizenship” (Borg and Mayo, 2006, p.23 in Mayo, 2009. p. 97). Jacques Delores (1996) when creating a collaborative report for UNESCO writes of these tensions and nearly two decades later they continue to provide insight, for it is during this period of significant expansion in higher education that the acknowledgement of the limits to neoliberalism requires us to rethink the pathways of inclusion for all future learners who do not envision higher education as a possibility:

The tension between...the need for competition, and ...the concern for equality of opportunity: this is a classic issue, which has been facing both economic and social policy-makers and educational policy-makers since the beginning of the century...Today... the pressures of competition have caused many of those in positions of authority to lose sight of their mission, which is to give each human being the means to take full advantage of every opportunity (Delores et al, 1996, Pp. 17-18).

Thus, while policies on diversity and multiculturalism frame and provide important democratic foundations for access and equity in higher education, they are not enough. Institutions of higher education in Canada and throughout the world must not lose sight of the societal values revealed, explored, and challenged in higher education. Therefore, the form of education chosen by society becomes an indication of the character of that society (UNESCO, 2008).

Rationale

During a time when higher education functions as a system of almost exclusively preparing the student for the knowledge economy, the threat of neoliberalism becomes manifested in higher education. There are those in higher education who now more than ever before question its responsibility and ask, what form of education is required for a future world society (Connell, 2013; Giroux, 2012, 2013b; Apple, 2011)?

Higher education, once believed to be the forum for engaging and defending citizenship has become criticized for its market driven paradigm reducing its primary role for creating citizens within a society to a commercial base ideology shaping all levels of education with no talk of mutual leadership or critical social responsibility. Far too many institutions of higher education have become driven by economic, military, and vocational interests that lack authentic effort in the humanities; thus, contradicting the traditional intention of university and higher education (Giroux, 2012).

In Australia, where the neoliberal imaginary has had a growing effect on higher education (OECD, 2007), Raewyn Connell of the University of Sydney posits three consequences of the neoliberal agenda- “First, is the reproduction of global dependency. We are positioned in global as well as local markets, and the global market leaders are Harvard, Columbia, Cambridge and their peers. Their curricula serve as the gold standard... Local intellectual cultures are undermined, and the potential wealth of global diversity in knowledge formation is shrunk to a single hierarchy of centrality and marginality... Second, is the entrenchment of social hierarchies in knowledge production and circulation ... Third, and perhaps most serious, is the impact of market logic on our relation with truth” (Connell, 2013, Pp. 3-4).

Connell (2013) argues for a global dialogue where alternatives to neoliberal policies are explored through contemporary forms of “intellectual labour”(p.8) which, necessitates the need to incorporate different bodies of collaboration built upon mutual respect; including a crucial association with present knowledge so that the development is enlightening. Assisting institutions to nurture such activity will be challenging; however, it is a challenge “worth our intelligence”(p.8).

Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the possibility of critical pedagogy in the context of neoliberal restructuring of higher education. This thesis argues for the pursuit of a pedagogy with cosmopolitan intent; one, that in “lifting complex ideas in to the human space” (Said, in Giroux 2012) critically engages the learner and educator so to create “border literacy” (Giroux, 2012); which, Giroux defines as learning to read and write from different perspectives. This is an extraordinary concept when applied to the challenges of social justice and equity; for, while there are those whose aim it is to internationalize higher education, there has been little focus paid to ‘different ways of knowing ... transforming them [institutions of higher education] from patriarchal bastions into more gender and ethnically inclusive institutions’ (Mayo, 2009, p. 98).

As a result of the intensification of globalization, there becomes a dire need to create connections between critical pedagogy, education, and employment. University is a space that should create ideas; educators who function as political activist and argue for forms of pedagogy that close the gap between higher education and everyday life (Giroux, 2012) are needed to challenge the present neoliberal imaginary. Paulo Freire’s (1970/2011) humanist perspectives argue how each individual possesses the power to transform their own oppression. Freire suggests that although education has been historically used as a political mechanism for control and domination, once transformed, education becomes the key for liberation. Thus, through the elimination of the banking system of education and the opportunity of *conscientização* this may be achieved.

Yet, for those who advocate the importance of critical pedagogy, the question becomes how does one reconcile neoliberal efficiencies and competencies with a

commitment to such a pedagogical approach? Herein lies one of the many challenges for those in higher education; for, as Easthope & Easthope (2000) posit, if neoliberalism is perceived successful in education, it is only as a result that it has been accepted as a natural extension to many of the professional beliefs that already exist.

This point then brings my thinking back to critical pedagogy, Paulo Freire's *Consciousization*, and the critical theories of Ulrich Beck regarding sociology and cosmopolitanization in the Twenty-First Century. What if the structural changes taking place in education are similar to the 'caterpillar becoming the butterfly' (Beck, 2007)? What if these neoliberal times are messy- complicated growing pains? What if, in practicing agency, educators continue to engage critically with their students and each other no matter how exhausting at times it may be; and, what *if* through our critical consciousness we struggle toward a form of critical democratic-corporate citizenship (Giroux, 2012), where along with business, government, and each other we share in the challenges, responsibilities, and successes of a transformative education?

Conceptual Framework

I draw on theories of critical pedagogy as advanced by Freire, Giroux, McLaren and others to investigate for the possibility of critical pedagogy in neoliberal times. Paulo Freire's (1970/2011) humanist perspectives argue how the individual in society, through the ability to engage in critical thinking, possesses the power to transform their own oppression. Peter McLaren (1995) argues how critical pedagogy challenges the traditional perspective and hierarchical role of the teacher- student, creates an anesthetized society where the dynamics of power, economics, and history are

represented in a Western, Eurocentric, and androcentric manner, a manner, which maintains the ideologies of the status quo and no longer should be endorsed.

Key to Freirean philosophy is knowledge; however, it is the contextual importance of knowledge born from praxis that proves paramount to Freire's arguments. Freire (1970/2011) offers what some consider his foremost contribution to deconstructing the complex relationship between that of student, teacher, and knowledge through the creation of his concepts of *banking education* and *conscientização*.

In his later writings, Paulo Freire's (1998) pedagogy addresses the challenges to education brought about by neoliberalism with regard to "ethics, aesthetics, politics, and research" (Roberts, 2003, p. 455). Freire discusses liberation, power, ideology, agency, injustice, ... and the formation of knowledge (Roberts, 2003). The dominant discourse of neoliberalism prophesized as inevitable created through an ideology supported by those who argue economic and social inequity as a necessary function and outcome within societies based upon meritocracy and open-market logic can be challenged. A new critical-democratic neoliberal imaginary can be achieved by that which Freire posits as cardinal ethical understandings which, stress the human capacity to investigate, analyze, criticize, apply worth to, chose, rupture from, and hope, as the foundation for opposing the conservative neoliberal imaginary which has become commonplace (Roberts, 2003).

Although Freire and others do not envision education as a cure for all inequities found in society Freire does stress how through critical reflexiveness, dialogue, and reciprocal teaching and learning, the transformative dimension of social development will occur (Roberts, 2003). Contesting the present neoliberal imaginary becomes important in a dynamic globalized world (Roberts, 2003); and, thus it is in higher

education that critical pedagogy becomes explicitly associated with the pursuit of critical democracy and critical cosmopolitanization.

A core belief of Paulo Freire and for many who embrace the perspective of critical pedagogy is that human fullness will never be achieved, it is an ongoing fluid process influenced and shaped by history, class, culture, economics and most importantly knowledge. Freirean philosophy is not idealistic; however, it is hopeful and in being so creates one way in which Freire diverges from the philosophies of Marx and the critical theory of the Frankfurt School. While many of Freire's writings build upon the Hegelian philosophy of dialectics, Marx's theory of dialectic materialism, and Sartre's existentialism (Dale, 2003); he expands upon these philosophies in important ways that have made Freire such an important contributor within the philosophy of education. Unlike Marx, Freire does not believe that an individual's existence is determined by their history and suggests, "This distortion occurs within history; but it is not an historical vocation" (Freire, 1970/2011, p.44).

Freire, similar to Marx, argues it is the ability for self - awareness, creative thought and ultimately our species' ability to create change, which makes us as human beings truly distinct (Blackburn, 2000). The concept of human potential for transformation is essential to Freirean philosophy and is captured when Freire suggests, "no reality transforms itself" (1970/2011, p. 53). Similar to Marx and critical theory, Freire also borrows from the Hegelian philosophy of dialectics. Simply explained, dialectic is a contradiction. Hegel believed contradictions were necessary within society for they provide a method for defining and understanding our world, and chose this method for understanding historical transformation (Ritzer, 2008). Hegel posited that

these contradictions are creations of our mind and therefore could be resolved through the reasoning of our mind itself. Marx and Freire, however, did not subscribe to this belief and hence developed the important concept of praxis for understanding our world (Ritzer, 2008; Freire, 1970/2011). Freire advocated for the liberation of all people; thus, as mentioned previously, his humanist perspectives argue how the individual within society possesses the power to transform their own oppression. He suggests that although education has historically been used as a political mechanism for control and domination, once transformed, education becomes the key for liberation.

Critical Pedagogy is a culmination of many different theories and as a result has been criticized for its complexity and ability to be taught and understood. It has been criticized as a grand theory negating the local experience while focusing on the universal experience of oppression, and at times has been accused of being class focused (Macedo, 2011 in Freire, 1970/2011). Thus, significant challenges occupy the thoughts of those who subscribe to the ethos of critical pedagogy. Paulo Freire states that “these issues include, but are by no means limited to, the manner in which subjectivity is constituted in language; the relationship among discourse, social action, and historical memory; the connection between interpretation; and, how forms of authority may be addressed and justified in the context of a feminist pedagogy” (Freire, in McLaren and Leonard, 1993: X).

However, while there are those whose aim is to make critical pedagogy more accessible, there are also those who recognize that in so doing they risk simplifying the strength in its ability of remaining mindful to the global dynamics of difference (Freire, in McLaren and Leonard, 1993). Also of significance to the growth of critical pedagogy,

and at the same time its challenge is the awareness of new voices and approaches to liberation and transformation that are not defined through a Western world understanding of stories of emancipation. Narratives of liberation must remain contextual and yet at the same time, similar to Diasporas, they must seize the opportunity to embrace and act globally (Freire, in McLaren and Leonard, 1993).

Critical Pedagogy was inspired to empower, it beckons individuals to begin to question not only the type of knowledge presented to them but the meaning of this knowledge. Freire argues for the solidarity of men and women in their quest for humanness; it is within his discussions of the human consciousness that Freire's critical pedagogy begins to emerge as a philosophy of its own, one enshrined in hopefulness. Crucial to the understanding of critical pedagogy is its awareness of the practice of power; such awareness is not endorsed to maintain certain hegemonic experiences of privilege; rather this critical consciousness is designed to facilitate the development of new social constructions founded on diverse customs, communications, and characteristics (Freire, in McLaren and Leonard, 1993).

Important then is the recognition of multiple forms of power and authority within any given society where inequality proliferates and implicates the understanding of diverse lived experiences. Cornel West (1993) summarizes this best when he suggests, "Freire's project of democratic dialogue is attuned to the concrete operations of power (in and out of the classroom) and grounded in the painful yet empowering process of conscientization" (West, 1993, in McLaren and Leonard, 1993, p. XIII). Critical pedagogy is *liberatory pedagogy* (Freire, 1970/2011); it provides the form of praxis that enables transformation, transformation, which is brought about through human

consciousness with intent (Freire, 1970/2011). Through transformed education individuals will learn how to critically address the right to resist and unpack the many forms of oppression that directly or indirectly threaten their survival and human right.

Neoliberalism, for the purpose of this research, will be defined as economic policies that focus on, “macroeconomic stability; cutting back government budgets; privatization of government operations; ending of tariffs and other forms of protection; facilitating movement of foreign capital; emphasizing exports; charging user fees for many public services; and lowering worker protections through flexible labour markets” (Klees, 2008, p.312). Globalization, as defined by Ulrich Beck, is “a non-linear, dialectic process in which the global and the local do not exist as cultural polarities but as mutually implicating principles...the processes [of globalization] involve not only interconnections across boundaries, but transform the quality of the social and the political, inside nation-state societies”(Beck 2002, p.17).

Democracy for the purpose of this research shall be understood as posited by C.B. Macpherson (1964) who writes,

there are three concepts of democracy actively at work in the world today, each one shaping and being shaped by a particular kind of society at a particular stage of development...The three kinds are indeed so different that one might ask whether one word should properly be used to describe them all... [yet]...when all three concepts of democracy are seen in perspective another reason appears why they should share a single name. They have one thing in common: their ultimate goal is the same- to provide the conditions for the full and free development of the essential human capacities of all the members of the society (1964, Pp. 35-6).

Although democracy and a democratic education become complicated to define, Simon Marginson (2006) suggests that democratic conjecture and advocacy in

education in the Western world can be linked to the writings of the 18th Century philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau and is mainly indebted to John Dewey more than to any other scholar (2003, pp. 1-2). Democracy in education is strengthened through the freedom of those who are encouraged to contribute to the diverse fabric of our global political, economic, and cultural diversity. Thus, it becomes those who advocate for the importance of quality education while seeking to empower and transform both individual and their community who strengthen a critical democratic education.

Summary

This research will investigate the tensions between the purpose of higher education, neoliberalism, globalization, quality assurance, and the possibility for enacting critical pedagogy. In the first chapter of this thesis the reader has been provided the structure of the thesis, the research questions, context, rationale, purpose, and conceptual framework. There is a gap in the research at present with regard to these tensions and it is my intention to investigate and prick at the surface of this gap in hope that I may provide the beginning toward a dialogue that pushes beyond the present neoliberal imaginary. Although I have tried at best to present non-biased research, I will not profess that it is not. There is no pre-packaged solution, and we will continue to err; however, we must continue to strive, not toward a perfect practice, but toward a best practice for all.

Chapter 2/ Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter represents the literature reviewed regarding the discourses on the massification of higher education, neoliberalism, the possibility for enacting critical pedagogy, and the gap in existing research. More specifically, this chapter focuses on the themes that emerged regarding the recent phenomenon of neoliberal measures of quality assurance and accountability, hybridity in higher education, and the significance of a critical-democratic education. While quality assurance and accountability are not new to higher education, current neoliberal reforms have created compelling and urgent changes that have local and global consequences with regard to the transformation of higher education, governance, citizenship, and issues of social justice and equity.

This chapter will also investigate the possibility of an alternative to the current neoliberal imaginary and the importance of a critical-democratic education. Giroux (2004) states, “the important recognition...in the twentieth century work of W.E.B. Du Bois, Bertrand Russell, Jane Addams and John Dewey, among others is...that a substantive democracy cannot exist without educated citizens”(p.6). However, there are those in higher education who caution that further complicating issues of quality education is the prolific spread of neoliberalism. Those in society who possess the most economic and political power value conservative neoliberal strategies, they use their status to influence public discourse while endorsing conservative neoliberalism as the natural expansion of capitalism (Hursh and Henderson, 2011), and it is here the gap in the literature reviewed is revealed. There are voices that are missing from this very important research, and it is the goal of this thesis to highlight the need for these voices to be heard.

The Enterprise of Higher Education: Quality Assurance, Hybridity, and the Neoliberal Agenda

Increasingly over the past two decades there has been a growing focus with regard to quality assurance in tertiary education. The intensification of globalization has brought about many changes, including many economic alliances and the proliferation of academic & skillful employment portability. Globally, as the political practices of many nations contemplate their agenda for higher education, questions of quality assurance and enrichment subsequently have become a major area of debate. Responding to neoliberal influences, institutions of higher education are increasingly encouraged to respond to the needs of the market. This is exemplified through the expansion of curriculum offered, the increasing size of certain disciplines, and the creation of bridges for the increasing diversity of the learner (El- Khawas et al, World Bank, 1998).

Regardless of economic variance in some countries, many themes have begun to emerge adding to the interest in developing government policy that will establish quality and accountability in higher education; of specific interest is the growing trend in the massification of higher education. Witnessed globally, this is experienced in part with the growing curricula now offered, possibly in acknowledging of the diversity and mobility of who the learner is, in co-relation with the changing economy, and the documented positive life advantages that are associated with higher education (El-Khawas et al, World Bank, 1998). As a result many countries now offer a variety of institutions for higher education, universities are growing in size, while simultaneously becoming more diversified and specialized, often as a result of the emerging demands of business and the professional world both locally and globally (El-Khawas et al, World Bank, 1998).

EI- Khawas et al (1998) claim, that globally, the transition to formal systems of quality assurance is one of the more prominent trends experienced within higher education at the start of the 21st Century. However, they suggest that quality assurance has become a contested notion as the debate has evolved from what role does quality assurance hold to what form of quality assurance is deemed best and most effective. Many in higher education have objected the initial efforts of quality assurance, defending the customary methods of quality assurance that were developed and refined during the last Century, but were believed lacking in clear, quantified transparency. This is leading to what Altbach et al (2009) call an “Academic Revolution” (para. 1).

Evidenced by shifts unparalleled in breadth and scope, Altbach et al (2009) in their research suggest that the recent transformations taking place in higher education are reminiscent only to those experienced at the start of the 19th Century, when the first research university was established in Germany, forever, changing the landscape of higher education on a global scale. However, they share, the changes experienced within higher education at the end of the 20th Century and beginning of the 21st Century are more intense as a result of globalization and the institutions and populations it affects. Higher education, they claim, at the start of the new millennia is an enterprise defined by increasing competition as students vying for limited space to elite universities becomes more difficult.

Altbach et al’s (2009) work reveals that higher education once viewed as an institution that endorses public good, the development of community, citizenship, quality of life, while encouraging economic growth has more recently become viewed as a launch for private good, as universities themselves seek to create bridges to prosper

from both globalization and the mobility of people. Thus, as globalization continues, the movement of people, the expansion of curriculums in higher education, and the growth in distance learning assisted through the proliferation of technology, it has become argued that newer methods for quality assurance are not only required but also significantly needed. However, research conducted by the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials (2013) suggests that the current multitude of assessment methods, the absence of national accreditation systems, as experienced in Canada, the focus on quantitative versus qualitative measures of quality education as produced through the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), and the absence of how current assessments assist in the development of what is deemed quality higher education on a world scale make for hefty, but not hopeless challenges.

While generalizing is not the aim of this research, it is posited that the goal for many intuitions in higher education today is to provide less of the essential disciplines in place of professional degrees. Altbach et al (2009) indicate that queries regarding the intent of higher education have become increasingly weighted, in particular, for developing nations where the requirement for those skilled in the sciences and technologies, as well as those who can provide guidance through their fortuitous knowledge in the humanities, and are creative, adaptable, and provide ethical wisdoms for social growth are sought. Thus, it is Altbach et al's (2009) position that quality assurance has become a principle focus in higher education as many countries and their institutions of higher education compete to prepare their students for the knowledge economy, and the goal is subject of achieving a variety of capabilities to engage with a more complicated and interconnected world are required.

El-Khawas et al (1998), in their report for the World Bank, suggest that many researchers have recorded that quality assurance protocols have resulted in institutions of higher education paying “greater attention to issues of effective teaching and learning... Quality assurance systems that focus on institutions... have found that institutional management has improved, that strategic planning has been strengthened and that programs have become more responsive to changing needs”. However, they caution, limitations have also been noted, such as conformity and an insurmountable amount of administrative tasks. This has led to challenges of administration in higher education eclipsing at times the educational concerns that reinforce the pathways to quality assurance. Further, they argue that in consideration of these transformations, this present era of educational practice may become antiquated by the movement toward quantified frameworks and resolved procedures for a number of quality assurance systems.

Writing just before the start of the new millennia, El-Khawas et al (1998) posit a new archetype for the purpose of higher education has evolved. Thus, it is assumed, they state, that while universities continue to protect their responsibility as the guardian for the principles of civilization, more efficient roles have been materializing with time, “universities no longer pursue knowledge for its own sake, rather they provide qualified manpower and produce knowledge. With this new economically oriented paradigm, comes accountability. Higher education will be judged in terms of outputs and the contributions it makes to national development” (El-Khawas et al, 1998).

In a report on higher education published by UNESCO (2009), it is suggested that the hybridization of higher education is expected to be principal for the massification of higher education; therefore, there can be an anticipated growth in

teaching arrangements in forthcoming years. In fact, El-Khawas et al (1998), posit, that we can prepare for the implementation of “bench-marking” strategies and the creation of a variety of benchmarking research across higher education. They indicate that these markers assist in the ranking of universities geographically, conferring to instruction, research, and a variety of educational goals. Rorabaugh (2012), states that the common understanding of the term ‘hybridity’ in education is that we operate in different spaces: “digital space and empirical space ...[a]s technologically engaged teachers we create some experiences designed for engagement via electronic media. Our teaching, and the learning it encourages, is hybrid in that it combines the classroom space and the digital space” (para. 3).

With the growing number of international students, the emergence of e-learning, and of the more recent phenomena of Massive Open Online Course’s (MOOC’s), issues with regard to quality assurance, while many, appear to have increased. Each of these phenomena also share in their ability to fascinate and captivate those in the education world with regard to the challenges of evaluation and auditing of learning, as it increasingly occurs within spaces foreign from traditional environments of higher learning. Therefore, one question El-Khawas et al (1998) present regarding quality assurance becomes, how can learning in the 21st Century be audited and how can the continuity of a program be evaluated across diverse educational regions, taking into account the increasing heterogeneity of many nations and the changing architecture of many of the education programs within. In either situation, the critical responsibility for systems of quality assurance, they suggest, is to target what remains essential to higher education, which is learning.

A Language of Possibility: Beyond the Neoliberal Imaginary

The journal article *A Revolutionary Manifesto for the Twenty-First Century* (2009) provides a relevant and insightful critique of neoliberal capitalism and the profound consequential effects it has upon the environment, language loss, and English as a colonizing language (Smith, Ryoo, and McLaren, 2009). However, the article leaves somewhat open the role of democracy; if, education is to become *just* within the rush of neoliberal capitalism we must begin to, as Stuart Hall (2009) suggests, move away from a “politics of guarantee” towards a “politics of possibility”. In order to achieve this, the question becomes what is a democratic education and what does democracy mean to education? Foremost, a democratic education involves a language of possibility, one in which a, “pedagogy of questioning gain[s] ground against a pedagogy of answers” (Freire, 1998, p.62). At the level of higher education a democratic education requires the participation of all disciplines, as this “development task is not restricted to schools of education” (Freire, 1998, p.61). Freire advocated for a democratic de-centralized system of education; for, de-centralizing education inspires democratic attitudes (Freire, 1998) as it encourages a reciprocal, dialogic environment for creating discussion (Freire, 1998).

Canada, as a nation, is uniquely positioned as the world’s foremost leader in providing the map for a democratic-decentralized system of education, as it is the only country in the world to operate without a National Ministry of Education. Yet, even in Canada, provincially, institutions of education at all levels struggle to resist the neoliberal imaginary as the lure for that which Giroux terms “Casino Capitalism”(2013a) appears to captivate and enthrall. Thus, democracy and neoliberalism have become debated notions,

and similar to globalization, their definitions have become dependent upon historical, geographical, and cultural contexts (Harvey, 2009).

Although democracy maintains itself as the focus for what the meaning of education should be, how and for whom education should be organized, and how it should be administrated; the core essence of a democratic education challenges citizens to ask, “what kind of a society do we want and what kinds of politics will help us get there” (Apple, 2011, p.23). Thus, Giroux (2013) argues that there is an obligation within higher education, specifically, to create a pedagogy that is at the heart of the principal worth of politics, an obligation that leads to liberation.

Democracy & Education

However, as Giroux (2004) and others argue, these are complex times we live in. At the start of our new millennium human kind arrives within a global space where all that was, is being challenged and begging (rightfully or wrongfully) to be redefined: family, democracy, citizenship, education, cosmopolitanism and more. Ours is a modern world, where former Western world leaders Ronald Regan and Margaret Thatcher declared in 1980 the “death of society” (Giroux, 2004, p.218). Peter Kemp (2011) shares that in the last century the world has experienced more war and lost more civilians due to war than at any other time in human history. The American government’s reaction to the terrorist actions taken against the United States on September 11, 2001 and the retribution the world observed in a paralyzed trance has left many wondering what does it mean to be a citizen. Thus, human kind must critically ask, “Am I really the kind of [hu]man who has the right to act in such a way that humanity might guide itself by my actions”(Sartre, 1995, p. 39)? The painful, yet liberating, answer is yes!

Therefore, Gandin and Apple (2002), in their research suggest with regard to our present struggles in education, “rather than assuming that neo-liberal and neo-conservative policies dictate exactly what occurs at the local level, we have to study the rearticulations that occur on this level to be able to map out the creation of alternatives” (p. 100). Although my research looks specifically to the challenges of higher education during a climate of neoliberal restructuring and the significance of critical pedagogy, I turn now to Porto Alegre, Brazil and the creation of its Citizen Schools. For, the Citizen Schools of Porto Alegre challenge directly that which Connell (2013) posits as the three consequences of the neoliberal agenda.

Historically, education in Brazil has consisted of a centralized system of governance; however, in 1979 the Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT), or the ‘Workers Party’ as it has come to be called in the North, was established and it was elected to govern the city of Porto Alegre from 1989 to 2004. Gandin and Apple (2002; 2012) share in their research that within the party’s first three consecutive re-elections the number of public schools more than doubled, qualitatively tremendous gains were made for its citizens, and most significantly the drop out rate of its youth reached less than one percent; no small feat. At the centre of this transformation, they state, was the creation of the Citizen School, their focus, “to initiate a ‘thick’ version of education for citizenship... through the creation of democratic institutional mechanisms” (Gandin & Apple, 2002, p. 101).

Gandin and Apple (2002) claim, that the Citizen schools were designed with a very precise vision, one that foresaw the potential for all people to acknowledge themselves as the agents of respect, opposing the commercialization of life. In the Citizen School, the traditionalist pedagogy that maintains the ideology of history as an exercise

pre-determined as an understanding of capitalist commitment is rejected (Silva, 1999 in Gandin & Apple, 2002, p. 104). Hence a politics of possibility was born, one that challenged the hegemonic worldwide neoliberal discourse occurring in education, and in doing so it created a new language based upon a lost ideal that reignited the dream of “democratic management, democratization of the access to school, and democratization of the access to knowledge” (Gandin & Apple, 2002, p. 104). Thus, I posit, important to a democratic education at each level is the critical pedagogical quest for what counts as knowledge, the significance of multiple voices speaking from different *life worlds*, one that recognizes the essentialness of a respected multi-disciplinary collaboration.

Porto Alegre, Brazil and the Citizen Schools have taught and mapped for those who contest the present neoliberal imaginary that a politics of possibility can be achieved only when democracy, as it was intended, begins to flourish again. Neoliberalism and education can collaborate to create and enhance equity, so richly deserved by far too many that have been denied, once *democratically* and *critically* informed. The design of the Citizen School demonstrates to nations seeking a language of possibility, that when authentically committed to education, transformation that is critically and democratically informed, like that envisioned by Paulo Freire, enables social transformations that are not only achievable, they embody the pivotal roles in transforming the connection between state and society (Apple, 2010).

Challenges & Transformations

The challenges highlighted in the literature reviewed are, in part, found often in the application of now dated policies and perspectives themselves. Stephen J. Ball (2012) suggests, “there is an enormous gap in the research field of education policy... most education policy analysis is still locked into a nation-state, policy-government paradigm... We lack tools and perspectives suited to the task of a more cosmopolitan sociology”(2012, p. xii). Expanding upon Ball’s (2012) suggestion that this gap in education research is a result of limited insights relevant to the Twenty-First Century, it can be suggested that there exists a gap within critical pedagogy that could be approached and expanded in a more cosmopolitan way.

Further challenges of the literature explored relate to the effects of globalization with regard to the formation and transmission of knowledge. Simon Marginson (2006) suggests, that much of what is written may well have been written in 1975 “for all their acknowledgement of how instantaneous communications and more frequent cross-border movement of people and cultural transmission have affected the practices of democracy and blown open the potential for agency” (2006, p. 218). Neoliberalism, Marginson (2006) explains, “in education and elsewhere has always been intent on weakening democratic cultures, except to the extent that these cultures support the market order” (2006, p. 218); thus, Roberts (2003) states, contesting the present neoliberal imaginary becomes important in a dynamic globalized world. It is in this way, that higher education and critical pedagogy becomes explicitly associated to the pursuit of critical democracy and critical cosmopolitanization.

As neoliberal globalization continues at a stealthily apace the discourse recognizing the essentialness for diversity in and outside of one's community is increasing; this often leads to debates surrounding neoliberal and critical democratic cosmopolitanism, two concepts which are often treated as binary opposites and overlooked as constituting a more contentious, symbiotic, and increasingly dynamic relationship. Neoliberal cosmopolitanism is market-oriented with a global focus. Its principles are efficiency, control, and standardization. Within the educational setting it values individual initiative. Alternatively, critical democratic cosmopolitanism, while also globally oriented, stresses community, equality, human dignity and rights. Within the educational setting students "communicate through what Habermas (1990/1996) terms communicative action and deliberate democracy" (Camicia and Franklin, 2011, p. 314). Thus, communicative action is understood as dedicated to many of the principles of critical democratic cosmopolitanism: global citizenship (community) and social justice. Neoliberal cosmopolitanism and critical democratic cosmopolitanism can then be understood to be reflexive of geography and as a result this difference in worldview is often expressed through curriculum and curriculum reform (Camicia and Franklin, 2011).

However, there are voices missing from the literature reviewed and these voices belong to faculty members in higher education itself. Critical pedagogy was founded upon the principle of dialogic teaching, which creates a reciprocal relationship between the teacher and the learner so to enrich our understandings of our world. Could we not ask then, is there not the possibility for the roles to become reciprocal between faculty members, management, and the education developer (Lockey, 2013)? Could this blurring of boundaries, in an age of flattening out education as a method of

internationalizing it, create instead a more situated, connected, and relevant educational experience that embraces all voices; or, what Giroux terms “border literacy, learning to read and write from different points” (Giroux, 2012)? The time to amplify the missing voice is now- critical pedagogues are needed for greater understanding of the challenges that will lead to greater educational transformation. To remain silent is to be complicit, and would be allowing a limited stewardship of critical pedagogy and higher education in the Twenty-First Century.

Summary

This chapter highlighted the themes that emerged through an extensive literature review of higher education, neoliberalism, and globalisation. The chapter focused on the tensions and challenges of quality assurance and accountability in higher education and neoliberalism, while stressing the significance of a democratic responsibility for systems of quality assurance that ought to target what remains essential to higher education, which is learning. Also examined are the recent phenomena of Hybrid pedagogies and MOOCs that are creating significant debate regarding the corporatization of knowledge and research. Finally, this chapter explored the possibilities of moving beyond the present neoliberal imaginary through the example of the Citizen Schools in Porto Alegre, Brazil and the significance it provides for the transformative power of a critical-democratic education.

Lastly, this chapter also presented that those in society who possess the most economic and political power value conservative neoliberal strategies; they use their status to influence public discourse while endorsing conservative neoliberalism as the natural expansion of capitalism (Hursh and Henderson, 2011), and it is here where the

gap in the literature reviewed is revealed. There are voices missing from this research, and these voices belong to faculty members in higher education itself. Thus, in chapter four I investigate the experience of three faculty members and how they reconcile neoliberal efficiencies with the significance of critical thinking.

In our world where borders are no longer defined in terms of being national, where culture, class, gender, or race and the issues that arise within each intersect there must emerge an educational philosophy that questions, understands and brings meaning to the complex reality as experienced by our citizens of the world. Understanding that knowledge has become more accessible, combined with the tools of critical and digital pedagogy, transformations of global societies are in reach of *all* citizens. Inter-disciplinary knowledge will be of necessity and will increase in this world where knowledge is so easy to gain.

Chapter 3/ Methodology & Design

Background

Drawing on qualitative case study research I intend to investigate the impact of neoliberal accountability regimes on faculty members who identify as critical pedagogues. One of the principal goals of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of how neoliberalism has shaped the experience of those practicing as critical pedagogues within higher education and why critical pedagogy is of increasing importance at the start of the Twenty-First Century.

As a form of qualitative research I have chosen case study methodology as conceptualized and practiced by Robert Stake (1995) and Robert Yin (2003). Hesse-Bieber and Leavy (2006), state, qualitative research “differs in terms of [its] assumptions regarding the extent to which knowledge can be “objective”, most qualitative paradigms agree on the importance of subjective meanings individuals bring to the research process and acknowledge the importance of the social construction of reality” (Hesse-Bieber & Leavy, 2006, p. 75). Baxter and Jack (2008), claim that the qualitative case study is one path in education research that promotes the examination of an experience or event within its context utilizing multiple sources. It is this approach, which can safeguard that the case or cases being studied are studied not through one perspective but rather multiple perspectives which in turn affords a variety of issues to be exposed and understood (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p.544).

Robert Stake and Robert Yin’s case study methodology are the two main approaches in case study research. It is the position of Baxter and Jack (2008) that Stake and Yin’s methodology attempts to assure that the case in interest is well traveled, and

that the substance of the situation is revealed. Based on the paradigm of the Constructivist, Stake (1995) and Yin (2003) endorse the ethos of the constructivist who posits that, “the truth is relative and that it is dependent on one’s perspective” (Baxter and Jack, 2008, p. 545). Hence by choosing the case study method and the approach of the qualitative interview my goal is to create an analysis that is rich in breadth and depth, while providing an authentic and meaningful account of my participant’s experience (Patton, 2002).

Data Collection

Patton (2002) suggests that the significance of the qualitative interview lies in its ability to “to capture how those being interviewed view their world, to learn their terminology and judgments, and to capture the complexities of their individual perceptions and experiences” (p.348). Therefore, in order to develop a deeper understanding of neoliberalism in the context of higher education, an instrumental case study will be conducted using the standardized open-ended interview as conceptualized by Patton (2002). Patton (2002) suggests this interview approach as it affords the researcher the ability to conscientiously design each question prior to the interview, while respecting the importance of the participant’s ability to answer using his or her own voice.

Choosing the method of purposeful sampling, participants will be required to be a faculty member of Education, Social Science or Humanities; and to identify themselves as a critical pedagogue. Patton (2002) indicates how purposeful sampling used in qualitative research creates a detailed account of the participants’ experience, where the researcher is then able to study the issues that are paramount to the purpose of the

investigation. As previously stated the type of interviews I will conduct will be semi-structured, also known as the standardized open-ended interview (Patton, 2002). The standardized open-ended interview will best inform my research, for the principal features of it allow for interview consistency, it uses limited time wisely, and assists in the process of data analysis through its comparative ability.

Data Analysis

Robert E. Stake (1995), when discussing data analysis for case study research states, “At no point in naturalistic case research are the qualitative and quantitative techniques less alike than during analysis. The qualitative researcher concentrates on the instance, trying to pull it apart and put it back together again more meaningfully- analysis and synthesis in direct interpretation” (Stake, 1995, p.75).

Once the interviews were completed for this research, a data analysis using an approach informed by critiques of neoliberalism and critical pedagogy theorists was enlisted. While Patton (2002) cautions that no formulaic recipe exists for qualitative analysis, each interview conducted for the purpose of this research will be transcribed, breaking down original text so as to separate rich experience from possible incidental. This will highlight important patterns and the substance of that which is being investigated within this research.

Following shortly after each interview transcribed, the coding process was then conducted leading to an analysis of the data. Coding of my interviews consisted of several readings of the transcribed work, with each reading providing me the opportunity to highlight, underline, circle key terms, and comment on the interviewee’s responses while adding notes with regard to non-verbal body language. I also included within the

transcripts notes thoughts and questions. No formula exists for qualitative data analysis, thus leading Patton (2002) to suggest, “no way exists of perfectly replicating the researcher’s analytical thought process. No straight forward tests can be applied for reliability and validity” (p. 433). Each qualitative interview is as exclusive to the research as the analysis used for each qualitative investigation.

Strength’s and Limitations

The strength of the case study as a method in education research is that it is fortuitous in context; however, Cohen et al (2011) caution that it may be challenging to construct. While case studies have been criticized for their weakness with regard to generalizations, what motivates those in qualitative case study research is the focus on the depth and particularity of a case not the generalizabilty across populations.

Stake (1995) suggests, that when using the method of case study research, as researchers, we choose a specific case and come to understand it conscientiously, not for how it is similar or different from others; rather our goal is to provide a deeper understanding as to why it exists and it’s fundamental purpose. The strength of the case study lies in its distinctiveness, and this depends on the perspective of others that the case is unique from; however, the primary focus is on considering the case itself.

Summary

This chapter provides the reader with the background and reasoning for the qualitative method of case study research. The qualitative case study promotes the investigation of a phenomenon within its situated context utilizing multiple sources. It is this approach which can safe guard that the case being investigated is studied through multiple perspectives which in turn allows a variety of issues to be exposed and

understood (Baxter & Jack, 2008). A purposeful sampling technique was used, and three semi-structured interviews were conducted. The semi-structured interview allowed each participant greater freedom to respond spontaneously, which in turn created greater breadth and depth within my research.

Chapter 4/Findings

Findings

In this chapter I will present the findings from interviews conducted with three faculty members from a university located in South-Western Ontario, Canada. As previously stated in chapter three, choosing to use purposeful sampling, each participant was required to be a faculty member of Education, Social Science or Humanities; and, to identify as a critical pedagogue. Patton (2002) indicates how purposeful sampling used in qualitative research creates a detailed account of the participants' experience, where the researcher is then able to study the issues that are paramount to the purpose of the investigation. Each interview conducted provided me with the opportunity to investigate the impact of neoliberal accountability regimes on faculty members who identify themselves as critical pedagogues. One of the principal goals of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of how neoliberalism is shaping the experience of those practicing as critical pedagogues in higher education and why critical pedagogy is of increasing importance in an era of neoliberal restructuring. Thus, in this chapter I will investigate the academic lived experience of three faculty members and how they reconcile neoliberal efficiencies with the significance of critical pedagogy. For purposes of confidentiality the participant's names have not been used.

Participants

Each of the participants interviewed for this research are critical pedagogues in an institution of higher education, with two of the participants instructing at an affiliate to the larger University that one of the participants is a faculty member of. All three participants are in the field of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences; they each expressed the importance for ongoing research on neoliberalism, critical pedagogy and issues of equity and social justice. When asked of their teaching philosophy each believes in the importance of critical pedagogy. Two of the participants specifically mention the work of Paulo Freire and other critical pedagogues. One participant mentions the works of Gustavo Gutierrez and Jon Sobrino as being “so much more than Paulo Freire”; while another participant cites bell hooks as being “really my starting point”. All three speak to the importance of creating a space where students feel comfortable engaging critically within the classroom.

When asked what informed their interest in their disciplines each without question mentions their varied lived experiences. Each participant mentions their family, the communities they grew up in, their educational experiences, and the scholars who inspired them. When asked about their pedagogic philosophy, again participants speak of the significance of lived experience. Two of the participants mention specifically the importance of being raised in “politically conscious” families, and all three mention having lived and spent time in colonized communities, with each having a substantial global experience outside of Canada. Each participant shares that their goal as an educator and scholar is to create a space where students can safely begin to critically engage with the world. One participant in sum stated:

I think that my philosophy is to create a space for my students to engage with critical theory and empirical research. To facilitate for them an understanding of their role and their place in the world, and the context within which social relationships are established and the processes that govern institutions both locally and globally.

I think that initially I was absolutely inspired by the work of Paulo Freire years ago, with his notions of critical consciousness and that that's the ultimate goal for me in my teaching; to help students to come to their own understanding of what critical consciousness means for them, whatever that may be, and to really make the classroom experience a space where they can be comfortable with being critical and exploring for themselves what that is going to mean about how they interpret the world and their experience and their place within it.

An analysis was completed whereby each interview was transcribed and read and re-read again, so as to begin to develop themes and possible disconnects between the impact of neoliberal restructuring in higher education and the possible affects this holds for the future of critical pedagogy. The literature reviewed presented that those in society who possess the most economic and political power value conservative neoliberal strategies, they use their status to influence public discourse while endorsing conservative neoliberalism as the natural expansion of capitalism (Hursh and Henderson, 2011); and, it is here where the gap in the literature reviewed is revealed.

Existing literature struggles to define neoliberalism as a result of globalization; however, Stuart Hall, Doreen Massey, and Michael Rustin (2011) suggest, that while “the term ‘neoliberal’ is not a satisfactory one...that naming neoliberalism is *politically* necessary” (2011, p. 10). Ideology performs the function of messenger by circulating and authenticating projects of power and privilege, further propagating notions of the neoliberal imaginary (Hall & O’Shea, 2011). Neoliberalism is penetrating all levels of social life and informing what many now accept as everyday thinking. The faculty

members selected for this research speak to these struggles, while providing rich accounts of how neoliberalism challenges and concerns them, both, philosophically and pedagogically. Thus, it is in analyzing these interviews that, while many themes emerge, there are three that are most prevalent: 1) The Neoliberal Mystique; 2) Quality Assurance & the Audit Culture; and 3) Transgressing: Global education, Neoliberalism, and Critical Pedagogy.

The Neoliberal Mystique

When considering the research question of how neoliberalism has shaped the experience of faculty members in higher education who are sympathetic to the principles of critical pedagogy and practice dialogical teaching and learning in higher education, while reconciling neoliberal efficiencies and competencies with a commitment to such an approach, each participant is asked what *they* think of neoliberalism. The answer each participant provides begins to shed light onto the neoliberal mystique. The corporate presence in higher education cannot be denied and there is growing concern that the domination of neoliberal markets within and between nation-states is creating an ability to silence both citizen and state, while simultaneously re-creating a class power not experienced since the pre-Depression era (Harvey, 2007). Thus, further complicating how we have come to understand higher education, citizenship, and globalization is the prolific spread of neoliberalism.

Neoliberalism as an economic philosophy is not a recent phenomenon; it has existed since the 18th Century and is believed to be inspired from the writings of Adam Smith, a prominent philosopher and political economist from that period who wrote *The Wealth of Nations*. Therefore, neoliberalism has had many incarnations. However, it

would be the global economic and political crisis at the start of the 1970s that would come to re-shape neoliberalism in a manner where at the start of the 21st Century it has become embedded in everyday life in such a way that it is difficult to understand exactly how we think of neoliberalism.

It quickly becomes clear, as each of the research participants begins to share their perspectives on what they think of neoliberalism, just how layered and complex neoliberalism is. It is this complexity that one participant speaks to when they state, “it’s a question to struggle with...I mean to look at it, you have to work with it, to look at it from different perspectives. It would be *easy* for me to say it’s [neoliberalism] a bad thing”. Stephen Ball (2012) speaks to these complexities in the forward of his book *Global Education Inc.* (2012), when he states, “I do not take up a simple or obvious position in relation to neo-liberalism...what I am trying to do here is to provide tools and methods for thinking about neo-liberalism rather than telling you what I think you should think” (2012, p. xiii).

At its most simple level, the literature consulted all too often will cast neoliberalism as the privatization of once publically funded services and in that way it is not all too different from Liberalism and in fact one participant shares that, “one of the things I don’t understand about neoliberalism is how it is all that different from Liberal-Political philosophy”? Yet, as each participant begins to share their perspectives of what they think of neoliberalism the layers of neoliberalism begin to emerge through the themes in language used. However, the language used does not include words such as “rights”, “freedom”, or “liberty”; the language used when each discusses neoliberalism uses words such as “power”, “exclusion”, “ideology”, and even “potential”.

When speaking to neoliberalization, David Harvey (2007) suggests that the accepted inquiry of the dynamics at play tends to focus on the mix between the strength of neoliberal beliefs, the urgency to acknowledge the financial pressures of different kinds, and more efficient paths to remake government so as to advance an ambitious environment within the world market. Although each have played a compelling part in neoliberalization, the absence of any probe of the class power endeavored are astonishing. However, Harvey (2007) argues that the one unrelenting experience within the contextual story of neoliberalism has been its global habit to escalate social inequality and to unmask the most disadvantaged aspects of society to the cold exactness and blunt consequence of pushing those with less to the outer edge. What is even more confounding for Harvey is the customary acceptance of this as a small or regrettable outcome of neoliberalism. That this could be the actual intent of the newly incarnated neoliberalism emerges as inconceivable (Harvey, 2007).

Thus, one participant when speaking to inequality and issues of power and exclusion shares, “I think that it [neoliberalism] is incredibly oppressive of difference and diversity, it is such an effective way to obscure power”. While another states, “as it stands, it [neoliberalism] is really designed to maintain old systems of power that are exclusionary”. And, as an ideology each participant shares neoliberalism as being dangerous, with one participant stating, “I think that it is *the* most dangerous, probably, current of thought that exists right now globally. I think that the danger in neoliberalism is its *over simplification* and its *a-historicism*. I think that for me those are the two pieces that trouble me the most, because I think that as an instructor, my students find those aspects the most difficult to refute”.

However, when speaking to the complexity of neoliberalism it does become problematic for some to paint neoliberalism with one broad stroke, for some neoliberalism is a two sided mask and as the lines of education and other once state operated services become further blurred by corporate and philanthropic participation there are those who will argue that there are aspects of neoliberalism that have the potential to provide positive outcomes at the start of the new millennium. One participant when speaking to the potential of neoliberalism shares, “I’m also cognizant of the fact that there are a lot of people who would say, “But if I hadn’t had these opportunities my family would be living in deep poverty”. So, it’s really a layered and complex thing. I mean, I think a lot of things about neoliberalism, but I always come back to the point of thinking about it in *context*, I don’t want to generalize”. Thus, signaling Nelly P. Stromquist’s (2002) discussion on globalization, it can be suggested that neoliberalism “has geography...it engages in distinct economic and political practices and produces differential benefits across the world”(2002, p.9). However, are those benefits long lasting and at what cost do they come?

When providing a *context* for each participant to discuss neoliberalism, they are asked whether neoliberalism has had an impact on the university and if so could they explain. There are many critical theorists, such as Stuart Hall (2011) and Stephen Ball (2012), who argue that neoliberalism is not something that has already happened leaving society with no choice but to accept. On the contrary, Steven G. Hoffman (2011) suggests that in the university, neoliberalism has created a focus on the knowledge economy that may or may not necessarily eclipse the values higher education was once believed to endorse. However, what Hoffman does suggest, is that “academic capitalism” has created

a new market oriented language in higher education; and, it is this new market oriented language and thought that consciously and un-consciously begins to unfold with each research participant's discussion of how they perceive neoliberalism to have impacted the university. With words such as "competition", "niche-market", "austerity", and "knowledge profit", the neoliberal mystique appears to be maintained. One thing is evident, through the literature consulted and the research interviews conducted: there is now a world market for higher education and this is having a direct impact on program prioritization, curriculum, and research funding.

At present the activities of neoliberal globalization emphasize the contraction of the Keynesian welfare state while coinciding with a vision for greater private market driven activity that is protected, as a citizen would be, under Keynesian terms. These neoliberal globalized practices promote economic events that are creating a new global vision founded on a very different understanding about the responsibility of government and what it means to be a citizen. Neoliberal globalization increasingly places pressure on governments, which includes the increase of exports, reduced government controls, and reduced social programming while simultaneously encouraging resources to restructure nation-state economies in such a way that they become pieces within the larger transnational fiscal movement. This has had a direct effect on many governmental networks, including education (Rizvi & Lingard, 2000). One participant when speaking of the impact of neoliberalism on higher education shares, "Every move that the government makes that takes away something, forces a response here [in the university], that *rarely* serves the student, that *rarely* serves the community, and typically kills those departments and programs that don't have an explicit economic function".

When considering measures of austerity, how complex and layered neoliberalism is in higher education, and the struggle to unpack it, another participant shares this:

At an institutional level the program prioritization that's coming out of the province of Ontario right now is having an institutional impact on how we organize ourselves. I know at [our university], because we are the junior institution to [the main campus] there's a lot of concern about how government cuts to institutions end up trickling down to us. [Because our university] doesn't get to negotiate with governments, [main campus] negotiates on our behalf and [they] have different interests than we do. So, that makes it a little bit tricky in an institutional setting. I mean certainly [when] looking at the responsabilization of students for their own tuition. And, in my Intro classes I use this again and again as a way to say, "look we are embedded in this, *you are* embedded in this, when we are talking about class inequality. Talking [of] the fact that you guys pay \$5000.00 dollars a year for tuition! So, we're not outside of this". I think that makes a huge difference. I think the fact that they pay so much for tuition...and the broader discourses make them [the student] feel that they're entitled to something. They are like a consumer, and they always joke about this [the university] being a customer service organization, and I find that *insanely* frustrating!

However, when considering program prioritization in Chile, a nation with a long history of neoliberal re-structuring in higher education, Stromquist and Sanyal (2013) either omit this sense of entitlement or it does not exist? For, in their discussion their focus is on the implication neoliberalism holds for credentialism and the maintenance of social inequality when they argue,

The result is a system consisting largely of private universities that favour students who can pay... A degree in the social sciences costs around \$150 per month, whereas a degree in engineering or medicine costs \$1200 per month (Zibechi, 2012 in Stromquist and Sanyal, 2013). This means the professions that are more highly paid and respected in society generally have a higher cost, conditioning at a more specific level [those] that can and cannot access higher-paying careers (2013, Pp. 157-58).

It is to this form of classism that Harvey (2007) suggests, the brilliance of neoliberalism is found. Neoliberalism skillfully creates a generous image using the language of liberalism so as to camouflage the cruel realism of the re-creation of raw class power.

Regarding equity, Rizvi and Lingard (2010) offer a simple definition: “The idea of equity...relates to who gets what, when, and how” (p.76). Thus, in the context of higher education equity can be understood most simply to mean access without probing into the socio-economic background of what mechanisms have enabled increased access during current neoliberal times. One participant when speaking of the impact of neoliberalism states, “I think neoliberalism has had a huge impact on multiple levels. I think that the whole downloading of university expenses onto the student is probably one of the most egregious actions taking place. Not only are Ontario universities the least funded nation wide per student, they are also the most expensive on average”.

When placing under the lens issues of program prioritization and competition another participant shares, “increasingly we are being told it’s about the number of bums in seats. So, we have to think of ways to increase student numbers to justify our existence”. When considering how embedded neoliberal practices and language has become another participant goes further to share,

The whole idea of program prioritization [is] having to carve out a niche market. Right now the department of Sociology at [my university] is one of the largest departments. It operates at just over a hundred percent capacity, which is really highly problematic and creates inter-departmental inequities in terms of workload. There was a semester where I had ten times as many students as a colleague in another department. But, it’s the same right? I understand that not all departments can contribute in the same way, because part of it is tied to the student’s choice, which is tied to neoliberalism. But, what that means is that we end up *servicing* [my emphasis] more students and doing a lot more work

in our department, and resources are not necessarily allocated to reflect that.

Thus, the university as an institution finds itself at the start of the 21st Century as an organization increasingly having to re-shape itself in the image of and for big business. Higher education is now a product; higher education, once the forum for discussion and exploration is now viewed as a mean to an end for employment, and this is causing those who teach in higher education to consider this as highly problematic. One participant shares,

We are always being pushed toward thinking in austerity terms, [how] we think about education. It [neoliberalism] has framed education in a very problematic way; that education should *not* be connected to social justice, should *not* be connected to thinking about equality. That education *should be* about the accumulation of wealth or at least fulfilling middle class aspirations. That education should be about becoming a *citizen with money*, as opposed to or in addition to a citizen who thinks more broadly about the world.

Thus, Ball (2012) eloquently states, “ Knowledge is no longer legitimized through ‘grand narratives of speculation and emancipation’ (Lyotard 1984, P. 38 in Ball, 2012, P. 33) but, rather, within the pragmatics of ‘optimization’ - the creation of skills or of profit rather than ideals” (Ball, 2012, P. 33). However, one participant still clearly struggling with the context of neoliberalism shares,

I don’t know that I’m trying to suggest that there was ever a time that education wasn’t connected to those sorts of things, but it seems to be deepening. I think students are being *pushed* to think that the only reason they should be here is to get that degree so that they can make some money and acquire things. And, I think that’s problematic. I see that in our university in terms of programs being cut, in terms of people coming out with PhDs and being told there are no jobs so you have to settle for a contract position. Those are the examples I see in the university. We are being told to tighten our belts. But, I think there’s a lot of money out there; there’s wealth. I think that we could do this differently. I don’t think there is a *will* to do it differently...

When asking this same participant the question of how it [higher education] could be done [thought of] differently, she replies, “If we didn’t have such a myopic view about what it means to live a fulfilling life, we could have the kind of education that people think would be good for *them*”.

Yet, program prioritization in response to globalized neoliberalism appears to be the modus operandi in higher education creating concern and challenges for faculty as presented by one participant who shares,

Its like our philosophy classes are dying now. We have an astounding philosophy faculty here; well, they are only getting nine or twelve people in a class! You can’t fund that! Our business classes are bursting at the seams. You know you’ve got 150 in every Economic section! So what do you do? I mean these are the trade offs and the responses, and I just think we’re going to have a bunch of widgets running around soon that won’t even know how to respond. I guess this is probably the next thing, and (begins to laugh) I don’t want to go into a whole neoliberal tailspin here, but you know I even have students that say, “well, you know I just want to go into Nursing because that is a for sure job!

The implications are quite clear and the day of the widgets has already dawned I fear. We simply need to look at the war in Syria, a situation that on a global scale is barely mentioned yet alone registers in our thought. Where are the human rights protests? Where are the civil rights movements that North American culture has popularized from the 1960s and 1970s when the Vietnam War and all of its atrocities outraged our youth? Where is our ability to think and act for humanity? Thus, program prioritization creates problems that are not only about fiscal bottom lines and balance sheets; it creates problems for preparing the learner with how to critically engage with their world and the

events that shape it. How then is the value of a program measured? This next section looks at the impact of neoliberalism on teaching while further exploring program prioritization and the unexpected discussion on the interconnectedness of teacher evaluations and performativity in the era of the audit culture.

Quality Assessments & the Audit Culture

The act of comparing can be painful; neoliberalism makes this act that much more when considering evaluations of teaching, quality assurance, and program prioritization in higher education. As Davies and Guppy (2010) point out there has never before been as much discussion on accountability and performance measures in education as there are at present. Global comparisons become provocative tools for heads of state as higher education increasingly becomes market-driven and curricula are valued for its economic usefulness. However, to suppose that the marketplace or marketplace indications can appropriately decide *all* is to suppose that *all* in theory can be treated as a product. The marketplace then, it is supposed, creates the proper model for all personal activity (Harvey, 2007). As educational performance measures in terms of teaching quality and student outcomes are increasingly adopted in higher education, Ball (2012) when discussing performativity signals Lyotard (1984) and suggests that it is the archetypical shape of neoliberal politics that embodies “subjectivity, institutional practices, economy and government. It is both individualizing and totalizing. It produces both an active docility and depthless productivity” (Lyotard 1984, P. 38 in Ball, 2012, P. 33).

As mentioned previously, El-Khawas et al (1998) in their report for the World Bank suggest that many researchers have recorded that quality assurance protocols have resulted in institutions of higher education paying “greater attention to issues of

effective teaching and learning... Quality assurance systems that focus on institutions... have found that institutional management has improved, that strategic planning has been strengthened and that programs have become more responsive to changing needs". However, they caution, limitations have also been noted, such as conformity and an insurmountable amount of administrative tasks. This has led to challenges of administration in higher education eclipsing at times the educational concerns that reinforce the pathways to quality assurance. Further, they argue that in consideration of these transformations, this present era of educational practice may become antiquated by the movement toward quantified frameworks and resolved procedures for a number of quality assurance systems. One participant when speaking to both the challenges that arise from measures of performativity and the consequence of teacher evaluations as an instructor in higher education states:

I have a colleague who acknowledges that if he taught the class the way he wanted to, he just recently got tenure, that his teaching evaluations would cascade, they would plummet, right! Because right now, he teaches... *he's funny*... he teaches what the *students* want to hear. He's got it all pieced together, very aesthetic... But, that's not really how *he* wants to teach the course, right? So, there is a way in which these performance incentives, which at [our university] are not really performance incentives because we don't get merit pay, but because of the publication for instance of the 'Honour Roll of Teaching', or whatever... That makes it difficult to stand against that. What I think is really important is for students [to] understand that Canada *is* a Settler-Colonial society and that is deeply problematic. As opposed to, you know, Bourdieu's four Forms of Capital! Which is a lot less challenging to students'! So, I think that those kinds of mechanisms are troubling...

As stated previously, while generalizing is not the aim of this research it is posited that the goal for many institutions in higher education today is to provide less of the essential disciplines in place of professional degrees. Altbach et al (2009) indicate

that queries regarding the intent of higher education have become increasingly weighted, in particular, for developing nations where the requirement for those skilled in the sciences and technologies, as well as those who can provide guidance through their fortuitous knowledge in the humanities, and are creative, adaptable, and provide ethical wisdoms for social growth are sought. Thus, it is Atlbach et al's (2009) position that quality assurance has become a principal focus in higher education as many countries and their institutions of higher education compete to prepare their students for the knowledge economy and the goal of achieving a variety of capabilities to engage with a more complicated and interconnected world are required. However, if quality assurance has become a principle focus for many countries and their institutions of higher education to prepare their students for the knowledge economy and the goal of achieving a variety of capabilities to engage with a more complicated and interconnected world are required, what one participant shares in their discussion on the importance of critical pedagogy within the context of quality assessments/evaluations holds very serious implications not only for the integrity of teaching, but of equal significance, the integrity and hope of how the learner is to engage with the material being taught:

I think teaching critical pedagogy is *difficult because of* the neoliberal context... It's like student evaluations of teaching. I have colleagues who do extraordinarily well and they're excellent colleagues, I'm not disparaging them in any way at all. But, if you are telling students that Canada is racist, which they [the student] do not want to hear and that our assumptions are racist, *and* that they might have their own implication in this racism; or, I would argue, I would probably say it more gently. I would probably say "likely" or "there are questions"... When what I mean is that we are all engaged in racist practices and yes, I am a racist and you're a racist, whatever. Those kinds of things don't go over well on teaching evaluations. So, when institutions look at individuals who teach challenging topics and compare them to their peers, and compare them on something like a student evaluation of teaching, you're penalized for doing that kind of work...

A disconnect is created then between the literature consulted and the reality of this faculty member's lived experience or does it become a misunderstanding of how we define *knowledge* economy? How is it that the literature consulted exalts the importance of critically engaging with knowledge only for those who practice critical pedagogy to express a punitive environment in higher education when doing so? Why would it become beneficial to restrict those who practice critical pedagogy and want to engage the learner in a critical, reflexive, manner? Who benefits from this form of academic censorship? Davies and Guppy (2010), when discussing the future of higher education share that it will be the ability to critically and creatively engage with knowledge that will rescind the tides of an overly applied curriculum in higher education; and, while universities are experiencing growth in professional degrees while simultaneously experiencing a decline in the humanities, it is the latter that in reality is sought by certain professional bodies as they provide the necessary *knowledge* to participate in a global economy. And it is to this that one participant shares,

I think that there has been such an explosion of business faculties and I really don't know what a business faculty in the end, what it is really teaching other than to prepare someone to get out into the world; and, so in the end it is now providing a service to the private sector where they used to train their employees! And, even most business leaders will say they would rather have a Philosophy or English grad, because at least they are literate, and they can think, and they kind of have a 'tool-bag' of knowledge to draw on... that they become much more creative problem-solvers.

Thus, this leads one to ponder what form of measurement do assessments use to evaluate the quality and value of a program and teaching? And what are the implications to this current method of assessment? When specifically asked the question

whether neoliberal policies have had an impact on their teaching one participant's answer encompasses all of the above,

Well, I would say that as we are going into a program review, they're definitely going to shape the types of courses that we are going to offer going forward; because, we are going to be funded now based on what kind of applicability that we can demonstrate in our courses...

And, when this same participant is asked how that is measured, they state,

Well, that's a matter of definition! I think that if you are the Minister of Higher Education right now you probably see that as having some kind of trade or skill attached to it, or a co-op. That is basically what they want now. I have a course that I teach where students are working in local Social Justice oriented agencies in the community... They are not at the United Way and that's because it's supposed to be a critical community based learning experience. So, I guess what I will try to do, to probably preserve that course, will be to redefine it as a co-op experience and I will have to demonstrate some kind of job path that's not explicitly social work, and that has a role to play in the community. I don't know what that's going to look like? I think that at this point, I really, really, resist linking their educational experience to their job. I'm old school in that. I say, "don't worry about that, that will come. Right now gather your experiences, develop your mind, and learn as much as you can, and you will be able to apply it in some way that will work for you"... I would like to believe that...

While another participant when answering the question on neoliberalism and its possible impact on teaching shares, "we've been seduced into justifying our existence through even tighter moves towards professionalization... and part of my job as a teacher, now, I am beginning to realize is to think about how I am going to support these students towards getting jobs". This concern was another emerging theme and something I would like to revisit later in the thesis, as each of the three participants spoke of this concern in the interview, of their student's increasing anxiety, sense of fear of failure, and their growing role as faculty to assist in alleviating this.

When discussing who performs the evaluations of teaching and the potential implications of this one participant states that the evaluations used at the institution in

which they are a faculty member are student-teacher evaluations, which while she agrees that the student should be involved in the assessment process, she also fears that this potentially places the student in the role of expert. However, peer evaluations simply could never be, as this was discussed as an option in her department and not received well at all. When discussing the implications of the current method of assessments this same participant shares how this has led to two very different and problematic issues of institutional power,

[This university] is particularly focused, because we are not a research based institution, it's particularly focused on student evaluations of teaching. So, this year was the first year that we didn't get a list in our mail box of all the people who are on the 'Honour Roll of Teaching Excellence', because something like 60 or 70 percent of people are on the 'Honour Roll of Teaching Excellence' it's more like a list of exclusion! I think that, *that* is deeply problematic. That is a way, I think, of shaming people. That does not take into account who's teaching the class. I have a colleague, a good friend, who teaches at another institution right now, she is a woman of Colour and her teaching evaluations are not as high... they are very good, but they are not as high as they would like them to be. And, she has had to put together literature on how women of Colour have a difficult time in the classroom because of things like, White students can't read their body language, and because she complains about racialism she looks like she has a vested interest and she's whining. Whereas, I complain about racialism [as a White person] and I make my career off of it... quite easily.

Another participant when discussing evaluations in teaching shares how she finds an environment in universities is created that encourages performance rather than an instructor's education philosophy. This same participant, who is a member of another faculty shares that while evaluations of teaching in her department administer both peer and student-teacher evaluations, they prove no less problematic,

Our peers evaluate us all! It's a realization...I'm not quite sure I'm making a criticism, but that it's a broader realization, because I don't think that you *shouldn't* be held accountable for the things that you do, we all have jobs to do and we all should be committed and so forth. But, I

think it's the kinds of things that get left out. It's the kinds of relationships that we have with students, it's the way we mentor students, it's the ways that our *philosophy* of teaching informs how you connect with students, how you teach them, how you feel about them. Those things cannot be scored!

... So, the student that was sitting out there when you came in... I mean this is somebody who I know... somebody who I want to say, "Okay let's talk about this, let me show you what other students have done". There's a *human* type of relationship that we are invested in with our students that a 2.5 on a paper, for me, cannot capture!

I don't know what the solution could or should be? But, I do know that when you measure people's worth that's assigned to what they are doing, the score is here but what they are actually doing is here (physically gesturing with hands a large gap). And, I see that with all of my colleagues, the score is here, but what we actually do is here [again physically gesturing a large gap in space]. Because what we actually do out here is connected to our teaching philosophy. Scores cannot capture that. So, that's what I mean about disconnections, the way that we think about pedagogy individually in my department and collectively, scores cannot capture that. A neo-liberally structured environment that's tilted toward measuring you cannot speak to that, that's what I mean.

The relationships we have with our students reflect the philosophy that I started to talk about [at the start of our interview], but because the institution isn't invested in philosophy, really, that type of philosophy, you can't score me! You can never score me...

Returning to the unexpected theme of nurturing that each participant spoke to when asked about the impact of neoliberalism on their teaching, I found this to be an intriguing revelation as it runs contrary to all that neoliberalism as a philosophy has tried to impart and impose: rugged individualism, personal responsibility, and essentially the social Darwinism that too many appear to take shelter in. Thus one participant when speaking of student anxiety shares,

They are so anxious, they are very anxious about being here and what does one get out of it and should I be doing this? Then, I'm called to say, "Well, let's talk about what you could do with a PhD when you're done, let's justify why it's important to do this". It doesn't necessarily affect the material I teach, but it certainly affects the interactions that I have with very anxious students. And, so it's not...it shrinks the space,

because people think it's a myth that people can't come to university and do really well when they're finished. If they are targeted, and strategic, and so forth...you can do well and you can do a lot of things with a PhD. I would like to see more students coming in with that mindset as opposed to me being called to convince them. And, I think increasingly I am being called to convince them that it's okay to be here.

It doesn't necessarily affect the material I choose for my courses, they remain what I want them to be. But, it certainly affects the curriculum and I don't mean the curriculum on paper. I mean curriculum in terms of interactions and the things we do, and with our students and the kinds of conversations we might have with them. We kind of have to do a lot of allaying of fears and anxieties...

When discussing student's academic fears one participant shares, "Students are really afraid of failure. I find students are not really willing to take risks and they want me to approve their work before they do it. I don't know, I have thought a lot about this, how can you set up a safe space for failure"? When I asked this same participant where they perceive this fear of failure in students to come from, they respond by saying,

I think that there's a social norm that you don't fail, right? That if you fail, *you* have done [it]... it's *moralizing* [my emphasis]... it makes *you* a bad person! If you fail something you're a bad person! I also think, recognize, that I don't actually think it would be that different in a Graduate Institution, that their lives are hyper-competitive right now. But to fail something would be so, so... What does it mean to 'fail' something if you intend to go to Grad school? Will that one assignment that you failed, that one time in Intro... actually change Grad school, your opportunities for Grad school? I would argue probably not. By the time you average everything out is it going to make a big difference? But I think there is an overwhelming sense that *every* decision you make... *every* assignment that you do is so important...

It becomes important to highlight a word choice by the above participant when they state how failure carries a *moralizing* consequence rather than a *de-moralizing* one, for while similar the distinction is significant. How is it then, on this level, the reverse of the neoliberal ethos appears to be occurring I ask myself? Or, could it be that each participant being female is in some way demonstrating the clichéd feminization of the

workplace? Would a male faculty member be as concerned for their students? I reflect on my own experience as a female student and while I had mainly female Professors, of the Professors I did have as instructors, two female and two male stand out as demonstrating an uncanny ability for understanding the stresses, anxieties, concern, and subjective lived experience of a student; while simultaneously challenging and inspiring my learning. Thus, is this a question of gender? Informally I would have to answer no and if I were to consider what the common denominator were to be for each of the Professors (including those interviewed for this research) who expressed an understanding of their students' own lived experience it would be this- each is a critical pedagogue.

Thus, neoliberal globalization is changing how we perceive educational values. Globally, there is a push to link higher education to 'human capital' through program prioritization and an increasing focus on efficiency and effectiveness. However, accountability measures while needed to ensure quality in higher education often conflict with what is deemed equitable, just, and autonomous, thereby creating neoliberal moments. Although the following quote is lengthy, it is when discussing neoliberalism and its impact on teaching that one participant not only shares such a moment, but clearly demonstrates how everyday neoliberalization has become as she herself becomes entangled in a neoliberal moment,

Right now experiential learning is this kind of ad hoc, nobody knows whether or not there's funding. Or, nobody knows how some programs get picked. So, we suggested that we need to regularize it in some way; and, someone suggested that the money should come from my department and I said there's no conceivable way I can ask my department to let me teach a course with 15 students' in it!

We have a colleague right now, who has a 4th year course and the title has "Advanced" in it and *we* [my emphasis] want him to change the name so that more students will enroll. Because, right now they see

“Advance” and they don’t want to take it. We want him to change the title; in fact we had a meeting where we were furious at him because he wouldn’t change the title. He feels entitled to have a class with a few students. At the same time there are lots of other courses that run with 12 students. So, we really shouldn’t have to ... if you look at it, *intra-*departmentally it’s frustrating. *Inter-*departmentally it shouldn’t be problematic; but I find that’s because my department gets caught in this neoliberal moment where there’s cuts of funding. We’re an extremely lucrative department because we teach large classes, our classes are full and the college can make lots of money off of us to support other organizations; but, at the same time that comes back to bite us. So, when we say we would like to offer something in experiential learning, they say well you can’t do that because we can’t offer a course with 15 students in it, because it ends up being the cost per student. Experiential learning ends up being, I think, about ten times what it is for a regular course. There’s no way, there’s no way I can ask my department for that.

Thus, signaling Friedan (1963/2001) has education become the prized object of this new neoliberal mystique? Ball (2012) states neoliberalism is not creed but capital, and at the end of the day higher education is now a product to be sold and it is increasingly being marketed as a brand that is subjected to the same market mechanisms of any other brand, the same marketing strategies, management theories, same value; where enterprise has become its bottom line. Increasingly there has developed a massification of higher education creating a global market, which utilizes the tag line ‘the knowledge economy’. The commercial value becomes undeniable when observing the explosion of higher education in nations such as China and India. However, once again, there emerge the two faces of neoliberalism as the massification in higher education creates increased access for some and provides a method for which to improve future labour for the knowledge economy. However, there are also serious implications of this phenomenon further escalating inequality and acting as a method of neo-colonialism on a global scale as local knowledge becomes antiquated in the shadow of large, mainly

American and British, universities imparting Western knowledge, theories, and practice, particularly in programs such as business and science.

Education Friedan (1963/2001) posited, “should and can make a person “broad in outlook and open to new experience, independent and disciplined in his [or her] thinking, deeply committed to some productive activity, possessed of convictions based on understanding of the world and on his [or her] own integration of personality” (Ibid, p.244). Thus, this next section will be devoted to the increasing focus on global education, what role neoliberalism is thought to hold within that, and why critical pedagogy could be of importance to global education in the 21st Century.

Transgressing: Global Education, Neoliberalism, & Critical Pedagogy

The findings in this section suggest very difficult issues, which for me as a researcher to report became problematic, as the issues that arose in each interview have incredible depth that I become fearful I have not done each the honour they deserve. Global education at the start of the 21st Century is big business; global education is now a product marketed to attract foreign students, sold, and used to create alliances to set up foreign campuses as a method for the massification in higher education and a means to create a market ready supply of labour for foreign local business (Ball, 2012). This translates into directors and officers in higher education devoting greater energies to the promotion and marketing of their institution in foreign markets. Higher education, also, increasingly becomes framed within the neoliberal discourse as a hub for knowledge production through research that can assist in all levels of corporate development. However, Rizvi and Lingard (2010) suggest that unique to the university environment, more so than any other institution, has been its ability to profoundly engage in issues

regarding diversity. Thus, universities are at the heart of contested meanings of personal and learned existence, as they contend with the ever growing challenges and opportunities from a diverse population, while simultaneously grappling with transformations brought about through globalization, the knowledge economy, and as a result the economically fortuitous environment that now presents itself.

Although there has always existed mobility for the learner in higher education, of recent past it had been made accessible for those deemed most academically talented from developing nations as a result of scholarships. Then slowly toward the end of the last century a shift began that correlated with neoliberal globalization whereby mobility in higher education became synonymous with economic trade rather than global aid. Global higher education driven and framed by the neoliberal rationale in the 21st Century has become perceived as a window into industry. Thus, there are those who perceive that a global education will improve opportunities for them to work within a global transnational market as a result of having strong English skills, global experience, and a broader understanding of cultural relations (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). However, there are also those who are critical of this current direction and what is meant by global higher education. Therefore, it becomes important, as the shift in higher education moves from a liberal system to a neoliberal system to understand concepts and approaches of global higher education, the contradictions, and the implications (Spring, 2009).

Schugurensky (2006) suggests three historical periods that help to define the concept and purpose of higher education and these are: 1) The initial liberal custom of the university as guardian to virtuous and humanizing principles, 2) The university as a service organization for the production of human capital to fulfill professional/corporate

requirements, and 3) The university as advocate for social justice and change.

Increasingly what is observed at present are universities functioning explicitly as service organizations for the production of human capital, which is creating a greater focus in higher education on foreign student markets and faculty as research entrepreneurs, where ultimately knowledge is treated as a product (Schugurensky, 2006 in Spring, 2009).

When asked to explain their approach in global higher education and the role of the Bologna Process in this, four Canadian universities were consulted by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) for the *Report of the 2009 AUCC Symposium*; each share that while their institution has an international strategy, their actions are loosely based on the mechanisms of the Bologna Process rather than a direct implementation. One university consulted for this report when discussing their approach to internationalization in higher education states that as a result of their university having a diverse population *all* [my emphasis] of their students receive an international education whether they spend their entire undergraduate time at the home campus or not. Where another university consulted directly links their international approach to training of researchers for industry-oriented tasks (Report of the 2009 AUCC Symposium). Thus, it becomes these current concepts and approaches in global education that create tensions for the faculty members interviewed for this research with one participant sharing,

Well, here's where I start to get nasty. I think that the whole notion of global education, not to be completely cynical, but the dominant rationale within the discourse is definitely to facilitate, I think, a work force that is comfortable working for businesses that have locations internationally. So, in the same way that researchers are being (says quietly) *forced*? (Now speaking with excitement) *Urged*? You know *challenged* to do international research. I think that it's the same thing for students; and, do I think that is to solve the problems of the world? Only if you can make a buck from it; I think that the whole *global education* thing is more designed to attract international students here,

to attract international researchers- the top one's- here, and to open up new interesting sites for research.

Therefore, as mentioned previously in this thesis, El-Khawas et al (1998) posit a new archetype for the purpose of higher education has evolved. Thus, it is assumed, they state, that while universities continue to protect their responsibility as the guardian for the principles of civilization; more efficient roles have been materializing with time, “universities no longer pursue knowledge for its own sake, rather they provide qualified manpower and produce knowledge. With this new economically oriented paradigm, comes accountability. Higher education will be judged in terms of outputs and the contributions it makes to national development” (El-Khawas et al, 1998). Hence, as knowledge capitalism paves the road for the knowledge economy this too creates blurred boundaries and contradictions regarding the neoliberal mystique. Therefore, we are once again in a place where what is valued in higher education is deemed measurable. But, how does government or institutions of higher education measure the ‘output’ and ‘contribution’ of national development? How is national development defined? Are we speaking solely of economic development, or does community conscience as mentioned within the ten actions of the Bologna Process count as development, and if so how is this measured? Could global education as it is framed at present assist the learner in creating a community conscience or a deeper sense of global citizenship? How then is this tied to national development, or is this in the end about knowledge capitalism? To this one participant states,

An increased focus on global education, how is this tied to neoliberalism? Well, I would say that one of the frameworks for global education [is] a focus on global citizenship; although I’m not really sure what anybody means... and market based skills. Like, if you go

somewhere else you'll have this inter-cultural competency that you can translate to global capitalism... I find that disturbing.

What then are the possibilities and purpose of global education? In 1999 in an effort to define the understandings and purpose of higher education in a globalized world and its challenges going forward into the 21st Century, Ministers of Education and university leaders of twenty-nine countries in Europe set forth a document titled *The Bologna Process*. Contrary to popular thought, the European University Association (EUA) declares that the intent of this document was not to 'harmonize' higher education between European states; rather this document was created to recognize the complexities of globalization, to improve mobility, quality, and access in higher education, to inspire, protect, and advocate for both the individual nation-state, the autonomy of the university and the global learner; and, to be an ever evolving document (EAU/AUCC). For close to a decade the AUCC observed the activities of the EUA, its challenges and successes, through the adaptation of the Bologna Process. However, it was not until 2009 that the AUCC met with the EUA to discuss the Bologna Process and its implications for Canada and the future of global higher education (Report of the 2009 AUCC Symposium).

As a result of this meeting the AUCC created the *Report of the 2009 AUCC Symposium* whereby Mme. Quintin of the European Commission is reported as stating,

[T]he Bologna Process is Europe's response to the challenges of globalization, innovation, the need for excellence, cooperation, and competition – in the context of ensuring individual welfare and well-being. The higher education system must adapt, but to do so requires sustained investment in education and training, including support for lifelong learning. The Bologna reforms aim to ensure the quality of education and training that meet the needs of the labour market for high-level competencies.

While the research participants in this study do not directly speak to the implications of the Bologna Process in Europe or Canada; as faculty members in a Canadian university that has only of recent begun to aggressively pursue global education what each share with regard to the challenges and implications of neoliberal globalization and how this translates in higher education leave many questions for this researcher. Each participant when speaking to concerns of ‘individual welfare’, ‘well-being’, and the university’s ability to ‘adapt’ shares a different yet no less significant experience regarding the foreign learner. One participant who remains open to the potential of neoliberalism and global education shares,

I think it [global education] has a lot of good possibilities for a vibrant, diversified community. I have not seen it here [in this institution]; I have not seen that translated here; at least not in this space. I think that in terms of exchange and collaboration, I think that the goal is a good one and it should be an ongoing one. But, I also think there is a wider cast and search for that one elusive student or students, who can bring more money into the institutions. We charge people from China or India lots and lots of money to come here. I cannot speak to what other people do on campus, but just from my own observations, sometimes we set people up for failure. Because, the goal isn’t really...how do you *help, nurture, and prepare* this person to meet the goals they have? But to how much money can they bring into the institution. I think we set students up and we do them a great dis-service in that regard.

When this same participant is asked whether they would consider this a neoliberal aspect of global education they respond saying, “Yes, and everybody thinks ‘Oh, if we could get students from China and India’! I think it’s really telling where those bodies are coming from”. When then asked, if in their perspective, their institution has enough mechanisms in place to assist those learners they reply:

From my perspective, and I say that cautiously because we are not a department that attracts a lot of international students, we’re not. But, the ones... So, just on a very small scale, the ones I have seen

[international students] were very smart, but cannot function in the environment. They do not have the language skills or... they just do not have the language skills. And, I think that we set them up for failure. I'm of two minds, because on one hand I don't want to say...like I said I think there is a range of ways, a lot of things people can bring to enrich a program. I do not want to discount those things; but I think that if you are going to recruit students, or if you are going to invite students to come there should be things in place to give them all of the support that they need to succeed. And, I don't from what I have seen, from my observations; I do not think that we do that very well.

Another participant, continues in this vein, when speaking to global education and the challenges for the foreign student and their level of preparedness:

In my very first year teaching and in my second year, thirty percent of my class was international students, which it is what it is. I've taught ESL for a year, so I'm reasonably comfortable in that context. But, a lot of those students, I would say, were not prepared, did *not* have the English language skills, and did *not* have the cultural background to be in a sociology class. A lot of them for instance, a lot of them were really confused. We had a discussion about the health care system in Canada and how in neoliberal models of health people assume that a patient is misusing or abusing the system. They couldn't understand that! Because, they didn't understand that Canada has a public health system. So, within the first couple of months I went to go see the Dean and the Dean of Students. So, the Academic Dean, the Dean of Students, [and] the International Advisor, and [I] just said, "I don't know what to do here"? And the comment was, "Just treat them like any other student"! *If I had taught, treated them like any other student, they would have failed because their language skills were just not there...*

This then leaves questions as to who is accountable for foreign students and their level of preparedness? Is this the role of the university to determine after the student has paid for their tuition and arrived, or the role of TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) a standardized test that universities and colleges in North America use to determine the level of English proficiency before granting entrance of foreign students? Is a standardized test that is used to evaluate a student's level of technical writing enough? How is critical engagement assessed and who are these tests designed and evaluated by?

Thus, despite at present the possibilities that may exist for global higher education, there appears to remain a complex web of issues that continue to mire the possible potential of global education (EUA/AUCC). Who becomes accountable? As nations, such as Canada, increasingly decentralize their systems of higher education, universities are placed in positions of having to seek funding elsewhere, and often this is through increasing their foreign student enrollment and through creating international partnerships in research.

When speaking of global education one aspect that is mentioned is international research and how this affects faculty. The discussion here is no less lively with one participant sharing,

For me, my work is on international partnerships and so I just see how the university is creating opportunities for Professors to *participate* in neoliberal exploitative activities where I don't think that's the role of the university at all. Universities, now, are so closely *aligned* with the national-political or provincial-political agenda, that funding and granting and everything are so closely aligned to what your research is. And, the only way you can tap into that is, you know, if you get some sort of research agenda that's actually going to have some sort of knowledge profit in the end. And, so Professors who might not initially be drawn to these types of projects find themselves in positions where they are aligning their work with interests that are exploitative on a particular level. And, I think that is *incredibly* problematic.

This same participant continues,

Outside of education, I know that within the business faculty and science faculties, they really, they really operate as quasi corporate-capitalistic entities. You know, you may be a Professor with a research interest in your faculty and you may teach, but on the side you may also be running a corporation where your research findings are then patented and then there's a whole other opportunity for profit. So, we *don't* really understand what all of the parameters are around this and there has not been a whole lot of research into this, the *ethics* of it. And, again this is another one of those kinds of ambiguities that exist now within the university; and, I would say that neoliberalism *loves* a nice big gray area...

I ask the participant how this might encroach on their sense of academic freedom as a researcher? They respond by stating,

What I see right now is *pressure* at *all* levels in the university for everyone to have an international dimension to his or her research. For example, researchers who wouldn't necessarily be drawn to international work, or have any experience in it, are jumping on board... Often, if they demonstrate an international dimension to their research, they are more likely to receive funding, there's a certain glam factor to international work... I can speak to one example where I was in Africa doing research... to see researchers coming from Canadian universities... with *no* African experience, *no* cultural context, *no awareness*, initiating research agendas that I would find problematic within that specific cultural, political, economic... And, you know I think that really is part of the problem- the way knowledge is produced when it is about the Global South, *without* any consultation with those communities, *without* any kind of *interpretative* context. You know, what are you doing except practicing neo-colonialisms? So, what do I think? We are creating a context for it; *we*, are creating a generation of scholars that aren't necessarily critical about it, particularly if they don't come from a critical faculty...

Regarding the welfare and well-being of foreign students what one participant has to share is of such grave importance to the critics discourse surrounding global education and a topic that until our meeting I had not come upon in any literature reviewed thus far. This story speaks directly to neoliberalism, its blinding effect of class, and its gross perpetuation of social inequality,

The other thing, (begins to laugh softly in an embarrassed-apologetic manner) that can I just say, is they treat the [foreign] students typically poorly. I just had a discussion with a President from a local college here about a problem that he is having, because they have launched a huge recruiting effort to bring in international students to shore up enrollment for tuition. But, the students often come and they get no financial aid, and because they are a college recruiting, they're probably not drawing on the upper middle class, they're drawing on the lower middle class; and, he's finding that students are living 15 and 16 to a two bedroom apartment! And, nobody really knows how to access these stories and find out what's going on! He would not have even known either if there had not been an incident in one where students became quite sick. He

said that his International Supervisors went and saw where the students were living... it was horrifying...

And, this is not unusual. This is what happened when we lived in Vancouver, [in] little studio apartments because the cost of living there is so exorbitant. They will put themselves through extraordinary situations. So, they're not all the rich students who are coming, who are going to live in lux buildings. There are multiple levels in this narrative. But, again it's the neoliberal institution. They're just bringing them in, hooking them, as fast as they can... (Long silence)...

Have these issues truly become so embedded within the pursuit of global higher education that they have become everyday? Or, at the dawning of this new century are these challenges (if I may call them so) raising a social conscience regarding issues of tuition fees, support for foreign learners, quality assurance, international research and humanism? These are no longer issue of access; they have become issues about how we define success in higher education and issues of its purpose.

Thus far this chapter highlights how at the start of the 21st Century a very compelling discourse on higher education is beginning to take place that seeks to inform the methods of how universities critically approach education and global education. This discourse reveals the concerns and potential for links in global higher education and future labour opportunities that are being created through the increasing mobility of people, markets, and knowledge. It also emphasizes the dire need for new ways in understanding how we envision higher education and global relations that are increasingly framed by neoliberal globalization, which has been touted as being based on a knowledge economy that necessitates an intercultural understanding and comfort ability. This discussion also brought to light how neoliberal trends have embedded

themselves to such a degree in education that they have created a mystique that might actually be a crisis of conscience; not politics, not economics.

Rizvi and Lingard (2010) suggest that if knowledge for economy and understanding of Other are to be viewed as central to the goals of education then there is a requirement for economies and culture to be understood as historical and fluid in a manner that moves away from focusing on tradition to a manner that explores the subjectivity of these differential experiences. Critically important then are the questions we ask, 'for what purpose', 'for whose benefit', and 'whose knowledge'? This then leads us into our next discussion of why critical pedagogy would be of importance to global education and why a critical pedagogic philosophy is of importance in higher education.

As previously mentioned, although democracy maintains itself as the focus for what the meaning of education should be, how and for whom education should be organized, and how it should be administrated; the core essence of a democratic education challenges citizens to ask, "what kind of a society do we want and what kinds of politics will help us get there" (Apple, 2011, p.23). Thus, Giroux (2013a) argues that there emerges an obligation within higher education, specifically, to create a pedagogy that is at the heart of the principal worth of politics, an obligation that leads to liberation. When asked why critical pedagogy would be of importance to global education and if they could explain, one participant shares,

I think to cut through the veneer that the world is changing just because of proximity; just because I can text you if you if you're sitting on a beach somewhere in Africa very quickly; or, because you can send me an email that can get to me in five minutes or less. I think that we have a very warped sense that, that is all that we need to do, right? Without thinking through the power and the politics of how other things get masked in those kinds of transactions. So, I think that especially because of this generation being so clued into technology and what not,

and because we are so big at [this university] on ... the “good student experience”, which increasingly means you send students overseas or you bring people here. And, that’s great and the whole idea is to expose people to different languages, communities, and so on and so forth. I don’t think that is a bad thing. But, I think that it can be done really well, or it can be done really poorly.

This same participant goes on to describe why critical pedagogy in global education is important, and while it is a lengthy passage it responds to questions of power, knowledge, purpose, and what can happen to global education when void of critical pedagogy:

I remember going to a talk a few years ago on campus where some students had gone on an exchange and they were invited to come and talk about their experiences. I remember sitting in a presentation where a young woman, very smart, talked about two experiences she had had so far in her career as an undergrad. I think she had been to France and she had been to an African country. It was really interesting how she talked about going to France to *learn*, but going to Africa to *help*. And, I thought “OH! Okay?”. *This* is why we *need* critical pedagogy! How do you unpack that! I don’t necessarily blame the student for that because I think it’s... part of my responsibility as a teacher is to say there are different ways to look at it; that’s my job. But, what informs this idea that you’re going to France to learn, but going to Africa to help? It really struck me. I thought that was such a powerful moment! It was a moment that reminded me of the importance of doing the kind of work that we do, to *disrupt* these kinds of ways of looking at the world. To shift our thinking to *yes*, you can actually go to an African country and *learn* something! You can go to India and *learn* something! You don’t always have to be in the heart of the Western civilization to learn.

So, I think it’s even more important to have a critical pedagogical perspective, because there’s so much that tells us increasingly that, oh well, look technologically we can do so much with each other, to and for each other, that we don’t have to think about these things. That technology is the big equalizer! We are told that we are emerging as advanced people and so forth... I think it’s very seductive. We get into discussions about why it’s important to *not* talk about race, or to *not* talk about violence against women, or to *not* talk about homophobia or disability and so forth. We are seduced into thinking we’re making progress...

I become somewhat confused by what this participant has shared, how could it be considered progress *not* to talk about issues of social justice and equity? So I ask the question, ‘By *not* talking about it’? And the participant states,

Exactly, or this thinking that everything will work itself out. We don’t need to have these conversations; we don’t need to have social justice any more. I think that’s a really... the spaces for those types of conversations are shrinking at a time when I really feel that this is when they *need* to be happening.

Do they [the participant] see neoliberalism playing in to that? They respond saying,

Yes, of course I do for all of the things I talked about. How people see themselves, how we are seduced into thinking of ourselves, how increasingly we don’t need to be connected to communities, we don’t need to think about choices and responsibilities. We only need to think about what rights *do I* have, I see it all the time.

Rights with no responsibility, I ask? The participant shares,

Exactly! I don’t know how it is in other departments but by in large the people who continue on in [my department] do have a different worldview. They do see the world differently, or at least they are open to seeing the world differently. But, [my department] is not valued as a discipline on campus, and that in itself says something...

This directly relates to a statement shared earlier in this thesis by Peter Mayo (2009), for it would appear that while there are those whose aim it is to internationalize higher education, there has been little focus paid to ‘different ways of knowing ... transforming them [institutions of higher education] from patriarchal bastions into more gender and ethnically inclusive institutions’ (p. 98). It is to this that in *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), bell hooks suggests that if we were to investigate critically the time-honoured role of the university in its quest for that which is principled and collaborative regarding what is deemed as knowledge, it will become achingly apparent that preferences which, endorse Eurocentrism, androcentrism, and I would add capitalism,

have perverted education so that it is in no shape or form about the pursuit of liberation. Thus, hooks (1994) beckons for the acknowledgement of Other, an acceptance of diverse knowledge, an unpacking of traditional ways of knowing, and an insistence that we revolutionize the learning environment, in curriculum and curricula, in a manner that explores ways to resuscitate a soul into a nefarious and doomed institution.

The potential for critical pedagogy to unpack social and political experiences becomes one of its most daunting tasks, even more so at present as a result of the neoliberalization. Joe Kincheloe (2004) speaks to this challenge when discussing what he terms the *Great Denial* in education, whereby conservative educators have for far too long existed in denial of the political aspect of education. In the *Great Denial*, curricula and curriculum that disregard the threat of the status quo are perceived as empirical and politically correct (Kincheloe, 2004). Kincheloe (2004) suggests that critical pedagogy argues how such judgments are not founded on a comprehension of *power* and are dismissing how social participation is constructed through unequal patterns of power. Thus, when asking each participant why is a critical pedagogical philosophy of importance in higher education, one participant shares,

One aspect that's easy to identify, is that this is kind of the place where if you are going to identify the circuits of power and privilege that kind of are governed by neoliberalism, this is a really good place to begin to map those and to think about their implications; and to analyze their impact. It's very hard to do that in the real world. You know when students are out there in their daily lives, they're... they forget about it.

Giroux (2013c, in Lake & Kess, eds. 2013) suggests that there is more at jeopardy here than the crisis of government and the suppression of *critical thought*. Too many spaces for learning have become *dead zones*. Giroux continues by stating that too often

now the learning environment has become a space void of creativity, critical thinking, or reflexivity. Higher education, he argues, has diminished its civic view for corporate interests by re-shaping itself as an accreditation industry for the learner and a laboratory for the reduction in faculty members. Thus, another participant when asked the question regarding the importance of a critical pedagogical philosophy in higher education, answers,

I don't know that it's *just* of importance in higher education... [However], at a university level I've been really frustrated by hearing that industry wants, or, that the government wants post-secondary institutions to train people so that they have industry ready skills. I feel like that really absolves industry of their need to train people, to do the specific tasks that they require. I don't understand that? Because, if universities are to take up that challenge then as soon as the skills change then the worker's are now unskilled, right? Instead of providing a background or a basis upon which people can scaffold... use scaffolding, or whatever specific skills they, people, might need within the industry.

This same participant then later continues,

I think that critical pedagogy is important because, for me, it involves self-reflexivity. Globally, that's important to me. I think also, in the micro-context, it's important to have that kind of reflexivity about what's going on in the meetings that you're in. I think that if we want people to be *meaningful* contributors in their communities and in their work places, and in whatever other circles they're in, that they need to be able to identify problems and think through those problems; and, [to] become willing to *address* those problems. Be willing to take on difficult tasks and difficult issues. I think that if that training or those issues... that if you start confronting those issues in your courses, that you are better able to address them...

Another participant when speaking to the lack of critical thought shares,

But, at this point there's not a prick of criticality anywhere. Freire talks about that, that there's got to be something, there's got to be some catalyst that creates awareness within the person. And, I would just [like to] say one more thing, that I don't even like to say, [it] is that I am very critical. But, I also don't want to lose what I have, and so I often don't push that far either (becomes very quiet and reflective). I don't have

tenure yet, I'm female, I have children to put through university... (begins to speak showing great trepidation) I've felt the very frightening sting when I've gotten too close in my research to a particular interest. So, even in my dissertation you kind of have to read between the lines because I was so afraid, right up until the end, until the day, that I wasn't going to be allowed to defend. I was so anxious because it just... ya, there were some real ramifications with my research. In particular after I defended, that made me realize that this is tricky stuff in the university and you really need to be sure that your protected before you say too much... (Deep silence)... Very tricky...

Thus, while faculty voices have a place within their own research, how censored are they becoming? What has happened to their 'Academic Freedom' and what are the implications of this on future knowledge and human development? What then becomes important are to remind those in the Academy who continue to believe in the importance of a liberatory education that they are not alone. That while the challenges are daunting and exhausting, they are challenges worth their mettle and they are challenges that they truly are more than equipped to take on. If we continue to live with the concerns of evaluations, miscalculation, accomplishing things badly, failing, or disrupting, we will never create in higher education an authentic space for, and of, the Other. Where education, faculty, and learner, explore every aspect of diversity (hooks, 1994).

As measures of austerity increase, as employment becomes less predictable, many of the minor dynamic mediations that were created to transform higher education, to create a more liberal space for difference are at risk of being de-valued or deleted. These risks ought not to be overlooked. Neither must the shared responsibility of Other shift due to a belief that we have yet to create or apply the ideal action (hooks, 1994). However, to create a space in higher education that embraces every element of diversity we must have the *will*. Or, as one participant shares,

It is really important to me, and the more I see a shift away from critical pedagogy the more invested...I think it's important for me to become more invested in it. So, I don't want to hear conversations about why we're living or how we're living in a post-racial society, or a post-feminist society, because we're not yet. I don't want to have conversations about why we don't need to address homophobia any more, because after all Gays and Lesbians can get married in Canada. So, I never want to be seduced into that kind of conversation. And, it's so easy, *so easy*. So, I think for all of those kinds of reasons, some of the reasons, it's much broader than that. But, those are the things that I teach and the things that I'm interested in. For me, I see a good deal of *value* in that.

Thus, before closing this chapter I will share one last discussion regarding how critical pedagogy has come to be perceived in the Academy and its pedagogic importance in higher education from the perspective of another participant who speaks to it's significance being in the *reflexivity of privilege* when she states,

I think we do tend to think that critical pedagogy is old fashioned. I think there are a lot of people who think it's old fashioned in the Academy and there's a shinier discourse out there- its social entrepreneurship and it's public partnerships. They sound so great, like you can have your cake and eat it too. Like all right! I can have a social conscience, but can have a really great job too, my really big house, and be a Prof, and be off for sixteen weeks a year! All those great things, and have my sabbaticals and stuff. We forget how privileged we are in Higher Ed., and that's probably a frightening thought. The *privilege*, probably, and the *reflexivity of our privilege* has to start here! There you go, that'll end it!

Summary

This chapter presented the findings from interviews conducted with three faculty members from a university located in South-Western Ontario, Canada. Choosing the qualitative purposeful sampling technique, each participant was required to be a faculty member of Education, Social Science or Humanities. Each interview conducted provided the opportunity to investigate the impact of neoliberal accountability regimes on faculty members who identify themselves as critical pedagogues; for one of the principal goals of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of how neoliberalism is shaping the experience of those practicing as critical pedagogues in higher education and why critical pedagogy is of increasing importance in an era of neoliberal restructuring.

Existing literature struggles to define neoliberalism as a result of globalization; further, present neoliberalization is penetrating all levels of social life and informing what many now accept as everyday thinking. Each of the faculty members selected for this research speaks to these struggles, while providing rich accounts of how neoliberalism challenges and concerns them, both, philosophically and pedagogically. Thus, it is in analyzing these interviews that, while many themes emerge, there were three that became most prevalent: the neoliberal mystique, quality assurance and the audit culture; and the need to transgress global education, neoliberalism, and critical pedagogy as it is understood and enacted at present.

This chapter highlights how at the start of the 21st Century a very compelling discourse on higher education is beginning to take place that seeks to inform how universities critically approach education and global education. This discourse reveals the concerns and potential for links in global higher education and future labour opportunities

that are being created through the increasing mobility of people, markets, and knowledge. It also emphasizes the dire need for new ways in understanding how we envision higher education and global relations that are increasingly framed by neoliberal globalization.

Foremost what became clear from the discussions conducted for this research is this: While instructing is a *performative act* it is not to be confused with performance (hooks, 1994). Teaching critically is to inspire, engage, peel back, and disrupt not only knowledge for the learner, but the teacher also, as learning is meant to be a dialogic experience. Secondly, if the Academy is to earnestly move forward into the 21st Century as a bastion of global diversity it must be *willing* to create a space where *all* disciplines are honoured and begin to engage with each other, the learner, and research in a manner that is critical, reflexive, unsettling, *ethical* and *just*.

Chapter 5/ Conclusion

This is an inauspicious road, for he who takes it- passive, lost, ruined- becomes henceforth the creature of another's will, frustrated in his transcendence and deprived of every value. But, it is an easy road; on it one avoids the strain involved in undertaking an authentic existence (de Beauvoir, 1949 in Kolmar/Bartkowski, 2010, p. 152).

Neoliberalism has carved out for each a challenge, a challenge to transform higher education and our understanding of Other. This will not be an *easy road*. One of the principal goals of this research was to gain a deeper understanding of how neoliberalism is shaping the experience of those practicing as critical pedagogues in higher education and why critical pedagogy is of increasing importance at the start of the Twenty-First Century. Specifically, this thesis attempted to answer the following questions: What are the possibilities for enacting critical pedagogies within a neoliberal climate of educational restructuring? How has neoliberalism shaped the experience of three faculty members in higher education, who are sympathetic to the principles of critical pedagogy and practice dialogical teaching and learning in higher education, while reconciling neoliberal efficiencies and competencies with a commitment to such an approach? And, what is the possibility of critical pedagogy in the context of neoliberal restructuring in higher education; and, how is critical pedagogy of increasing importance at the start of the Twenty-First Century?

I have presented the findings from semi-structured interviews conducted with three faculty members from a university located in South-Western Ontario, Canada. Each interview conducted provided me with the opportunity to investigate the impact of neoliberal accountability regimes on faculty members who identify themselves as critical pedagogues. I chose the qualitative case study method as it promotes the investigation of

a phenomenon within its situated context utilizing multiple sources. It is this approach which can safe guard that the case being investigated is studied through multiple perspectives which in turn allows a variety of issues to be exposed and understood (Baxter & Jack, 2008).

This research reveals how neoliberalism at the start of the 21st Century has evolved in a manner that defies definition thereby creating what I have termed the *neoliberal mystique*. Thus, signaling Ball (2012), another purpose of this thesis was not to define neoliberalism, but to challenge how we have come to think of it so that we may begin to engage and unpack it. The interviews conducted highlight how a very compelling discourse in higher education is beginning to take place in the Academy that seeks to inform the methods of how universities critically approach education and global education. This discourse reveals the concerns and potential for links in global higher education and future labour opportunities that are being created through the increasing mobility of people, markets, and knowledge. It also emphasizes the dire need for new ways in understanding how we envision higher education and global relations that are increasingly framed by neoliberal globalization, which has been touted as being based on a knowledge economy that necessitates an intercultural understanding and comfort ability.

The faculty members selected for this research each spoke to these struggles, while providing deep and rich accounts of how neoliberalism challenges and concerns them, both, philosophically and pedagogically. Thus, it was in analyzing these interviews that three themes became most prevalent: 1) The Neoliberal Mystique; 2) Quality Assurance & the Audit Culture; and 3) Transgressing: Global education, Neoliberalism,

and Critical Pedagogy. Although the findings from the interviews conducted at times revealed differences, what did become evident is that there is now a world market for higher education and this is having a direct impact on program prioritization, curriculum, and research funding. Neoliberal globalization is re-shaping the purpose of the university, learning, and global learning and it is to this that each faculty member as a critical pedagogue provides a very rich account.

Foremost this thesis presents through the literature consulted and the interviews conducted a cautionary tale whereby neoliberal globalization has become the provocative tool for both heads of state and higher education to increase a market-driven agenda that endorses curriculum that is valued for its economic usefulness as opposed to civic mindedness. However, Harvey (2007) similar to those interviewed for this research, posits that to suppose that the marketplace or marketplace indications can appropriately decide *all* is to suppose that *all* in theory can be treated as a product. It is to this problem of marketization and commodification of higher education, which each faculty member interviewed for this research found most problematic and dangerous. The interviews conducted for this research also brought to the fore issues of quality assessments/evaluations that rely on quantitative measures for performativity. That while instructing is a performative act; it is not to be confused with performance (hooks, 1994). Teaching critically, each interviewee shares, is to inspire, engage, peel back, and disrupt not only knowledge for the learner, but the teacher also, as learning is meant to be a dialogic experience. The most significant aspect of higher education in an era of neoliberalization that this research amplifies is its complicity and assistance in the perpetuation of gross acts of social inequality. Thus, if the Academy is to earnestly move

forward into the 21st Century as a bastion of global diversity it must be *willing* to create a space where *all* disciplines are honoured and begin to engage with each other, the learner, and research in a manner that is critical, reflexive, unsettling, *ethical* and *just*.

Critical pedagogy advocates for the empowerment of each individual through the ability of critical thought and ‘problem-posing’ education; it rejects the banking system and in its place offers “posing of the problems” of all people in the context of their experiences within the world (Freire, 2011, p. 79). While at present there are various critiques of critical pedagogy, Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989) continues to be among the most cited in academia. Ellsworth, an educator in higher education in the United States, argues that critical pedagogy “has developed along a highly abstract and utopian line which does not necessarily sustain the daily workings of the education its supporters advocate” (1989, p. 297). Ellsworth goes further to state that the principal aims of critical pedagogy such as “empowerment”, “student voice”, “dialogue”, and even the term, “critical are-repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination” (1989, p. 298); suggesting, for those who adhere to the educational philosophies of critical pedagogy to “come to grips with the fundamental issues this work has raised-especially the question, What diversity do we silence in the name of “liberatory” pedagogy”? (1989, p. 299). Those who seek to critique Freire or the philosophy of critical pedagogy are encouraged, for as bell hooks (1994) posits it is exactly this form of critical engagement that critical pedagogy is founded on, and I might offer will provide insights into how critical pedagogy can continue to evolve in a manner that proves relevant to our educational and political challenges of the 21st Century.

Limitations

Methodologically, Cohen et al (2011) caution how the qualitative case study may be challenging to construct. Qualitative case studies have been criticized for their weakness with regard to generalizations and thus may be considered a limitation to this research; however, what motivates those in qualitative case study is the focus on the depth and particularity of a case not the generalizability across populations. Another limitation to this study may be that each of the participants comes from a similar discipline, and thus my findings may be deemed as biased. While, I do concede that it could have proven of great interest to add to this research faculty voices from other disciplines who consider themselves critical pedagogues, the purpose of this research was to focus on those in Education, Sociology, or the Humanities, as it has become these disciplines that are perceived as having the greatest restructuring as a result of neoliberalism. Finally, the most significant limitation of this research occurs, I fear, in the insurmountable task to capture the importance of this discussion on neoliberalism, critical pedagogy, and higher education. Although I have endeavored to be succinct with my analysis, this research proved to be incredibly rich and complex; thus, I fear that by omitting certain conversations I have failed to honour the participants who so graciously gave of their time and the importance of what this research means to critical pedagogy and higher education in the 21st Century.

Implications for Future Research

If there could be one resonating implication from this research it is this- neoliberalism at the start of the 21st Century has evolved in such a manner as a result of globalization that it defies definition. It is complex, situated, sophisticated, and for some

carries the belief of possibility. However, from the literature consulted and the interviews conducted one other thing is apparent, neoliberal globalization has been extremely effective in restoring class power to a degree not experienced since the pre-Depression era and this carries with it many dangers with regard to increasing social inequality at a rate not experienced before. The other element that is astonishing is how little attention has been devoted to this in research (Harvey, 2007). Neoliberal globalization is transforming government to governance, citizen to consumer, while simultaneously creating a combination of people who are increasingly mobile, morally flexible, while being capable of communicating civic, corporate, and humanitarian worth (Ball, 2012). Thus, what becomes prevalent in this research is that while there exists a neoliberal mystique it is this mystique itself that perpetuates the ideology for the neoliberal imaginary. Therefore, in order to critically engage with how society defines neoliberalism a broader discourse is encouraged as to how we have come to think of neoliberalism by studying how it has evolved, its context, who it benefits, and who it leaves out.

Further, highlighted in this research is that while teacher evaluations are an important aspect of higher education, the present form that is dependent on quantitative measures simply cannot capture the value of those who engage critically with their student, their curricula and curriculum. The present evaluation methods also run the risk of placing the student in the role of expert while systematically reducing what an instructor does from performative to performance. New methods of assessment are required, methods that are able to capture the value of what is being taught and who is teaching, without reducing a discipline or a person's worth to a number on a page. Global education, through the massification of higher education, is a new phenomenon and the

implications are vast; thus, better methods for testing foreign students English proficiency that coincide with the ethos of global education and the expectations of those who will be learning and teaching are also required. Needed then are authentic mechanisms in place in higher education to assist *all* learners once they arrive that go beyond welcoming, token multi-cultural trope, and technical supports. Student, teacher, and community members are encouraged to understand that knowledge is diverse and that higher education is a journey for many students, who while they may struggle greatly at the beginning, when given the proper support and encouragement through patience, understanding, and the ability to actively engage will prosper in untold ways.

Thus, similar to Ball (2012), this research is not exhaustive in any form; many things are missing due to the scope of the subject, such as the students' perspective on neoliberalism and the immense pressures their teachers spoke of as a result of the competitive nature of undergraduate and graduate programs; the value that many graduate applications now place on cultural capital for those applying, how this excludes those who have not had the same opportunities due to socio-economic circumstance and the implications this holds; the pressure some students feel to choose a study path in higher education that will directly lead to employment; and, the possible consequences this holds for both the learner and society in time.

Immigration became another important aspect of these conversations. This concern was raised, in part, as a result of a CBC Report (Trementi, 2013), whereby two Nigerian students invited to study at the University of Regina, Victoria Ordua and Ihouma Amadi, faced deportation from Canada without any transferability of their university credits after three years of study. Misunderstanding Canadian eligibility for

work as foreign students they sought and gained part-time employment for a two-week period with Walmart, a large North American retailer. Although Immigration Canada has revised several policies for work-study permits effective June 2014 (Ontario Immigration-International Students, 2014), that future misunderstandings do not occur remains to be seen, and once again raises the question as to who is responsible for these policies to be clearly communicated and understood?

I have endeavored to make the most striking points in this research, to peel back the mystique society has come to place on how we think of neoliberalism and how this is affecting those who practice as critical pedagogues in higher education in the hope that this will inspire more to begin engaging with the *reflexivity of our privilege*. I hope to inspire and point out that which Hall (2009) terms not a *politics of guarantee*, but rather, a *politics of possibility*. To new ways in which to accomplish our goals and ideals, to other ways in which to think about what is going on *out there* and *in here*. This will be a challenging road, however, it is a challenge worth *our intellectual labour*.

Summary

Giroux suggests, “Within this impoverished sense of politics and public life, the university is gradually being transformed into a training ground for the corporate workforce, rendering obsolete any notion of higher education as a crucial public sphere in which critical citizens and democratic agents are formed” (2005, p.225). Although the corporate presence in education cannot be denied, I suggest similar to an ant in nature when faced by an obstacle and must forge a new path, so too will humankind.

Neoliberalism, I posit, is not *rendering obsolete any notion of higher education as a crucial public sphere*. Neoliberalism is causing higher education to rethink and reshape its space; a space where when neoliberalism is tempered can continue to critically question and accomplish its steadfast goals and ideals. Illustrating this is *Education and Struggle* (2012), a global project by critical pedagogues Michel Peters and Peter McLaren, who when writing on the “political production of meaning”, suggest,

That as we struggle within the realm of educational politics based around a series of interrelated themes: Indigenous struggles; Western-Islamic conflicts; globalization and the clash of world views; [and] neoliberalism as the war within...Education and Struggle promises to be on the cutting edge of social, cultural, educational, and political transformation (Peters & McLaren, 2012).

Thus, while challenges remain, especially in light of the MOOC revolution, the significance of critical pedagogy must be nourished. Critical pedagogy continues to place discourses of contradictory experiences into the centre of educational activities. It is for this reason that I suggest to fully experience a just and equitable society it will be through the transformations within an education infused with problem-posing questions; an education which explores the many contradictions of our shared life experiences, and an education that not only seeks inclusion of all but *success in education for all*.

There is an expression I have come to like, *A smooth sea never made a skilled sailor*. Thus, if we are to authentically embark on our goal of revolutionizing higher education so that it becomes a space where *Other*, in every sense of its meaning, inspires all levels of learning we must be prepared to critically engage with knowledge, to be reflexive, to value lived experience, to disrupt all that has made some comfortable, to challenge this erosion of conscience that has infected every level of society, remain open to all that is yet to occur; and above all, to be blissfully exhausted knowing that we are committed to this task. Whether we are up to this challenge for change is something Ulrich Beck (2007) once posited when enlisting the metaphor of the caterpillar and the butterfly.

References

- Allman, P. (1994). Paulo Freire's contributions to radical adult education. *Studies in the Education of Adults* 26 (2), 144-162. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/ehost/detail>
- Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., Rumbley, L. (2009). *Trends in higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. UNESCO. Retrieved July 19th, 2013 from <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/trends-global-higher-education-2009-world-conference-en.pdf>
- Apple, M. (1979/2004). The hidden curriculum and the nature of conflict. In *Ideology and curriculum 3rd ed.* 77-97. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M.W. (2010). *Global crises, social justice, and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M.W. (2011). Democratic education in neoliberal and neoconservative times. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 21(1), 21-31. doi: 10.1080/09620214.2011.543850
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, (2009). *The Bologna process and Implications for Canada's Universities, Report of the 2009 AUCC Symposium*. Retrieved February 19th, 2013 from <http://www.aucc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/bologna-report-20091.pdf>
- Ball, S.J. (2012). *Global education Inc.: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Barton, A. (2001). Capitalism, critical pedagogy, and urban science education: An interview with Peter McLaren. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 38 (8), 847-859. Retrieved from http://journals1.scholarsportal.info.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/pdf/00224308/v38i0008/847_ccpau-seaiwpm.xml
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559. Retrieved May 25th, 2013 from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR13-4/baxter.pdf>
- Beck, U. (2002). The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1-2),17-44. doi: 10.1177/062632764020

Beck, U. (2007). "Ulrich Beck Online". Retrieved March 3rd, 2012 from <http://www.ulrichbeck.net-build.net/index.php?page=cosmopolitan>

Blackburn, J. (2000). Understanding Paulo Freire: Reflections on the origins, concepts, and possible pitfalls of his educational approach. *Community Development Journal*, 35 (1), 3-15. Retrieved from <http://cdj.oxfordjournals.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/content/35/1/3.full.pdf+html>

Borg, C. and Mayo, P. (2000). *Learning and social difference. Challenges for public education and critical pedagogy*. Boulder: Paradigm.

Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials (2013). *Quality assurance practices for post secondary institutions in Canada*. Retrieved July 10th, 2013 from <http://www.cicic.ca/510/fact-sheet-no-5.canada>

Camicia, S. P. and B. M. Franklin (2011). "What type of global community and citizenship? Tangled discourses of neoliberalism and critical democracy in curriculum and its reform" *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 9 (3-4), 311-322. doi: 10/1080/14767724

Cohen, L. Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Commission of the European Communities, (2009). Report from the commission to the council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and social committee and the committee of the regions: Report on progress in quality assurance in higher education. Retrieved July 17th, 2013 from http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc/report09_en.pdf

Connell, R. (2013, February 20). Neoliberalism and higher education: The Australian case. Retrieved on March 14, 2013 from <http://www.isa-sociology.org/universities-in-crisis/?p=994>

Dale, J. (2003). Freire, Aristotle, Marx, and Sartre: A critique of the human condition. Retrieved June 19th, 2013 from <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/310/Dale.pdf?sequence=1>

Davies, S. and Guppy, N. (2010). *The schooled society*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

de Beauvoir, S. (1949). *The second sex* in W. Kolmar/ F. Bartkowski (Eds). *Feminist Theory ,third edition* (pp.147-158). New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Delors, J. et al. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing. Retrieved March 3rd, 2012 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001095/109590eo.pdf>

El-Khawas, E., DePietro-Jurand, R., Holm-Nielsen, L. (1998). *Quality Assurance in higher education: Recent progress; Challenges ahead*. World Bank. Retrieved July 17th, 2013 from http://www.squ.edu.om/Portals/28/Quality%20Assurance/Quality_assurance_in_higher_education_EN98.pdf

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review* 59 (3), 297-324. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/docview/212326648/fulltextPDF/B5488AF ADE00492APQ/3?accountid=15115>

Elshtain, J.B. (1993). *Democracy on trial*. Canada: House of Anansi Press Inc.

European University Association (2004). *What is the Bologna process*. Retrieved February 19th, 2013 from <http://www.eua.be/eua-work-and-policy-area/building-the-european-higher-education-area/bologna-basics.aspx>

Freire, P. (1970/2011). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York; London: Continuum publishing company.

Friedan, B. (1963/2011). *The feminine mystique*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company Ltd.

Gale, T. (2011) Expansion and equity in Australian higher education: three positions for new relations. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 32(5), 669-685. doi: 10: 1080/01596306.2011.620751

Gandin, L.A. and Apple, M.W. (2002). Thin versus thick democracy in education: Porto Alegre and the creation of alternatives to neo-liberalism. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 12(2), 99-115. Retrieved from

http://journals1.scholarsportal.info.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/pdf/09620214/v12i0002/99_tvtdietcoatn.xml

Gandin, L.A. and Apple, M.W. (2012). Can critical democracy last? Porto Alegre and the struggle over 'thick' democracy in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(5), 621-639. doi: 10:1080/02680939.2012.710017

Gerhardt, H.P. (1993/2000). Paulo Freire (1921-97). *Prospects: The Quarterly Review of Comparative Education* (Paris, UNESCO: International Bureau of Education)/UNESCO: International Bureau of Education. Retrieved June 18th, 2013 from http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/archive/publications/ThinkersPdf/freire_e.PDF

Giroux, H. and S. Giroux (2004). *Take Back Higher Education*. United States of America: Palgrave MacMillan.

Giroux, H. (2010). "Rethinking education as the practice of freedom: Paulo Freire and the promise of critical pedagogy". Retrieved on October 2nd, 2013 from <http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/87456:rethinking-education-as-the-practice-of-freedom-paulo-freire-and-the-promise-of-critical-pedagogy>

Giroux, H. (2012). *Public speaker series*. Western University of Canada, London, Ontario, Canada.

Giroux, H. (2013a, January 22). The new extremism of politics and distraction in the age of austerity. Retrieved on February 1, 2013 from <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/13998-the-new-extremism-and-politics-of-distraction-in-the-age-of-austerity>

Giroux, H. (2013b, March 26). Neoliberalism and the politics of higher education: An interview with Henry A. Giroux. Retrieved on April 5, 2013 from <http://truth-out.org/news/item/15237-predatory-capitalism-and-the-attack-on-higher-education-an-interview-with-henry-a-giroux>

Giroux, H. (2013c). The fruit of Freire's roots. In *Paulo Freire's Intellectual Roots*, ed.'s, R. Lake & T. Kress (pp.x-xxi). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Habermas, J. (1996). Three normative models of democracy. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting boundaries of the political*, ed. S. Benhabib, 21-30. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hall, S. (2009). Race the floating signifier. Retrieved June 19th, 2013 from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bMo2uiRAf30>

Harvey, D. (2009). *Cosmopolitanism and the geographies of freedom*. United States of America: Columbia University Press.

Hall, S., Massey, D., Rustin, M. (2011). "After neoliberalism: analysing the present". Retrieved on February 12, 2014, from <http://www.lwbooks.co.uk/journals/soundings/pdfs/s53hallmasseyrustin.pdf>

Hall, S. and O'Shea, A. (2011). Common-sense neoliberalism. *Soundings: A Journal of Politics and Culture*. Retrieved on February 12, 2014, from <http://www.lwbooks.co.uk/journals/soundings/manifesto.html>

Harvey, D. (2005/2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Hesse-Biber, S.N. and Leavy, P. (2006). *The practice of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Hoffman, S.G. (2011). The new tools of the science trade: contested knowledge production and the conceptual vocabularies of academic capitalism. *Social Anthropology* 19 (4), 439-462. doi: 10.1111/j1469-8676.2011.00180.x

Holston, J. and Arju Appadurai (1996). "Cities and Citizenship" *Public Culture* (8),187-204.

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

Horne, H. H. (1903). *The philosophy of education*. London: The MacMillan Company.

Hursh, D. & Henderson, J. (2011). Contesting global neoliberalism and creating alternative futures. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural Politics of Education*. 32(2), 171-185.

International Institute for Educational Planning, (2007). News Letter, UNESCO. Retrieved October 27th, 2012 from www.unesco.org/ieep

Jünger, E. (1939) in Hutchins, R. M. (1953). *The University of Utopia*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Kemp, P. (2011). *Citizen of the world: The cosmopolitan ideal for the Twenty-First Century*. United States: Humanity Books.

Kincheloe, J. (2004). *Critical pedagogy primer*. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang Publishing.

Klees, S.J. (2008). A quarter century of neoliberal thinking in education: misleading analyses and failed policies. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*, 6 (4), 311-348. doi: 10.1080/14767720802506672

Lim, L. (2011). Beyond logic and argument analysis: Critical thinking, everyday problems and democratic deliberation in Cambridge International Examinations' thinking skills curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43 (6), 783-807. doi: 10.1080/00220272.2011.590231

Lindsay, J.M. (2012). "Will MOOC's revolutionize higher education?" *The water's edge*. Retrieved January 16th, 2013 from <http://blogs.cfr.org/lindsay/2012/09/20/will-moocs-revolutionize-higher-education/>

Lockley, P. (2013). Of machine guns and MOOCs: 21st Century engineering disasters. Retrieved May 23rd, 2013 from www.hybridpedagogy.com/Journal/files/Of_Machine_Guns_and_MOOCs.html.

Lyotard, J.F. (1984). *The post-modern condition: A report on Knowledge* (Vol.10). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Macedo, D. (2011) in Freire, P. (1970/2011) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, London: Continuum International Publishing.

Macpherson, C.B. (1964). *The real world of democracy (CBC Massey lecture series)*. House of Anansi Press.

Marginson, S. (2006). Engaging democratic education in the neoliberal age. *Educational Theory*, 56 (2), 205-219. doi: 10:1111/j.1741-5446.2006.00012.x

Martel, L. (2008). Global inequality, human rights and power: A critique of Ulrich Beck's cosmopolitanism. Retrieved March 3rd, 2012 from <http://www.scribd.com/janeyjones/d/44607453-Global-Inequality-Human-Rights-and-Power-a-critique-of-Ulrich-Beck-s-cosmopolitanism>

Mayo, P. (2009). Competitiveness, diversification and the international higher education cash flow: the EU's higher education discourse amidst the challenges of globalisation. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 19:3, pp. 87-103. doi: 10.1080/09620210903257174

- McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in Schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.
- McLaren, P. and Leonard, P. (1993). *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter*. London, USA, Canada: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture, Oppositional politics in a postmodern era*. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. and Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical Pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York: Peter Lang.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*, (Third edition). Sage Publications. Retrieved online May 5, 2013 from http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/29986_Chapter3.pdf
- Myerson, G. (2001). Rethinking black Marxism: Reflections on Cedric Robinson and others. *Cultural Logic*, 3(2) in Smith, Ryoo, and McLaren (2009) “A revolutionary critical pedagogy for the Twenty-First Century”.
- OECD, (2007). *Review of tertiary education country background report: Australia*. Department of education Canberra. Retrieved July 10th, 2013 from <http://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/38759740.pdf>
- Ontario immigration-International students (2014). *Studying in Ontario*. Ontarioimmigration.ca. Retrieved from http://www.ontarioimmigration.ca/en/study/OI_HOW_STUDY_INTL.html
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods, Third edition*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Peters, M. and McLaren, P. (2012, December 8). *Education and Struggle*. Retrieved from Facebook
- Postiglione, G.A. (2013, August 29). China weighs the value of American liberal arts. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved September 4th, 2013 from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise/china-weighs-the-value-of-american-liberal-arts/32943>.
- Ritzer, G. (2008). *Sociological theory, seventh edition*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Rizvi, F. and Lingard, B. (2000). Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *Educational theory* 50 (4), 419-427. Retrieved from rch.proquest.com.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/docview/214136886/fulltextPDF/47EAA644F5CA4967PQ/3?accountid=15115

Rizvi, F. and Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Roberts, P. (2003). Pedagogy, neoliberalism and postmodernity: Reflections on Freire's later work. *Educational philosophy and theory*, 35(4), 452-465. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=f76dff22-0ba5-445a-9000-53f32a0a2dc5%40sessionmgr114&hid=127>

Roman, L. G. (2007). This earthly world: Edward Said, the praxis of secular humanisms and situated cosmopolitanisms. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 27(3), 357-368. doi: 10.1080/01596300600838827

Rorabaugh, P. (2012). Hybridity, pt. 1: Virtuality & empiricism. *Hybrid Pedagogy, a journal of learning, teaching, & technology*. Retrieved May 23rd, from http://www.hybridpedagogy.com/Journal/files/Hybridity_1.html

Sartre, J.P. (1995). *Essays in existentialism*. New York: Citadel Press Book.

Schugurensky, D. (2006). The political economy of higher education in the time of global markets: Whither the social responsibility of the university? In *The University, State, and Market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*, eds. R. Rhoads & C. Torres. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, Pp. 301-320.

Silva, L.H. (Ed.) (1999). *Escola Cidadã: Teoria e Prática*. Petropolis: Vozes.

Singleton, R. and Straits, B. (2010). *Approaches to social research, third edition*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simburger, E. (2013). Moving through the city: Visual discourses of upward social mobility in higher education advertisements on public transport in Santiago de Chile. *Visual Studies* 28(1), 67-77. doi: 10.1080/147258X.2013. 765219

Smith, M., Ryoo, J. and McLaren, P. (2009). A revolutionary critical pedagogy manifesto for the twenty-first century. *Education and Society*, 27, 59-76.

Soudien, C. (2011). Interrogating the nature of the 'universal' in South Africa's new educational order *Globalisation, Society and Education* 9 (3-4), 323-336. doi: 10/1080/14767724

Spring, J. (2009). *Globalization of education*. New York: Routledge.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Ltd.

Stewart, W. (2013, July 19). Pisa rankings are 'utterly wrong'. Tse.co.uk. Retrieved from <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6343921>

Stromquist, N.P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: the connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. United States: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers LTD.

Stromquist, N.P. and Sanyal, A. (2013). Student resistance to neoliberalism in Chile. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 23:13 Pp. 152-178. doi: 10.1080/09620214.2013.790662

Trementi, A.M. (September 12, 2013). *Nigerian students Victoria Ordu & Ilhouma Amadi face deportation to Nigeria*. CBC.ca. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/thecurrent/episode/2013/09/12/nigerian-students-victoria-ordu-ilhouma-amadi-face-deportation-to-nigeria/>

UNESCO, (2009). *World Conference on Higher Education 2009: Final Report*. Retrieved October 4th, 2013 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001892/189242e.pdf>

UNESCO, (2010). *Regional Overview: Sub-Saharan Africa, Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2010*, UNESCO Library Home Database. Retrieved October 4th, 2013 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001865/186526e.pdf>

Welch, A. (2012). "Opportunistic entrepreneurialism and internationalisation of higher education: lessons from antipodes?" *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 10:3, 295-315, DOI: 1080/ 14767724.2012.710119

West, C. (1993) in McLaren, P. and Leonard, P. (1993). *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter*. London, USA, Canada: Routledge.

Wright, E.O. (2010). *Envisioning real utopias*. New York, NY: Verso. Zizek! 2005. Documentary. Zeitgeist Films.

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods, Third edition*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Appendix A

The neoliberal imaginary: Investigating the role of critical pedagogy in higher education

LETTER OF INFORMATION

Project Title:

Beyond the neoliberal imaginary: Investigating the role of critical pedagogy in higher education

Principal Investigator:

Dr. Goli Rezai-Rashti, Faculty Education, Western University of Canada

Letter of Information

1. Invitation to Participate

You are being invited to participate in this research study about higher education and the significance of critical pedagogy in your teaching. You are being asked to participate as you are a practicing faculty member in an institution of higher education, and for your critical perspective, teaching experience and research in higher education.

2. Purpose of the Letter

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with information required for you to make an informed decision regarding participation in this research.

3. Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the possibilities for enacting critical pedagogies within a neoliberal climate of educational restructuring in higher education. I will investigate this while seeking the experience of three faculty members in higher education, who are sympathetic to the principles of critical pedagogy and practice dialogical teaching and learning in higher education. The research will focus on how they reconcile neoliberal efficiencies with the importance of critical pedagogy and critical thinking.

4. Inclusion Criteria

Faculty members who use critical pedagogy as their teaching philosophy will be those eligible to participate in this study and will be required to be a faculty member of Education, Social Science, or Humanities; and, to identify as a critical pedagogue. I will

approach each participant for their critical perspective, teaching experience and research in higher education.

5. Exclusion Criteria

Individuals who are not eligible to participate in this study will be those who are not a faculty member in higher education, do not possess a critical perspective in their teaching and research in higher education, and are not from the faculty of Education, Social Sciences, or Humanities.

6. Study Procedures

If you agree to be a part of this study, you will be asked to participate in an hour long semi-structured, digitally recorded interview. The task(s) will be conducted in a mutually agreed upon location.

7. Possible Risks and Harms

There are no known or anticipated risks or discomforts associated with participating in this study.

8. Possible Benefits

You may not directly benefit from participating in this study, but information gathered might provide benefits to society, as the intention of this research is to explore critical pedagogies that challenge the present reform and restructuring of higher education.

9. Compensation

You will not be compensated for your participation in this research.

10. Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time with no effect on your future academic status.

11. Confidentiality

All data collected will remain confidential and accessible only to the investigators of this study. If the results are published, your name will not be used. *If you choose to withdraw from this study, your data will be removed and destroyed from our database. *While we will do our best to protect your information there is no guarantee that we will be able to do so. There will be no inclusion of your initials or your date of birth, which may have allowed some to link the data and identify you. * Representatives of The University of Western Ontario Health Sciences Research Ethics Board may contact you or require access to your study-related records to monitor the conduct of the research.

12. Contacts for Further Information

If you require any further information regarding this research project or your participation in the study you may contact Dr. Goli Rezai-Rashti, Principle Investigator. Dr. Rezai-Rashti can be contacted via email at _____, or alternatively

Goli Rezai-Rashti, Ph.D
Professor
Faculty of Education
XXX
XXX
XXX

You may also contact Melanie Lawrence-Mazier, student researcher, at _____

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or the conduct of this study, you may contact The Office of Research Ethics xxx-xxx-xxxx, email: _____

13. Publication

If the results of the study are published, your name will not be used. If you would like to receive a copy of any potential study results, please contact Melanie Lawrence-Mazier, at _____.

14. Consent

Written Consent

Include a Consent Form with this letter that the participant will sign.

Appendix B

Beyond the neoliberal imaginary: Investigating the role of critical pedagogy in higher education

Melanie Lawrence- Mazier

Consent Form

Project Title: Beyond the neoliberal imaginary: Investigating the role of critical pedagogy in higher education.

Study Investigator's Name: Dr. Goli Rezai-Rashti

I have read the Letter of Information, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participants Name (please print): _____

Participants' Signature: _____

Date: _____

Person obtaining Informed Consent (please print): Melanie Lawrence-Mazier

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix C

Interview Protocol

Research Questions:

1. Tell me about yourself: years of teaching, discipline, and Undergraduate/Graduate teaching experience.
2. What is your teaching philosophy?
3. How did you become interested in your discipline?
4. How did you become interested in your pedagogic philosophy?
5. What do you think of neoliberalism?
6. Do you think that neoliberalism has had an impact on Universities? Please explain and provide some examples.
7. Have neoliberal policies impacted your teaching? If so how? Such as?
8. There has been an increasing focus on global education. What role does neoliberalism hold within this based on your experience as Professor?
9. Why would critical pedagogy be of importance in higher education? Please explain.
10. Why is a critical pedagogic philosophy of importance in higher education? Please explain.
11. Do you have any comments or questions? Is there anything that you would like to tell me in addition to the questions asked?

Appendix D

EHTICS APPROVAL



Research Ethics

Use of Human Participants - Initial Ethics Approval Notice

Principal Investigator: Prof. Goli Rezaei-Rashid
File Number: 104658
Review Level: Delegated
Protocol Title: Beyond the neoliberal Imaginary: Investigating the role of critical pedagogy in higher education
Department & Institution: Education/Faculty of Education, Western University
Sponsor:
Ethics Approval Date: December 13, 2013 **Expiry Date:** February 03, 2014

Documents Reviewed & Approved & Documents Received for Information:

Document Name	Comments	Version Date
Instruments		2013/11/08
Western University Protocol		
Revised Letter of Information & Consent		2013/12/02
Recruitment Items		2013/12/02
Letter of Information & Consent		2013/12/01

This is to notify you that The University of Western Ontario Research Ethics Board for Non-Medical Research Involving Human Subjects (NMREB) which is organized and operates according to the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans and the applicable laws and regulations of Ontario has granted approval to the above named research study on the approval date noted above.

This approval shall remain valid until the expiry date noted above assuming timely and acceptable responses to the NMREB's periodic requests for surveillance and monitoring information.

Members of the NMREB who are named as investigators in research studies, or declare a conflict of interest, do not participate in discussions related to, nor vote on, such studies when they are presented to the NMREB.

The Chair of the NMREB is Dr. Riley Hinson. The NMREB is registered with the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services under the IRB registration number IRB 00000941.

Western University, Research, Support Services Bldg., Rm. 5150
London, ON, Canada N6A 3K7 t. 519.661.3036 f. 519.850.2466 www.uwo.ca/research/services/ethics

Curriculum Vitae

Name: Melanie Lawrence-Mazier

Post-secondary Education and Degrees: The University of Western Ontario
Honour Specialization, Sociology
2008-2012

Western University of Canada
Master of Education
2012-2014

Related Experience: Western Education Research
Symposium: 5th Annual Robert
MacMillan Graduate Research in
Education Research Symposium
April 10th, 2014

Publications: Lawrence-Mazier, M. (2013).
A critical consciousness.
<https://uwo.academia.edu>
MelLawrence