

Tertiary Education for Social Justice in an Age of Uncertainty

Linda Keesing-Styles, TTC, PGDipEd, MEd

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Deakin University

December, 2009

DEAKIN UNIVERSITY



CANDIDATE DECLARATION

I certify that the thesis entitled:

**TERTIARY EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE IN AN AGE OF
UNCERTAINTY**

submitted for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**

is the result of my own work and that where reference is made to the work of others, due acknowledgement is given.

I also certify that any material in the thesis which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by any university or institution is identified in the text.

Full Name (print) **LINDA MARIE KEEsing-STYLES**

Signed:

Date:

Acknowledgments

I will forever be indebted to two fabulous people whose direct support provided the wherewithal to complete this thesis. Without them, I know I would never have done it.

First, I want to thank warmly and sincerely my dear friend and colleague Ray Meldrum whose continuous support, encouragement, affirmation and advice is immediately responsible for this achievement. Ray, your endless faith in me and unwavering commitment to seeing me through what you knew I could do (even when I didn't) is the direct catalyst for me sticking with this and achieving something I am proud of. Your generosity is doubly appreciated as you were also doing your own PhD in parallel with mine. Everyone deserves a Ray but I'm fortunate to have had one. Kia ora Ray.

And to Robyn Reid – you always believed in me. Mentor, friend, encourager, conscience, comforter, supporter, champion, prop – whatever role you needed to take, you took it. When I packed it all up and put it away, you didn't nag or chide, you just chose your moment, gently encouraged and proposed creative options. Thank you always.

I also acknowledge the role of beautiful places in New Zealand and Bali for the inspiration, tranquillity and space to achieve completion.

Table of Contents

Abstract	6
Prologue: The Telling of Tales	8
The Tale Unfolds	8
Genesis – Epistemology and Ontology	9
Act 1: Tales of Trouble	15
1.1 Naming the Trouble	15
1.2 The Postmodern World	17
1.3 Contemporary Tertiary Contexts	20
Tertiary Education in Postmodernity	21
The University in Ruins?	22
The Australasian Experience	24
Knowledge in Tertiary Education	26
1.4 Performativity and Tertiary Education	28
The Consequences for Teachers and Teaching	29
1.5 Producing Identities	33
Identities in Postmodernity	34
A Pedagogy for Uncertainty: A Pedagogy of ‘Being’	38
1.6 Educating for Social Justice	41
Contemporary Theorising	42
1.7 Social Justice Theorising and Tertiary Education	52
1.8 Conclusion	57
Act 2: Tales of Circumstance	59
2.1 Introduction	59
Immersion in the Text	59
2.2 Methodology	61
The Hermeneutic Circle	61
Everyday Life	63
2.3 Narrative Process	65
Dialogue, Dissonance and Divergence	65
Truth and Interpretation	66
Uncertainty and Ambiguity	67
2.4 Research Design	68
Participant Selection	68
Interviewing	71
Process	73
2.5 Narrative Analysis	79
The Process of Narrative Analysis	79
Making Narratives	81
Approaching Analysis	83

2.6 Troubling Matters	87
Ethical Issues	87
Accuracy of Representation	88
Conclusion	89
2.7 Introducing the Participants	90
Betty's Story	90
Carl's Story	93
Evangeline's Story	94
Harry's Story	96
Jane's Story	97
Phillip's Story	99
Rose's Story	101
Turtle's Story	103
Conclusion	105
Act 3: Tales of Tertiary	106
3.1 Introduction	106
The Voices of the Participants	106
3.2 The Grand Narrative of Uncertainty	107
Stories from the Everyday World	108
3.3 Contexts of Tertiary Education	114
The Nature of Tertiary Education in New Zealand	114
Stories from the Everyday World	117
And Performativity ... ?	121
3.4 A Future for Tertiary Education	125
3.5 Production of Identities	128
Producing Academic Identities	130
Stories from the Everyday World	131
Student Identities	132
Tertiary Academic Identities	137
Conclusion	141
3.6 Social Justice and Tertiary Education	143
The Policy Context	143
Immersion in the Context	144
The Identity of the Social Justice Teacher	146
Future Possibilities	148
Stories from the Everyday World	150
Social Justice Identities	155
Capacity to Teach	158
3.7 Conclusion	163
Act 4: Tales of Teaching	166
4.1 Introduction	166
4.2 'Good' Teaching	168
Emotions in the Classroom	172
Stories from the Everyday World	173
Conclusion	180
4.3 Teaching in and with Uncertainty	182

Stories from the Everyday World	182
4.4 Education for Being	187
Engaging the Curriculum – Knowing, Acting and Being	187
Education for Being – Producing Identities	188
Complementary Approaches	191
Stories from the Everyday World – Reactions to Barnett	194
Stories from the Everyday World – Being in Practice	200
Conclusion	205
4.5 Developing Dispositions	208
Stories from the Everyday World	211
4.6 Education for Social Justice Revisited	217
But what are the Rules?	219
It is Principally about Principles	221
Comment	224
Education as Process	224
Actions and Possibilities	228
The Emotional Terrain of Teaching	233
Stories from the Everyday World	234
Commentary	247
4.7 Conclusion	250
Act 5: Tales of Possibility	254
5.1 Introduction	254
5.2 Pedagogies of Engagement	255
Other Voices on Engagement	258
Stories from the Everyday World	259
5.3 Connections with Theories of Social Justice	267
Justice and the Politics of Difference – Young Revisited	268
Stories from the Everyday World	268
Justice Interruptus – Fraser Revisited	272
Stories from the Everyday World	273
5.4 Capabilities Revisited and Revisioned	279
Pedagogical and Ethical Possibilities	282
Stories from the Everyday World	284
Conclusion	288
Epilogue: A Tale of Hope	290
Synthesis – Professional, Pedagogical, Ethical	290
Not only Pedagogical but also Professional	292
No Panacea but Hope	295
Appendices	298
References	304

Abstract

This thesis is located in the context of contemporary tertiary education and investigates two key influences on teachers and teaching. The first arises from the uncertainty and ambiguity that is attributed to postmodernism while the second is concerned with performativity demands that focus on accountability, surveillance and judgment. Each of these creates challenging conditions for teachers.

Within this milieu, the thesis is concerned with teachers who teach with a social justice orientation within a range of disciplines. It asks a question about the professional, pedagogical and ethical issues around the production of graduate identities confronting teachers committed to social justice in contemporary tertiary institutions. Two aspects of identity are of central importance – the socially just graduate and the resilient graduate who is able to thrive in conditions of uncertainty. The identities of the teacher are also implicated because the influences of uncertainty and performativity impact on their lives and work.

Data were collected using a narrative method through in-depth interviews with eight New Zealand tertiary teachers from the disciplines of accounting, architecture, education, law and marketing. Further data were obtained through a second phase of data collection utilising an asynchronous online discussion amongst participants. They were asked to comment on issues of uncertainty, their understanding of ‘good teaching’, their approaches to social justice content and processes in their teaching, the development of desirable dispositions, and the notion of education for *being* – that is, an ontological approach to education.

The research found that the contemporary conditions of tertiary education create challenging circumstances for all teachers. Identities of both teachers and students are subject to multiple disturbances, particularly with a potential

shift of focus from epistemology to ontology in relation to learning, as outlined by Ronald Barnett. This calls for the development of graduate dispositions including resilience, criticality, courage and openness.

But for the social justice teacher, there are particular issues to confront and resolve and they relate to both the content and process of their teaching in conditions of uncertainty and performativity. The teachers in this study are interested in incorporating social justice content into their teaching in balance with their disciplinary content. Some of them also attend to processes that enhance equity and opportunities for all students. They seek to find ways to deal with the relational issues of the classroom so that students engage with their learning, with both disciplinary and social justice content and with each other.

The thesis also identified that some theories of social justice are more helpful in providing pedagogical guidance for teachers in complex contemporary circumstances. It is suggested that a ‘capabilities’ approach, as proposed by Amartya Sen and developed by Melanie Walker, can provide the basis for attending to professional, pedagogical and ethical issues for tertiary teachers. The thesis concludes that these teachers remain hopeful about the possibilities for enhancing social justice in tertiary education and society.

P R O L O G U E

The Telling of Tales

The Tale Unfolds

This is a tale of tales. Like any good prologue, it describes the coming into being of the bigger story and introduces its focus. All tales have a beginning – a moment that signals their creation and a reason for their being, and so it is with this tale.

Only as the thesis proceeded, did some of the nuances and issues of importance become clear in the process of its becoming. That is no doubt the nature of a thesis. ‘The initial subject matter might not have anything finally to do with what we really need to say. Just keep your hand moving and let whatever is about to happen unfold’ (Goldberg, 1990, p. 84). I learnt in the PhD process to let things unfold and, importantly, to let things go. Sometimes, I or other influences got in the way but, ultimately, the complexity of detail that contributed to the thesis converged to strengthen the work’s ends – ends that were very definitely not clear at the outset. These issues are methodologically important in this thesis.

This is, therefore, a collection of tales, told through multiple voices that reflect important issues troubling tertiary education.

Genesis – Epistemology and Ontology

In 2004, Ronald Barnett published an article entitled *Learning for an Unknown Future*. Barnett's commentary begins with a question – 'what is it to learn for an unknown future?' (Barnett, 2004a, p. 247). He contends that this is a question that has received insufficient attention and, harking back to his opening question, Barnett presents what he calls 'a logical conundrum'. 'If the future is unknown, what would it mean to learn for it? [...] The unknown cannot be anticipated so how can a learning take place that is adequate to the unknown, to the unanticipated?' (p. 247). For tertiary education, these are the types of provocation that keep issues of pedagogy to the fore.

Barnett locates his thesis in the context of two influencing factors. First, 'There is the educational task of preparing students for a complex world' (p. 250), a world where coming to an understanding is enormously difficult because of the incompleteness or insufficiency of evidence and the unpredictability of outcomes. Nevertheless, education is charged with assisting students to come to 'a position where one can prosper in a situation of multiple interpretations' (p. 251) – this is the second factor. Barnett suggests that the two factors require quite different responses and that presents challenges for tertiary education. Assisting students to prosper requires a different kind of pedagogy, Barnett contends, one 'in which it is recognized that knowing the world is a matter of producing epistemological gaps' (p. 251). Amid conditions of what he calls 'supercomplexity', education becomes an ontological rather than merely epistemological task and learning takes on a new character. 'It is a form of learning that sets out not to dissolve anxiety – for it recognizes that that is not feasible – but that sets out to provide the human wherewithal to live with anxiety' (p. 252).

Implicit in Barnett's proposal are concerns related to the identities of students, with an acknowledgement that, in an uncertain world, there are no stable descriptions of the self, potentially leading to a destabilisation of identities.

Under such conditions, a double educational task arises: first, bringing students to a sense that all descriptions of the world are contestable and, then, second, to a position of being able to prosper in such a world in which our categories even for understanding the situations in which we are placed, including understanding ourselves, are themselves contested (pp. 252-253).

The notion of *being*, a central concept of this thesis, is implicit and goes to issues of identity. Therefore, identity is conceived of as contested and unstable, reflecting a poststructuralist understanding that acknowledges multiple identities and subjectivity.

Although these ideas themselves were intriguing, embedded in Barnett's article was a sentence that provoked consideration of another area of personal interest. Barnett says:

The pedagogical task is none other than eliciting a mode of being that can not just withstand incessant challenge to one's understandings of the world, such that any stance one takes up is liable to be challenged, it is the even more demanding task of encouraging forward a form of human being that is not paralysed into inaction but can act purposively and judiciously (p. 259).

Barnett does not locate his proposition in the context of socially just action but this reference to purposive and judicial action triggered thoughts about the relationship between these ideas about uncertainty, epistemology and ontology and the pedagogies that are integral to the promotion of social justice.

My current position involves working with teacher and program development in a dual sector institution so I am embedded in the context of tertiary education. In this role, I have some responsibility for the development of both curriculum and pedagogy and am alerted to the work that is still required in attending to issues of social justice in teaching. I work with social justice intent and notice that there remains a yawning gap between policy rhetoric and practice reality in issues such as biculturalism – something this country and most of its tertiary institutions espouse a commitment to. Other aspects such as gender, ability, sexual orientation, religion all receive at least token acknowledgement in institutional policy but I see little in curriculum

documents that suggests this is an integral part of the curriculum or pedagogy in most programs. As I teacher, I utilised critical pedagogy in my own teaching and still have a strong commitment to it. I am also alerted to issues of subjectivity, power and identity development.

If there is the possibility of a new approach to tertiary pedagogy that assists students to thrive in conditions of uncertainty, my belief is that this pedagogy, whatever it turns out to be, could and should concurrently attend to issues of social justice which are threatened with invisibility. If the *being* of students is to be considered, these ideas could be implicit and explicit.

Therefore, my own experience of tertiary education, Barnett's story and the stories of critical pedagogy coalesced and gave rise to the research question:

What are the professional, pedagogical and ethical issues around the production of graduate identities confronting teachers committed to social justice in contemporary tertiary institutions?

The idea of graduate identities was slow to crystallise out of Barnett's notion of *being*. This is a significant issue for the field given the focus on defining graduate attributes in terms of specified competencies in Australasia and elsewhere (see Barrie, 2004). Seeking an answer to this question involved my own investigations and subsequent engagements with eight quite different tertiary teachers working in the fields of accounting, architecture, education, law and marketing. Each of these teachers has an espoused commitment to a social justice orientation in their teaching and was chosen for this project for that reason. Their stories provide generous, rich and provocative narratives.

This study is located within the field of education as a discipline in its own right and in the sub-field of higher education. However, disciplines are both influenced by other fields of study and, concurrently, reflect their own emerging modes of inquiry (Piantanida & Garman, 1999). Therefore, this study reflects the historical traditions of sociology and philosophy and the more recent attention to the influence of the arts (Barone, 1995; Eisner, 1993).

This is most evident in the research genre and the choice of narrative as the mode of inquiry.

The study draws from a number of sociological and theoretical perspectives, generally reflecting a postmodern view of the world. However, it does not locate itself entirely in any one paradigm, rather calling on and debating a variety of discourses that bring challenges and complexities but also offer a range of provocations and possibilities for consideration. So, for example, there are significant differences between the tenets of postmodernism and those relating to radical discourses such as critical and feminist pedagogy which are particularly evident in relation to social justice pedagogies. Yet, consideration of their relative approaches suggests that while they differ in practice, there is some commonality in intent. My position, therefore, is to consider what a range of perspectives might have to offer the debate at hand, noting that, at times, there will be tensions. As the thesis progresses, I will attempt to identify and name these.

The thesis follows a non-traditional format, using the device of Acts to frame the discussion, each of which tells tales about a particular aspect of the investigation. This format arises from a hermeneutic moment where the notion of ‘trouble’ inherent in the research question merged into the image of Macbeth’s three witches chanting ‘double, double, toil and trouble’. The thesis structure thus replicates a standard Shakespearean tragedy format of five Acts, offering a useful design to represent the narratives and reflect the methodology.

Act 1 – *Tales of Trouble* - is concerned with outlining the nature of the problem, providing an overview of the Acts that follow. It begins with the premise of uncertainty underpinning Barnett’s (2004a) proposal and locates this within the context of postmodernism (Bauman, 2000). The key concepts of ambiguity, disruption and complexity provide a rationale for what Barnett calls conditions of supercomplexity, both in terms of society and, specifically, in terms of learning and tertiary education. The rest of the Act introduces each of the key themes – tertiary education, performativity and identity production. In investigating the relevance of Barnett’s proposal, it was critical to consider

political and professional factors impacting on tertiary teaching. The Act concludes with an overview of social justice, beginning first with theories espoused by key theorists (Young, 1990; Fraser, 1997; Sen, 1992; Nussbaum, 1997) and then considering briefly how they relate to tertiary education.

Tales of Circumstance are considered in Act 2. This Act parallels what might typically be found in methodology and research design chapters but goes beyond this to bring together ideas from the thesis topic itself and aspects of research form and function. The circumstances of this particular thesis become clear. The role of the hermeneutic circle as a process for reflection and integration is described and the choice of a narrative methodology to pursue a qualitative investigation is fully considered. It becomes clear that the thesis relies on in-depth interviews but that this is supported by a second phase of on-line discussion with the participants. Narrative analysis is discussed before the Act concludes with an introduction to each of the participants. Their stories are central so their professional circumstances are worthy of introduction, ensuring their narratives do not stand in isolation.

Acts 3 and 4 allow a full discussion of the issues and themes arising out of the literature and analysis of the participant narratives. Here their voices become central. In Act 3, the focus is on *Tales of Tertiary* tertiary education, particularly in the New Zealand context, is examined in detail with regard to the themes overviewed in Act 1. So uncertainty (Barnett, 2004a; Bauman, 2000), performativity (Lyotard, 1984; Blackmore, 2003) and identity production (Barnett, 2004a; Weedon, 1987; Davies & Harré, 1990) are revisited, this time extrapolating from the literature into the experiences, beliefs and practices of the participants. It emerges that the milieu of tertiary education is no less troubling in New Zealand than in other parts of the western world, with much uncertainty of purpose and practice existing and influencing what happens in the participants' teaching. The 'unfixity' of student and teacher identity comes under scrutiny. Again the theme of social justice rounds off the Act with a discussion of what it means to the participants to be teachers for social justice, particularly in contemporary conditions. In essence, Act 3 attends to professional issues for tertiary teachers in times of uncertainty.

The actualities of teaching come to the fore in Act 4 – *Tales of Teaching*. Here, the focus is the everyday work of teachers and this Act is the core of the thesis in terms of teaching practice. It begins with a discussion on the nature of ‘good teaching’, including consideration of the role of emotions (Boler, 1999). Both the literature and the participants reinforce the importance of relationships in learning. This then provides the basis for a subsequent examination of Barnett’s key premise – education for *being*. The participants grapple with these ideas and locate them in relation to other aspects of their pedagogy within the conditions of tertiary education. Dispositions that will enhance the identity and resilience of students are considered. Each of these issues then contributes to the final section where pedagogies that enhance social justice are investigated both through the literature and through the participant narratives with a view to identifying if there are indeed synergies between education for *being* and education for social justice. Both ethical and pedagogical issues are central in this Act.

Act 5 offers *Tales of Possibility*. It first considers a key integrating idea – engagement as a central component and predictor of learning. The nature of that engagement is problematised, clarified and expanded. The culmination of the argument occurs when the theories of social justice, introduced early in the thesis, are revisited (Walker, 2006). But in this revisit, they are considered in relation to each of the other issues that have been explored in the thesis with a clear possibility for future pedagogy arising.

A brief epilogue concludes the thesis offering *A Tale of Hope*.

Through this prologue the reader is consequently invited into the narrative that ensues, and enters into an encounter now with the writer and the writer’s acquaintances that comprise both the characters and plot of this tale. In doing so, the boundaries between all become unstable. There is no dispassionate participant, no neutral theory, no impartial observer, no detached researcher, no disinterested or neutral reader. We are all storytellers and players in each other’s stories (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990).

A C T 1

Tales of Trouble***1.1 Naming the Trouble***

In the prologue, I identified the overarching thesis theme of uncertainty and the contexts of tertiary education as the study setting. In tertiary education in uncertain times, many influences and possibilities are at play and two concerns arise that are of specific interest. One of these is the ways in which performativity has influenced tertiary education creating complex professional challenges for teachers. Another relates to the pedagogies implicated in the production of graduate identities, including the identity of graduates with socially just dispositions. There are complex relationships between and among these two concerns, the theme of uncertainty and the context.

In Act 1, I examine in turn each variable named here and begin to investigate their inter-relationships. The primary focus is on defining the ‘trouble’ that exists at the centre of this thesis – trouble that is reflected in the research question. This asks ‘what are the professional, pedagogical and ethical issues around the production of graduate identities confronting teachers committed to social justice in contemporary tertiary institutions?’ Each of the following Acts develops these ideas more fully.

Educating with a social justice orientation in a time of uncertainty is difficult to define and subject to multiple interpretations. Later in this Act I note that the term ‘social justice’ reflects multiple meanings and ideologies in its contemporary discourses. My understanding of the term as it relates to this thesis expects opportunities for all people to participate equitably with respect and dignity in society and, in particular, education, although I acknowledge the limitations of such a definition. To be a teacher for social justice has always been a challenging role. To be a tertiary teacher in a complex, contemporary world potentially offers more challenges than ever before. Trouble abounds

and truth is elusive. The best on offer may be a partial truth or localised certainties.

1.2 The Postmodern World

The unknown future and its corresponding concept of complexity is a recurrent theme in a broad range of literatures. Many would claim the complex times we live in are a condition of the postmodern world, or potentially, the reverse – the postmodern understanding is a reaction to the existence of complex times. ‘Post-modernism is a broad umbrella term for commentators in the social world who have a variety of both positive and negative versions of what that world is all about. These versions may be very different and apparently contradictory but they all share a concern with some common themes’ (Miles, 2001, p. 83). However it is viewed, the postmodern world is characterised by themes of uncertainty, disruption, complexity, subjectivity and ambiguity (see Lyotard, 1984; Beck, 1992; Giddens, 1994; Barnett, 2004b). In earlier times, life was perceived as more stable and the future more knowable. Concepts of truth and certainty predominated, or at least were purported to. Notwithstanding this acknowledgement, questions are asked as to whether the challenges of the ‘now’ are sufficient to create a world called ‘post’ modern, or whether this is simply an extension of modernity.

Whatever it is called, postmodernity and postmodernism have created new challenges and new ways of being. However, despite its pervasive influence, the notion of postmodernism is vigorously debated, not only in its terminology but also in its declared impact on the world, experience and existence as they were previously known. Perhaps more than ever before, academic positioning around a concept has had, and continues to exert, a polarising effect on our understanding of a condition of our existence. It is not my intention to engage deeply in this debate but rather to outline briefly the position I have taken in defining the context and pursuing the argument in this thesis. Miles (2001, p. 83) notes that ‘post-modernism and post-modernity remain highly contested terms and this is partly their attraction’. He also suggests that the debates these terms engender are never resolved.

The concept of postmodernity suggests a following on from something. Beck (1992, p. 9) talks about ‘post’ being a very unremarkable prefix, but

nevertheless also holding an elevated position as ‘the key word of our times. Everything is “post”’. He contends that the notion of ‘post’ hints at something ‘beyond’ which is not able to be named and therefore the familiar continues to hold on to some of its intrinsic meanings through the suggestion that something follows it. Thus, he says, there is an ongoing need to ‘understand the meanings that the historical development of modernity has given to this world’ (p. 9). However, he warns that any attempt to understand postmodernity requires some wrestling against traditional theories and customary ways of doing things, without which there is the risk of continuing to engage in modernist practices ‘artificially prolonged by the word “post”’ (Beck, 1992, p. 9).

Giddens (1994, p. 83) identifies the existence and outcomes of what he posits as post-traditional society and suggests that the challenge to traditions implicit in the concept of such multiplicity has created ‘a runaway world of dislocation and uncertainty’, indeed a world of ‘manufactured uncertainty’. He suggests that in this period of what he terms high modernity, there is no certainty of knowledge or meaning so there is a continuous process of seeking new meanings and understandings and an inevitable feeling of doubt in the absence of definitive meaning or authoritative experts.

Bauman (2000), while not denying the complexity of contemporary life, makes a strong claim for the classification of the world as one of liquid modernity. He argues that the world we live in is no less modern than it was in the past with its focus on ‘compulsive and obsessive, continuous, unstoppable, forever incomplete *modernization*’ (2000, p. 28). It is the nature of that modernisation that he challenges and he contrasts the ‘heavy’ modernity of the Fordian era with the lightness and fluidity of the current world with its mobility, shiftiness and incessant change. In fact, Bauman (2005, p. 303) suggests that, in liquid modernity, ‘all social forms melt faster than new ones can be cast’.

All of these writers identify the complexity of the contemporary world.

Even such a very brief introduction to these contested theories provides evidence of the difficulty asserted by Beck in terms of describing definitively

what constitutes contemporary life. Theories of postmodernism will necessarily be complex and contested given that it would be antithetical for them to prescribe one definitive interpretation of the world. What is common amongst these ideas is the sense of disturbance and uncertainty. For the purposes of this project, it is more important to consider the impact of the theories of postmodernity, liquid modernity or high modernity on life, society and especially education, than it is to grapple with the range of terminology that names the current state of play. In summary, Lemert (2007, p. xi) asserts that ‘whether “postmodern” is the best name for what is going on in this world may be reasonably doubted. *That* something powerful, deep, and potentially far-reaching is going on seems to me beyond doubt’.

Just before leaving this overview, there is one further viewpoint that will become significant. Barnett takes the concept of complexity a step further and suggests that the contemporary world is characterised by supercomplexity as an outcome of multiple interpretations, tolerance of diversity, resistance to universals and acceptance of ambiguity. It is important to note the distinction he makes between complexity and supercomplexity. He contends that the former suggests there is a vague possibility of solving problems even though they are manifold and complex. The latter inherently means that no universal solution is remotely possible because of the existence of multiple perspectives, ideologies, and approaches. A multiplication of incompatible differences of interpretation exists (Barnett, 2004a). Supercomplexity will become important once I begin to look at issues of pedagogy and identity.

What, therefore, are the implications for tertiary education in such a milieu?

1.3 *Contemporary Tertiary Contexts*

If indeed this uncertainty and complexity exists, it provides a very demanding environment for tertiary education. Before I introduce the concepts of performativity, identity production and social justice, I define the contexts of tertiary education as discussed in this thesis.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (1998, p. 9) states that ““Tertiary” refers to a stage or level, beyond secondary and including both university and non-university types of institutions and programmes’, noting the preference not to use the term ‘higher’ education because of its connection primarily with universities. I therefore use the term here as I have utilised both university and polytechnic contexts for my investigation.

Internationally, the distinctions between these two types of organisation have been blurring with a government white paper in Britain setting the scene for the convergence of the universities and polytechnics in 1991 (Booth, 1999). A similar trend occurred in Australia and, while there have been attempts to reclassify some polytechnics as new universities in New Zealand, this has been successful in only one case. Despite a report completed in 1989 (Department of Education) and the subsequent enactment in the *Education Amendment Act, 1990*, providing opportunities for polytechnics to enjoy much greater autonomy, further reclassification has not occurred and parity of esteem between the different types of organisation has not been achieved.

Regardless of the relative roles and status of polytechnics and universities, the OECD (1998, p. 15) proposes that ‘It is not too much to say that it is an era of searching, questioning, and at times of profound uncertainty, of numerous reforms and essays in the renewal of tertiary education’ across the OECD member countries and beyond. Nevertheless, it makes some claims for categorising tertiary education, and, with reference to Taylor (1996), suggests there is agreement that tertiary education provides some common benefits

including the development of a more informed and responsive electorate, cultural tolerance and understanding, progress in social justice, an improvement in the overall quality of life and a self-reliant, innovative and competent workforce. Notwithstanding this attempt to universalise the goals of tertiary education, Bourgeois, Duke, Guyot and Merrill (1999, p. 36) propose that ‘higher education institutions have multiple, ambiguous and highly contested goals. The university could hardly be reduced to any single mission’. A key issue to investigate in this thesis is whether current tertiary education institutions do indeed focus on the development of cultural tolerance and understanding and progress issues of social justice.

Despite the increased coalescing between different types of institutions, the literature is more focused on the changing nature and identity of universities so, while my broader sphere of interest is noted, it is nonetheless useful to look to that literature.

Tertiary Education in Postmodernity

Bauman (1997, p. 21) contends that ‘everything the universities have been doing for the last nine hundred years made sense inside either the time of eternity or the time of progress; if modernity disposed of the first, post-modernity put paid to the second’. However, it is important not to over-emphasise this perception of difference as there may be a disparity between image and reality with reference to the changing face of tertiary education. In referring specifically to universities, Smith and Webster (1997, p. 99) contend that ‘they have never been a fixed entity, frozen in form. Quite the contrary: universities have been ever changing, always adapting to new circumstances’ and, moreover, ‘there never was a uniform type of university institution, whatever the popular image might conjure’. Cowen (1996) concurs, noting that the university will and does change but the key is that the change must be publicly critiqued. So caution is required when defining the current contexts of tertiary education and unilaterally accepting the demise of their traditional identity and function.

Nonetheless, conjecture about the nature of education for the 21st century has increased in the new millennium. Bridges (2000) classifies the shifts in boundaries which previously defined universities and students' experiences of them and names these as 'identities' of place, time, the scholarly community and the student community. Tertiary education can now occur at almost any location and in any time frame, thus both student and staff communities are correspondingly altered significantly from traditional concepts.

The University in Ruins?

Analyses of the nature of universities are frequent in the literature, especially since Readings' (1996) volume *The University in Ruins* where he claims that the university is very uncertain in its contemporary role, confused in its function as producer of knowledge, influenced by globalisation and 'becoming a transnational bureaucratic corporation' (p. 3). Readings develops ideas first articulated by Lyotard (1984) regarding the commodification and instability of knowledge and I will return to this soon. Smith and Langslow (1999) edit a contemporary collection of articles on the idea of the modern university. Langslow (1999, p. 175) contends that 'the idea of a university is changing, that universities themselves are changing and that change is not a new phenomenon and has been an aspect of theories and realities of universities all along, and will remain so'. Unlike other writers here, he is less convinced that what is happening is necessarily a new and menacing occurrence.

Peters (2004, p. 70) is concerned that 'the founding discourses of the modern university have been permanently fractured' and that the university cannot be conceived of through 'the force of a single idea'. Barnett has commented repeatedly noting 'we use the term "university" but we no longer have any clear sense as to what it might stand for: we no longer have a concept of "university"' (Barnett, 2000b, p. 115). He later observes that 'In the twenty-first century, it is surely impossible to hold a single idea of the university, at least so far as its surface features are concerned'(Barnett, 2004c, p. 196). Smith and Webster (1997, p. 104) concur, noting the relationship with 'plurality of knowledges [that] announces an end to established and common purposes of

the university, there being no identifiable unity and no possible agreement on goals or even methods of work'. Cowen (1996) comments on the confusion about what universities really are and discusses the existence of major reform pressures which alter the configuration of knowledge, internal structures and external links. Bauman (1997) also questions whether there are any common features remaining in the entities known as universities and links this strongly to the postmodern condition that influences the whole social milieu. He offers optimism though suggesting that:

it is precisely the plurality and multi-vocality of the present-day collection of the gatherings 'for the sake of the pursuit of higher learning' – the variety which so jars with the legislators' love of harmony and which they treat therefore with the disgust and contempt due to public threats and personal offences – that offer the universities, old and new and altogether, the chance of emerging successfully from the present challenge (Bauman, 1997, p. 25).

Delanty (2001, p. 136) shares some of Bauman's viewpoints noting that 'there can be no *idea* of the university since there are too many different kinds of university'. He suggests that they previously existed within totalising narratives which are now dismantled.

The tertiary education sector is, therefore, responding to huge societal influences including: globalisation; digital technologies; relationships with and responses to industry; agendas of access and participation; marketisation and commodification of education; and a rise in competition (Barnett, 2000b). In the context of tertiary education, Jongbloed (2003, p. 13) defines marketisation policies as being 'aimed at strengthening student choice and liberalising markets in order to increase quality and variety of services offered by the providers of higher education'. Commodification follows suit.

Tertiary education in recent years has consequently confronted a wide range of issues including: huge increase in numbers; reductions in government funding; declining infrastructure; diminution in the status of academics; emphasis on vocational education; a culture of audit and assessment; a move toward managerial methods; focus on relationships with outside agencies; and

astonishing growth of new subject areas (Smith & Webster, 1997). Also implicated is the drive to make research more productive and useful for the economy.

McLean (2006) summarises these issues and acknowledges that there is general agreement that tertiary education is facing a crisis, while noting that there is disagreement on its nature and severity. However, she sums up the challenges by suggesting that the ‘literature about the meaning and impact of the transformation of universities emphasizes contradictions, tensions and complexities. Despite grand ideas, the history of universities is one of struggle, ambivalence, resistance, compromise and reconciliation’ (p. 38).

The Australasian Experience

While these are somewhat universal influences, they can be contextualised closer to home. In Australia, Marginson and Considine carried out case studies on 17 universities, determining the impact of such issues. They classify these as ‘enterprise universities’, choosing this term because of its capacity to capture both economic and academic dimensions. They claim that ‘the Enterprise University is associated with an undermining of identity, a narrow capacity for organisational innovation and a weaker capacity for educational innovation. It faces not just a decline in public funding, it faces a crisis of purpose’ (Marginson & Considine, 2000, p. 243). In New Zealand, similar forces have been at play. The OECD (1997, p. 22) observes that in New Zealand there were ‘rather higher levels of dissonance and tension than in some other countries, although the reform measures everywhere are generating anxiety in some sectors and can be expected to stimulate opposition’. This is hardly surprising if, as Peters and Roberts (1999, p. 18) suggest, that the universities have ‘encountered more far-reaching challenges to their status, role and character in the last ten years than ever before’. Roberts (1999, p. 68) comments specifically about polytechnics noting that the marketisation of education has created ‘a kind of educational “open warfare” resulting in pressure to attract and retain increasing numbers of students and generate international reputations.

Almost a decade on, little has changed. Malcolm and Tarling (2007), in a volume aptly titled *Crisis of Identity: The Mission and Management of New Zealand Universities*, discuss the traditional influence of primarily British but also US trends on universities in New Zealand but also comment on the specifics of the New Zealand context. They contend that, because of the influence of these international trends, the challenges to academic identity are occurring more quickly in New Zealand than in other parts of the academic world. New Zealand's accelerated commitment to these international influences has been exacerbated by the direction of successive governments and the state of the New Zealand economy. During the late 1980s and early 1990s New Zealand had serious economic problems and this was a key driver in policy reform (Olssen, Codd & O'Neill, 2004). In fact, as Butterworth and Tarling (1994) observe, although New Zealand was not alone in its reforms, it was experiencing an economic recession and the relatively poor performance of its economy meant that it was desperate for economic growth. Blackmore (2002, p. 423) also notes that New Zealand (and Australia) sit 'on the edge of the new regionalised economies [...] have gone down the structural adjustment path more rapidly and radically', resulting in reduced public expenditure, than those in regional identity groups (e.g. European Union, Asia Pacific Economic Community, North American Free Trade Alliance) who have been more protected.

So, recent decisions about tertiary education should be located in the context of broader government policy reforms which include aggressive privatisation drives and an economic philosophy committed to market liberalism and competitive individualism (Peters & Roberts, 1999). Inevitably, education has been ripe for the picking as an instrument to support economic restructuring. In fact, it has come to be seen as a key agent of the New Zealand government in its economic policy direction and reforms, particularly as New Zealand's national economy becomes increasingly subsumed within the global economy (Dudley, 1998). Many of the writers above have urged that such influences and actions must be addressed before the universities lose sight of their academic mission.

Knowledge in Tertiary Education

Before moving on to examine further the impact of these factors, I want to touch briefly on one more central consideration that will become more explicit later in this Act but needs introduction now. Notwithstanding the conditions explained above, tertiary education has traditionally been characterised by a reliance on advanced forms of knowledge, implicit in the terminology of ‘higher education’. If that knowledge is no longer deemed to be universal and, perhaps even more problematically, if it is perceived as more transitory than ever before, it may cease to hold its central position in education. Scott (1997, p. 36) suggests that ‘paradoxically the more closely the “knowledge” society is approached, the more problematical, contested and elusive knowledge seems to become’. Delanty (2001) notes the influence of postmodern thinking and suggests that everything has been de-legitimised, including knowledge. To take the radical position, it could be said that ‘knowledge as we have known it in the academy, is coming to an end’ (Griffin, 1997, p. 3). But the key idea here is ‘as we have known it’ because perhaps it is the Enlightenment notion of knowledge that has been dismantled. ‘The crisis of the university today exists because that conception of knowledge has finally been undermined by conditions established by the social production of knowledge’ (Delanty, 2001, p. 105).

However it is viewed, all these changes confronting tertiary education mean that potentially a privileged body of knowledge no longer exists, and certainly does not reside solely in the academy. Therefore, in tertiary education, not only do we have the concerns of uncertainty, globalisation, managerialism and accountability, we are facing a time of ‘epistemological insecurity’ (Scott, 1997, p. 42).

If this is indeed the case, then it is equally evident that something different must happen in relation to curriculum, pedagogy and learning. If knowledge is uncertain, changeable, ambiguous, distributed, elusive and transitory, what then is the role of knowledge and learning in the future? Nobody confronts this question more directly than Bauman.

Don't mind the breath-taking speed with which knowledge is changing tack, old knowledge is ageing, and new knowledge is born only to start ageing right away; the volatility of the disjointed, poorly integrated, and multi-centered liquid-modern world makes it certain that each successive episode of a life-through-projects will call for another set of skills and information, invalidating the skills already acquired and the information already memorized (as it will surely be shown to no avail). Loading oneself with information, absorbing and retaining information, struggling for a completeness and cohesion of the information stored – it all looks suspiciously like offering oneself as a dumping site for prospective waste, and thus like an outrageous waste of time (Bauman, 2005, pp. 313-314).

This brings with it further concerns for teachers and teaching that will soon become explicit.

In summary, Blackmore (2002, p. 423) contends that 'This is a moment of historical discontinuity for universities, where the idea and status of the university are under reconstruction'. One way of conceptualising the changes and pressures impacting on the universities is through the lens of performativity (Lyotard, 1984). While it could be argued that this is the universities' (or more accurately, governments') valid response to uncertainty, was this the only option or one that has arisen out of 'the urgent anxieties of several governments to link their university systems more tightly to a changing economic world, domestically and internationally' (Cowen, 1996, p. 247). That is, the government policies and reforms are a given but have the tertiary responses been a knee-jerk reaction?

This section has considered broadly some factors impacting on contemporary tertiary education. In the next section, I introduce the first of the three key issues named earlier – performativity as it relates to tertiary education. This establishes some context for the work of tertiary teachers and cuts to the heart of their professional role and identity.

1.4 *Performativity and Tertiary Education*

The universities have been responding to the contexts of uncertainty by utilising new techniques of governance and audit and this can be classified using Lyotard's (1984) concept of performativity. Peters (2004, p. 73) suggests that 'As Lyotard argued prophetically in *The Postmodern Condition* not only has knowledge and research become commodified but also so have the relations of the production of knowledge in a new logic of *performativity*'. Ball (2003, p. 216) explains that 'Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change – based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic)'. The performance of individuals and organisations are thus measured according to outputs and quality assurance mechanisms. The contexts of business and management predominate and Lyotard himself (1984, p. xxiv) says that performativity is aimed at 'optimizing the system's performance-efficiency'. Cowen (1996, p. 247) observes that Lyotard was not writing specifically about education, but nevertheless acknowledges that 'Lyotard's analysis in 1979 is remarkable because by 1996 he is still not wrong'. Writers in the field continue to propose that Lyotard's ideas remain relevant and his critiques and concerns are increasingly evident in the functioning of universities and the work of teachers.

However, as changes to world economies and globalisation impact on societies, so governments move to align tertiary systems more closely with these domestic and international pressures. Blackmore (2001, 2002) argues that universities have responded to such influences by adopting business models and increasing their reliance on quality assurance, outcomes, performance measures, and indicators related to success and retention of students, and research outputs and commercial successes of staff. Ball, too, (2000, p. 2) mentions the predominance of such mechanisms and says 'It is the data-base, the appraisal meeting, the annual review, report writing and promotion applications, inspections, peer reviews that are to the fore. There is not so much or not only, a STRUCTURE of surveillance, as a FLOW of

performativities both continuous and eventful – that is SPECTACULAR’. In fact, ‘the logic of performativity is writ large over the entire reform process’ (Peters & Roberts, 1999, p. 101).

The Consequences for Teachers and Teaching

This increasing reliance on business models and accountability clearly has significant impact for teachers and their work and scholarship. ‘Not only is there a deterioration in the working conditions of academics, there is also a sense that the market is creeping into universities by stealth and determining the lives of academics to a much greater extent than it did a decade or two ago’ (Currie, 1998, p. 4). Currie, in the Australian context, suggests that this is creating a shift for tertiary teachers from scholars to entrepreneurs. In referring to all sectors of the education system, Codd (2005a, p. 199) sums up the issue in New Zealand predicting that:

Not only is education to be the key instrument for producing the new global citizen, but it is also becoming a major component of economic globalisation as a billion dollar export industry. Teachers, as employees of the state, are now positioned as productive workers within the new global service industry.

Ball (2003, p. 215) hits even harder suggesting that the ‘new performative worker is a promiscuous self, an enterprising self, with a passion for excellence’.

Blackmore (2001) notes the influence of these factors on teachers’ work. She suggests that this new outcomes focus has resulted in teaching and learning being central in the managed postmodern university but accompanied by increased surveillance over the work of academics. This undoubtedly influences teachers’ capacity to teach effectively and to focus on issues of philosophical or professional importance to them. She contends that responses to such forces have had a profound influence on both epistemology and pedagogy and that academics need to rethink and respond in non-traditional ways to teaching and research. They have fewer choices about their areas of

focus, are constrained by research funding models (e.g. New Zealand's PBRF¹ and UK's RAE (see Archer, 2008)), are committed more and more to industry and other external links for research and development funds, and measured in every imaginable way. Barnett (1992, p. 212) ably summarises the everyday impact of performativity on teachers:

If there is a single word that captures the spirit of the age in higher education, it is 'technique'. Technique, as I have indicated, is to be found at the levels of institutional evaluation and curriculum design. Controlling quality or improving quality, at either level, comes to be seen as a matter of technique. On the one hand, we see the imposition of technique as a means of assessing institutional performance through performance indicators. On the other hand, the greater effectiveness of the curriculum is felt to lie in the promotion of specified competencies and outcomes. Here the curriculum becomes a matter of technology, in which the required outcomes are engineered.

While this may sound an extreme interpretation, there is ample research to indicate Barnett's summation more than 15 years ago remains a reality for many. Vidovich and Currie (1998, p. 205) undertook an empirical study in three representative Australian universities and summarised their findings as 'a change in the nature of academic work towards greater accountability and reduced autonomy'. Marginson and Considine's (2000) investigation produced similar findings, and Gewirtz (2000, p. 363) believes that teaching is now viewed with 'an increased emphasis on outcomes rather than process and a more utilitarian, test-oriented, didactic approach'. In New Zealand, the Human Rights Commission (2004, p. 277) conducted an investigation into a range of sectors and reported that many participants in their study were concerned about 'the erosion of the "higher purpose of learning for the sake of learning", the increased focus on business and commercial applications, and the lack of quality assurance in tertiary education'. There are some mixed messages here but there is nevertheless an indication that the New Zealand tertiary situation is also market focused and this raises questions for human rights.

¹ New Zealand has followed the lead of others internationally (e.g. Britain's RAE) in adopting a funding mechanism for the distribution of research funds to tertiary institutions based on their collective institutional research outputs. The Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) has had a significant impact on individual and institutional approaches to research activity (Smith & Jesson, 2005).

What is even more troubling is that teachers themselves have become deeply implicated in the processes of performativity. Ball (2000, p. 5) laments ‘I am agent and subject within the regime of performativity in the academy’, responding inevitably to the forces at play. He suggests that academics are becoming new kinds of teachers, embedded within the discourses, cultures and demands of accountability and they too play the role of peer reviewers, write accountability reports and monitor outputs and quality, their own and others. This accounts for his description of teachers as ‘promiscuous’ beings. So new selves, new subjectivities, new identities are being constructed, selves that are unfamiliar. Ball contends that the teacher’s very soul has become a site of struggle. ‘The act of teaching and the subjectivity of the teacher are both profoundly changed within the new management panopticism (of quality and excellence) and the new forms of entrepreneurial control (through marketing and competition)’ (Ball, 2003, p. 219).

When this issue is examined in light of the context of uncertainty, synergies and relationships begin to emerge. Regimes of accountability and measurability create conditions of uncertainty over tenure, curriculum, quality and satisfaction criteria, expectations, performance indicators and the ability to achieve them, outputs, inputs, and more. Tertiary teachers may therefore ‘become ontologically insecure: unsure whether we are doing enough, doing the right thing, doing as much as others, or as well as others’ (Ball, 2003, p. 220). Academic identities are increasingly unstable. As Archer (2008, p. 392) suggests, ““successful”, authentic academic identities are rendered insecure, temporary and risky within regimes of performativity.

This idea of academic identity is developed further in Act 3. However, it is timely to note that while the focus thus far has been on teachers, they are not alone in feeling the pressure to reconsider their roles. Internationally, within the globalised and management-focused contexts of tertiary education, students are now construed as consumers (see Bourgeois et al, 1999; Roberts, 1999; Wortham, 1999; Robertson, 2000; Blackmore, 2001). This role reclassification creates a more complex environment, more pressure to take ownership of their learning and increasing demands related to their own construction of self. So

not only the institutions but inevitably all those involved with them, both teachers and students are impacted. Notwithstanding this acknowledgement, the focus of this thesis is on the work, conditions and beliefs of teachers so it is their voices that are foremost.

With this in mind, in the next section I focus on issues of identity production which, considering the above and the earlier conjecture about the nature of knowledge in tertiary education, is relevant for both teachers and students.

1.5 *Producing Identities*

In acknowledging the contexts and influences described above, challenges are created for the individual within the complex structures or, conversely, absence of structures that characterise the world. Already it is clear that tensions exist in relation to postmodernism and performativity because, although the former suggests a dismantling of structures and systems, the latter has created a superfluity of them and contributed to an even more uncertain tertiary environment. Nevertheless, the individual is implicated and, therefore, the notion of identity is of interest. It is a *postmodern view of identity* that underpins this investigation of the role of the individual and the instability of the self and so it is vital to consider what is said about identity in relation to postmodernity. And, it is not the intention here to traverse fully the literature related to identity as it is but one of the key concepts at the centre of this study. Ultimately, it is the teacher's role in the producing of student academic identities, particularly those of socially just graduates, that is the focus of attention. Therefore, the literature chosen relates to identity in postmodern/postructural circumstances. Academic identity is the particular focus with attention paid to teachers' views of the world and the impact of this on how they teach.

Miles (2001, p. 95) comments that 'identity construction is crucial to the debate over post-modernity in the sense that many theorists argue that social change is such that the nature of identity constructions are fundamentally different to what they were in the past'. He acknowledges, therefore, that as the nature of society changes, so does the nature of people. According to Kobena (1994, p. 259), identity becomes an issue 'when something assumed to be fixed, coherent and stable is displaced by the experience of doubt and uncertainty' so postmodernity is clearly implicated.

The notion of producing identities is a thorny one. 'Identity is a construction, a consequence of a process of interaction between people, institutions and practices [...]’ (Sarup, 1996, p. 11). Sarup considers identity in postmodernity

and notes that the traditional idea of identity suggested that a person had a ‘given’ identity and that it was coherent, fixed and unified, whereas recent conceptions acknowledge that it is subject to interactions, fabricated, constructed and therefore always in process. It is this complex view of identity that is relevant here, noting that identity is not stable and unchanging but subject to a continuous process of change over an individual’s lifetime, an idea that occurs particularly within the literatures of postmodernism, poststructuralism and feminism. ‘[P]eople choose to belong to social groups in order to become *who* they want to be and to realise their self-image’ (Kirman & Teschl, 2006, p. 304). This view of identity construction acknowledges that becoming *who* requires people to change *what* they are now, and this is not without disruption and discomfort. It is unsettling as it asks people to grapple with their identity/ies and to make some conscious choices about paths of action. These literatures also acknowledge that identities are discursively constructed and Butler’s (1990, p. 23) seminal work proposes that ‘the “coherence” and “continuity” of “the person” are not logical or analytic features of personhood, but, rather, socially instituted and maintained norms of “intelligibility”’. This complicates the notion of identity further, introducing the idea of the social and cultural construction of identities. In terms of the construction of academic identity, these ideas are critical. ‘Identity is understood not as a fixed property, but as part of the lived complexity of a person’s project and their ways of being in those sites which are constituted as being part of the academic’ (Clegg, 2008, p. 329). These ideas will be investigated further in Act 3 and will influence the analysis of participant narratives.

Identities in Postmodernity

It is worth looking briefly at thinking about identity from some of the key theorists of postmodernism already encountered so there is consistency but also some new voices. As Hall’s important paper (1996, p.1) notes in relation to identify formation, ‘The endlessly performative self has been advanced in celebratory variants of postmodernism’.

Returning to Bauman's notion of liquid modernity, he does not deny the reshaping of society and the relative roles of the members within it. In fact, he examines the recast and powerful role of the individual and remarks that 'casting members as individuals is the trade mark of modern society' (Bauman, 2000, p. 31). He contends that the development of individualisation and identity has been transformed from a given to a task and 'needing to *become* what one *is*, is the feature of modern living' (p. 32). He claims that this is a fate rather than a choice and that individuals are now forced into coping (individually) with the risks and contradictions that have always been produced socially. Thus there is unprecedented opportunity for freedom and experimentation accompanied by an equally unprecedented task of coping individually with the form and consequences of that experimenting. 'The yawning gap between the right of self-assertion and the capacity to control the social settings which render such self-assertion feasible or unrealistic seems to be the main contradiction of fluid modernity' (p. 38).

The result of such an environment is that the individual finds herself in a state of perpetual uncertainty where the opportunities are displayed and available everywhere she looks. Bauman (2000) uses a metaphor of shopping where the consumer has endless opportunity to consider, try and purchase. She is bombarded with images and possibilities and confronted with 'necessities', thus is faced with the constant challenge of what to choose and thus, in life choice terms, what *to be*. It all comes down to the individual and the incessant choice and perpetual desire for more. An inevitable outcome is the never-ending state of incompleteness because there are always more opportunities and nothing is ever finished. So individuality is a double-edged sword and, as Bauman (2000, p. 63) indicates, 'the consumers' misery derives from the surfeit, not the dearth of choices'.

According to Touraine (1998, p. 177), we must consider 'the end of the definition of the human being as a social being, defined by his or her place in society which determines his or her behaviour and actions'. He proposes that this has been replaced by the emphasis on the development of a meaningful individual life that is no longer defined in social institutions or by universalistic

principles. With the reduction of institutional or societal frameworks for establishing and maintaining universal rules, ‘our identity is increasingly detached from what we do and more and more dependent upon what we are, on our needs as expressed through economic consumption, but, more important, determined by our ascribed statuses, our age and sex, our cultural heritage or choices’ (Touraine, 1998, p. 168). Or, in terms of the performative university, what our outputs are and how much funding we attract.

The rise of individualism associated with the rise of productivism and the loss of tradition (Beck, 1992), is also referred to by Giddens (1994). Giddens, however, claims that this situation is caused by manufactured uncertainty and the outcome for the individual is potentially emotional disruption and a sense of isolation arising from the loss of moral resources. Whichever way one looks at it, the challenges for the individual are keenly evident. There are seemingly endless opportunities to prosper, engage in a vast array of experiences, make personal choices, and explore the world in ways never before possible, but also salutary reminders of the potential confusion and destabilising influences of such a diverse and possibility-rich world. There is potentially never an end to what one can do or be. In the coming section, the impact of this pressure on governments and, therefore, universities and teachers will be introduced with attention to the ways in which risk and responsibility have been loaded onto the individual or the academic unit.

There is further complexity to be considered in terms of identities and therefore it is important to look beyond these theorists of postmodernity. This thesis not only assumes the instability of identity but also that identity is not a unitary concept. Rather it draws from a poststructuralist interpretation of identity which understands that subjectivity is constructed and produced within discursive practices of society (Butler, 1990), and this is important in relation to issues of social justice, as will be discussed later. Butler and other key philosophers of poststructural theory have identified many ambiguities of identity formation and their thinking is central to this thesis. Davies and Harré (1990, p. 44), building on Butler’s ideas, note that discursive practice names ‘all the ways in which people actively produce social and psychological

realities'. Further, it recognises that subjectivity is not only created within language but can have multiple interpretations and understandings, some of which may be contradictory but all of which are socially constructed and subject to power relations. The impossibility of fixing meaning to a concept such as, for example, 'woman', arises.

This does not mean that meaning disappears altogether but that any interpretation is at best temporary, specific to the discourse within which it is produced and open to challenge. The degree to which meanings are vulnerable at a particular moment will depend on the discursive power relations within which they are located (Weedon, 1987, pp. 85-86)

Davies and Harré remind us that not only are discourses constructed within power relations, they 'can compete with each other or they can create distinct and incompatible versions of reality' (p. 44). This means that any individual can experience multiple identities, seemingly simultaneously. 'Human beings are characterized both by continuous personal identity and by discontinuous personal diversity. It is one and the same person who is variously positioned in a conversation' (Davies & Harré, p. 45). So any individual is at once juggling possible multiple identities. This is the nature of both the student and the teacher in contemporary tertiary contexts. Returning to Hall, who frames his analysis in terms of 'late modern times', 'identities are never unified and [...] increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions. They are subject to a radical historicization, and are constantly in the process of change and transformation' (Hall, 1996, p. 3).

The university is also the site or production of particular identity formations. At the same time, Clegg (2008, p. 341) notes that the university itself is a deeply ambiguous place and 'even when thinking of identity in terms of strictly professional and work-related aspects of being, these are not confined to higher education as such. The boundaries of higher education emerged as porous, with other epistemological claims impacting on how individuals imagined themselves'. Identity is not singular and defined and students and teachers developing resilient and socially just identities face challenges.

These discussions also indicate some of the tensions that exist between the various interpretations of identity. So while post structuralists tend to focus on subjective relations and the individual in the sociological agency/structure balance, others are more concerned about how material and cultural conditions shape identity formation. Most social theorists however, note fluidity of identity and the subsequently confronting demands arising from increased choice but also increased risk. Academics are positioned within universities as mediating pedagogic relationships, but within the constraints of performative cultures and more demanding material conditions.

So, whatever the context, tertiary education is implicated in identity production and has the power to define, or at least influence, desired identities (Bernstein, 1975, 2001). What then are the implications for the construction of graduate student identities? What pedagogical issues are at stake? How do teachers grapple with these issues?

A Pedagogy for Uncertainty: A Pedagogy of ‘Being’

Two key ideas are converging. Firstly, it has been suggested that knowledge is no longer stable and definable in the postmodern tertiary institution – there is epistemological insecurity. Secondly, individuals, both teachers and students, are confronting conditions of uncertainty in relation to their roles and identities.

These two aspects are dealt with conceptually by Barnett (2004a). He makes a strong claim for learning to focus not merely on the advancement of knowledge or skills but on the development of human qualities and dispositions, that is, for learning and education to take an ontological rather than epistemological turn, with the individual at the heart of the process. His focus is on the production of individual student identities that are resilient against risk, able to deal with uncertainty, and also able to make choices responsibly. This requires an education for *being*, an education which transcends the earlier focus of higher education – the accumulation of knowledge – and deals instead with the individual student far more holistically,

recognising her as capable of agency and thus able to make choices as professionals. Furthermore, Barnett and Coate (2005) contend that the central purpose of contemporary tertiary education in the changing world is the enhancement of human capacity and the corresponding development of dispositions that assist students in developing self-awareness and self-confidence and he names these as ‘strength, care, openness, resilience and criticality’ (Barnett, 2004a, p. 258). Knowledge and skills are deemed insufficient in the changing world as the world may have moved on.

With the development of such dispositions to the self and the world, the contention is that students are more prepared for *being* capably in the current supercomplex world and more prepared for the uncertainty of the unknown future. So *one* desired graduate identity is that of a resilient, responsive, reflective and critical self, an individual able to thrive in uncertainty, and therefore, capable of handling multiple identities – for resilient students in an uncertain world do not inhabit a single identity. Barnett (2004a) refers to this when he discusses the ontological risks that arise out of supercomplexity and the subsequent destabilisation of the ‘I’. This is an issue that will be examined in Act 4.

Notwithstanding this focus on the development of *being* and the centrality of self and identity, Barnett acknowledges the necessary relationships between knowing, acting and being in the holistic learning process for the student. He traces some of the history of higher education and acknowledges the earlier focus on both the accumulation of knowledge and also the development of skills, both of which have been key drivers influencing the evolution of education. Barnett contends, however, that each of these typifies static approaches to education where it is assumed that there is some discrete package of information that can be transferred to students, evident in Australia and New Zealand, for example, in the competency debates of the late 20th century. He prefers the dynamism inherent in the alternative construct of knowing and acting and then adds to this the less common but, he claims, essential concept of education for *being*. Knowledge and skills are not

redundant but rather a part of the repertoire of strategies and ways of knowing required for thriving in the uncertain future.

In summary, the key question is whether such an approach to education proposed by Barnett is indeed possible in the performative university, the university characterised by a focus on accountability and market-based provision with the corresponding reliance on transfer of key content reportedly required by industry (Blackmore, 2001). Is there any scope for such a focus on the development of the student for thriving in the uncertain world when accountability demands are so central and often oppressive in terms of determining both pedagogy and content?

The challenges for tertiary teachers are evident. The discourses discussed suggest that the world is uncertain, tertiary education is changing, and the roles of academics, knowledge, learning and students are unstable. This potentially creates insecurity for all. Under conditions of epistemological insecurity and changing subjectivities, on what basis are decisions about teaching and desired student identities made? In particular, for those academics concerned about equity and opportunity as well as participation of all students, how are these challenges addressed in their classrooms and pedagogies? What does it mean to be a teacher for social justice in contemporary tertiary contexts?

1.6 *Educating for Social Justice*

The final area of interest to the question of teaching within the postmodern university is the concept of educating for social justice. Earlier, I introduced why this is a central theme of this thesis and later I discuss in more detail the role of social justice in tertiary education. For now, I acknowledge that social justice is a contested notion and its history is long. In fact, ‘the idea of social justice is historically constituted and [...] is a site of conflicting and divergent political endeavours’ (Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard & Henry, 1997, p. 128). It is also contested in terms of its core meaning and interpretation, with terms such as ‘equal opportunities’, or ‘equity’ or even ‘ethics’ being conflated to mean social justice. Troyna and Vincent (1995, p. 149) acknowledge that the term functions as a ‘condensation symbol’ (Edelman, 1964) where key phrases or concepts ‘derive their potency, emotional impact and seductive qualities from their intrinsic, or “essential” ability to defy stipulative definition’. Thus people have multiple reactions to ‘social justice’ because it offers multiple meanings in different cultural contexts.

Despite conflicting beliefs about the role of education in promoting social justice, I perceive one role of education as being instrumental in minimising injustice and maximising opportunity, while recognising that education also has reproductive effects with regard to gender, ‘race’ and class. However, I acknowledge that social justice ‘has powerfully resonant connotative as well as denotative properties and the debate about its actual and desired articulation with education hinges critically on the meaning we give to the term’ (Troyna & Vincent, 1995, p. 152).

Because my interest is in the work of tertiary teachers, the focus in this thesis will be on aspects of *pedagogy* in relation to promoting social justice. So although I will refer here to historical and contemporary theorising around key social justice concepts and précis some recent developments, what is included here lays the foundation for the subsequent examination of the work of teachers, so notions of critical pedagogy are therefore key. Critical pedagogy,

as I understand it, promotes practices that have the potential to transform oppressive institutions or social relations, largely through educational practices. It encompasses understanding curriculum as political text. However, it is a complex issue, given that critical pedagogy ‘is not physically housed in any one school or university department, nor does it constitute a homogeneous set of ideas’ (Giroux & McLaren, 1995, p. 29). Additionally, there are radical and feminist perspectives on and critiques of critical pedagogy because of its modernist tendencies (see Gore, 1992; Ellsworth, 1992). However, the key aim of critical pedagogy involves a way of thinking about, negotiating and transforming the relationship among classroom teaching, the production of knowledge, the institutional structures, and the social and material relations of the wider community, society and nation state with a view to achieving greater equity in social circumstances (McLaren, 1993).

With this focus, I will investigate how the pedagogies of teachers who espouse that they teach for social justice, and the processes they use in the classroom, articulate with or differ from the underlying principles embedded in the work of selected theorists within particular conceptual frames of social justice.

When that analysis is complete, I will juxtapose teaching for social justice as an ethical enterprise, and teaching for *being* in times of uncertainty, in order to open up an opportunity to consider options for the tertiary teachers in this study identifying as having a social justice orientation.

.

Contemporary Theorising

Within Western philosophical debates over social justice, Rawls (1971) is a seminal writer who focuses particularly on the liberal-individualist concept of justice as fairness. Rawls writes from a modernist perspective and understands social justice from a universalist position, assuming that principles and theories apply to all. He proposes that ‘the primary subject of justice is the basic structure of society, or more exactly, the way in which the major social institutions distribute fundamental rights and duties to determine the division of advantages from social co-operation’ (Rawls, 1971, p. 7). Rawls’ theory

provides the groundwork for what has come to be known as the ‘distributive’ paradigm of social justice. This is so named as Rawls contends that a conception of social justice ‘is to be regarded as providing in the first instance, a standard whereby the distributive aspects of the basic structure of society are to be assessed’ (p. 10). He argues that the principal area over which justice presides is the distribution of primary goods such as wealth, position, opportunity and liberty (Sturman, 1997). In his two underpinning principles, Rawls asserts that all should have equal rights to liberty, and that social and economic inequalities should offer advantages to all and be attached to positions available to all. If these principles were applied to the basic structures of society, they could, says Rawls (1971, p. 61), ‘govern the assignment of rights and duties and [...] regulate the distribution of social and economic advantage’.

Rawls’ early work has provided the basis for further theorising and Gewirtz (1998), in considering education, acknowledges that his distribution theory, as articulated in later theories and debates over distribution, is commonly considered synonymous with social justice. However, his modernist understanding is potentially incompatible with the subsequent principles underpinning this thesis which acknowledge and accommodate difference. Gewirtz names an alternative dimension – the relational paradigm – which draws from a feminist philosophical tradition and which *is* of interest here. She distinguishes between the two dominant dimensions of social justice (distributive and relational) and identifies the latter as implicit in the nature of relationships which form the basis of and provide structure for society. Within this dimension, she says, it is possible to investigate and theorise about issues of power that are not so explicit in the distributive paradigm.

Despite the distinctions, Gewirtz and the majority of other theorists note that the two paradigms are intimately connected and, indeed, this will become evident in looking briefly at the work of two key feminist theorists who are at the forefront of this debate – Iris Marion Young and Nancy Fraser. Each of these writers takes the work of Rawls and develops alternative theories that variously negate and build on the distributive paradigm to include the concept

of recognition, which is itself a version of the relational paradigm. These writers highlight the notion of difference in relation to social justice thus shifting both the language and underpinning tenets of social justice from a modernist discourse into poststructuralist debates over difference.

Justice and the Politics of Difference – Young

Young looks at the distributive paradigm and suggests two particular problems. First, she asserts, it focuses on the allocation of goods or positions and ignores social structures and contexts including relational issues of power and decision-making. Secondly, when it does allude to such issues, it represents them as static things rather than as functions of social relations (Young, 1990) and she argues strongly against such a position. However, she does not suggest that social justice as related to distribution should be rejected, rather that it should be widened and reconsidered in the broader context of social relations and should not be perceived as a coextensive concept with social justice.

Young warns against regarding power as a possession – as do poststructuralists – and conversely argues that it is a relation thus providing a platform for the launch of her theory of oppression. She addresses oppression, suggesting that it:

consists in systematic institutional processes which prevent some people from learning and using satisfying and expansive skills in socially recognized settings, or institutionalized social processes which inhibit people's ability to play and communicate with others or to express their feelings and perspectives on social life in contexts where others can listen (Young, 1990, p. 38).

She offers a helpful consideration of the concept of oppression. She explains that historically it was linked to the exercise of tyranny but that social movements of the 1960s and 1970s shifted its meaning to encompass the disadvantage and injustice some people suffer 'not because a tyrannical power coerces them, but because of the everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society' (1990, p. 41). Implicated here are the unquestioned norms, habits, symbols and assumptions that underpin institutional and societal rules with the resulting reproduction of dominant processes and beliefs. In this

interpretation, oppression is rife in contemporary society and, as will be investigated later, education is implicated.

Young's framework identifies five faces of oppression – exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. She critiques theories of oppression as a unified phenomenon (e.g. Rawls) and claims that these tend to leave out either oppressed groups or delimit ways in which oppression occurs. Her own theory, she contends, functions by providing criteria for determining if groups are oppressed rather than as a full theory of oppression in and of itself, maintaining that the five faces can be operationalised in particular contexts. This practical application is important because, as she comments, 'while I think general social theory has a place, causal explanation must always be particular and historical' (Young, 1990, p. 65). In summary, 'Oppression [...] is the primary concept for naming group-related injustice' (Young, 1990, p. 195). And practical action against all faces of oppression is required. Young's shift in language from justice to oppression is clear.

Justice Interruptus – Fraser

Fraser's approach to social justice has many synergies with that of Young but differs in some pivotal ways. Her basic contention is that justice requires *both* redistribution *and* recognition but that, inappropriately addressed or simultaneously challenged, one can and does undercut the other. She believes that the greatest challenge is in 'figuring out how to conceptualize cultural recognition and social equality in forms that support rather than undermine one another' (Fraser, 1997, p. 12).

Fraser's theory relies on a distinction between two conceptions of injustice, each related to a particular approach to theorising social justice – the socio-economic and the cultural or symbolic. The former is linked to the work of Rawls and his distributive paradigm, while the latter is linked to social patterns of representation and interpretation – a poststructuralist position – and is labelled as 'recognition'. She concedes that the distinction between the two is largely analytical and that in practice they are intertwined. She concludes too,

in looking at remedies for cultural and economic injustice, that it is necessary to abstract from the real world as life's realities blur the distinctions both between socio-economic and cultural injustices and between their corresponding remedies of redistribution and recognition, resulting in dilemmas for action.

Fraser introduces a continuum on which to plot redistribution and recognition demands, and names groups that can be easily mapped onto the theoretical extremes of the continuum in terms of required action. She also observes that the required actions result in very different outcomes with one putting the group out of business and the other valorising 'groupness'. For the theoretical extremes (she cites class and sexuality as examples), this is not necessarily seen to be problematic. To address issues of class, redistribution is required rather than recognition. And to address issues of sexuality, redistribution is not necessarily an issue and what is required is recognition. However, the middle of the conceptual spectrum is 'murkier territory' (Fraser, 1997, p. 19) for here, the implicated groups are subject to both injustices and potentially require both remedies. Fraser offers 'gender' and 'race' as examples of those groups inhabiting the murky territory in the centre of the spectrum and names these as 'bivalent collectivities' (p. 19) that are excellent representations of the redistribution/recognition dilemma as they have been exposed to 'a vicious circle of cultural and economic subordination' (p. 21).

To address the dilemmas that arise from this juxtaposition of competing demands, Fraser names two possible approaches that cut across the redistribution/recognition divide. These are 'affirmative' strategies that correct the inequitable outcomes of social arrangements without disturbing their underlying frameworks, and 'transformative' strategies that correct inequities by focusing specifically on the underlying generative framework. While the strategies themselves create resulting tensions in the same way the demands do, ultimately, she believes, transformative strategies have more potential.

Fraser concludes that the redistribution/recognition dilemma is real and there is no neat theoretical way it can be resolved. The most appropriate way forward

is to soften the dilemma by finding approaches that minimise the conflicts between them.

Just before leaving Fraser, one further proposal she makes to address this issue is that it might be possible to bring together the notions of distribution and recognition into what she calls a bivalent conception of justice without reducing either of the theories to the other. She names this concept *participatory parity* (Fraser, 1996, p. 30) and suggests that ‘according to this norm, justice requires social arrangements that permit all (adult) members of society to interact with one another as peers’. This requires two conditions: ‘an objective precondition of just redistribution, and an intersubjective precondition of reciprocal recognition’ (Robeyns, 2003, p. 539). In introducing this concept, Fraser critiques writers who reside solely in theories of distribution.

I include the work of these two writers because they have been relatively dominant in leading theorising around social justice, and have certainly led the redistribution/recognition debate (Fraser, 1997, 2000; Fraser & Honneth, 2003; Fraser & Naples, 2004; Young, 1990, 1992, 1997, 2000). However, their work goes only some way to addressing issues in education as their writing is more focused on the broader societal and policy context. While they definitely offer application to tertiary education in terms of access and participation, another quite different approach has gathered momentum in recent years. This approach addresses pedagogy and practice and offers greater synergies with the other themes in this thesis, despite being located within more modernist frames.

Capabilities – Sen and Nussbaum

Amartya Sen (1980, 1992, 1999) has focused on the issue of social justice, not from a distribution or economic growth standpoint (Rawls, 1971), nor from the position of recognition, but from a perspective of capabilities, which is a more individualised concept premised upon basic human rights. However, Robeyns (2003) argues that Fraser’s critique of distributive theorists in Sen’s case is not justified because Sen’s theory is indeed founded in the distributive paradigm

but provides a framework that does justice to both the breadth of human diversity and also allows for the incorporation of recognition claims.

Nussbaum has worked extensively, both collaborating with Sen and writing independently, on developing notions of capability and shares his concerns regarding the distributive approach to social justice, which, she believes, does not take account of the differences that exist for individuals to capitalise on available resources (Nussbaum, 2002). She comments that ‘Sen and I both argue that Rawl’s theory would be better able to give an account of the relevant social equalities and inequalities if the list of primary goods were formulated as a list of capabilities rather than as a list of things’ (Nussbaum, 2003, pp. 50-51). This capabilities approach has attracted wide interest in recent years.

Capabilities, according to Sen, are those things that create the opportunity for people to be able to *be* and *do*, rather than focus on what they have. It is therefore, the ability a person has ‘to do valuable acts or reach valuable states of being; [it] represents the alternative combinations of things a person is able to do or be’ (Sen, 1993, p. 30). Further, ‘In the capability-based assessment of justice, individual claims are not to be assessed in terms of the resources or primary goods the persons respectively hold, but by the freedoms they actually enjoy to choose the lives that they have reason to value’ (Sen, 1992, p. 81). This differs from Rawlsian theory in its perception of the individual as an end rather than a means to economic growth, though Sen’s approach in no way focuses on a neo-liberal interpretation of the individual and corresponding assertion of rights to self-actualisation.

Sen’s notion is about a space in which comparisons regarding quality of life can be made, and, as such, has been used extensively throughout the world in such evaluations in developing nations. ‘Sen has also insisted that it is in the space of capabilities that questions about social equality and inequality are best raised’ (Nussbaum, 2000, p. 12). Again the shift in discourse is evident with ‘equality’ being preferred over notions of social justice.

The capability approach thus offers a broad normative framework to conceptualize and evaluate individual well-being and social arrangements in any particular context or society. It is not a complete theory of justice, but it does deal with questions of balance between freedoms and equality that have characterized work on social justice since the late eighteenth century (Walker & Unterhalter, 2007, p. 3).

Capability is, therefore, not a free-standing theory in its own right but rather a framework that allows the possibility of interaction with other theories in specific or localised contexts (Unterhalter & Walker, 2007), which makes it a compelling possibility in the context of this thesis. Rather than define or explain privilege or inequality or well-being, it allows the evaluation of these ideas (Robeyns, 2006). Central to the capability approach are the concepts of *doing* and *being* and, indeed, *becoming*, ideas already introduced in relation to tertiary pedagogy in uncertainty.

An important component of the capability approach is the distinction it makes between capability and functioning. Functions are, in essence, achieved outcomes and reflect human choice. Capabilities, conversely, are the potential to achieve these functionings. ‘The difference between a capability and a functioning is one between an opportunity to achieve and the actual achievement, between potential and outcome’ (Walker & Unterhalter, 2007, p. 4). This distinction is critical in terms of issues of social justice because, in the process of evaluation, often the focus falls on functionings when capability may have been non-existent or delimited and similar functionings, despite appearances, can provide no insight into potential differences in capability. Nussbaum (2002, p. 132) offers a helpful example of the distinction. ‘The person with plenty of food may always choose to fast, but there is a great difference between fasting and starving, and it is this difference we wish to capture’. Therefore, capability and not functioning, for Sen and Nussbaum, is the appropriate political goal. Robeyns (2006, p. 355) outlines a number of rationales for focusing on functionings and/or capabilities and concludes that the ‘choice to focus exclusively on one of them, or both of them, will depend on the kind and context of the application, on certain normative choices, and (if applicable) on the data-availability’.

One issue where a number of theorists, and particularly Nussbaum and Sen, have differed is their relative positions on a definitive list of capabilities that forms the basis for evaluation of equality. In fact, Robeyns (2006) places Nussbaum and Sen at opposite ends of a spectrum on their approach to this. Sen is resolute in his refusal to do so, his initial theorising offering no list of capabilities and his recent work remaining steadfast on this position. He contends that the ‘problem is not with listing important capabilities but with insisting on one predetermined canonical list of capabilities chosen by theorists without any general social discussion or public reasoning’ (Sen, 2004, p. 77). He admits that he has looked at lists over the years and acknowledges there appear to be some key ones that could be universally applied but is concerned about the potential to create definitive lists in isolation from the realities of contexts. He leaves his framework quite vague on the issue of lists preferring to encourage communities to establish for themselves what capabilities are of value to them.

[...] pure theory cannot “freeze” a list of capabilities for all societies for all time to come, irrespective of what the citizens come to understand and value. That would be not only a denial of the reach of democracy, but also a misunderstanding of what pure theory can do, completely divorced from the particular social reality that any particular society faces (Sen, 2004, p. 78).

At the other end of the continuum, Nussbaum is renowned for having created a list of ten ‘central human capabilities’ which are included under titles of: life; bodily health; bodily integrity; senses, imagination and thought; emotions; practical reason; affiliation; other species; play; and control over one’s environment. Much of her prolific writing has an interest in sexual equality, which she continues to view as problematic (see Nussbaum, 2000), so this contributes to her rationale for supporting a definitive list. She argues that:

the capabilities approach will supply definite and useful guidance, and prove an ally in the pursuit of sex equality, only if we formulate a definite list of the most central capabilities, even one that is tentative and revisable, using capabilities so defined to elaborate a partial account of social justice, a set of basic entitlements without which no society can lay claim to justice (Nussbaum, 2003, p. 36).

Nussbaum contends that her list of capabilities is central to living a life with dignity but she concedes that this list can be further specified by particular societies. She admonishes Sen for stopping short of defining a minimum list believing that to do so leaves the approach ‘hopelessly vague’ and is therefore ‘wrong and misleading’ (Nussbaum, 2003, pp. 46-47).

So, despite their collaborations, Nussbaum and Sen remain separated on the list issue. Walker and Unterhalter (2007, p. 11) categorise these differences in relation to their philosophical positions noting that ‘Sen’s approach is grounded in participatory human development, and Nussbaum’s in analytic philosophy’. A focus on human development may have the edge in terms of usability for teachers’ practice.

1.7 Social Justice Theorising and Tertiary Education

None of these theories or frameworks is explicitly about education, although it is included in Nussbaum's 'senses, imagination, and thought' category where it is assumed that people are able to 'imagine, think and reason – and to do these things in a "truly human" way, a way informed and cultivated by an adequate education' (Nussbaum, 2003, p. 41). Rather, each approach offers ways of conceptualising, structuring or evaluating aspects of society for their impact on social justice. The challenge in this thesis is to identify which best provides explanatory power for how teachers think about teaching for social justice and which principles they honour or reflect in their pedagogies. Here there are valuable links between human capabilities, the development of dispositions and education. There are relevant ideas about oppression as it plays out in educational contexts. There are challenges in relation to identity politics and considerations regarding access and participation. Some of the challenges resulting for tertiary teachers and how these can be understood through these conceptual frameworks will be explored more fully in Acts 3 and 4.

There are tensions between these conceptual frameworks around the meaning of social justice. For example, there are tensions between the theories of postmodernism introduced here which see a dismantling of structures and a resistance to universals and the notion of capability as described by Sen and Nussbaum where, essentially, normative frameworks are suggested. These appear to be coming from incompatible standpoints so while Bauman might claim that social forms are melting faster than they can be replaced, Sen and Nussbaum find ways of creating universalising constructs around notions of capability. Feminists have sought to resolve issues such as when to use the category of woman, for example, and when to talk about difference among women – using the notion of strategic essentialism. So there are some situations where essentialist arguments need to be made to bring about equality, as in this instance, as it applies to human rights for all women. There are others where differences need to be fore-grounded, as in the case of class. So, for example, equity for women often means less freedom for men within capabilities theory.

But these, while they offer contrasting positions, do not need to prohibit reflection and action in relation to what happens in classrooms. Throughout this thesis, references to differing and sometimes competing philosophies and paradigms are included, unapologetically. They offer provocations and encourage readers to consider their relevance, interoperability, challenges and potential. So, for example, Fraser (1996) has critiqued Sen's work as being grounded in the distributive paradigm with its modernistic underpinnings. However, Robeyns (2003, p. 545) contends that Fraser's critique of Sen is unjustified and that his capability approach offers 'intrinsic attention to human diversity, and the impact of social, environmental, and individual conversion factors on a person's well-being' and thus 'allow[s] us to incorporate aspects of distributive justice as well as issues of recognition'. Robeyns also comments on the opportunities available through the capability approach to pay attention to issues of identity, particularly in relation to the implications of power relations. She does warn, however, that the capability approach is not yet mature enough to deal with all issues of justice.

Similarly, postmodern analyses provide challenges for critical pedagogy and vice versa. Their understandings of the world differ quite significantly. 'The goals related to resistance of oppression so firmly rooted in the history of critical pedagogy are not the same goals of postmodernism, where analyses of texts and multiplicity of approaches are uppermost' (Keesing-Styles, 2002, p. 61). However, they do not need to be mutually exclusive. They both offer opportunities for examination of the relationship between people, they both respect and acknowledge difference and therefore both offer provocations for teachers. The alternative of doing nothing because of the critiques of their interrelationship is not tenable.

So, as I discuss further in the next Act, it is important not to reject different perspectives but to tease them out, consider what they might offer and utilise whatever understandings contribute to a better understanding of what is useful action in the classroom.

What is of specific interest to me in this thesis are the everyday practices of teachers in everyday classes as they work to enhance social justice in the context of increasingly diverse groups and individuals who inhabit tertiary education classes and the multiple identities they experience. How, through the everyday practices of teaching, are the goals of social justice, contested and/or progressed? How, in this class and beyond, ‘should we best live with the lovely diversity of human beings?’ (Griffiths, 2003, p. 10). How are students encouraged to identify, name and address oppressive or marginalising practices in this class, this institution, their own lives? How are human capabilities considered, fostered and supported in tertiary classrooms? How are different identities produced, negotiated or even acknowledged in this classroom by academics? Such questions presuppose that there is some expectation of action, not only for the teacher, but also on the part of the student who is equally implicated in the tertiary classroom.

It is my contention that if there is indeed so much diversity and uncertainty, and in the context of performativity and standardisation, there is a need to call all students to account for their own learning and social actions. This may require the provision of educational experiences that are discomforting to any students who reside in mono-cultural positions of complacency or whose acceptance of diversity is limited. Perhaps, in this way, students will learn to contemplate and consider the ‘lovely diversity of human beings’ and adjust their own practices, approaches and existence in society to be able to respond respectfully and critically to diversity and resist oppressive practices. ‘An education suitable for all learners – good for each and good for everyone – requires everyone to take account of the real differences between them, however they are expressed. This is not ever going to be a cosy consensual process, even in theory’ (Griffiths, 2003, p. 37) and this will become the focus later in the thesis.

Despite this acknowledgement, critical pedagogy’s desired outcome is that teachers get on and do something, notwithstanding that this should be located in the particular groups and communities where education is sited (Kohl, 1998).

Tertiary education is a specific site, ‘an arena of hope and struggle’ (Ayers, 1998, p. xvii). While there would appear to be some broadly agreed principles related to the provision of a pedagogy for social justice, and these will be examined in full in Act 4, tertiary teachers seeking to participate in such endeavours will necessarily analyse their own contexts, know their own students and develop their own processes which reflect the specifics of their particular classroom. Griffiths also reminds us that new theory necessarily builds on old theory and there is nothing completely new, stable, unchangeable and certain. ‘The best that can be done is to look for knowledge from different perspectives, in the context of the social and historical situations in which it was discovered, interpreted and constructed’ (Griffiths, 1998a, p. 82), hence a range of paradigms for consideration. Therefore, for tertiary teachers there are two critically important issues for consideration with regard to a theory or even pedagogy for social justice education in an uncertain world – context and revisability.

In his analysis of social justice in education, Sturman (1997) contends that education is a social process and therefore social justice needs to be rethought around issues of the curriculum and teachers’ work. Distributive justice in educational contexts is incomplete.

What must also be considered is that theorising without action is unacceptable and, in the context of education for social justice, empty. ‘Theory is not inherently healing, liberatory, or revolutionary. It fulfils this function only when we ask that it do so and direct our theorising towards this end’ (hooks, 1994, p. 61). The challenge is not only to conceptualise radical theories that have the capacity to reconstruct tertiary education (and ultimately society) but then to operationalise these. Teachers have historically been resentful of the ‘outside expert’ dictating practice so there are strong imperatives for theory to arise from the realities of educational contexts (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1995). What then will tertiary teachers see as appropriate in terms of theorising and participating in education for social justice in tertiary settings?

What this thesis is concerned with is how teachers who teach with a social justice orientation deal with issues of social justice where this content is not necessarily prescribed nor expected, where such a focus will not be cosy and consensual. In everyday classes focused on architecture, accounting, marketing, education and law, how are social justice issues included and honoured? How is each student, regardless of background, social status or privilege, encouraged to consider issues of social justice within and outside the classroom? So there is a dual focus, firstly on the pedagogies that teachers use to introduce and promote such consideration and secondly on the strategies used to develop dispositions in students that will encourage them in turn to act in socially just ways.

This then is one central area of focus to discuss with research participants. How do the participants handle the tensions that exist between prescribed content and social justice content? When knowledge is already contested, what is the place for liberatory content or goals? When the demands of performativity constrain, how can teachers still maintain a focus on social justice? How do they enact their desired teaching within pedagogies that engage, particularly in the face of standardisation and accountability demands? How are student and teacher identities produced in these contexts? In summary, in institutions and classrooms that are impacted by the influences and constraints of contemporary societies, where uncertainty and ambiguity abound, what are the possibilities and challenges?

1.8 Conclusion

The trouble is now evident. The key concerns of uncertainty, tertiary education, performativity, identity production and social justice have been introduced and their complexity and interrelationships exposed.

In the contemporary world, tertiary education is immersed in challenges to its traditional roles, notwithstanding the acknowledgement that this might always have been so in some form throughout the history of the university. If we are in a time of epistemological uncertainty (Scott, 1997), tertiary education may need to revisit its role and function. It may be obliged to utilise curricula and pedagogies that forego a primary focus on content (knowledge) in favour of a more active, inclusive approach that promotes curriculum and pedagogies focused on the development of knowing, acting and, importantly, *being*.

When the two literatures of education for *being* and education for social justice are analysed alongside each other, as they will be fully in later Acts, many synergies appear. Each of these pedagogies briefly introduced here acknowledges messiness, uncertainty and risk but they also propose engagement, agency and action. Each focuses on the relational aspects of learning and acknowledges the centrality of context and the particular participants. For each, process is paramount and the relationships between teachers, learners, context and content all become integral to the milieu of the learning environment. On paper at least, it seems there are reasons to consider their alignment, but, as already suggested, they create a complex mix.

What then are the challenges and possibilities for tertiary education, particularly for tertiary teachers who espouse a social justice orientation in their teaching? This thesis is concerned both with education *for* social justice and education *about* – that is, both content and process issues. Gewirtz (2000, p. 363) acknowledges that ‘Issues of equality and social justice are effectively downplayed in comparison to overall commercial success’ in times of efficiency and accountability. What then are the professional issues and

considerations in situations of performativity? In what ways is educating for *being* a process of producing graduate identities? How are pedagogical processes of social justice influential in the postmodern classroom and how are they reconciled with education for *being*, if at all? What will teachers do in their classrooms if they are educating for *being* with an eye to eliminating oppressive practices and encouraging the development of socially just graduates? Are the two processes of education for *being* and education for social justice indeed compatible, especially when there are modernist, postmodern and critical influences to consider? How are the issues of liquidity, ambiguity, shiftiness and multiple interpretations implicated? In essence, how is education for *being* able to be developed within what are agreed as the desired principles, processes and pedagogies of education for social justice in a time of uncertainty?

According to Ayers, these are potentially times of ‘endemic hopelessness and deepening despair’ (Ayers, 2001, p. 286). It is my contention that they can also be times of optimism, potential and hope. The challenges facing tertiary education may also be key to the creation of different futures, futures that blend together each of the various components introduced here. Do these futures allow for further development of education for social justice that also enhances each student’s capacity for *being* in an uncertain world? This is the central issue of investigation in this thesis, an issue that is reflected in the research question. Implicated here, too, is the tension between individual and group consequences.

In the next Act, I outline the broad range of particular circumstantial issues that surround an investigation of this question.

A C T 2

Tales of Circumstance

2.1 Introduction

With the trouble broadly described in the previous section, I now introduce the circumstances that surround this project. The research question, introduced in the previous Act, focuses on professional, pedagogical and ethical issues that impact on teachers' work in contemporary tertiary institutions. To investigate this, I utilise a narrative methodology, chosen for its capacity to reflect life-world settings and produce compelling stories. This involved face-to-face interviews and an online discussion with eight tertiary academics and, in this Act, I explain a range of concerns associated with the identified issues, the methodology and the participants.

Immersion in the Text

Many writers (Piantanida & Garman, 1999; Bruner, 1991; Miniciello, Aroni, Timewell & Alexander, 1995; Guba & Lincoln, 1998) comment on the close relationship that exists between researcher and research, despite many traditional efforts to separate them. I resolved to accept that this research implicates me and that my own perspectives and world views inhabit the text.

Long-standing debates around researcher 'independence' contribute to the position I adopt in this thesis. As Miniciello and others (1995, p. 180) suggest, 'methodologies and methods are not constructed or chosen in isolation from ontological and epistemological positions [...] but [...] are directly related to our image of reality and the way we think we can know it'. Denzin and Lincoln (1998) relate researcher embeddedness to Levi-Strauss's (1966) concept of the *bricoleur*. The researcher pieces together a number of interrelated concepts, events, practices and solutions that become a reflection of both researcher and researched. 'The *bricoleur* understands that research is an interactive process shaped by his or her personal history, biography, gender, social class, race, and

ethnicity, and those of the people in the setting' (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 4). They note that the researcher enters the research setting from within their own interpretive community and that this historical situation is implicated in the research. Therefore, even the research question is framed by two sources – the researcher and the subject (Denzin, 2002).

Indeed, Gitlin and Russell (1994, p. 187) are critical about educational research that leaves the author out of the text. They are explicit about naming and exposing the researcher's judgments and biases rather than 'bracket out the subjective' and say:

the author is part of the research not only because the questions posed reflect a focus on one set of concerns rather than another, but also because the constructs developed [...] and even the form and style of the communication are all linked to the perspective and orientation that the author brings to the research project.

These issues are central to describing and analysing the circumstances surrounding this study. The outcome is that I acknowledge my own biases, interests and interpretations in the thesis as presented.

2.2 *Methodology*

A statement of any research methodology is not straightforward. Guba and Lincoln (1998, p. 195) suggest that ‘Questions of method are secondary to questions of paradigm, which we define as the basic belief system or worldview that guides the investigator, not only in choices of method but in ontologically and epistemologically fundamental ways’. Therefore, working within a qualitative, broadly interpretivist theoretical perspective, this study is located in a constructivist paradigm where the ontology is driven by the investigation of local and specific constructed realities, none of which are more or less true than others. The epistemology is transactional and anticipates created findings, and the methodology is hermeneutical and dialectical, refined through interactions between and among the research participants (Guba & Lincoln, 1998). All these ideas are discussed in this Act.

Before looking at these in more detail, it is timely to note the relationship between the project’s constructivist methodology and the critical pedagogy approach implicit through the focus on social justice as discussed in Act 1. The approach here is interpretive and constructivist rather than adhering to the expectations of critical pedagogy. This reflects my process of interpreting the perspectives of the participants (understanding and reconstruction) as they consider how to advance social justice in their teaching rather than promoting critical action (transformation and emancipation). However, the values of critical pedagogy are implicit in many aspects of this research.

The Hermeneutic Circle

Hermeneutics is the study of the interpretation of texts with a view to obtaining a valid and common understanding of the meaning of the text (Kvale, 1996). In the case of this research, the text is achieved through the transformation of both oral and written discourse into text to be interpreted. Implicit in this approach is the hermeneutic circle, originally conceived of by Heidegger (1927/1962). He sees the interviewer as an integral part of the research process, and the concepts and questions brought to the study by the researcher

as part of that process. Heidegger argues that an interpretive circle surrounds the research process and that ‘This circle of understanding is not an orbit in which any random kind of knowledge may move’ but a deliberate process and ‘What is decisive is not to get out of the circle but to come into it the right way’ (1927/1962, p. 195).

The goal, then, is to enter the hermeneutic circle in the right way ‘by placing the researcher and the subject in the center of the research process’ (Denzin, 2002, p. 354). Indeed, Denzin claims that there is potentially a double cycle as the subject tells a story which the researcher interprets from their own perspective and therefore the two interpretive structures interact.

Of central importance is the relationship between researcher and subject and between the parts and the whole. Kvale (1996, p. 47) says ‘the understanding of a text takes place through a process in which the meaning of the separate parts is determined by the global meaning of the text, as it is anticipated’. He suggests that getting to an understanding of the separate parts may change the anticipated meaning of the whole which subsequently impacts on the constitutive parts, and so on. Although potential exists for an infinite cycle, in practice the process is complete when a sensible, valid meaning – free of inner contradictions – is arrived at, though it is only one of many possible meanings.

The hermeneutic cycle helped me understand some moments of indecision and transition. For example, the thesis structure in Acts rather than chapters relates directly to a hermeneutic moment when the notion of ‘trouble’ at the centre of the thesis prompted consideration of the convergence between narratives, tales and trouble. Similarly, when discussing teaching for social justice and teaching for *being* with research participants, the theme of engagement was never explicit in the interviews because it had not featured in my early thinking. But in reviewing the transcripts, the synergies between the two and the centrality of engagement in achieving both became explicit and my phase two methodology altered accordingly, as discussed in Act 2.4.

So the hermeneutic cycle and its process of reflection were helping me reflect on the texts and develop some sensible, valid meaning, largely derived from investigating the participants' everyday worlds.

Everyday Life

In Act 1, I identified that the research focus is on everyday practices of tertiary teachers. This point is central when looking at the research participants and context. To encourage the participants to co-construct meaning from their engagement, the focus of the research is their everyday life-worlds as derived through interviews and online discussion.

Several writers note the importance of locating research in the everyday life of participants. Kvale (1996, p. 30) suggests that it is descriptions of the interviewees' lived worlds that are the primary focus of interpretive research and the interviewer 'seeks to interpret the meaning of the central themes in the life world of the subject'. Miniciello and others (1995, p. 69) contend that what interviewers 'are actually interested in is people's experience of social reality through their routinely constructed interpretations of it'. Building on these premises, Holstein and Gubrium (2004, p. 149) view the interview as an unfolding drama intent on developing an interpretive view of reality. 'From this perspective, interview participants are practitioners of everyday life, constantly working to discern and designate the recognizable and orderly features of the experience in question'.

Despite the focus on the participants' life-worlds, Johnson reiterates that the interviewer's role is also critical and that, in order to do justice to the research, it is important to consider the researcher's 'relationship to member knowledge and lived experience' (Johnson, 2001, p. 107). Without good knowledge of the context, the researcher may not elicit the best data from the process. This confirms my decision to research in my known context of tertiary education.

Charmaz provides a summary to this section on methodology and the importance of the research setting being life-worlds. She says:

I make the following assumptions: (a) Multiple realities exist, (b) data reflect the researcher's and the research participants'4 [sic] mutual constructions, and (c) the researcher, however, incompletely, enters and is affected by participants' worlds. This approach explicitly provides an interpretive portrayal of the studied world, not an exact picture of it (Charmaz, (2003, p. 314).

During the research, I encountered multiple, unexpected and confronting realities which persuaded me to think differently about some issues. I was also inevitably challenged by the fields of law, architecture, business and marketing education, that previously had held little meaning for me and though my immersion was necessarily cursory, the contexts of these foreign worlds created provocations.

2.3 *Narrative Process*

The focus on interpretation, co-construction of meaning and life-world settings led to a decision to utilise a narrative method of interview, data collection and analysis. This choice to use narrative was far from arbitrary. Narrative has the capacity for liberatory potential if it is compelling narrative (Rodriguez, 2002). Some of the criteria attributed to compelling narrative include the push they create to act upon the world (not dissimilar to the critical pedagogy approach named earlier), the challenge they provide to understand the consequences of actions, the capacity they offer to allow us to grapple with ambiguity, diversity and mystery, and the potential to speak to the commonality of being human. Ideally, compelling narratives ‘push us to be courageous, to be brave, to be strong. Compelling narratives inspire hope; give us new visions and dreams. We are encouraged to find new and different ways of being’ (Rodriguez, 2002, p. 5). This potential of narratives to accommodate ambiguity and diversity was a central consideration.

Dialogue, Dissonance and Divergence

Whilst I engaged in a process that allowed meaning to emerge and multiple interpretations to be negotiated, I am supremely aware that, as *author*, I retained *author-ity*. What is at issue here is the power the researcher has to engage in, analyse and describe particular circumstances and to reach definitive conclusions as to what is worthy of inclusion. Czarniawska (2004) suggests that the battle of emplotment, the telling of the story and the understanding of the plot, is a power battle, one that brings a number of voices into potential conflict. For there is a writer, there are characters and there are potentially multiple readers and the interplay between these is constant. Whose voice, whose interpretation prevails? Bruner (1996) suggests that narrative construction does not need to be adversarial and can indeed be counter-hegemonic with no version of the story dominating another but rather the possibility of legitimate negotiated meaning arising. Extending the ‘battle’ metaphor, he suggests there is no need to ‘go to war’ over multiple meanings but rather that they can be used to help understand possibilities.

These challenges meant that I needed to find ways for the research to be less authoritative and more interpretive in its representation. Nonetheless, the work essentially still reflects my choices in relation to inclusion, omission and analysis. Therefore the question I faced was not about whether I had ‘authorial’ power, but about how to use that power of textual representation wisely and morally to answer the research question.

Truth and Interpretation

Grappling with these issues led to considering the ways in which narrative could be used to examine and name particular issues, within the context of postmodernism. Richardson describes the *doubt* that is inherent in any postmodern analysis and the tendency to *suspect* all truth claims of serving particular interests. ‘What postmodernism does is to recognize the situational limitations of the knower. It recognizes that you have partial, local, temporal knowledge, and that is enough’ (Richardson, 2001, p. 35). This is a reminder that the content here does not necessarily make claims to universal knowledge or truth but describes and claims a place for a partial knowing, a situated interpretation in a moment in time. This does not make it any less valid. Writing is always partial and situational even when it is presented in terms of ‘objective’ science, as it always reflects the writer’s predispositions.

There is a sense in which narrative is a reflection of the humanity of those implicated in the text – writer, participants, readers. This allows a sense of freedom to do what Barone (2001, p. 7) suggests – to ‘promote a conversation between the author of the work, the various characters that inhabit it, and the story’s readers. As each brings a distinct perspective to the conversation, the likelihood of a singularly privileged, final, impartial, objective outlook is subverted’. He also notes that like all life narrative, ‘writing is rife with exaggerations, distortions, inconsistencies, contradictions, and imaginary constructions that disqualify it as a final, factual rendition of people and events’ (p. 178). These are realities of this thesis.

Uncertainty and Ambiguity

There are strong synergies between the study's overarching theme, the notion of uncertainty, the process of narrative inquiry and the approach that implicitly eschews intent to produce a substantive outcome. 'Abandoning an obsessive quest for certain and total knowledge that transcends a fallible, human perspective, they [writers] opt for an epistemology of ambiguity that seeks out and celebrates meanings that are partial, tentative, incomplete, sometimes even contradictory, and originating from multiple vantage points' (Barone, 2001, p. 152). In this study, therefore, I intend to enhance meaning rather than necessarily to reduce uncertainty. Uncertainty becomes certain when 'objectivity' and impartiality in research are abandoned as driving forces.

These potential multiple interpretations are not to be seen as problematic but rather offer 'productive ambiguity'. 'By productive ambiguity, I mean that the material presented is more evocative than denotative, and in its evocation, it generates insight and invites attention to complexity' (Eisner, 1997, p. 8). They also reflect Davies and Harré's (1990, p. 44) notion of multiple subjectivities because the participants' stories 'are located within a number of different discourses, and thus vary dramatically in terms of the language used, the concepts, issues and moral judgments made relevant and the subject positions made available within them'. Thus methodology and context converge and the decision to include literature from a number of differing epistemological positions is justified.

2.4 Research Design

The key themes of the project have been explained as uncertainty, performativity and education for social justice and the context is tertiary education. As discussed in Act 1, uncertainty and tertiary education give rise to the possibility of education for *being* as a way of producing graduate identities. These topics, together with the research participants, can be considered as the ‘substantive frame’ of the study (Weiss, 1994, p. 15). The research question therefore, as introduced earlier, is:

What are the professional, pedagogical and ethical issues around the production of graduate identities confronting teachers committed to social justice in contemporary tertiary institutions?

The notion of uncertainty was an underpinning theme for investigation but was purposefully not explicit in the question. The relationship is explored through the perspectives of the literature and the research participants.

Participant Selection

The participants are eight New Zealand tertiary education academics, four from education backgrounds and the other four from law, architecture, marketing and accounting. Education is my life-world, the discipline I am immersed in as a practitioner and theorist, so I wanted to interview educators. Those teaching in the field of education have generally had to confront issues of social justice more than many as this has been an integral component, particularly of teacher education, for many years. However, it was important to consider how these issues are handled in disciplines less accustomed to the regular inclusion of social justice, hence the range of participants. The individual academics were selected according to Weiss’s (1994) categorisation of a ‘panel of informants’ rather than a ‘sample of representatives’. They are not representative of any particular demographic but were selected purposively according to the following criteria: teaching in a New Zealand university or polytechnic; considered an excellent teacher by students, peers, or through nominations to

tertiary teaching excellence awards; and personally claim a social justice orientation in their teaching. Some were already known to me through my own teaching work and participation in national forums or through contacts in other institutions – New Zealand is a small country – and others were identified through excellence awards nominations or literature searches.

I convened a small reference group of academic colleagues to provide guidance on the final selection of candidates. They advised on the gender mix, range of disciplines, institutional type and distribution across the country. Identifying both ‘teaching excellence’ and ‘social justice orientation’ was challenging because, beyond the tertiary teaching excellence nominations, excellence is a very subjective category. As already introduced, interpretations of social justice are broadly diverse. All participants were asked a question about their social justice orientation and all considered this was a key driver of their work. This issue was the most complex and created some testing moments in the selection, interview, analysis and writing, as will become evident.

As it happens, the four education participants are all women, and the non-education participants are all men, though this was coincidental rather than planned. No participants were chosen specifically on the basis of ethnicity so there are no identified Maori² participants. This purposeful decision was made because adding indigenous teachers and including the significant debates in New Zealand about the distinctiveness of indigenous knowledge, research and pedagogy would have complicated an already complex methodology. The perspectives of participants were likely to be broadly differing without adding another defining variable. Clearly this provides a limitation for the research because it excludes a significant issue of social justice.

Academics in four universities and one polytechnic were ultimately selected and interviewed, though their institutional type was a matter of chance rather than specific choice, the primary focus being on the other identified criteria.

² Maori is the most commonly used name for the indigenous people of New Zealand, the tangata whenua (people of the land). It is not a term necessarily primarily used by Maori people themselves who prefer to name themselves according to tribal affiliations.

All but one participant were located in North Island³ institutions and location was more related to accessibility for a face to face interview with the participants than to achieving coverage across the country.

Despite the focus on graduate identity and the multivocality of the thesis, I chose not to interview students. My interest is on the work of teachers and, although students are ‘recipients’ of their endeavours, it is the conditions and perspectives of the teachers themselves that are of interest. This allowed me to focus on the research question and the academics’ beliefs and perspectives about pedagogy and social justice. How these were received by students is another research project.

My ethics approval, secured on 28 August, 2006, required me to use pseudonyms to protect the identity of participants, although most of them would have preferred to use their own names (see later reference in online method discussion). Each pseudonym used was selected by the participant.

The following table indicates the order of interviews, the participants (by pseudonym), their fields of study and their institutional types.

Order	Selected Pseudonym	Field of Study	Type of Institution
1	Jane	Early Childhood Teacher Education	University (1)
2	Betty	Continuing Professional Development	University (1)
3	Harry	Architecture	University (1)
4	Rose	Early Childhood Teacher Education	Polytechnic
5	Phillip	Marketing	University (2)

³ New Zealand has two main islands – the North Island and the South Island. The North Island has the largest population and the greatest number of tertiary institutions. I live in the North Island.

6	Carl	Accounting	University (3)
7	Turtle	Law	University (3)
8	Evangeline	Primary and Secondary Teacher Education	University (4)

They are a very disparate group whose perspectives are broadly diverse. Their stories are introduced later in this section.

The plain language statement and consent to participate are included as Appendix One and Appendix Two respectively.

Interviewing

In line with the focus of the research and the principles of constructivist and narrative approaches, interviewing reflects Kvale's traveller metaphor based on the original Latin meaning of conversation – ‘wandering together with’. ‘The traveler metaphor understands the interviewer as a traveler on a journey that leads to a tale to be told upon returning home. The interviewer-traveler wanders through the landscape and enters into conversations with the people encountered’ (Kvale, 1996, p. 4).

Holstein and Gubrium (2004, p. 151) develop the notion of conversation, suggesting that interviewers ‘converse in such a way that alternate possibilities and considerations come into play.’ They focus on a process that they call ‘active’ interviewing which represents a very interactive dynamic. Rubin and Rubin (2005, p. 14) offer the term ‘conversational partner’ suggesting that this term ‘has the advantage of emphasizing the active role of the interviewee in shaping the discussion and in guiding what paths the research should take’. Interviewing in this context is an exchange between equals and I attempted to adopt this practice during interviews.

In similar vein, Minichiello and others refer to the interview as:

a dialogue, an exchange of speeches between speakers. Their speeches will be intertextual, that is, they will refer to and comment on one another's material. Each speaker will speak from a sequence of position: maker of statements, answerer of questions, endorser of truths, critic of assumptions, and so on (Minichiello et al, 1995, p. 38).

This dynamic is implicit also in Mishler's (1986, p. 53) contention that the interview develops 'through mutual reformulation and specification of questions', suggesting a shared responsibility for the development of the interview exchange.

The issue of egalitarianism or, more specifically voice and power, are implicit in these approaches. Weiss (1994) notes the privileged role of the researcher but warns against failing to work with the respondent as partner or fighting to take control of the interview, both of which reduce the potential of the interview and the ultimate findings to truly capture the participants' perspectives. At the centre of the issue is the question of voice and ownership – whose and which story is most tellable? This reflects the complexities evident in the discussion of narrative power and also links with the issue of everyday life considered earlier. If the issue of voice is handled with respect and the researcher truly listens to the research participant, 'voice works at the level of everyday life ... whereas subject positions are what we imagine to be their operating standpoints' (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003, p. 21). I had to confront many of these challenges during the interviews and adapt my process to ensure I was respectful, reciprocal and aware of my own privileged position.

Kamler (2001), however, while generally supporting giving voice to participants, favours the concept of story rather than voice as she contends that stories are specific rather than abstract. They don't tell single truths but rather represent a truth, perspective or particular way of seeing experience and naming it. They are partial and located rather than universal. This sits more comfortably with the approach taken in this thesis where stories predominate. Therefore the interviews took an unstructured format where I asked initial questions and then followed participant interest and direction.

Process

The research process unfolded in two distinct phases.

Phase One

After contacting each participant by telephone and securing agreement to participate, I set up interviews with them in locations of their choosing. This reflected their geographical location around the country and honoured their busy lives and their own spaces. Research indicates that participants need to feel comfortable and able to operate to a certain extent on their own terms.

The first phase proceeded according to the plan as outlined in the ethics approval. I undertook one in-depth, face-to-face interview with all but one participant where the interview time (typically 90 minutes) was cut short and a subsequent follow-up interview was conducted. Wengraf (2001, p. 6), although taking a fairly analytical and relatively structured approach to interviewing, notes that ‘to go into something in depth is to get a sense of how the apparently straightforward is actually more complicated, of how the “surface appearances” may be quite misleading about “depth realities”’. This is all part of the mystery and unknowingness of interviewing and was definitely an issue in this research process.

Interviews took a semi-structured approach. In fact, Kvale (1996) makes a case for categorising all qualitative research interviews as semi-structured as he contends that they are never absolutely open conversation and the interviewer generally has a guide that focuses on particular themes and questions. The themes I focused on as a result of my early reading were:

- The participants’ responses to the notion of uncertainty:
 - What do you understand about uncertainty in relation to education?
 - How does uncertainty play out in classrooms?
 - What is the impact on teachers, students, knowledge?
- The principles underpinning the participants’ teaching philosophy:
 - What is ‘good’ teaching?

- What theory base underpins approaches to teaching?
- What principles guide teaching practice?
- Social justice orientation in participants' teaching:
 - How do you interpret teaching for social justice?
 - What principles does it infer?
 - How does it influence teaching practice?
 - What is the role and nature of content?
 - How is process implicated?
 - What does teaching for social justice look like in your classroom?
- The development of desirable dispositions in students:
 - What dispositions are being developed?
 - Why are these important dispositions?
 - How does this relate to education for being?
 - Is supercomplexity implicated?
- The challenges perceived by participants in educating for social justice:
 - How might the future unfold?
 - What are the institutional barriers?
 - What issues do students face?
 - What are the challenges for staff?
- The notion of hope in tertiary education:
 - In what ways is tertiary education hopeful?
 - What inhibits hope?
 - What creates hope?

These prompt questions were merely markers to guide engagement and each interview took its own path. In fact no questions were ever asked in this form or this order. Some unexpected issues arose from early interviews and guided later ones – specifically those related to performativity of the university and associated factors such as class size. These did not reveal themselves during early reading of the literature and therefore did not guide my initial questions. I aimed to explore and not interrogate (Charmaz, 2003), but I acknowledge my particular interest so interviews were never entirely free ranging.

Only some of the participants were familiar with Barnett's work. As he was the key theorist whose thinking underpins this thesis, I prepared a brief summary of his ideas around education for being and used this to introduce the topic for those who were unfamiliar and include this as Appendix Three. In doing so, I acknowledge that this was very little for the participants to go on and they had no real time to reflect or consider the full implications of the proposal. However, this appeared in the context of an interview that progressively opened up ideas that Barnett addresses.

The transcription and initial analysis of the narrative data occurred immediately following each interview. This served a dual purpose, allowing early identification of themes for exploration with other participants and therefore subsequent reshaping of the following interviews. It also meant I was able to return the interview transcripts to the participants soon after the interview for verification while the discussion was still fresh. Typically, transcripts were returned within about a week of interview. The entire phase one process was completed within three months at the end of 2006.

Kvale's (1996) traveller metaphor and the cues about the conversational approach to interviewing were critical reminders in the actual process. Before beginning the research interviews, I carried out two pilot interviews and recognised the more formal voice I adopted once engaged in the interview process – a situation I did not anticipate and needed to adapt so that the participants and I could engage in more relaxed conversation. Feedback from the pilot participants helped in subsequently refining my process and relaxing into an inter-view situation.

Phase Two

Phase two followed approximately seven months after the last interview was completed and after the themes arising from the data had been discerned. As I noted earlier, an important moment in the hermeneutic cycle occurred prior to this phase. During the process of analysis, an issue that became central was that of engagement in learning, engagement of students but also of teachers. This is a central theme in both the literatures of *being* and social justice and it

appeared too in the participant stories, though not always explicitly. Initially, I had intended to analyse all the responses to the first interview and map them against the literature, then offer my own proposal about the relationship between education for social justice and education for being for participant discussion in an online forum. This no longer seemed appropriate – not least of all because of the diversity of opinions of the participants. Attention to engagement as a unifying theme became the way forward. So the method remained but the focus altered. Phase two was the only opportunity the participants had to engage with each other on the key themes in the research.

The actual proposal put to participants is included as Appendix Four but they were asked to contribute in a two-phase process, the first phase being a personal narrative posting regarding student engagement and the second phase being a response to other postings. To manage this second phase, I set up a web-based discussion forum accessible by all participants utilising *Blackboard* – the web-based program used by my own institution. Entry to this discussion was by password so only the participants had access. It is possible within this forum to protect the identity of participants but all agreed to be identified to each other. This is not necessarily surprising amongst social justice educators, as alluded to earlier. As Lang observes, ‘Making the decisions to use our real names rather than pseudonyms in writing this paper [...] are acts of social justice. Using our real names could be viewed as a conscious act of owning what we said and striving to enact our beliefs in our practice’ (Sandretto, Lang, Schon & Whyte, 2003, p. 4).

The forum involved asynchronous computer-mediated discussion. Issues could be raised by any participant and responded to at any time by others thus offering the potential for collective creation of meaning. These participants have similar motivations but significantly diverging approaches so they were theoretically able to develop and refine theory as they went in response to each other, creating the intertextual speeches Minichiello and others (1995) refer to. Bauer (2002) notes some advantages of asynchronous online discussion. Though referring specifically to students, he suggests that they can utilise research, use direct quotations and make impressive cases. They can also ‘take

their time to reflect, to craft contributions thoughtfully, and pay strict attention to usage, grammar and spelling' (Bauer, 2002, p. 34). Althaus (1997) affirms the use of online discussions suggesting that an intellectual environment is created, encouraging active participation from all and equal opportunity for contribution. Pragmatically, there are other benefits of online discussion including the accuracy of the data (captured verbatim online), the elimination of transcription from this phase of the research and the potentially concise nature of the data (Franklin & Lowry, 2001).

After negotiation with all participants, I posted the proposal about engagement on the discussion forum and, to accommodate everyone's availability and work commitments, left it active for a period of six weeks (initially proposed for two weeks). Notwithstanding the pedagogical possibilities of online discussion noted above, this phase was one of the most difficult parts of the thesis. Despite initial negotiation, personal invitations and reminders and leaving the discussion open for six weeks, only four of the eight participated and only three of these responded to other postings. The three full contributors were all involved in education. The fourth did the initial posting but then apologised for not being able to participate further due to taking leave overseas. The software analysis function indicated that two others accessed the forum but did not participate in discussions (lurking). There are several potential reasons for this lack of participation. Benfield (2002) considers what constitutes effective online discussions and suggests that they need to have a structure and a clear reason for collaboration, both of which I believe were present. But having set up the discussion topic, I purposefully stood back to allow uninterrupted online voices and stories. Benfield (p. 1) warns that 'a good "facilitator" does not imply a passive one. The "e-moderator" must actively work to ensure online discussions engage students and lead to high quality educational outcomes', in this case well-intentioned but without the expected outcome of a dialogue between all participants.

Timing was possibly also an issue. Extending the forum over six weeks perhaps allowed for what Benfield proposes as providing 'a host of opportunities to procrastinate' (p. 3). He also notes that the 'most active and

effective online discussions are highly purposeful and task oriented' (p. 3). Though this phase was critical for me and I believe the brief was explicit, it was clearly less so for my participants who did not see any personal immediate value. With the exception of the three full contributors, they did not 'offer up valuable time to post their thoughts and suggestions' to others 'for philanthropic reasons' (p. 3) – in this case, my PhD.

In summary and potentially most importantly, parallels can be made with the key drivers for students in participation in online courses. 'Although some students may feel that a topic is inherently interesting, many will not and they will avoid participating unless compelled' (Benfield, 2002, p. 4). In essence, this means no assessment, no contribution. There was no compulsion for the participants to contribute, despite their consent to do so at the outset.

Despite my frustration at the second phase, the contributions of the four participants who did engage were generally thoughtful, responsive, respectful, targeted and extremely helpful and they form the basis of the discussions on engagement in Act 5. The inter-relationships amongst the participants offered some richness not so evident in the more formal interview situation.

2.5 *Narrative Analysis*

With both phases of data gathering complete, I immersed myself in the process of narrative analysis. Eisner (1997, p. 4) highlights eloquently an issue I faced early in the process.

One of the basic questions scholars are now raising is how we perform the magical feat of transforming the contents of our consciousness into a public form that others can understand [...] [T]he motives for such concerns emanate from the growing discontent with traditional conceptions of knowledge, conceptions that for many – especially younger scholars – have been regarded on the one hand as too restrictive to encompass and convey all that is important about education and on the other hand as preserving the status quo and the power of the methodologically enfranchised.

Speaking generally about educational research and specifically about narrative, Barone (2001) identifies the messiness of research and the complexities of interpretation. He talks of ‘perched precipitously on the rusty ledges of memory and perspective’ and ‘subjective, ambiguous, and fragmented character’, ‘adding layers of ambiguity to the text’, ‘conflicting analyses’ and his text being ‘rife with exaggerations, distortions, inconsistencies, contradictions, and imaginary constructions that disqualify it as a final, factual rendition of people and events’. Indeed he acknowledges that ‘elements of the real world have been selected and recombined – that is, manipulated [...]. As I wrestled with uncertainty I took heart in such acknowledgements, starting to get an appreciation that ‘Interpretation is an art; it is not formulaic or mechanical’ (Denzin, 1994, p. 502).

The Process of Narrative Analysis

I took some time to resolve how to progress the issue of narrative analysis. Clandinin and Connelly (2000, p. 132) offered some solace. They note that ‘The move from field texts to research texts is layered in complexity’ and warn against thinking there is a smooth transition from collecting to sorting to analysing. In familiar voice they reveal that ‘We return to them [research

texts] again and again, bringing our own storied lives as inquirers, bringing new research puzzles, and re-searching texts' (p. 132).

A very fortuitous reading by Mauthner and Doucet (1998) indicated a direction. They note that there has been an increase in attention to qualitative data analysis throughout the 1990s but;

[...] would nevertheless maintain that, compared to other stages of the research process, such as entering the field or data collection methods, data analysis is still largely neglected. Of particular concern is the relative paucity of guidance in the literature, the lack of training on data analysis, the difficulties of finding appropriate support, mentoring and supervision from other researchers, and the increasing move to equate computer 'coding' with qualitative data 'analysis' (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998, pp. 119-120).

Given the earlier exhortations for flexibility, innovation and boundary-crossings, it would seem appropriate that there are no 'rules' for analysis, just as there are diminishing rules for methodology itself. But, for those who are novices in the field, clear guidance about how to approach analysis is warranted, particularly as much of the 'validity' of research must be justified on its rigorous analysis. Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 10) are explicit about this, noting that 'the strengths of qualitative data rest very centrally on the competence with which their analysis is carried out'.

Riessman (2002, p. 217) notes that narrative is 'inherently interdisciplinary' and 'does not fit neatly within the boundaries of any scholarly field'. Clearly, the 'crisis of representation' continues. Geertz's (1983) 'blurred genres' are still in place. Confusion (and near-anarchy according to Mishler, 1995) potentially reigns. But, as we have seen, the door is open for new, inclusive, approaches and methodologies and there will remain common commitments despite the inability of the stories of the past to speak to us in the future (Denzin, 1994). Mishler (1995, p. 117) optimistically notes that 'As the field of narrative research continues to develop, it is important to pursue alternative, more inclusive strategies that would provide a more comprehensive and deeper understanding both of how narratives work and of the work they do'.

Making Narratives

Armed with this encouragement, a way forward crystallised. Mishler (1995, p. 117) says, ‘It is clear that we do not *find* stories; we *make* stories’. This indicates that the researcher/writer has a powerful role in deciding what we make of narrative. Similarly, Riessman (2002, p. 218) notes that ‘Nature and the world do not tell stories, individuals do’. Denzin (1994, p. 500), says ‘In the social sciences there is only interpretation. Nothing speaks for itself’. Research stories are therefore socially and contextually constructed and there is nothing straightforward about them. So the stories we tell **and** the way we tell them are socially constructed. Benjamin cited in Burman (2003, p. 280), notes that modes of storytelling reflect their time and place: ‘each sphere of life has, as it were, produced its own tribe of storytellers’ (Benjamin, 1955/1973, p. 84) and ‘the traces of the storyteller cling to the story the way the handprints of the potter cling to the clay vessel’ (p. 91). Those writing narratives can now fashion new ways of writing stories, ways that define our period of time and reflect our personalities, preferences and possibilities.

Acknowledging that the making of the story is not complete when the writing is done, Barone (2000) is explicit too about the relationship between reader and writer. He reminds us not to view the text as a noun, as a complete and finished thing but rather as a verb, as an ongoing interaction between writer and reader. With reference to Bakhtin (1981), Barone talks about the third set of agents (beyond the characters and the writer) that are a construction of the writer and reconstruction of the reader. So there are only story constructions, not mirror images of reality. Miller and Glassner (2004, p. 126) relate this to the broader context of qualitative research when they note that research ‘cannot provide the mirror reflection of the social world that positivists strive for, but it may provide access to the meanings people attribute to their experiences and social worlds’.

So, in narrative the story is about those interviewed, about the stories they tell, the contexts in which they live and the worlds they inhabit. It is about the broader theoretical terrain and its relationship to the lives and stories of the characters. It is also about reconstructed selves (Barone, 2000). And Barone

(p. 254) cites Bakhtin (1981) when he notes that ‘boundaries between selves are illusory, that there are no stable identities, and so we all inevitably speak in many possible voices, for ourselves and for each other’.

Narrative analysis, as I approached it, mirrors Denzin’s (1994) notion of life and method being intertwined. Whatever we write is conditioned by our social, cultural, political and educational experiences. We are ‘storytellers and characters in [our] own and others’ stories’ (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 2).

Narratives that appear here, therefore, are multi-voiced texts. They are my own and others’ stories melded together through the research process. They are tentative, incomplete, made and not found and they exude ambiguity, uncertainty, tentativeness and mystery. While my analysis is alert to seeking synergies and aligning stories, this is not always achieved, nor, I argue, possible. That makes the narratives no less valid than other research. The difference is that I am explicit about that uncertainty, as is becoming the expectation. In fact, Brunner says narrative is ‘expressed uncertainty’ and she does not use any one method of analysis because ‘no such theory, philosophy, or method may provide the ultimate lens for making sense of this work, for writing this text, or for understanding anything today, tomorrow, or in the future’ (Brunner, 1994, p. 18).

This is consistent with the nature of this thesis and the decision to include multiple epistemologies in its text. There are no ultimate tellings, no single truths, no uncontested assumptions. ‘Understanding and mystery are central to the writing project’ (Denzin, 1994, p. 505).

I conclude here with reference to Brunner who speaks of the complex relationship between theory and practice and notes that tensions exist ‘partly because theories, research and practice do seem to be more contradictory than complementary’ (Brunner, 1994, p. 17).

What may seem to be comfort with uncertainty is but a reflection of what I wish were true; what I am learning, however, may be called

more appropriately a patience with uncertainty. And it is perhaps this patience that encourages me to take up various theoretical perspectives even those that seem opposed (Brunner, 1994, p. 20).

Narrative analysis, as it is presented here, required patience with uncertainty and does indeed cross boundaries. My participants do not inhabit a singularly defined world. The stories here represent a range of theoretical paradigms and the interpretation is all the richer for that. ‘Any gaze is always filtered through the lenses of language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity [...] no single method can grasp the subtle variations in ongoing human experience’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 25). So the reader will find thoughts and concepts inspired by critical theory, postmodern and poststructural analyses, feminist approaches, narrative theory and much more, for this is a reflection, though not a mirror, of reality. The gaze is filtered and far from fixed.

Approaching analysis

Over the years, and more recently in the context of struggling to write this chapter, we have pondered why writing about data analysis, in both theoretical and practical terms, is such an elusive task. The latter stages of data analysis, which tend to be structured, methodical, rigorous and systematic, are often easily described. For example, once a critical set of issues has been identified, the data are systematically scanned for examples of particular themes. However, the initial stages of actually getting to know the data and identifying what are the key issues feel more intuitive than anything else (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998, p. 121).

Novice researchers may be less inclined to sit comfortably with intuition. I was experiencing that the early phases of analysis can ‘feel messy, confusing and uncertain because we are at a stage where we simply do not know what to think yet’ (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998, p. 122). Mauthner and Doucet describe how the feeling of uncertainty is indeed normal because the whole point of data analysis is to not know, to learn from the data. But they also warn that this is a deeply uncomfortable time and that a profound level of self-awareness is required. Being aware that one is ‘not knowing’ is a troubling position and one that is heightened by the expectation that one should ‘get it right’.

One thing was clear to me and that was that my own ‘feeling voice(s)’ would be implicit in this analysis (Ribbens, 1998) because to deny them would be to create a dishonest analysis. So I was immediately engaged when reading about a particular version of ‘voice-centred relational method of data analysis’. In this approach, described as grounded in relational ontology, the intention is to explore ‘individuals’ narrative accounts in terms of their relationships to the people around them and their relationships to the broader social, structural and cultural contexts within which they live’ (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998, p. 126). Also implicit in this approach is an expectation that I, as interviewer/analyst, would also be listening for my own responses to the text and to the positions taken by the research participants. All these issues are congruent with the themes of this thesis and the methodological and interpretive approaches already described. The hermeneutic circle is evident, with the key issue being the relationships between all.

The Four Readings

In this approach to analysis, up to four readings of the text are undertaken. In the first, the intention is to read for the plot and for the reader’s response to the narrative. The former part of this phase is not dissimilar to many other research approaches where themes and plots are derived through the initial analysis. But the latter expectation deviates markedly from some approaches.

The first reading of the interview text thus represents an attempt to come to know our response to the respondent and her or his story. The underlying assumption here is that by trying to name how we are socially, emotionally and intellectually located in relation to our respondents we can retain some grasp over the blurred boundary between their narratives and our interpretation of those narratives. If we fail to name these emotions and responses, they will express themselves in other ways such as in our tone of voice or the way in which we write about that person (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998, pp. 127-128).

In the second reading, the focus is on locating the ‘voice of the I’ – the ways in which the research participant speaks and feels about herself, where she stays in the ‘I’ and where she shifts the focus to the third person or the generic ‘we’. The intention is to acknowledge and validate ‘the respondents’ multi-layered

voices, views, and perspectives rather than simply and quickly slotting their words into either our own ways of understanding the world or into the categories of the literature in our area' (p. 130). This was an invaluable realisation for me, encouraging me to deviate slightly from the method as described. As part of the first reading, it is suggested that the particular themes and subplots are noted and named. While I did note key recurring words and ideas, I purposefully did not record and analyse themes and plots/subplots at this point. I felt that this had the potential for me to begin to interpret from the perspective of my reading and my interview themes rather than to listen legitimately for the participant's voice and important relationships. I chose to leave this phase of naming themes until after I had concluded the four readings. This is consistent with van Manen's (1997, p. 88) suggestion that a 'theme gives shape to the shapeless' and reflects an openness to something.

These two first phases are considered the keys to the relational voice-centred approach. Two further readings are encouraged, depending on the nature and intent of the research. In the third reading, the analyst listens for reference to interpersonal relationships that are explicit or implicit in the participant stories. The final reading serves to place participants, as a result of their accounts and experiences, in particular cultural contexts and social structures.

Overall the four readings of the interview transcripts emphasize the multi-layered nature of narratives and trace voices across and within a particular transcript. This approach is fundamentally different to the thematic organization characteristic of most methods of data analysis, including those assisted by computer programs. It delays the reductionist stage of data analysis when transcripts are cut up into themes and aggregated [...] this approach respects and to some extent exposes the relationship between research and researched (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998, pp. 134-135).

Engaging in these multiple readings threw up many unexpected issues and interpretations and offered insights that might have otherwise been invisible with a more traditional form of analysis.

This was my key analytical approach and allowed me to get a sense of both the wholeness of each participant's story and the thematic particularities. I

subsequently used other methods to unpack the data and investigate relationships including: mapping responses onto Barnett's descriptors of engagement; noting where the participant pedagogies articulated with the various social justice pedagogies; cross-referencing components of each story with the overall interview and with other interviews; noting where synergies within an interview existed and where potential conflicts or inconsistencies were evident; and mapping each story against the revealed subplots. The time spent in analysis honoured the themes discussed in this section. I was searching for rigour yet accepting of epistemological uncertainty. I was equally alerted to methodological issues that are required to 'prove' that rigour, issues now attended to.

2.6 Troubling Matters

No methodology occurs without attention to troubling issues. This project had its share to consider.

Ethical Issues

Like all research, this project is imbued with potential ethical dilemmas and considerations. Punch (1998) believes that the roots of ethical considerations lie in attempts to protect subjects in biomedical research and that this has become the model for the social sciences. At times, this can appear to place unnecessary barriers in the way of the researcher, as in the case of the issue of informed consent which can reduce participation rates and skew samples. Punch notes that the whole issue of ethics is a swamp and there is no map as there is no consensus on what is public and private, what constitutes harm and what the benefits of knowledge are.

Despite such challenges, the key focus of ethics is on issues of harm, consent, deception, privacy and confidentiality of data. All of these issues were considered in the progression of this study. Guba and Lincoln (1998) identify that ethics are intrinsic to constructivist research because of the inclusion of the participants' values in the inquiry. They are so central to both the process and the outcomes that it is critical to ensure that their perspectives are ethically represented, despite the analytical complexities fully articulated here. However, the researcher is implicated too and it is an ethical imperative for the researcher to examine their own ideas (Johnson, 2001).

All participants provided informed consent prior to the study and were ensured confidentiality, with the exception of the online discussion as noted earlier. Utilising online research methods does raise some particular ethical issues to do with public and private information, confidentiality and anonymity but, fortunately, these were not ever implicated in the closed, small group who participated in my discussion, and made clear in the process of consent.

Accuracy of Representation

Guba and Lincoln (1998) note that positivist and postpositivist research paradigms still exercise hegemony over critical theory and constructivist research, while acknowledging recent movement on this issue. As validity is a term primarily associated with positivist research, new rhetoric is required in relation to validity in qualitative research (Mishler, 1986). Mishler notes that in positivist research there is an assumption of one ‘true’ interpretation of data whereas now there is an acknowledgement and, to some degree, acceptance of difference. To ensure attention to issues of validity – or more appropriately, accuracy of representation – a number of strategies can be used.

These include the care with which the research process, for example, observing and interviewing, is carried out and documented; the specification of rules that guide analysis; the explication of a theoretical framework and of the ways inferences and interpretations of analyses are grounded in and related to it; the judgements of various interested audiences, including the subjects of a study, as to the plausibility and meaningfulness of interpretations (Mishler, 1986, p. 113).

These considerations were attended to in the development of the proposal, the subsequent research process itself and, particularly my approach to analysis.

Whereas validity formerly referred to particular research techniques and procedures, of greater interest now is the relationship of the research to the things it is intended to be an account of (Maxwell, 2002). Therefore understanding is a central and fundamental concept. There are indeed multiple perspectives expressed both in the literature and through the narratives of the participants and thus there is polyvocal representation of these in the subsequent sections and stories.

The research design has been constructed with an eye to ensuring accuracy of representation and respect and honouring of the research participants’ perspectives. Arskey and Knight (1999) offer some very practical advice in this regard including: utilising interviewing techniques that build rapport, trust and openness; not asking irrelevant questions; using prompts that encourage informants to illustrate, expand and clarify; and, using a sample that is fit for

the purpose of the research. Working in the context of uncertainty as this study does, there is additional rationale for avoiding ‘truths’ in favour of honouring narratives and perspectives and representing accurately.

Conclusion

Research, particularly for the novice, provides all manner of challenges which, if handled effectively, can enhance the final outcomes of the project. In this section I have made explicit the challenges I encountered . I have outlined my approach to the research inquiry, commented on theoretical frameworks that influenced and defined it and located myself and the participants in the study. I have also fully examined the process of analysis and latterly reflected on some of the ethical and representational considerations that were rigorously applied to ensure the research achieved its potential.

However, despite these assertions, the nature and form of the inquiry were necessarily tentative. I would not have been true to my research intent if they were not so, nor to the voices and desires of the participants. This intent was to create a ‘good story’, a compelling narrative and a rigorous piece of academic work. My task included the need to listen for gaps, silences and contradictions (Chase, 1995), my own and others’. They were evident at various times, particularly with some participants who held views quite different from my own. They arose in multiple places in the interview process and in the analysis phase of the research. Nowhere were the gaps more evident than in the online discussion and that was a challenging situation and one that, as researcher, I had to grapple with in terms of its impact on the overall study.

Throughout this section I have highlighted the importance of valuing the stories and perspectives of the participants. I now move to a fuller introduction to these people. The following section can be perceived as a social courtesy similar to introducing some new arrivals at a party. I don’t attempt to analyse or deconstruct these people or their responses in any detail here but do so more thoroughly in subsequent sections.

2.7 Introducing the Participants

With due respect for the caution expressed by Burman (2003) when she reminds me to attend to how I assume the voice of another in narrative, I now introduce each of the research participants using a combination of their own stories and my interpretation and retellings of their stories. Finely balanced here is the issue of presenting the stories and analysing the stories, with the emphasis on presentation offering the opportunity to represent authentic, undistorted narratives.

In creating these vignettes, I use some of the material that arose out of my fourth reading of the texts (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998). This reading focused on placing participants, as a result of their accounts and experiences, in particular cultural contexts and social structures. My interpretation is supported by each participant's own narrative. These stories provide context for the participant responses that appear later in the thesis and are but one story that could be told about the participants. They are, therefore, unstable tellings.

The stories of the participants appear in Verdana font. Where **bold** text is used, this acknowledges the emphasis given to the words by the participants during the interview.

Betty's Story

Betty works in the professional development department in a university. She is the only participant whose primary work is not currently teaching students. She is, however, involved in teaching classes in the university in a qualification for academic staff members so her students in these classes are colleagues and peers. Betty therefore plays a dual role as teacher and staff developer, as well as engaging in supervision of postgraduate students. She has mixed feelings about these roles but enjoys some aspects of the flexibility and freedom.

[...] one of the reasons I want to stay working in the field I work and don't want to jump ship across to education, is that I've got

quite a lot of discretion and have had historically, I always feel that this will be closed down any minute now, but so far I still have quite a lot of discretion about where I do my work, and so I have been able to choose to work on projects that reflect, um, my interests and commitments to social justice curricula in relation to women, perhaps and Maori and Pasifika⁴ communities. So that's one of the really **strong** opportunities that my current position offers me so being able to work with academic women [...] So I am able to choose to advance projects and agendas that actually, and I've always done stuff on the edges that I'm kind of interested in, from that kind of slightly broader perspective as well. And I can go about those things in ways that **are** more participatory and collaborative because they are not tangled up inside courses for credentials which is what the other work **is** tangled up inside of so it is fraught for those reasons I suppose.

Betty was previously a tutor in the university student learning centre but she acknowledges that her location outside of a school of education limits her ability to prove herself as a scholar (see Clegg, 2008). She is a capable academic and is well respected for her teaching and theorising but she notes feelings of pain, alienation and exclusion in her experiences of becoming an academic and being included in the community of the academy – a process she does not feel is complete.

I suppose my own position in the academy was, kind of sneaking as a staff member really, I snuck in because I started working in a small group with the student learning centre as a student and gradually my student-ness shrank as my staff-ness grew and only last year, in September or July whenever it was I had my viva, did it finally kind of shift to a point where I was no longer kind of a student at the same time as being a staff member in a reasonably marginal position – both marginal because my actual contractual position is a senior tutor one which is second citizen position in the university and also marginal because I've been located in the

⁴ Pasifika is a generic term used to describe collectively groups of people from a range of Pacific Islands.

student learning centre and the continuing professional development department and so marginal in that I'm seen not to be a real [...] I had that real mixed reaction [...] of grief that I will never be a regular education academic, so that I don't actually really want to be one either because I actually really **like** the work that I do.

Recently, Betty completed her own doctoral studies and the interview with her tapped into some strong, painful memories around that and its relationship to her feelings of inclusion in the academy (see Archer, 2008).

But yes, the painfulness of this is something to kind of notice and to think 'this is interesting and what does this mean for people in higher education generally?' Not just me, other people in higher education who for one reason or another are not taking the traditional pathway in their academic work or their career or whatever.

In our conversations, Betty owns being a feminist and also claims commitment to poststructural preferences which influence her teaching practices. She also adheres to many principles of critical theory and claims a social justice orientation to her teaching. She is thoughtful about students and considers issues of access, participation and privilege in relation to her own teaching and in relation to students generally. She celebrates the work she engages in with other women in the academy and enjoys the opportunity to play a key role in writing retreats for women. She also challenges other academics on marginalising practices.

Betty is an eloquent, provocative and scholarly participant in this project who engages deeply with the issues and relishes the opportunity to think and talk about her work. She speaks powerfully in the 'I' for most of the interview.

Carl's Story

Carl is an English immigrant who has been working in New Zealand for many years. He was an accountant and came to teaching almost by accident. Carl now works in the management school of a university where he is an associate professor. He took his pseudonym from Carl Rogers who has had a huge influence on his teaching approaches. Carl is highly critical of the role of accounting in business and believes that it utilises some unethical practices. This is one of his drivers – to ensure that future generations of accountants behave ethically.

[...] a lot of my teaching is about how decisions are made in society and how accounting is used to support a lot of decisions that are made and the accounting process is both used and abused in society. So, ah, I hope that many of the students who graduate do realise what responsibility they have to make sure that accounting is properly used in the future.

Although he lives in an arguably bicultural nation and works in an institution that strives to honour this, Carl does not agree with bicultural approaches to teaching. He sees this as privileging Maori. He concedes that having some Asian students in class is good but too many come with English difficulties and the teaching is not satisfying.

Carl's major intention in teaching is to produce 'good citizens' though he doesn't actually define what this means. Carl names himself as an existentialist and this is his primary teaching motivation.

Well, in my paper outline I've got what I aim to do in my class and the number one objective is to produce good citizens. So, good teaching is getting them to become the best citizens that they can be. But, um, [...] they don't come to university to become good citizens so, I mean, I'm not always popular [...]

Carl challenged my perceptions of what a teacher with social justice orientation might believe in and do, though he has some connections with some of the goals of social justice. He says social justice is not a term he would use.

Carl says he feels honoured to be asked to contribute to my research and had expected that I would be sympathetic to his views. The interview offers him the opportunity to rethink his teaching practices.

Evangeline's Story

Evangeline is an immigrant who completed her postgraduate studies in New Zealand and has subsequently gone on to teach in the Faculty of Education in a university where she is primarily involved in teacher education. She teaches a range of education subjects including Treaty⁵ education.

I've been at the university since mid 1999. I was a research assistant, I was a guest lecturer, I was a PhD student and now I'm a lecturer. I've lectured mostly in Ed Studies papers, some teacher education papers, some Bachelor of Education papers [...] Foundations of Education 101, Educational Policy and Maori Education, Family Issues and Culture in Education, Gender Issues in Education and my postgrad paper is Researching Personal Practice.

Despite her American heritage, Evangeline is a New Zealand citizen and considers herself a Treaty partner. She is an active teacher for social justice although, by her own estimation, she focuses on classroom processes that support social justice rather than necessarily including significant social justice content in her classes. She holds firm views on the role of process in the university classroom and is quick to challenge positions which construct good teaching as something that can only happen in small classes. She highlights

⁵ New Zealand has a founding document, the Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840 between representatives of the Crown and representatives of the Maori people. The Treaty has current legislative authority. Many New Zealanders regard themselves as 'Treaty Partners' if they adhere to the principles agreed to in the Treaty of Waitangi and endeavour to honour and reflect them in their lives.

tensions between those who come from a College of Education⁶ and those from traditional university situations.

Evangeline is very familiar with the social justice literature, refers to it easily and relates readily to the notions included there. She considers issues of redistribution and recognition but seems primarily concerned with relational aspects of social justice and has some strong opinions on how these play out in the classroom. Her sympathy with poststructural theory is evident, though she also indicates connections with other theoretical positions including critical theory and feminist theorising.

Evangeline acknowledges the challenges of social justice education and the toll it can take on teachers. She affirms the importance of seeking support and leading a balanced life.

I guess in some ways it's about being a bit selfish, it's about looking after yourself, it's about having a life outside academia, it's about not staying up to 11 o'clock every night working and not doing it on the weekends, and letting your family see you and have time, work life balance is a bit trite but nonetheless. It is **really, really** important.

Despite being strongly committed to social justice education and having researched in this area, Evangeline, as is typical of many, downplays her contribution. She speaks of her reticence about being interviewed about social justice and is concerned that she is, or could be perceived as, a 'fraud' because she maybe talks about rather than enacts a socially just pedagogy. My sense is that Evangeline is absolutely not a fraud and is an articulate and committed educator for social justice who offers very valuable provocations that will become evident in the thesis.

⁶ Colleges of Education are institutions for teacher education (typically primary and secondary teacher education). In New Zealand all colleges of education have, in recent years, merged with local universities and cease to exist as independent entities.

Harry's Story

Harry is a British immigrant to New Zealand who has been teaching in an architecture faculty in a university for quite some time. His own architecture education was in Britain in the 1970s and he locates his current attitudes in relation to that period of time. He notes that the prevailing attitudes then and now are markedly different.

It's [social justice orientation] probably there to some extent, yea it bobbles around but, it's currently kind of unfashionable, I guess when I was a student in the 70s and 80s sociology was a kind of, had a kind of impact on architectural education. You know there was a kind of, because of the politics current at the time, I was also in the UK, there was a kind of understanding of kind of you know, urban housing, collectivised kind of housing, affordable housing, the occupation of cities that really kind of disappeared in the 80s and 90s. And I think in [this city] we don't really have that understanding, it's still very much about making [...] a cool place to live for people who can afford to live here.

Harry comments that we live in a time of opportunistic capitalism and that this tends to define the way we go about doing a number of things, including education. He sees himself aligned in some ways with his colleagues, his institution and the profession but is also able to see and articulate multiple ways in which he finds the norms and expectations constraining and in opposition to his values. He is very articulate on the subject of the predominant attitudes to architecture and city planning and actively pursues alternate approaches and ideals in his own teaching.

I guess also in architecture, in [this city] anyway, there's been a kind of shift recently towards thinking in terms of kind of urban design [...] and the debate has been kind of led by politicians and architects who are really looking at a kind of formalistic, on one hand a kind of formalistic view of what a city should be and, on the other hand, a kind of corporate understanding of what a city should be and, if you look at the kind of discussion about urban design

[here], they're really trying to create this kind of real estate based view of the city. You know, to **attract** investment, to **attract** certain kinds of workers, certain kinds of people into the city centre and I think there's a responsibility in any school of architecture to kind of try and question that in terms of, you know, we're not trying to build a city that real estate agents would love, we're not trying to build a city that corporates would love, you know. And so what, how might we kind of deal with kind of ordinary people living [here] who now can't afford to live in the centre that we're trying to build up?

Harry is fully aware of changing student demographics and also of the selection processes that determine which students are accepted and successful in architecture education. He holds some sympathies for Bourdieu's notions of cultural and social capital, referring to them in the interview, and is aware that students who have 'taste' that is consistent with the dominant norms are likely to succeed. He tries to expose his students to a range of interesting alternatives to those which define architecture ensuring that women's and alternate cultural views are considered.

Harry holds some strong sympathies with social justice goals though he prefers to consider them in terms of ethical practice. He applies these both to architecture and to education.

As a participant, Harry ranges widely over a number of issues and areas that are unfamiliar and challenging for me and his interview probably most closely resembles Kvale's (1996) traveller metaphor with him often wandering off to new places. I was very comfortable travelling with Harry.

Jane's Story

Jane works in the Faculty of Education of a large university as an early childhood teacher educator. Her institution (previously a College of Education) merged and she is now experiencing some of the challenges of

shifting into the university culture. Jane is pakeha⁷ but has strong commitment to Treaty education and sees herself as a Treaty partner. She has worked long term in Treaty education and seen many changes and challenges evident there.

Jane is lesbian and sometimes struggles with what that might mean for her in terms of disclosure with students. Her feminist ideals continue to influence her approaches to teaching. Her history is a strong influence on who she currently is and how that impacts on her teaching.

I sort of came through the women's movement in the 70s, started going to women's groups and [...] increased my awareness of fairness, equity and all those sorts of issues. And there's something also around feminism that links [...] People belonging to marginalised groups can affiliate and can therefore be more powerful and when I look back on the history of what happened around the Springbok Tour⁸ there were, you know, women's groups that got together to protest against the Springbok Tour for example, and it was through the Springbok Tour in **my** personal history [...] that I became aware, more aware of Treaty issues [...] it would have been after that that I came out as a lesbian but being involved in women's groups and being involved in lesbian groups there was a lot of political action, so the political action brings an awareness of greater, brings greater insights I suppose.

Jane's history in early childhood education has led to her holding some ongoing beliefs about how education should be and she sees strong parallels between early childhood education and learning for student teachers – the principles are the same. She believes people (children and adults) don't learn if they don't feel safe.

Jane indicates a general comfort with being an educator for social justice but

⁷ White or non-Maori New Zealanders, primarily those from European descent.

⁸ In 1981, the Springboks, the touring rugby team from South Africa, divided New Zealanders and New Zealand in a way not seen before in relation to issues of apartheid, politics and sport. This marks a critical moment in New Zealand's political history.

admits that doing this the way she wants to has challenges in an institutional context. She names power issues, timetabling, class sizes, content demands, and student expectations as barriers to engaging fully in investigating issues of social justice more deeply in her teaching. She also names her own reticence to challenge too deeply for fear of alienating or being alienated. Nevertheless, she sees a wide range of ways in which social justice education can be ‘woven’ into tertiary teaching, or rather teacher education.

Jane calls her own practices into question. She found the interview process, initially daunting, a valuable opportunity to think about, articulate and question her own practice. Despite Jane’s concern that ‘I won’t have anything to say’, by her own admission she:

[...] found that I had plenty to say and [...] I was pleased that my ideas about it were reasonably well formed when I went to talk about it [...]

Jane is able to clearly articulate her thoughts around teaching and social justice.

Phillip’s Story

Phillip is an associate professor in a marketing department in a university. He is British but has been in New Zealand for some time. He won a New Zealand tertiary teaching excellence award for his teaching innovations and it was on this basis (his biography and subsequent discussion during invitation to participate suggested a social justice orientation) that I interviewed him for this study. He is clearly passionate about his teaching.

Phillip has worked with large classes of up to 300 students though seldom does so now. Most of his teaching is with honours and masters students. He is very aware of the constraints large classes put on students, or rather on teachers who may want to introduce challenging issues.

Phillip believes his discipline does place constraints on him. He talks about hard and soft sciences and is quite convinced that his discipline (a hard science

by his definition) demands particular outcomes of university teaching that might not impact on other disciplines. He comments on the need for quick responses and adaptability and profitability. So the demands for students are also different and demanding in Phillip's view.

I mean marketing is a classic if we take the standard economics view of marketing, the role of an organisation is to make money. Full stop. But hang on, there are all these other issues of corporate social responsibility, moral and ethical issues in marketing decision-making. Hence we have the role of things like the advertising complaints authority. The fair trading act. There are all these issues that have to come into play.

Phillip is cautious about challenging students as individuals in the context of large university classes and calls into question how appropriate this is in university settings. He facilitates independently in other contexts outside the university (though is not explicit about the specifics) where he feels he can investigate this territory more acceptably with participants.

It's interesting the set of words [resilience, criticality, adaptability, flexibility] that you've just used there, are, um, there's another side of my life that are far more familiar to me in the context of life skills. And not necessarily words that we tend to use a lot in a tertiary education system. Which is quite interesting.

The interview process seems unsettling to Phillip who is perhaps not anticipating my particular questions and focus around social justice.

I've been possibly calling it [social justice] something else, you know, related to my sort of moral issues or approach that I take in my teaching. So from that perspective, it's provoked and brought up to the surface some issues that are very, very easy just to let settle and, you know, push over there. So you go back to think about the most effective way to deliver content and not these other

issues. But I **really**, it does still represent a major teaching challenge in a very, very large undergraduate class.

His perspectives offer me many provocations about social justice education in the context of commerce. Phillip, more than any other participant, converses in the ‘we’ throughout our discussion.

Rose's Story

Rose is the only participant in the study who works in a polytechnic⁹ rather than a university. She is an early childhood teacher educator and this background in early childhood education permeates her practice and her philosophies of teaching, in a similar manner to Jane.

She articulates that she believes the principles of *Te Whariki*¹⁰ are valid for use with adults in teacher education as well as for children. This means that she is driven by a commitment to the development of reciprocal and responsive relationships and seeks this at the centre of her teaching practice.

We have this wonderful statement in *Te Whariki* about responsive, reciprocal relationships, you know and there it is in an early childhood curriculum but it's **equally** important for adults. And I think if students see that you'll go the extra mile for them – that's not to say that at a certain point I don't say 'well that's it', and with some students that moment comes – but they see that you'll go the extra mile and I do things like, this semester I ran a tutorial for people who are still obviously struggling to write. Now, although that's not part of hours or what I'm required to do, it just seemed to me that when you pick up students like that who are obviously struggling, you need to target one to one.

⁹ Teacher education is still delivered in a number of polytechnics in New Zealand.

¹⁰ *Te Whariki* is the New Zealand early childhood curriculum framework, an internationally leading edge approach to early childhood education. Its principles focus on empowerment, holistic development, family and community, and responsive and reciprocal relationships.

Rose is very concerned with issues of gender and this is an integral part of her teaching. But she is primarily interested in her role as a Treaty partner and educator and this is one of the principal influences on her teaching. The bicultural aspects of her teaching also impact on her approaches to multicultural education. As a pakeha New Zealander, she is aware of the importance of acknowledging the role of dominant beliefs on those from minority groups and she attempts to address this in her teaching.

I think I have a very strong gender lens. I would say the other lens, of course, is my work as a Treaty educator. And there I think it's about people learning some history, and I'm passionate about that because I don't think we teach that well. Children are coming through our education system and **still** do not know, you know what happened in relationship to the indigenous people. And so, don't understand the conflicts, and, or the positive things that are happening around that now, in the 21st century.

Because she works in a polytechnic, Rose works with smaller groups of students than most others who have an undergraduate teaching role and who bemoan the difficulties of lecturing to large classes. She rejects the notion of lecturing and creates class situations that are open, supportive and yet challenging, encouraging students to take responsibility for their own learning.

So, in that respect, because we're sharing those experiences and doing that, we're constructing knowledge together so I'm, part of my, I'm a constructivist in that sense so we're creating knowledge and building knowledge, not just reproducing knowledge and that's important to me. And then, I don't see, as part of it I don't see learning as an individual process. I see it as a cooperative and collaborative process and so that then determines a lot of the things that I set up to happen in the classroom.

Rose is very articulate about her teaching and her social justice orientation which is clearly a key driver. She has been honoured by her institution for

teaching excellence and was nominated to the national tertiary teaching awards in 2007. She found the process of the interview helpful on a number of fronts.

It's been quite nice to talk about it. You don't get the opportunity very much to talk about it and, as you know, having won an award, I'm supposed to write about but I missed the deadline [...] so maybe I will get it written. So I actually think that talking through some of this is quite helpful to me too.

I was deeply engaged in Rose's stories and perspectives which are founded on both practice and her interpretation of literature. Rose's was the most extensive interview.

Turtle's Story

Turtle is a law lecturer and associate professor in a university. He is the most definitive and challenging of all participants and has extremely clear ideas about the issues under debate. He completely rejects the principles of postmodernism and suggests we are in the latter stages of the Enlightenment.

Technology is more difficult, you know, and you can look at say things like nuclear technology and the threat of weapons of mass destruction and you can look at some kind of cataclysmic environmental problems like climate change and that, and these **are** new. Let me establish that, these are new. And the speed with which things change is new but the issues aren't. I mean humanity's always had to deal with, you know, nasties.

Turtle is a New Zealand citizen who has spent some time working in Europe. Outside of his university role, he does diplomacy work for the government both in this country and internationally. His international work takes him to all manner of places including war zones such as Bosnia and Iraq. He utilises his experience to put complex and challenging issues in front of his students.

See that one [slide]. That's a picture of a woman who was raped in Bosnia and that's her hand with the list of all the men that she knew who raped her in her village. Yea, if you flashed that up on the board as you are talking about the laws of war and rape is a war crime, and they see the picture, it's like they get it.

He discusses some engagements he has had with Maori leaders and is interested in analysing effective ways of working with and for Maori. However, he has been through an affirmative action phase and now does not believe this is an appropriate way of dealing with issues of social justice. He speaks fondly of the diversity of people who inhabit his classes and community, but curries them no favour, indicating he is primarily interested in their development as lawyers.

Turtle claims a big ego and his interview is testimony to this. He does not engage with other colleagues (or at least does not make reference to this) and does not claim any theoretical influences on his work. He makes statements, however, that identify he is his own man and will act according to his own analyses rather than on the basis of other popular or current theories. His contributions are always short, sharp and to the point. He notes he has had few mentors and relies on his own resources, feeling confident about the outcomes.

I score very high in all my teaching. I always have done. And I think to be a good teacher you've got to communicate and to communicate you've got to know the area. And you've got to be confident and you've got to be friendly and willing to engage with people. I think if you go in there with any of those components missing, you'll be in trouble.

I felt Turtle tolerates rather than engages with me and my questions. He has social justice drivers but he offers me challenges on my own perceptions of what these are. Only on reflection am I able to appreciate Turtle's perspectives. In the interview, there are no possibilities of me taking the power or authority, nor of coaxing Turtle into preferred responses (Holstein and Gubrium, 2004).

Conclusion

Earlier in this section I discussed the notion of making stories and introduced the following: ‘It is clear that we do not *find* stories; we *make* stories’ (Mishler, 1995, p. 117). As author, I have exercised my powerful role in relation to this by introducing the particular and partial stories told here, stories included to provide some context for what is to come in the following Acts.

As I made each of these stories and subsequently re-read them, I was reminded of what Mauthner and Doucet (1998) have to say about the importance of naming how we are located in relation to our participants. They warn that if we don’t acknowledge our emotions, the way we write about people will give away our responses and blur the boundaries between narrative and interpretation of narrative. It is entirely possible that the stories I have just told have indeed blurred boundaries.

However, this is consistent with what I have described previously about my version of narrative methodology and reinforced by Clandinin and Connnelly (2000). They note that when narrative inquirers are in the field, they are never there as disembodied recorders of someone else’s experience but are also having experiences. This creates a tension around moving between full involvement and distance, a tension that is unavoidable as narrative inquiry is relational. So, just as this thesis is focused on relational issues in social justice and education, so too is the telling of stories relational. Indeed, the hermeneutic nature of this research requires an ongoing series of interactions between and among researcher and participants (Guba & Lincoln, 1998) and so the interaction potentially continues.

So, these stories are subjective, they are multi-vocal and they reflect the complexities and ambiguity of narrative construction. They are tentative and incomplete, but, ideally, they invite the reader into what is to come so that, as Barone (2000) suggests, the relationship and the construction of the stories continue, but now between writer and reader in the following Acts.

A C T 3

Tales of Tertiary

3.1 *Introduction*

In this Act, the stories become more specific and contextualised and the action, as suggested by the Act device, gets underway. To set the scene, I begin by testing out participant responses to the notion of uncertainty. I next examine uncertainty's particular relationship to the context of tertiary education in New Zealand and to aspects of the professional lives of the participants. I also consider the impact on students in this milieu. Finally, I focus specifically on the research issue of the professional, pedagogical and ethical issues of teaching for social justice in contemporary tertiary education institutions.

The Voices of the Participants

As noted earlier, several voices are heard alongside each other in this and subsequent Acts. These are the expected voices telling stories of contemporary literature (interpreted through my academic voice) and the voices of my research participants telling everyday stories about their own experiences and perspectives of teaching (also interpreted sometimes through my voice). These separate voices continue and extend the conversations of the interviews and feature throughout the text. The reader will become familiar with the juxtaposition of the various voices, encountering alternating stories representative of the published discourses and those of the everyday worlds of the participants, bearing in mind that postmodern theory debates the existence of a 'real' world and suggests there are only versions of it. Several versions appear here.

This Act provides the contextual yet theoretical grounding for the investigations regarding the practices of teaching that occur in Act 4.

3.2 The Grand Narrative of Uncertainty

The unknown future and its corresponding idea of complexity was introduced in Act 1 along with the related concepts of uncertainty, disruption, subjectivity and ambiguity (see Lyotard, 1984; Beck, 1992; Giddens, 1994; Barnett, 2004a; Barnett, 2004b). I very briefly traversed some of the key concepts of postmodernism, introducing some ideas that are deemed to underpin a postmodern world, referring primarily to Beck (post/going beyond), Giddens (high modernity), Bauman (liquid modernity) and Barnett (supercomplexity). Postmodernism absolutely eschews the notion of grand narratives yet these concepts are generally associated with the big picture of a postmodern world.

It is important to note the broad interpretation of postmodernism that I use in this thesis. Bertens (1995, p. 3), in the opening lines of his book, comments that:

Postmodernism is an exasperating term, and so are postmodern, postmodernist, postmodernity, and whatever else one might come across in the way of derivation. In the avalanche of articles and books that have made use of the term since the late 1950s, postmodernism has been applied at different levels of conceptual abstraction to a wide range of objects and phenomena in what we used to call reality. Postmodernism, then, is several things at once.

He suggests that there are multiple postmodernisms, an important factor for consideration here because multiple viewpoints and paradigms are included or referred to. However, if there is one common denominator, ‘it is the crisis of representation: a deeply felt loss of faith in our ability to represent the real, in the widest sense’ (Bertens, 1995, p. 11). In similar vein, Peters (1995, p. 22) asserts that ‘The terms *postmodernism* and *postmodernity* are catch-all concepts allegedly signaling an epochal break not only with the so-called modern era but also with various traditionally “modern” ways of viewing the world’. This then is the broad perspective that underpins my approach and acknowledges the uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity inherent in what is to follow. The distinction between postmodernity and postmodernism (Peters, 1995) is important. The former generally refers to the historical and material

conditions of society that impact on economy and social structure, while the latter is more concerned with theorising about the period and therefore focuses on world views, ontologies and epistemologies. Both are implicated here.

Although the dominant discourse as introduced asserts the existence and influence of postmodernism on contemporary life, there are those who contest this interpretation of the current world (see, for example, Callicinos, 1989; Eagleton, 1996). However, rather than dwell on the debates regarding postmodernism or attempt a comprehensive investigation or synthesis, in this thesis I note the dissenting voices but focus on the dominant discourse of uncertainty and complexity as described in Act 1 and seek to understand if and how tertiary academics experience its impact on themselves, their work and their students.

Stories from the Everyday World

In relation to the postmodern condition and its impact on the production of identity, the same diversity of opinion that exists in the literature is evident in the participant stories. I began my interviews by suggesting that this is a time of uncertainty and asking each of them if, in their opinion, this is so. I wanted to find out how their perceptions of uncertainty impact on the thesis issues, including social justice and education for being. So at this stage, I had not introduced any of the key concerns but was just setting the scene and seeking global perspectives. Barnett's notion of *being* hinges on an understanding of uncertainty and I wanted to establish a sense of how the participants considered this. This section is not related directly to their practice and experiences so their responses are generally theoretical.

All but one participant acknowledges at least some degree of uncertainty that they experience in the world but name it differently. Some are very definitive and have no doubt about the existence or challenges of uncertainty.

I think, the older I get the more uncertain things become. And I think the more I read and the more I learn and the more I teach (laughs) the more uncertain things become.

(Jane)

I think it's a time when hegemonic, and I use that word because it makes sense to me, and **dominant** ideas are being challenged from many directions. And I think that within the uncertainty where national boundaries are being challenged and questions of identity and where do I belong and how do I fit in here are being challenged. So I do think there is a degree of uncertainty and a degree of anxiety on a global perspective.

(Rose)

Both Jane and Rose are very clear that uncertainty exists and tap directly into the challenging of knowledge and the resulting impact on identity, both themes discussed earlier. They both refer in some way to identity in discussing their understanding of uncertainty and hint at an unsettling response to it. While Jane responds personally, Rose refers to broader issues and, in the quoted passage, immediately signals her interest in social justice, though this concern has not yet been introduced in the interview. She has made links to social justice from my first screening conversation and appears to have thought about it prior to the interview. Her social justice orientation occurs repeatedly throughout the interview so it is uppermost in her mind. ‘Identity’ becomes important and is discussed later in this Act.

Some participants are less definitive about the existence of uncertainty and express doubts related to perceptions of the world and specifics of their own disciplines or contexts. The idea of perspective or different lenses through which to view the world is also introduced.

I guess it sort of really depends on how you view the world, doesn't it? Um [...] we [...] like [...] humans don't cope terribly well with uncertainty and so we like to tell ourselves sort of a coherent narrative that has a clear past and a clear future. Um, so, I guess

in some respects it has always been a time of uncertainty, from my parents' generation right through 'cause no-one can tell the future. Um, but I think one thing we can say for certain is that change has sped up. And so the rate at which things change has pretty much gone exponential. So that is one thing I think we can safely say. Whether that means it's **uncertain** depends on how you look at things.

(Evangeline)

Evangeline's response contains an acknowledgement of the human tendency to try and compensate for uncertainty by constructing familiar narratives, thus reducing the anxiety identified by Rose. She links her ideas of uncertainty to change and sees this as an ongoing condition of humanity. In fact, it is not only the future that may be uncertain but, as Sarup (1996, p. 40) suggests, 'The present is by definition uncertain for everyone since it is always in the process of emerging'. This indicates what many globalisation theorists have argued regarding the uniqueness of contemporary times – the speeding up of change.

Evangeline continues picking up this theme, this time questioning premises regarding the uncertainty of knowledge, and also raising the issue of ownership of that knowledge.

So, our knowledge base, or sort of quantity of knowledge, is increasing at a sort of exponential rate. And, of course, we're becoming slightly better at thinking about whose knowledge and whose knowledge counts and that there are multiple points of view, um, and yes those kinds of things need to be taken into account. Now whether that means knowledge isn't **fixed** ... I mean will some things change? Will the periodic table change? I mean I guess it depends on in which realm you work and what you're thinking about knowledge.

(Evangeline)

Phillip is even more equivocal and, right at the outset of the interview, is grappling with ideas. He goes immediately to tertiary education and to his own

discipline and hints at some issues of uncertainty of knowledge, but does not develop these in any depth. He interprets uncertainty as ‘challenge’ and does not refer specifically to any macro-level ideas of postmodernism.

Ah, that's a very good question. I would say well first of all my response would be, depends on what we mean by uncertainty. Uncertainty today, I believe has very different connotations to what people defined as uncertainty say ten, fifteen years ago. Certainly the environment in which we live, the educational environment, tertiary education environment is very, very different today relative to what it was, not only from the perspective of staff but also from the perspective of students. So, in that sense, there is probably higher levels of **perceived** uncertainty, putting the objective uncertainty to one side – perception is reality, golden rule of marketing. Um, (pause) I mean uncertainty to me, uncertainty has a, has a negative connotation. I prefer, my preference would be to use the word challenge or opportunity, turn it round. So we're facing a different set of challenges and opportunities relative to what we have faced in the past, although they are different. So, in that respect, yea, we face higher levels of uncertainty.

(Phillip)

Turtle alone is unequivocally resistant to the whole concept of postmodernism or, indeed, postmodernity.

No, I don't think it is uncertain whatsoever. I don't actually agree with postmodernism either. I think we are more at the end of the Enlightenment. And we are just going through to the next stage. I think people of every generation look on their own world as, to give it more meaning. And, if we believe we are at some sort of great turning point, it makes it more exciting. Whereas I think most of the debates today are just a continuation of the debates we have had for 200 years.

(Turtle)

While I felt confronted by a view that differed so significantly from the literature I had reviewed and the views of other participants, I pondered this vigorous denial of the existence or influence of postmodernity and Turtle's is not a solitary view, as acknowledged earlier. Barnett (2000a, p. 32) contends that we are living in a new Enlightenment. 'Whereas that Enlightenment was contemplative in character, the new Enlightenment is operational in character.' Osborne (2007, p. 3) discusses the history of the western world and expresses similar viewpoints to Turtle's. He contends that we have a somewhat sanitised view of civilisation that excludes acknowledgement of 'an almost unbearable amount of suffering and misery, of injustice and cruelty to ourselves and to others'. Osborne believes we have been facing uncertainty throughout the history of western civilisation, often represented by the carrying out of unspeakable acts.

It is clear, both through these statements and the introductions contained in Act 2.7, that there is a broad range of perspectives evident in the positions taken by the participants, from complete acknowledgement of the uncertainties of postmodernism to total rejection of the concept. These will become clearer as the analysis continues and their impact will pose some specific challenges.

Having established this foundation, I move now to the specific context of tertiary education and gain some insights into how the participants therefore experience tertiary education in conditions of postmodernity and in the face of performativity demands. This is beginning to ground the participants more in their everyday work.

Harry provides a nice link between the notion of uncertainty and the contexts of tertiary education in talking about his discipline of architecture.

[...] we're now kind of struggling to deal with uncertainty, some of us in this institution are moving back towards trying to impart greater certainty, if you like, into the process. So we talk about the design process, as if it was a linear progression from kind of conceptual idea to resolved building, and I think the reality, of course, is that it that

never happens, you never take this linear path, you take a series of kind of detours and you go backwards and forwards depending on a whole range of things as new knowledge becomes available [...]

(Harry)

This is a familiar context for many of the participants with the challenges of uncertainty impacting on them in multiple and differing ways, depending on the particular context.

3.3 Contexts of Tertiary Education

In Act 1, I defined the scope of tertiary education both globally and locally as it relates to this study and outlined some key influences in times of uncertainty. Two key themes emerged – those of a change in and destabilisation of the nature of tertiary education, and the corresponding but unique concern of performativity's impact on both institutions and teachers. Here, I locate these influences close to home, expanding on the ideas introduced earlier and investigating their applicability to the experiences and, therefore, the stories of the research participants.

The Nature of Tertiary Education in New Zealand

It became evident in Act 1 that many of the factors impacting on tertiary education in other Western nations are equally influential in New Zealand. Malcolm and Tarling (2007), aligning their thoughts with the international literature, go so far as to question whether the university in New Zealand is experiencing a crisis of identity in both its mission and management. The former – mission, reflects its quest for a purposeful role in a postmodern world while the latter – management, goes to the heart of issues of performativity.

Earlier I questioned whether the universities might have had some ‘knee-jerk reaction’ to the challenges of government policy and reform. In New Zealand, Malcolm and Tarling (2007, p. 49) propose that ‘What a university can do depends, however, not merely on the challenges it faces from the outside, but the challenges from the way it is itself organised’. They confront the possibility of internal negative responses to external drivers and state that ‘In few cases, we fear, did university leaders put up much resistance to the changes that governments sought to impose’ (p. 50). They contend that, regardless of motive ‘too little was done by the universities themselves to assert their traditional values and the need for them in a changing world’ (p. 51).

Bauman engages in conjecture over these values and traditional roles. ‘In a world characterized by the episodicity and fragmentation of social and

individual times, the universities, burdened as they are with a sense of history and linear time, fit ill and must feel ill at ease' (Bauman, 2001, p. 132). He comments on the tensions felt by the universities in the market economy where they find it difficult to compete by being flexible and adapting at a pace that allows them to stay current with industry and the job market, which is changing at alarming speed and expecting skills of workers to do the same. These concerns are not uncommon in New Zealand where increasing numbers of specialised vocationally-driven programmes are appearing in universities.

Tertiary education in New Zealand has therefore not been immune from international influences but rather has experienced all the pressures identified in the literature.

[O]ver the last ten years, the prevailing concern with fiscal matters has been joined by talk of crises in: the humanities, scholarly publishing, the nature of university teaching, conditions of employment, the scope and purpose of the curriculum, and the governance of institutions. Increasingly, questions about the purpose and character of higher education have come to the fore (Roberts, 1999, p. 67).

Roberts alludes both to the nature and purpose of the university and issues of performativity and the role and identity of academics. With the pressures from outside and the corresponding choices made inside, the form and nature of the contemporary New Zealand tertiary institution has changed substantially.

The goal for the university becomes its optimal contribution to the best performance of the social system. This goal demands the creation of two kinds of skills indispensable to the maintenance of the social system: Those necessary to enhance competitiveness in the world market and those necessary for fulfilling the need for its internal cohesion (Peters, 1995, p. 35).

Malcolm and Tarling (2007) argue that much of the responsibility for the imposition of performativity demands can be laid at the doorstep of university management. Although they acknowledge that there were few successful examples from other countries to guide them, they claim that 'Pressed by the continued need to respond to the outside challenges [...] the [New Zealand] universities accepted without substantial or sufficient consideration the

managerialism adopted by or enjoined upon other corporate bodies'. Indeed, they believe that, notwithstanding the government pressure to reduce expenditure and increase accountability, universities have profited from the challenges of compliance and bureaucratic control, but at a cost to themselves and their people.

These costs may have been greater than expected. 'We are sure that we detect among staff, academic as well as general, a feeling of helplessness, of alienation, even at times of fear, that seems to us utterly alien to the proper spirit of the university and utterly incompatible with its proper aspirations' (Peters & Roberts, 1999, p. 219). And the pressures created by the responses to neo-liberal reform and external and internal demands of managerialism continue to bite at the heart of academic life. Time is always in short supply. 'There has simply been too much to do, too much pressure, too many essays to mark, too many urgent (*always* urgent) administrative tasks to attend to, too many financial crises to address' (Peters & Roberts, 1999, pp. 28-29).

Within this context, the nature of 'knowledge' itself has become uncertain, as discussed in Act 1. Peters (2004, pp. 77-78) summarises the situation, bringing together a number of the key issues.

The role of the university is undergoing a transition in late modernity as a result of structural shifts in the production and legitimization of knowledge. The older goal of the democratization of the university has now been superseded by new challenges arising from the dual processes of the globalization and fragmentation of knowledge cultures.

So New Zealand tertiary institutions would appear to have confronted the same issues and responded in similar ways to their counterparts in other parts of the world. Indeed, as Blackmore (2002) notes, they have done so much faster than most because of geographical and political isolation. Inevitably this has impacted on the lives and work of tertiary teachers.

Stories from the Everyday World

When investigating the professional, pedagogical and ethical issues impacting on tertiary teachers, the contemporary construction of the university and the impact of marketisation and performativity are important contextual issues. Although not all participants consider the broader political and social contexts in relation to their own work, references to it inevitably arise in relation to the conditions that teachers experience. Several participants refer to the nature of their institutions and the educational reforms that impact on their ability to teach in ways that are satisfying and consistent with their own pedagogical philosophies. However, in this section, the participants are largely analysing the current contexts and thinking about their institutions and the sector generally rather than confronting their own position and identity.

Betty makes a number of contextual references throughout our conversation, often exposing her thinking on this subject. She has recently given a keynote address on the concept of uncertainty in tertiary education and shares that:

I read a couple of other things that were thinking about higher education and its purpose and since then I have thought more about that – more about the way in which it's endemic to higher education at the moment, across the western world at least, we are **really** uncertain about what the primary purpose or purposes of what we are doing are.

(Betty)

Her reflection notes the role of tertiary education in a postmodern world and its equivocation about nature and purpose. She is thinking conceptually at this point, however, as indicated by her reference to ‘we’.

Betty continues on this theme of uncertainty, this time with reference to ‘equity’. She is concerned that New Zealand is reacting too readily to international equity agendas and she questions whether the related structures and goals espoused internationally are able to be justified or realised in this

local context and, indeed, what the outcomes for the university might be in terms of purpose.

And in New Zealand we see now talk about a diversification of the sector, our tiny sector, a re-diversification and I am wondering if that is partly about beginning to face the brute reality of how institutions can manage such diverse agendas. And when there are such competing agendas what that does to the stability of the institution and the stability of purpose. In my institution's documents they are always wobbling around these different purposes.

(Betty)

Her final comment refers to the challenges of the equity agenda and indicates the struggle that tertiary education institutions often experience – they define themselves uncertainly in conditions of uncertainty!

Harry makes multiple references to institutional and societal factors throughout our discussion. His thoughts feature strongly in this section because this is an area where he has particular interest, largely through his own PhD study. He begins by linking together the expectations of the architecture profession and education in relation to uncertainty, and remarks on the tensions that exist.

I think also, I've just been looking in my field, kind of looking at architectural education and looking at these conditions of uncertainty and comparing those to kind of professional accreditation requirements where there is an assumption that students should have some degree of certainty.

(Harry)

He is aware of the influence of industry preferences on his discipline and speaks of the frustration he experiences at the resulting potential reduced scope for creativity, the modularisation of knowledge in his university and the tendency to separate out various components of the learning process, all impacting negatively on his notion of desired teaching.

Yea, because this is technology and this is art and this is, you know, I think architecture has always tried to **blur** those distinctions. But we're also constrained by what, um, other people think of as being proper architecture, the professions see architecture as being within certain boundaries, they want to see, this is not universal but, you know, typically professions want to see graduates who are kind of technically competent, who can contribute something to their practice immediately upon graduation, which is not really the purpose of education, I think as we see it here. I think our education only becomes apparent five or ten years down the track. Then they have the experience to reflect on what they've done.

(Harry)

Harry's comments go to the heart of industry influence on the purpose, desires and traditional values of the university. 'Tertiary education is changing to address client and stakeholder expectations, to respond more actively to social and economic change, to provide for more flexible forms of teaching and learning, to focus more strongly on competencies and skills across the curriculum' (OECD, 1998, p. 10). Harry expresses concerns about the nature of education and the distinction between learning for vocations and learning for life. Indeed, Bauman (2001, p. 130) suggests that the universities are competing on allegedly equal terms with other agencies for authority over knowledge and 'the once unquestioned right to decide the canons of professional skill and competence [are] fast slipping out of their hands'. Notwithstanding the advantages of education and industry working closely, there are tensions created that contribute to adding complexity to the work of tertiary teachers. They also give rise to reflection on the part of the institution as to their contemporary identity and mission (Malcolm & Tarling, 2007).

Phillip, too, refers to the necessity of engaging with stakeholders and the resulting impact on his role.

So it's complex in the number of people you have to deal with, but it's also complex in the sense you have to, the issues surrounding managing those diverse sets of stakeholders have changed as well.

So, expectations have changed, demands are far greater, people are expecting higher response times to what you're doing. So it's a larger number of people you're dealing with but the manageability side, certainly in my role as a researcher, has changed significantly.

(Phillip)

He is also alerted to the changes within his particular discipline in relation to pedagogical strategies and expectations of graduates.

[...] the world in my discipline, the content of marketing has become more complex as we become more technology driven, so the content side of marketing has changed. I believe it's become far more complex, more analytical driven, and more, more, a greater array of the use of scientific aids to help marketing decision-making. So it's become more complex in that sense. That's the subject. Marketing is both an art and a science but it has become more complex over the last five years.

(Phillip)

These teachers are each referring to elements of the demands on the contemporary tertiary teacher in conditions of supercomplexity as described here and in Act 1. They acknowledge the uncertainty of role and purpose of tertiary education in postmodern times. Turtle, however, throws in a strong viewpoint regarding the importance of tertiary education in contemporary times, times he is adamant are not 'postmodern'.

You've got to educate people. Because one of the difficulties now, more like the reformation, and there's some complete idiots out there and complete bastards as well, and some people kind of have this idea of history that you sort of start off with zero and you go to utopia. I'm not so sure. I think everything we've got which is valuable is up for grabs. And each generation can lose it and we almost have lost it. You know, with fascism or with extreme

communism. And, it's, unless you have education, and critical thinking, I mean, then you can lose all these things. You can lose them to the extreme right, you can lose them to the extreme left. Yea, there's no monopoly on idiots.

(Turtle)

Here Turtle is signalling that he has faith in education to produce a more democratic society. He is also indicating his strength of ideas, something that recurs frequently in our conversation and the strong, resilient and defined identity he constructs for himself. His passion for a 'balanced' education, and one that is not captured by political viewpoints is evident, though I would contest that all education is political in some way, even when it chooses not to be 'political'. Turtle's position around social justice does not support this, however.

And Performativity ... ?

While the participants make reference to the nature and mission of the university in times of uncertainty and in a globalised market, woven in are comments about aspects of their professional lives that are influenced by performativity demands. Phillip is not alone in talking about time – most refer to this in some way. However, there is more at stake here than just the busyness of academic life.

So there's a whole, the rhetoric is different at the university, the model is the kind of rhetoric which is about efficiency and all these things. But there's also this kind of postmodern rhetoric which is about kind of individualisation and choice and freedom and flexibility which is just the other side of flexibility is insecurity, you know.

(Harry)

Harry neatly draws together issues of performativity, individuality and uncertainty (Ball, 2000; 2003) and the complexities embedded within them. In doing so he cuts to the heart of contextual issues and names the efficiency rhetoric underpinning contemporary institutions. Harry's discomfort with

efficiency as the driver and its impact on education is evident in his repeated critique (Blackmore, 2002).

Evangeline hints at performative inclinations when she talks about the development of dispositions in students, and, while I will return to this theme later, her statement suggests that threats of performativity are ever-present in her work.

I'm fearful of dispositions because they turn into laundry lists. And they turn into someone at the back of the room ticking you off so you can be certified.

(Evangeline)

Harry picks up this theme again to discuss his own PhD investigations into the ways in which managerialism impacts on his discipline and the accreditation of institutions for the delivery of architecture education.

So I looked at managerialism and how things are made and then how, the kind of rhetoric of managerialism that, you know, nowadays everyone in educational institutions wants to be innovative and creative and they are all aware of being and they've all adapted to the kind of post-structuralist critique and it's like now they're kind of trying to do everything. They're trying to have it both ways. They talk about kind of [...] they want a kind of certainty **and** choice. They want certainty because you don't want risk, you don't want students to go through that. But you also want **choice**, it's student centred so they can **choose** their way through the curriculum but they can't really quite allow them to do that. They encourage, you know, kind of institutional solidarity but also kind of competition within and between institutions. You know like the vice chancellor saying 'we're all in this together guys' but when it comes to individual staff, they're kind of different. And then they compete with other institutions.

(Harry)

This story, a stream of consciousness, is an example of the tensions explored in this thesis between competing discourses such as competitive individualism and collegiality within tertiary education, and clearly these tensions impact on Harry's practice. He notes the rhetoric of flexibility that is coupled with the increased demands for compliance. Woven in are theoretical issues related to postmodernism and uncertainty, rhetoric of student-centredness, demands of performativity, questions about university mission and values, impact of marketisation and the resulting outcomes for tertiary teachers.

These brief glimpses into the worlds and experiences of the participants name some of the realities for at least some academics in their everyday practice in New Zealand contexts. They grapple regularly with these societal forces and feel the uncertainty of purpose – their own and the university's, they struggle with time claims, and they juggle multiple sometimes conflicting relationships and demands such as those Harry refers to above. Perhaps academics have always done so, but there is strong articulation between what the current literature referred to in this thesis has to say about these things and the lived and felt experiences of these participants. For some, their very identity as a tertiary teacher is confronted and, potentially destabilised, though this is only just starting to appear in their stories. According to Ball (2003, p. 219), 'The act of teaching and the subjectivity of the teacher are both profoundly changed within the new management panopticism (of quality and excellence) and the new forms of entrepreneurial control (through marketing and competition)'. The professional identities of academics are in constant flux in this milieu (Morley, 2003; Clegg, 2008). As Jane says:

The traditional idea of being in front of the class is you were the person with the answers. And I don't think I have ever sort of aspired to that hugely anyway because my thinking is that I have always wanted interaction anyway but certainly it is, it has, the uncertainty that is more prevalent now has made us, has put us on our toes more.

(Jane)

Later, in Act 3.5, I examine this notion of changing identities in relation to both students and staff. However, before leaving the overview of tertiary education in unstable conditions, I speculate about what may be needed, moving into the future, to address the challenges.

3.4 A Future for Tertiary Education

Undoubtedly the contemporary university is (and its people are) confronted by multiple challenges, many of which can be attributed to the postmodern condition. Barnett is less inclined to accept postmodernism's power and reflects these challenges smartly back onto the university itself.

In the Western world, despite their intermeshing with the wider world, and despite that wider world (through the state, the world of work, and client groups) exerting limitations on the university – both in its self-understanding and its practices – universities continue to enjoy considerable space. They even enjoy space to articulate stories of postmodernism. In other words, reminding ourselves about the practical space available to universities, we remind ourselves also about the discursive space available to universities.

The postmodern story is not a recipe for closure but it is a recipe for restricted and local conversations (Barnett, 2004b, p. 68).

This is an important point. While there are some universals impacting on tertiary education, teachers, students, teaching and learning, there is still much scope for the construction of local stories, and perhaps that is all that is possible, as Barnett suggests. Thus there is not a reason to do nothing because, in the local context, there may be ways to confront the issues and make changes. Change is the norm in tertiary education and it is incumbent on those associated with it to find ways of confronting, embracing and potentially even driving change. And there is scope here for effecting cultural change. Bruner (1996) argues that education generally tends to represent one particular view of the world or it runs the risk of offending some individuals or groups if its views are not consistent with the norms of the culture. But this multi-vocality and ambiguity may be just what is required. ‘An educational enterprise that fails to take the risks involved becomes stagnant and eventually alienating [...] When education narrows its scope of interpretive inquiry, it reduces a culture’s power to adapt to change’ (Bruner, 1996, p. 15). So, rather than be constrained by the pressures of performativity or the unknowingness of uncertainty, tertiary education continues to have the capacity, space and potency to effect positive change. The question is *how?*

Proposals for new approaches to tertiary education, and specifically universities, arise from these analyses. It is generally acknowledged that some things need to change. Barnett has been prolific in his publications, variously proposing ways of ‘realising’ (2000a), ‘reconfiguring’ (2000b), ‘recovering’ (2004b) and ‘reclaiming’ (2004c) the university in and from an uncertain and supercomplex world. He contends that the university is triply implicated in relation to supercomplexity being principally responsible for creating it, constructing and scrutinising frameworks for understanding it, and developing a comfort with it through a focus on tolerance, openness and reflexivity (Barnett, 2000a).

So the future tertiary institution may need to live more productively with supercomplexity, uncertainty and ambiguity. Risk and its elimination is a central driving notion in contemporary society (see Beck, 1992) and in education, risk management plans are commonplace. Educational quality seems contingent upon managing risk and is a key component of performativity. This viewpoint is consistent with Harry’s earlier comments about the efforts of universities to remove risk from the experiences of students. But this risk driver may act negatively to place barriers and obstacles in the paths of those who wish to engage in ‘risky’ pedagogy or innovative approaches to educational provision. Smith (2005, p. 139) takes up this idea when he says:

Might it not be that there is a place in the university – a minor one, it might seem to some, but still a place – for uncertainty as opposed to certainty, for risk and chance rather than total reliability? In fact, in the context of teaching in particular, the admission – even to some extent the celebration – of uncertainty might well be one of the distinguishing features of the university and its pedagogical relations.

Kress (2000) also examines this issue and argues for much more engagement in education for instability. He is particularly interested in curriculum and comments that existing curricular practices are based on the assumption that education is teaching young people old dispositions, whereas old notions of education cannot survive in the instability of the future. Scott (1997, p. 42) contends that tertiary education is experiencing a time of ‘epistemological

insecurity' brought about by the challenges to knowledge. This, too, appears in much of Barnett's writing with his contention that the university is not only epistemologically but ontologically adrift (Barnett, 2004a).

Notwithstanding all these challenges, it is germane to note, in summary, that not everyone adheres to the premise that the university is in ruins or crisis. Blackmore (2001) questions whether there is a crisis or universities are merely in transition or located within a system in flux. Barnett (2000a, p. 2) has a dollar each way, claiming that 'Readings has it half right. The university is a ruined institution, but we do not have to dwell in its ruins'. Earlier I referred to Barnett's (2004b) later statement regarding the considerable space the university still enjoys and creates even within contexts of postmodernity and globalisation. So, although there remain challenges, constraints and even threats, there are those who express a sense of optimism about the current status and future possibilities for tertiary education.

The university remains precious as a concept and as an experience for an increasing proportion of the population. The literature on the idea of a university and about the 'crisis of the modern university' multiplies and will continue to do so, testimony to continuing evaluation. Meanwhile the university and higher education as a social system, and as a territory occupied by diverse and warring tribes, still displays remarkable resilience in the face of great expansion and governmental incursions (Bourgeois et al, 1999, p. 33).

Barnett (2004b, p. 71) is even more definitive in naming the current societal situation and challenging the university to rise to it. 'If the world is characterised – as it is – by uncertainty, unpredictability, changeability and contestation, then let these ideas become the watchwords of the university in the twenty-first century. If, in the process, other hitherto dominant concepts – such as knowledge, truth and learning – are put in the shadows, so be it.'

What, though, is happening to the identities of the various players in this context?

3.5 Production of Identities

In postmodern times, identities are considered by social theorists to be uncertain, unstable, highly contingent on societal and relational influences and, as discussed earlier, multiple. In essence, ‘There is no unified postmodern self; now the self is conceived in its contradictory phases, which allow a better description in terms of unfixity’ (Hinkson, 1995, p. 138). This notion of ‘unfixity’ stands in stark contrast to the modern construction where it was taken for granted that the self was unified with fixed qualities. In this postmodern view, ‘the human subject is decentred, constantly in process of becoming and increasingly hybrid’ (McGuigan, 1999, p. 103).

In tracing the history of identity, Bauman (1996) speculates further on the differences between modern and postmodern concepts. He proposes that it is a modern invention and that it was, from its inception as a concept, designed to address a problem. The problem is often about where one belongs, a question embedded in uncertainty, and therefore the concept of identity relates to the escape sought from that uncertainty. Further, ‘if the *modern* “problem of identity” was how to construct an identity and keep it solid and stable, the *postmodern* “problem of identity” is primarily how to avoid fixation and keep the options open’ (Bauman, 1996, p. 18). This comes about, he suggests, because of postmodernism’s eternal shiftiness and endless opportunities and ultimately leads to a situation where a ‘Well constructed and durable identity turns from an asset into a liability’ (p. 24).

This liability occurs precisely because postmodernism has thrust much of the responsibility for dealing with such challenges onto the individual. Miles (2001, p. 95) explains that the ‘overwhelming theme of post-modern conceptions of identity in general is that the onus for the construction of such identities increasingly falls on the shoulders of the individual’ who becomes increasingly self-dependent and increasingly vulnerable. But the individual is not in a vacuum developing some kind of persona in isolation from relationships and experiences. The identity of any person takes its shape as a response to a multitude of relational and societal factors and reflects a process

of continuing change. Kirman and Teschl (2006, p. 317) contend that a '*triangle of identity*' is at play with three aspects of the individual that change over time: '*what* she currently is and does, *who* she wants to be and *where* she chooses to participate, that is, to which social group she chooses to belong'. Implicit in this view is the relationship of the individual to others. The development of identity is, therefore, located in the context of history, language and, importantly, power. But, as Giddens (1991, p. 82) suggests, the individual has the task of acting in and engaging with a world of plural choices and this is a challenge 'given that the signposts established by tradition are now blank'. This creates 'tribulations of the self'.

'Living in the world', where the world is that of late modernity, involves various distinctive tensions and difficulties on the level of the self. We can analyse these most easily by understanding them as dilemmas which, on one level or another, have to be resolved in order to preserve a coherent narrative of self-identity (Giddens, 1991, p. 188).

Drawing on a Foucauldian perspective, Sarup (1996, p. 73) suggests that 'every person's identity is a site of struggle between conflicting discourses' and that the construction of identity is the product of relations of power. Hall concurs, noting that it is:

Precisely because identities are constructed within, not outside discourse, [that] we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices by specific enunciative strategies. Moreover, they emerge within the play of specific modalities of power, and thus are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are the sign of an identical, naturally constituted unity – an 'identity' in its traditional meaning (that is, an all-inclusive sameness, seamless, without internal differentiation) (Hall, 2000, p. 17).

Here it becomes clear that there are institutional, including educational, influences on the shaping of identities which are not necessarily singular because, as Davies and Harré (1990, p. 45) remind us 'people bring to the particular situation their history as a subjective being, that is the history of one who has been in multiple positions and engaged in different forms of discourse'. So the discourses of education are implicated.

Producing Academic Identities

Academic identities relate to both students and teachers. Both curriculum and tertiary education practices are embroiled in the process of structuring identities, and the authority and power of teachers and the system have roles that may need problematising.

Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 51), renowned for their work theorising about the formation of individual and collective identities through communities of practice in educational contexts, note that learning is ‘the historical production, transformation, and change of persons’ and that it involves the whole person in the context of both the learning experience and the broader communities in which the learner belongs. When activities happen, they are therefore part of a broader context of relations. ‘Learning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations. To ignore this aspect of learning is to overlook the fact that learning involves the construction of identities’ (p. 53).

So student identities are constantly being produced in the process of tertiary education. The question then becomes what kinds of identities? As outlined, this study is interested in two types of identity – the resilient graduate able to cope with uncertainty, to *be* successfully in the changing world, and the socially just graduate. The pedagogical practices and possibilities associated with each of these will be examined fully in Act 4.

Also of interest are the identities of teachers in tertiary education. ‘We teachers are motivated by identity needs the same as everyone else, and our pedagogical aims, strategies, tactics, and reflexes all in one way or another serve to maintain or enhance our identities’ (Bracher, 2006, p. 75). Earlier in this Act, I addressed the local issues related to performativity and the role of teachers and noted the changing identity of academics, remembering Ball’s (2000) contention that teachers are now becoming ‘promiscuous beings’ deeply implicated as ‘agents and subjects’ in relation to performativity in the university. Morley (2003, p. 70) is very critical of performativity’s impact on identity, suggesting that it ‘involves a damaging process of ventriloquism and

impersonation as academics and managers attempt to represent themselves in a language that quality assessors will understand and value'.

While these issues of performativity are oppressive, there is more to this than just work and accountability requirements, and professional teacher identity is deeply implicated. Brint (1994) carried out an in-depth study of the changing nature and role of 'intellectuals' in his investigation into the 'age of experts'. He remarks on a move away from a social purpose orientation and towards marketable expertise and names this as a distinction between 'social trustee professionalism' and 'expert professionalism'. He says that 'demographic pressures encouraged these new recruits [into the professions] to think more exclusively as entrepreneurs and less as members of an occupational collective with a stable set of community-minded ideals' (Brint, 1994, p. 204). This is consistent with Currie's (1998) view of tertiary academics as entrepreneurs. Sachs (2001), although generally writing about compulsory education, also examined this issue and describes two competing discourses that are shaping the professional identity of teachers – democratic and managerial professionalism – with the latter tending to dominate. These themes are relevant in tertiary settings and the overlapping perspectives all raise questions about the identity of tertiary teachers in relation to social justice because of the demands of other more 'marketable' outputs. I will come to this soon.

In any tertiary classroom, therefore, there are multiple identities being produced and there is instability. Indeed, Barnett and Hallam (1999, p. 139) note that supercomplexity has already found its way into tertiary pedagogies since 'lecturers in higher education are now being faced – for the first time – with multiple and contesting invitations to interpret, and to act out, their professional selves'. What do the participants in the research have to say about their experiences of this kind of influence on their professional identity and that of their students?

Stories from the Everyday World

The production of identity is a common theme throughout the interviews, with some participants overtly theorising how they think about identity construction

and others providing insights about identity in comments they make about themselves or their students.

Student Identities

Rose is particularly interested in the notion of ‘individual’ and the construction of identity. She is currently engaged in Master’s level study in feminist notions of gender and identity. Rose is the only participant to raise identity as an issue spontaneously and to articulate her emergent thinking on multiple identities with regard to ethnicity and nationality, gender and sexuality.

And then, there’s questions around, if we come back to the New Zealand context, there’s questions around what it is to be a Kiwi and people confuse identity and ethnicity and nationality and those kind of debates. Do they need to be confused about it? Well from my reading, why can’t, we’re many identities so we can have a national identity and we can have an ethnic identity and we can have a gender identity and a sexuality identity. So my reading, and I’ve probably just come to that quite recently, this idea that we are multi-identities.

(Rose)

And very often those are competing identities.

(Linda)

Yea, well just in your own personal roles. Well, I’ve always thought of them as roles, as a mother and role as a person working and role as a partner and I’ve always thought of them as roles and not as identities. And I think that thinking of them as identities has been really interesting for me. So I think there are challenges to all those things and, um, that’s leading to uncertainty, this idea that there are not fixed boundaries and that we don’t **fit** nicely into fixed boundaries creates uncertainty on both a personal and a political level.

(Rose)

Rose's recent engagement with these ideas is evident but she is pulling together concepts from her reading and her encounters both in her life and work as an educator in an effort to try and make sense of them. In the process, she is constructing her own identity as an academic as she finds words to express her growing interest and expertise with the concepts. Rose also raises the impact of the common understanding of identity taken up in 'role theory' of fixed notions and lack of power analysis which is in contrast to the dynamic nature of multiple subjectivities.

Rose comments further on the challenges both for students and teachers. In talking about the lack of certainty and its impact on 'knowledge' she says:

That's a little unsettling. Sometimes, it's easier, isn't it, when you know. (Laughs) And, you don't really, and I think that's what education does in some ways and the more you do of that, in some ways, the less certain, because what you thought two years ago doesn't look like what you think now, won't look like what you think into the future and that's, unless you feel strong about yourself, that's, that can be quite scary too. [...] Teachers are supposed to know. [...] And we were **taught** to know and be absolutely certain and clear.

(Rose)

In this comment Rose indicates the need for teacher resilience in the face of 'unknowingness'. She is reflecting on her own tentativeness and her changing identity as a teacher. Despite the challenge, she is aware of the need 'not to know' and be uncertain with students. She goes on to comment on the impact for students who struggle with this not knowing, particularly 'with first year students' who want the teacher to deliver the required knowledge. Rose's discourse illustrates the vulnerability that can be associated with the continuous construction of identity in the process of becoming. It helps in understanding Giddens' (1991, p. 54) statement about the 'capacity to keep a particular narrative going' in the development of identity. It is little wonder tertiary education can be such a struggle for some as their personal narratives come under threat and they are constantly reinventing themselves.

Carl resides in an entirely different philosophical position. While not naming identity, he strives to help students construct identities synergistic with the notion of ‘citizens’. His idea of ‘citizen’ though, differs widely from that espoused by Nussbaum (1997, p. 9) where ‘cultivation of humanity’ is the goal and is achieved through ‘the ability to see ourselves as human beings bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern’. Carl does not express ideals related to the ‘ties of recognition’, in itself a reflection of identity. His is a more universal notion of citizenship that does not necessarily recognise difference. However, he considers himself a teacher teaching beyond the discipline and making forays into the broader construction of identity for living in a complex world, though he names this as ‘the development of people’. Carl is fairly strongly located in modernistic paradigms and frameworks which continue to appear throughout his narrative.

[...] if they are going to be professional accountants and go out to be known as professional accountants and as good accountants, we've got to make also sure that we give them the **self-building** encouragement to make them not only be good accountants but to be good citizens too. And that's what I'm trying to use my course to do. [...] when they come to the university, the university job is to educate them, that's the development of people. Now within that, we know that they have opted to take management and they come to [this] Management School, and within that I am particularly charged with talking to them about accounting. But, I think my overall objective is the development of people.

(Carl)

Turtle dismisses the idea of teaching beyond the discipline. He is solely interested in the students’ development as lawyers.

And so there is a really good mix of people. It’s lovely. It is one of the best things about it. And that’s just great. So, you know, in terms of student numbers, I think about 70% of the students now are women and, with all due respect to ethnic minorities or men or women, I don’t really give a shit. I am here to make them into

good lawyers. You know, to me it doesn't matter where they come from or what their gender balance is, it's how well they can reason, how well they can argue, and how well they can learn.

(Turtle)

Here Turtle highlights some of the complexity regarding identity production. Although he speaks about the development of good lawyers, he is alerted to the diversity of students and the importance of context in making decisions. So the development of the identity of 'lawyer' is more complex than he suggests here. This is another example of where Turtle is definitive in his articulation of ideas and yet there are complex interrelationships, and sometimes conflicts, between his various statements.

Several of the participants talk about their perception of the changing nature of student identities, adopting a more instrumental disposition. Phillip says:

Student expectations have changed significantly over the last five years as well. In many cases students come into the system, wanting to come in and go out as quickly as possible. They're after one thing – qualification. That's it. So, I'm not quite sure, whether the wider societal changes that are really **driving** that, what I mean is, ten years ago students would come in as, hungry for knowledge, for learning consumption. That's their prime focus. Whereas today, in many cases, not all but in many cases, it's **not about learning**. It's all about passing an internal assessment, an exam to gain a qualification which allows them to do something else. The learning is not recognised. Now I don't know why that is, but it's something that they have before they come in to the system. It's not necessarily something we do with them while they're here. They actually come in with it.

(Phillip)

Phillip underplays the role of education and the agency of the teacher and gives himself and other teachers insufficient credit for the power they have to influence student approaches to learning.

However, Harry shares Phillip's view of inter-generational shifts in the nature of student identity.

[...] there's a kind of, there's a generational difference, there's a marked, maybe I just hit the age when you begin to notice it but I think there **is** a generational **expectation** for education that is, that differs from the expectations that I and my colleagues' generations may have had. Education seems to be, I don't know actually, maybe it's not, education **seems** to be kind of instrumental, you know, for a lot of students, not all.

(Harry)

He does go on to qualify his thinking and notes that their identities are complex and multiple.

[...] one of the kind of demographic shifts if I can use that word, is really that the students are probably more individualistic. They are more [...] competitive [...] not aggressively so or kind of visibly so necessarily but they are competitive and grades are very important. I'm also surprised by how co-operative they are, so it's a kind of strange thing but yea [...]

(Harry)

In engaging in this conjecture over the identities of students, Harry is also exposing some of the challenges to his own thinking as a teacher and grappling with aligning the multiple ways of being that students reside in. In doing so, he is potentially identifying one reason why education is challenging for both him and his students. But in relation to this issue of the changing nature of students, one key issue may well be the reduced levels of academic literacy with which many students enter tertiary education (Ainley & Canaan, 2005) and this cannot be underestimated in terms of the impact on students' ability to deal with challenging material.

So there are a number of different approaches embedded in the participant stories in relation to students. Each, in their own way, expresses some kind of understanding of the concept of identity production in the discourses and practices of education but few of them relate this directly to any particular theoretical position.

It is clear through their dialogue that their own identities are also implicated.

Tertiary Academic Identities

Betty is very articulate in relation to the construction of her own identity in the academy. She reflects back to her own recent experience of writing a doctoral thesis and describes the impact of uncertainty on identity.

[...] one of the things that I found really hard in my doctoral thesis was writing the conclusion in a way that expressed this feeling of uncertainty but somehow in an expert and scholarly fashion. (Laughs) It was terrible, it was terrible, I was very paralysed. So, I think at that point, the kind of uncertainty I am thinking about really is more epistemological uncertainty and I was interested in, um, modes of theorising, I suppose, higher education and, in the case of my doctoral work supervision of graduate students, that fore-grounded uncertainty but I was aware of how I had been able to think about that with quite a lot of confidence. But when I came to write the actual thesis conclusion and I needed to write **about** that, it was unnerving actually because it felt like I was in the wrong voice for the kinds of words you should be for a graduating doctoral student. And I think that must have leaked through because both my examiners, or at least one of them, if not both, thirsted for more certainty in what I had to say in the conclusions of the work. So, I **do** think that there is an issue around uncertainty and what it means to think with uncertainty, which is very real for me as a scholar and I don't, I have quite a lot of ambivalence about that, about how you do that in a way that still garners respect, actually.

(Betty)

Betty's thoughts indicate a high degree of emotion in relation to the construction of academic identities in conditions of uncertainty. She says 'I suppose what I learned is that epistemological uncertainty isn't just fun uncertainty in my brain, it's actually uncertainty that has affected or infected me much more deeply and it's actually been quite painful'. Her narrative is rife with indications of her fragile academic identity despite other parts of her conversation indicating a high degree of confidence and capability. She comes back to this issue multiple times, but not always in the context of pain.

I'm so glad Linda to be able to come out the other side and be Dr Betty [...] now, I never thought I'd have so much pleasure in the Dr because I never thought it would matter to me, actually. That's a kind of weird feeling. In other words, the process itself has re-informed the kind of pleasure I take in both myself and my work.

(Betty)

In this reflection, the identity of PhD graduate or Dr provides Betty with a sense of confirmation and affirmation about herself and her capacity as an academic and, correspondingly, a legitimate member of the academy. This is in stark contrast to Betty's pain about her sense of acceptance into the academic community expressed earlier. So the instability of identity is again evident and the discourses of education contribute to this. It seems that Betty's articulated position is a gender issue because it is more particular to her identity as a woman academic. None of the men interviewed expressed any such concerns about their place in the academy. Indeed, Davies (2006, p. 508) comments on acceptance in academe, with particular reference to women. 'We exist in so far as we are recognized and we exist inside the terms through which the act of recognition is accomplished. We are vulnerable both to the power of the one who recognizes and to the terms of their recognition'.

For tertiary teachers, there are obvious tensions between what one might be experiencing personally and the persona that is evident in the classroom.

Betty is not alone in addressing academic identity. Phillip reflects briefly on the distinction between his personal and teacher identity, but for him, this is not a reflection of any insecurity in his academic role. In fact, he draws on his earlier identity as a school teacher to supplement his current academic role, thus providing evidence of shifting identity influenced by historical and societal factors.

I am a secondary school teacher by qualification though very few people know that, but I am, although I never pursued it. So I really valued that, I did a BA/BEd joint degree in the UK but it imparted in me skills that were so valuable that I took elsewhere [...] I'm a very, I've been told in my own private life I'm a very, I'm a relatively introverted individual, but in a classroom situation I switch [...]

(Phillip)

He talks about the ‘performer’ and how it is important to ‘balance the performance with the content as well’ otherwise students will recognise that teaching is merely a performance. But there is nevertheless evidence that he understands that his behaviour in the classroom or lecture theatre requires him to take on an identity that is not necessarily ‘natural’ for him.

Evangeline has a perspective too on the changing nature of teacher identity and the challenges that brings.

We've shifted very much from the conception of teaching where the teacher is the 'expert'. I wouldn't say that I'm learning alongside my students necessarily, because I do have an obligation to be at least a step ahead of them and to know where we are supposed to be going.

(Evangeline)

She includes a somewhat amusing though telling story at the end of our conversation when I talk with her about the process of the interview itself. She

comments on a personal response which is very common, potentially more so with women, to being asked to participate in research. Her response addresses academic identity and its tentative nature. Her PhD was in social justice.

I'm not ready! I don't have my notes. I'll be honest, I'll be honest, my first thought was I got my thesis off the shelf and I went through it and I thought 'Oh my god, she's read this, what did I say? (Laughs) I can't even remember!' And then the next thought is 'she's going to find out! I'm a fraud. She's going to expose me! I'm really not that just. I just talk about it. No, no I don't want to be interviewed. She's going to find me out'. Which I guess is a natural sort of response to think that I don't do it well enough. And, of course, we'll never do it **well enough**. But, um, you now, we like to have a façade that we're together [...] actually I've had a lot more to say, to be honest, than I thought I did.

(Evangeline)

This passage sees Evangeline struggling with ownership of an identity that she desires, strives for and yet feels inadequate in. She sets herself high targets and, by her own evaluation, does not meet them. However, in the interview she is articulate, intelligent and focused, but her academic identity is vulnerable nevertheless. Boler (1999) discusses this phenomenon and the self-doubt that is common, particularly for women academics. She names the 'impostor' syndrome that Evangeline expresses as 'fraud' and comments that many women are plagued by doubts regarding their intellectual authority.

Turtle offers an interesting contrast and expresses no such doubts. When I ask him about the influences on his philosophy of teaching he says:

It's just me. It's just something I do. It's, I [...] I had a few mentors going through law school but not many. No, it's very much my own pattern. My own way of doing it. But you've got to be an expert. You've got to know the area. You can't just go in there and blag it. I mean, people can smell a rat.

(Turtle)

Turtle reinforces Phillip's statement about the importance of substance beyond the performance but, in doing so, he presents an extremely self-assured persona. Turtle's final statement at the end of the interview confirms his confidence with his academic identity – 'I have a huge ego.'

Conclusion

The production of identities is important in the context of this thesis because, according to Barnett, tertiary education in the future will need to focus more on ontology and less on epistemology if it is to assist students to live more productively with uncertainty. The development of dispositions is synergistic with the development of identities, whether those dispositions are related to 'being' in the world or whether they are related to developing commitment to social justice in the graduates of tertiary education. Both the discourses of the literature and the perspectives of the participants propose that identities are constantly under construction in tertiary education. But the process is much more complex and challenging than it might immediately appear. The current context of instability throws up barriers and the removal of definitive truths potentially leaves individuals in turmoil. They experience a tension between authority and uncertainty, creating what Giddens (1991, p. 201) calls a 'dilemma of the self'. '[I]n circumstances in which there are no final authorities, the reflexive project of the self must steer a way between commitment and uncertainty'.

Though tertiary teachers are aware of education's role in the production of identities, know and understand the challenges of uncertainty and acknowledge the insecurity created for students in education and in the world, students, as individuals, are still at the heart of this process. What teachers do in tertiary classrooms can either help or hinder their development. In Act 4, the thesis focuses specifically on what it is that happens in those classrooms and how the participants in this study deal with the issues identified here.

But there is one further concern to explore before getting into the specifics of teaching. Tertiary education, teacher identities, student identities and teaching

itself have all undergone major change. The professional and pedagogical challenges for teachers have been exposed. The last challenge related to the ‘ethics’ of teaching is still unexplored. Walker (2006a, p. 5) says, ‘By ethics I also mean specifically teaching and learning action which is ethical to the extent that “it is sympathetically informed by an understanding of its impact on the welfare and interests of those who are likely to be affected by it” (Bagnall, 2002: 79)’. Although there is no intention to conflate ethics with social justice, there are nevertheless justice overtones implicit in this.

3.6 Social Justice and Tertiary Education

Regardless of any particular philosophical underpinnings or theoretical influences and irrespective of connections with specific literatures, teaching with a social justice orientation in times of uncertainty and in conditions of performativity is challenging and often emotionally demanding. When an identity is one committed to the inclusion of social justice principles in teaching, the stakes are raised. With challenges to academic identities resulting from the demands of performativity and postmodernism, and given Brint's (1994) conclusions from his study of the nature of 'intellectualism', this is a troubling time for tertiary teachers committed to social justice education.

The Policy Context

Brint's analysis is a useful starting point. His study is based on an analysis of a wide range of periodicals and he concludes that the bold statements attributed to academics of the past, in relation to issues I will call 'social justice', have diminished significantly in recent decades. He contends that this is largely due to the influence of globalisation and marketisation and their corresponding demands 'whether these be of longer work weeks, race-sensitive policies, declining test scores, or new global challenges' (Brint, 1994, p. 173). He expresses concern about the ability to claw this back and predicts, somewhat pessimistically, a possible future 'in which intellectuals, far from contesting for status or power in society, are no longer moved by any sort of meaningful social ideals' (p. 210). While Brint may well be right, generally speaking, many would contest that his pessimistic outlook applies to all and, indeed, my research participants continue to see possibilities.

Notwithstanding the possibilities, many of the reasons for this change to the nature of publications and, therefore, the focus of intellectual work, have already been identified. But in terms of 'social justice' the impact has been marked. Social justice is a contested term and 'the immediate difficulty one confronts when examining the idea of social justice is the fact that it does not have a single essential meaning' (Rizvi, 1998, p. 47). Broadly speaking, it

encompasses many different concepts and its use reflects a range of linguistic shifts incorporating equity, diversity, equal opportunities and other such terms. Cribb and Gewirtz (2003) acknowledge that there are multiple conceptions of social justice and note that there are tensions between different interpretations which should not be ignored. However, their summary position is one that I find helpful. '[A] concern with social justice is a concern with the principles and norms of social organisation and relationships necessary to achieve, and act upon, equal consideration of all people in their commonalities and differences' (p. 18). This, I believe, can help those who teach for social justice to consider both process and outcomes in their teaching – that is, to teach *for* and to teach *about*.

Immersion in the Context

In the context of education, McCarthy and Whitlock (2002, p. 79) contend that 'Social justice education is a newly emerging field; it lacks clearly defined parameters, and it bridges distinctive disciplinary and academic areas such as social psychology, sociology, dialogue work, teacher education, urban studies, legal studies, and multicultural education'. This 'emerging' nature for social justice education as an academic area can be juxtaposed against policy directions for tertiary institutions. Blackmore (2002, p. 435) traces the use of different discourses in higher education policy and suggests that the concept of diversity 'now replaces access and equity in university mission statements. The language of equal opportunity and, even more so, of social justice has dropped from the management lexicon'. Elsewhere she investigates this further in the context of managing gender equity and cites Deem and Ozga's (1997, p. 33) observation that 'Whereas the concepts of equity and equal opportunity imply an underlying concept of social justice for all and active endeavours to achieve this, the notion of diversity invokes the existence of difference and variety without any necessary commitment to action or redistributive social justice'. Blackmore and Sachs (2003, p. 151), therefore, conclude that 'Recognition of diversity in current discourses is more about improving market position to attract a more culture diverse student population in an internationalised higher education system'. And, in the particular context

of the United States, Giroux (2003, p. 22) makes a similar point by claiming that the ‘ascendancy of corporate culture in all facets of American life has tended to uproot the legacy of democratic concerns and rights that has historically defined the stated mission of higher education’. Of greatest concern is Morley’s (2003, p. 73) contention that ‘New managerialism has demanded that all academics display characteristics of the “hegemonic” rather than counter-hegemonic intellectuals. Any analysis of power and power relations has to be suspended while performing technocracy’.

So while the field might be emerging (McCarthy & Whitlock, 2002), the policy context of higher education is less than welcoming. Blackmore (2002, p. 435) notes that the concept of equity (as a version of social justice) is not valued as a principle and ‘only justifiable if it contributes to national productivity, and is thus stripped of moral and ethical justifications’. Furthermore, the notion of diversity (as a catch-all concept for social justice) is viewed as a soft discourse and competes with the harder discourses of performativity that have been identified above. It is not surprising that Betty suggests that her institution is ‘wobbling around’ in relation to expressions of the ‘equity agenda’ (see 3.3).

The pressures of performativity, therefore, complicate the ability to teach with a social justice orientation. Teachers are faced with all the demands documented earlier and the ‘official view of good teaching is now therefore one with an increased emphasis on outcomes rather than process and a more utilitarian, test-oriented, didactic approach’ (Gewirtz, 2000, p. 363). Equity or social justice desires are downplayed in comparison to the predominant drivers of commercial success. Indeed, as Ball (2003, p. 223) laments, ‘Beliefs are no longer important – it is output that counts. Beliefs are part of an older, increasingly displaced discourse’. This confirms Brint’s conclusion about the disappearance of social ideals from the work of academics.

These influences appear to be universal in the Western academic world and are no less evident in the New Zealand context. The speed of change in New Zealand tertiary education has already been discussed, and this has had acute impact on the work of teachers in all sectors of the education system.

The radical transformation of New Zealand's education system that has taken place over the past 15 years has had a profound effect upon the teaching profession. By placing the emphasis firmly on the economic purposes of public education, neo-liberal policies have eroded fundamental democratic values of collective responsibility, cooperation, social justice and trust (Codd, 2005a, p. 204).

Codd notes that this emphasis on performativity with its corresponding focus on competencies and outcomes, has delimited the opportunities to focus on the moral dimensions of teaching in New Zealand. Pedagogy is inevitably affected. Indeed, Blackmore (2002) makes the point that it is now risky business for teachers to teach in ways that make students feel 'uncomfortable' or to challenge their views of the world because, in a climate of evaluation and student satisfaction, such practices are likely to be contentious and decrease student satisfaction. She concludes that such pressures and conditions are changing relations and shaping academic identities in new ways.

The Identity of the Social Justice Teacher

Sachs discusses the professional identity of teachers and confirms that in times of rapid change, teacher identity, like other identities, cannot be seen as fixed. Rather, 'it is negotiated, open, shifting, ambiguous, the result of culturally available meanings and the open-ended power-laden enactment of those meanings in everyday situations (Kondo, 1990: 24)' (Sachs, 2001, p. 154). Teachers experience challenges to their professional and personal identity which can be, and feel, incongruous and unstable.

Earlier in 3.5, I introduced Sachs's (2001) contention that there are currently two competing discourses shaping the professional identities of teachers. She names these discourses as democratic and managerial professionalism, and suggests the former arises from the profession itself and the latter is imposed by employing authorities. I have traversed generally the terrain relating to managerial professionalism. With reference to Apple (1996), Sachs (2001, p. 152) describes democratic professionalism as one 'which seeks to demystify professional work and build alliances between teachers and excluded

constituencies of students, parts and members of the community on whose behalf decisions have traditionally been made either by professions or the state'. Clearly there are social justice themes inherent in such a description. Sachs proposes that an activist identity arises from this democratic discourse. Teachers seeking such 'an activist identity are concerned to reduce or eliminate exploitation, inequality and oppression. Accordingly, the development of this identity is deeply rooted in principles of equity and social justice' (p. 157). Despite all the challenges, many teachers are still seeking to develop this activist identity within the discourse of democratic professionalism, but it is definitely not without its share of challenge and requires persistence.

Bathmaker and Avis carried out in-depth investigations on the construction of the identity of tertiary teachers with democratic intent in the British context. They observe the challenges introduced here and their impact on the development of professional identity. They analysed a broad literature in relation to this issue and conclude that 'those who seek opportunities for transformative practice and critical pedagogies distinguish between forms of professional identity which involve compliance with the performative requirements of managerial cultures, and professional identities which are defined as "authentic" to democratic values and practices' (Bathmaker & Avis, 2005, p. 5). While acknowledging all the pressures and distractions outlined here, they include some hopeful comments in relation to the possibilities for teachers, noting that action against performativity demands may be limited. Nevertheless:

In the context of chronic intensification of teachers' work (Hargreaves, 1994; Helsby, 1999), and the pressures associated with monitoring, inspection and accountability, the world of practitioners can seem far removed from notions of critical pedagogies and transformative democratic practices. At the same time, there is evidence from other studies (Gleeson & Shain, 1999; Smyth *et al*, 2000) that some teachers use the contradictions and spaces that exist in the controls that confront them to pursue a course that they believe is in the long-term interests of the students in their care (Bathmaker & Avis, 2005, p. 9).

While some of the writers referred to above locate their investigations in compulsory or further education, the explanatory power for tertiary education

is often evident, as many of the contextual factors have become familiar in the discussions in this thesis. However, this is not to say that all factors of their theories are translatable and caution must be exercised to not overgeneralise.

Future Possibilities

Nevertheless, this offers some optimism that has been picked up by others. ‘When tertiary education is defined purely as a form of (self-interested) private investment goals such as promoting a love of learning, fostering public debate, and enhancing democratic citizenship disappear from the agenda. These ideals must be defended’ (Roberts, 1999, p. 80). Roberts, who earlier provided some insights into conditions of performativity, says that ‘Maintaining a commitment to scholarship and academic rigour through adopting what might, in Freirean terms, be termed an investigative, curious, probing, questioning, dialogical, *critical* approach toward the act of study (Freire, 1985) rubs against the grain of a market system built on the process of *consumption*’ (p. 81).

So, ideally, it is still possible for tertiary teachers to work with the goals of social justice education and to teach in ways that are socially just. Codd recently juxtaposed the human capital and social capital approaches to education, the former being vested in individuals (economic drivers) and the latter in communities (social drivers). He urges education to enhance a focus on social capital, thus concerning itself with the development of independent and critical thinkers capable of testing truth claims and justifying beliefs and, ultimately, increasing its role in the promotion and preservation of social justice. He summarises the comparison by stating that ‘whereas the economic purpose of education is to prevent economic and technological alienation, the social purpose is to promote societal well-being and social and economic justice’ (Codd, 2005b, pp. 15-16).

Codd is not alone in considering a different and positive future for tertiary education. In a new volume edited by Barnett and Di Napoli (2008), several writers consider the potential for new and powerful identities in higher education. Miller (2008, p. 105), citing Apple says, ‘Some fear there has been a corrosion of academic integrity in a context that favours the “thin morality”

of competitive individualism over the “thick morality” that connects learning to citizenship and the “common good” (Apple, 2001). She contends this does not have to be. While acknowledging the potential ‘emptiness’ of the current profession and the ‘dessicated forms of identity that universities create when academic knowledge is subsumed by market forces’ (p. 111), she urges that academics should see their quest as one in which education and research should be revitalised ‘not just so that it is relevant to industry and potential employers, but so that it serves society as a whole’, including our students. This requires a focus on ‘context-sensitive forms of teaching and learning’ (p. 112) in which ‘Reflexivity, discussion and, above all, engagement are the key to the success of the modern university’ (p. 112).

Taylor (2008, p. 28) goes further. ‘Put bluntly, much of the current discussion of the decline and fall of universities and academic work is based on myth’. He bases this on an investigation of academics from several countries and contends that there is a sentimental grieving for the loss of the ‘golden age’. He believes academics should not look back with anger or blame at their managers for ‘the disappearance of collegiality and collegial decision-making [which have been] displaced by managerialism and corporatism’ (p. 33). Instead, they have the capacity to take back that which they feel they have lost. He offers options, including one ‘for reworking academic identity [that] involves a refocusing on the centrality of learning to academic identity. Learning may provide a unifying commitment for academic identities’ (p. 39). He concludes that ‘Nostalgia for a golden era of academic identity, like any other object of grieving, will not provide a basis for renewal’ (p. 39).

So, some of the writers discussing the roles and identities of the social justice tertiary teacher see reason for optimism, hope and action, while others paint a very bleak picture. This leads me naturally into some discussions with the participants about their attitudes to social justice teaching in current tertiary contexts and the related issues of their own identities within those contexts. Do these teachers see the pressures described here as too great, removing them from notions of democratic practice, or do they utilise spaces and contradictions to continue to pursue social justice goals and processes?

Stories from the Everyday World

My discussions with the research participants regarding social justice begin in different ways with different people. For some, the discussion is an easy transition from other topics with no real evidence that there is anything contentious to discuss. With others, there is an interruption to the flow of conversation and a moment, or more, of clarification. It is at this point in the interviews that I discover unexpected and challenging positions from some participants. It is important to note that the process of participant selection, when I was not personally familiar with the people concerned, included a query as to their commitment to social justice outcomes and processes in their teaching. In each of these pre-selection discussions, those finally included in the project articulated such a commitment. Once we discussed the issue of social justice explicitly, some slippery notions of social justice were evident.

I begin with some discussions around the nature of teaching for social justice and what that might mean for teachers.

It is a slippery slope, social justice. One of the things I argued for in my thesis was I found in the political theory a lot of attention to redistribution and recognition and so forth but not a lot of attention to what we do in teaching which is an ethic of care. So I think that for us in education, it doesn't make much sense to talk about social justice without also talking about relationships. [...] so I think social justice is tending to issues of equity, tending to all those issues of redistribution and recognition, but it's also about relationships and the emotional work that goes into teaching.

(Evangeline)

This narrative from Evangeline is rich with references to varying aspects of social justice. She confronts the complexity of dealing with the term itself and she is well-positioned for doing so, having investigated this issue in her own PhD work. She also identifies the key theories of redistribution and recognition that dominate the social justice discourse. But, in the context of teacher education, Evangeline comments on the inadequacy of each of these approaches for dealing with the intensity of social justice work and the

relational dimensions discussed by Gewirtz (1998). She is indicating her comfort at least with the theories associated with social justice, despite her earlier concern about being a fraud in this domain.

I ask Carl what teaching for social justice means to him and he is less definitive.

Well it is not a term that I would have used until you used it on me. Very often I've argued that we should not have an ethics course at the University Management School because I feel ethics should permeate every single course that we teach and we should repeatedly be referring to ethical values.

(Carl)

He equates social justice with ethics but does not develop this idea at all in our conversations. However, throughout our discussion, his interpretation becomes clear. Ethics and good citizenship go hand in hand, according to Carl. But, as the reader will see, his ethical considerations have particular meanings and applications that are out of synchrony with key debates outlined earlier in relation to social justice. Carl's notion of social justice does not encompass inclusivity, opportunity and difference in the way I would interpret it and, despite his desire to educate people to be good citizens, it is Carl's concept of citizenship that dominates.

Phillip is also quizzical about social justice, asking me 'What do you mean by that?' This is a very surprising comment to me given that I used this term in our initial screening discussion. He may be looking for my interpretation of social justice but, our subsequent discussions indicate he does not have a well-developed notion of social justice as outlined in the debates and theories in this thesis.

Nevertheless, I respond, suggesting that I consider that education is a political act related to enhancing justice but Phillip is unable to articulate any clear

notion of social justice and rather refers to the postmodern concept of viewing problems through different lenses.

Harry, too, hesitates when I ask about his approach to social justice, but his is a more considered hesitation. He draws into focus a range of historical and contemporary approaches and this pause allows him to consider multiple understandings of the concept.

Well, I was going to ask you actually, um, I mean, I guess it depends on discipline to a certain extent but I suppose, anything can happen, you're talking about some kind of political engagement, some kind of affirmative kind of action programme or something that deals with kind of redistribution or availability of opportunity I suppose, kind of universal availability of opportunity.

(Harry)

His ultimate definition indicates that he is well aware of the literature and is thoughtful in considering the implications in the context of discipline.

Turtle gives a direct, unequivocal response to the question about the meaning of social justice.

Um, a society of equals. Where everyone has got the same chance to compete. Where you bring up those at the bottom so that we can all enter into the race together and we look after those who can't compete.

(Turtle)

He mentions no theoretical approaches but rather constructs his notion of social justice in competitive terms. This theme of competition is woven throughout his narrative, and the reader will see evidence of this at times throughout Turtle's discourse. This could be linked to Turtle's discipline (law) and his own avowed sense of self (ego). Nevertheless, he believes he has a social justice orientation to his teaching. His definition here suggests an understanding of distributive issues.

In the discussions about social justice, the participants and I also talk about what the term might mean in current tertiary education contexts. Some of the complexities identified earlier become evident as they grapple with a number of different ideas and what this might mean regarding the ability to deliver on social justice goals in their educational contexts.

Betty comments on the changing perceptions of social justice in tertiary institutions, and laments the narrow definition currently in use, noting:

[...] there is a sense in which if we understand EEdO to be a kind of policy speak on behalf of social justice, then, that is what that is about. I mean it is a very limited story about what social justice is, I suppose, but it's one that institutions are currently willing to listen to because the Labour Government has kind of insisted that they do.

(Betty)

Betty is incessantly reflective and comfortable with policy and political level considerations. Here she notes the universities' lack of ownership of proactive attention to issues of social justice, thus articulating with the concerns expressed by Blackmore (2002) and others who note the capture of the terms and the subsequent limited interpretation and expectation.

Evangeline seems to align herself with the position proposed by McCarthy and Whitlock (2002) who contend that social justice education is an emerging field.

[...] recently it's become a really popular term and [...] it's nice in some new ways because it's an umbrella term and so then you can talk about sexism and racism and able-ism and hetero-sexism and all those things that can get lumped under that wide umbrella but then, at the end of the time, because it's an umbrella, it gets left [...] it's unarticulated, unsaid, assumed, and that's, I think, when these things become dangerous when they're not **unpacked** and explained [...] so those terms can be co-opted and used for lots of different purposes. And you have to be really careful **how** we use

them. And I think that's where becoming, we talk about positionality and positioning ourselves, that's when you say 'for me social justice is x, y and z' or 'I'm drawing upon these folks in my thinking' and we say 'OK, here's where you stand'.

(Evangeline)

Implicit in Evangeline's story is recognition of the broad scope of social justice education and the challenges this presents. She not only describes this breadth but acknowledges the importance of naming this with students and 'unpacking' both the terminology and the theoretical positions inferred by that terminology. Evangeline's position on this stands in stark contrast to that of Turtle who, as we will see soon, prefers to remain 'neutral' with his students and not to declare his position on things.

She continues, reinforcing that social justice has many interpretations and stating that she personally feels some comfort with poststructural theories and how they have produced new insights and ways of thinking about social justice. She, more than any other participant, is very familiar with the multiple theories of social justice and their expectations of teachers. In this narrative, the 'embodied' nature of that teaching becomes important and explicit as she begins to discuss her approaches to teaching in later sections.

Well I think if you are going to work within a, I don't know, if you work within a poststructural framework, if you're going to work within a postmodern framework, I think one of the important contributions we can make to that area is a way to think about theorising social justice that also attends to the embodied nature of teaching [...]

(Evangeline)

Evangeline's discipline of teacher education has prepared her well for such considerations. Indeed, it quickly became evident that those involved in education (including teacher education) had a much greater capacity to articulate clearly their own understandings of social justice education and refer easily to theories of it in their discussions. This is not altogether surprising. I

explained very early on in this thesis that I was aware that those working in the field of education would likely be more able to do so given that education has long traditions of engaging with social justice. I also noted that this confirms my decision to include those from other disciplines so that a broader view of the situation in tertiary education could be examined. Generic academic identities in relation to social justice are not easily defined.

Social Justice Identities

In the next section, the issue becomes more personalised as the focus begins to attend to how the participants see themselves or their teaching in terms of social justice. For several participants, their own identity as ‘social justice teacher’ is introduced seamlessly into the discussion. In answer to the same question about perspectives on social justice, Jane does not try to define the term merely theoretically but immediately refers to the New Zealand context and the importance of her role as a Treaty educator. However, she quickly brings other discourses into the discussion and names her own identity as a social justice teacher.

Probably the first thing I think of when I think of social justice in Aotearoa New Zealand is Treaty stuff. That would be the baseline for me and even though I have feminist ideals and lesbian sensibilities, the Treaty does sort of stand to me in this country as a huge human rights and social justice issue [...]

(Jane)

Jane is explicit that for her there is nothing more critical or natural than an unwavering commitment to Treaty education – to locating the Treaty of Waitangi at the core of her work and her discussions with students. In New Zealand, this is to be expected for someone with social justice intent. But Jane introduces other identities in acknowledging her own ‘lesbian sensibilities’ and her feminist orientation, being open about who she is as person and teacher.

Rose offers very similar perspectives, naming both gender and Treaty considerations as central to her work. Her postmodern orientation is also evident through her references to lenses, referring to her ‘strong gender lens’.

Both Jane and Rose understand that these aspects of the construction of their own identities as individuals and as teachers impact on their teaching practice, and contribute to defining them as teachers (Bracher, 2006). They do not seek to separate these from their work but name these as integral to who they are in the classroom. This is interesting in terms of wider understandings of cultural issues of identity and social justice and stands in stark contrast to more individualised notions of social justice expressed by Turtle. He prides himself on being unreadable to students and sees that any evidence of his own belief systems or ‘private’ identity has no place in the classroom.

So, if you have a social justice orientation to your teaching, how does that play itself out in classes for you? How would anybody know that you had that orientation?

(Linda)

Well they don’t. This is it, the students are continually trying to work out if I am left wing or right wing. And I won’t tell them because it is not for me to tell them which way I vote. Because I don’t want them to go out there and sort of say well Turtle thought voting ACT¹¹ is a good thing and therefore I will or Turtle thought voting Green was a good thing. What I try to show them is that every decision, every legal decision, every policy decision has a context. And to me social justice is about understanding that context. Not just taking something as being value-free. I think that is very important for the law. Because law is often put across as being value-free but it’s not. It’s laden with it. So the students have to try and work out what the, what the background considerations are, what the philosophies are, you know, what the sociology is. And to me that’s what social context is.

(Turtle)

This statement from Turtle stands in stark contrast to most literature written by those with social justice intent who promote teachers identifying their positions and advocating for social justice goals and outcomes. Indeed Gonzalez (2003,

¹¹ ACT is a right-of-centre New Zealand political party.

pp. 10-11) says ‘It seems to me that to embody values is only problematic when it is tied to a position of authority. If what you say carries institutional weight, it is difficult to contest; your knowledge is property, not part of a common stock, and you control its distribution and allocate it among others’. However, Turtle may see it as appropriate, robust teaching. But I will come to this later.

The most challenging social justice identity is presented by Carl. Carl is commenting that his university is trying to label itself as ‘sustainable’ and he and other lecturers are having difficulty with this orientation. I follow this up suggesting ‘your institution also makes some quite stringent claims about its approach to biculturalism. Is that something that is part of your experience here at the university?’ I am unprepared for his response.

With the Maoris particularly? (Pause. Sigh) We’ve, that’s almost an accident of our geography and our history that we’ve got a big Maori influence here and we’re asked to do things like put on accounting courses in [another city] and we’ve, my department and me personally don’t want to put on accounting courses for Maori [there] because I personally don’t think that’s the best use of our resources. [...] Ah, so, yes we’ve got to, I think, tip our **hat** at biculturalism, but I’d say many people here, are not committed to it and I say that I’m not. That’s not because, I’d hate to be considered anti-Maori, but, ah, I feel that, I suppose we shouldn’t privilege Maori and I don’t want my staff having to go down to [there], fly down, fly back, spend their weekend there, they’ve got better things to do with their time for a general audience rather than for people [there].

(Carl)

Here there is no acknowledgement of white settlement as invasion or about social justice recognition of difference and prior injustices which should be rectified. This narrative is a reinforcement of the concern regarding approaches to social justice and the complex and contrasting perspectives that can be assumed in the name of social justice. When Carl introduced this idea,

it created a troubling situation for me as interviewer and one that has caused me much reflection ever since. It presents a moment of ‘depth reality’ (Wengraf, 2001) where what sits on the surface is complex underneath. It also articulates with Johnson’s (2001) reference to ethical research where he urges the researcher to examine their own ideas. I had a chance to exclude Carl from the thesis but he believes he teaches for social justice and some of his practice confirms that. Biculturalism, however, is not in his sphere of concern in terms of developing ‘good citizens’. His heritage is probably implicated given that he grew up in England and is an immigrant to New Zealand. Nevertheless, Carl is responding from a position of white privilege and expressing ideas that are in serious tension with his espoused commitment to social justice. This indicates how some forms of difference are recognised in discourses of social justice, and others not; some are more collective and others more individualistic.

I find it difficult to link Carl closely with the literature that would allow me to define him as a social justice educator, despite Rizvi’s (1998) acknowledgement of there being no single essential meaning of social justice. This is not a congruent identity, despite his espoused commitment to ethical practice. Nevertheless, multiple identity theory allows for Carl to define his notion of social justice differently from my own or to focus on specific social justice issues. I will return to this in Act 4.

Capacity to Teach

My interviews continued with the eight quite diverse teachers, though they shared some perspectives and disagreed significantly on others. Finally in this section, I return to the issue of capacity to teach for social justice in times of uncertainty and contexts of performativity in tertiary education. It has become clear that the constraints indicated in the literature do impact on the work of these teachers and they feel the difficulties and tensions in varying degrees.

It is Betty who is most reflective and eloquent on this issue. She has considered this deeply, discussed it in her keynote speech relating to teaching for uncertainty and conceptualised the tensions for social justice. I think that,

because she works in the continuing development department of her university, she has given considerable thought to these issues in order to be able to debate them with other staff members. Despite her own commitment, she is very doubtful about the university's ability to maintain commitment to social justice.

So there was an equity agenda in the university system in New Zealand I think from the beginning but it took off in the 60s and 70s in higher education and there is a very recent article in the Times Higher Ed talking about have we kind of come to the end of the road with the access agenda [...] And then there was a time when we thought we could maintain a traditional higher education system but take up these other agendas of equity and access and maybe national usefulness, and now I think we are beginning to wonder if we can manage all these agendas.

(Betty)

She discusses the entanglement this creates for teachers who can become uncertain in their role and in their capacity to act in socially just ways in their teaching. She notes the tensions between working for social justice and responding to the expectations of university norms, particularly naming the 'tradition' that surrounds her university.

[...] we're in a university that is a credentialing machine and credentialing is a process that involves some really powerful norms around transparency, parity, parity slash equity, and then there are also regulations some of which are trying to protect disciplinary norms, high standards, other things which are [...] I mean this is where the agenda that we are in at the moment is so confused and like what are we doing here? [...] it is a very entangled agenda that we have here [...]

(Betty)

Implicit in Betty's discourse is some of the tension and uncertainty that she experiences as a teacher which is evident in the way that she struggles with naming the situational factors and with finding an appropriate balance for

herself in these contexts. Betty chooses to be in this institution but nevertheless grapples with the identities she has to juggle within the competing discourses and expectations that she encounters.

She considers the issues of performativity and their impact directly on teachers, in the process reflecting on relationships with those around her (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998).

[...] we are entangled in a system of accreditation, recognition, stratification of students and so [...] and we're doing it on this massive scale and we're doing it with a squeezing budget and I can see in my colleagues the exhaustion and the difficulty of managing their workloads. And so then I think 'so what is it that I'm doing?' [...] I'm so aware of how the ground on which I stand to do things, how much it has shifted in the last ten years even.

(Betty)

Betty paints a bleak picture – but one which she is at least prepared to confront and reflect on and, potentially find ways in which to attend to some of these issues in her own approaches to teaching. She is not alone in her reflection and her interpretation of the situation. Harry, too, notes the confusion between the different discourses of tertiary education and the tensions created when competing discourses are juxtaposed. He also highlights the discord, from his perspective, between the university's espoused and real commitment, in the process naming the untenable position that teachers might find themselves working in with the tension between the two.

So, that's [culture of efficiency] one of the things I looked at, kind of institutional rhetoric that goes along with this because, you know, most institutions are now **for** kind of social justice. I mean no one is going to say 'we are against social justice' but it's couched in a kind of neo-liberal and neo-managerial thing so it becomes things like flexibility, so you can educate kids for flexible workplaces which means, what?

(Harry)

Blackmore and Sachs (2007) discuss this situation in terms of the impact of managerialist performativity on the lives of teachers, including those who teach with a social justice orientation. They address the increasing surveillance and management of teachers' work, and note that performativity is interested in efficiency – getting more outcomes for less input. They contend that decision-makers are in the business of accumulating power and that 'In matters of social justice and scientific truth alike, the legitimisation of that power is based on optimising the systems' performance-efficiency' (2007, p. 107). This leaves little space for attention to issues of social justice. As Betty notes:

I haven't been able to hold on to that [social justice] agenda, I haven't held on to that agenda as well as I might have because of the way in which I am sharing the responsibility of being the teacher...

Betty talks about how she and her co-teacher colleague approached a particular issue from different perspectives.

... So that was a fascinating conversation because mine came out of a desire to be accommodating and flexible to people who had very different lifestyles and hers was about trying to signal that people should protect their private lives for their own use. So we were both thinking in terms of a justice, or, I mean she's a strong feminist, I'm a strong feminist, but we got to a very different place via our different modes of thinking.

(Betty)

What is evident here are the multiple identities of the social justice teacher. Betty and her colleague both have an orientation that desires attention to issues of justice but there is not a common understanding of this particular situation.

I close this section with Jane articulating the inevitable time constraints.

Well, um, time is a huge challenge. Time, I feel we have less time as a sector altogether as early childhood. I know we have less

time to engage in really authentic and critical discussion in terms of philosophy and I see social justice and education for hope as being philosophical constructs that require ongoing and meaningful and real discussion and debate and [...] I think it could be a little bit piecemeal at the moment so [...] perhaps an institutional recognition of the importance of these things might assist.

(Jane)

For social justice educators, this adds further challenges, because, as Betty and Jane suggest, there is little time to formulate thoughts and engage in reflection in conditions of performativity, and the allied risk that reflection itself is merely a performative exercise.

3.7 Conclusion

According to the literature and most research participants, this is a time of change, uncertainty and ambiguity and a time of rethinking and reshaping tertiary education. Societal changes have created forces for marketisation and industrialisation of not only the identity of tertiary institutions but also their approaches to knowledge and teaching. The pressures of managerialism, resulting in conditions of performativity, have changed the face of tertiary leadership and management and, correspondingly, the nature and identities of the teacher. The result is an altered approach to teaching, a potential reduction in the autonomy and independence of teachers and increasing pressures on the curriculum and pedagogy, pressures that potentially limit what individual teachers feel they are able to achieve. This is very evident through the stories of the participants included here.

The professional, pedagogical and ethical environments and conditions of teaching are also in flux. What it means to be a tertiary teacher in this environment is ‘up for grabs’ but the demands of performativity seemingly leave few options and, even more critically, less time for teachers to consider the philosophical and pedagogical aspects of their work and to negotiate and discuss these with their colleagues. Many teachers feel increasingly isolated and constrained by the pressures of this environment and correspondingly distracted from what they consider to be their core business. For those who teach for social justice, the constraints are no less, and arguably greater, in terms of potential to include social justice considerations in their teaching. The situation appears oppressive. Betty summarises this in relation to performativity, uncertainty and social justice:

Yea, I mean yes, but once upon a time higher education, if you participated in it, there was a certain predictability about where you would end up afterwards. Now of course, one of the trade-offs of the massification of higher education is that there isn't any and, in fact, the data coming back to us from the UK, which is one of the

clearest data sets, says that we're just seeing the same patterns of privilege and so on that used to work alongside having a degree but then you were a person who had a degree. Now the degrees are more widely distributed but the selection processes for jobs, good jobs and so on, are not matching that wider distribution – not when you look at it at the level of kind of big studies anyway - some individuals maybe. And of course you add to that the ontological insecurity of debt and, you know, uncertainty about debt repayment and that's another very important ground...

(Betty)

But is it possible that this is also a time of opportunity? Is it a time when there is the capacity for new ways of thinking, of doing and of being in tertiary education? Perhaps it is not necessary to capitulate entirely to such pressures but, indeed, possible to find ways of resisting oppressive demands and constraining trends. Phillip suggests so, with the desired outcome of shifting the student perception of issues.

And everybody, you know if I look at my colleagues here or it doesn't matter, anyone who is employed in higher education, depending on the nature of the subject and depending on people's backgrounds, they will have different frames of reference and they will, those frames of reference will inevitably be reflected in their own different teaching styles and their different delivery mechanisms as well. Um, but what's the role of a tertiary institution? You know, I'm adamant it's to see, it's to get the students to see their world and examining their experiences through different lenses.

(Phillip)

While this again reflects Phillip's 'multiple lenses' orientation, he nevertheless identifies some desire to broaden his students' knowledge about and attention to diversity. This brings me to an acknowledgement that the context is indubitably challenging, but there remain possibilities. I conclude here with

Barnett's reminder introduced earlier in this Act. 'The postmodern story is not a recipe for closure but it is a recipe for restricted and local conversations' (Barnett, 2004b, p. 68). It is very tempting to consider that the current conditions of tertiary education delimit opportunities for the inclusion of social justice in teaching and therefore the door is closed or closing on opportunities for democratic education. This does not need to be. In Act 4, I continue local and restricted conversations with the participants and consider their positions in relation to such possibilities.

In doing so, I move the focus from the broader contexts of tertiary education to the more specific environments and conditions of classrooms and bring into perspective the essential nature of teaching and the ways the participants practice teaching and learning and specifically social justice teaching on a daily basis. I also explore more fully the possibilities of education for *being* and juxtapose the two to expose the synergies and complexities that might arise from bringing the two approaches together.

A C T 4

Tales of Teaching

4.1 *Introduction*

Having considered the broad context of tertiary education in times of uncertainty, I now concentrate the focus on the work of tertiary academics. Act 3 traversed many of the professional issues they encounter both in relation to their existence in tertiary education contexts in postmodernity and their shifting identities as teachers. In Act 4, I investigate more deeply the pedagogical and ethical issues they deal with in their lives as teachers in tertiary classrooms, so the focus now becomes tales of teaching.

A number of issues are central in this Act. Initially, I look at the concept of ‘good teaching’. Each of the participants is considered to be a ‘good teacher’ through nominations to tertiary excellence awards or through other commendations and so I seek to understand their notions of good teaching. While teaching for social justice demands and requires good teaching if it is to create engagement and action and address difference, much more is required as will become evident. During this Act the connections between good teaching and teaching for social justice, specifically in relation to the perspectives and practices of these participants, will be unpacked.

The context of uncertainty remains, so an investigation into the practices of tertiary teaching for and in uncertainty is undertaken. Linked to this is a more thorough analysis of the nature of education for *being*, for it is in the context of uncertainty that Barnett contends education should focus more particularly on the development of the *being* of the student for prospering in such conditions. What does this mean and what does it look like? Identity is implicated and revisited in 4.4.

Throughout the thesis, I have juxtaposed the two notions of education for *being* and education for social justice and pondered their possible synergies and challenges. Now, this relationship is fully explored. What, specifically, are the principles underpinning education for social justice and how do the teachers in this study represent how they experience and utilise them, if at all?

The juxtaposition then allows me to consider more fully several key notions that have already been introduced. These are notions of student identities, the development of desirable dispositions and, importantly, pedagogical approaches to teaching for social justice.

So this is a crucial Act and one in which the key themes of the thesis are considered fully in turn and the relationships between them exposed and examined. There will be disturbance, ambiguity, complexity and discontinuity. There will be writing (mine and others) that is ‘rife with exaggerations, distortions, inconsistencies, contradictions, and imaginary constructions that disqualify it as a final, factual rendition of people and events’ (Barone, 2001, p. 7). I predicted just such an approach in Act 2, for that is the nature both of narrative and of my understanding of the world. There will be no ‘final, factual rendition’ but there will be a richness of experience and possibility arising from the examination of the literature and, importantly, the everyday worlds of the participants.

4.2 ‘Good’ Teaching

‘Linda, you know the literature says that’s highly contestable,’ Rose admonishes me when I ask her what good teaching is about and, rightly so. She is taking Minichiello and others’ (1995, p. 38) position as ‘critic of assumptions’ in our conversation. There is a huge literature around tertiary teaching and the principles that underpin it and it would be a foolish person who believed they could categorically define good teaching that is effective in all contexts. Nevertheless, there are some principles that can be applied and these are explored below, though the localised context and the particulars of the classroom should necessitate a negotiated approach and a degree of diversity. At this point, I am interested in generic notions of teaching rather than in critical pedagogies or other pedagogies associated with social justice because I am testing the participants’ understanding of teaching generally.

A number of writers have forged a name for themselves as observers and commentators of tertiary teaching. Ramsden, a major contributor to the field, makes very explicit links, some might say self-evidently, between the students’ learning and the quality of teaching. He defines the nature of good teaching in higher education as that which ‘encourages high-quality student learning’ (Ramsden, 2003, p. 84).

Ramsden comes from a very specific paradigm and arguably his theorising is located in neo-liberal policy, but I include him here as he is one of the most commonly referenced writers regarding ‘good’ teaching in tertiary education. The foundation of his approach is a distinction between surface and deep approaches to learning, originally attributed to Marton and Säljö (1984). The former, he contends, results in students intending only to complete the task at hand whereas the latter predisposes an intention to understand. It is the way the teacher teaches that creates the appropriate orientation to learning and, clearly, it is a deep approach that is desired. The key concept associated with the deep approach is engagement such that the student wishes to understand and make meaning rather than take a reproduction orientation to satisfy the teacher’s assessment demands. Ramsden (p. 53) proposes that ‘*What* students

learn is indeed closely associated with *how* they go about learning it' and, correspondingly, how much satisfaction students derive from their learning.

Of course there is much, much more to Ramsden's theories and observations that, by necessity, I must skim over. Having dispensed with what he calls fallacies and myths about what teaching in higher education is about he distils his theory of effective teaching into six key principles. These, briefly are:

Interest and explanation in which the lecturer ensures that student interest is aroused, learning is pleasurable and the value of the material is explained and enhances deep learning.

Concern and respect for students and learning rejects 'The consummately arrogant professor, secure in the omnipotent possession of boundless knowledge' (p. 94). This reflects lack of care and compassion for students and should be replaced with 'benevolence and humility' (p. 95) by teachers who are generous, honest, interested in their teaching, versatile and available.

Appropriate assessment and feedback is founded on student engagement with their learning and the availability of the teacher to assist students in developing strategies to provide evidence of their understanding.

Clear goals and intellectual challenge achieves a balance between freedom and discipline such that the student is able to progress their learning positively. Control over learning resides with both student and teacher but the teacher's task is to make the challenge of learning interesting.

Independence, control and engagement acknowledges that 'students must be engaged with the content of the learning tasks in a way that is likely to enable them to reach understanding. Perceptions of choice over how to learn the subject matter, and of control over which aspects students may focus on, are related to high-quality teaching' (p. 97).

Learning from students notes that all the other principles count for little if teachers are not prepared to assess the impact on students and adjust their teaching accordingly.

Ramsden, although offering a somewhat technicist approach, provides a very clear outline of what teachers should consider to maximise student learning. His views are supported by others also renowned for their attention to ‘good’ teaching in tertiary. Biggs (1999) favours ‘rich’ learning environments that create opportunities for all students to engage and, like Ramsden, aims for students to participate in deep learning. Biggs contends that there are four key factors that ably define rich learning environments: a well-structured knowledge base; an appropriate motivational context; learner activity; and interaction with others. Evident here are aspects of both content and process and, again, the relational nature of teaching and learning. He explicates each in turn, providing indicators of how to achieve them. For example, constructing a knowledge base includes: building on the known; maximising structure; using student error constructively; and maximising students’ awareness of their own knowledge construction. Biggs sees the responsibility as shared between teachers and students and student activity is key. He explains that learning is significantly enhanced through appropriate activity that can be teacher, peer or self-directed. At the heart of the process are the relationships that need to be developed in order to fully engage students.

Knowledge is constructed through learner activity and interaction. Activity has several roles. The fact of being generally active in and of itself provides general alertness and efficiency; TLAs [teaching/learning activities] using different sensory modes of learning provides [sic] multiple access to what has been learned. Learning may be directed by teacher, peers or self. Each agent best serves different purposes (Biggs, 1999, p. 94).

So a fairly consistent picture begins to emerge. Knight (2002) also names the importance of relationships with students and knowing your learners. He comments on the need for effective teaching to involve the whole person and notes that teaching necessitates the inclusion of the whole embodied being of

the person and it is insufficient to give teachers a set of techniques or a script to follow. This will not allow them to truly engage students in complex learning. In a similar vein, Brookfield (1990) views teaching as a process that requires much more than instruction and he describes attributes of the skilful teacher. He begins by acknowledging that teaching is complex and his opening discussion reflects the themes of this thesis.

Passion, hope, doubt, fear, exhilaration, weariness, colleagueship, loneliness, glorious defeats, hollow victories and, above all, the certainties of surprise and ambiguity – how can one begin to capture the reality of teaching in a single word or phrase? A book that addresses this reality and focuses on the actual experience of teaching must eschew simple descriptors or neat conceptualizations. For the truth is that teaching is frequently a gloriously messy pursuit in which surprise, shock, and risk are endemic (Brookfield, 1990, p. 1).

Like Ramsden, Biggs and Knight, Brookfield proposes that the measure of effective teaching is whether students are learning and ‘A constant feature of your teaching should be a concerted effort to understand how students are experiencing learning’ (p. 200). He also urges teachers to note and tend to the ‘fragile egos’ (p. 207) of students and this is consistent with Ramsden’s consideration of the importance of achieving a balance between intellectual challenge and student independence. He believes the bottom line is that teachers are helpers of learning and anything that assists a student to learn can be regarded as skilful teaching, though this must be understood within a set of ethical standards focused on the achievement and well-being of students.

I began this section by noting that, although it is possible to define a set of principles that underpin good teaching, these cannot be universally applied. Brookfield is very strong on this position:

Teaching and learning are such complex processes, and teachers and learners are such complex beings, that no model of practice or pedagogical approach will apply in all settings. A lot of fruitless time and energy can be spent trying to find the holy grail of pedagogy, the one way to instructional enlightenment. No philosophy, theory, or theorist can possibly capture the idiosyncratic reality of your own experience as a teacher (p. 197).

There are guidelines but these pale into insignificance inside the realities of classrooms where ambiguity, uncertainty, the unexpected and, according to Brookfield, even chaos, reign.

Emotions in the Classroom

One important factor that several writers acknowledge, but Brookfield devotes particular attention to, is the ‘emotionality of learning’ (p. 204). He notes that most textbooks on teaching fail to attend to the centrality of learning being about human beings with all their attendant emotions. Students are confronted with a huge array of diverse emotions from elation to fear to anger to grief and these are often accompanied by a resulting loss of self-esteem as the learning process challenges them and their values, beliefs and abilities. ‘Even when they experience forward movement, there is likely to be a grieving for old ways of being and for lost assumptions’ (p. 205). Brookfield urges teachers to be aware of this and prepared for the resulting behaviours in and out of the classroom that occur when students’ emotions are engaged.

More recently, Boler has written extensively about emotions in the classroom and acknowledges that feminist theorising has helped understand emotions in relation to ethical, cognitive and, particularly, political domains of education. She names emotions as a site of social control in education and encourages the inclusion of emotions as a legitimate part of the learning process. In doing so, she notes that ‘In higher education and scholarship, to address emotions is risky business – especially for feminists and others already marginalized within the hierarchy of the academy’ (Boler, 1999, p. 109). Luke (1993, p. 69) makes a similar point with regard to those marginalised in the academy, specifically women. ‘Women’s deferral to “experience”, to things relational and emotional, as a discursive strategy with which to “get into” a discussion, or by which to concretize “theory”, is often trivialized in academic contexts’. So although it might be desirable, it will not always be straightforward or welcome. Boler also acknowledges that it is not easy to develop pedagogies that invite emotions as, for example, when challenging each others’ experiences or differences in beliefs or values. Brookfield and Boler, amongst

others, claim a role for emotions in the classroom as part of ‘good’ teaching. Once issues of social justice are included, their inclusion appears even more important.

Stories from the Everyday World

I ask each of the participants what they believe constitutes good teaching in tertiary education. This is an early question, following generally after the discussions relating to uncertainty. This order is purposeful. If each of these participants is considered to be a ‘good’ teacher, I want to understand their general approach to teaching before we begin to explore issues of social justice and how these are included in their teaching. I also want to hear if there are any links made between their beliefs about uncertainty, their understanding of social justice practices and their thinking about education for *being*, even though they might not name it as such.

In general, there is a high correlation between these participants’ beliefs about good teaching and the principles and approaches introduced above.

Given Rose’s immediate challenge of my question, it is appropriate to start with her beliefs.

What do I think good teaching is? I think good teaching is, um, transformational. And so, Pennie Brownlee¹², who is a bit of a guru in my life and who I have aspired to be [...] be myself but there are many qualities about her teaching that I admire. And she described really transformative experiences as ‘the scales fell away from my eyes and the world no longer looked the same’. And I think, ‘wow’, if that happens, then there’s something amazing going on. So the question is, how does that happen? And I really believe that it happens through experiential learning. I’m trying to, even experiential learning is only part of that, it, and, this is where I find words really difficult. I think, for me,

there's an aspect of applied learning in there and I've come up with my own definition of applied learning. And experiential learning is one aspect of that.

(Rose)

I urge Rose to continue with her definition.

Well I think you have to build on students' prior knowledge and you have to acknowledge their prior knowledge [...] and help them to then make connections, in a sense to theorise about that experience, whether it's personal lived experience outside of teaching or whether it's an experience they're having in their centres with children. So that's the first thing. And, um, I want that experience to be, in some ways, central to the process as well, so in that way that it shapes curriculum. So curriculum isn't something that I'm kind of pulling in here, delivering there, they're soaking that up and regurgitating it to me. I don't see that as, something that's happening [...]

(Rose)

Rose is rich and expressive and covers in a short time many essential factors of good teaching. However, reading her narrative it is clear that she holds some powerful ideas about teaching but, at the same time, is still generating further notions as she develops her 'teacherness' from her study, her mentors and her own personal reflection. Her teacher identity is under construction but she is in her element thinking and reflecting and ranges quickly and efficiently well beyond this to cover a broad diversity of issues. She is considering her role and reflecting on whether she holds the power over curriculum or whether this is something that is up for negotiation.

At one point I begin to move the conversation on and Rose is insistent in exploring the nature of teaching further, saying: Relationships, I haven't talked about relationships.

¹² Pennie Brownlee is a New Zealand freelance educator who focuses in her workshops on both social justice education and principles of good teaching.

So she talks about the centrality of relationships in good teaching, naming this as the key to engaging students both with the teacher, with each other and with the curriculum. Rose is a teacher educator. Her comfort with theories of learning and her acknowledgement of relationships is not surprising.

Evangeline, too, is a teacher educator. She expresses similar ideas in describing her own teaching. Here Evangeline is eloquently naming her beliefs and her practices. She is not referring to other theories but rather readily talking about herself as a teacher, stating her expectations and teaching processes. In doing so she is beginning to introduce some of her thinking around social justice, even though we haven't traversed this in the interview to date.

Um [...] for me interaction is really important, um, time for discussion, time for ourselves, for students. In my 101 sessions where they think they're going to come in and I'm going to give them a bunch of notes [...] 'no, I want you to think'. In an ideal world they would have done the reading before they came to class so that what I'm providing is value-added if you will and getting them to think. I always try to provide alternative perspectives so rather than doing a session on ethnicity I did a session on 'whiteness' and introduced them to whiteness studies because I said let's think about ethnicity from a different angle. Maybe we can shake it up a bit. I think the best thing they can leave university with is the ability to think and write critically.

(Evangeline)

During discussions, several participants name the difficulty of working with very large classes. Evangeline is referring to this when she speaks of the 101 class, but she doesn't buy the argument that you cannot engage students in large classes. She continues:

I have quite a lot of fun with them, actually. I told you I throw minties. Because again, they come in and I talk about the architecture of the room we're sitting in and the kind of teaching

that architecture expects me to do – sage on stage sort of teaching – and then, just to get everybody sort of loosened up, I do Oprah, run up and down the stairs, and throw minties and just get everyone to relax and engage and think and so forth and [...] yea, yea [...]

(Evangeline)

Evangeline is reflecting her own enthusiasm for teaching and finding ways to connect students with each other and with their learning. This is reminiscent of Ramsden's (2003) 'delight in improvising' in her teaching. She uses Brookfield's (1990) Critical Incident Reports with students, calling them exit tickets where students note issues they want to spend more time on for the following session and she honours this at the start of every class. She indicates thus that the students' learning matters to her. She also acknowledges Gonzalez's (2003) point about the role of the architecture in defining approaches to learning. Here and elsewhere, Evangeline is providing narrative accounts of her relationships with her students, something I became particularly alerted to through the third reading of her transcript (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998).

Both Rose and Evangeline are articulate about engaging students, moving beyond 'the lecture', pushing students into situations that encourage them to think, to relate and to confront issues in the context of their particular classes, rather than outside them.

Relationships, and in particular power relationships, appear again as a central theme in Betty's approach to teaching.

One thing I would want to say about good teaching is that good teaching is attentive to the power dynamics that are going on in the classroom. And there are lots of different ways those power dynamics play out and some of them have got a social justice kind of caste, really [...] But one thing that is important in good teaching for me is to be attentive to the pedagogical dynamics between teacher and student [...] to be attentive of it between

students and to have some sense of responsibility towards that as the teacher in the classroom, who opens up possibilities for students to interact with each other and to take some responsibility for how those possibilities might play out without being able to dominate or foreclose those possibilities.

(Betty)

Betty's thinking articulates strongly with the approaches suggested by Boler (1999) regarding the relationship between power and emotion and the corresponding importance of acknowledgement and inclusion of emotions in the classroom. Betty is now engaging in significant thinking and reflection on her own teaching and the ways in which her behaviour as a teacher impacts on the development of the identity of the student.

Jane, too, comments on a similar theme, noting the emotion of 'caring' as part of the development of relationships.

Yeah, so, to me, that's what, good teaching is about relationships. It is about knowing your student teachers or the children. I do think it is about **caring** about them to a certain extent. I do think that care comes in there. Um, I think that their ideas need to **matter** to me.

(Jane)

Each of these teachers notes the importance of relationships in establishing a learning environment that is conducive to student engagement and that will allow students to learn not only from the prescribed texts and the teacher but also from each other, as live texts. As I reflect on each of these, I note that not only are these discourses all from those involved in education, but they are also all from the women participants. They each reflect on the personal element of learning and the importance of engaging students in their own learning through relationships. These teachers are all referring to what Jane names as the 'caring' dimension of teaching.

Betty reflects on this notion of relationships and power, indicating that negotiation with students is part of the process.

[...] some of the issues that have come up for me that are, that have impinged on my sense of 'what is good teaching' have been issues around negotiating the relationship that I have as a teacher with the students in the classroom who are colleagues actually in the university and trying to think through what that means.

(Betty)

For Betty there is an added dimension as her students are her peers and so she is confronted with considering how her 'teacher' identity aligns with her 'peer academic' identity and how she can best accommodate each in her teaching. She talks about this a number of times in our discussion.

Harry concurs with these viewpoints, also commenting on the importance of interrelationships between students as well as negotiable relationships between students and teacher. He grounds his thoughts in the actual contexts of his teaching and is able to reflect on specifics of his practice.

[...] the best studios that I've done have tended to be when that kind of model is kind of disrupted where, you know, I think it's really a kind of **peer** process. I think students learn **much** more from each other than they do from the teacher. That's true of any discipline probably but it's particularly true in architecture when they're immersed in this sea [...]. I think also the teacher learns as much from the students and the students become teachers and the teachers become students and the students become critics and, you know, if you can create that kind of condition where it's kind of an [...] exploratory process or it's a kind of peer group process is very useful. And I think you have to create the conditions of, I suppose, **trust** and confidence that allows students to take that on because they can often be, you know, students often want to be led.

(Harry)

In this narrative, Harry moves seamlessly between speaking in the 'I' from his own experience and articulating his thoughts from a more distanced perspective which talks about 'the discipline' and 'the teacher'. He is very happy to acknowledge that the teacher is not necessarily 'the expert' but he also hints at the resistance that students experience or impose. Harry is articulating thoughts similar to the women above with regard to the emotional components of teaching. So, while he is theorising, he is also locating the theory in his own experience of teaching and reflecting on his experiences of it.

Phillip takes a slightly different approach.

But the number one ingredient above everything else is [...] the 'p' word and that's passion. If you don't have passion then that's not gonna be, the enthusiasm to learn is not going to be imparted on students.

I ask him what passion means.

It means, it means, passion means, putting across ideas, concepts, theories, applications in a way which engages students and in a way that reflects their own individual learning styles 'cause every individual student will have their own individual way of learning and I believe that the role of a good or great teacher is to recognise that, pick up on that and deliver in a way that meets those needs. [...] It's figuring out real world things that are part of their day-to-day lives and day-to-day experiences that they can relate to. So **engagement** but through things that are relevant. And bringing those things alive in a, in a classroom situation. So yea, you're right, this wording is used, but it is the way you implement it through engagement and being exposed to real world examples that they can individually understand.

(Phillip)

Phillip, too, reflects some of the ideas evident in the theories of good teaching but his approach articulated here, though focused on student engagement, does

not discuss the notion of relationships with and between students. So while he understands that students need to be able to connect what happens in the lecture theatre with aspects of their real lives, he tends to this in a somewhat performative way. Phillip is not speaking directly about himself and his practice but rather is engaging in some conjecture generally about what good teaching might be without locating it in the realities of his teaching or tending to issues of relationships. In fact, later it becomes evident that he is very wary of introducing a ‘feeling dimension’ in the university classroom at all. I will come to this later in 4.5.

Conclusion

Despite differences in approach and depth of personal engagement with the issue of ‘good teaching’, I encounter no real surprises in these discussions. Those who I have not referred to directly here also consider that teaching is a diverse and complex business focused on engaging students. Carl is a huge fan of Carl Rogers and takes his lead from him, though probably has a more teacher-centred focus than most other participants. Turtle admits to being the performer but says this is because that is what students have come to expect. With the performer persona comes an understanding about capturing and retaining student attention and immersing them in their own learning through real world examples and his teaching revolves around this. Jane is insistent about the inclusion of emotions and relationships though struggles to find ways to maintain this in larger classes.

These teachers, in different ways, seem to understand that to learn effectively, students must be engaged and they each strive to create opportunities for deep learning. They say they are prepared to take the time to explain, though some are more likely to do this than others. They intend to create rich learning environments and they challenge students to think. Many acknowledge and incorporate the emotional dimension. In general, they are well poised to assist their students to respond to the challenges of uncertainty, and to respond themselves. They already note that teaching is uncertain and complex and they seek to find ways to utilise that uncertainty creatively and to good effect.

However, Betty notes the complexity of ‘good teaching’ and names some challenges teachers face. Teaching is not formulaic.

Instead of being able to **confidently** teach things, I find that it's very **hard** to, I want to, I have a contrary personality which helps but I want to say well 'the received wisdom at the moment is that lectures are an old-fashioned way of teaching which position students as passive', blah, blah, blah, blah, and actually I think that's far too simple a way of, you know, and that a badly run group discussion can be agony for everybody involved. And we're talking actually about badly run lectures typically, the ones that bore people – not good ones. And so that's the distinction that we've kind of lost, the difference between good and poor.

(Betty)

Betty again raises questions about what is perceived as the norms of current practice developed within socio-historical contexts. McLean's recent (2006) work notes some of the challenges university pedagogy has undergone in these contexts and she comments that it has lost direction and is potentially facing a legitimization crisis. So, although there is plenty of rhetoric around good practice, and lots of excellent classroom processes by these participants, more is possible and McLean makes a case for the inclusion of practices that promote equality, citizenship and democracy. So, in the coming sections, further aspects of pedagogy are explored and ultimately, in 4.6, the potential of social justice education is identified.

For now, Betty's last narrative allows further uncertainty to creep in and, in the next section, I look very briefly at how some participants comprehend uncertainty in relation to their own teaching and students.

4.3 Teaching in and with Uncertainty

Teaching can be a complex mix of emotions, behaviours and attitudes for both students and teachers, particularly in conditions of uncertainty. Armed with effective approaches, the participants nonetheless often encounter conditions in their teaching which serve to unsettle either themselves or their students. We discuss these.

Stories from the Everyday World

Jane has already indicated that she works productively with uncertainty. I ask her how that plays itself out in the classroom.

Um, I think how that plays out in the classroom sometimes is that I might appear a bit wishy-washy. Like when a student said to me ‘well what’s the truth or what’s the answer then?’ and I have to throw it back or I feel I have to throw it back on them, or all of us and say this is, there aren’t any easy answers to this and, in a way, we make our decision about what is wise practice based on our knowledge and understanding of the situation that we find ourselves in and each one of those will be absolutely unique. And they roll their eyes! (Laughs)

(Jane)

Despite suggesting that she lives comfortably with uncertainty, in this narrative Jane indicates some concern that she might not appear ‘teacherly’. This is not explicitly stated but is easily interpreted through Jane’s use of ‘wishy-washy’ and feeling she has to ‘throw it back’ to students and they ‘roll their eyes’. She no doubt understands the beliefs many students hold about the supposed expertise of the teacher and she correspondingly articulates a degree of discomfort with how these students might interpret her abilities or identity as a teacher. She goes on to suggest that some students blossom and thrive in such circumstances while others are puzzled and often angered by the lack of ‘definitive truths’ coming from the teacher.

Rose experiences almost identical responses. I pick up a narrative begun in Act 3.

Teachers are supposed to know. [...] And, and we were **taught** to know and be absolutely certain and clear. And that plays out in the classroom [...] there's some tension there. Particularly with first year students. Cause they just want to know. 'I'm here to get the recipe and, if you just give me the recipe, I'll be all right'. And so from the very beginning I start talking about the fact that teaching is a very complex field to be in and there are no easy answers because every situation is going to be different. So I start giving those messages very early on and that grey is OK and, in fact, there's lots of grey. And this is situation with possibilities around that.

(Rose)

Though she acknowledges the difficulties of 'unknowingness', Rose does not shy away from confronting it head on and taking the students with her. She seems more prepared than Jane to deal with this explicitly.

Harry is again very thoughtful in relation to the uncertainties created for students, teachers and the institution. He draws in the issue of emotions (Brookfield, 1990; Boler, 1999) in the context of his teaching and, specifically, his discipline. He is very alert to the complexities of the students' lives outside of the university and the impact these have on their capacity to learn. In this brief comment he traverses a broad range of familiar issues.

You know, I've been kind of looking at the **affective** realm and you know, in our studio, we kind of forget these kids, kids, you know they're twenty years old, they're falling in love, they're leaving home, you know, they're discovering life and all of these things have an impact, an unpredictable impact in many cases. Yea, so I think the other thing that comes out in the work that I do in studio is that, if you allow, or if you encourage risk-taking as part of the creative process, like any kind of risk or experiment, it **could** go wrong. And I think this is something

that is difficult for education institutions to deal with, the idea that everyone says they want innovation and risk and creativity, but, you know, they don't necessarily want the implications or the **outcomes** if things start to go wrong. And neither do students. They feel they've somehow, they can feel they've been short-changed and lead into some kind of unknown zone.

(Harry)

Familiarity with the real issues of students' lives is evident in this narrative and Harry is willing to work with them. He articulates ably why some teachers choose to take the straightforward path of 'knowledge transfer' and the corresponding importance of encouraging students into risky places with care and skill.

I identified these themes early in my first and second readings of the transcripts and they arise repeatedly. Carl locates his references to uncertainty in the context of business education and his reflection is not dissimilar to that of the other participants above.

Yea, I mean, it is difficult and some of them don't cope at all well particularly in Accounting Business Studies area because, when I was doing my business studies, you knew exactly what business was all about, it was maximising profitability [...] So I get students asking me, um, [...] what **is** the purpose of business and **what** is going to be in the examination and they want some certainty, they want to know, they don't want me to stand at the front of the classroom and say 'I'm not quite **sure** what the purpose of business in society is now. I'm not **sure** what the auditors are testifying to when they say that the accounts of Microsoft are **fine**'. [...] but I do **worry** that some students find it so very **difficult** to feel that they're in this life and they're coming here to learn what it's all about and they've got to decide for themselves. I mean, this is, I am an existentialist and I teach them basically to take responsibility for their own thoughts, their own actions and the results of their thoughts and actions.

(Carl)

Implicit in such descriptions are issues of identity as discussed earlier. Both teacher and student identities are being produced in complex learning circumstances (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and the instability and uncertainty of identities, considered in Act 3, take on particular meaning here. The discourses of tertiary education and the specific disciplines of the participants exert pressures on students and create unsettledness that can potentially derail them, impede their learning and even fracture their identity. Teachers should be alerted to just such possibilities, particularly if they are intent on using effective pedagogical practices to enhance student learning, and even more so if teachers are going to introduce concepts that go to the heart of beliefs the students hold. For, in such circumstances, education is indeed ontological.

A point to note are the demands of marketisation and performativity that impact on teaching no matter how well intentioned the teachers are and how creatively they plan their classroom interactions or respond to students. In Act 3, these teachers already identified the ways in which these forces constrain. It would be remiss to suggest all is well and teachers are able to just get on and do what they desire. The challenges of performativity remain potent.

However, what is heartening as I discuss these issues is that all the participants who acknowledge that at least some degree of uncertainty exists, teach productively within and about uncertainty and do not withdraw from utilising pedagogical practices that promote a living-in-and-with uncertainty, despite the challenges this creates for them and their students. They are aware of trouble and they are seeking ways of responding effectively to it, minimising it, even eliminating it. And, although they do not name it as such, they might be, in Barnett's terms, educating for *being* as a response to it.

But it is complex and requires much of both teacher and student.

Well in a way, then, it's about, um, negotiating those, those conflicting ideals and ideas and sometimes we're contradictory ourselves and I think that is actually part of being. And I think that it requires a generosity not only of others but of ourselves that we

are dealing with complexities that aren't, that we might not always act in a way that is, that on reflection was the very wisest way we might have acted and I suppose that whole sort of thing around judgement, I see, I think in terms of teachers having, yea, open-mindedness and non-judgemental of yourself as well as others and generosity [...]

(Jane)

What is powerful and optimistic about Jane's reflection here is her note to self and other teachers about the importance of a sense of generosity and forgiveness because there are no non-negotiables or universals. So the trouble inevitably exists but teachers are aware of it as they go about trying to utilise a range of pedagogies for thriving in uncertainty and for attending to the *being* of their students.

4.4 Education for Being

In Act 1, I introduced briefly Barnett's notion of education for *being* as a possible response by tertiary educators to uncertain times. In this section, I examine the concept as described by Barnett (and Coate) in greater depth, identify other supporting views, and report some participant narratives on the role of education for *being* as a current or potential part of their pedagogical practice. So this section is strongly pedagogical. However, in order to discuss and analyse pedagogical issues, it is necessary to consider first the broader construction of the curriculum.

Engaging the Curriculum – Knowing, Acting and Being

Barnett and Coate (2005) present a thorough analysis of the many faces of curriculum and their relationship with the social and historical contexts of tertiary education and, indeed, society. They consider curriculum at various times throughout history as outcome, special, culture, reproduction, transformation, consumption and liberal and, they conclude that curriculum does indeed reflect the social context in which it is located. They also deduce that, while some of these approaches to curriculum may have had or have some value and currency, a new approach to curriculum is now required because of the contemporary context of uncertainty and the changing world.

Barnett and Coate note that there is currently much discussion about the redundancy of knowledge and the typical responses to this in higher education,¹³ which result in either packing more content into the curriculum or focusing attention with students on learning how to learn (that is, learning skills). They consider neither of these as desirable but offer a different proposal, one in which there are 'three intertwined stories as to the ways in which curriculum in higher education might move in the future as a means of coping with a changing world' (Barnett & Coate, 2005, p. 43). These stories revolve around a) the development of skills and capabilities suited to meeting

¹³ In this section, I use the term 'higher education' to reflect the terminology used by Barnett and Coate.

particular needs; b) establishing new relationships with and to knowledge through information-processing and problem-solving; and c) developing powers to remake the self. This last approach becomes necessary because of the complex relationship between the individual and the changing world and, they contend, is the only approach that is going to offer possibilities of closing the gap between the individual and that world.

Barnett and Coate (p. 43) take care to clarify that curriculum and pedagogy are closely aligned and that ‘good curriculum design is partly in action, in the pedagogy, in the daily shaping of the student experience’. This explains why each of the approaches is described in active ways. The first approach acknowledges that the changing world does not actually rule out the need for knowledge, but the students’ engagement with that knowledge becomes important, hence, their knowing. The second proposes that the changing world calls for action, with students being involved in and interpreting their own actions, thus, their acting. The third takes on particular meaning because it suggests that the changing world calls for the development of human capacity and dispositions for thriving in that world and the key concept of *being* is introduced. While it is the last that I will focus particularly on, the importance of the relationship between all three must be understood. It is a dynamic relationship, just as each of the descriptors is dynamic, with an ongoing interaction between the various components. A focus on *being* does not exclude the need for knowing or acting; indeed, they suggest, to know is to be because certain forms of knowledge create particular types of *being*.

But, notwithstanding the acknowledgement that all three are central components of their theory, I now examine the proposal relating to *being*, for it is in this domain that the production of student identities is most deeply implicated and understood.

Education for Being – Producing Identities

If there is such change in the world, such supercomplexity and such related ‘unknowability’, the processes of learning will also need to change, according to Barnett and Coate. Barnett (2004) describes a desired shift from focus on

epistemology to ontology, that is, a focus on the identity or *being* of the student. Barnett revisits a point I introduced in Act 3 – that the changes affecting individuals in the postmodern world are essentially internal ones. ‘They are primarily to do with how individuals understand themselves, with their sense of identity (or lack of it) with their *being* in the world; this is a world order which is characterized by ontological dispositions’ (Barnett, 2004a, p. 248). This being the case, destabilisation of identities is implicated. What Barnett proposes is an educational task that is designed to mitigate such instability and, conversely, help students to prosper in contexts and situations where multiple interpretations exist or are possible. To do so, he suggests, requires a focus not on existing forms of knowledge. He notes Mode 1 knowledge (formal knowledge with universal aspirations) and sees little role for this in contemporary education. He then briefly describes the more recent Mode 2 knowledge (citing Gibbons, Limoges, Nowotny, Schwartzman, Scott & Trow, 1994) – a more active form of knowledge which allows for problem-solving *in situ*. He acknowledges a role for this but contends that it too falls short of what is required in supercomplexity for it assumes that there is the possibility of a single solution to specific problems.

Barnett, therefore, proffers Mode 3 knowledge.

The very act of knowing – knowledge having become a process of active knowing – now produces epistemological gaps: our very epistemological interventions in turn disturb the world, so bringing a new world before us. No matter how creative and imaginative our knowledge designs, it always eludes our epistemological attempts to capture it. This is Mode 3 knowing, therefore, which is knowing-in-and-with-uncertainty. The knowing produces further uncertainty (Barnett, 2004a, p. 251).

Perhaps this is what Jane was referring to earlier when she said: ‘And I think the more I read and the more I learn and the more I teach (laughs) the more uncertain things become.’

This knowing-in-and-with-uncertainty can be explained as ‘pedagogical being’, or the production of student academic identities. The development of academic skills or the accumulation of knowledge is simply not enough.

Rather, learning for the unknown future brings new priorities into view. ‘If, in different ways (as the outcome of both complexity and supercomplexity), the world is radically unknowable, then knowledge and skills can no longer provide a platform for going on with any assuredness. The ice, as we have observed, is thin and perpetually cracking’ (p. 254). Barnett contends that in such conditions, the self prospers not because of the accumulation of knowledge nor for being armed with the requisite skills for the task but because ‘one has a self that is adequate to such an uncertain world’ (p. 254).

The challenge then is for teachers to consider and construct both a curriculum and, more importantly, pedagogies that utilise Mode 3 knowledge. They aim at transformation of the individual and a corresponding development of the *being* of the student so that she is able to both learn actively and thrive in uncertainty, secure in herself and in her place in, and responses to, the changing world. This does not necessarily presuppose a unitary identity but rather encompasses complexity. This is no easy task and involves a pedagogy that is risky because it constantly exposes the student to dilemmas and complexities and potentially puts her into unsettling places, such as coming to understand that ‘academic disciplines can only carry us so far in addressing the open-textured challenges of supercomplexity’ (p. 257). This logically leads to what Barnett calls ‘pedagogical disturbance’ where the learning processes are high-risk and transformational. For students, this means being engaged as persons and not just as knowers. Just as I identified earlier that there is no place for the detached teacher in creating ‘good’ teaching, there is no place for the disengaged student in conditions of pedagogical disturbance.

This explains the high-risk nature of such pedagogies because the very *being*, the identities of the student, are challenged and potentially destabilised. So there is the possibility of danger for the student which is why Barnett argues for pedagogies that are focused on a new approach and terminology that is not synonymous with the language of higher education – imagination, love, becoming, disturbance, inspiration, encouragement. ‘Smiles, space, unease, frisson, humanity, empathy, care and engagement’ (p. 258) are all going to be potential ingredients of a learning environment that is aimed at bringing forth

the human being that is the student. It becomes obvious that this requires the engagement of the *being* not only of the student but also of the teacher so the pedagogy is risky for all. It would be inappropriate for the teacher to disturb the *being* of the student while remaining personally and steadfastly detached from the processes of learning – assuming that were even possible! In fact, hooks (1994, p. 21) is adamant. ‘I do not expect students to take any risks that I would not take, to share in any way that I would not share’.

While this brief summary barely covers the key elements of Barnett’s proposition, it does provide sufficient scope to consider this notion of education for *being*. Essentially, this pedagogy is designed to engage the self so that the student is encouraged to reconsider her approaches to learning, herself and society. Her identities are implicated and thus the importance of attention to the emotions of the students in the classroom becomes clearer.

Complementary Approaches

While I have focused specifically on Barnett and Coate’s interpretation of education for *being*, they are not alone in conceptualising such an approach to learning, though others do not necessarily use the same language. Writers from a broad range of perspectives, philosophies and paradigms share similar approaches and beliefs. Indeed, according to Mills (2002a, p. 1), ‘Many progressive academics call for a radical reform in educational paradigms, adopting pedagogical practices from postmodern, critical, feminist, and anti-colonial sectors that challenge conservative, academic rationalism’. A range of writers outside these paradigms are also enthusiasts of education for *being*, though not all focusing on the development of the individual.

Mills notes that education itself ‘is a being, a being that constantly stands in opposition to itself by confronting its own process, the process of its own becoming’ (p. 1). But, he argues, far too little attention is paid to the personal development of the student in the context of their learning and life. ‘Higher education is in need of a radical transformation, a reconstitution that will address the wider subject of the overall development of the human being. This

has been a perennial concern since antiquity but today remains only a peripheral footnote on education's agenda' (p. 3) because of the marketisation focus of that education. He predicts hope, however, noting that 'in certain spectrums of educational philosophy and pedagogy, education is gradually taking on a new appearance as it moves toward a curriculum for being that elevates human values and ideals over mere knowledge and skill acquisition' (p. 4). He later (Mills, 2002b, p. 124) uses very similar language to Barnett in describing a potential pedagogy. 'Although neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for effective teaching, techniques designed to rouse, excite, incite and awaken students from their "dogmatic slumbers", often lead to a dynamic classroom environment marked by intellectual vitality and emotional rigor'. They can also lead to resistance and I will touch on this briefly soon.

Some critical pedagogy philosophies are evident in Mills' writing. Freire is often considered the 'inaugural philosopher of critical pedagogy' (McLaren, 2000, p. 1) and he too has something to say about uncertainty and the resulting pedagogies required. 'It is not the case that it is impossible to be certain about some things. What is impossible is to be absolutely certain, as if the certainty of today were the same as that of yesterday and will continue to be the same as that of tomorrow' (Freire, 1997, pp. 30-31). Thus, he suggests, 'The world, in order to be, must be in *the process of being*' (p. 31). Consequently, transferring information or content to learners is out of the question. 'Such ideological separation between text and context, between an object and its reason for being, implies regrettable error; it involves taking away the learner's *epistemological curiosity*' (p. 47).

Despite this reference to epistemology, Miller (2002) proposes that Freire also holds ontological views and suggests that Freire's philosophy of education examines the nature of thinking. 'Thinking roots and at the same time uproots. It is a continuum of believing and doubting, doubting and believing. The ambiguity inherent in all thinking, I believe, is not [sic] be expunged but embraced. For such ambiguity is the stimulus to more thinking' (Miller, 2002, p. 95). Thus he proposes a dynamic classroom where engagement, debate, doubt and dynamism prevail – a pedagogy of becoming.

Ellsworth (2005, p. 165) expresses similar ideas.

The job of pedagogy is to destroy knowledge in order to acknowledge the experience of the learning self. This is the risk-filled time and space of pedagogy. Pedagogy takes place at the turbulent point of matter crossing into mind, experience into knowledge, stability into potential, knowledge and promise and provocation into bodies in action, doing and making.

Indeed, she suggests rather poetically that ‘Pedagogy’s job is to tear learning selves away from curriculum’s static objects of mourning, out of their loyalties to knowledges that are inert, noncontemporary and already configured’ (pp. 164-165).

Claxton (1999, p. 245), writing from a totally different perspective, notes what is necessary for lifelong learning. Referring to conditions of uncertainty and the instability of identity he queries: ‘The question is: now that we are all required to make up a sensible and satisfying life for ourselves, by engaging personally and intelligently with unprecedented forms of complexity, what can we do to help ourselves, and each other, be equal to the challenge?’ Though somewhat rhetorical, he answers his own question suggesting that being a good learner is what is required. He notes the destabilisation of identity and the quest for authenticity and the necessity of utilising one’s own resources.

We have to learn to make our own way through a complex world without the benefit of an accepted, trustworthy route map – indeed with a profusion of different and conflicting maps – and with only one compartment of the toolkit available when we break down. This predicament tests our powers of learning and discernment to the limit (Claxton, 1999, p. 254).

Claxton’s solution is for higher education to become ‘the college beyond knowledge’ (p. 302), which is one that follows many of the principles introduced here.

I leave the final word on this subject to Carl’s existential theoretical mentor. Rogers (1983), writing earlier than all others cited here, discusses freedom to learn and proposes that realness and genuineness are key elements of education and that, therefore, emotions are implicated. He believes ‘facilitators’ must

care, must trust learners and must create new learning environments. He says he is moved when reading of the work of some teachers. ‘Here are teachers, risking themselves, *being* themselves, *trusting* their students, adventuring into the existential unknown, taking the subjective leap. And what happens? Exciting, incredible, *human* events. You can sense persons being created, learnings being initiated, future citizens rising to meet the challenge of unknown worlds’ (Rogers, 1983, p. 131).

I now return to the voices of participants regarding Barnett’s notion of education for *being*. I present these narratives in two sections. The first covers immediate responses to being presented with Barnett’s ideas. The second covers aspects of education for *being* that appear embedded in the participants’ teaching approaches but not explicitly stated as linked to Barnett’s proposals.

Stories from the Everyday World – Reactions to Barnett

In introducing Barnett’s ideas, I presented the participants with the information contained in Appendix Three. Carl is most enthusiastic when confronted with these ideas and names Barnett as a ‘kindred spirit’. There are no elements of the proposal as presented that he takes any umbrage with nor wants to debate.

I could have written that, you know, I’m in total, full agreement with him. I mean, you can’t get away from knowledge as I said before. You’ve got to learn numbers, you’ve got to learn the alphabet, you’ve got to develop skills to live in this world. But that in itself is not education for a broad proper living of life, and the fact that you can read and write isn’t enough, you’ve got to be able to challenge and change things and decide when action is necessary and have the confidence to strive for changes when **you** feel that change is necessary.

(Carl)

Carl seems to have found the point of the interview that articulates clearly with his thinking around tertiary education and which supports the ways he goes

about teaching. It is not clear though what Carl's 'proper' life entails and which changes he supports.

Betty launches immediately into a long narrative stream. She has had plenty of time to think about Barnett's ideas, so she is extremely thoughtful and considers ideas well beyond those offered by most other participants.

I found that really interesting when I read that in Barnett at the time I was preparing for the keynote, because [...] my own work has been premised on the idea that when you educate people you mess with people. That education is a form of interference with people. And I think that higher education, every time we make a claim for higher education being an important institution in a society which is committed to democracy because of the way in which it prepares young people to be citizens in democracy, we are acknowledging the extent to which it interferes with people. But we've stopped talking about it like that. If we ever did much in New Zealand, we now talk about it as making them useful members of society and actually what we mostly need is jobs and vocational preparation, and you don't have to mess with people, I don't think [...] So, when I read Barnett, my first reaction was these kind of ways of being are the sorts of values that we might associate with a western society which values its democratic structure and wants that structure to be perpetuated if you like.

(Betty)

In this sequence, Betty is struggling to find a place that she feels comfortable in relation to Barnett's ideas. She knows and understands that education is about influencing people's lives (interference) and she has a fondness for Barnett's ideas, but she is also having difficulty locating them in the university as she knows it – particularly in the context of performativity which she spoke about in Act 3 in terms of its impact on teaching (making them useful members of society). Perhaps there are, as Ball (2003) suggests, challenges to her 'teacher's soul' within the 'terrors of performativity'. Betty's narrative is imbued with reference to the challenges she observes and feels and which she

is yet to settle in her own mind. She continues this tenuous speculating and her uncertainty is evident:

How do we think that the kind of massified higher education that we now have with the plurality of students who come at those values with such different, either different appreciations of them or such different cultural castings of them, can we even speak about this meaningfully? And I felt a crack open underneath me in terms of what it is that we think higher education, this goes right back to what I said at the beginning about this, um, if it's not fatal, it may be fatal, this crack, this, or this level of uncertainty about what we're doing with higher education.

(Betty)

What is delightful about Betty is how open and honest she is with her thinking and with her acknowledgement of instability of identity and purpose – her own and that of the university. She is unafraid of critiquing her own thinking and practice and calling into question the current norms and generalisations about tertiary education. Her strength and vulnerability are both evident.

Rose has not encountered Barnett but makes some quick connections.

Hmmm. Um, I'm not surprised. It sort of makes sense to me. About **being** in the world and being adaptable. So it's about being able to stand strong in self, isn't it, and who I am and being certain about that. And then I'm not so, um, daunted by the changes that are going to be inevitable, really. Yea, way of being in the world, I quite like that. And I guess part, it seems to me teacher education is quite, well the whole reflective thing has taken on such a strong component of the programme which is about self and, um, examining that. That doesn't necessarily mean that's easy and some students struggle with that.

(Rose)

Rose deftly aligns these ideas with those she expressed earlier about identity and uncertainty. Perhaps she is constructing her own thinking as she goes and seeking to be an articulate participant in the research! While this is new theorising to her, she is wise enough to note that, despite the good intentions of such an approach, the challenges for some students will be taxing.

Like Betty, Evangeline is also in two minds. She knows Barnett and links these ideas to the work of others – not that Barnett would suggest his theories are poststructural. But she is also suspicious of elements of the theory, particularly when it comes to prescribing particulars and this will be a point of discussion in relation to dispositions.

I guess in some ways it makes me think of a poststructural pedagogy. The work of Elizabeth Ellsworth and Betty St Pierre and some of those folks. I think there are a lot of parallels to that. [...] Yea, I think we have to be **so** cautious [about homogeneity and diversity] and that's why I love poststructural theory and why I am so drawn to it is because it constantly keeps things at play. It constantly shakes it up and so we cannot ever become **complacent**. We will never get it right once and for all. We might get it slightly more right-ish. Laughs.

(Evangeline)

Phillip is caught somewhat on the hop and, unlike Rose, does not make connections. He seems somewhat guarded in his statements.

They are a set of grand words and the question is how you articulate that. There are some universities in the world that claim they are already doing that. In fact, I think if you asked most universities in this country, I think there would be a loud voice within most of them, if not all of them, that they would claim to be doing that.

(Phillip)

I suggest to Phillip that there is sometimes a gap between rhetoric and reality and he is uneasy. He makes a distinction between his own and other disciplines and decides that this is a theory that is not relevant to marketing where, he believes, knowledge and skills are more what is required. There is some tentativeness in his response. I wonder if Phillip is encountering ideas in the interview that he was not expecting and therefore is unprepared, on the spot, to challenge his current principles. Locating this theorising in other disciplines is potentially safer.

I think also, I think there are some fundamental differences between social sciences and some of the hard sciences as well. You know, commerce is an area, we tend to focus on kind of knowledge and tools and techniques. But within other subject areas, particularly more of the softer social sciences like the, you know the arts and the likes of philosophy and psychology, um [...] the [...] the **ground** isn't moving as quickly there. In commerce it is moving **extremely** quickly. We're constantly being challenged and we're required to update new, you know new tools and techniques, you know new ways to deliver better market decision-making, new ways to deliver higher profitability and so on. So there's some really major differences in there, I think, by individual, individual subject area.

(Phillip)

Maybe the speed of change that Phillip is referring to, and the question of which principles decisions are contingent upon, is precisely the reason why Barnett suggests Mode 3 knowledge becomes critical.

Conversely, Turtle is adamant. I am almost loath to introduce Barnett's notion, feeling sure, having discussed earlier his utter rejection of uncertainty, that he will reject this idea too. He does. He shares some of Phillip's reticence about relating this to his discipline of law but goes well beyond this critique, speaking strongly in the 'I', leaving no doubt where he stands.

I don't buy it. I just don't think, I mean, yea, there is a little bit of uncertainty but [...] I think it's discipline related. I think it's foolish to think about all disciplines being in a state of uncertainty, a state of flux. I think you've got to look at each discipline in itself. And I don't think there is uncertainty. I think there's change, and there's some quick change going on. And there's some technologies that are changing quickly. But the disciplines aren't. You know, I teach international law and it's a discipline which is 4000 years old and, you know, I will have my time here, I will make my small contribution and the next generation will be dealing with different problems. But the tools are the same.

(Turtle)

He continues.

I'm also sceptical about the use of the word ontology as well because, when you're trying to impart theories of being and to what a student should be, I think you're in the wrong field. You know if you want to go into ontology you should go into metaphysics or go and work in scripture. I don't think you should be doing it as a lecturer. And I think, you know, students come to you for a particular purpose and that is to be an accountant or a sociologist or to be a psychiatrist. I don't think you should be therefore saying well 'this is going to help build up your theory of being'.

(Turtle)

There is no grey area here for Turtle. Ontology is not the role of tertiary education and he made this very clear in his earlier statements where he totally rejected uncertainty and stated that his discipline work was singularly about producing good lawyers. His reference to scripture is interesting, however. It could be argued that the law is similar to scripture in the ways in which 'the word' is interpreted and renewed as changing circumstances bring new questions and ways of being. Any body of knowledge is represented through particular world views, whereas Turtle potentially represents knowledge as

neutral, a somewhat positivist view representing his truth, and this creates some tensions with notions of social justice as represented here.

So, for the participants, the jury is out with regard to the ‘theory’ of education for *being*. There is complete agreement, partial acceptance, uncertainty and suspicion and there is utter rejection. What hints are there about education for *being* in their discussions of their practice – that is, in the pedagogical issues they deal with?

Stories from the Everyday World – Being in Practice

In my analysis, I searched the narratives of the participants to identify if there were embedded elements of education for *being*. It is tempting to take a superficial approach to this and seize on any evidence of its appearance and I have resisted this temptation, seeking instead examples of sustained discourse that became evident through my first two readings of the transcripts. These narratives are not taken from a specific discussion on education for *being* but are rather examples from their teaching that arose during the broader course of the interviews.

Rose talks about a new strategy she has recently learnt at a conference – still-play drama – where a situation is described and then played out repeatedly with students to explore the scene from a number of perspectives.

And a situation arose the other day where a student shared something that’s made her uncomfortable and I said ‘well let’s just work with this for a little while’. And so I did the still-play drama. The students came up with all sorts of possibilities about what that person might have been thinking and you could have heard a pin drop. It was just amazing and I thought ‘wow. This is quite powerful’. Suddenly this person wasn’t the evil teacher doing this evil thing. This teacher was a person, who in fact, there could have been quite a lot of things going on for them and, so, yea, that’s kind of what I’m trying to do, so it is the multi-perspective, there are lots of perspectives here and often when they are really wanting something, I’ll ask the class. So

what do you think's happening here or what possibilities are there here?' But I may also give several or add to that. And 'had you thought about this?'

(Rose)

In this sequence Rose is seeking student engagement with an idea that is perplexing and potentially has multiple interpretations. She does not leave the students with 'the' answer, but encourages them to consider multiple possible answers and to contemplate the position of the protagonist – the evil teacher – from a number of perspectives. This is powerful and tangible and, in doing this, Rose is attempting to develop the being of the student and their capacity to handle complexity. She is also giving the students a clear message that she does not take the high ground as teacher, instead provoking them to consider multiple possibilities. I believe this is what Ellsworth (2005, p. 165) might be referring to when she comments that the 'job of pedagogy is to destroy knowledge' so that the students' learning selves prosper. Rose is using innovative pedagogy to destroy existing perceptions.

I introduce now a substantial sequence from Harry in which he indicates his attempt to get to the heart of issues of existence, being, identity and community with his architecture students.

Well, I think I'm trying to, there are a number of things really. I'm trying to kind of get them to think about, at one level, I mean at one level, all architecture is a kind of, I think architecture is a kind of **ethical** endeavour really. You know, it's really about how do we live here, how do we live in this place? And part of that is a universal part, it's also local because we have a particular kind of topography and climate and whatever. So I'm asking students at a very broad level, how do we occupy this space that happens to be Auckland? And how do we live together? So I never, for example, I never set a project where students design an individual single family house because I think, you know, that has been the kind of main, that's what New Zealand architecture is kind of known for. Round the world, if

you think about architecture in New Zealand, you think about the single family house. It's still relatively, until recently has been relatively affordable for middle class, upper middle class people to design and build their own house, relative to other countries. That's kind of changing now. But I think, those kind of issues are really kind of formalistic. They all end up looking three, four bedrooms, two, three bathrooms, it's a real estate driven kind of model. And they're on exclusive kind of sections and, you know. So I think in a way those problems are not really that interesting. They're not really there for the next generation to solve. They can be **fun**, that's why people keep, that's why I keep doing it [...] I **love** designing houses, don't get me wrong but they're not, you know the trick for architects is to put two or three or four or a hundred houses together and still make a meaningful kind of environment. So I guess I'm looking at that, looking at the kind of, and again, in the suburbs, you've got all this kind of complex situation between the individual house on the section and the community. And then when the suburbs get, as the city grows, the suburbs get more **dense**, the population goes up but we don't have very good models as to how to put new things into these suburbs, you know, so I'm saying you don't just kind of repeat these things and make smaller and smaller houses or smaller and smaller apartments, you actually have to think about why people like to live there, what are the good things about living in that particular suburb, and how might you then **intensify** but still keep a kind of, I talked about this kind of democratic ethos before, how do you get kind of privacy and community, how do you balance the rights of one householder against the community, how do you balance the neighbourhood against, you know whatever [...] you know, one of my colleagues last semester had to design a prison which is a **classic**, you know, who wants a prison in their neighbourhood? No one, so that's a whole kind of other, I haven't done prisons but [...] You know, I just looked at, what I'm looking for, I guess I'm looking for evidence that the students can think about these issues like how to live here, how to live together, how to live with each

other, you know, as a community and how to live with nature.
Now that's enough for them to be thinking about.

(Harry)

Any editing of this narrative would strip the essence from it and reduce it to representative words. There is energy in Harry's discourse and it provides evidence of his pedagogical intent to provoke students to think beyond the norms and expectations of architecture and to consider implications for the future, whatever that might look like. He challenges the standard premises that underpin the teaching of architecture, especially in relation to the design of individual houses. He wants more from his students, who are not always ready for more. He wants them to interrogate ideas, to sense and feel the issues, to debate, to ponder, to consider, to engage and to provoke. He unsettles, he delves into ontological areas and creates opportunities and expectations for students to consider responses in and with uncertainty. And he acknowledges later that students don't always like these kinds of challenges or expectations and they can impact on student satisfaction. But this does not deter Harry.

In this narrative he is eloquent, fluid and provocative. He has clearly been thinking about the impact of such things on his teaching and students and he chooses to take the challenging path. Harry has chosen to eschew the standard practice of architecture as described and push his students into thinking more about the conditions of existence for the users of architecture. In doing so, he allows himself to be tentative and he encourages his students to feel discomfort, uncertainty and unknowingness with a view to getting them to think and engage with complexity.

Even Turtle displays elements of pedagogy for *being* in his classes, though he would not define it as such. He is a provocateur and uses real world examples from his international diplomacy work with his law students. In the following discourse, he acknowledges the emotion and identity work that is required for thriving with uncertainty, bearing in mind that he does not accept that this time is more uncertain than any earlier time.

Nevertheless, he is pushing his students by taking the identity that serves him in his diplomacy work and bringing it into the classroom. So, although he knows there are legal answers to particular questions, he doesn't use these as starting points with students but begins from the standpoint of difficult situations and pushes students into having to consider these.

[...] one of the things we were discussing in one of my law 1 papers was freedom of speech. I am very much a strong believer in freedom of speech. So we were discussing the examples about the Mohammed whose turban was a bomb. You know, the Danish cartoon, the Southpark episode, you know. And so you sort of like say 'well how far do you want to push free speech?' Do you want to get it so you can actually have a picture of the Virgin Mary menstruating on someone, which is what the Southpark episode did? You know, so you are **really** in their face. So you get the kid saying 'I believe in free speech, I believe in free speech.' How far do you believe that? And you really like take them to the extreme examples. And like we also discuss things like the laws of war and basic questions of philosophy and justice around why we go to war and what we do in war and so you really push them with questions like 'how many civilians are you prepared to kill to win?' And there's legal answers, you know. There's philosophy behind it as well. And so you really get into their face. And you make them think, as if they were the ones that were going to make the decisions.

(Turtle)

It is this final line that signals the work that Turtle is doing, although there are hints of it earlier in the narrative. He is determined to use real world examples, though not always those that come from the students' own experience. He tells me he does not tolerate 'politically correct' answers. He demands that they think and argue and justify and feel. He wants them to confront the emotions they experience in relation to the examples he offers. While this approach is still relatively teacher directed and could be justified in terms of other theoretical approaches to teaching, there are definitely elements of a pedagogy for *being* embedded here, because Turtle acknowledges the complexity of the

world his students live in and challenges them to think and argue for themselves about how to thrive within that. Despite his protestations, he is, indeed, dealing with ontology.

Conclusion

There are many more examples woven through the narratives of the participants that indicate they employ teaching practices that articulate with Barnett's (and the other writers') approaches to education for *being*. Evidence of this will continue to appear in this Act. However, in some cases this is a limited articulation because I seldom find examples of love or the engagement of emotions in the described pedagogies.

Carl notes the barriers and speaks from his own experience of attempting to introduce unsettling ideas early.

Well, they're not ready for it at day one either, but again, unfortunately our 101 classes are about 'this is what you've got to know about accounting'. Debits and credits. You know, just as when you go to school you've got to learn numbers, you've got to learn how to use the alphabet and the 101 classes are very much about 'sit down and learn this' and I wish I had the time to redesign the way that we do encourage them to broaden out right from year one but I tried it and I was **so** much out of kilter with all the other lecturers doing first year courses that I was badly battered. And so I thought the best place is later on.

(Carl)

Carl makes a good point that students can struggle if one lecturer takes a very different position from others. Conversely, other participants like Evangeline and Rose are intent on doing the difficult things early on in the student experience, regardless of the disruption this might cause. Is it, as Carl suggests, about time to create new ways of teaching? Is it potentially because Carl is not prepared to be unpopular with students or out of line with his peers? While he does use a number of interesting approaches with students, his

narrative is often reflective of more teacher-centred practices than most other participants.

Betty produces a strong challenge that, despite her support for Barnett's ideas, reflects the complexities of contemporary tertiary education. Regardless of the potential, these are realistic considerations.

It is scary! I feel quite scared, I think where can it go, what, where can it, how can we say we're doing the things that Barnett is asking us to do in the kind of context? And why should we be asking our **teachers** to consider these sorts of achievements in the context they're actually teaching where it will be rare for them to have classes [...] I mean they're now closing down classes which have students under a certain number at graduate level. So you're talking about graduate classes of 20 or 30 or 40, that's **graduate** end so that's good to have those, that does allow a certain face-to-faceness but at the undergraduate level that's so [...] um, the semesterisation has contributed to this because you **can't** physically **mark** certain sorts of assignments any more and get them back to students in the kind of turnaround [...] you **can't give** them enough to say have three goes at the same kind of assignment across the year because there isn't enough time so they can't build capability. The fact that they weren't because some of the practices were not in place is still an issue but you sort of **can't** now because there is another layer of change in the [...] and that was done, semesterisation was done to increase choice, was done from the sort of consumerist discourse actually.

(Betty)

This is another example of Betty grappling with her own thinking and, in the process, cutting to the heart of many of the thesis issues, particularly the contextual ones such as intensification of labour and classes based on size and not curriculum, surrounding the contemporary university. She indicates affinity with the ideas but cannot reconcile them with the realities of her experience.

Throughout this section, the ideas have revolved around disturbance of the identities of the student, either deliberately or unexpectedly through a pedagogy that focuses not merely on epistemology, but on ontology. Some participants employ pedagogies designed to do just this, even those who claim no place for ontology in the university and notwithstanding Betty's observations. They want students to be unsettled, to consider multiple perspectives, to look at the world differently, to engage, to think but also to feel. Others are far less explicit, less articulate and less comfortable with the ideas and focus greater attention on issues of knowledge and content or academic experience. However, they are each, in their own ways, consciously attending to the development of particular dispositions in their students.

4.5 Developing Dispositions

The previous three sections have considered ‘good’ teaching, especially in the context of uncertainty, and education for *being*. In each of these, teachers, as part of their processes of the classroom, are working with the identity of students and the development of particular dispositions is therefore implicit. The notion of dispositions appears in a number of different literatures and, in this section I take a very limited snapshot of a number of approaches to these, just to set the scene for one particular component of education for *being*.

Barnett is very clear about the role of dispositions in terms of education for *being*. I have already traversed his ideas regarding knowing, acting and being but, to reinforce, he says ‘learning for an unknown future has to be understood neither in terms of knowledge or skills but of human qualities and dispositions’ (Barnett, 2004a, p. 247), that is, ontologically. This is necessary, he says, because students need to be brought to an understanding that ‘all descriptions of the world are contestable and, then second, to a position of being able to prosper in such a world in which our categories even for understanding the situations in which we are placed, including understanding ourselves, are themselves contested (pp. 252-253). To survive and even thrive in such environments will require the development of the confidence of the student.

Barnett’s Mode 3 knowledge was introduced in the last section and the importance of new pedagogies full of love, imagination, frisson, disturbance and humanity were discussed. He reinforces the importance of openness in pedagogy and considers how ‘being-for-uncertainty’ can help in framing higher education pedagogy. He notes that such pedagogy does not have a raft of skills at its beck and call, but rather, ‘Being-for-uncertainty stands in certain kinds of relationships to the world. It is *disposed* in certain kinds of way. It is characterized, therefore, by certain kinds of disposition. Among such dispositions are carefulness, thoughtfulness, humility, criticality, receptiveness, resilience, courage and stillness’ (Barnett, 2004a, p. 258).

Barnett adds a note of caution that such dispositions could result in creating the kinds of attitudes and skills of ‘adaptability’, ‘flexibility’ and ‘self-reliance’ that are often stated as prerequisites for graduates in terms of economic and performative drivers and requirements. While this may be so, that is not the justification for their inclusion. ‘They are fostered because they offer the prospects of an education adequate to a world of uncertainty. They offer, in short, the fashionings of being that may thrive in such a world’ (p. 259).

As I indicated above, notions of dispositions abound in the literature, though they are not always called such. Claxton and Carr (2004, pp. 87-88) overview the disposition literature and point out that:

[M]ost definitions have particularly highlighted the importance of ‘inclinations’, though the concept has proved ‘hard to pin down’ (Perkins, et al, 1993, p. 18) with the degree of clarity that would be helpful to teachers. Carr (2001) and Cowie and Carr (in press) have attempted to clarify the situation by suggesting that ‘inclinations’ are centrally associated with identity as a learner, social schema, and ‘possible self’ (Cross & Marcus, 1994).

There is much familiarity here, particularly with reference to the relationship between the development of dispositions and the production of learning identities. Also of interest are the suggestions that those identities are socially constructed and tentative. Claxton and Carr make even more connections with the material covered in this thesis.

[T]here is merit in reading ‘disposition’ not as a noun, as a ‘thing’ to be acquired, but as a verb with qualifying adverbs. One does not ‘acquire a disposition’, one becomes more or less disposed to respond in such-and-such a way. Learning dispositions can be construed as *default responses* in the presence of uncertain learning opportunities and circumstances (p. 88).

They share some of the beliefs about dispositions made explicit by Barnett. They believe the development of dispositions is dynamic and what the teacher does either strengthens or weakens their development.

Costa and Kallick (2000a) refer to ‘habits of mind’ and I include their work here as they have published prodigiously on the subject. Their habits are described as ‘a pattern of intellectual behaviors that leads to productive actions. When we experience dichotomies, are confused by dilemmas, or come face to face with uncertainties, our most effective response requires drawing forth certain patterns of intellectual behavior’ (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, p. 8). They name their set of proposed habits as: persisting; managing impulsivity; listening with understanding and empathy; thinking flexibly; thinking about thinking (metacognition); striving for accuracy; questioning and posing problems; applying past knowledge to new situations; thinking and communicating with clarity and precision; gathering data through all senses; creating, imagining, innovating; responding with wonderment and awe; taking responsible risks; finding humour; thinking interdependently; and remaining open to continuous learning. These are specifically related to school-based learning situations and are linked neither to uncertainty nor social justice so their scope and intent is entirely different from others here. Nevertheless, there are some parallels in some of the proposed dispositions. Costa and Kallick (2000b) suggest that effective teachers use a number of strategies to teach the habits directly. In doing so, the habits of mind can attend to values; inclination; sensitivity; capability; and commitment (2000a). Here the parallels are more visible, even though the approach taken is more technical.

So the development of dispositions is seen as desirable in the learning process. However, they are presented in a number of ways, some of which lead to more technicist and managerial perspectives of student outcomes or attributes. Of those described here, only Barnett distinguishes the dispositions required for an uncertain world rather than more localised or personal uncertainty encountered on a daily basis. And there are questions to be considered in terms of whether any dispositions can be generalised as desirable for graduating students.

What, then, do the participants think about dispositions?

Stories from the Everyday World

I ask some of the participants what kinds of dispositions they are attempting to promote in their students. This question gets raised at different points with different participants, depending on where we have ‘travelled together’.

Carl offers the following:

Well basically critical theory (I think he means critical thinking because I find no evidence of critical theory in my discussions with Carl). I want them **not** to accept everything that is thrown at them. I want them to, instead of being certain about what they know because it was told to them by an educated person, to question **everything** that they know no matter where it comes from and say ‘is this reasonable?’

(Carl)

This articulates with Barnett’s criticality but I go no further with Carl. He goes off on another tangent and does not develop his response further.

With Evangeline, I have just discussed Barnett’s ideas so she is attuned to his thinking. She waxes and wanes on the idea, offering a number of different possibilities but also expressing her concern that the prescribing of dispositions makes some suppositions and offers universals that might not be appropriate. She is also anxious, as I indicated earlier, about the performativity concerns regarding established lists of desirable dispositions, which lead to the managerialist process of defining graduate outcomes.

Ahhh, oh, I don’t know, I mean empathy is a slippery slope because it can turn into paternalism. We like to say in the critical literacy research that by considering alternative viewpoints, the children will be slightly more empathetic. So maybe they might vote for a minority group. [...] Ah, um, ahhhh [...] I’m fearful of dispositions because they turn into laundry lists. And they turn into someone at the back of the room ticking you off so you can be certified. I think the most important thing is critical reflection

and what I **mean** by critical thinking isn't thinking hard but is actually considering social justice issues in, you've probably read all the different sorts of work on reflection, 'how did my lesson go? Powerpoints weren't too flash'. And there's dialogic reflection where you reflect with your buddy, and there's descriptive, a bit more narrative. And there's critical reflection where you are then thinking about 'well hang on, did I marginalise all those folks by using that example? Maybe I should have used something else. Maybe that wasn't the best text or [...] It's reflecting on the social justice aspects, that's what I mean by critical reflection. And so I think if they can keep that awareness, of ah, that they will never get it totally perfect, but nonetheless, that they continue to reflect on those aspects, then I reckon we've done a pretty good job actually.

(Evangeline)

She ultimately decides on critical thinking and criticality as the key disposition, suggesting it is possibly a catch-all for others. She, more than any others, delves into what she understands that criticality to be and makes explicit links with social justice.

There is a certain familiarity and consistency appearing here. Jane, too, goes to the issue of critical thinking but extends a little further. She wants her students to translate what they learn and do in her classrooms into their subsequent work with children.

I suppose I'd like them to be, to think critically, um, reflect on their practice, think about their values and their beliefs and attitudes, have warmth and caring and respect and be responsive to children. Those sorts of things. And philosophy. Have thought about, you know, actually thought.

(Jane)

There is strong synergy between Jane's own articulated philosophy of teaching and that which she desires her students to develop. The ethic of care she talked

about earlier returns now in what she wants her students to consider in their own teaching practice.

Phillip also notes critical thinking. I am beginning to think this is standard tertiary education rhetoric.

To be, to be [...] balanced and well grounded in problem-solving and critical thinking, but to recognise there is no one, there's not necessarily one right approach to solving a particular problem or address a particular issue.

(Phillip)

Phillip is interesting. In response to the question about developing dispositions in his students, he offers the above for consideration, indicating that he wants the students to be thoughtful and critical problem-solvers. However, when I ask him later what he thinks about Barnett and I propose Barnett's set of dispositions in the context of *being*, he is very guarded and cautious.

[...] ah, the word of **being** and being purposeful, that's very much an individual thing. And how we want to be, not only how we want to be in terms of interacting with our work colleagues, how we want to be at work more generally in terms of a university system, but how we want to be inside here, in terms of being with oneself and, ah, [...] I mean, that's another, that's another set of [...] whaa, what am I getting at here? [...] pause [...] Ha, we don't go, in commerce, we don't go anywhere near that. [...] and I [...] sigh [...] no [...] we don't, we don't. [...] Um, [...] I think it would be **extremely** problematic and, and, and possibly [...] **dangerous** to go there with 300 students. It's dangerous to go there, some people don't, some people just don't want to go there, full stop. Because it's challenging a lot of things about them as individuals [...]

(Phillip)

Perhaps it is just the notion of being itself that causes his concern. Phillip does independent consultancy work outside the university in a life-skills programme and acknowledges that he feels more comfortable with the notion of *being* and the associated dispositions in that context. I don't push him to discuss this further as his discomfort is obvious. I found this passage fascinating when doing my second reading – looking for the voice of the 'I' and the 'we'. Phillip's unease is evident through his 'voice' as well as his words.

At the time of these discussions, during the analysis and again while writing this Act, I find myself somewhat disappointed with the lack of diversity in responses to this question. Critical thinking is, by all accounts, central, but stops well short of what is possible. Barnett's proposals go much further, as do the demands of critical pedagogy. I must, however, acknowledge the difficulty for the participants of responding to such a question in the moment and with little opportunity to reflect fully on their approaches, so I might need to accept some culpability in this regard.

Rose, however, provides a more considered and fulsome answer to this question, while also including criticality in her response. She refers to Dewey, who did some foundational work around dispositions.

Well, open-mindedness would be the first one, responsibility, I mean I go back to Dewey, responsibility. The disposition of relationships, responsive, reciprocal, respective, respect! Respect, you know if you think about what is respect and how you do that and what **sounds** like and what that feels like, so those would be important and, the ability to reflect, if they can do that and to think, um critically about what they're doing, to continue to examine their assumptions, beliefs and values that they're operating from. If they continue to do that and to see themselves as people who love learning, because if they don't love learning they should perhaps think about a different career.

(Rose)

Rose is in her comfort zone, discussing easily notions that underpin her teaching. Familiarity with Dewey's work helps her out but she goes beyond that and is again in the territory of relationships and respect for students. Rose presents a pretty consistent identity throughout the interview, albeit one that is still developing ideas about who she is as an academic.

However, notwithstanding Rose's ability to supersede the notion of criticality, there is little reference to Barnett's other ideas of carefulness, thoughtfulness, humility, receptiveness, resilience, courage and stillness in the participants' considerations of dispositions, although there are some aspects of these ideas embedded in some of their responses here and, more importantly, in other descriptions of their practice. Indeed, in some ways, there is more evidence elsewhere than in response to this particular question. What does appear, though, is a desire amongst these teachers to dispose students to a commitment to others and an acknowledgement of the importance of working for diversity in many of the responses.

Evangeline notes the challenges of defining dispositions, despite some good work that she considers happens in New Zealand.

I think in New Zealand, not that we're perfect, but we're much better at it than a lot of other places in considering indigenous knowledge and minority concerns and so, when they talk about equipping students with dispositions and things, I think of 'whose dispositions?' Who's choosing that this is important over that? Whose knowledge is being valued? Because of course, if you're someone who's in the privileged position of being able to move in and out of different cultural contexts, if you're a bicultural person, then you can bring your, you will have different dispositions you will use in those different cultural contexts. [...] And so, um, I'm really, really fearful of some of these sort of um, claims or proposals because are they going to make allowances, are they going to create spaces for a more diverse set of dispositions or are they going to come up with another bloody laundry list? I'm just really fearful of those because they just

homogenise people and they stuff them into boxes. And they don't allow for diversity.

(Evangeline)

Evangeline seemingly wishes to develop appropriate dispositions for assisting graduates to be socially just but is simultaneously reflective about the implications of this for all. Her Treaty partner persona is in discussion with her teacher educator and she is balancing both these to find a position she is comfortable with and one which she can apply equitably in her practice. So she acknowledges issues around ‘whose knowledge counts’, affirms some potentially good practice in New Zealand, but is left with some legitimate concerns. Gonzalez (2003, p. 4) addresses this issue of selected knowledge noting that ‘We value and acknowledge only specific and limited kinds of understanding; to the rest, we accord only a peripheral worth in a general undefined area of “life experience”, but this is not “real” knowledge as we have implicitly defined it’. In raising this issue, Evangeline offers a timely reminder about the relationship between dispositions and social justice and rejects the tendency to prescribe a standardised set applicable to all.

Having now considered education for *being* and the related idea of the development of dispositions for thriving in uncertainty, I now turn to the principles of education for social justice to identify if the two approaches can co-exist and to identify what dispositions might be embedded in education for social justice.

4.6 Education for Social Justice Revisited

In Act 1, I introduced the broad arena of social justice theorising and noted that it is a critical pedagogical approach that underpins the thesis. However, in this section I am seeking to fill in the gaps that occur in relation to critical pedagogy in tertiary education including the justifiable critique that it offers little advice to teachers about what it means in terms of practice. While I am aware of some of the work done in the field of Women's Studies, my interest is in tertiary education per se, rather than those courses designed specifically as a means to critique and address issues of social justice. Compulsory education is well served and provides some useful material for consideration in the context of tertiary education. However, it remains to be seen if the participants' practices articulate with those described here.

In presenting this analysis, I refer to McLean's recent work about pedagogy and the university with particular reference to teaching for social justice. She proposes that 'critical university pedagogy would take up the function of universities to educate citizens and professionals who can tackle injustices and social problems' (McLean, 2006, p. 39). Although she acknowledges the constraints of current conditions, she makes a case for optimism. 'From the perspective of critical pedagogy, alternative constructions of "pedagogic quality" would be connected to an egalitarian agenda underpinned by notions of empowerment of individuals and the transformation of society' (p. 56). This optimism leads to an investigation of the literature surrounding pedagogy for social justice.

Teaching has been subject to multiple critiques and analyses, particularly in relation to the professionalisation of teaching, and many aspects of this debate have become evident in the thesis thus far. However, Fenstermacher (1990, pp. 132-133) critiques the tendency to reduce this analysis to issues such as knowledge, skill, objectivity and validity and says:

these are not the concepts that capture the essential meaning of teaching. Without the specification of the moral principles and

purposes of teaching, the concept amounts to little more than a technical performance to no particular point. Just as a physician who has no idea of why or to what end he or she practices medicine or a lawyer who lacks any sense of the rule of law in the just society, a teacher without a moral purpose is aimless, as open to incivility and harm as to good.

So what are the moral imperatives that drive teaching practice? For teachers with a liberatory intent, it is education for social justice. However, ‘Social justice issues continue to be vexed by the broad range of interpretations of goodness and justice which marks our fast-changing and increasingly plural and fragmented society – including the interpretation which refuses terms such as “goodness” or “justice” as relevant’ (Griffiths, 1998b, p. 181). Given these challenges, social justice education is not a unitary concept. And neither is ‘teacher’ a universal concept. Teaching itself is complex and teachers are located within particular discourses and defined in multiple ways.

Nevertheless, it is possible even within such diversity and complexity to identify what the broad goals of social justice education might be and what social justice teachers might look like in practice. I cannot find a better description than the following:

Teaching for social justice is teaching that arouses students, engages them in a quest to identify obstacles to their full humanity, to their freedom, and then to drive, to move against those obstacles. And so the fundamental message of the teacher for social justice is: You can change the world (Ayers, 1998, p. xvii).

Green also focuses on arousal and claims that ‘teaching for social justice is teaching for the sake of arousing the kinds of vivid, reflective, experiential responses that might move students to come together in serious efforts to understand what social justice actually means and what it might demand’ (Green, 1998, p. xxix). She claims that teaching for social justice is ‘to teach for enhanced perception and imaginative explorations [...] so that the young may be awakened to the joy of working for transformation in the smallest places, so they become healers and change their worlds’ (p. xlvi).

So this notion of arousal and change can be considered as the broad goals of education for social justice. What this demands is clearly a range of ways to approach education but all with the intent of creating student arousal with the goal of action.

But what are the Rules?

One trend that is strongly evident regarding social justice education is that there can never be a single, definitive prescription for classroom process. Both the theory of critical pedagogy and postmodern theorising, though arising from different goals and philosophical foundations, contend that context is of primary importance and that it is not possible to generalise from the particular in a manner that is universally applicable. Kincheloe and Steinberg (1995, p. 7) state that critical theory ‘is not a set of official laws – on the contrary it is a filter through which men and women view information and the world around them; indeed, theorizing is an act of meaning making’.

What is clear is that teaching itself is a messy business full of ambiguity and uncertainty. Despite universals and rules about teaching, at the practice level teaching is always ‘more complex, more conflictual and less straightforward’ (Gitlin, 1995, p. 112). Nieto, too, notes the messiness by referring specifically to the ways in which people attempt to classify particular aspects of education. She warns against categorising reality because when we do, ‘we run the risk that it will be viewed as static and arbitrary, rather than as messy, complex and contradictory, which we know it to be’ (Nieto, 1998, p. 8). This can be hard work for teachers but there is a positive side. Shor, in referring specifically to problem-posing education, identifies one of the beauties of working within messiness and complexity, naming liberatory pedagogy as ‘an art as well as a science. If there were only one way to do it, dialogic teaching would be easy and dull at the same time – easy because teachers could memorize the one best way and dull because the one best way would suppress creativity in education’ (Shor, 1992, p. 237). Messiness and uncertainty seem much more inspiring and certainly consistent with the nature and practices of the uncertain world *and* the pedagogies already discussed.

So the particular context, specific individuals and localised issues become paramount. Bringing universally prescribed rules or norms to bear is replaced by a collaborative process ‘depending on the difficult business of discovering the perspectives of others rather than assuming any universal subject or object of knowledge’ (Griffiths, 1998b, p. 176). McLean (2006, p. 59) is clear that ‘to move towards critical pedagogy university teachers must be enabled to focus on the realities of teaching and be trusted to make their own accounts of what and how they teach’. This requires that teachers work both within and around the particular culture and context of the situation, politics, environment and educational setting to achieve desirable outcomes at the local level (Cochran-Smith, 1991). In this way, teaching and theorising for social justice is never boring, never prescribed and seldom ‘safe’. It requires talented, engaged teachers who are willing to be vulnerable in the classroom and immerse themselves in learning processes with students.

The participants have experienced this vulnerability in the classroom and express their pain around it. Jane relates a story where she was challenged by a student ‘because you don’t like me’ and she identifies the impact this had on her.

And I was at that time going through a very difficult time in my life, as you do, and ... she attacked me in class and I actually went over to the window and ... it’s the, maybe not the only time because I’ve been in this job for a long time, but I **cried**, because it like, it was a huge personal attack ...

(Jane)

Rose has experienced the inevitable critique associated with ‘shooting the messenger’ and she too feels this. She seems to need to justify herself as she doesn’t want to own this critique but her point is probably one that many other teachers have experienced. When the message becomes uncomfortable enough, people will find a way of criticising the messenger.

Sometimes people don't always like the message and I've been criticised, you know that can come through critically in evaluations, student evaluations and I'm mindful of, um, so it's like, um, I'm telling people they have to think in a particular way because they don't like the message. In fact I never tell people what to think ...

(Rose)

So, in terms of social justice teaching, there is no instruction manual and no certainty. 'Instead, a framework of principles is developed around which possible actions can be discussed and analysed. Teachers who are conversant with critical theory are never certain of the exact path of action they will take as a result of their analysis' (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1995, p. 9).

It is Principally about Principles

This principled nature of theorising is important. Most writers advance models, frameworks or components of pedagogy, with 'principles' being by far the most common schematic approach. It is useful to identify the nature of some of these to ascertain commonalities but, in doing so, a wide variety of debates, philosophical traditions and approaches is implicated as social justice education does not reside within a single theoretical paradigm.

Okazawa-Rey (1998) outlines a set of principles derived from Freire's work and based on her own experiences of teaching in multicultural classes. Her principles are strongly practice-based and include: using a variety of materials as 'text' including the experiences of the students themselves; employing a wide range of activities; relating work to the everyday lives of students and constantly connecting theory with practice; asking critical questions; requiring students to work in groups; and applying democratic principles in the classroom. It is this last principle that I believe offers the greatest potential, for transformation happens in contexts where the pedagogical environment reflects the desired outcome. It is not enough to teach *about* democracy – it is necessary to teach *within* it.

Rose describes an example of her pedagogy that is closely aligned with Okazawa-Rey's principles. In doing so, she is trying to link directly to student experience and ensuring democratic practices occur.

We did that quite successfully in the Treaty workshop where we split them in to groups, they had to name their group, they had to do all sorts of things about groups, and then every week, everyone had to take a different turn. So it was **highly** structured in terms of sharing round responsibilities and enabling different people to take **leads**. And was really good, quite time-consuming, (laughs) and so it did eat into that content stuff but then a lot of that content stuff they can read. So again I say to myself, 'actually this is more important, this needs to be happening here'.

(Rose)

Adams (1997) proposes a set of principles that she believes encapsulates the essence of liberatory pedagogy. She emphasises the importance of the affective domain in the classroom (arising primarily from feminist theorising). Her principles are:

1. Balance the emotional and cognitive components of learning;
2. Acknowledge and support the personal (the individual student's experience);
3. Attend to social relations within the classroom;
4. Utilize reflection and experience as tools for student-centred learning; and
5. Value awareness, personal growth, and change as outcomes of the learning process.

These, she believes, are not only principles for social justice education but they equally identify the dilemmas that teachers face in the classroom.

Hackman, the most recent of these writers, offers *Five Essential Components for Social Justice Education*. She believes that 'social justice education encourages students to take an active role in their own education and supports teachers in creating empowering, democratic, and critical educational environments' (Hackman, 2005, p. 103). Her five components are: content

mastery; tools for critical analysis; tools for social change; tools for personal reflection; and an awareness of multicultural group dynamics. She begins with acknowledging that content mastery is a critical component of social justice education but then identifies that it is insufficient on its own in providing students with ways to move from knowledge to action. The last component is the linking factor that defines how teacher and students manage the other four components in classrooms.

These are themes that appear in the participant stories and, although I will return to them soon, I introduce snippets of their voices to keep them alive in the narrative. Turtle describes aspects of his pedagogy that articulate with Hackman's components.

You know, you've got to use things like humour. You've got to use things like critical thinking. You've got to make them feel. You can't, I mean you can just go in there and read things from the text book and be 100% technically correct. But they will forget it within, you know, 30 seconds of hearing it.

(Turtle)

Phillip is talking about pedagogy generally and notes the importance of going beyond content to engage students in analysis and group process and encourage different perspectives.

Well if you approach a problem by taking the view of one particular lens, you may not bring all these other people with you to make that particular issue a reality. So organisational commitment and buy-in and teamwork is, you know, these are the issues that develop if you look at a particular problem through a particular social lens.

(Phillip)

However, there are reminders that content cannot be discounted nor its role demeaned. Phillip suggests that 'understanding of content' remains important

and Betty says: 'Like the curriculum itself is important, you can't say it's just the process.'

Comment

Each of these writers has made an attempt at specifying some components that characterise effective ethical pedagogy, but they also each identify the importance of the individual context and the requirement for responsiveness within that.

Despite the range of proposed approaches, some of the similarities and principles that permeate the literature are easily visible. Although writing some time before the others here, I summarise this overview by quoting Shor. His list of attributes of the nature of liberatory pedagogy encapsulates the principles outlined by each of the other writers. Building on a Freirean approach, he proposes that empowering pedagogy is 'participatory, affective, problem-posing, situated, multicultural, dialogic, desocializing, democratic, researching, interdisciplinary, activist' (Shor, 1992, p. 17). Implicit in both this description and in these models is the centrality of both the goals and process of social justice education. All the writers examined here are seeking equitable outcomes for learners and in the wider society so there is an expectation of action. It is this notion of active process that I now attend to.

Education as Process

Social justice education, then, is a process that occurs differently in each particular context. With such diversity being required, it is not surprising that the process, with a focus on action, becomes paramount and this is clear in the elucidation of the principles above.

'Social justice is a verb; that is, it is a dynamic state of affairs in that it is never – could never be – achieved once and for all. It is always subject to revision' (Griffiths, 2003. p. 55). Griffiths discusses not only social justice itself but the equally dynamic nature of teaching. It is not simply about content as Hackman (2005) reminds. It is about an ongoing, active, empowering, challenging,

participatory and demanding process where learners and teachers are collaborators, provocateurs and creators of meaning. It is difficult, controversial, sometimes painful and always dynamic. It is also potentially celebratory, healing and future-focused. It is about ‘hearing each other’s voices, individual thoughts, and sometimes associating these voices with personal experiences’ (hooks, 1994, p. 186). It is therefore, imbued with potential and inherently requires action against oppression and injustice.

Earlier I introduced the analysis of teaching as a moral act. Building on that principle, Fenstermacher (1990, p. 133) suggests that ‘what makes teaching a moral endeavour is that it is, quite centrally, human action undertaken in regard to other human beings’. Here are the two fundamental concepts of action and the role of human beings – both teachers and learners. And teachers are morally bound to consider outcomes for their students as the process of education inevitably raises awareness. But it is not acceptable to raise awareness of social justice issues without also helping students to an understanding of possibilities for change. If the latter is neglected this is ‘prescription for despair’ (Adams, 1997, p. 38). Being exposed to some of the challenges of social justice and consequences of inequality can cause anguish for students, including the arousal of emotions such as anger, grief, denial and blame. Teachers must be prepared to acknowledge and work with these emotions in constructive ways.

Jane describes an example of this which she calls a ‘beautiful moment’ where a young Maori woman approached her at the end of a class where they had been looking at issues related to the history of the Treaty of Waitangi.

She came up to me afterwards and she said ‘you know, its never occurred to me before this class, that ... pakeha, all pakeha, may not have only been out to rip Maori off. That there might have been some pakeha who actually thought that the Treaty would protect Maori ... I’ve always grown up in my hapu and iwi thinking that pakeha were just bloody rip-off artists and just out to get

what they could do now I can see that they were just people.
Some of them were people doing their best'.

(Jane)

Jane engaged in a process that tapped into specifics, awareness and relationships and, despite the rhetoric surrounding the issue and the emotions of all those concerned, new meaning was made, at least for this student.

In summary, education for social justice must be seen as ‘a process involving continuous inquiry as opposed to a product governed by rules, both formal and informal, that can “pre-scribe” how they are to act in the classroom’ (Gitlin, 1995, p. 114). What is evident in this analysis is the emphasis on the relational aspects of social justice.

Quick words from Betty and Jane reinforce the centrality of process, relations and engagement as well as attention to content.

[...] no matter what we’re doing, a process is going on and it’s teaching us things or it’s teaching either clearly or in obfuscating kind of fashion ways to be with each other, ways to be with material that we read, ways to be with ideas, and ways to treat ideas and each other, if you like, to be with ourselves.

(Betty)

[...] my perception of process is that process is the, [...] is extremely important because it is the **key** to whether the experience of learning is meaningful or whether I’m making or we’re as a collective group making connections for people that fit with their experiences so that they can make sense of them for themselves so that they can see where it is relevant to them as individuals as well as them within their whanau or family and community and culture as well as relevant to them in their teaching.

(Jane)

But caution is necessary and, despite her support for process, Betty provides a warning arising from her reflection on pedagogy and espoused ways of teaching.

So I think, for a long time, I would have wanted to argue that the curriculum is kind of taking care of itself and we need to attend to process because that's the thing that is invisible when you go from classroom to classroom to classroom and the process is always the same. It's just invisible. And yet the students who are, um, in any way kind of marginal to the assumed subject of university education, the process is likely, the process is likely to be a significant obstacle to them engaging.

(Betty)

She talks about Maori students and how the lecture mode of teaching may articulate more readily with oratory familiar to them from the marae¹⁴ where those with authority speak uninterrupted and those without rank listen.

Whereas, the more discussion-based mode which is apparently more democratic and I would have argued that it wasn't democratic, I can see more clearly now that it is democratic if you believe in a western participatory style of democracy which is not, which is premised on a certain way of understanding individuals and their rank in relation to each other. And which of course is constantly subverted by things like gender politics and other ... And it's also, if you consider any small group discussion in the university you will see how it is subverted not only by gender politics, but by personalities and by incompetent facilitation skills, lack of facilitation skills and [...]

(Betty)

Betty's evolutionary thinking is evident here as a result of the reflection on her practice and new information that challenges her understanding of appropriate

pedagogy. Ultimately, despite the guidance from the literature, there are no right answers and teachers are challenged with developing pedagogies that are contextually appropriate. As McLean (2006, p.76) says:

Whatever contested ideas about what constitutes a good university teacher, teaching is intellectually and emotionally complex and demanding. It involves finely honed judgements about content; about the process of giving students access to content; and about relationships in and out of seminar and lecture rooms. University teachers are inevitably embroiled in the cognitive, social and emotional development of their students.

There is no room for dispassionate teaching.

Actions and Possibilities

The teacher's role is central in establishing the environment of the classroom in ways that promote the investigation and practice of social justice. This requires creativity on the part of the teacher who 'creates an environment for learning that has multiple entry points for learning and multiple pathways to success. That education must be abundant with opportunities to practice social justice; to display, foster, embody, expect, demand, nurture, allow, model, and enact inquiry towards change' (Ayers, 1998, p. xxv).

Jane talks about this and notes that she tries to embody such principles in her teaching so she is not just teaching *about* but teaching *within*.

I **try**, I try to keep those in mind in my teaching and I **know** that I am in a position of power as a lecturer. We are an accrediting institution so the power relationships are a given but I attempt to be respectful of the student teachers. I attempt to treat them as individuals within their community whatever it is.

(Jane)

¹⁴ The marae is the traditional tribal-based meeting place where oratory and meetings happen.

It is tempting to present such practices as straightforward and uncontroversial. In practice they are anything but. They are hard work and personally demanding on both teachers and students, particularly in contexts of managerialist performativity. They also require a reconfiguration of the relative roles of the players. Traditional positional authority vested in the teacher has little place here, notwithstanding the reluctance of many students to accept this role reversal. The teacher's role becomes even more critical as the classroom becomes more complex and demanding, particularly with the increasingly diverse student population. The teacher must be prepared to work with whatever arises and to manage the relationships, resentments, resistance, and resolutions (see Ainley & Canaan, 2005). She is however, not alone. Learning requires the student to make some choices and take some action. This can be fulfilled if teachers handle the process with care, respect and skill and the classroom becomes potentially a powerful and safe, though challenging, space where dialogue can occur between and among individuals, even individuals of unequal power and influence. It is also a space where identities are produced – both student and teacher.

Adams (1997, p. 40) explains the pivotal role of the teacher but also clarifies student agency.

Our goal as educators is to provide information and experiences that students can incorporate into their own developmental journey, in ways that make sense to them. Even as we feel a responsibility to challenge and contradict all stereotypic beliefs or attitudes, the decision to shed these beliefs or attitudes belongs to the student, not us.

Collaboration between all is necessary and, according to Nieto (1992, p. 245) ‘Rather than the authoritarian wielding of power, either on the part of professors or of students, collaborative relations of power means working together to create learning experiences that can both challenge and support all learners’. Shor (1992, p. 90), in promoting the use of dialogue as a pedagogical strategy, explains clearly what is required. ‘Dialogue transforms the teacher’s unilateral authority by putting limits on his or her dominating voice and calling on the students to codevelop a joint learning process’.

Students need to feel empowered by the process and several participants note this. Jane says ‘I try [and] bring stuff from their background that they can share with others’ which she names as a simple but powerful exercise that helps in making meaning. Harry notes the role of the teacher as critical in creating openness and opportunity for this to happen. He says, rather than have a competitive environment, ‘you can have a kind of more collegial kind of, more supportive kind of environment that allows them to discuss the rights and wrongs or pros and cons of the project’. And Betty names the ways in which she has ‘put things back with the class’ to allow students to do things such as ‘submit not only a proposal for the assignment but a proposal for the assessment process’. These are all ways in which these teachers try to avoid the wielding of power and encourage students to own the process of learning.

Also under critique is the nature of the content. While the teacher still has the responsibility of providing some material for investigation, it is the daily, real-life experiences of the students and the relationships in the classroom that are the primary texts. So the classroom begins to look very different and the expectations on all are high. ‘In the liberatory classroom, the authority that usually comes from course content and the expertise of the teacher is dismantled, scrambled and reconstructed. Because the content centres on the experience of the students, the authority must be shared’ (Power, 1998, p. 122).

To manage such a milieu, effective pedagogical strategies are required. Students are going to be engaged in some very demanding situations and the management of the relationships and the learning environment will be critical. Adams (1997, p. 42) highlights the difficulties that can arise when students move from certainty and dualistic thinking to uncertainty and relativistic thinking and provides guidelines for managing the process, suggesting:

1. draw upon the concrete, personal, and experiential as the grounding for abstract knowledge;
2. take ample time to help students process sources of contradiction or conceptual confusion, both at personal level and level of theory;

3. provide explicit course structure and support for the inevitable student-generated dissonance and contradiction;
4. make explicit use of our own authority as teachers to endorse and explain more complex thinking modes.

Teachers and students will inevitably experience some challenging situations and emotions. This is a necessary, yet unsettling, part of the process of education for social justice and the resulting production of identities. ‘When education is the practice of freedom, students are not the only ones who are asked to share, to confess [...] empowerment cannot happen if we refuse to be vulnerable while encouraging students to take risks’ (hooks, 1994, p. 21). But it does not need to be defeating. Evangeline talks about teachers looking after themselves and reflecting on their teaching in order to do the work of social justice.

But you do need a support system. And whether it's a teaching buddy and someone you co-teach with, um, where you can talk through these kinds of issues, where you can reflect critically on your pedagogy in a safe way, where you're not being assessed, where you can, you know, new strategies can be suggested where you can do some PD and think about how you teach in a tertiary context, um, mmm, so I guess again some of the same sorts of things, you know, thinking about your process as well as your content.

(Evangeline)

Evangeline’s narrative suggests she has felt the vulnerabilities and the emotions that go with this work and has learnt not only to accept them but to embrace them with appropriate support strategies.

What has become clear through this analysis is that teaching for social justice, although it demands a particular orientation to promote equity and diversity, involves good teaching and good pedagogy (Adams, 1997; Nieto, 2002). The same practices that enhance equity and challenge domination are just as effective in the practices of everyday teaching, as is easily identified by looking at the parallel literatures presented here.

But this is no tale of unqualified possibility. There is no escaping the resistance that can occur in relation to the inclusion of social justice content and processes. Many students are resistant and, without care, many teachers exacerbate that resistance through ill-considered or clumsy pedagogy, albeit with the best of intentions. Ellsworth (1992) warns that much of the work done around critical pedagogy results in anything but ‘empowerment’ for those whose oppression or alienation it is intended to address. She notes that classrooms can still be unsafe places even when democratic principles and dialogue are employed. This is a complex arena that teachers committed to social justice should examine closely in relation to their own practice. Ellsworth (1992, p. 115) suggests:

If you can talk to me in ways that show that your knowledge of me, the world, and ‘the Right thing to do’ will always be partial, interested, and potentially oppressive to others, and if I can do the same, then we can work together on shaping and reshaping alliances for constructing circumstances in which students of difference can thrive.

Although she is referring specifically to enhancing social justice for the oppressed in tertiary classes, the principle rings true for the kinds of classrooms this thesis has been investigating.

Students are not the only ones to resist. Gitlin and Margonis (1995) discuss the resistance that teachers can engage in when ideals such as social justice appear mandated or imposed in a change process and urge caution when encouraging reform. Teachers need to be helped not coerced to such positions.

So, notwithstanding these challenges, there is no mystique or air of secrecy about teaching for social justice. Given Ellsworth’s warning, however, teachers may require particular contextualised guidance on how best to do this (Gore, 1992). In liberatory classrooms, where effective communities are developed and divisive and difficult issues confronted and debated, there is no guarantee that ideological issues and philosophical differences will be banished forever. So teachers need to be resilient. In the words of Cochran-Smith

(1991, p. 285), ‘teachers who want to work against the grain must name and wrestle with their own doubts, must fend off the fatigue of reform and depend on the strength of their individual and collaborative convictions that their work ultimately makes a difference in the fabric of society’.

The Emotional Terrain of Teaching

These final sentences reinforce the role of student and teacher emotions in the classroom. Evidence of the importance of the emotional dimension is embedded throughout the descriptors of social justice education just introduced. So, emotions are a critical part of ‘good’ teaching, linked to the production of identity, and central to developing socially just graduates.

I return to Boler’s (1999) work. In the preface to her book she notes that education is a hopeful endeavour if we include emotions as a legitimate component of education because ‘emotions help us envision future horizons of possibilities and who we want to become’ thus they are a ‘mode of resistance’ (p. iii). If emotions are reclaimed in the classroom they can assist in providing hope for action towards social justice. Boler says ‘I see education as a means to challenge rigid patterns of thinking that perpetuate injustice and instead encourage flexible analytic skills, which include the ability to self-reflectively evaluate the complex relations of power and emotion’ (p. 157). She suggests a ‘pedagogy of discomfort’ – one which encourages the investigation of values and beliefs on the part of students and teachers and the examination of self-images. The intent is to encourage a widening of perception and expectation, acceptance of difference and potentially a dismantling of cherished beliefs. Destabilising of identity is again evident. ‘A pedagogy of discomfort invites students to leave the familiar shores of learned beliefs and habits and swim further out into the “foreign” and risky depths of the sea of ethical and moral differences’ (p. 181).

Boler and Zembylas (2003, p. 125) also note the importance of confronting and understanding difference and the related emotional turbulence that can result as identities are unsettled. For, they propose, ‘The arbitrary nature in constructing identities implies plenty of space for ambiguity’. The intention is not to

diminish the student, nor to leave them emotionally spent but ‘Ultimately, the goal is to inhabit a more ambiguous sense of self not reduced to the binaries of good and evil’ (p. 126). In the process of critical ontology, of interrogating oneself, the emotions are deeply implicated, for Boler and Zembylas note that inhabiting ambiguity can be very discomforting and result in the playing out of a wide range of emotions including anger, fear and vulnerability but also offer the possibility of transformation. The capacity to deconstruct and shape habits and emotions, however, ‘is comforting because, despite the entailed ambiguity, it makes it possible to encourage vitalism, critical thinking and the invention of new ways of being in the world’ (p. 133).

There are both inspiration and salutary warnings in these descriptions of education for social justice. How do the participants perceive teaching for social justice?

Stories from the Everyday World

The participant narratives are rich with tales of teaching for social justice, albeit their interpretations of what it means differ. After discussing these interpretations, I ask the participants how their social justice orientation plays itself out in the classroom. Bear in mind that these people are not specifically teaching classes named or focused on social justice. They are teaching a broad range of content areas and disciplines and the social justice component is woven throughout their teaching. There is also a mix of attention to content and process in their approaches.

Rose is articulate and thoughtful about her practice and speaks confidently about the processes she uses. She is constantly on the look-out for opportunities to address injustice and meticulous in seizing these. Aspects of Okazawa-Rey’s (1998) and Hackman’s (2005) approaches are evident in her pedagogy.

Well first of all I try to identify the put-downs. I identify it when it's happening. 'Oh, do you realise what's just happened here?'

and, we need to [...] Just starting with if people are speaking making 'I' statements rather than this is how the whole world thinks about this. [...] Well sometimes I name them and sometimes I have some conversation about them, sometimes I'll go away and think about it and think 'oh that's something that needs to be, I need to think about a process how that can be addressed. How that can be revisited.'

(Rose)

She is acutely attuned to the ways in which the practices of her classroom might be oppressive. Reflecting on this encourages her to find ways of avoiding ongoing marginalisation or oppression and Rose is not afraid to engage in any kind of practice that names or identifies issues, even when this might be challenging for students. Her regular reflection is evident again and she indicates there are no universals in terms of the way she addresses issues. This requires nimbleness on her part as well as courage to confront. In the following narrative, she names some regular practices designed to provide voice for students and identifies that, despite best intentions, these too can contribute to oppression.

I'm kind of mindful that we can **think** we've got democratic, trustful, dialogical conversations going on and that's what I encourage, and so I do a lot of small group work, but there's a dilemma in there [...] you can put them in to small groups but, the dominance will continue in the small group. It persists. So you can put in strategies like when you're holding the pen you will get a turn to talk, you can put in strategies like everyone's got to have a turn at being the recorder.

(Rose)

Rose tells a delightful story about addressing gender inequity – 'putting out agenda-ed leads' – in the simplest ways through children's storytelling in her classroom and is challenged by a student who says she is just being politically correct. She seizes the moment and talks about gender issues and their lack of resolution, even now, and she follows up with the student. She clearly

welcomes challenge, questioning and openness in her classroom and relishes the opportunity to work with what arises, not fearing the possibilities of conflict or emotions arising. In this narrative, she reflects Power's (1998) point about class content valuing student experience and the necessary sharing of power.

That's OK. I told her the other day I had found an **excellent** chapter for her to read. So she laughed. Sometimes I just think she likes to be the devil's advocate. And that's not a bad thing. That's not a bad [...] I see that as quite a positive thing to have in the class because they just don't take what you say. They'll go 'hang on a minute'.

(Rose)

Rose sums up her approach which is not spectacularly impressive, confrontational pedagogy. It is her attention to the small things – to the ‘soul’ of the student.

There's this wonderful quote that says 'teachers affect eternity. You never know where their influence will last'. And so in terms of social justice I think I sow seeds. All right? And some people, those **seeds** won't necessarily grow straight away. But there's a little thing being planted in there and so, that's how I look at it.

(Rose)

As already discussed, Phillip sees social justice through a postmodern ‘lenses’ perspective, but nevertheless is committed to ensuring students consider issues from more than their own cultural or other localised viewpoint.

Central to my teaching philosophy is making sure that students see their world, in the teaching of marketing, in my teaching of marketing, see their world through different lenses. That is central because often in marketing decision-making, depending on how you approach a problem and which lens you are examining that problem through, you may come up, and often do come up with different solutions to different problems. So how we, how we **frame** a problem and what lens we use to solve a

problem, can generate some very, very different things. It's adamant that, through, through, my teaching, I believe it is critical to ensure this is not a finite, **definite** answer.

(Phillip)

While this could be seen as encouraging students to see diversity as a positive marketing tool, Phillip indicates in our discussion that he does think beyond this. He goes on to describe a situation that has previously caused him discomfort given its impact on a single student from a different culture. He outlines the lengths he went to to resolve the situation. However, in doing so, Phillip indicates his own tentativeness in practice as a result of having caused offence and, given his unwillingness to draw emotions and vulnerability into the classroom, he now prefers to play his pedagogy more safely.

[...] you see you have to be very, very careful as well because, ah, yea I can recall a case as well six, seven years ago which really **got** me at the time. There was a particular ad that I showed in a class of 200 students. And while, it was not sensitive as far as domestic student base was concerned, while recognising that the views of the ad in **no way** reflected my own views, and making that clear, and while demonstrating that this was what the organisation was trying to do, it **offended** one person in a class of 300. Now, that issue became very, very sensitive to me. Now in a class of 300 you could easily dismiss that as being irrelevant. But one particular Tongan student, the ad was offensive to, um [...] so I naturally put in various processes to mitigate that offence and it took quite a while and certainly the student was very, very satisfied at the end [...] I mean, it was a good example of social injustice.

(Phillip)

So Phillip is clear about the possibilities of marginalisation and alienation, although his reference to 'social injustice' is perplexing. He seems to suggest his practice that caused offence was unjust and he felt the need to rectify it with the student – at great effort. Might there have been the opportunity to process

this in class with students and maximise the possibilities of learning from it? Beyond this example, however, Phillip is not particularly eloquent about how social justice principles are evident in his teaching, either in content or process. Perhaps this is not surprising given that he was unclear about how to define social justice when I asked him about it. However, at the end of our interview he had done some more reflection and comments:

[this] has allowed me to explore some of the meanings that you were starting to place on social justice. But more importantly some of the meanings that I place on social justice although I've been possibly calling it something else, you know, related to my sort of moral issues or approach that I take in my teaching.

(Phillip)

Conversely, Jane embeds social justice content, principles and practices throughout her teaching in every possible way. Like Rose, she capitalises on opportunities to confront *issues* as they arise but tries not to confront *people* for fear of alienating them. While being prepared to challenge where appropriate, she also uses other strategies that operate in a more invisible way.

Um, one of the things that happens is that, [pause] um, I will challenge things that I consider to be, you know, statements that are made or attitudes or things that come through in the classroom that I consider to be unfounded or ill-considered or ignorant, and often it is ignorance isn't it? So, [...] sometimes I will just make, pretend to make assumptions, you know, so I will say things like, you know talking about Treaty stuff I will just say 'well as you **know**' which just sort of **precludes**, um, debate because there are some things that I think its reasonable are givens and I think that the fact that at a certain level of education student teachers can be expected to have a certain degree of knowledge and understanding about Treaty stuff. And if they don't then maybe some of these things will make them think 'oh she says I should know about that. Maybe I should find out about that', rather than debating it in class because I think sometimes **debating** in class is not always the most productive.

(Jane)

Jane is traversing a lot of territory in this narrative, and seems to be constructing her thinking and clarifying her position as she goes. Her attention to aspects of pedagogy, especially challenging pedagogy, is evident as Jane is not shy about addressing issues that she finds unacceptable. What is also clear is that she has a set of 'bottom lines' that underpin her teaching practice and her expectations of students. Her reflection around this is obviously something that is a regular part of her work. However, Jane's caution has some basis. We talk a little about alienation.

Yea, and I've seen, I've seen it happen and, in fact, I've seen student teachers put off the whole thing around the Treaty and just, you know, when they've been challenged to the hilt, close the door not to look at it again for another ten years perhaps. And I've been round long enough to see that happen. (Laughs) Cause the early anti-racism stuff, workshops that I did, if we didn't cry, if we weren't screaming messes on the floor feeling totally guilty and ashamed to be pakeha, the facilitators didn't feel that they had done their job.

(Jane)

It is valuable to remember the times Jane refers to but also to celebrate that we have moved on pedagogically and ethically from such practices which happened just as Jane describes. They were justified as appropriate in the historical context in which they were used, but it is debatable as to whether or not they achieved long term positive social justice outcomes. Jane's experience suggests not and soon Evangeline comments on this.

Jane is particularly alerted to the relational dimension.

[...] and so I attempt to weave it through [...] um [...] But even [...] like I am teaching a hauora¹⁵ course at the moment so there's all that postmodern stuff I suppose about being open and responsive and not making judgement and like what I try and

model or try and explore is that there are no right answers is that, that [...] I mean obesity is a classic if you are thinking about social justice stuff, eh? And the **absolutely** judgemental things that people will come out with around obesity. And so I don't think there's, I'm trying to think of an area of teaching that social justice couldn't be woven into. And although I don't teach science or maths and oh [...] I can see social justice in there and [...] language, the arts [...] I cannot see any area where you wouldn't be able to weave it.

(Jane)

Again Jane is thinking and reflecting as she goes and, it seems, making links with other themes that have been traversed in our conversation to this point. She begins on a particular thought and then her mind travels to other related places. She ends up here being resolved that there are no topics where social justice themes do not have a place in her pedagogy – something which might be quite unexpected, and unwelcome, by many of her students. So Jane can be confronting and she is also explicit that she is not afraid to challenge, though wonders sometimes if she does enough of this.

I challenge respectfully. I hope! I hope. Oh no, I do. Sometimes I think I'm a bit gentle. Sometimes I think my challenges are a bit um, don't always hit the mark, you know, because, because I'm balancing, I'm balancing that, um like ... someone says something that I think is crap and I want to say 'that's crap'. And I will say things like 'does anyone else have an idea about this?' ... So that is something that I, that is something that I grapple with. Am I sometimes a bit too soft in my approach in an attempt to balance those two things?

(Jane)

This is indicative of the balancing act that many teachers articulate in relation to their practice. Harry comments on this also in musing over his definition of

¹⁵ Hauora is a Maori word referring to aspects of health and well-being.

social justice. He acknowledges that this has evolved over time, as have his ideals in terms of teaching for social justice.

Sometimes, you know, you can only do so much. I guess it's like when I was an architect or when I was an architecture student I wanted to do something that would change the world, you know. Then you realise that you're not going to change the world but you can do a little bit, you know. You can do a little bit. And I guess part of me thinks yea, sometimes, hopefully, I can get students to do kind of odd little things well and think about ordinary things in a new way, that's kind of fine. I suppose at the moment I've kind of come, my position is probably now, kind of 'do no harm'. (Laughs) From kind of change the world to kind of 'do no harm'.

(Harry)

It would be easy to critique Harry's statement as selling out social justice or compromising his ideals, but it is important to see this in the context of the multiple issues that have been discussed in this thesis. Harry is dealing with changes in the nature of knowledge, the university, educational and social expectations, student expectations, not to mention that he is constrained by the requirements of his discipline and the demands of content. He is still managing to achieve small wins.

With Evangeline, I discuss this practice of not teaching 'Social Justice 101' (a dedicated course for identifying and addressing issues) but rather taking an inclusive approach, weaving the concepts in wherever possible and appropriate. This is exactly her intent, enhancing this by bringing her own research into the classroom and providing opportunities for students to engage with real world examples.

Though I do sneak it in to 101! Because we work through different issues. My run is on culture and education, we work through different issues and the last class is teaching for social justice, what might it look like in the classroom? And that's where I get to bring my research in which is very exciting to talk about critical literacy and what we're doing out in schools.

(Evangeline)

Even this approach is more specific and focused than the work of some other teachers included in this research who, typically, might not, or cannot, dedicate sessions to such topics.

The following narrative from Evangeline is evocative, comprehensive and moving. In it she traverses a wide array of issues that permeate and define social justice teaching, from the initial establishing of relationships, through the moving people outside of their bounds of thinking, to the production and destabilisation of identities, to the emotional dimension and to the dangers of confronting people too quickly. This could be a model for social justice teaching, incorporating so many of the principles already articulated. It, too, goes directly to the heart of a relational approach to social justice. Particularly evident is Okazawa-Rey's (1998) encouragement to teachers to use the students' everyday experiences as texts.

So all that groundwork that you do at the beginning of the year, you know, to build up the team, to build relationships with your students and their families, that lays the foundation for you to do the hard, challenging work to get them to think differently. Now, when you have a run of seven lectures in a paper with 250 students, you do it pretty quickly and you do it, in some ways, at a surface level, but none-the-less you do sort of make that effort to make yourself a bit sort of approachable and amenable and your door's open and you're happy to talk to folks. Um, and yet you slip it in wherever you can and maybe it isn't always explicit – 'now we're going to talk about social justice' – what was I teaching? [...] we were talking about a classroom lesson and reading stories aloud to kids and I said 'you know, you need to think about these issues all the time. How inclusive are you of all your children? Do you read "Heather has two mommies"? And they absolutely lost it and fell apart. 'We can't do that. That's [...] no, no, no, no.' And I said 'it is **guaranteed**, over your time teaching, you will have Heather who has two mommies. How are

you going to [...] you know? So you're going to exclude her?' 'Oh, you know, I'm just going to talk about critical literacy work and selecting texts and how so often kids get faced with texts day after day after day where them, they themselves or their family are not included in the stories. Middle class pakeha families. You know, the old stories but it still happens to an extent where Maori families are always going fishing and hunting, you know, come on. So then, of course, they went, 'what, no we can't do that.' So then of course the next week I came rushing back just to push them that much further and it is still a kick because I know a lot of social justice work, particularly around the Treaty, has often been taught in a very **combative** manner saying 'oh, we've got to break them down'. Again, you have to consider that emotional work and in, I was a Spanish immersion teacher, in second language instruction we talk about the **affective** filter. When you are learning something really new and you're really anxious, your affective filter goes up and it filters everything out and you stop learning. So when I push you too hard on the Heather has two mommies thing, you shut down and you stop listening to me and you don't take in any of the other clever things I have to say for the rest of the 50 minutes, and so it is a balancing act of, and so that's I guess maybe where the uncertainty comes in the judgement call of **the moment** where I read the vibe, for want of a better term, of the room, and go 'that's enough for today. I'll come back to this next time, but I'm not going to push it any more today'.

(Evangeline)

It is not difficult to imagine Evangeline teaching in just such a context and the reactions and discussions that go on in her classroom. She seems totally conversant with the practices that will enhance and those that will inhibit student engagement with issues of social justice and she has worked out her version of the balancing act. So she will stop when she thinks students have been pushed far enough. However, leaving the issue hanging the way she does probably serves a double purpose. While it stops the students being pushed beyond the point where they will give the issue due consideration, it also

allows time for the students to reflect further and, potentially, clarify their own thinking. Then, back she comes with the next part of the challenge – this is sophisticated and strategic practice. McKinney (2007, p. 228) engaged in some interesting research in terms of this student resistance and suggests it sometimes serves a useful purpose. She observes:

However, in my experience, such resistance does not necessarily prevent productive engagement; on the contrary, it can provide powerful teaching moments. While not part of a linear progression, resistance may be a necessary part of the process of anti-racist pedagogy for some students and may be the only way that they can engage with particular texts at particular moments. What we need to do is to find ways of engaging productively with students' resistance. Enabling them to reflect on their views is one way of doing this.

Evangeline seems to have found the balance here and reflects on the way she goes about this. She believes that if students go into resistance mode:

... I'll just re-entrench whatever biases or beliefs or whatever 'isms' that they've brought with them and rather than getting them to think just for a moment how they might do it differently, yea they won't.

(Evangeline)

Evangeline is very conversant with the literature around social justice – both the theoretical literature and the literature about pedagogy. Therefore her comfort with these ideas is not unexpected. Nevertheless, her discussions are not derived from the literature per se, but reflect the reality of her pedagogy. She notes the importance of attention to social justice in localised contexts.

Yea, so there also has to be some sort of, it has to be a multi-dimensional thing and I know Nancy Fraser is really interested in globalisation and theorising social justice across boundaries and borders and so forth, but for us in teaching, we're dealing in the micro-politics often. You know, practicum supervision is one-on-one.

(Evangeline)

Evangeline is completely at ease discussing social justice issues despite her concerns expressed earlier about being a ‘fraud’.

Betty describes how she hopes to assist other teachers in thinking about their practices, encouraging them to go well beyond just the content of their classes and consider a broad range of other aspects of their pedagogy. Her narrative indicates that the process of the classroom is critical (Shor, 1992; Griffiths, 2003).

I'm wanting to say that this is a way for us to think about ourselves as teachers. And it's an important way because there **are** things that we can do, we **can** think about what readings we have on our reading lists and what they signal to students. We can think about the ways in which we design assessments and how we close down possibilities and narrow them to privilege or advantage certain groups of students. We can think about class dynamics. We can think about what we might do to kind of engage the poly[nesian] voices that sit along the back rows of the lecture theatres which is where they sit, you know.

(Betty)

What is particularly important here is the way this narrative stands in stark contrast to some of Betty's other cautions about the current prohibitive contexts of tertiary education for enhancing social justice. Notwithstanding these, Betty remains committed to finding ways herself and helping her colleagues also find appropriate ways to do so. She has not given up. She also acknowledges that process is only part of the issue.

[...] when we do workshops using workshop processes of interaction and small group activity and so on, it's the **ideas** that people absolutely react against or for or whatever, so that also makes me see that the process is important but the curriculum is equally important ... But I actually think that both are really important because the curriculum carries a weight of, of ethical baggage [...]

(Betty)

Harry and I have an extended conversation about the nature of teaching per se and specifically teaching for social justice and he muses over changes he notes to the nature of teaching and expectations of both the university and the students. Though he favours a less didactic style of teaching consistent with that described by the writers on social justice pedagogy, he acknowledges the challenges.

I think there's more pressure on students now. You know, grades and stuff and that idea of kind of risk and certainty is much more important. You know that they, we, and also because there's been a lot of work in education done on kind of teaching and learning practices and a focus on particular outcomes and assessment systems and so a shift towards a kind of student focused environment. So all of these things have kind of worked towards generating a kind of procedural transparency to some extent but I'm not sure they've really kind of, um, I'm not sure they've really kind of made a kind of qual-i-ta-tive (he accentuates this word) difference. I hesitate there, I don't know. And whether they've kind of actually, whether that means they are then more socially just because students have more, relatively more power, I'm not sure, cause students are quite often kind of quite privileged anyway.

(Harry)

This is not the first time in our conversation that Harry has addressed the nature of the learning environment for students and the change in both student and institutional expectations. He notes the privilege that many students experience and that has not been named by others and he expresses tentativeness around whether student-centred approaches have indeed made a difference to student outcomes in general and social justice graduates in particular. This doesn't stop him from continuing to engage in such practices but he is not unequivocally accepting of them or their potential to achieve change.

Harry's thoughts are a good place to conclude this section because he ponders issues alluded to by some of the other participants. The processes of teaching can aim to be socially just, they can utilise empowering pedagogy and they can attend to emotions, but, as Harry reminds us, there are no guarantees and the milieu of tertiary education often mitigates against achievement of the goals of social justice education.

Commentary

Despite the challenges, the participants generally commit to attending to social justice goals and practices. There is, for some, attention to the emotional dimension. Importantly, the teachers in this study, each in their own particular way, strive to include some form of social justice commitment, either through content (about) or process (for), in their pedagogy. In essence, they are seeking to develop and utilise ethical pedagogy. Their approaches vary dramatically from Evangeline, Rose and Jane's purposeful consideration and inclusion and skilful pedagogy, to Phillip's acknowledgement of complexity and diversity and his desire to ensure his marketing students see the world through a variety of perspectives. Those in teacher education are far more prepared and capable of talking about these issues in terms and concepts that articulate with the literature and there are no surprises there, given that teacher education has engaged with these philosophies and principles for many years and these teachers are all very experienced in dealing with such issues. They also reflect, largely, a commitment to critical pedagogy or poststructuralist, postcolonial and/or feminist approaches to social justice which attend to difference and situatedness.

However, it is not wise to completely dismiss the approaches taken by some of the other participants, even though on first analysis the depth of commitment to social justice ideals appears shallow. There are two issues relevant here. As indicated earlier in this thesis, the definition and scope of 'social justice' is implicated. So although Carl, for example, is resistant to 'privileging Maori', he intends generically to develop 'good citizens' and 'ethical accountants'. Carl's notion of social justice fits more comfortably with a humanistic,

universalist approach which constructs individuals as class, gender and culturally neutral and is less informed by more recent conceptions of critical pedagogy. Indeed, his reference to critical thinking as ‘critical theory’ indicates his lack of awareness of the breadth of contemporary theorising. Despite his somewhat colonial orientation to Maori, and his personal location within white privilege, he is, nevertheless, alerted to issues of justice, more so than many tertiary teachers. It is not however, appropriate to categorise Carl as a social justice educator.

At stake here, also, are the identity issues covered in Acts 1 and 3. The participant narratives here are complex and I have already indicated where there are tensions within individuals’ stories or perspectives. It is important to remember that discourses are constructed within social contexts and within power relations (Davies and Harré, 1990; Sarup, 1996) and these participants are not immune from these influences. Their stories are often indicative of conflicting beliefs or practices and this is not unexpected. Take Harry, for example. Without considering his personal life, he is an architect, an architecture lecturer, a colleague of other architecture lecturers, a PhD student, an employee of the university, an individual with a long-term interest in issues of social justice, a studio facilitator, a citizen of a large city, and more. It is highly unlikely that he inhabits one, single, uncomplicated and consistent identity that frames his responses and beliefs in all circumstances and this accounts for some of the variations or tensions in his narrative.

The second concern is that each of the disciplines has quite different expectations and demands and the inclusion of social justice principles in marketing or accountancy, for example, is much more unexpected, and potentially less welcome, than in the context of teacher education, or education per se. So, notwithstanding their lack of eloquence on the subject, some unfamiliarity with recent conceptions of justice or the limited attention paid by some to seemingly empowering processes, there remains an interest in and at least a degree of commitment to ‘ethical’ issues for all participants. And, again, this is impacted by the expected identity of a teacher in each of these disciplines.

It is timely to remember the earlier reference to social justice as a ‘condensation symbol’ (Troyna & Vincent, 1995) covering a multitude of concepts. These people all have their own interpretation of what that means and their own particular drivers and are all constrained, in different ways for different teachers, by their institutional and disciplinary mores and expectations as discussed in Act 3.

I have purposely not indicated the connections between the pedagogy of social justice discussed here and the theory, particularly that espoused by Young, Fraser and Sen, and introduced in Act 1. In Act 5, I will do so, making some observations on the relationship between them and pedagogy for uncertainty.

4.7 Conclusion

I indicated at the beginning of this Act that there was important and complex territory to traverse, and so it has been. What has become clear is the significant and sustained interrelationships between and among the various themes of this Act. When the literatures relating to ‘good’ teaching in tertiary education, education for *being* and teaching for social justice are juxtaposed and examined, as they are here, there are repeated synergies.

Ramsden (2003) defines good teaching in terms of deep learning and reinforces the importance of respect, engagement and the relationships of the classroom. In support, Jane says, ‘I work at attempting to have some sort of authenticity’. Biggs (1999) promotes rich learning environments, concurs about the importance of relationships and interaction, and encourages student activity as the key basis of learning. Harry is in agreement, proposing an active pedagogy because ‘students learn **much** more from each other than they do from the teacher’. Knight (2002) also discusses the centrality of relationships and notes the importance of dealing with the ‘whole person’. Phillip is not completely convinced at the insertion of the whole person in tertiary education, expressing concern that ‘It’s dangerous to go there, some people don’t, some people just don’t want to go there, full stop’. Brookfield (1990) is eloquent about skilful teaching which includes attention to passion and hope and the emotional dimension. Evangeline agrees, locates herself actively in the process of teaching, and notes ‘if we didn’t have hope, if we weren’t hopeful we wouldn’t be in this business’. Boler (1999) attends also to emotions and the role of power in education. Rose is attuned to both these concepts and models them in her teaching. For her students, she says, ‘I want them to work in a power with children model. Rather than power over.’

These key components of ‘good’ teaching, in general owned and reinforced by the participants, then appear repeatedly in the following sections and articulate strongly with Barnett’s (2004a) contention about education for *being*. Barnett’s attention to the production of student identities, including the

processes of pedagogical disturbance, shares much in common with the themes just summarised. The use of Mode 3 knowledge to attend to this pedagogical disturbance, takes the themes and moves them further into concepts of love and humanity and humility and stillness and frisson. Here the significance of ontology really starts to take root as the emotions and identity of students and teachers are implicated. And from here, the dispositions required for thriving in the uncertain world become clear, albeit not all participants see a role for either ontology or the development of related dispositions in tertiary education.

Finally, the pedagogy of social justice shares so many of these same characteristics. Bearing in mind the thesis is interested in everyday classrooms where there is significant student diversity, where there are privileged and disadvantaged, dominant and marginalised people working and learning together, where the content of the class is not necessarily expected to be confronting of values and beliefs, there are pedagogical processes and possibilities elucidated that appear to enhance the potential for establishing engaged pedagogies that articulate with the ideas discussed in this Act.

One uniting theme recurring throughout all the participant narratives is that of engagement – whether our discussions are regarding good teaching, uncertainty, being or social justice and notwithstanding the different perspectives expressed here. I acknowledged engagement in Act 2 as a ‘unifying narrative’. Evangeline, in discussing a particular assessment event, articulates the interrelationships of these themes.

And, um, that's what I talk to them about, their responsibilities when they become teachers as Treaty partners and there's an assignment that we give them, that's a Treaty discourse analysis assignment where they're asked to look at the current world around them, media, newspaper, commercials, text books, what have you, for discourses in and around the Treaty and to consider what, and how, the Treaty is being constituted in this particular moment in time. So they can think about the complexity of the Treaty because I'm sick of a Maori/Pakeha binary in and around the Treaty. It's just not that simple. It's

not going to be that simple for them to try and attend to that in classroom practice. Yet another bloody assignment on the three articles of the Treaty and the Maori and English versions is **not gonna help them**. Yes they need to know about that, that is important and the historical background that we work through, um, **but, I love** that discourse assignment actually, I'm very fond of it because, I think, it really, if they do it well, they have to engage with the complexity of it and the particular context.

(Evangeline)

So, these ‘engaged’ pedagogies might well synthesise a number of the themes of Act 4. They may well attend to issues of knowing, acting and being; provide opportunities for the development of dispositions for ‘knowing-in-and-with-uncertainty’; address issues of disturbance of student identities; allow for the inclusion of passion, hope and inspiration; assist students to ‘awaken from their dogmatic slumbers’ (Mills, 2002) ; and face the challenging and uncertain world with élan. They may deal with relationships as central in the learning process and perhaps they might even aid the ‘becoming’ of the student.

There are no guarantees, however, and Betty, yet again, introduces a qualifying thought that reflects the situation many tertiary teachers find themselves in.

And that, the old, more elite mode did allow face to face tutorials, did allow a kind of quality of attention to students' work, those things were possible. They may not have happened, but they were possible in a way that is, actually just becoming impossible. Now, I'm talking about it inside an institution that would have had a certain face-to-faceness 25 years ago but has hardly any now.

(Betty)

What has been discussed in this Act is potentially ideal, but is it possible?

As yet unexplored, is the relationship between the theories of social justice introduced early in the thesis and the ideas arising in this Act. These two notions of engagement across pedagogical themes and the potential then for a pedagogy of social justice in uncertainty, present themselves as questions to examine in the final Act. What, then, are the possibilities for the future, for tertiary teachers with a social justice orientation who wish to pursue professional, ethical pedagogy in a variety of disciplines and in the contexts of both uncertainty and performativity?

A C T 5

Tales of Possibility

5.1 *Introduction*

Before the final conclusions of the thesis can be reached two ideas introduced earlier are developed further. As indicated at the end of Act 4, engagement is a central idea in terms of ‘good’ teaching, education for *being*, and education for social justice. In each of the literatures, and in the participant narratives, engagement appears repeatedly as a key component of learning. But what exactly is meant by engagement and how do teachers develop pedagogies that truly engage students? In the following section, this question is addressed.

In Act 1, I provided a brief overview of the work of four key social justice theorists. Their ideas have subsequently been largely invisible as the discussion has followed a complex path through a range of related concepts. In the previous Act, while fully investigating pedagogies for social justice, their role was still not explicit. But there has been a rationale for this and, in this final Act, Young, Fraser, Sen and Nussbaum return with consideration of a promising new possibility – the inclusion of a capabilities approach to pedagogy in tertiary education.

In this Act, the themes of uncertainty, identity, education for *being*, education for social justice, and the sub-themes of engagement, dispositions and related pedagogies – all in the context of the contemporary tertiary landscape – are revisited and discussed alongside a potential list of capabilities for tertiary education. The three central considerations of professional, pedagogical and ethical issues for tertiary teachers are all implicated. The Act concludes with an air of optimism, explicated in the epilogue.

5.2 Pedagogies of Engagement

Barnett and Coate (2005) outline the significance of engagement in the processes of developing the *being* of students. They develop a description of an engaged curriculum and subsequently, engaged pedagogies, locating their argument in the context of education for uncertainty. I outline very briefly their proposal.

Unless students are engaged, Barnett and Coate contend, nothing much will happen in relation to their development and therefore contemporary curricula should be imagined and enacted in terms of engaging students with knowledges, with opportunities for action, and in ways that enable students to become more fully themselves. They describe some of the requirements of such a curriculum and note spaces and time as two key considerations.

Spaces should consider both ‘operational engagement’ and ‘ontological engagement’ (Barnett & Coate, 2005, p. 138). The former suggests students are involved in specified projects and are active in their learning and this is perhaps what is evident in some of the narratives from the participants. Through these, it appears that almost all the participants ensure students are operationally engaged. However, Barnett and Coate propose a second level of engagement which is required for a pedagogy for *being*. ‘This is the level of engagement that reflects the student’s inner and personal involvement in her acts of learning’ (p. 138) and involves a commitment of herself on the part of the student – an ontological engagement. This is a space that allows her to ‘enter into herself such that she engages herself fully and willingly’ (p. 139). A curriculum that is too full of opportunities for operational engagement will not allow sufficient time and space for ontological engagement.

One of the key spaces required is ‘collective’ and this, according to the writers, implies interaction. Togetherness is a powerful and expected component of collective space and the curriculum can come alive when students are actively and effectively engaged together. This offers several benefits including collective safety, the development of a ‘learning community’ (Wenger, 1999)

and the opportunity for students to each play their part in the theatre of curriculum-in-action. Educational power is implicated because:

the curriculum – as we envisage it – becomes imbued with *collective power*. It is a site of educational happenings that would not occur under other circumstances. But note too that the tutor's responsibilities in this curriculum are not diminished but are positively heightened. Keeping the show on the road when the students have such collective space of their own and are engaging together is a demanding and complex matter (Barnett & Coate, 2005, p. 142).

The second key component of engaged curriculum is time and Barnett and Coate urge teachers to allow time because '*Human being* develops through human beings' (p. 143) and is often a time-consuming and painstaking process. Curricula should ensure there is time enough for students to 'come into themselves' and develop relationships of trust, understanding and capability.

Time and space therefore, work together to allow for the development of *being*, and relationships are at the core of pedagogical encounters. It is acknowledged that the increasing student:staff ratios that are endemic in mass higher education pose challenges to time, space and the development of relationships. 'But the quest for injecting personal and human dimensions into the learning experiences are not abandoned on that account' (Barnett & Coate, 2005, p. 144).

I have summarised some key components of engaged curricula as proposed but it is pedagogy that is of ultimate interest here. Barnett and Coate touch on this.

A curriculum for engagement, therefore, calls for a teaching that is likely to engage, to connect, to lift, to enthuse and even to inspire. A curriculum for engagement, in other words, calls for a pedagogy of engagement. It is a pedagogy of deep and abiding respect for each student, of generosity and of space and time. It is a pedagogy in which the students are enabled to develop a strong voice, but a voice that is responsive to others and the challenges and standards inherent in the experiences opened up. It is a pedagogy that understands that ontological engagement precedes intellectual and even practical engagement. The self has to be granted the central place and to be given space in which it can flourish (p. 148).

Barnett (2004a) develops this notion of a required pedagogy for uncertainty proposing a schema that maps pedagogical options. One axis maps educational development and educational transformation as opposing poles. The other axis maps risk, with ‘no risk’ at one pole and ‘high risk’ at the other. This then creates four quadrants named as (1) ‘disciplinary initiation’, (2) ‘disciplinary wonder’, (3) ‘generic skills’ and (4) ‘human being as such’ (p. 255). Barnett discusses the learning opportunities offered by each of these.

Not surprisingly, it is the fourth quadrant that offers high risk educational transformation that Barnett proposes as the necessary pedagogy for uncertainty. *‘This pedagogy allows for human flourishing as such. A human flourishing here is precisely that of living effectively amid uncertainty’* (p. 257). Barnett suggests that this kind of pedagogy engages students as persons and offers disturbance to the human being. *‘A pedagogy for uncertainty gains its ultimate achievement when the self is engaged’* (p. 257).

While I believe Barnett offers much of value to teachers seeking to engage students more fully and enhance their becoming, it is wise not to lose sight of other issues identified in this thesis, particularly those related to pedagogical power, student readiness, and content-filled curricula. Selves, too, are not always engaged in developing desirable identities so teachers may need to approach such pedagogies with caution. Even if students are working towards the development of desirable dispositions and becoming ‘more fully themselves’, other pressures and competing demands are ever-present. There will always be demands of disciplinary knowledge, as several of the participants have suggested, so a balance between content and process will be required. There will usually be institutional, societal or student demands on the nature of learning, the required ‘outcomes’ and assessment expectations. And there will undoubtedly be student resistance to such pedagogies. So, despite the potential value, teacher reflection on the circumstances of their own contexts is critical and localised solutions, open communication, support for students, time for engagement, flexible demands and evolving practice will be necessary.

Other Voices on Engagement

Notwithstanding this cautionary note, very little included here is new or unexpected in terms of the terrain covered in this thesis. Embedded in this description are many of the tenets of ‘good’ teaching and the principles of education for social justice summarised in Act 4. Engaging, connecting, lifting, enthusing, inspiring, respectful, generous – these are all recognisable ideas. Mann (2001) writes about what she proposes is a necessary shift from a focus on surface and deep learning to one on alienated or engaged experiences of learning and refers to some of the writers quoted in Act 4 and below. While I don’t disagree with the necessity for such a shift, I believe that ‘good’ teaching as discussed in this thesis expects similar approaches to engagement as evidenced in: Ramsden’s (2003) exhortation for teachers to be benevolent, generous, humble and respectful and to take delight in their teaching; Biggs’s (1999) attention to the relationships of the classroom and engagement of the senses; Knight’s (2002) reminder about embodiment of the whole person; Brookfield’s (1990, p. 1) acknowledgement of the roles of ‘Passion, hope, doubt, fear, exhilaration, weariness, colleagueship, loneliness, glorious defeats, hollow victories and, above all, the certainties of surprise and ambiguity’; and Boler’s (1999) encouragement of the inclusion of the risky business of emotions in the classroom. And regarding principles of social justice teaching, there is Shor’s (1992, p. 17) proposal for ‘participatory, affective, problem-posing, situated, multicultural, dialogic, desocializing, democratic, researching, interdisciplinary, activist’ pedagogies. None of these could be possible without student engagement in the manner Barnett is proposing.

Indeed, even the term ‘engaged pedagogy’ is familiar. hooks (1994, p. 13) writes about this and discusses the process and outcomes for both teachers and students. She maintains that inspiring teachers ‘approach students with the will and desire to respond to our unique beings, even if the situation does not allow the full emergence of a relationship based on mutual recognition’. She affirms the relationship between classroom practice and experiences of the world and the desires many students have for their teachers to ‘see them as whole human beings with complex lives and experiences rather than simply as seekers after compartmentalized bits of knowledge’ (p. 15). This would certainly be the

ideal, though as hooks acknowledges, it is a more demanding pedagogy and one that requires the engagement of the teacher as much as the student. The participants share some of these perspectives.

Stories from the Everyday World

In the process of initial analysis of the participant narratives, the importance of engagement became clear as it was a theme that was repeated in nearly every discussion. In Act 2, I discussed some hermeneutic moments and encountering the centrality of engagement was one of these. It led me to alter my original plan and focus purposefully in the phase two on-line discussion on the ways in which the teachers set out to enhance student engagement. So although many participants made reference to this in the initial interviews, it is those who participated in the on-line discussion – Carl, Rose, Betty and Jane – who offered the particular narratives I include here. These narratives occasionally differ a little in tone from the others recounted to this point because they were written rather than verbal and the audience was the other participants rather than the more informal conversations they had with me. I have left them unedited as posted on the discussion board.

I begin with Carl who initiated the discussion. He posted a brief response and included some examples both from his students' learning experiences and assessment requirements for his course and from the final exam. He indicates that, although he teaches accounting, he believes he should teach his students about their role as citizens and challenges some mores about accounting and management. He posts the following about small group projects.

Students are asked to split into groups of 3-5 and select a controversial topic to conduct a dialectical enquiry on. [...] The group members must start with a thesis and an antithesis and work towards a synthesis over the semester. They are given time to work on this in tutorials after the weekly presentations have been completed. Each group produces a report on its dialectical enquiry, which I grade at the end of the semester.

(Carl)

He also includes this as an example of a final exam question (his formatting).

The following quotation is taken from the film, 'The Corporation':

The operational principles of the corporation give it a highly anti-social "personality": it is self-interested, inherently amoral, callous and deceitful; it breaches social and legal standards to get its way; it does not suffer from guilt, yet it can mimic the human qualities of empathy, caring and altruism.

Explain why there is no 'real' problem, or how a problem might best be addressed.

(Carl)

While using a relatively teacher-centred approach, Carl is attempting to use a number of engagement strategies – group work, student choice, real world examples, reflection, and argument. Betty responds.

I really liked reading your exam paper Carl – the questions were pretty amazing for a course in accounting! (Apologies if my stereotypes are showing!! ☺) Your comments about getting students to think about themselves as citizens connect with a course we teach [...]

(Betty)

It is pleasing to see the participants engaging with each other for the first time. However, returning to Barnett's schema for pedagogical options, Carl could be said to be working with disciplinary wonder. The focus in this quadrant, although high risk, is on educational development because, although the bounds of the discipline are being pushed, the students' own being is not necessarily deeply implicated or disturbed. This is legitimate pedagogy but not necessarily pedagogical disturbance or an expectation of the utilisation of Mode 3 knowledge.

Jane is an early contributor to the on-line discussion and offers the following narrative. She is talking about the importance of reflection and the ways in which she promotes it with student teachers.

One of the ways that I have found helpful in introducing reflection is to read or tell a story. Sometimes I read a story about a child, for example a short story by Patricia Grace¹⁶, or a picture book. Sometimes I tell a story of my own, often one that shows my most fallible or human side. Recently I told a story about how I had spoken abruptly to a group of student teachers and shared that I still felt bad about it. This story was still a bit too raw and my voice faulted [sic]. I felt quite vulnerable. But although it was a large group you could have heard a pin drop. By telling stories I believe we can make connections with people who may be very different from ourselves. [...] We have a very diverse student population and their life experiences, cultural values and understandings will be very often different from mine. Emotions make connections between people and I find if people are touched by my story they will tell their own, which shows safety and trust in the class and builds relationships and understandings. Obviously I have to manage this as we do not have time to dwell for long periods on people's stories even if I wished to.

(Jane)

There is much in this narrative that indicates synergies with the themes discussed to date – emotions, vulnerability, connections, relationships and identity. In Act 4, Jane described a situation where she was challenged in class and cried and her resulting feelings of vulnerability. Here, she is visibly moved in front of her students and is willing to do that so that she is seen as ‘real’ and, as she states, this can influence the ways in which her students react. She is very aware of what it takes for people to ‘feel’ and therefore engage deeply. She is, consistent with hooks’ (1994) ideals, exposing her own vulnerability and indicating to the students that this is all right. In Barnett’s (2004a) terms she is creating pedagogical disturbance, using a high-risk pedagogy and making educational transformation a possibility.

Rose responds and tells Jane that ‘your statement resonated with me’. She relates a recent real world story from one of her classes. Earlier I indicated her

¹⁶ Patricia Grace is a Maori author.

capacity and desire to pick up on issues of social justice wherever they occur. In this narrative, she does just that.

Last week, the topic in communicating with children was on listening. The importance of listening to children for bias and prejudice was part of the discussion which lead onto discussions about Dancing with the Stars and the interview on TV with the young boy who 'suffers the taunts' of children and adults because he has chosen ballroom dancing – similarities to Billy Elliot – the movie, the students made that link. I wrote hegemonic on the whiteboard and a discussion centred around the hegemonic view of masculinity in NZ, which threw up many examples from the students own experience when they are confronted, mainly by males, who don't want their son coming home with nail polish on or dressing up in anything perceived as feminine. This even came down to one person stating 'boys don't have pink milkshakes, we will have chocolate!' What's in a shake you may very well ask. So the stereotype is alive and roaring, the homophobia is still prevalent! Those are sites of tension that the students need to recognise, understand and confront in ways that do not undermine the relationship of children with their caregivers, children and the centre but that transform. Not an easy road.

(Rose)

Rose understands the importance of engaging the students in issues that are topical and real and that they have to confront on a daily basis (Power, 1998; Ayers, 1998). This is another example of where we see her capitalising on what comes up with the students and being prepared to use their experiences as text. She offers another example a few days later.

I just had to tell you all, I got 'engaged' again on Wednesday, the topic was descriptive language as a teaching technique and moved onto inclusive language and the idea that its all just political correctness gone mad was suggested. This lead to a discussion on feminism and the fight for women's rights. There are 18 and 19 year olds in the class who can hardly conceive of a

time when sexual harassment was unrecognised. They asked what women did when it happened. Those from a different generation discussed how invisible women were when they married. Mail was addressed to Mr & Mrs X (husbands initial) and name, not being able to get a bank loan or hire purchase, someone even had to have her husband sign permission for her to go on the pill (1974). Someone else discussed their grandmother not being allowed to learn to drive. Power and control!

Oh how easily history becomes forgotten and how quickly some human rights hard won can be taken for granted. I despair sometimes about how poorly our history seems to be taught, lest we forget. So, yes, language matters. Our values and beliefs are constructed in the language we speak.

(Rose)

Rose's delight in sharing this vignette, along with her cautionary warning about the loss of history, are evident in this narrative. I have a vivid picture of this discussion playing itself out in the classroom and the perspectives and beliefs of a wide range of students being the 'text' for engagement (Okazawa-Rey, 1998). In this example, the ontological engagement that Barnett and Coate (2005) describe is occurring in practice. It would be difficult for any student to stand detached from such a discussion when their own views and experiences are so central, and histories from their families are implicated. Implicit in the telling of this story are possibilities for transformation. Disciplinary knowledge is implicit in such a narrative.

Betty takes quite a different approach and expresses some caution. She wonders why it is even up for discussion because, she suggests, 'engagement is the sine qua non of teaching for me, the thing I work so hard to get, the thing that has to happen to make me feel successful as a teacher' but she warns that it is not always a surety that students will be actively interested or engaged in social justice agendas. Nonetheless, she offers this:

I guess two ways the idea of engagement is important to me are (1) that I think the best kinds of academic or professional development are grounded in the activities that people really have to do. And (2) I also attempt to hold out the expectation that if people are going to be academics (or students or teachers or accountants) they will take some kind of responsibility for themselves and each other to be the best they can be (given all the other things they are committed to) in that capacity.

(Betty)

Betty makes excellent assumptions about the ways people engage, or ideally should engage, with their learning. The reality for many is that this does not always happen and she hints at this when referring to the other things that call on their time. However, the ideal is worth pursuing. She describes the work she does in writing retreats with women academics.

For me it has to do with reframing academic life as one of active commitment to do the best work we can and to support and challenge each other and ourselves in that ambition. In a way I am trying, with others, to set up a way of being together as academics that models what the just society might look like. Like you, Rose, I think that the weaving-through model of teaching important values/curricula is the best – but not always easy in the modularised world of tertiary education eh.

(Betty)

Betty addresses issues of working for social justice in contemporary institutions, particularly in the context of managerialism and performativity demands. She is also naming aspects of academic identity and, implicit in her description, is the need for engagement with each other, with the curriculum, with pedagogies and she, too, expects this engagement to enthuse and, potentially, disturb.

So, notwithstanding Betty referring to the inescapable centrality of student engagement, it cannot be assumed that all teachers in tertiary education share

her aspirations or capabilities. However, she and other participants understand its importance and each work in a myriad of ways to create opportunities for engagement with the whole spectrum of pedagogy, whether the focus is discipline content, development of dispositions, construction of identity or social justice principles. They are, nonetheless, confronted with barriers to that engagement through the very pressures and tensions Betty alludes to and it takes talented, dedicated teachers to find ways around these obstacles to truly engage students in their own learning and development and in the issues confronting them in society. There are many hints in the literature and narratives of this thesis as to how to go about doing that. But, it is the *nature* of the engagement that is central and, ideally, it is engagement that creates pedagogical disturbance and engages the self, rather than just the intellect, that is the goal. This allows maximum potential for the production of graduate identities that represent resilience, courage and justice. This type of engagement is not necessarily the ‘*sine qua non*’ of teaching.

It is not all straight forward and unproblematic, though. In her earlier interview, Jane describes just how complex this can be and there are cautions here about how much we can expect of students in terms of engagement.

... the question that comes up for me ... I mean being respectful of culture and family when in one hand yet promoting equal opportunities for girls and boys on the other that might be totally contradictory in terms of what a family wants and I think, um, believe that educating for being could have the same sort of contradictions that student teachers might grow up in a family and ... you know and taking culture and beliefs and values into account is one thing, expecting people to leave them at the door is another . Also expecting them to be whole people within that is, yet another.

(Jane)

So for teachers committed to social justice orientations in their teaching, there seems no doubt that engagement of students in complex and ‘disturbing’ ways is central, but not necessarily easy. McLean (2006, p. 103) notes the

importance of both content and process in engaged pedagogy. ‘Universities’ pedagogic role in achieving the critical objectives of social justice and the capacity to address the problems of a globalized society is to develop minds capable of communicative reason’ and this requires certain dispositions (analysis, criticality, imagination) as well as knowledge.

McLean’s contention brings me to the one unexamined link from the earlier discussions. Some literatures of social justice were introduced in Act 1 and not developed alongside social justice pedagogies in Act 4. How might these literatures of social justice contribute to the debate? What do the theories of social justice offer in terms of pedagogy? How might they assist with promoting student engagement and education for *being*? How can they contribute to the development of desirable dispositions and resilient students? What can they offer in terms of the production of graduate identities for thriving in the uncertain and complex world? Looking to these literatures might offer possibilities for the integration of the themes of this study.

5.3 Connections with Theories of Social Justice

In Act 1, I outlined three key contemporary approaches to social justice – those proposed by Fraser, Young and Sen/Nussbaum. In Act 4, I discussed principles of social justice pedagogy. In this section, I consider how the pedagogies for social justice, described by the participants in relation to their own teaching, articulate (or not) with these theories. I do not attempt to do so comprehensively but rather look for indicators in the participants' teaching practices that suggest they are attending to the principles of social justice elucidated by the writers. This thesis is interested in all students so those who are impacted are not merely those who have been traditionally marginalised or oppressed. As indicated earlier, neither do I deal with issues of distributive justice such as access and participation for disadvantaged groups of students, notwithstanding the importance of such attention. Ultimately, I identify which approaches to social justice education offer the most pedagogical potential for other tertiary teachers in similar contexts. Which approaches offer opportunities to fully engage students in their own development so they are better poised to attend to the development of others?

The localised stories presented by the participants in their disciplines may offer some guidance for others, though attention to the differences in individual and specialised contexts is paramount. There is no intended generalisability, but there may be some moments of wisdom or assistance in these stories for those interested in pursuing similar goals.

I now provide a very brief reminder of the key ideas expressed by Young and Fraser and then attend to the ways in which their theories are evident in the pedagogy and practice of the participants. It is wise to note that our conversations on social justice theory and pedagogy were only one part of the discussions and I did not probe deeply into their pedagogies. It was the broader arena of the relationship between social justice teaching and education for *being* that was ultimately of interest – particularly because these are teachers whose primary work does not relate to social justice.

Justice and the Politics of Difference – Young Revisited

Act 1 contained a summary of Young's thesis on social justice. Briefly, her theory considers the shortfalls of viewing the distributive paradigm as co-extensive with social justice and she proposes moving beyond this paradigm to consider other relational aspects of justice. She offers a valuable definition of oppression as encompassing the disadvantage and injustice some people suffer 'not because a tyrannical power coerces them, but because of the everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society' (Young, 1990, p. 41). She identifies five faces of oppression that occur in society and, by extension, in education. These are exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. Oppression is not, she contends, a unified phenomenon. It is these particular aspects of oppression that she urges should be attended to in specific contexts. In the everyday practices of well-intentioned tertiary teaching, there may well be ongoing oppressive practices.

Stories from the Everyday World

It is Rose who seems most attuned to the faces of oppression and refers to some of them on occasions. In Act 4, I introduced her narrative where she reflected on the impact of ongoing domination in small group work and her methods of attending to that. In this story she considers some of the insidious aspects of cultural imperialism that continue to exist but she is hopeful about practices that attend to this and make a difference.

The lack of clarity when you're in a dominant culture, the lack of clarity about what that means and that whole thing about difficulties around the word pakeha, difficulties of around 'oh well, we're all kiwis, aren't we?' so that wanting to be the same and unified and so therefore not acknowledging differences is still very strong. Having said that, 'cause I've been teaching now, sort of like working, one of my identities is a Treaty educator, um, there's not such **hostility** any more to discussing that so I think there's a significant shift in people's thinking, in terms of accepting actually, there is a dominant culture and this is what it looks like. I mean, we can name some of those things. And, it's

really good when you've got people who've come in, immigrated in, who can quite clearly identify some of those things that are quite clearly taken for granted and not thought about in any significant way.

(Rose)

Rose actually names the key identity that drives her work with student teachers and, from the perspective of that identity she is happy to note where change has occurred, but she recognises the work still left to do. Her point about immigrant perspectives is helpful and it is clear that Rose will use these perspectives as part of the discussions in her classes.

Evangeline makes reference to marginalising practices in her teaching and names her efforts to notice and reduce these. In doing so, she is cognisant of the issue of 'texts' and the importance of these arising from the students' own experiences (Okazawa-Rey, 1998). Therefore, she is attending to central issues of engagement, noting that students will be likely to connect with text or material that articulates with their own lives or work.

It's a balancing act. I mean I think it's always carrying an awareness of that in the back of your head. You're never going to get it right. It's always, my current work is critical literacy and so I very much take a critical literacy lens to a lot of different things. You can call anything a text, not just stuff that is written down and so I do try to reflect critically on my teaching and what I mean by that is to consider who I might be including and excluding, you know, am I being fair, am I being equitable, not in the sense of giving everybody the same but giving everybody what they **need**. So some students I will bend over backwards to support them to do what they need to do if that's what they need. I try to accommodate them.

(Evangeline)

This is perhaps one of the most eloquent examples of a participant naming her own shifting position and evolving her thinking. Evangeline identifies her current

research interest and the ways in which it influences her teaching, in fact her current teacher identity. But she is also clear about the continual ‘balancing act’ that we have seen referred to several times. Her teaching is never sorted once and for all and the process of the classroom is dynamic and responsive in ways that are constantly changing and which require her ongoing reflection if she is to do justice to the students and the topic under consideration.

Phillip, in his own way, also attempts to notice and address issues of difference, marginalisation and cultural imperialism. He locates this example in the context of his marketing teaching and, although this could be critiqued as underpinned by economic imperatives, I don’t believe this is Phillip’s intent. In his discussions with me he is aware of the importance of engaging and honouring a diverse student group and his earlier narrative about offending one Tongan student and his attempts to redress that evidence this.

Well the concepts of marketing, again in drawing out real world examples, taking into account, ah, some very, often some very, very sensitive cultural issues. So it’s demonstrating that while something might work well in a domestic context, these are some examples of product failures in an Asian context or this would not work in Maori context because of the, because it’s not politically correct and the various protocols that haven’t been followed. So, recognising that there are different contexts is very, very important.

(Phillip)

It is interesting to note, however, that Phillip refers to the Maori context as ‘politically correct’ – not something one would normally expect in relation to social justice.

Harry muses over cultural capital in relation to architecture. In this edited narrative he acknowledges the challenges for some students of a kind of cultural imperialism resulting in marginalisation or alienation. He refers to the ‘hidden curriculum’ and considers that ‘taste’ could well be implicated.

I guess one of the particular cases in architecture is that really the whole discipline is kind of predicated on a series of kind of **taste**-based judgements, you know, we know for example there are certain students who always do well in architecture school because their tastes are kind of informed by the right attitudes [...] Yea and there are those who don't have that social capital and don't really ever learn how to acquire it. They don't really get it, they don't get, and they go through thinking that architecture is about kind of producing buildings or houses, you know, so that idea of kind of social and cultural capitals is kind of critical [...]

(Harry)

This presents difficulties for Harry who uses a range of strategies to try and mitigate the effects of such disadvantage. He brings in guest speakers from a range of cultural perspectives and discusses with his students a democratic ethos in relation to architecture and design.

... another thing I try to do is to have also different role models for the students, coming in as guest critics, you know, Chinese women for example coming in as architects, or Chinese men for that matter. Or you know, Eastern European or, so it's not just the kind of white middle class male architect kind of thing.

(Harry)

He is trying to ensure he can engage all students, not merely those who have come in with the requisite 'cultural capital' but also those who bring diverse perspectives. He is also widening the perspectives of those who think of architecture from one dominant viewpoint.

Betty urges teachers to face issues of oppression and marginalisation.

I want teachers in university classrooms to consider the ways in which higher education is implicated in unequal distribution of privilege ... because I really think they can make a difference.

(Betty)

She does, however, express some misgivings about the ability to do this within the ‘entangled agendas’ she named earlier, including the challenges of performativity. She warns that ‘we haven’t resolved the dark abyss of contradiction between the equity agenda and the academic standards agenda’.

Further examples are evident in the earlier narratives, with several participants using strategies to address some of Young’s faces of oppression, and, while doing so, ensuring that students are engaged in their own development and alerted to the development of others. Most narratives also indicate that the teachers are grappling with several demands simultaneously so they are trying to address content requirements while also seeking to attend to issues of social justice and encourage students to engage with demanding ideas. This is no easy task. However, it is also clear that for some of these participants, notions of oppression, marginalisation and imperialism are not uppermost in their thoughts or integral components of their pedagogy. Carl’s ‘no privileges for Maori’ statement is a case in point.

Justice Interruptus – Fraser Revisited

Fraser’s theory shares some synergies with Young’s but is also starkly different in some respects. She favours an approach built on both the distributive and recognition, the former relating to the socio-economic environment and the latter relating to cultural or symbolic factors and linked to social patterns of representation and interpretation. Fraser analyses these components of social justice and differentiates them with examples of why and how they should be handled differently. She discusses the ways in which the diverse and often competing demands of two ways of attending to injustice can create tensions such as when gender and race issues are to be considered simultaneously. Young offers both affirmative and transformative strategies as possible ways of addressing injustice, favouring the latter as more potent.

It is much more difficult to find examples of Fraser’s theories in the participant narratives. There are two reasons for this. Her theory is strongly embedded in

the social context and designed to attend to social, political and economic structures and processes of inequality. Also, Fraser bases her theory around the bipartite redistribution/recognition dilemma and acknowledges that it is predicated on a theoretical abstraction that does not always reflect the reality of sites of struggle. Nevertheless, she provides this theorising to promote both thinking and action on issues of social justice that still permeate society.

Stories from the Everyday World

Analysis of the participant narratives does, however, indicate some thinking synonymous with Fraser's theory, particularly in relation to transformative strategies to address recognition demands. Bear in mind I was not discussing distribution and recognition directly with the participants but the New Zealand context impacts here as will be discussed soon.

Betty is quizzical over nomenclature of students and this goes to the heart of issues of recognition, albeit not in expected ways in relation to culture, class or gender. Nevertheless, she knows that for students to feel included and engaged, it is important to attend to how they are 'named'.

Well I suggested that in our very first class, 'cause we had this discussion as a group about who do we call the people, do we call them students or participants and everyone wanted to call them participants and I wanted to call them students so that was one of the issues. So we put the issue out to the class – so one thing I do where possible is to put issues back to the class even though this guzzles up teaching time, which is a tension for teachers and the students, I have to say. So we put that issue out to the class and canvassed their ideas about how it is they wanted us to refer to them to see what kind of issues surfaced. So that was one kind of strategy.

(Betty)

Betty articulates again her strategy of 'putting it back' to the class, as discussed earlier. In doing so, she indicates her understanding of power and emotion in

relation to teaching and the related importance of breaking down barriers to inclusion and engagement and attending to issues of recognition. However, her narrative also reveals that even those teaching with social justice intent do not necessarily agree on ways to proceed. Intent is shared, but practice is variable. In this narrative Betty uses the ‘we’ because of her shared teaching role but also to indicate the differences between her preferences and those of others.

I had an interesting discussion with Turtle, talking with him about how social justice plays out in his teaching. He tells a story of how his thinking has changed over time. Implicit in the following narrative are issues of how Maori position themselves in terms of recognition. They claim entitlement of recognition and this is mandated in legislation in New Zealand, more so than in other countries, and therefore does not rely on individual willingness. So recognition is a given but embedded within this narrative is reference to both the affirmative and transformative dimensions of Fraser’s theory. If I interpret correctly what Turtle is saying, he is listening to the voices of Maori elders and using strategies in the context of his broader class and not specifically just in relation to Maori. The elders are telling him they will deal with the transformative issues of being Maori (recognition demands) and it is his job to provide the Maori students with the wherewithal to operate effectively as lawyers *for* Maori.

Making the best students that you can. You know, so that, to me, you get a [...] say a Maori student coming through and, we have big debates here, big debates elsewhere, about whether we should have Maori-only streams and things like that. I used to fully subscribe to that. But like I work with a lot of people in Wellington¹⁷ who are very high up in Maoridom and they’re all telling me the same thing now. And that is, you know, that they will be Maori, it’s in them, they are Maori, but what we need are brilliant lawyers. We don’t need brilliant Maori lawyers, we need brilliant lawyers, you know. And we don’t want them to sort of like become soft by being surrounded by these people. We want them to go out there and learn. Because they’ve got to defend

our interests. And so, in the past, I used to think well maybe we should have completely Maori streams and things like that, and, um, that's not what these people are wanting, that I work with. I work with some very high profile people. Yea, that's not what they want at all.

(Turtle)

Notwithstanding Turtle's assertions, this is an interesting position for him to take. Is it reasonable for a teacher to leave the transformation to others who claim it for themselves? Most of the social justice literature would suggest not and, conversely, provoke teachers to include it in their pedagogies. However, Ellsworth (1992) warns against teachers taking on the empowerment mission and contends we can engage with people on their own terms and in terms of our own capital but we cannot empower them per se. There are no guarantees it happens elsewhere, though, and it is debatable as to whether the inclusion of transformative pedagogies or attention to cultural considerations result in people becoming 'soft', as Turtle suggests. Nevertheless, he is articulating his evolving philosophies and there is more tentativeness here than in most of the rest of his narrative suggesting this is still thinking under development.

Rose understands the importance of transformation – for all students, not simply those from marginalised groups. Here she talks about the difference between information and transformation and describes the centrality of process in aiding movement from positions of comfort to discomfort.

You know we're just bombarded, in some ways, with knowledge, and bombarded with information and so it's more important that, in some ways, I know how to sift and sort that and what bits I pay attention to and so to bring a critical eye to that is part of the process as a learner, otherwise it can just feel too hard in some ways. So if I've got people coming on to campus, in some ways I've got to value-add 'cause otherwise why don't they just log on and learn all this stuff? 'Cause if education is information well we could all just stay at home actually. We could shut down the

¹⁷ Wellington is the capital of New Zealand and location of government.

institutes and everyone could just get it delivered. Someone could select what needs to happen but I don't see it like that because it's social and if we're going to get transformation, then I think that's where the process comes in. Because it's, and how do we get that challenge to thinking and ideas and trying to think critically about what's going on [...]

(Rose)

Rose is supremely aware of the power of process and also of the importance of multiple perspectives in helping to shape thinking and, therefore, identity. She sees herself as a learner alongside her students – another of the multiple identities she experiences.

What is particularly important about this narrative is that Rose gently introduces the notion of transformation in the midst of a general discussion about the nature of education. She notes the importance of transformative educational practices in a more broad discussion about her teaching practices. This is the kind of embeddedness that is critical to achieving social justice outcomes.

Jane does similar work in her pedagogy. As discussed, she finds small ways to make a difference with her students in the everyday work of her classes. Here she introduces the notion of recognition.

I just gave them all a nice little piece of paper and asked them to draw a symbol that in some way represented something of their identity and then asked them, in small groups, to talk about it. And that was just a little exercise in order to help the group to get to know each other better, to bring out aspects of culture perhaps. And some of them, I mean, for some of them it was **so** meaningful to be able to share just this **little symbol**.

(Jane)

Again, there is nothing spectacular about what is happening here, but it does provide evidence that some teachers are doing the work of social justice

whenever they can, in small, meaningful, continuous ways. Perhaps Jane could then ask her students what this symbol may mean for them as critical professionals in terms of the children and families they work with – families who may not share their cultural capital.

Evangeline discusses Fraser directly, being fully aware of her work and seeing merit but also deficits in her theorising. She identifies the necessity of the caring dimension and is concerned that the globalising nature of Fraser's theories is insufficient for the localised realities of teaching which is about relational and emotional work. We are discussing approaches to teaching about social justice and Evangeline is troubled about universal application of theories.

A lot of harm has been done under the best intentions sort of model. Um, so I think you just sort of, um, I guess you sort of just bumble along as best you can in a lot of respects. But for me a model, I guess of social justice includes attention to all those things that Nancy Fraser and other folks speak of but also there has to **be** that ethic of care ...

(Evangeline)

Evangeline continues, talking about the importance of this ethic of care and attention to the embodied nature of teaching and therefore attention to localised discussions and solutions.

So there is potential, it seems, for the theories espoused by both Young and Fraser to have utility in tertiary education contexts. Teachers who are familiar with these theories can 'sift and sort', as suggested by Rose, to find material that will aid educational processes for social justice. However, both these theories remain more valuable in social contexts in terms of addressing issues directly for those who are marginalised, disadvantaged or oppressed, rather than provide direct pedagogical guidance for teachers who are wishing to promote social justice orientations and actions in all their students. They are

not intended primarily for use in inclusive classrooms and they potentially offer greater value as content rather than process.

This brings me to the issue of capabilities theory that provides strong explanatory power around the themes of this thesis.

5.4 Capabilities Revisited and Revisioned

In Act 1, I introduced the capabilities approach to social justice, outlining the writing of Sen and Nussbaum. Capabilities are a way of assessing the freedoms that an individual has in order to act in the world. Sen (1992, p. 81) says ‘individual claims are not to be assessed in terms of the resources or primary goods the persons respectively hold, but by the freedoms they actually enjoy to choose the lives that they have reason to value’. Capabilities, then, are those things that create the opportunity for people to be able to *be* and *do* and are not a measure of what they have. A distinction is made between functionings (choices and outcomes) and capabilities (the actual potential to achieve those functionings). This notion of being and doing articulates with the key themes of this thesis and therefore there is a strong correlation between the capabilities approach to social justice and the concept of education for *being*.

There are persuasive reasons to look to the capabilities approach when it comes to tertiary education pedagogies. Walker (2006a) argues that pedagogy in higher education should be claimed for ethical purposes, is influenced by contextual conditions and is imbued with issues of power. ‘Teaching approaches or methods and student learning are therefore socially inflected by the identities of teacher and students, institutionally situated, and influenced by curricular aims and design’ (Walker, 2006a, p. 12). Within this context she argues for a focus on capabilities for social justice and higher education.

Walker makes reference to writers already acknowledged in this thesis. She notes Barnett and Hallam’s work on education for supercomplexity and the corresponding implications for pedagogy.

If we are faced with an inchoate, unpredictable and continually challenging world, then graduates will have to have powers of self-reliance in order to cope with and to act purposively in that world. Responsibility is placed on the self for surviving in an uncertain world. In turn, if this call is to be heeded, pedagogies in higher education will presumably need to be those that foster such human qualities (Barnett & Hallam, 1999, p. 138).

The relationship between uncertainty and the development of human qualities or capabilities is evident, and Walker exploits this.

She also considers Mann's (2001) work on learning and engagement which focuses on student engagement or alienation from their learning. She notes students' inclination, as a survival mechanism, to 'take surface approaches to learning rather than to risk the self through the uncertainty of active, creative and engaged participation in learning' (Walker, 2006a, p. 16). In search of a pedagogy that utilises the capabilities approach, Walker proposes that higher education should focus on the development of students' own valued achievements. Her pondering offers a constructive summary of the themes of this thesis.

The question is less how do we teach and how do our students learn, but how might higher education contribute through such practices of teaching and learning to human flourishing. The pedagogical process is taken to be an ethical project of critical discourse, creative thinking, engaged learning and commitments to a democratic ethos and a rich and vibrant public life in the twenty-first century (Walker, 1996a, p. 18).

Here are suggestions that are implicit and explicit throughout the discussions of Act 4 and therefore an invitation to utilise capabilities both for enhancing justice in tertiary education and as a pedagogical approach. Walker notes that 'Through attention to fostering capability in and through education, the capability approach indicates a practice as well as a theory along the three key elements of social justice in education: redistribution, recognition of diversity and identities, and participation' (p. 62). It is the relational aspects of recognition of diversity and identities that are particularly relevant for this thesis, especially with regard to the practice/theory issue, which I will discuss more below.

Walker addresses capability lists, introduced in Act 1, and grapples with some of the same tensions that Sen and Nussbaum have debated. She is quick to point to the importance of considering capability lists within particular contexts, as indicated by Kohl (1998) and Griffiths (1998a), and the

importance of revising within those contexts. Nevertheless, she suggests that agency, genuine reflective choice and ethical and informed citizens are important considerations in terms of the capability approach and therefore should be to the fore in terms of educative practice. This is consistent with the pedagogies promoted in this thesis and in her exhortation for higher education to provide not only engaged and approachable lecturers but also care and friendships in learning arrangements. Evangeline's reference to the importance of an 'ethic of care' in teaching articulates with such proposals.

Walker names some processes identified through discussions with students that allow for the development of high-order and critical thinking and deep understanding. 'Their voices point to conditions of support for and confidence in learning, of provocation of thinking, of independence in thinking, and of respect and recognition of differences in perspectives and identities' (p. 67). Walker, remembering her own references to Barnett and Hallam, does not shy away from acknowledging issues of complexity, contradiction and ambiguity that will surround educational attention to capability development. She notes that pedagogy will always be complex and teachers should resist the temptation to look for recipes, for this can risk the technicisation of teaching.

Walker is thus both beginning to frame some possible capabilities for tertiary education and concurrently expressing concern about a universally prescribed list. Ultimately, she offers a 'draft ideal-theoretical, multi-dimensional education list' (p. 128) that draws on a number of sources. It is not presented as authoritative but rather, subject to discussion and revision. The capabilities proposed reflect some of those referenced in Nussbaum's (2000) list and also pick up the themes introduced above. Her list proposes the following as capabilities for higher education: practical reason; educational resilience; knowledge and imagination; learning disposition; social relations and social networks; respect, dignity and recognition; emotional integrity, emotions; and bodily integrity (Walker, 2006a, pp. 128-129). The links with the thesis themes are inescapable. In her descriptions of each of these capabilities, Walker covers issues of pedagogy, engagement, uncertainty and supercomplexity, development of desirable dispositions, social justice, identity

production and emotions. Professional, pedagogical and ethical concerns, all key considerations of the thesis, are implicit.

Pedagogical and Ethical Possibilities

I will come to the professional issues soon. For now, I return to the use of capabilities as both a pedagogical and ethical approach in tertiary education and note that there are particular benefits in this way of considering justice that are not so evident in the work of the other social justice theorists discussed. What is of unique value is the potential for both *content* and *process* to become explicit through pedagogies constructed around capabilities. Walker suggests that the capability approach ‘points to a problem and suggests a practical approach. It requires not only that we talk about and theorize change but that we are able to point to and *do* change through its focus on beings and doings in and through higher education’ (Walker, 2006a, p. 144). This is clearly of enormous benefit in that one can talk about, discuss, analyse and evaluate the capabilities Walker identifies (or others that arise out of localised discussions), *while simultaneously enacting them* in higher education pedagogies – content and process. The wherewithal to do so has become evident in both the principles of ‘good’ teaching and the principles of teaching for social justice, identified here through the literatures and participant narratives. So this offers significant potential. What becomes clear is that the themes Barnett (2004a) discusses are able to be considered and realised in pedagogies that focus on such aspirations and capabilities. Ontological engagement is absolutely possible and notions of respect, generosity, arousal, voice and, indeed, human being are expected.

But there is one further possibility which has become manifest in my own reflection on the issues embedded in this study. The capabilities approach offers an extremely beneficial advantage that is not apparent in other discussions on the subject that I have encountered, and this goes directly to the purpose of capabilities as an approach to social justice. The central focus of this thesis has been the work of everyday teachers working in everyday classrooms – teachers who teach with a view to enhancing social justice while teaching in law, marketing, accounting, education and architecture. Some of

these teachers have been very clear about their desire to do as Walker suggests and teach *about* while simultaneously teaching *within*. But their focus is on *all* students. The capabilities approach provides an excellent baseline for teachers with these desires and goals. So rather than look to see who is marginalised, oppressed or privileged and act accordingly, or to address the way resources are distributed, or to implement transformative strategies for disadvantaged groups, capabilities offer the potential to construct pedagogies that consider the beings and doings of all. In so doing, by default, they would address issues such as marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and, ultimately, transformation.

This offers the promise of concrete guidance for teachers. An excellent example of just how this might work is evident in Walker's description of her capability of 'respect, dignity and recognition', described as:

Being able to have respect for oneself and for and from others, being treated with dignity, not being diminished or devalued because of one's gender, social class, religion or race, valuing other languages, other religions and spiritual practices and human diversity. Being able to show empathy, compassion, fairness and generosity, listening to and considering other person's points of view in dialogue and debate. Being able to act inclusively and being able to respond to human need. Having competence in inter-cultural communication. Having a voice to participate effectively in learning; a voice to speak out, to debate and persuade, to be able to listen (Walker, 2006a, pp. 128-129).

These capabilities relate to all students, regardless of whether they are currently marginalised or privileged. There is an expectation that students will be valued, but also that they will value. There is also explicit direction for the teacher in terms of correspondingly appropriate pedagogies. Rather than take a theory of social justice, interpret it in terms of how it attends to a range of groups and individuals and establish a pedagogy that subsequently deals with those issues, here there is guidance for inclusive pedagogies. If implemented successfully, those pedagogies potentially develop capabilities in all students and attend to the relational issues of social justice that have been so deeply embedded in the thesis discussion.

Stories from the Everyday World

Questions were asked at the beginning about the contributions of the participants – would they add value or present opposing views? Now that the final thesis is evident, there seems little doubt that their contributions have not only added to but significantly enhanced the stories.

So looking to the participant narrative for indicators of the inclusion of some of Walker's capabilities in the teachers' pedagogies provides rich rewards. The texts as presented here are alive with reference to beings and doings that both enhance individual capability and concurrently attend to the beings and doings of others. A re-reading of the narratives already included to this point will provide ample evidence of this kind of orientation to teaching but there is more. I include here a few very brief examples, each located alongside one of Walker's (pp. 128-129) capability descriptors. These examples do not, in general, cover all aspects of the relevant capability but are indicative of their intent. They are localised and partial stories provided within the specific context of each participant.

Capabilities***1. Practical Reason***

Being able to make well-reasoned, informed, critical, independent, intellectually acute, socially responsible, and reflective choices. Being able to construct a personal life project in an uncertain world. Having good judgement.

Participant Narratives

Because law is often put across as being value-free but it's not. It's laden with it. So the students have to try and work out what the, what the background considerations are, what the philosophies are, you know, what the sociology is. And to me that's what social context is. It's not about saying 'you must do this' you know, or 'you must support that'.

(Turtle)

2. Educational Resilience

Able to navigate study, work and life. Able to negotiate risk, to persevere academically, to be responsive to educational opportunities and adaptive to constraints. Self-reliant. Having aspirations and hopes for a good future.

Um, so I guess one of the ways you can prepare students to be more resilient is equipping them with the skills that can be, you know, transferred across disciplines and so forth, ways of thinking, um, you know, [...] and also just ways of **sustaining** themselves and doing the work. [...] maybe another favour you can do them is not to sugar-coat the reality of what teaching is going to be like. And so perhaps, equipping them with ways of looking after themselves, of being healthy, that sort of thing so they can do that work and stay well.

(Evangeline)

3. Knowledge and imagination

Being able to gain knowledge of a chosen subject – disciplinary and / or professional – its form of academic inquiry and standards. Being able to use critical thinking and imagination to comprehend the perspectives of multiple others and to form impartial judgements. Being able to debate complex issues. Being able to acquire knowledge for pleasure and personal development, for career and economic opportunities, for political, cultural and social action and

And then I ask them to debate it on a weekly basis and keep records of how they develop their thinking and write a report. They also share what their group's doing with the other groups in the class so they see that, for any particular problem, there are different ways of looking at it, neither of which are necessarily right or wrong, I mean we can't have these right or wrong types with so **many** decisions. But you've got to learn to **argue** around and, instead of proving whether you're right or wrong, if you can

participation in the world. Awareness of ethical debates and moral issues. Open-mindedness. Knowledge to understand science and technology in public policy.

4. Learning disposition

Being able to have curiosity and a desire for learning. Having confidence in one's ability to learn. Being an active inquirer.

manage to reach a **synthesis** [...]

(Carl)

And, it [inclusive process] creates hopefully the curiosity to find out more, to celebrate the learning that they are doing and to think 'yes I've begun on this journey but I **know** that I need to do more' because in our classes we can't do everything. You know, and so it is about making meaning, it is about meaning-making isn't it? And it's about creation of a culture of learning and a desire to learn and a curiosity and a respect for others and all those nice things.

(Jane)

5. Social Relations and Social Networks

Being able to participate in a group for learning, working with others to solve problems and tasks. Being able to work with others to form effective or good groups for collaborative and participatory learning. Being able to form networks of friendship and belonging for learning support and leisure. Mutual trust.

So, in that respect, because we're sharing those experiences and doing that, we're constructing knowledge together so [...] we're creating knowledge and building knowledge, not just reproducing knowledge and that's important to me. And then, I don't see [...] learning as an individual process. I see it as a cooperative and collaborative process and so that then determines a lot of the things that I set up to happen in the classroom.

(Rose)

6. Respect, dignity and recognition

Being able to have respect for oneself and for and from others, being treated with dignity, not being diminished or devalued because of one's gender, social class, religion or race, valuing other languages, other religions and spiritual practices and human diversity. Being able to show empathy, compassion, fairness and

Um, I'm wanting to say that this is a way for us to think about ourselves as teachers. And it's an important way because there **are** things that we can do, we **can** think about what readings we have on our reading lists and what they signal to students. We can think about the ways in which we design assessments and how we close down possibilities and narrow them to privilege or advantage certain

generosity, listening to and considering other person's points of view in dialogue and debate. Being able to act inclusively and being able to respond to human need. Having competence in inter-cultural communication. Having a voice to participate effectively in learning; a voice to speak out, to debate and persuade, to be able to listen.

groups of students. We can think about class dynamics. We can think about what we might do to kind of engage the poly[nesian] voices that sit along the back rows of the lecture theatres which is where they sit, you know.

(Betty)

7. Emotional integrity, emotions
Not being subject to anxiety or fear which diminishes learning. Being able to develop emotions for imagination, understanding, empathy, awareness and discernment.

[...] this idea of kind of flexibility is encouraged because it means people become much more manageable, they become kind of flexible and enterprising and all these things, which are kind of double edged things. They can be liberating for some people but they can also be, they can also add to conditions of uncertainty and therefore insecurity for other people. So I think as an educator you are always kind of trying to kind of encourage students to step out of their comfort zone. But on another level you have to be aware that you can't destabilise them too much. I think that's kind of an interesting balance.

(Harry)

8. Bodily integrity
Safety and freedom from all forms of physical and verbal harassment in the higher education environment.

[...] while demonstrating that this was what the organisation was trying to do, it **offended** one person in a class of 300. Now, that issue became very, very sensitive to me. Now in a class of 300 you could easily dismiss that as being irrelevant. But one particular Tongan student, the ad was offensive to, um [...] so I naturally put in various processes to mitigate that offence and it took quite a while and certainly the student was very, very satisfied at the end [...]

(Phillip)

This last narrative, previously encountered, somewhat artificially illustrates bodily integrity, because this was not an issue that arose at all in the discussions with participants. However, it does attend to issues of feeling culturally safe in terms of pedagogy.

While I have located each of the examples alongside particular capability descriptors, in many cases they could equally apply to others. This is reflective both of the inter-connectedness of the capabilities and the integrated and respectful pedagogies of many participants.

What is particularly appealing about the capability approach and Walker's list is their capacity to tend to multiple issues. So there is promise for guidance on excellent and engaged pedagogies that address issues of complexity and therefore identity and being. Concurrently, there is guidance on pedagogies that promote social justice because the majority of principles that guide the practice of social justice educators are implicit in these capabilities.

Conclusion

I am not suggesting an unequivocal catch-all in terms of education for social justice. There are still many outstanding issues of access and participation (distribution) to address and there are also multiple other uses for capabilities in terms of educational policy and provision. Robeyns (2003) comments on the ongoing distribution/recognition debate and suggests that the capability approach integrates both by addressing economic and cultural injustices. Education, of course, is implicated in both. Saito (2003) discusses some ways in which education and capability interact and acknowledges the role education can play in enhancing both capability and human capital and influencing intrinsic and instrumental values. Walker (2006b) explains issues of social justice in relation to educational policy-making and discusses the shortcomings of human capital ideas. She acknowledges education's role in identity formation and proposes that specified capabilities can be utilised for equality assessment, particularly in relation to gender issues.

Walker and Unterhalter (2007) edit a book on the relationship between capabilities and social justice in education. They affirm that education itself is a basic capability that is influential on all other capabilities. They suggest that aspects of education such as curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and even the culture of the learning institution all affect educational experiences and therefore, ultimately influence life choices and thus capabilities. Accordingly, they refer to pedagogy but do not develop its role. In the same volume, Flores-Crespo (2007) makes the closest links with pedagogy, acknowledging Nussbaum's (1997) three capacities and suggesting these are a step forward in the development of pedagogies for inclusion. However, he suggests there is more work to do.

Highlighting the possibility of the capability approach in pedagogical terms requires us to look at other aspects, such as how knowledge is provided. In this sense, educational contents, written and visual materials, commonly used in the classroom, can present images or assertions that are far from Nussbaum's idea of cultivating humanity (Flores-Crespo, 2007, p. 57).

Advancing Flores-Crespo's thinking, I propose that there is much work to do if teachers are to maximise the capability approach in tertiary education to enhance pedagogical practices. The relationship between education and capabilities is clearly on the agenda, but tertiary education, and particularly pedagogy, appears under-theorised. In Act 1, I discussed the importance of there being no theorising without action, in essence an acknowledgement of the interrelationship between content and process. Therefore, the capabilities approach as a pedagogical strategy for *all* students, addressing content and process, theory and action, in relation to the promotion of social justice, is an exciting proposal. It allows for teaching *about* and teaching *for* social justice.

E P I L O G U E

A Tale of Hope***Synthesis – Professional, Pedagogical, Ethical***

I began this thesis by outlining the conditions of uncertainty that frame and define both tertiary education and postmodern times and therefore create circumstances that require consideration for tertiary teachers. Ambiguity, shiftiness, disruption, complexity and disturbance have recurred repeatedly, not only with regard to current conditions of tertiary education, but also in relation to particular pedagogies and, indeed, to the methodology of this thesis. And they are explicitly acknowledged in Walker's (2006a) first three capabilities – reason, resilience and imagination. These three similarly address the notion of 'epistemological insecurity' that arises from the uncertainty of knowledge in postmodern conditions (Scott, 1997).

The participant teachers have been eloquent on this subject of epistemological insecurity. Like a number of teachers, Jane summarises this in relation to her own thinking and teaching and thus names ongoing uncertainty for teachers when knowledge is unstable.

I mean I'm quite, I'm rethinking, I think, I'm constantly, and language, discourse, aware of how, every time I open my mouth, I am making visible to somebody who might have the ears for it, my values and beliefs and that sometimes I will say something and I will think, 'wow, I didn't, you know, that exposed something of my thinking that I didn't know [...]'

(Jane)

The identities of tertiary students, and ultimately graduates, have been a central consideration in this study and the context of uncertainty offered up two key concepts – unfixity, instability and the multiple nature of identity, and the

corresponding pedagogical concern of education for *being*. These two interconnected ideas have given rise to discussions in the thesis around the development of dispositions for both learning and living, for these two are intricately intertwined. Implicit in these is the kind of engagement that offers Barnett's (2004a) 'pedagogical disturbance' aimed at 'human flourishing'. The thesis has shown that Walker's capabilities of resilience, learning disposition, social relations and emotions are deeply connected, for if tertiary teaching attends to these and not merely to knowledge, the being of the student may be engaged. Throughout the thesis, the relationship between teacher and student, teaching and learning has been emphasised so that it has become clear that deliberate acts of teaching provide opportunities for enhanced learning.

Rose articulates how she responds to such issues, confirming that teachers must attend to the whole student if 'human flourishing' is to occur and encourage students to engage more fully with social justice concepts.

So I don't separate the head and the heart. You know people are sitting there scared of learning and some of them come in very fearful of failure, so trying to establish that self-belief, talking to them about that little voice in their head, what's that saying to them [...]

(Rose)

Critical pedagogy is a powerful influence on teaching for social justice and Unterhalter and Walker (2007) conclude their analysis of capabilities, social justice and education by paralleling and comparing critical pedagogy and the capability approach, work that is paralleled by the investigations and propositions in this thesis. They acknowledge that both are able to embrace complexity and are concerned with voices that are often not heard. They contend that critical pedagogy is better at dealing with power, oppression and, indeed, transformation in education. However, they propose that 'the concern in the capability approach with what we can actually do and be grounds critical pedagogy in processes of learning and equality of learning outcomes and the

connection between learning, education, and other processes of social change' (Unterhalter & Walker, 2007, pp. 248-249).

Through the discussions in Act 4 of principles and practices of social justice pedagogies, the importance of processes that promote engagement, including emotional engagement, and action have been emphasised. These factors now become even more important if the connection between learning and social change is to be enhanced. Betty questions:

Like what kind of curriculum are we putting in front of people and what, how does the curriculum invite them or not invite them into thinking and understanding things differently? So for me, good teaching tries to be attentive to those things and to see all of those things as kind of politically inflected ...

(Betty)

So, although the participants did not explicitly link social justice, education for being, engagement and capabilities, the analysis has indicated that there are strong correlations between and among these that might offer productive guidance for teachers concerned with social justice.

Therefore, this approach to capabilities provides a potential framework for teachers who wish to work concretely with critical pedagogies. Although there are references throughout Walker's list, her capabilities of reason, social relations, and respect, dignity and recognition are particularly valuable. Even if other approaches to promoting social justice (such as Phillip's postmodern lenses and Carl's citizens) are utilised, the same capabilities are valid.

Not only Pedagogical but also Professional

While Walker's capability list is drafted with the student in mind, I argue that it is no less applicable for teachers whose own being and identity are produced in tertiary classrooms. Their beings and doings are equally valid for consideration. To my knowledge, a similar process has not been carried out in

relation to teachers and this may well be a focus for future attention because, as has become evident, it is not only ethical and pedagogical concerns that require consideration but also professional matters that continue to vex teachers. The voices of Betty, Harry, Phillip and Jane as they name the professional challenges that confront them every day in conditions of performativity still resound. Phillip says: I'm not quite sure how you would do it (educate for being) in a large undergraduate class of 300 students. I'm not saying it couldn't be done, but [...]

So, the capability approach may well provide some guidance for the development of these tertiary teachers and others as an antidote to the 'terrors of performativity' (Ball, 2003) and in conditions of uncertainty. It could, therefore, provide a framework for consideration of the professional lives of teachers.

Walker refers to teachers but only broadly in terms of educational development with particular reference to teaching and learning.

In my view, the capability approach offers a vision of what ought to be in teaching and learning in higher education, providing a normative framework to orient educational development in universities. When combined with a discourse of (pedagogic) rights, it further foregrounds both power and the obligations of those involved in educational development (Eyben, 2003). [...] The capability approach is a critical analysis *for* higher education, not only *of* higher education (Walker, 2006a, p. 142).

There is potentially much scope to go beyond this to theorise and provide guidance to address the pressures currently encouraging teachers to act as 'promiscuous beings' (Ball, 2000). So a set of capabilities designed to guide the professional identity and practice of tertiary teachers might provide a framework to address some of the issues for teachers identified in this thesis. The beings and doings of teachers would benefit from such scrutiny and support if the issues of the unstable teacher identity discussed in Act 3 are to be addressed.

The final words of this thesis focus on hope but before introducing these, a few summary statements bring closure and synthesis to the key thesis themes.

Pedagogy is situated, complex and challenging and no pedagogical approach will be valid or appropriate in all contexts. Teachers grappling with the demands of uncertainty and performativity while working to promote social justice will benefit from opportunities to take ownership of their classroom practices, localise their pedagogy and respond to their particular students. Evangeline noted that we must constantly shake things up and never be complacent in teaching.

Teaching and learning are demanding emotional processes for students and teachers whose identities are at stake in tertiary contexts, as evidenced by Jane's narrative about being vulnerable in front of her students and Harry's acknowledgement of the complexity of personal issues students deal with. Participation in the emotional dimension, particularly with respect to issues of social justice, will create opportunities for student learning and promote their engagement with troubling concepts. In doing so, these pedagogies may enhance their being and assist their becoming.

Rose was clear that there are no universals when it comes to naming social justice principles and practices in tertiary education and everything is in context. There is, nonetheless, guidance available to help teachers identify appropriate pedagogical practices and the use of capabilities may provide assistance in determining ways to promote and practice social justice.

Opportunities for teacher development and support to promote democratic professionalism, such as that practiced by Betty and proposed by Evangeline, must be provided so that teachers can hone their craft, seek assistance, engage in collaboration and challenge their own thinking and practice. The development of a framework for teacher capabilities may aid this process.

Tertiary education institutions might do well to consider these issues in making judgments about the support and development available for their teachers and the degree of autonomy they allow them in making curricular and pedagogical decisions appropriate to their discipline, context and students.

No Panacea but Hope

The capability approach to teaching and learning in tertiary education, therefore, offers much promise for pedagogical and ethical issues, but also for professional concerns. However, it is not and cannot be a panacea for these three. The very notion of supercomplexity would prohibit such a simplistic or definitive conclusion. The ideas presented here are fledgling, partial, tentative and under development, but do offer hope, especially for those who teach with a social justice orientation such as Jane, Rose, Betty, Harry and Evangeline. Barnett (2004a) does not present his proposal about pedagogy for supercomplexity with the explicit intention of attending to social justice. But the juxtaposition of the two has shown that the goals of the one are achievable through the practices of the other. A pedagogy for *being* can attend to issues of both the self and the other. The introduction of the capabilities approach thoroughly integrates the two and reinforces the importance of ‘engaged pedagogies’.

Early in the thesis I introduced Ayers (2001, p. 286) premise that, in terms of social justice, these are potentially times of ‘endemic hopelessness and deepening despair’. They do not have to be as the participant stories suggest with their tales of pedagogy and possibility. Richardson (1996, p. 4) says ‘To hope is to tell stories and to absorb stories. The opposite is true also: narrative not only embodies hope but also inspires it and nurtures it’.

Notwithstanding all the identified difficulties of uncertainty and performativity, I ask the participants if they remain hopeful about influencing their students with regard to social justice. They do not speak with one voice, they acknowledge the difficulties, express some hesitation, but remain hopeful. They reflect what Terkel (2003, p. xv) says about hope in difficult times in proposing that ‘Hope has never trickled down. It has always sprung up’. One has to be purposefully hopeful.

It's not **hopeless**, but it's **such** a difficult agenda [...]

(Betty)

And, they've [students] got to give themselves **hope**. They've not got to be paralysed by fear of what is going to happen.

(Carl)

[...] if we didn't have hope, if we weren't hopeful we wouldn't be in this business.

(Evangeline)

Then you realise that you're not going to change the world but you can do a little bit, you know. You can do a little bit.

(Harry)

Hope is what keeps me here. I have a lot of optimism in the potential of graduates to make a difference.

(Jane)

[...] if we were all moving in the same direction, I think that would have **profound** effect

(Phillip)

Hopeful pedagogy is about possibilities. You have got to believe you can make a difference

(Rose)

Oh, it's the only thing you've got. I'm an optimist. I educate for optimism.

(Turtle)

Their hope, even equivocally expressed, is absolutely justified, not least of all because 'it is a uniquely human emotion that energizes us to engage in projects we believe will enhance our future well-being [...] Without hope to fuel our dreams and our ambitions, we become captive to whatever is happening in our immediate environment' (Reading, 2004, p. 3). In similar vein, Fraser (2002, p. xi) says that keeping hope alive is essential. 'When people lose hope, they also lose the will and the courage to act for change for a better future'. The thesis has identified many constraints in the immediate environments of tertiary teaching but has also offered opportunities to act for a better future. As

McLean (2006, p. 72) suggests, ‘Hope lies in the development of minds that are in tune with cognitive shifts in society and capable of tackling contemporary urgencies’.

Education for social justice in times of uncertainty, regardless of the pedagogy, indeed seems hopeful, though not necessarily safe. ‘To hope is to gamble. It’s to bet on the future, on your desires, on the possibility that an open heart and uncertainty is better than gloom and safety [...] To hope is to give yourself to the future, [which] makes the present inhabitable’ (Solnit, 2005, p. 5). As educators for social justice in tertiary education, there are undoubtedly challenges and obstacles. But, like some of those in Bathmaker and Avis’s (2005) study, these do not seem to deter my participants who are getting on with making the present inhabitable. They appear to subscribe to Renner and Brown’s (2006, p. 101) contention that hope ‘resides in a *process of becoming* and a *reality of being* that connects the future to an imagined possibility in the present’.

It appears worth the risk.

APPENDICES

Appendix One

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Research and Doctoral Studies
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT

22.11.06

Dear

My name is Linda Keesing-Styles and I am Associate Dean of Vocational Education and Training at Unitec. I am enrolled in a doctoral programme at Deakin University in Australia under the supervision of Associate Professor Catherine Beavis and Dr Andrea Allard in the Faculty of Education.

My doctoral research project will examine how educators understand and practice education for social justice in tertiary settings (polytechnics and universities).

The participants in this project will be between seven and ten New Zealand tertiary academics who identify a social justice orientation in their teaching.

I invite you to participate in this project.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time. If you withdraw, information gathered from you will not be used and will be either destroyed or returned to you within one month of notification of withdrawal.

Your participation will require one face-to-face, in-depth interview with me. This interview will take up to two hours, and will be at a time and place suitable to you. The questions will be open-ended and will cover the following areas:

- Your responses to the notion of uncertainty
- The principles underpinning your teaching philosophy
- Social justice orientation in your teaching
- The day to day practices in your classrooms
- The development of desirable dispositions in students
- The challenges you perceive in educating for social justice

I would prefer to audio-record the interviews with you and this can only be done with your consent. The recorder can be turned off at any time. After the interview, I will provide you with a written transcript for your approval.

Approximately six months following your one-on-one interview, I will set up an online discussion forum accessible by password only by me and the research participants. Over a period of two weeks, you will participate in an online discussion focused on a summary of the findings of the interviews with all participants and a review of the literature. You and the other participants will collaboratively discuss the proposals contained in that summary.

I wish to use a pseudonym supplied by you in this research, including the online discussion if you so choose. If there are particular matters you discuss with me that you wish to be kept confidential and not used by me, I will respect this. Similarly, if there are confidential matters

that I may use but not attribute to you, I will respect this too. The written transcript will clearly identify those statements that are not to be used and those that are not for attribution.

All interview data will be stored in a secure place for six years, as required by the University.

The data will be used in the writing of my thesis and may be used in writing for academic publications and conference publications. If I wish to use the data for wider publication, I will seek your approval before doing this.

If you agree to participate in this project, please fill in and return to me the attached *Consent Form* in the enclosed self-addressed reply-paid envelope.

If, before making a commitment, you have any questions about this project or your participation, please contact me by phone on 09 8154321 ext 7728 or by email – lmkees@deakin.edu.au Alternatively you may wish to contact Catherine Beavis by phone on 61 3 92446420 or by email - cathxx@deakin.edu.au, or Andrea Allard on 61 3 92446026 or by email – acallard@deakin.edu.au

Yours sincerely



Linda Keesing-Styles

Should you have any concerns about the conduct of this research project, please contact the Secretary, Ethics Committee, Research Services, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, BURWOOD VIC 3125.

Tel (03) 9251 7123 (International +61 3 9251 7123) or at research-ethics@deakin.edu.au.

Appendix Two



**FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Research and Doctoral Studies**

**DEAKIN UNIVERSITY HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE
CONSENT FORM:**

I, _____ of _____

Hereby consent to be a subject of a human research study to be undertaken by Linda Keesing-Styles, and I understand that the purpose of the research is to examine approaches to social justice education in tertiary contexts.

I acknowledge:

1. that I voluntarily and freely give my consent to my participation in this research study;
2. that the aims, methods, and anticipated benefits have been explained to me;
3. that the research findings will be used in Linda's thesis and may be used in writing for other academic publications and conference papers, and that I will be asked for my approval if my contribution to this study is to be used for wider publication;
4. that I will supply a pseudonym which will be used to identify my contribution except in relation to those statements identified as confidential in the interview transcripts I am provided with for approval;
5. that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time during the study, in which event my participation in the research study will immediately cease and any information obtained from me will not be used.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Please return consent form to:

Linda Keesing-Styles
Associate Dean, Vocational Education and Training Division
Unitec
Private Bag 92025
Auckland

Appendix Three

Summary of Education for Being

Barnett and Coate contend that the central purpose of contemporary tertiary education in the changing world is ontological rather than epistemological. It should be aimed at the enhancement of human capacity and the corresponding development of dispositions that assist students in developing self-awareness and self-confidence. Knowledge and skills alone are deemed insufficient in the changing world as there is the capacity for the world to have moved on. But, with the development of dispositions to the self and the world, the contention is that students are more prepared for *being* capably in the current supercomplex world and more prepared for the uncertainty of the unknown future. Notwithstanding this focus on the development of *being* and the centrality of self and identity, there is also the acknowledgement of the necessary relationships between knowing, acting and being in the holistic learning process for the individual student. Knowledge and skills are not redundant but rather a part of the total package required for thriving in the uncertain future.

Barnett claims that pedagogy for uncertainty will encourage the development of a human being not paralysed into inaction by the challenges of uncertainty but rather able to act purposively and judiciously as a result of developing skills and dispositions for ‘knowing-in-and-with-uncertainty’ (Barnett, 2004, p. 251).

Appendix Four

On-Line Discussion – Proposal

Thank you all very much for your time, openness and provocations in participating in the initial interviews, the last of which was completed early in December. You are an extremely interesting and diverse group who come from a variety of disciplines, institutions and philosophical beliefs.

I have now completed my initial, fairly crude analysis of your interviews and you have provided me with some very provocative and thought-inducing material. While there are many synergies in your beliefs and approaches, there are also significant differences in your philosophies and practices, which is not at all surprising given your backgrounds and disciplines. You were all invited to be participants in this study as you had each expressed commitment to a social justice orientation in your teaching. However, your definitions of and approaches to social justice vary appreciably and your classroom practices are quite diverse.

In my original proposal and invitation for you to participate, I indicated that I would analyse your interviews and create a proposal for discussion that was a synthesis of your responses and the literatures around social justice education and education for being. However, as I have proceeded in my study and analysed your interviews, my thinking around this has changed and I would like to honour your provocations differently. One theme that arose through each of your interviews was that of *student engagement*. All of you, one way or another, work to ensure that students are engaged in their learning and you use a broad range of strategies to achieve that. It is this issue of engagement that I now wish to pursue in the on-line discussion.

Barnett and Choate (2005) make the following claim:

If higher education curricula are going to help students develop the kinds of human qualities and dispositions that the twenty-first century calls for, we have suggested then that students need to be understood as human beings with their own unfolding ‘takes’ on the world. If students as human beings are not just to survive but add to the world and be exemplars of human *being* as such (which presumably are desirable aims for a higher learning), then they will have to be able to engage with the world and put in something of themselves. But they are hardly going to be able to develop the will, the energy, the courage and the resilience to engage with a changing and challenging world unless they are also engaged in suitable ways in their curricula.

Over the next few weeks, rather than respond as initially suggested to a proposal that I post, I ask you to reflect on the above statement and on your own approach to engaging students. Then I would like the on-line discussion to progress in two phases.

Week One: During this week, please post a personal piece on student engagement - why you think it is important and a central part of your teaching approach. If possible, please cite an example of how you have personally

focused on engaging students (successfully or unsuccessfully) and what the outcomes were.

Week Two: Please read at least some of the other postings and engage in discussion with one or more other participants. Identify and discuss any synergies or differences that arise out of your postings. As I identified above, your approaches vary considerably so you may find points of agreement and points of disagreement to discuss.

As this proposal differs to some extent from that you agreed to participate in, if you have any concerns about participation, please let me know.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. (1997). Pedagogical frameworks for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 30-43). New York & London: Routledge.
- Ainley, P., & Canaan, J. (2005). Critical hope in English higher education today, constraints and possibilities in two new universities. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(4), 435-446.
- Althaus, S. (1997). Computer-mediated communication in the university classroom: An experiment with on-line discussions. *Communication Education*, 46, 158-174.
- Apple, M. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Archer, L. (2008). Younger academics' constructions of 'authenticity', 'success' and professional identity. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(4), 385-403.
- Arskey, H., & Knight, P. (1999). *Interviewing for social scientists: An introductory resource with examples*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Ayers, B. (2001). *Fugitive days: A memoir*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ayers, W. (1998). Foreword: Popular education - Teaching for social justice. In W. Ayers, J. A. Hunt & T. Quinn (Eds.), *Teaching for social justice* (pp. xvii-xxv). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, S. J. (2000). Performativities and fabrications in the education economy: Towards the performative society? *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 1-24.
- Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215-228.
- Barnett, R. (1992). *Improving higher education: Total quality care*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Barnett, R. (2000a). *Realizing the university in an age of supercomplexity*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Barnett, R. (2000b). Reconfiguring the university. In P. Scott (Ed.), *Higher*

- education re-formed* (pp. 114-129). London & New York: Falmer.
- Barnett, R. (2004a). Learning for an unknown future. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 23(3), 247-260.
- Barnett, R. (2004b). The purposes of higher education and the changing face of academia. *London Review of Education*, 2(1), 61-73.
- Barnett, R. (2004c). Epilogue:Reclaiming universities from a runaway world. In M. Walker & J. Nixon (Eds.), *Reclaiming universities from a runaway world* (pp. 195-208). Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Barnett, R., & Coate, K. (2005). *Engaging the curriculum in higher education*. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Barnett, R., & Di Napoli, R. (2008). Identity and voice in higher education: Making connections. In R. Barnett & R. Di Napoli (Eds.), *Changing identities in higher education: Voicing perspectives* (pp. 197-204). Oxon: Routledge.
- Barnett, R., & Hallam, S. (1999). Teaching for supercomplexity: A pedagogy for higher education. In P. Mortimer (Ed.), *Understanding pedagogy and its impact on learning* (pp. 137-154). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Barone, T. (1995). Persuasive writings, vigilant readings, reconstructed characters: The paradox of trust in educational storysharing. In J. A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (Vol. 1, pp. 63-74). London: Falmer Press.
- Barone, T. (2000). *Aesthetics, politics, and educational inquiry*. New York: Peter Lang
- Barone, T. (2001). *Touching eternity: The enduring outcomes of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Barrie S. (2004). A research-based approach to generic graduate attributes policy. *Higher Education Research and Development*. 23(3), 261-275.
- Bathmaker, A.-M., & Avis, J. (2005). Is that 'tingling feeling' enough? Constructions of teaching and learning in further education. *Educational Review*, 57(1), 3-20.
- Bauer, J. (2002). Assessing student work from chatrooms and bulletin boards. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 91(Fall), 31-36.
- Bauman, Z. (1996). From pilgrim to tourist - or a short history of identity. In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 18-36). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

- Bauman, Z. (1997). Universities: Old, new and different. In A. Smith & F. Webster (Eds.), *The postmodern university? Contested visions of higher education in society* (pp. 17-26). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *The individualized society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). Education in liquid modernity. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 27, 303-317.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity* (M. Ritter, Trans.). London: Sage.
- Benfield, G. (2002). Designing and managing effective online discussions. *Learning and Teaching Briefing Papers Series 1-5.*, Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.
- Benjamin, W. (1955/73). The storyteller: Reflections on the works of Nikolai Leskov, and theses on the philosophy of history. In *Illuminations* (pp. 83-107). London: Fontana.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, codes and control: Towards a theory of educational transmission Vol III*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (2001). Symbolic control: Issues of empirical description of agencies and agents. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 4(1), 21-33.
- Bernstein, B., & Solomon, J. (1999). Pedagogy, identity and the construction of a theory of symbolic control. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 265-279.
- Bertens, H. (1995). *The idea of the postmodern: A history*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Blackmore, J. (2001). Universities in crisis? Knowledge economies, emancipatory pedagogies and the critical intellectual. *Educational Theory*, 51(3), 467-486.
- Blackmore, J. (2002). Globalisation and the restructuring of higher education for new knowledge economies: New dangers or old habits troubling gender equity work in universities? *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(4), 419-441.
- Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2003). Managing equity work in the performative university. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 18(41), 141-162.

- Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2007). *Performing and reforming leaders: Gender, educational restructuring, and organizational change*. New York: State University of New York.
- Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power*. New York: Routledge.
- Boler, M., & Zembylas, M. (2003). Discomforting truths: The emotional terrain of understanding difference. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change* (pp. 110-136). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Booth, C. (1999). The rise of the new universities in Britain. In D. Smith & A. Langslow (Eds.), *The idea of a university* (pp. 106-123). London & Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Bourgeois, E., Duke, C., Guyot, J.-L., & Merrill, B. (1999). *The adult university*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Bracher, M. (2006). *Radical pedagogy: Identity, generativity and social transformation*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bridges, D. (2000). Back to the future: The higher education curriculum in the 21st century. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(1), 37-55.
- Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts: The changing role of professionals in politics and public life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1990). *The skilful teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, 18(1), 1-21.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brunner, D. (1994). *Inquiry and reflection: Framing narrative practice in education*. New York: State University of New York.
- Burman, E. (2003). Narratives of "experience" and pedagogical practices. *Narrative Inquiry*, 13(2), 269-286.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Butterworth, R., & Tarling, N. (1994). *A shakeup anyway: Government and the universities in New Zealand in a decade of reform*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Callicinos, A. (1989). *Making history: Agency, structure and change in social theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Charmaz, K. (2003). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 311-330). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Chase, S. (1995). Taking narrative seriously: Consequences for method and theory in interview studies. In R. Josselson & A. Lieblich (Eds.), *Interpreting experience: The narrative study of lives* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-26). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Claxton, G. (1999). *Wise up: The challenge of lifelong learning*. London & New York: Bloomsbury.
- Claxton, G. (2002). Education for the learning age: A sociocultural approach to learning to learn. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for life in the 21st century: Sociocultural perspectives on the future of education* (pp. 21-33). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Claxton, G., & Carr, M. (2004). A framework for teaching learning: The dynamics of disposition. *Early Years*, 24(1), 87-97.
- Clegg, S. (2008). Academic identities under threat. *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(3), 329-345.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(3), 279-310.
- Codd, J. (2005a). Teachers as 'managed professionals' in the global education industry: The New Zealand experience. *Educational Review*, 57(2), 193-206.
- Codd, J. (2005b). Education policy and the challenges of globalisation: Commercialisation or citizenship? In J. Codd & K. Sullivan (Eds.), *Education policy directions in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 3-17). Southbank: Thomson Dunmore Press.
- Conle, C. (2000). Thesis as narrative or "What is the inquiry in narrative inquiry?". *Curriculum Inquiry*, 30(2), 189-214.
- Connelly, M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.
- Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (2000a). Changing perspectives about intelligence. In A. Costa & B. Kallick (Eds.), *Discovering and exploring habits of mind* (pp. 1-20). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (2000b). Teaching the habits of mind directly. In A. Costa & B. Kallick (Eds.), *Activating and engaging habits of mind* (pp. 72-308)

- 97). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Cowen, R. (1996). Performativity, post-modernity and the university. *Comparative Education*, 23(2), 245-258.
- Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2003). Towards a sociology of just practices: An analysis of plural conceptions of justice. In C. Vincent (Ed.), *Social justice, education, and identity* (pp. 15-29). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.
- Currie, J. (1998). Introduction. In J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds.), *Universities and globalisation: Critical perspectives* (pp. 1-13). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in social science research*. London: Sage.
- Davies, B. (2006). Women and transgression in the halls of academe. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(4), 497-509.
- Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20, 43-65.
- Deem, R., & Ozga, J. (1997). Women managing for diversity in a postmodern world. In C. Marshall (Ed.), *Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from primary and secondary schooling* (pp. 25-40). London: Routledge.
- Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge: The university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 500-515). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Denzin, N. (2002). The interpretive process. In A. Huberman & M. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion* (pp. 349-366). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1998). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 1-34). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Department of Education. (1989). *Learning for life II: Policy decisions*. Wellington: Department of Education.
- Dudley, J. (1998). Globalisation and education policy in Australia. In J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds.), *Universities and globalisation: Critical perspectives*

- (pp. 21-43). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *The illusions of postmodernism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Edelman, M. (1964). *The symbolic uses of politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (1997). The promise and perils of alternative forms of data representation. *Educational Researcher*, 26(6), 4-10.
- Ellsworth, E. (1992). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and critical pedagogy* (pp. 90-119). New York: Routledge.
- Ellsworth, E. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*. New York & London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Fenstermacher, G. D. (1990). Some moral considerations on teaching as a profession. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 130-151). San Francisco & Oxford: Jossey-Bass.
- Flores-Crespo, P. (2007). Situating education in the human capabilities approach. In M. Walker & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *Amartya Sen's capability approach and social justice in education* (pp. 45-65). New York & Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Franklin, K., & Lowry, C. (2001). Computer-mediated focus group sessions: Naturalistic inquiry in a networked environment. *Qualitative Research*, 1(2), 169-184.
- Fraser, J. (2002). *A history of hope: When Americans have dared to dream a better future*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fraser, N. (1996). *Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition and participation*. Paper presented at The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. Retrieved from <http://www.tannerlectures.utah.edu/lectures/documents/Fraser98.pdf>
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the 'postsocialist condition'*. New York: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*(3), 107-120.
- Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or recognition?: A political philosophical exchange* (J. Golb, J. Ingram & C. Wilke, Trans.). London & New York: Verso.
- Fraser, N., & Naples, N., A. (2004). To interpret the world and to change it: An interview with Nancy Fraser. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 29(4), 1103-1124.

- Freire, P. (1984). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart* (D. Macedo & A. Oliveira, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gewirtz, S. (1998). Conceptualizing social justice in education: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Education Policy*, 13(4), 469-484.
- Gewirtz, S. (2000). Bringing the politics back in: A critical analysis of quality discourses in education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 48(4), 352-370.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond left and right: The future of radical politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Giroux, H. (2003). The corporate university and the politics of education. *Revista Praxis*, 2, 22-31.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1995). Radical pedagogy as cultural politics: Beyond the discourse of critique and anti-utopianism. In P. McLaren (Ed.), *Pedagogy, culture and the body*. London: Routledge.
- Gitlin, A. (1995). Teacher education: What good is teaching and how do we teach people to be good teachers? In J. L. Kincheloe & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Thirteen questions: Reframing education's conversation* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.
- Gitlin, A., & Margonis, F. (1995). The political aspect of reform: Teacher resistance as good sense. *American Journal of Education*, 103(4), 377-405.
- Gitlin, A., & Russell, R. (1994). Alternative methodologies and the research context. In A. Gitlin (Ed.), *Power and method: Political activism and educational research* (pp. 181-201). New York & London: Routledge.
- Goldberg, N. (1990). *Wild mind: Living the writer's life*. New York & Toronto: Bantam Books.
- Gonzalez, M. (2003). Against indifference. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(4), 493-503.
- Gore, J. (1992). What can we do for you! What can "we" do for "you"?:

- Struggling over empowerment in critical and feminist pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and critical pedagogy* (pp. 54-73). New York: Routledge.
- Green, M. (1998). Introduction: Teaching for social justice. In W. Ayers, J. A. Hunt & T. Quinn (Eds.), *Teaching for social justice* (pp. xxvii-xlvi). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Griffin, A. (1997). Knowledge under attack: Consumption, diversity and the need for values. In R. Barnett & A. Griffin (Eds.), *The end of knowledge in higher education*. London: Cassell.
- Griffiths, M. (1998a). *Educational research for social justice: Getting off the fence*. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Griffiths, M. (1998b). Towards a theoretical framework for understanding social justice in educational practice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 30(2), 175-192.
- Griffiths, M. (2003). *Action for social justice in education: Fairly different*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1998). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 195-220). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action: Volume two: Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hackman, H. W. (2005). Five essential components for social justice education. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 38, 103-109.
- Hall, S. (2000). Who needs identity? In P. du Gay, J. Evans & P. Redman (Eds.), *Identity: A reader*, (pp. 15-30). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Hanrahan, M., Cooper, T., & Burroughs-Lange, S. (1999). The place of personal writing in a PhD thesis: Epistemological and methodological considerations. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 12(4), 401-416.
- Heidegger, M. (1927/1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hinkson, J. (1995). Lyotard, postmodernity, and education: A critical evaluation. In M. Peters (Ed.), *Education and the postmodern condition* (pp. 121-146). Westport: Bergin & Garvey.
- Holstein, J., & Gubrium, J. (2003). Introduction - Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns. In J. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside*

- interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 3-30). Thousand Oaks, London, New York: Sage.
- Holstein, J., & Gubrium, J. (2004). The active interview. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 140-161). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Hones, D. (1998). Known in part: The transformational power of narrative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 4(2), 225-249.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Human Rights Commission. (2004). *Human rights in New Zealand today*. Auckland: Human Rights Commission.
- Johnson, J. (2001). In-depth interviewing. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 103-119). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Jongbloed, B. (2003). Marketisation in higher education: Clark's triangle and the essential ingredients of markets. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 57(2), 110-136.
- Kamler, B. (2001). *Relocating the personal: A critical writing pedagogy*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Keesing-Styles, L. (2002). *Rethinking the concept of qualified teachers: A critical examination of early childhood teacher education*. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1995). Introduction: The more questions we ask, the more questions we ask. In J. L. Kincheloe & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Thirteen questions: Reframing education's conversation* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kirman, A., & Teschl, M. (2006). Searching for identity in the capability space. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 13(3), 299-325.
- Knight, P. (2002). *Being a teacher in higher education*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Kobena, M. (1994). *Welcome to the jungle: New positions in black cultural studies*. London: Routledge.
- Kohl, H. (1998). Afterword - Some reflections on teaching for social justice. In W. Ayers, J. A. Hunt & T. Quinn (Eds.), *Teaching for social justice* (pp. 285-297). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kress, G. (2000). A curriculum for the future. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(1), 133-145.

- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Langslow, A. (1999). Concluding questions. In D. Smith & A. Langslow (Eds.), *The idea of a university* (pp. 175-186). London & Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lemert, C. (2007). *Postmodernism is not what you think*. Malden & Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- Luke, C. (1993). Women in higher education: Gendered discourse and cultural power. In D. Baker & M. Fogarty (Eds.), *A gendered culture: Educational management in the nineties* (pp. 55-74). St Albans: Victoria University of Technology.
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Masumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Malcolm, W., & Tarling, N. (2007). *Crisis of identity? The mission and management of universities in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Mann, S. J. (2001). Alternative perspectives on the student experience: Alienation and engagement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(1), 7-19.
- Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1984). Approaches to learning. In F. Marton, D. Hounsell & N. Entwistle (Eds.), *The experience of learning*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press
- Mauthner, N., & Doucet, A. (1998). Reflections on a voice-centred relational method: Analysing maternal and domestic voices. In J. Ribbens & R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist dilemmas in qualitative research: Public knowledge and private lives* (pp. 119-146). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. (2002). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. In A. Huberman & M. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion* (pp. 37-64). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- McCarthy, L., & Whitlock, E. (2002). Review of the year's publications in

- social justice education. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35(1), 79-85.
- McGuigan, J. (1999). *Modernity and postmodern culture*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- McKinney, C. (2007). Caught between the 'old' and the 'new'? Talking about 'race' in a post-apartheid university classroom. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 10(2), 215-231.
- McLaren, P. (1993). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the social foundations of education*. New York: Longman.
- McLaren, P. (2000). Paulo Freire's pedagogy of possibility. In S. Steiner, P. Krank, P. McLaren & R. Bahruth (Eds.), *Freirean pedagogy, praxis and possibilities: Projects for the new millennium* (pp. 1-22). New York & London: Falmer Press.
- McLean, M. (2006). *Pedagogy and the university: Critical theory and practice*. New York: Continuum.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Miles, S. (2001). *Social theory in the real world*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Miller, G. D. (2002). Abolishing educational welfare: Redrawing the lines of interpedendency through dialogue. In J. Mills (Ed.), *A pedagogy of becoming*. (pp. 93-113). New York: Rodopi.
- Miller, J., & Glassner, B. (2004). The "inside" and the "outside": Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 125-139). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Miller, L. (2008). Scenes in a university: Performing academic identities in shifting contexts. In R. Barnett & R. Di Napoli (Eds.), *Changing identities in higher education: Voicing perspectives* (pp. 104-112). Oxon: Routledge.
- Mills, J. (2002a). Introduction: *Paideia* reconsidered. In J. Mills (Ed.), *A pedagogy of becoming* (pp. 1-18). New York: Rodopi.
- Mills, J. (2002b). An unorthodox pedagogy: Fostering empathy through provocation. In J. Mills (Ed.), *A pedagogy of becoming* (pp. 115-140). New York: Rodopi.
- Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E., & Alexander, L. (1995). *In-depth interviewing: Principles, techniques, analysis* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Longman.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of management*.

- managing and management development.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Mishler, E. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative.* Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.
- Mishler, E. (1995). Models of narrative analysis: A typology. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 5(2), 87-123.
- Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and power in higher education.* Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Nieto, S. (1998). Affirmation, solidarity and critique: Moving beyond tolerance in education. In E. Lee, D. Menkart & M. Okazawa-Rey (Eds.), *Beyond heroes and holidays: A practical guide to K-12 anti-racist, multicultural education and staff development* (pp. 7-18). Washington: Network of Educators on the Americas.
- Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). Capabilities and social justice. *International Studies Review*, 4(2), 123-135.
- Nussbaum, M. (2003). Capabilities as fundamental entitlements: Sen and social justice. *Feminist Economics*, 9(2-3), 33-59.
- Nussbaum, M. (2006). Education and democratic citizenship: Capabilities and quality education. *Journal of Human Development*, 7(3), 385-395.
- Okazawa-Rey, M. (1998). Educating for critical practice. In E. Lee, D. Menkart & M. Okazawa-Rey (Eds.), *Beyond heroes and holidays: A practical guide to K-12 anti-racist, multicultural education and staff development* (pp. 19-25). Washington: Network of Educators on the Americas.
- Olszen, M., Codd, J., & O'Neill, A. M. (2004). *Education policy: Globalization, citizenship and democracy.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1997). *Thematic review of the first years of tertiary education: New Zealand.* Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1998). *Redefining*

- tertiary education.* Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Osborne, R. (2007). *Civilization: A new history of the western world.* London: Pimlico.
- Peters, M. (1995). Legitimation problems: Knowledge and education in the postmodern condition. In M. Peters (Ed.), *Education and the postmodern condition* (pp. 21-39). Westport: Bergin & Garvey.
- Peters, M. (2004). *Higher education, globalization and the knowledge economy.* Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Peters, M., & Roberts, P. (1999). *University futures and the politics of reform in New Zealand.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Piantanida, M., & Garman, N. (1999). *The qualitative dissertation: A guide for students and faculty.* Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Power, K. (1998). No little I's and no little you's - Language and equality in an adult literacy community. In W. Ayers, J. A. Hunt & T. Quinn (Eds.), *Teaching for social justice* (pp. 102-123). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Punch, M. (1998). Politics and ethics in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 156-184). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). London & New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Ranson, S. (1998). Towards the learning society. In S. Ranson (Ed.), *Inside the learning society* (pp. 91-108). London & New York: Cassell.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reading, A. (2004). *Hope and despair: How perceptions of the future shape human behavior.* Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins.* Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.
- Renner, A., & Brown, M. (2006). A hopeful curriculum: Community, praxis, and courage. *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 22(2), 101-122.
- Ribbens, J. (1998). Hearing my feeling voice? An autobiographical discussion of motherhood. In J. Ribbens & R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist dilemmas in qualitative research: Public knowledge and private lives* (pp. 24-38). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

- Richardson, L. (1996). Educational birds. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 25(1), 6-15.
- Richardson, L. (2001). Getting personal: Writing-stories. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(1), 33-38.
- Richardson, R. (1996). *Fortunes and fables: Education for hope in troubled times*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Riessman, C. (2002). Narrative analysis. In A. Huberman & M. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion* (pp. 217-270). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Rizvi, F. (1998). Some thoughts on contemporary theories of social justice. In B. Atweh, S. Kemmis & P. Weeks (Eds.), *Action research in practice: Partnerships for social justice in education* (pp. 47-56). London: Routledge.
- Roberts, P. (1999). The future of the university: Reflections from New Zealand. *International Review of Education*, 45(1), 65-86.
- Robertson, D. (2000). Students as consumers: The individualization of competitive advantage. In P. Scott (Ed.), *Higher education re-formed* (pp. 78-94). London & New York: Falmer.
- Robeyns, I. (2003). Is Nancy Fraser's critique of theories of distributive justice justified? *Constellations*, 10(4), 538-553.
- Robeyns, I. (2006). The capability approach in practice. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 14(3), 351-376.
- Rodriguez, A. (2002). Redefining our understanding of narrative. *The Qualitative Report*, 7(1), 1-7.
- Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80s*. Columbus: Merrill Publishing.
- Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(2), 149-161.
- Saito, M. (2003). Amartya Sen's capability approach to education: A critical exploration. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 37(1), 17-33.
- Sandretto, S., Lang, C., Schon, P., & Whyte, B. (2003). *A collaborative self-study into teacher education and social justice*. Paper presented at the AARE/NZARE joint conference, Auckland.
www.aare.edu.au/03pap/san03373.pdf

- Sarup, M. (1996). *Identity, culture and the postmodern world*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Scott, P. (1997). The postmodern university? In A. Smith & F. Webster (Eds.), *The postmodern university? Contested visions of higher education in society* (pp. 36-47). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Sen, A. (1980). Equality of what? In S. McMurrin (Ed.), *The Tanner lectures on human values*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Sen, A. (1992). *Inequality re-examined*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. (1993). Capability and well being. In M. Nussbaum & A. Sen (Eds.), *The quality of life: Studies in development economics* (pp. 30-53). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. (2004). Dialogue: Capabilities, lists and public reason: Continuing the conversation. *Feminist economics*, 10(3), 77-80.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, A., & Webster, F. (1997). Conclusion: An affirming flame. In A. Smith & F. Webster (Eds.), *The postmodern university?: Contested visions of higher education in society* (pp. 99-113). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Smith, D. & Langslow, A. (Eds.), (1999). *The idea of a university*. London & Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Smith, R. (2005). Dancing on the feet of chance: The uncertain university. *Educational Theory*, 55(2), 139-150.
- Smith, R., & Jesson, J. (2005). *Punishing the discipline - The PBRF regime - evaluating the position of education: Where to from here?* Paper presented at the Forum on PBRF, Auckland.
- Solnit, R. (2005). *Hope in the dark: The untold history of people power*. Edinburgh, New York, Melbourne: Canongate.
- Sturman, A. (1997). *Social justice in education*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Taylor, P. (2008). Being an academic today. In R. Barnett & R. Di Napoli (Eds.), *Changing identities in higher education: Voicing perspectives* (pp. 27-39). Oxon: Routledge.
- Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). *Educational policy and*

- the politics of change*. London & New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Taylor, W. T. (1996). *The early years of tertiary education: A selective review of recent and current literature*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Terkel, S. (2003). *Hope dies last: Keeping the faith in difficult times*. New York & London: The New Press.
- Touraine, A. (1998). Can we live together, equal and different? *European Journal of Social Theory*, 1(2), 165-178.
- Troyna, B., & Vincent, C. (1995). The discourses of social justice in education. *Discourse*, 16(2), 149-166.
- Unterhalter, E., & Walker, M. (2007). Conclusion: Capabilities, social justice, and education. In M. Walker & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *Amartya Sen's capability approach and social justice in education* (pp. 239-253). New York & Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy* (2nd ed.). London, Ontario: Althouse Press.
- Vidovich, L., & Currie, J. (1998). Changing accountability and autonomy at the "coalface" of academic work in Australia. In J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds.), *Universities and globalisation: Critical perspectives* (pp. 21-43). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Vincent, C. (2003). Introduction. In C. Vincent (Ed.), *Social justice, education, and identity* (pp. 1-13). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Walker, M. (2006a). *Higher education pedagogies: A capabilities approach*. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Walker, M. (2006b). Towards a capability-based theory of social justice for education policy-making. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(2), 163-185.
- Walker, M., & Nixon, J. (2004). Introduction. In M. Walker & J. Nixon (Eds.), *Reclaiming universities from a runaway world* (pp. 1-11). Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Walker, M., & Unterhalter, E. (2007). The capability approach: Its potential for work in education. In M. Walker & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *Amartya Sen's capability approach and social justice in education* (pp. 1-18). New York & Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of*

- qualitative interview studies*. New York: Free Press.
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic narrative and semi-structured methods*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Wortham, S. (1999). *Rethinking the university: Leverage and deconstruction*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, I. M. (1992). Recent theories of justice. *Social Theory and Practice*, 18(1), 63-79.
- Young, I. M. (1997). Unruly categories: A critique of Nancy Fraser's dual systems theory. *New Left Review*, (222), 147-160.
- Young, I. M. (2000). Five faces of oppression. In M. Adams, W. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters & X. Zuniga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 35-49). New York & London: Routledge.