

Teaching critically as an act of praxis and resistance

by: Mary E. Boyce

Critical pedagogy applies a critical perspective to the practice of teaching and challenges critical theorists and educators to examine our teaching practices. Initially captivated by the critical teaching practice of a colleague in human development, this application of critical pedagogy to management and organization studies was developed during a sabbatical and is the grist of my current teaching. A description of work in progress, this paper presents an overview of critical pedagogy, shares examples of taking a critical perspective in the teaching of management and organization studies, and considers teaching as an arena of praxis and resistance.

Critical pedagogy: An overview

Beyond a casual reference to teaching practices, pedagogy concerns the way we construct relations between teachers and learners. How we understand processes of teaching and learning shapes our work as educators.

[Critical] pedagogy . . . signals how questions of audience, voice, power, and evaluation actively work to construct particular relations between teachers and students, institutions and society, and classrooms and communities. . . . Pedagogy in the critical sense illuminates the relationship among knowledge, authority, and power. (Giroux, 1994: 30)

Critical pedagogy, kin to critical theory, is theoretically grounded in the first generation Frankfurt school of critical theory, Gramsci's concepts of hegemony, subject, and counter-hegemonic practice, and a politics of ethics, difference, and democracy (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1988; Giroux & McLaren, 1994; McLaren, 1993; McLaren & Lankshear, 1994; Misgeld, 1987; Shor & Freire, 1987). The first generation Frankfurt school emphasized attaining emancipation by the critique and social action of critically conscious persons. For Frankfurt School theorists the practice of de-reification, of personal and political emancipation, [is] through negative critique: that is, the negation of false consciousness through ideology critique (Luke, 1992: 27). As persons become aware of how social and political systems work and become conscious of themselves as agents, they can identify and critique domination (a process that Freire calls conscientization).

Much can be said about Antonio Gramsci, simply however, Gramsci's contributions to critical pedagogy derive from his propositions of a powerful (but not seamless) hegemonic control of society and subjects that possess common sense, dialectical thinking, and intellectual possibilities (Gramsci, 1971; Luke, 1992). Although dominated, critical subjects can find sites (or spaces) for counter-hegemonic practices and solidarity. Universities can be such spaces. Schools and universities are sites in which intellectuals can develop a critique, articulate values of dominated groups, amplify stories of subordinated experience, and practice resistance and solidarity (Darder, 1991; Freire, 1985; Giroux, 1988; hooks, 1994; Weiler, 1988).

Third, a politics of ethics, difference, and democracy grounds the practice of critical pedagogy. An ethic that recognizes humanity and struggles overtly against oppression and injustice is central. We are part of communities within which we are members, agents. There is no emancipation without context or accountability. We work to make context evident and to establish and acknowledge accountability. A recognition of difference and the importance of many voices is a postmodern development in critical pedagogy (Giroux, 1994; Tierney, 1993; McLaren, 1993). Dialogue, a long-valued element of Freire's critical pedagogical practice, facilitates the voicing of difference and enables difference to

reside openly within relations rather than be suppressed. A relentless commitment to democracy requires social critique and transformation of social, political, and organizational structures. For radical educators, this politics of ethics, difference, and democracy requires praxis. This work cannot be solely an intellectual exercise.

As Freire experienced relations of power and domination in Latin America (Brazil, Chile, Nicaragua), he developed and practiced a radical approach to education that when linked to a social movement, made possible social and political change. Robert Arnove (1986) describes the social movement in Nicaragua in the late sixties and seventies, preceding the Somoza overthrow, as a powerful example of critical pedagogy exerting considerable counter-hegemonic influence. In Nicaragua, the social movement to which critical pedagogy was connected . . . drew together three strands [of] Sandino's popular national revolt, marxist class analysis, and Christian Liberation Theology (p. 8, 9). As people became functionally and critically literate, they worked for social change.

In addition to its theoretical grounding, three assumptions serve as organizing principles for critical pedagogy. These assumptions are that: (1) Education is not neutral; (2) Society can be transformed by the engagement of critically conscious persons; and (3) Praxis connects liberatory education with social transformation.

First, education is not neutral. Freire (1972) describes education as domesticating or liberating. Strengthening the dominant ideology by socializing learners is an expression of domesticating education. By contrast, education liberates when it challenges the dominant ideology, teaches critical literacy, and how to learn. Much of the work in which faculty in management and organization studies are engaged is domesticating. Traditionally, we prepare students for the world of work rather than lives of resistance. This is understandable - many of us are in colleges of business. The inherent conflicts between our radical convictions, our course content, and our teaching practices are unaddressed. We admire independent, critical thinking and wonder if our learners will become entrepreneurs because we cannot picture them as automotons in large corporations. Faculty rhetoric values self-directed learners, but our courses flow more smoothly if learners accept our course objectives, lectures, expertise, selection of readings, exercises, assignments, and evaluation without question or disagreement. We (consciously and unconsciously) use power and voice to exert influence and suppress dissent. Facilitated discussion about particular topics often leaves the essential frame of a course or the discipline unquestioned. The incongruence of radical content and domesticating practice may go unnoticed, and we may not think to assess the liberating and domesticating aspects of our teaching.

Constructivism lies beneath the second assumption. The central idea of constructivism, that reality is socially constructed, logically precedes the idea that social relations can be deconstructed, reconstructed and/or transformed. In liberatory education learners realize that the way things are has been constructed and serves some group. There are layers of consciousness to seeing systems and structures and then, to seeing the ways in which we are actors in the worlds that we begin to analyze. Two examples of consciousness and analysis in management and organization studies follows.

In the first example, we can begin with an industry about which learners have vast experience: the education industry (an approach developed by D. Fitzgibbons; shared in conversation, 1996). We can examine how education is organized, delivered, and whom it serves. Exploring the coma-like state in which learners passively receive information, we can consider the difference between learning to learn and domesticating uses of education. We can deconstruct knowledge and identify who constructs it. Liberatory education includes examinations of meaning-making and agency. Learners voice their

experiences and begin to identify and to articulate the changes which they understand are necessary for liberatory education.

A second example of consciousness and analysis begins with indicators of deindustrialization and making connections between student experiences and larger social, political, and economic processes. The work of developing a critique of advanced capitalism places the personal and professional aspirations of learners in a larger context - a challenging one regarding the opportunities and obligations of business in society. Next, we identify, in addition to profit, what business could be contributing to society. We identify examples of organizations and communities that are wrestling constructively with current economic and social conditions. Reflecting individually and then collectively, learners identify small and large actions they assess as necessary to sustaining a healthy economy and business climate. Examples like these evoke many other possibilities of linking consciousness and analysis in management and organization studies.

A third assumption of critical pedagogists is that praxis links liberatory education with social transformation. Social transformation is not merely the result of consciousness. Emancipation necessarily involves acts of individual and collective resistance and yet, not all resistance is effective. We know the futility of isolated and unexamined actions. Praxis is an iterative, reflective approach to taking action. It is an on-going process of moving between text or theory, application, evaluative reflection, and back to theory. As a meta-model, praxis places individuals in organizational and social contexts and draws attention to the iterative processes of consciousness, practice, and reflective practice in their experience. An individual engaged in praxis is well prepared to participate in collective actions.

Returning to the first example above, adding praxis to consciousness and analysis might involve taking collaboratively designed action in the immediate course to increase student involvement with course content and process. Further, learners could be encouraged to assess the learning process in other courses and engage in their learning experiences differently as a result of what they are learning and practicing.

Moving to praxis in the second example is facilitated with journal reflections regarding the dialogues on deindustrialization and advanced capitalism, responses to readings, application in some arena, and evaluative reflection on the application. Another approach following the critique of advanced capitalism is for the learner to design an application that connects herself/himself meaningfully to a social movement, engage in collective action, and reflect on the connections between the course, the application, and actions she/he will take subsequently.

Applied to teaching critically, praxis involves moving between a critical perspective, one's teaching practices, evaluative reflection on the liberating and/or dominating aspects of the teaching, and back again to a critical and liberatory perspective. A commitment to praxis necessitates the reflective practice of teaching behaviors (in addition to course content) that demonstrate a critical approach and increase one's effectiveness at creating a liberating learning environment. More on teaching and praxis follows in a later section of this paper.

The idea of linking what happens in the classroom with social movements is a difficult one for management and organization studies. Liberatory education is most effective in the context of a strong social movement. Peter Mayo (1993) examines the contexts in which Freire's work has been applied and considers the implications of applying critical pedagogy in isolation, without connection to a social movement. Mayo proposes that in isolation, liberatory education leads to intellectual praxis

instead of revolutionary praxis (p.15). To which current social movements can critical pedagogy in management and organization studies be linked? To maximize our practice of critical pedagogy we are challenged to identify movements with which we can align; movements in which we and our learners can participate with community and business members engaged in the work of social change.

The theoretical foundation and three underlying assumptions of critical pedagogy have been presented. Practicing a critical and liberatory approach to education necessitates that radical faculty in management and organization studies become conscious of teaching practices as well as content. A presentation of teaching practices facilitating the development of critical consciousness follows.

Developing critical consciousness

The focus of critical pedagogy is the development of critical consciousness. As Freire (1973) developed the practice of conscientization, he identified three stages of consciousness: intransitive consciousness, semi-transitive consciousness, and critical consciousness.

One with intransitive consciousness sees life as irrevocably set in place, without human agency. At this level, one does not imagine changing life; life is what it is. That things might change seems to be the result of magic or miracles - such as winning the lottery or having one's prayers answered.

One with semi-transitive consciousness has a world view in which cause and effect operate in fragmented ways. At this level, people can learn and change things and the semi-transitive person goes about changing one thing at a time. An organizational example is repeatedly hiring for a position in which there is attrition without addressing fundamental difficulties with the job description or the situation in which the job is embedded. An example of California state policy crafted and passed at the level of semi-transitive consciousness is the recent decision to eliminate social services to undocumented immigrants without addressing the long-standing agricultural demand for low-wage laborers in the western United States (Proposition 187). Actions taken with semi-transitive consciousness seem short-sighted and flawed.

The critically transitive or critically conscious person recognizes connections between individual problems and the social context within which they are embedded. Shor summarized critical consciousness with four qualities: power awareness, critical literacy, permanent desocialization, and self-education/organization (1992: 129-130). Brief descriptions of these four qualities follow:

(a) Power awareness is based in understanding that just as structures and systems are constructed with human effort, they can be transformed by collective, human effort.

(b) Critical literacy includes habits of thought, reading, writing, and speaking which go beneath surface meaning . . . to understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences (p. 129).

(c) Permanent desocialization is questioning power and inequality in the status quo; examining socialized values in consciousness and in society which hold back democratic change in individuals and in the larger culture; . . . nurturing a passion for justice and a concern for the environment, for the community and for public life (p. 129-130).

(d) Self-education/organization means knowing how to learn critically and how to organize transformative educational projects with others.

Critical consciousness is demonstrated in many ways and a variety of examples are cited here. Giroux's (1994) critique of Benetton's appropriation of social transformation is an example of critical consciousness that calls attention to manipulative and distorting messages in an advertising campaign. And, when Angela Davis (1996) advocates in a speech that various groups seeking civil rights in the United States forge unexpected alliances, critical consciousness is embedded in political action. In two additional examples, critical consciousness is demonstrated in an analysis of heterosexism that shifts attention from individual experiences of homophobia to the effects of living in a heterocentric society (Borrego, 1995) and by an ecological analysis of economic ventures by American firms in underdeveloped countries that is connected to subsequent migrations of environmental refugees (L. Arguelles, class lecture, 1995). Each of these examples demonstrates the power awareness, critical literacy, desocialization, and self-education/organization in critical consciousness.

In one's teaching practice, developing critical consciousness begins with the opening dialogue of a class in which learners begin to express their experience and understanding of a theme. It is the instructor's task to bring learners to the edge of their knowledge and to consider with them ways to continue learning. There are many critical teaching practices that can be applied to teaching management and organization studies (Shor & Freire, 1987; Shor, 1989, 1992; Weiler, 1988, 1994). Two practices are presented here: dialogue and problem-posing. Each is presented below with an example from management and organization studies.

Dialogue

For Freire, dialogue in education is the practice of freedom. Naming one's experience and placing that voiced experience in context is the essence of dialogue (Freire, 1970). Different than discussion, dialogue is characterized as a kind of speech that is humble, open, and focused on collaborative learning. It is communication that can awaken consciousness and prepares people for collective action. Building on Freire's work (1970) regarding the use of dialogue and generative themes to develop critical consciousness, Shor (1992) develops topical and academic themes as additional approaches to dialogue.

A generative theme is one that emerges from the lives of learners as they engage a course of study. It presents a point of entry for learning that has meaning and relevance to a particular group of learners at a particular time. Downsizing is a theme recently generated by learners in management and organization studies. Work with downsizing as a generative theme includes pairing an opening dialogue on downsizing with individual writing. This dialogue and writing process allows the learners to voice their experiences of life and work in a changing economy. Reading their writing aloud to peers in small groups and then discussing the writings allows learners to acknowledge and to engage each other's experiences and ideas of downsizing. Following an opportunity to rewrite their essays, a subsequent, enriched class dialogue can occur. Data on downsizing is introduced and the learners place their experiences in relation to the data. The dialogue deepens and broadens. Learners begin to analyze the data and to consider how the data was gathered and whether or not the data gathering creates problems for the utility or generalizing of the data. They consider all possible interpretations of the data - What can this data mean? Then, they reflect on the connections between their initial experiences, ideas, and the data. Downsizing, as a generative theme, has provided these learners an entry point and a context for the study of management and organization studies.

Use of a topical theme presented by the instructor is another approach to dialogue. Among many possible themes in management and organization studies are a changing workforce, control, emancipation, effectiveness, TQM, and welfare: corporate and/or social. When presenting a topical

theme, the instructor frames the opening dialogue, engages learners, uses texts and readings with various points of view, and facilitates writing and speaking tasks as learners work with the theme as a frame for the course. It is important to give learners opportunity to develop perspectives regarding the theme before presenting my position as an instructor. Student silence is a common response to faculty expertise. One way to sustain and deepen the dialogue is to ask small groups to bring back a question for the rest of the class from a dialogue that occurred within a small group. The group learns how to critically push itself, to engage in a quality of dialogue that challenges the extent of what they know to date and opens up the next consideration.

An example of a topical theme in statistics was asking learners to describe their community from the perspective of a city government official, a business owner, a social service provider, or a resident using 1990 census data of three communities in which the learners lived (J. Willets, in conversation, 1995). As learners took different perspectives on the data they began to ask questions about the data itself - How were people included or excluded in the census process? Why were particular ethnic categories used? Learners enjoyed the descriptive process, learned a lot about their communities and yet, were frustrated by differing perspectives presented by the co-instructors from psychology and management science. The learners wanted to hear the right answers, not responses with different points of view. More on the challenges of critical teaching is addressed further in the paper.

Academic themes provide a third approach to dialogue. An initial question to which learners might respond is, What is management? Following a dialogue that uncovers what learners know, a subsequent set of questions might be posed: What have you managed? How did you know whether or not you were effective? To whom is what you have learned valuable? A third round of questions and dialogue might follow: What is the essential knowledge of management? How is this knowledge constructed? How is it challenged or updated? Learners are encouraged to exhaust their reservoir of knowledge and to seek additional knowledge addressing the questions with which the class is wrestling. They are encouraged to share what they learn in dialogue, in writing, in reading their writing aloud, and in rewriting based on subsequent dialogue. My role is to frame questions, to facilitate dialogue, to design assignments that will lead to more learning, to introduce resources that will push learners to consider additional perspectives, and to weave a synthesis of the learning demonstrated by the students again and again.

A practice of dialogue limits teacher-talk (Shor, 1992) and encourages learner voice. Dialogue works against learner passivity and silence and attempts to develop critical consciousness by engaging learners in desocializing discovery and linking experience with text. Dialogic practice moves generally from an instructor-identified beginning point through numerous, subsequent rounds of working with questions raised by the learners and the instructor as a theme is explored.

A problem-posing approach

Freire's (1970) metaphor for traditional education is banking education, in which teachers make deposits of information and knowledge into the empty accounts of students. The central bank of knowledge from which instructors draw deposits is a metaphor for official knowledge: standard syllabi, accepted textbooks, canonical knowledge in a discipline, scientific truths, etc. . . It is material selected by those with the power to set standards (Shor, 1992: 32). Faculty deposit (cover) as much as they can during a course, and learners demonstrate how much they have gained by achieving high scores on objective tests.

In banking education, central bank knowledge is presented as neutral and universal rather than as historical choices of some groups whose usage and culture are privileged in society (p. 32). With a banking approach, knowledge is not usually critiqued or presented as historically embedded in a particular social, political, or economic context. Rather than dispensing society's essential facts and knowledge, deposits from the central bank celebrate the status quo, ignore problems of social inequality, and prepare students to accept external authority.

In contrast with a banking education, Freire proposed a problem-posing education. Problem-posing offers all subject matter as historical products to be questioned rather than as central bank wisdom to be accepted. . . . The responsibility of the problem-posing teacher is to diversify subject matter and to use students's thought and speech as the base for developing critical understanding of personal experience, unequal conditions in society, and existing knowledge. In this democratic pedagogy, the teacher is not filling empty minds with official or unofficial knowledge but is posing knowledge in any form as a problem for mutual inquiry (Shor, 1992: 32-33).

Problem-posing does not suggest that students have nothing to learn from established knowledge or that fundamental knowledge must be reconstructed by each group of learners. Rather that instructors and students concern themselves with how texts and syllabi are organized, with the underlying assumptions of a course or discipline, and questioning the sources and perspectives included and/or excluded from the domain of the course. Problem-posing contextualizes knowledge and is based on instructor and learner posed questions as catalysts for learning.

A problem-posing faculty in management and organization studies can ask a series of related questions: Why don't long-time employees have the work skills that companies say they need? What makes employees expendable resources and/or a vital aspect of the work enterprise? How are employees's knowledge and skill levels social problems? These questions draw immediately from learners's awareness and experiences of skill obsolescence, downsizing, and restructuring as well as training and development. The problem opens up an examination of the centrality or peripherality of workers to accomplishing organizational goals and the problem of remaining skilled in a quickly changing society. It suggests that the issue is larger than the sustained employability of one worker or a group of workers. The instructor can facilitate exploration at several different levels of analysis: employee (individual), department (group), organization, industry, national economy, etc. . . . Learners can consider the similarity and difference of the issues depending on the level of analysis. The problem identified above can carry learners into an examination and critique of knowledge related to organizational purpose and goals, organizational change, structure and design, globalization of business, labor relations, organization dynamics, human motivation, the future of work, and training and career-pathing as aspects of human resources management.

Problem-posing begins with learners experiencing themselves as knowledgeable persons by (a) writing, (b) critically examining the knowledge in a field, (c) identifying the individual aspects and social context of a problem, and (d) identifying possible collective actions. Problem-posing is a related and similar practice to the one presented above, utilizing a topical theme with dialogue. It is also similar to the use of cases with which faculty in management and organization studies are familiar. A problem frames an entry into a complex situation without an apparent solution. The objective is not to generate a solution but to explore the complexity and inter-relatedness of individual, organizational, and social issues, to learn about a problem and its context, and to identify ways in which learners can take collective action that constructively responds to the problem with which they have been engaged.

Challenges to critical teaching

Chief among the difficulties of developing critical consciousness are countering the acceleration with which learners live and their resistance to an active and engaged approach to learning (Shor & Freire, 1987; Shor, 1992). Society in the US is rapid-fire and quick hit by style; these metaphors for speed are violent and common. People are told they can hear all you need to know in a twenty minute newscast. Major newspapers intentionally format their presentation so people can scan major news stories in minutes (USA Today, Los Angeles Times). As people are inundated with information, they scan, skim, and surf more than they sink into thoughts and ideas. Developing critical consciousness requires reflection, dialogue, and engagement with complexity. Learners used to social and economic problems being referenced in 30 second sound bites and to interpersonal and social problems being handled in one hour television programs have difficulty slowing down to deeply consider a complex theme or problem. Beyond having difficulty doing so, they resist changing the familiar pace at which they move and experience.

Two pedagogical practices presented in this paper facilitate the shift in pace, deceleration. Dialogue and problem-posing are processes that necessarily slow one down. Learners taking the time to write experiences and ideas that they subsequently read aloud and listening and responding to the ideas of their co-learners are practices encouraging organization of thought and participation.

The approach and practices presented in this paper are not uniformly welcomed by learners (Shor & Freire, 1987; Shor, 1992). Passivity in learners has been fostered in the education industry for a long time. A receptive and compliant or at least information gathering and organizing approach to learning is familiar to students. Some learners resist practices that require engagement, listening to classmates, developing a reasoned critique of knowledge and of external experts, and identifying meaningful action. To use a metaphor of waking and sleeping, developing critical consciousness involves waking up in fundamental ways. Remaining asleep is comfortable. The work of waking up and becoming actively engaged in one's life and learning in meaningful ways is in no small way, work.

Faculty who are deeply committed to developing critical consciousness do not receive completely positive course evaluations. We are described by students as demanding and confusing as often as challenging and committed. It is common for learners to expect that faculty explain things, demonstrate relevance, make persuasive arguments, provide solutions to problems, and present complex ideas in a simple way. Their expectations are shaped by years of experience. Faculty who uncover and expose complexity, question knowledge, examine perspectives, connect course material to problems and questions in other fields, wrestle with teacher-learner power relations, and participate as co-learners catalyze engagement in some learners and resistance in others. Some students resist during the course and will later say that they learned a great deal, perhaps even, that they are changed; but the day-to-day work of developing critical consciousness is not easy going.

Another perspective on learner resistance is that it is well founded when faculty promote a particular agenda rather than lay a foundation for critique and critical engagement. Learners need the freedom to work with ideas without a requirement that they align with an instructor's ideological point of view. An instructor clearly advocating a critical process of teaching and learning will experience less resistance from students than a faculty perceived to be pushing a particular point of view.

Educators engaging in critical pedagogical practice must be clear about their intent and their practices. Developing critical consciousness is challenging work and life in our society mitigates against it. Dialogue and problem-posing are practices that aid deceleration and engagement.

Considering teaching as an arena of praxis and resistance

A critical perspective requires action or it is armchair revolution (Schipani, 1988). In addition to research (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992a, 1992b; Tierney, 1989; Weiler, 1988), text-writing (Boje & Dennehy, 1993; Frost, Mitchell, & Nord, 1992; Shorris, 1984), and engagement in social change efforts, faculty have teaching as an arena for praxis and resistance.

We link critical consciousness with praxis in order to bring about social transformation. This necessitates a learning process and a teaching practice that values application and praxis. Voicing one's experience and developing a reasoned critique places one in relation to a dominant ideology. Identifying possible individual and collective actions that express a critical position is creative and provocative. Thoughtful critique combined with acts of individual and collective resistance increase one's experience of power and agency in the world.

As an educator, praxis enables me to reflect on my roles and actions as a participant/member of a department, a university and a society. The iterative processes of consciousness, practice, and reflective practice form a cycle that is well applied to teaching. I become conscious of the influences in my environment and aware of my actions in the classroom as well as outside of it. Practice is iterative as I assess my level of teaching skill, identify skills and approaches that will increase my effectiveness, and as I acquire and practice these skills. Practice without consciousness reinforces the status quo (even if the lecture content is radical). Students learn from behavior more deeply than words. Without a critical and liberatory teaching practice, we are not liberatory educators.

Applied to teaching, reflective practice involves teaching, evaluating and reflecting on the results of my teaching practice, and engaging again in practice. The classic work on reflective practice in our field is Schon's (1983) volume, *The reflective practitioner*. Reflective practice is a life-long activity and establishes a foundation for individual learning and constructive change.

In addition to praxis, teaching critically in management and organization studies is an act of resistance. One might well resist many things. For me, teaching is a way to resist domestication. It is a vocation of liberation; one of being awake, critically conscious, and facilitating the awakening of others in a society in which unconsciousness and compliance is reinforced at every turn. I am not neutral as an educator. My goal is developing critical consciousness and participating in social transformation. My work is explicit and subversive at the same time. It is explicitly addressed with learners and colleagues, and yet, it is subversive work in management and organization studies.

Management and organization faculty resist critical pedagogy for different reasons. Some experience it to perpetrate an inappropriate, political agenda or to be anti-business. Others find that it challenges their familiar role as an expert or that it gives away too much of an instructor's power. The challenge to demonstrate learning outcomes and learner satisfaction with a critical approach is intensified by the deviation from traditional pedagogical approaches. I meet the challenge directly and indirectly by diligently assessing learning with students, sharing this evolving process openly, and engaging faculty development as a learner about teaching-learning processes and a faculty committed to developing excellence.

Because developing critical consciousness is not a shared goal in our department, I have established a group of faculty that dialogue about teaching-learning concerns and experiences. In this group I have shared triumphs and defeats as I engage in a reflective, critical teaching practice. I also seek connections with faculty in other places who wrestle with these issues. Colleagues in other universities report varying levels of difficulty at their institutions regarding critical teaching. It is unclear how much space there is for resistance within our departments and colleges. Faculty, who themselves resist and work at creating space in which students can think and act critically are radicals in management and organization studies. Teaching critically is subversive among traditional management faculty as well as business employers and corporate clients of our academic programs.

There is a curious relationship between business and industry and academic programs in business and management. Very quietly we have acquiesced to business critiques of education. Faculty and deans in management and organization programs survey business leaders for their assessment of what graduates (the potential employees) need to know and these data lead to revised curricula. Some of our institutions have corporate clients and we are designing and delivering educational programs specifically tailored to corporate interests. At the same time, faculty find ourselves uncertain about the essential nature and relevance of the knowledge we learned in school and are moving quickly to keep ourselves on the cutting edge of knowledge in our disciplines. The stakeholder voice of business regarding goals for education is clear. Employees capable of innovative and creative thought that are compliant and responsive to authority are highly valued. Teaching for liberation in management and organization studies is subversive, and some might say, ill advised.

As an individual act of resistance, teaching critically requires a unequivocal commitment to consciousness. I must live as awake as possible in order to practice awake. This is no small task in a society oriented toward shopping, escape and vicarious experience. It involves continually questioning and deconstructing social devices that fuel unconsciousness. Years ago, my personal process began with seeking out independent news sources. Frequently now, I find myself moving around and into complex social and organizational issues - seeking to identify leverage points for individual and collective change efforts. Resisting domestication and enacting liberation are becoming a way of life that is expressed increasingly in my teaching practices. My friends and allies, supporting acts of individual resistance, are cherished comrades.

Many of us, radicalized by our personal histories, are now safely nestled in places from which we make our critique of business and organization. Recently tenured, I wonder if job security will result in increased social and political engagement on my part. I know the arguments for tenure and am relieved to have it, and yet, academic freedom seems paradoxically related to socialization and alignment with an institution. We are tenured into a system with which we need to be in critical relationship. I find the witness of Freire's life inescapable: his life of praxis has had great personal and professional consequences. A commitment to praxis and resistance involves working courageously for liberation and critical consciousness as a community member in the university and as a consultant in other settings to which I have access.

There are also acts of collective resistance in teaching. We can resist domestication in our programs and course designs. We must wrestle with the influence of business on our curricula. We can work to develop (prospective) employees and managers possessing personal voice, critical consciousness, and competences of dialogue, conflict management, collaboration, organizing, numeracy, technological literacy, and entrepreneurship. While colleagues may argue with me about the competences they consider to be essential and the list of competences would change, critically conscious people with competences for individual and collective action in business and organization are needed in US

society. Our academic programs are stronger if we intentionally design learning experiences that develop these competences.

This paper presents an introduction to critical pedagogy as well as a description of my path as a critical educator. Being a critical educator involves weaving a radical content with liberating teaching practices. It means practicing approaches in the classroom that underscore the emancipation to which we are committed. Teaching critically in management and organization studies is an act of praxis and resistance.

References

- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1992a). On the idea of emancipation in management and organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 17 (3), 432-464.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (1992b). *Critical management studies*. London: Sage.
- Arnove, R. F. (1986). *Education and revolution in Nicaragua*. New York: Praeger.
- Boje, D. M., & Dennehy, R. F. (1993). *Managing in the postmodern world: America's revolution against exploitation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Borrego, S. E. (1995). *Exploring heterocentric oppression*. Unpublished paper. Claremont Graduate School.
- Darder, A. (1991). *Culture and power in the classroom*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Davis, A. Y. (February, 1996). *Reaping fruit and throwing seed: Women of color and community-building practices*. Paper presented for the 1995-1996 Hewlett Pluralism and Unity Speakers Series, The Claremont Colleges.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Education: domestication or liberation?* *Prospects*, 2, 173-181.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. trans. by D. Macedo. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Frost, P. J., Mitchell, V., & Nord, W. R. (Eds.). (1992). *Organizational reality (4e)*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1994). *Disturbing pleasures: Learning popular culture*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (1994). *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from prison notebooks*. (Q. Hoare, Ed. & trans.). New York: International Publishers.

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

Luke, C. (1992). Feminist politics in radical pedagogy. In Luke, C., & Gore, J. (Eds.). *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*, pp. 25-53. New York: Routledge.

Mayo, P. (1993). When does it work? Freire's pedagogy in context. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 25 (1), 11-30.

McLaren, P. (1993). *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture: Oppositional politics in a postmodern era*. London: Routledge.

McLaren, P. L., & Lankshear, C. (Eds.). (1994). *Politics of liberation: Paths from Freire*. London: Routledge.

Misgeld, D. (1987). Education and cultural invasion: Critical social theory, education as instruction, and the pedagogy of the oppressed. In J. Forester, (Ed.), *Critical theory and public life*, pp. 77-118. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Mumby, D. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology and domination*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Schipani, D. F. (1988). *Religious education encounters liberation theology*. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Schroyer, T. (1973). *Critique of domination*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Shor, I. & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation - Dialogues on transforming education*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.

Shor, I. (1989). Developing student autonomy in the classroom. *Equity and Excellence*, 23(3), 35-37.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Shorris, E (1984). *Scenes from corporate life: The politics of middle management*. New York: Penguin Books.

Tierney, W. G. (1989). *Advancing democracy: A critical interpretation of leadership*. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 66 (3), 157-175.

Weiler, K. (1988). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Weiler, K. (1994). *Freire and a feminist pedagogy of difference*. In P. L. McLaren, P. L. & C. Lankshear, (Eds.), *Politics of liberation: Paths from Freire*, pp. 12-40. London: Routledge.