InSight
A Journal of Scholarly Teaching

Volume 20 Article 3

Complementing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning with Engaged Pedagogy and Community Cultural Wealth

Rolf Straubhaar, PhD
Texas State University

Follow this and additional works at https://insightjournal.net/

Recommended Citation
Straubhaar, R. (2024). Complementing the scholarship of teaching and learning with engaged pedagogy and community cultural wealth. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, *20*, Article 3. doi: 10.46504/20202403st

Complementing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning with Engaged Pedagogy and Community Cultural Wealth

Rolf Straubhaar, PhD
Associate Professor of Educational and Community Leadership
Texas State University

Abstract. For Students of Color in the United States, to attend university is to live and work within a social reality that reproduces a hegemonic social order. Professors can and should assist students in recognizing the dominant social standpoint embodied in much of university instruction, while also recognizing the equal validity of their own and their students' socially situated standpoints. Building upon the scholarship of teaching and learning, I here present two pedagogical frameworks that have been constructed to recognize particular standpoints and work from them towards justice: bell hooks' engaged pedagogy and Yosso and Solórzano's community cultural wealth model. I also present practical applications of both, drawing on my own university teaching experience.

As various scholars have shown through empirical studies (Solórzano & Villalpando, 1998; Sue, 2010a, 2010b), tertiary schooling reproduces a hegemonic social order for college Students of Color[1] (hooks, 1990; Malagón et al., 2009), especially for female (Delgado Bernal, 1998, 2001, 2002; Perez Huber, 2009; Yosso, 2006a) and LGBT (Covarrubias & Revilla, 2003) Students of Color. Specifically, in university settings where normality is racially coded as white, Students of Color are regularly victims of micro-aggressions (Solórzano, 1998; Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue, 2010a, 2010b; Yosso et al., 2009), defined as subtle insults (both spoken and unspoken) directed towards them on the basis of their race, gender or sexuality, often without purposefully malicious intent. These microaggressions, coupled with an environment that might not recognize the value of the bicultural background[2] and navigational abilities[3] of Students of Color (Delgado Bernal, 2001), result in what scholars have theorized as "racial battle fatigue" (Smith et al., 2007), or the sense of constantly feeling questioned with regards to one's qualifications and abilities simply due to one's race.

As different disciplines use the term hegemony differently, when I speak of the hegemonic social order experienced by Students of Color in university settings, I define a hegemonic social order as one in which certain social groups hold power or status over others through indirect, implied means. In Bourdieuian terms, this results in a situation in which the dominant group—that which controls the economic, social and political resources—has its culture embodied in schools (Bourdieu, 1973, p. 80; 1974, p. 39).

One model that has been popularized as a means to make university learning more grounded and meaningful for all students is the broader scholarship on teaching and learning (SoTL). In order for university classroom settings to be just and fair in the opportunities for learning they provide students, the model of systematic inquiry into student learning explored in SoTL (Felten, 2013; Matthews, 2017) can be a useful framework for countering the systemic inequities and hegemonic order I have highlighted in the introduction to this article. Some scholars have begun to articulate more particularly how SoTL work can be engaged from an explicitly social justice-oriented perspective (Leibowitz & Bozalek, 2016). However, there is much work yet to be done in connecting SoTL to the broader literature documenting and exploring hegemonic structural inequalities in higher education—inequalities that if not recognized and addressed are likely to mitigate the effectiveness of implementing SoTL in the university classroom. To counter

[1] For the purpose of this article, Students of Color are defined as undergraduate and graduate students of African American, Latina/o, Chicana/o, Asian American and Native American descent. Chicana/o students are defined as students of Mexican origin living in the United States, while Latina/o students are persons of Latin American origin living in the United States. It should be noted that these last two terms, Chicana/o and Latina/o, may overlap; however, they are both included due to their separate use by Students of Color who primarily self-identify as one or the other but not both.

[2] In her work with Chicana college students, Delgado Bernal (2001) demonstrates how students use their biculturalism, or their ability to understand and navigate both the dominant culture embodied in university settings and the Chicana/o culture of their homes and communities, as a source of strength when academic settings seem hostile or difficult.

[3] In her study of bilingual immigrant children and the language-brokering they perform for family members, Orellana (2009) shows how the practice immigrant children gain in dealing with banking, legal and medical institutions on behalf of their parents from a young age grants them navigational skills that help them to handle unfamiliar educational situations in ways other children cannot.

this, I here argue that one path forward is through an understanding and incorporation into SoTL of standpoint theory (Harding, 1999), and on the theoretical foundation of standpoint theory, the instructional incorporation of engaged pedagogy (hooks, 1994, 2010) and community cultural wealth (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005). These were frameworks to which I was first introduced in my doctoral coursework at UCLA, both through theoretical study and through the exemplary practical application of my professors, in particular several of the authors of these frameworks themselves (Danny Solórzano and Sandra Harding, both truly masterful classroom pedagogues). I have since had the opportunity myself to implement these frameworks in my own university classroom teaching at several research universities in the United States, including my current institution.

Drawing on my own experiences with these frameworks as both a student and instructor in university classrooms, this article contributes to the existing SoTL literature through its illustration of concrete ways that these critical theoretical models can enrich and contribute to SoTL as a body of pedagogical practice in higher education. The primary purpose of this article is to introduce a larger SoTL audience to engaged pedagogy (hooks, 1994, 2010) and community cultural wealth (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005) and to provide practical and concrete suggestions for how to introduce these frameworks in the university classroom. This might be of particular interest to SoTL educators that are struggling to engage Students of Color in their classrooms and have not yet delved into these liberatory pedagogical frameworks.

Teaching Under the Hegemonic Social Order

First, it must be recognized that university education as it currently stands is reproductive and political in nature (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; hooks, 1990, 1994; Solórzano, 1989); that is, education can reproduce a social system in which those demographics that already hold preferred social status maintain that status. As Aronowitz (2008) states, "the structure of schooling already embodies the class system of society" (p. 18). Some students from lower classes are able to nonetheless achieve by virtue of personal merit, but some argue that these students are "selected" by the university system to allow the myth of meritocracy[4] to continue (Aronowitz, 2008, p. 45; see also Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977).

This tokenist[5] form of meritocracy encourages low-income students to accept the ideal of meritocracy as a social reality, and thus reduces their incentive to challenge the university system as a whole. This feeds into what Antonio Gramsci (1971) refers to as hegemony—that is, those who are oppressed by capitalist society allow oppression to continue because of their consent to and acceptance of the system as it currently functions. As universities have the potential to embody many of the meritocratic myths[6] which ground American social norms, they "are primary sites for achieving mass consent for social rule" (Aronowitz, 2008, p. 155). Professors may unknowingly reinforce the acceptance of oppression by low-income university students by reinforcing a "culture of domination" in their own classroom management and performance (hooks, 1994, p. 27). As domination becomes ubiquitous in their lives, including their lives in university situations, it becomes easy for marginalized students to accept that "domination is 'natural,' that it is right for the strong to rule over the weak, the powerful over the powerless" (hooks, 1994, p. 28).

In response, a fatalistic attitude[7] would be quite understandable, as rejection of or resistance against such structurally ingrained inequality might seem pointless. However, several theories point to how transformative resistance to such structures is not only possible, but a uniquely humanizing response to such a situation, particularly when embodied by professors in instructional settings. These theories provide powerful alternatives to simple acceptance of reproductive and hegemonic university structures as they currently exist, and they will be outlined below.

---

[4] Drawing on the work of Bowles and Gintis, I define the "myth of meritocracy" as the discursive notion that any student in the U.S. is given sufficient opportunities to succeed, no matter their circumstances (see, for reference, Bowles et al., 2009).

[5] When I use the term tokenist, I define tokenism as the perfunctory or symbolic recognition of the academic success of a select few Students of Color (see Niemann, 1999).

[6] Again, the primary "meritocratic myth" referred to here is that all students have equal opportunities, whatever their individual circumstances (see Liu, 2011).

[7] I define a "fatalistic" attitude as one that believes that individuals are powerless to change future events, making resistance to social inequalities fruitless (for further exploration of this, read Power & Frandji, 2010).

First, it is important to recognize that this dominant paradigm within the university system, which is reproductive and hegemonic, is socially situated[8]. This is one of the key tenets of standpoint theory, which asserts that "knowledge is always socially situated" (Harding, 1999, p. 7), and as such is a social construction. Traditionally produced scientific knowledge does not own this socially constructed nature, as its proponents hold that "good research methods are supposed to be culture free, value free" (Harding & Norberg, 2005, p. 2010). Traditionally produced knowledge in this sense does the "god trick," "speaking authoritatively about everything in the world from no particular location or human perspective at all" (Harding, 1999, p. 4). Standpoint theory counters this position by seeking to answer the questions posed by oppressed or marginalized groups from the subject position of those oppressed or marginalized groups (of course, such research always needs to be situated in the particular identity of the researcher, on the basis of race, social class, gender and sexuality, as no subaltern[9] voice can speak for *all* members of any of the various communities to which they pertain).

Standpoint epistemology, which arose in the second half of the 20th century as an academic project closely aligned with political feminism, in addition to accepting and celebrating its inherently personal status (that is, all research being intrinsically entwined with a researcher's personal subject position [Pillow, 2005]), also accepts and celebrates its "politicity" (Demo, 2009, p. 182), which is defined as an inherently political nature. This makes standpoint theory somewhat controversial, as "according to the conventional view…politics can only obstruct and damage the production of scientific knowledge" (Harding, 1999, p. 1). Standpoint theory rejects this dichotomization of politics and the production of scientific or academic knowledge, asserting instead that "there is philosophical grounding in feminism [and feminist politics] from which [one] can explore methodology" and academic research in exciting new directions which ostensibly "neutral" theoretical frameworks leave unexplored (Fonow & Cook, 2005, p. 2215). As hooks (1994) states, "no education is politically neutral" (p. 37). Thus, tertiary educators can embrace the politicity of their own position. Again, as stated eloquently by hooks (1994) in describing her own role in the university classroom, "our lives must be a living example of our politics" (p. 48).

This opportunity to embrace politicity exists at both an individual and collective level. Indeed, one of the primary purposes of standpoint theory is to promote the creation and support of collective organizing and the promotion of "oppositional consciousnesses and shared consciousnesses in oppressed groups;" that is, the end goal is to help oppressed or marginalized groups become "'subjects' of research rather than only…objects of others' observation, naming, and management" (Harding, 1999, p. 3). Rather than academic research being something that is done *to* oppressed groups or *about* oppressed groups, a situation in which oppressed groups are passive objects, academic research conducted at the tertiary level can be something in which oppressed or marginalized groups work as active "subjects of knowledge" (Harding, 1999, p. 4), conducting their own research with their own voices, speaking instead of being spoken for. Professors who teach students from subaltern groups can do a great deal towards changing such students' acceptance of hegemonic norms by creating courses and assignments which require the production of such research, even at the undergraduate level.

… academic research conducted at the tertiary level can be something in which oppressed or marginalized groups work as active "subjects of knowledge" (Harding, 1999, p. 4), conducting their own research with their own voices, speaking instead of being spoken for. Professors who teach students from subaltern groups can do a great deal towards changing such students' acceptance of hegemonic norms by creating courses and assignments which require the production of such research, even at the undergraduate level.

Even when professors come from more privileged or socially dominant standpoints, recognizing and acknowledging those standpoints in the classroom can lead to richer and more open and welcoming classrooms. I myself represent multiple intersections of privilege as a cisgender heterosexual white man with a doctoral-level

[8] By "socially situated," I mean that to imply that all paradigms are social products with inherent positionalities and biases, based in lived experience. For further exploration of this, please consult the work of Sandra Harding discussed in this article at length.

[9] Originally defined and operationalized by seminal critical theorist Antonio Gramsci, subaltern is a term used in postcolonial studies to refer to individuals that are separate from or outside of the hegemonic power structure. For further reference, consult Gramsci (1971) and Spivak (2023).

university education and a tenured university position. When I recognize that in the classroom, and especially when on the basis of that recognition I own when there is something I do not understand and that I can only speak from my own experience, I have seen my students also recognize their own standpoints and a greater variety of positions is heard—including (and especially) those whose standpoints are not the same as mine.

Standpoint theory asserts that the overt assumption of a particularly socially situated and political standpoint produces "the very best research," as good research "does and should 'speak' from particular, historically specific, social locations" (Harding, 1999, p. 4). I here argue that this maxim also applies to teaching—that overt assumption of one's particularly socially situated and political standpoint leads to better, richer teaching. This specificity is necessary to avoid unwarranted essentializing within demographics, a criticism to which feminist scholars have been particularly sensitive due to popular assertions that feminism and feminist work attempts to speak for all women (McCall, 2005, p. 1771). As a result, while it is important for female voices in the academy to assert the importance of their gender (due to the marginalized status of women), it is likewise important for individual female voices to maintain that which is specific and individual in their experience, so as to avoid unwarranted essentialization of the experience of women (Weldon, 2006, pp. 237-238). Especially as many Scholars of Color experience marginality on multiple intersecting levels (such as class, race, gender and sexuality), and "none of these lines of oppression...can be understood without reference to the others" (García Bedolla, 2007, p. 235), the inclusion of all of the elements of one's personal story is essential to making full meaning of one's individual experience.

This recognition of individual subaltern standpoints is imperative; if the dominant voices in educational research (or within a subfield like SoTL) predominantly represent one socially situated and political standpoint (albeit one that denies its own socially situated and political nature), then there are various similarly socially situated and political alternatives which are just as valid, and indeed potentially more valid as they strengthen their claims by owning that situated and political standpoint. It is crucial to recognize the validity of one's own experience, especially if that experience arises from a subaltern position. Given the authority and power that they hold within the classroom, professors' recognition of the experience of their subaltern students as valid is a powerful first step towards their own recognition of their experiences as such. Subaltern students with such recognition can produce powerful research. As hooks (1994) states, "personal experience…is such fertile ground for the production of liberatory feminist theory because it usually forms the base of our theory making" (p. 70).

Such recognition of the validity of subaltern experience is not only of personal importance in leading individual SoTL educators and researchers to a more critical awareness of their socially situated standpoint, but it also has the power to "lead to social transformation" (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001, p. 310), in the university and beyond. Having grounded this discussion in the theoretical basis of standpoint theory, the rest of this work will explore two particular responses to current hegemonic practices that build upon standpoint theory in tertiary educational settings: bell hooks' (1994, 2010) model of engaged pedagogy, and Yosso and Solórzano's (2005) construct of community cultural wealth.

Engaged Pedagogy in the Classroom

Engaged pedagogy (hooks, 1994, 2010) is a model for instructional practice that is strongly informed by Freirean (Freire, 1970) pedagogy. In both systems there is a strong rejection of the status quo in education, or what is referred to as the "banking approach to pedagogy," in which "teachers, working within the limits imposed by their academic discipline and training, open students' heads to the treasures of civilized knowledge" (Aronowitz, 2008, pp. 162-163). In this model, there is a clear power differential between students and professors, with professors representing complete knowledge, and students representing empty vessels that must be filled with the facts the professor desires to pass on.

Building from Freire's (1970) notion of horizontal, dialogic relationships between professors and students, hooks (2010) asserts that "engaged pedagogy begins with the assumption that we learn best when there is an interactive relationship between student and teacher" (p. 19). Rather than reinforcing a vertical line of authority from professor to student, such a model promotes a horizontal classroom structure in which both professors and students are seen as active and full participants, with the professor "[approaching] students with the will and desire to respond to [them as] unique beings" (hooks, 1994, p. 13).

The purpose of engaged pedagogy is two-fold: the creation of a welcoming classroom community in which all participants feel free to contribute and reach a fuller degree of personal critical consciousness, and the pursuit of

widescale social transformation. The first purpose is a prerequisite to the second, as the creation of a welcoming and supportive community at the university level makes such a community seem more possible at the societal level.

First, engaged pedagogy seeks to involve all students, and in so doing, create a welcoming and supportive classroom community. As hooks (1994) states, "making the classroom a democratic setting where everyone feels a responsibility to contribute is a central goal of transformative [or engaged] pedagogy" (p. 39). This setting may seem distressing in theory to some educators, as in their experience many marginalized students do not participate heavily in university classrooms, and such a push for participation might make them feel less safe and marginalize them even further. However, hooks (1994) states that in her experience and the experience of many other professors who practice engaged pedagogy, "many students, especially Students of Color, may not feel at all 'safe' in what appears to be a neutral setting…it is the absence of a feeling of safety that often promotes prolonged silence or lack of student engagement" (p. 39).

In an engaged pedagogy classroom, once a classroom atmosphere has been established that welcomes and invites full democratic participation while also recognizing and accepting all students as fully human and unique beings, the next step is to advocate for students to recognize the injustices and oppressive realities of their own experience. Drawing from Freire's (1970) notion of naming "the world and the world," hooks (1994) insists that it is crucial for marginalized students to learn to "name our pain" and "theorize from that location" (p. 74). As it stands, those in power name the reality of everyone else. In other words, the rhetoric by which one shapes one's reality is often unduly influenced by outside voices. As hooks (1994) states, "the privileged act of naming often affords those in power access to modes of communication and enables them to project an interpretation, a definition, a description of their work and actions, that may not be accurate, that may obscure what is really taking place" (p. 62). Though it is not easy to "name" that pain, doing so grants "a particular knowledge that comes from suffering" (hooks, 1994, p. 91) and gives students the power to work towards social change. Again, as hooks (1994) states, "in [theory's] production lies the hope of our liberation, in its production lies the possibility of naming all our pain—of making all our hurt go away" (p. 75). This process leads students to become subjects rather than objects, to realize their own power to change reality. hooks (1994) calls this state "self-actualization," the point when one begins to be able to name his or her experience and the institutions (including universities) that perpetuate oppression, and as a result reaches the "historical moment when one begins to think critically about the self and identity in relation to one's political circumstance" (p. 47).

At this point, students begin to see social transformation as not only an appealing dream, but a potential reality. Self-actualization is a process of both personal and communal wrestling with recognition of social structural inequality that leads to critical consciousness, or an increased critical awareness of both the inequalities in the world and the potential for marginalized actors to change those inequalities. Through this process, one gains an increased sense of self-efficacy that makes social change seem not only possible, but plausible. The form of social change that this allows is liberation—liberation of both students and professors from the hegemonic social thinking that has been bequeathed without question (Freire, 1970). As Aronowitz (2008) states, "the true vocation of humanization is to liberate humanity, including the oppressors and those, like teachers, who are frequently recruited from among the elite classes to work with the oppressed, but who unwittingly perpetuate domination through teaching" (p. 167). Engaged pedagogy makes that liberation possible, at both the personal and university level.

Community Cultural Wealth

Another theoretical model which provides an alternative to the dominant hegemonic form of social thinking perpetuated by universities is Yosso and Solórzano's (2005) construct of community cultural wealth. This is a model that recognizes the contributions of Students of Color that often are ignored by the formal university system, as well as the latent abilities and strengths which Students of Color draw specifically from their racial communities and which provide them with unique forms of cultural capital to which other communities do not have access. As defined by Yosso and Solórzano (2005), "community cultural wealth is an array of cultural knowledge, skills, abilities, and contacts possessed by socially marginalized groups that often go unrecognized" (p. 129).

Yosso and Solórzano (2005) identify a number of specific dimensions within community cultural wealth that delineate specific forms of capital to which Communities of Color have access: namely, aspirational capital, or a particularly powerful motivation to continue to work towards one's educational and occupational dreams despite structural impediments; familial capital, or the strength and support Students of Color drawn from their family members; social capital, or the networks of Students of Color within schools that students lean on for academic support; navigational capital, or the learned ability of how to survive and function within social institutions such as universities;

resistant capital, or transformative oppositional behaviors such as protest that Communities of Color have learned as a result of social struggle; and linguistic capital, or the particular language style and content available to various Communities of Color (see Yosso & Solórzano, 2005, p. 129). All of these various constructs within community cultural wealth represent forms of cultural capital that are both unique to Communities of Color and largely unrecognized by universities in which hegemonic social norms are dominant.

This model is based in the theoretical framework of critical race theory, in which the continued structural and institutional nature of racism takes particular prominence. As Yosso and Solórzano (2005) state, "racism is about institutional power and People of Color in the United States have never possessed this form of power" (p. 118). In response to the structural and institutional nature of racism, critical race theory "recognizes that the experiential knowledge of People of Color is legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing, and teaching about racial subordination" (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005, p. 123).

Community cultural wealth recognizes the positive cultural elements which Communities of Color bring to their university experience, rather than simply viewing them with a deficit lens that shows how they lack "proper" cultural capital (see Yosso & Solórzano, 2005, pp. 128-129). Solórzano and Yosso's (2005) construct of community cultural wealth identifies the powerful and valuable portions of students' cultural heritage left unrecognized by the formal university system. This notion of community cultural wealth, and the various constructs into which these authors divide it (e.g., navigational capital, aspirational capital, and so forth) provide a compelling and powerful starting point for social research that re-codes disenfranchised Communities of Color as self-efficacious agents, capable of transformative resistance. Such a theoretical model has the potential to reframe the way in which the academic difficulties faced by Students of Color are discussed within academic research, and thus promote a more egalitarian society for Communities of Color.

…the purpose of engaged pedagogy is to create a welcoming class community in which all students feel free to contribute and learn, while pursuing large-scale social transformation…. always preface your preparation of a lesson with the thought exercise, "How will this lesson push my students to engage with the social realities around them?"

Next Steps: Practical Recommendations Using Engaged Pedagogy and Community Cultural Wealth

Since the adoption of pedagogical alternatives within SoTL which celebrate and build on the inherent cultural strengths within student Communities of Color is central to the goal of this article, specific recommendations on how each of the two aforementioned pedagogies can be implemented will now be addressed. These recommendations are not abstract, but rather derived from my own classroom experiences when implementing these frameworks, and whenever possible my own pedagogical experiences will be cited.

Engaged Pedagogy. The purpose of engaged pedagogy is to create a welcoming class community in which all students feel free to contribute and learn, while pursuing large-scale social transformation. While the following recommendations are good ways to begin that journey, always preface your preparation of a lesson with the thought exercise, "How will this lesson push my students to engage with the social realities around them?" What follows is a list of practical ways to begin incorporating engaged pedagogy into your university classroom:

- Situate your classroom so that all participants are equally able to participate in discussion, with no undue focus on the instructor (e.g., a circle of desks rather than traditional rows facing a podium). This is my default classroom setup. In my experience, when seated in a circle of chairs without desks or tables, fewer people have a device open, people look at each other more often, and all participants actively listen to one another. Without the physical separation of tables and the distractions of screens, the conversation that follows is more present, real, and substantive.
- Get to know your students personally, making sure you know all students by name and at least one or two things about their personal lives or academic interests (if your class size is too large to make this plausible, consider the use of discussion sections with TAs that could get to know students more personally). I currently teach in programs that have capped enrollment at 25 students and have the luxury to spend most of the first day of instruction getting to know each of those students. I also spend the first 30 minutes of each subsequent class period as a "check-in," with each participant (including myself) sharing about what they have done this week, how they are feeling, and what is concerning them. Over the course of a semester, as each of us get to know each other better through this exercise, we build both

relationships with each other and a sense of community within that classroom. This not only has social benefits, but it leads to richer, more meaningful discussions of the course material.

- Organize lessons around guiding questions for discussion, rather than previously established conclusions you hope students will reach (e.g., instead of basing a lesson around teaching students about inequities in academic opportunities in Communities of Color, instead invite several Students of Color to lead a discussion about their own academic experiences and how they differed from those of their colleagues). In my own experience, I primarily teach seminars in which class time is spent discussing assigned readings. When reviewing the readings for a given class, the notes I make in preparing my instruction are primarily a list of questions. Some of these questions are intended to follow the shared reading of a key passage, some are more general about the themes of the week, and some (as just mentioned) focus on how the readings connect to students' lived experiences. Once I have created a list of 5-6 questions which are open-ended and generative enough to likely merit a half-hour of discussion each, I pick one to start class with, and then use the rest of the list as needed, depending on the natural flow of the discussion.
- Do not allow yourself to give up on dialogue as an instructional method if it does not always go well. University students have had years of practice in the "banking method" of education (Freire, 1970), and do not always expect to be pushed to think through tough questions and have their personal opinions valorized. Basing lessons around questions rather than destinations can mean that not all lessons end on a solid "concluding" point, and this may seem frustrating. Remember that the process of engaged pedagogy is just as important as the final destination: a higher state of critical consciousness. Especially when teaching a group of students who are new to our program, or whom I have not taught before, the first few weeks have some awkward pauses and silences when I ask an open-ended question. In my own field, I primarily teach future teachers and school administrators, and unfortunately degree programs in education in the United States have recently been trending more towards online, asynchronous instruction where students are expected to complete modules with prepackaged answers, while discussion-oriented seminars are becoming more and more rare (Dyment & Downing, 2020). As a result, students typically require a period of transition to become comfortable in a discussion-oriented format. Once they adjust, the discussions are incredible—it is worth persevering through those early awkward pauses.

Community Cultural Wealth. In education classrooms, given the predominance of educational literature that views Communities of Color in a deficit framework, choosing readings from the educational literature that theorizes Communities of Color as having inherent cultural strengths would be recommended (see the reference list of this article for an introductory collection). Such research would recognize the structural manner in which Communities of Color are disenfranchised for lacking the cultural framework prized by universities.

In addition—especially in classrooms in which students are predominantly Students of Color—consider orienting entire class periods (or, if time constraints are an issue, shorter time blocks within class periods, as time permits) around activities that highlight the various forms of community cultural wealth held by your students. The following examples are a starting point, drawn from my own experiences trying to incorporate this framework into my instruction. Please feel free to build upon these as appropriate or needed:

- *Aspirational capital*: Have students discuss in small groups their reasons for attending college, as well as the difficulties they've encountered in doing so. Then have students write a short essay answering the question, "What keeps you motivated to stay in school despite the difficulties you face in doing so?"
- *Familial capital*: Direct a dialogue in which students talk about their families and the ways in which their families strengthen and support them, both in a general sense (in their everyday lives) and specifically with regards to their academic goals. Have students write a short essay answering the question, "How does your family make you stronger?"
- *Social capital*: Direct a dialogue in which students talk about the people that they lean on for support in school (e.g., friends, mentors, coaches, etc.). Ask students about the things these people help them to do, and the things they don't think they could do without that support. Ask students to write a short essay about the people and groups that support them in their schooling.

- *Navigational capital*: Begin a dialogue with the question, "What did you have to do to pass high school?" Probe for answers beyond "get good grades" and "pass tests," and make as exhaustive a list as possible on the board of responses. Identify that students' knowledge of these expectations reveals their navigational capital. Stimulate a continuing dialogue on the following question, "How does your navigational capital help you as a college student?"
- *Resistant capital*: Ask students to share experiences about times they have resisted forms of authority that felt unjust (examples can include anything from participation in protests or marches to talking back to authoritative school figures or resisting arrest when being stopped by police). Ask students about the different ways students can resist authority, probing the perceived efficacy of each example given.
- *Linguistic capital*: Make a list on the board of all of the different languages spoken by people in the room. Once that is finished, ask students about the ways in which they speak differently in different situations—add these different situational vocabularies to the list of languages ("school-speak," "mechanic shop-talk," etc.). Ask students what they feel these different linguistic abilities add to their personal lives and academic work.

Conclusion

In conclusion, all education and educational research, including SoTL, takes place in a political and socially situated framework. By recognizing and consciously teaching from one's own socially situated and political standpoint and encouraging one's students to do likewise, as exemplified by bell hooks (1994, 2010) and Yosso and Solórzano (2005), professors and researchers working within SoTL can work try to promote a more democratic and socially just reality. Engaged pedagogy (hooks, 1994, 2010) and community cultural wealth (Yosso and Solórzano, 2005) are two pedagogical and theoretical frameworks through which social justice can be pursued, but they are only a beginning—and not the limit—of where such critical exploration in education can lead. In the spirit of SoTL work, practical applications of these concepts should be followed by systemic inquiry, with evidence of student learning. I acknowledge this introductory essay did not include this step, and there is more work that needs to be done in documenting the student learning that is possible when utilizing these frameworks. As I have begun to describe in this piece, I have seen the pedagogical benefits of these frameworks myself, as a student in the classrooms of the educators who developed these models and also as I have implemented them in my own classroom.

The mingling of these two frameworks, one of which has prior to this been utilized primarily as a framework for research rather than teaching, is a new and exciting area of pedagogical inquiry for SoTL. While some prominent SoTL scholars have referenced what hooks (Behari-Leak, 2020; Kreber, 2013; Maniglia, 2022) and Freire (Quist-Adade, 2007) have meant to them personally in their own scholarly identities, prior to this work there has not been a robust discussion for how they can be integrated into SoTL. The coming generations of SoTL scholars have the opportunity to build upon these models in new and innovative ways, both through research into what these models look like in the classroom and pedagogical exploration of practice. Through this work, we can continue to pursue a vision wherein the academy and the classroom are "a site of resistance" (hooks, 1994, p. 21), and by so doing continue to pursue the creation of "a world in which it will be easier to love" (Freire, 1970, p. 40).

References

Aronowitz, S. (2008). *Against schooling: For an education that matters.* Paradigm Publishers.

Behari-Leak, K. (2020). Toward a borderless, decolonized, socially just, and inclusive scholarship of teaching and learning. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 8*(1), 4-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.8.1.2

Bourdieu, P. (1973). The three forms of theoretical knowledge. *Social Science Information*, *12*(1), 53-80. https://doi.org/10.1177/053901847301200103

Bourdieu, P. (1974). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. In J. Eggleston (Ed.), *Contemporary research in the sociology of education* (pp. 32-46). Methuen.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture.* Sage.

Bowles, S., Gintis, H., & Osborne Groves, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Unequal chances: Family background and economic success.* Princeton University Press.

Covarrubias, A., & Revilla, A. (2003). Agencies of transformational resistance: Dismantling injustice at the intersection of race, class, gender, and sexuality through LatCrit praxis. *Florida Law Review*, *55*(1), 459-477. https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/flr/vol55/iss1/19

Delgado Bernal, D. (1998). Using Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, *68*(4), 555-582. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.68.4.5wv1034973g22q48

Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Learning and living pedagogies of the home: The mestiza consciousness of Chicana students. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *14*(5), 623-639. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390110059838

Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: Recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 105-126. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040200800107

Demo, P. (2009). Afterword. In C. A. Torres (Ed.), *Globalizations and education: Collected essays on class, race, gender, and the state* (pp. 178-187). Teachers College Press.

Dyment, J. E., & Downing, J. J. (2020). Online initial teacher education: A systematic review of the literature. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *48*(3), 316-333. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2019.1631254

Felten, P. (2013). Principles of good practice in SoTL. *Teaching and learning inquiry*, *1*(1), 121-125. https://cdm.ucalgary.ca/index.php/TLI/article/download/57376/43149

Fonow, M. M., & Cook, J. A. (2005). Feminist methodology: New applications in the academy and public policy. *Signs*, *30*(4), 2211-2236. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/428417

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

García Bedolla, L. (2007). Intersections of inequality: Understanding marginalization and privilege in the post-Civil-Rights era. *Politics and Gender*, *3*(2), 232-238. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X07000050

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. International Publishers.

Harding, S. (1999). Introduction: Standpoint theory as a site of political, philosophic, and scientific debate. In S. Harding (Ed), *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies* (pp. 1-15). Routledge.

Harding, S., & Norberg, K. (2005). New feminist approaches to social science methodologies: An introduction. *Signs*, *30*(4), 2009-2015. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/428420

hooks, b. (1990). Marginality as a site of resistance. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures* (pp. 341-343). MIT Press.

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

hooks, b. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom*. Routledge.

Kreber, C. (2013). The transformative potential of the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, *1*(1), 5-18. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1149728.pdf

Leibowitz, B., & Bozalek, V. (2016). The scholarship of teaching and learning from a social justice perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *21*(2), 109-122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1115971

Liu, A. (2011). Unraveling the myth of meritocracy within the context of US higher education. *Higher Education*, *62*, 383-397. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9394-7

Malagón, M., Perez Huber, L., & Velez, V. (2009). Our experiences, our methods: Using grounded theory to inform a critical race theory methodology. *Seattle Journal for Social Justice*, *8*(1), 253-272. https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sjsj/vol8/iss1/10

Maniglia, R. H. (2022). The promise and threat of engaged pedagogy: A tribute to bell hooks. *Sustainability and Climate Change*, *15*(4), 239-248. https://doi.org/10.1089/scc.2022.0059

Matthews, K. E. (2017). Five propositions for genuine students as partners practice. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, *1*(2). https://mulpress.mcmaster.ca/ijsap/article/download/3315/2895

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs*, *30*(3), 1771-1800. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426800

Niemann, Y. F. (1999). The making of a token: A case study of stereotype threat, stigma, racism, and tokenism in academe. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, *20*(1), 111-134. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3346994

Orellana, M. F. (2009). *Translating childhoods: Immigrant youth, language, and culture*. Rutgers University Press.

Perez Huber, L. (2009). Challenging racist nativist framing: Acknowledging the community cultural wealth of undocumented Chicana college students to reframe the immigration debate. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*, 704-729. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.4.r7j1xn011965w186

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(2), 175-196. https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000060635

Power, S., & Frandji, D. (2010). Education markets, the new politics of recognition and the increasing fatalism towards inequality. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*(3), 385-396. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930903576404

Quist-Adade, C. (2007). What does the scholarship of teaching and learning mean to me? *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning Journal*, *1*(1), 1-3. https://journals.psu.edu/td/article/download/589/119

Smith, W. R., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). Assume the position...you fit the description: Psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American male college students. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *51*(4), 551-578. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207307742

Solórzano, D. (1998). Critical race theory, racial and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 121-136. http://ereserve.library.utah.edu/Annual/ELP/7260/Parker/microaggressions.pdf

Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1/2), 60-73. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2696265

Solórzano, D., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, *36*(3), 308-342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085901363002

Solórzano, D., & Villalpando, O. (1998). Critical race theory, marginality, and the experience of minority students in higher education. In C. Torres & T. Mitchell (Eds.), *Emerging issues in the sociology of education: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 211-224). SUNY Press.

Spivak, G. C. (2023). Can the subaltern speak? In P. H. Cain & M. Harrison (Eds), *Imperialism* (pp. 171-219). Routledge.

Sue, D. (2010a). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Wiley.

Sue, D. (2010b). *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestations, dynamics, and impact*. Wiley.

Weldon, L. S. (2006). The structure of intersectionality: A comparative politics of gender. *Politics and Gender, 2*(2), 235-248. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X06231040

Yosso, T. (2006a). *Critical race counterstories along the Chicana/o educational pipeline*. Routledge.

Yosso, T. (2006b). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. In A. D. Dixson and C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 167-190). Routledge.

Yosso, T., Ceja, M., Smith, W., & Solórzano, D. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(4), 659-690. http://ereserve.library.utah.edu/Annual/HONOR/3425/Parker/microaggressions.pdf

Yosso, T., & Solórzano, D. (2005). Conceptualizing a critical race theory in sociology. In M. Romero & E. Margolis (Eds.), *Blackwell companion to social inequalities*. Blackwell.

Dr. Rolf Straubhaar is an Associate Professor in the Educational & Community Leadership program at Texas State University, where he primarily teaches future administrators and educator-scholars. His research is primarily focused on teacher education policy and policies related to emergent bilingual students. He is also an ethnographer and qualitative methodologist. Prior to his work in the academy, Dr. Straubhaar was an educator in public elementary schools in the US as well as in adult education settings in the US, Brazil, and Mozambique.