Chapter 4

A Humanizing Pedagogy: Reinventing the Principles and Practice of Education as a Journey Toward Liberation

MARÍA DEL CARMEN SALAZAR
University of Denver

I went to school with all of my treasures, including my Spanish language, Mexican culture, *familia* (family), and ways of knowing. I abandoned my treasures at the classroom door in exchange for English and the U.S. culture; consequently, my assimilation into U.S. society was agonizing. One of my earliest memories is of wishing away my dark skin; I wanted desperately to be White, and I abhorred being *la morena*, the dark-skinned girl. I came to associate whiteness with success and brownness with failure. I was overwhelmed with feelings of shame over the most essential elements of my humanness. As a result, my experience in the U.S. educational system was marked by endless struggles to preserve my humanity.

—María del Carmen Salazar

INTRODUCTION: THE NEED FOR HUMANIZATION IN EDUCATION

The preceding epigraph captures my experience as a hyphenated American navigating the *hybrid space* (Bhabha, 1994; Calabrese Barton, Tan, & Rivet, 2008; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejeda, 1999) between my Mexican and U.S. cultures. My educational experience was marked by a deep sense of isolation that resulted from systematic practices in the U.S. educational system that suppressed vital elements of my humanity, both at home and at school. My experience is not unique; students of color have been compelled for generations to divest themselves of their linguistic, cultural, and familial resources to succeed in U.S. public schools.

Such resources are inclusive of Yosso's (2005) conceptualization of *community cultural wealth*, or "an array of knowledge, skills, abilities and contacts possessed and utilized by Communities of Color to survive and resist macro and micro forms of oppression" (p. 77).

Deficit notions of the resources of Communities of Color have fueled intolerance, bigotry, and assimilation throughout the history of U.S. public education. In 1903, W. E. B. Du Bois published *The Souls of Black Folk* in which he asserts that educators inundate African Americans with notions of inferiority because of their racial peculiarities. Although Du Bois examines deleterious perceptions of African Americans at the turn of the 20th century, in reality, throughout U.S. history, educators have intentionally and unintentionally bombarded students of color with messages of their inferiority through a hidden curriculum (Jackson, 1990). Moreover, educators have compelled and at times coerced these students into whiteness (Sanchez, 1993; Woodson, 2006). Although scholars may describe the experience of students of color with detached and objective prose that attempts to explain the human condition of Communities of Color, narratives can be powerful tools for illuminating and challenging the inhumanity that marks the oppressed (Morrell, 2008; Parker & Lynn, 2002). I inject my narrative throughout this section to give voice to the struggles of students of color and as a means to humanize the lexicon that litters academic spaces, which is often presented through the discourse of whiteness including detached, objectified, and linear modes of expression. Furthermore, I attempt to humanize this review of research by presenting my research through my own voice—a voice that stems from a proud and powerful woman, mother, and scholar of color.

I am filled with endless stories of advertent and inadvertent messages of inferiority that compelled me to crave whiteness as a young child. In the third grade, I desperately wanted to be White. My teachers privileged whiteness through the English language and U.S. culture, and they excluded all that was native to me; hence, I ascertained that White children were smarter, more attractive, and affluent. As a result, I became a connoisseur of whiteness when I was eight years old. I observed my White classmates closely and dissected their behaviors until I discovered a common pattern; every White student in my class was in the highest reading group. Thus, I hypothesized that if I propelled myself into the top reading group, the Red Robins, the color of my skin would change and I would become White and worthy. I achieved my goal and my name was called to join the Red Robins. I ran home that day and examined my complexion in the mirror, to no avail; my skin remained the color of burnt toast. I waited anxiously for days, yet the transformation never ensued, and I became distressed that I would have to live in my dark skin forever as *la morena*, the dark-skinned girl.

In recent times, the educational goals for students of color continue to be those of cultural replacement and assimilation into mainstream values and practices. When students of color experience academic difficulties, their struggles are often attributed to their culture, language, and home environment (Cummins, 2001; Macedo &

Bartolomé, 1999; Nieto, 2002; Salazar, 2010; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Valenzuela, 1999, 2004; Wade, Fauske, & Thompson, 2008). As a result, these students are expected to "act, speak, and behave as much as possible like the White middle class" (Warikoo & Carter, 2009, p. 374). Concomitantly, they are stripped of cultural resources needed to survive and thrive in the educational system and in U.S. society (González, Moll, & Amantí, 2005; Nieto, 2010; Pizarro, 1998; Sadowski, 2003; Salazar, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999).

Ladson-Billings (1995) suggests that successful students of color experience academic success "at the expense of their cultural and psychological well-being" (p. 475). These students may demonstrate a "raceless persona" (Fordham, 1988, as cited in Warikoo & Carter, 2009, p. 379) to navigate the educational system, thus sacrificing an essential part of their humanity. They may also *act White* (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986) or *act gringo* (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004) in an effort to fit into the *whitestream* (Grande, 2000). In my research on a high school ESL program (Salazar, 2010), I found that Mexican immigrant students accuse one another of acting gringo when they adhere to English-only rules in the classroom. Ultimately, students of color experience *subtractive schooling* (Valenzuela, 1999) through the denial of their heritage and assimilation into White America.

Educational scholars have long documented the struggles of students of color to resist assimilation, maintain their cultural roots, and merge their *double selves* (Du Bois, 1903). For example, Du Bois describes the struggle of African Americans as follows: "One ever feels his twoness,—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder" (p. 46). I experienced this sense of *twoness* as a child of two nations; with one foot on either side of the border, yet neither side would claim me. I was torn from my motherland when I was 2 weeks old, the bond was irrevocably severed; consequently, I grew up in a land where I was considered the *other* or worse, an alien. I lived in *nepantla*, the *Mexica* (Aztec) word for no man's (or woman's) land. My educational experience was marked by my struggles to sustain bicultural ways of being.

Warikoo and Carter (2009) suggest that students of color resist teachers who do not understand students' bicultural and multicultural worlds and reinforce cultural lines of demarcation that are systematically imposed in schools. In my own research with Mexican immigrant high school students (Salazar, 2010), I propose that Mexican American students engage in disruptive behavior such as raised voices, disrespectful comments, gestures of disdain, defiance of classroom expectations, and *huelgas* (strikes) to resist practices that exclude their native language and culture from their learning. Furthermore, my research demonstrates that Mexican immigrant students use *boundary maintaining mechanisms* (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986) to pressure their peers to resist English in an effort to maintain their cultural affiliations and resist the whitestream because blurring the boundary might signal to others a sense of shame in one's heritage, language, and culture. For example, a teacher in my research study

described the typical discourse of Mexican immigrant students as follows: "Sometimes students tell other students to speak Spanish because they are with other Mexicans. If they speak English with a group of Mexicans it's like they want to be different—White, not Mexicans" (Salazar, 2010, p. 117). Scholars assert that students of color resist the loss of their resources because they perceive the power of their culture as a safe zone against the onslaught of the dominant culture (Quiroz, 2001; Reyes, 2007).

Although students of color may resist overt tactics that strip them of their cultural resources, in recent times, systemic approaches to assimilation are often masked in the language of measurement and quantification that is rampant in 21st-century educational discourse. The focus on measurement and quantification in U.S. public schools results in pedagogical practices that favor high-stakes test-taking skills (Giroux, 2010; Nichols & Berliner, 2007); foster memorization and conformity (Giroux, 2010); promote reductionistic, decontextualized, and fragmented curriculum (Bahruth, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2012; Rodriguez & Smith, 2011); advance mechanistic approaches that are disconnected from students' needs (Bartolomé, 1994); and reinforce one-size-fits-all scripted practices (de la Luz Reyes, 1992; Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Nieto, 2010). Educational scholars stress that such myopic, technical, and generic practices repress and silence students and lead to a decline in student efficacy (Bartolomé, 1994; Giroux, 2010; Huerta, 2011). Furthermore, a pedagogical focus on materials and delivery methods results in a "detachment from the human beings teachers encounter in the classroom" (Rodriguez & Smith, 2011, p. 91). A superficial and uncritical focus on methods often privileges whitestream approaches aimed at assimilation, ultimately robbing students of their culture, language, history, and values, thus denying students' humanity.

Students and educators are constrained from finding meaning in the current educational system as a result of the tension between educators' pedagogical practices and systemic constraints, such as high-stakes standardized tests and district-mandated instructional curriculum. Such restrictive educational policies limit educators from developing humanistic approaches (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Huerta, 2011). Educational scholars call on schools to move away from one-size-fits-all paradigms and instead focus on humane approaches such a humanizing pedagogy (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004, Freire, 1970; Huerta, 2011). Educators orienting toward a humanizing pedagogy heed the call of Paulo Freire (1970), who laments the state of dehumanization in education and asserts that "the only effective instrument in the process of re-humanization is humanizing pedagogy" (p. 55). A humanizing pedagogy is crucial for both teacher and student success and critical for the academic and social resiliency of students (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Reyes, 2007).

Given that current U.S. educational policy is dominated by standardized and technical approaches to schooling that reinforce assimilationist notions and dehumanize students of color, this review of literature examines Freire's conceptualization of *humanization, pedagogy*, and *humanizing pedagogy* as a counterpractice to dehumanization in education. Moreover, this chapter synthesizes the conceptual and empirical literature on humanizing pedagogy from Paulo Freire and other humanizing peda-

gogues across the globe. This literature—when synthesized—suggests that the philosophical, theoretical, and operational foundations of humanizing pedagogy can be delineated into five essential tenets and 10 principles and practices for humanization in education. The chapter concludes with a call for the moral responsibility of educators to humanize pedagogy and an appeal for studies that engage the voices of the oppressed as central to humanization in education.

FREIRE'S VISION OF A HUMANIZING PEDAGOGY

Educational scholars have proposed that Paulo Freire is one of the most influential thinkers of modern times, and perhaps the most important and original educational thinker of the 20th century (Carnoy, 2004; Macedo, 1994; Roberts, 2000; Siddhartha, 1999). Indeed, Darder (2002) advances the notion that "more than any other educator of the twentieth century, Paulo Freire left an indelible mark on the lives of progressive educators" (as cited in Schugurensky, 2011, p. 10).

Humanism Influences Freire's Worldview

Humanism is a central component of Freire's worldview and is essential to understanding Freirean philosophy (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010). Freire's philosophy is guided by the notion that humans are motivated by a need to reason and engage in the process of becoming. Freire's focus on humanism is centered on his curiosity in the cognitive capacity of humans to shape their experiences and achieve personal and collective self-actualization, thus developing their full humanity (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010; Schapiro, 2001).

Freire's humanist approach evolved over time through the influence of an eclectic array of intellectual traditions, including liberalism; Marxism; existentialism; radical Catholicism; phenomenology; progressive education; developmentalism; feminism; and critical race theory (Schugurensky, 2011). Scholars note that Freire was particularly influenced by Christian humanism, an approach that promotes the worth of human beings and asserts that humans strive to become more fully human in unity with others, despite impediments to humanization such as injustice, exploitation, and oppression (Kirylo, 2001; Schugurensky, 2011).

Freire was also influenced by the tenets of Marxist humanism that challenged societal structures and systems responsible for reproducing social inequalities and creating a pedagogy of inhumanity (Keet, Zinn, & Porteus, 2009). Kiros (2006) describes Marxist humanism as merging a "focus on systemic violence and structural inequalities with unlocking the humanistic potential of human beings" (p. 217). Through Marxist humanism, Freire denounces oppressive political, social, and educational structures, and he announces the power of the oppressed in reclaiming their full humanity (Kirylo, 2001).

Freire draws on Christian humanism and Marxist humanism as analytical tools to probe the essence of humanity. Hence, the dialogical space between Christian humanism and Marxist humanism reveals the crux of Freire's philosophy of humanization, liberation, hope, and transformation.

Freire's Conceptualization of Humanization and Pedagogy

Although Freire made numerous contributions to liberatory educational paradigms, Dale and Hyslop-Margison (2010) claim that humanization is the single most important element to Freire's philosophical approach. *Humanization* is the process of becoming more fully human as social, historical, thinking, communicating, transformative, creative persons who participate in and with the world (Freire, 1972, 1984). To become more fully human, men and women must become conscious of their presence in the world as a way to individually and collectively re-envisage their social world (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010; Freire & Betto, 1985; Schapiro, 2001). Humanization is the ontological vocation of human beings and, as such, is the practice of freedom in which the oppressed are liberated through consciousness of their subjugated positions and a desire for self-determination (Freire, 1970, 1994). Humanization cannot be imposed on or imparted to the oppressed; but rather, it can only occur by engaging the oppressed in their liberation. As such, Freire (1970) proposes that the process of humanization fosters transformation and authentic liberation of the oppressed; thus, "to transform the world is to humanize it" (Freire, 1985, p. 70).

Whereas Freire's conceptualization of humanization is key to understanding his educational philosophy (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010), his ideological stance related to the underlying notions of pedagogy is vital to the enactment of humanization. Freire's use of the term *pedagogy* is a "complex philosophy, politics, and practice of education . . . that demands of educators a clear ethical and political commitment to transforming oppressive social conditions" (Roberts, 2000, pp. 13–14). According to Freirean ideals, all pedagogy is political and requires radical reconstruction of teaching and learning (Giroux, 1988); moreover, pedagogy must be meaningful and connected to social change by engaging students with the world so they can transform it (Giroux, 2010). As such, meaningful social change can be triggered by curricular resources that are tied to the needs of marginalized students and locally generated by teachers and communities in order to interrupt patterns of exclusion (Giroux, 2004).

Although Freire's pedagogical assertions flow from ethical and political stances that challenge inequity and promote humanization, critics denounce his inability to provide specific formulas and clear methodological examples of his pedagogical vision (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010).

Freirean scholars, however, interpret his pedagogical vision as a way of living in the world rather than a bundle of technical pedagogical practices. Moreover, these scholars proclaim that Freirean pedagogy cannot be reduced to reproducible technical concepts or universally applicable and decontextualized techniques, skills, or methods (Aronowitz, 1993; Bartolomé, 1994; Brady, 1994; Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010; Macedo, 1994; Roberts, 2000). As a result, educators who grapple ineffectively with Freire's pedagogical assertions may engage in technical and reductionistic approaches and ignore the ideological implications of schooling (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010).

In fact, Freire was vehemently opposed to reductionistic and decontextualized interpretations of his educational philosophy that identified predetermined technical

practices (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010). Freire and Macedo (1998) establish that generic pedagogical approaches are "static and objectifying, with outcomes antithetical to humanization" (as cited in Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010, p. 74). Scholars concur that uncritical approaches to teaching and learning strip teachers and students of their individuality and thus undermine the fundamental principles of humanization (Burke, Adler, & Linker, 2008; Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010). Consequently, teachers and students are devalued and dehumanized through mechanical pedagogical approaches that distract them from meaningful learning and silence their collective voices (Balderrama, 2001; Burke et al., 2008; Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010).

Freire repeatedly emphasizes that his pedagogy is not transferrable across contexts but rather should be adapted to the unique context of teaching and learning (Roberts, 2000; Weiler, 1991). Dale and Hyslop-Margison (2010) assert that "although there are not precise technical methods emerging from Freire's pedagogy, its potential application is limited only by our creativity and imagination" (p. 74). In fact, Freirean pedagogy necessitates that educators reinvent his philosophy and pedagogy across contexts (Rodriguez & Smith, 2011). Above all, Freire encourages educators to listen to their students and build on their knowledge and experiences in order to engage in contextualized, dynamic, and personalized educational approaches that further the goals of humanization and social transformation.

Freire Envisages a Humanizing Pedagogy

Throughout his many literary works, Freire grapples with the meaning of human existence and the purpose of pedagogy; as a result, he envisages a *humanizing pedagogy*. Various scholars note the concept of humanizing pedagogy as one of Freire's original contributions (Huerta & Brittain, 2010; Keet et al., 2009; Parker-Rees & Willan, 2006; Rodriguez, 2008; Salazar, 2008; Schugurensky, 2011). In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire (1970) describes humanizing pedagogy as a revolutionary approach to instruction that "ceases to be an instrument by which teachers can manipulate students, but rather expresses the consciousness of the students themselves" (p. 51). Teachers who enact humanizing pedagogy engage in a quest for "mutual humanization" (p. 56) with their students, a process fostered through problem-posing education where students are coinvestigators in dialogue with their teachers. This dialogic approach to education should be pursued with the goal of developing "conscientizacao" (p. 26) or critical consciousness, which is "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (p. 17). There are limitless possibilities for Freire's pedagogical philosophy, and Freire urged his followers to reinvent his ideas in the context of their local struggles.

REINVENTING HUMANIZING PEDAGOGY

The application of Freire's ideas in the context of education in the United States and other countries has been a challenge for educators. Some critics have charged that Paulo Freire offers an elusive portrayal of humanizing pedagogy that is detached from

the context of actual classrooms (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010; Schugurensky, 2011). In response, in 1994, Lilia Bartolomé published, "Beyond the Methods Fetish: Toward a Humanizing Pedagogy." This seminal piece was instrumental in situating humanizing pedagogy as a substantive and tangible educational philosophy and practice (Murillo et al., 2009). Bartolomé promotes the notion that a humanizing pedagogy builds on the sociocultural realities of students' lives, examines the sociohistorical and political dimensions of education, and casts students as critically engaged, active participants in the co-construction of knowledge. Bartolomé was followed by a growing number of humanizing pedagogues who answer Freire's call to reinvent humanizing pedagogy in their own context (Rodriguez, 2008).

In what follows, I provide examples of scholarship from across the globe, including South Africa, Brazil, Jamaica, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Analysis of the literature reveals the following five key tenets are requisite for the pursuit of one's full humanity through a humanizing pedagogy:

1. The full development of the person is essential for humanization.
2. To deny someone else's humanization is also to deny one's own.
3. The journey for humanization is an individual and collective endeavor toward critical consciousness.
4. Critical reflection and action can transform structures that impede our own and others' humanness, thus facilitating liberation for all.
5. Educators are responsible for promoting a more fully human world through their pedagogical principles and practices.

1: The Full Development of the Person Is Essential for Humanization

A humanizing pedagogy is a process of *becoming* for students and teachers (Freire, 1970; Price & Osborne, 2000; Roberts, 2000). Roberts (2000), a scholar from the United Kingdom, further describes the process of becoming in a humanizing pedagogy, "One can never, on the Freirean view, become fully human—one can, at best, become *more* fully human" (p. 41). Scholars of humanizing pedagogy insist that in schools, the process of becoming more fully human must be tethered to the needs of the whole person (Bell & Schniedewind, 1989; Price & Osborne, 2000). For example, Price and Osborne (2000) describe humanizing pedagogy as "a pedagogy in which the whole person develops and they do so as their relationships with others evolve and enlarge" (p. 29). Moreover, the authors note that the purpose of humanizing education is not only to transfer meaningful academic knowledge but to also promote the overall well-being of all students. Cammarota and Romero (2006) state that educators attend to students overall well-being when they connect with students on an emotional level by (a) providing reciprocal opportunities to share their lives, (b) demonstrating compassion for the dehumanizing experiences students of color encounter, and (c) situating learning in social issues that are relevant to the experiences of marginalized communities. Additionally, Talbert-Johnson (2004) adds that schools should be "places where students of color feel their full humanity is visible and

cherished by their teachers" (p. 32). The authors suggest that students' full humanity is honored when educators affirm students' ambitions and assist students in dealing with obstacles to their ambitions. The focus on the whole person in humanizing pedagogy is based on Freirean notions that "education is more than technical training because it involves the full development of the person, it has a humanistic orientation" (Schugurensky, 2011, p. 67).

From South Africa, Keet et al. (2009) explore "humanizing" pedagogy and the dimensions of the human experience, stating, "A humanising pedagogy is a radical pedagogy, not a 'soft' one, and its humanising interest is linked to focusing on both structural and psycho-social dimensions of human suffering, and human liberation" (p. 113). A humanizing pedagogy is inclusive of the psychological and emotional dimensions of the human experience; thus, a humanizing pedagogy is intentionally focused on the affective domain (Bell & Schniedewind, 1989) and requires that educators interact with students on an emotional level (Cammarota & Romero, 2006). For instance, Cammarota and Romero (2006) suggest that students and teachers should share their perspectives about life and educators should express verbally and nonverbally their "faith in students' intellectual capacities and a respect for their concerns about the world" (p. 20).

A humanizing pedagogy correlates with caring literature in education and is inclusive of respect, trust, relations of reciprocity, active listening, mentoring, compassion, high expectations, and interest in students' overall well-being (Bartolomé, 1994; Cammarota & Romero, 2006; Gay, 2010). In fact, in my own research with scholar María Fránquiz (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004), we found that when Chicano/Mexican students develop positive relationships with supportive adults and peers, they are protected from risk behaviors, alienation, and despair. Furthermore, we discovered that strong relationships with adults and peers that are grounded in students' cultural funds of knowledge influence students' academic resiliency through the construction of a strong academic identity, or scholar ethos. The humanizing pedagogy we describe aligns with research on women educators in Brazil by Jennings and Da Matta (2009), who found that a humanizing pedagogy reflects feminist principles in "consciousness-raising through dialogue, knowledge grounded in personal experience, relationship-building, and a view of students as emotional and social beings, not solely cognitive learners" (p. 225).

Ultimately, a humanizing pedagogy is rooted in the relationships between educators and students and, as such, "respects the human, inter-personal side of teaching, and emphasizes the richness of the teacher-student relationships" (Huerta & Brittain, 2010, pp. 385–386).

2: To Deny Someone Else's Humanization Is Also to Deny One's Own

Freire contends that "to deny someone else's humanization is also to deny one's own" (Roberts, 2000, p. 45). Dehumanization, or the denial of humanness to others (Moller & Deci, 2009), is a by-product of a *banking model of education* (Freire, 1970) that transforms students into receiving objects by perpetuating practices such as rote

memorization and skill-and-drill that encourage students to receive, file, and store deposits of knowledge transmitted by educators. In a banking pedagogy, educators "constantly tell them (students) what to do, what to learn, what to think, seldom seeking their input, suggestions, comments, feedback, or thoughts about their education" (Cammarota & Romero, 2006, p. 19). The banking model of education promotes passivity, acceptance, and submissiveness and turns students into objects that must be filled by the teacher. By implication, "to treat humans as objects, thereby lessening their abilities to act to transform their world, is to dehumanize them" (Freire, 1982, p. 5). Scholars insist that dehumanizing approaches silence students, lead to self-denigration, and instill a sense of internalized failure and self-contempt (Quiroz, 2001). In my own research (Salazar, 2010), I found that when Mexican immigrant students are denied access and use of their mother tongue in academic spheres, these students begin to devalue their native language and denigrate their culture. Such students are often faced with the choice of conformity and denial of all that is native, or forms of resistance to English that are detrimental to their educational success. In this research, I found that few students engage in transformational resistance where they learn to navigate the world of the oppressor, yet challenge systemic inequities. Students are disempowered when they resign themselves to the conditions of their existence and believe their circumstances will never change or, more important, that they cannot change the conditions of their schooling (Cammarota & Romero, 2006). As a result, silencing becomes commonplace in the colonized minds of marginalized youth submersed in a banking model of education.

The banking model of education is "well suited to the purposes of the oppressors, whose tranquility rests on how well people fit the world the oppressors have created, and how little they question it" (Freire, 1970, p. 57), thus indoctrinating the oppressed to fit into a world of oppression. The banking method of education is described by scholars as *reductive education* (Bartolomé, 1994) and *backlash pedagogies* (Gutiérrez, Asato, Santos, & Gotanda, 2002); these approaches endorse learning in reductionist, highly scripted, skill-focused, and test-centric terms. Such pedagogies "prohibit the use of students' complete linguistic, sociocultural, and academic repertoire in the service of learning" (Gutiérrez et al., 2002, p. 337). In my own research (Salazar, 2010), I documented reductive pedagogies that emphasize rote memorization and remedial learning through the vehicle of "English or nothing" (p. 116) approaches to educating Mexican immigrant students. Burke et al. (2008) maintain that "when life experiences are ignored dismissed or devalued, students infer that their personal perspectives and world views are nonessential to their learning experiences" (p. 66).

Bartolomé (1994) uses the term *dehumanizing pedagogy* to describe deficit approaches in teaching that result in "discriminatory practices that strip students of the cultural, linguistic, and familial aspects that make them unique, self-possessed individuals" (p. 176). Valenzuela's (1999) research provides an example of deficit approaches that subtract students' culture and language, thus resulting in the "de-Mexicanization" of Mexican immigrant students. Consequently, dehumanization reduces students to the "status of subhumans who need to be rescued from their 'savage' selves" (Bartolomé, 1994, p. 176). Such egregious pathologization of students of color locates the nexus of

school failure in students and their language, culture, and family (García & Guerra, 2004; Valencia, 1997, 2010) and blocks real and meaningful change in schooling (Wade et al., 2008). Educators must guard against deficit orientations that strip students of their humanity. Although many educators may explicitly advocate for respect of cultural and linguistic differences, educational systems often perpetuate cultural replacement and assimilation into mainstream values and practices through a focus on high-stakes testing, English-only programming, whitestream curriculum, uncritical pedagogy, and deficit perspectives of parents and families.

Dehumanization affects "not only those whose humanity has been stolen but also (though in a different way) those who have stolen it" (Freire, 1993, p. 26). The construct of dehumanization is best understood as a distortion of the vocation of being more fully human; when human beings are dehumanized, both the oppressed and the oppressor are constricted from the intentionality of consciousness and are thereby stifled in their quest for humanization.

3: The Journey for Humanization Is an Individual and Collective Endeavor Toward Critical Consciousness

The individual and collective development of critical consciousness is paramount to the pursuit of humanization. According to Freire (1970), in a humanizing pedagogy, "the method of instruction ceases to be an instrument by which teachers can manipulate the students, because it expresses the consciousness of the students themselves" (p. 513). Students and teachers engage in a quest for *mutual humanization* (Freire, 1970, p. 56) through the development of *conscientizacao* (p. 17), or critical consciousness. Critical consciousness is the process of "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (p. 17). Moreover, critical consciousness is a process by which students learn to "think actively, and with intentionality and purpose" (Frymer, 2005, p. 6) about their own contributions and the contributions of society to the perpetuation of inequity, injustice, and oppression. As such, in research on emancipatory methodologies and aboriginal peoples in Canada, Alexander (2002) found that a humanizing pedagogy "gives the oppressed access to their consciousness and gives voice to their consciousness" (p. 112).

Educators become humanizing pedagogical agents through critical self-consciousness (Keet et al., 2009). In my own research with Fránquiz (Salazar & Fránquiz, 2008), we describe the transformation of one teacher's pedagogical orientations toward her Mexican immigrant students as she developed critical self-consciousness of her deficit notions of her students, and she subsequently built on her students' funds of knowledge through elements of *respeto* (respect), *confianza* (mutual trust), *consejos* (verbal teachings), and *buen ejemplo* (exemplary role model).

Bell and Schniedewind (1989) promote the notion that "consciousness of self can challenge unconscious oppressive or oppressing behaviors" (p. 211). For instance, as educators develop consciousness of their own role in upholding inequitable structures, they come to act as oppositional intellectuals who engage critically with authority to develop pedagogical principles that link learning, social responsibility, and political agency (Giroux, 2010). Milner (2003) engages teacher candidates in

critical self-consciousness through race reflective journaling. Through journaling, teacher candidates realize themselves as racial beings and begin to substantively challenge themselves and the role of educational structures in perpetuating oppression.

Although critical self-consciousness is essential for a humanizing pedagogy, Freire insists that the pursuit of humanization can never be an isolated or individualistic endeavor. As such, from Freire's perspective, "Our being, is a being with" (Roberts, 2000, p. 43). Freire envisaged a humanizing pedagogy as "teaching in relationship with the other" (as cited in Murillo et al., 2009, p. 385). Accordingly, a humanizing pedagogy stems from relationships between educators and students and their collective and dialogic pursuit of humanization for all people (Huerta & Brittain, 2010; Price & Osborne, 2000; Roberts, 2000). As such, in my research with Fránquiz, we found that when Mexican/Chicano students are invited to use their voices as central vehicles for expressing their views of social issues that are relevant to their lives, students and teachers are able to co-construct a network of mutual trust that allows them to identify problems and solutions that are dynamic, contextualized, and inclusive of the needs of local communities (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004). Ultimately, an individual and collective journey toward humanization allows for spaces where humans can "sculpt real and imaginary corners for peace, solace, communion, and personal and collective identity work" (Fine, Weis, Centrie, & Roberts, 2000, p. 132).

A humanizing pedagogy, thus, results from the individual and collective process of critical consciousness that is provoked through dialogue (Freire, 2000). Freire (1997) claims that

dialogue requires an intense faith in humankind: faith in their power to make and remake, to create and recreate; faith in their vocation to be fully human – which is not the privilege of the elite, but the birthright of all humanity. (as cited in Goduka, 1999, p. 48)

Dialogue for critical consciousness is grounded in one's lived experiences, reflects social and political conditions that reproduce inequity and oppression, and fosters action to interrupt and disrupt oppression (Souto-Manning, 2006). An example of dialogic critical consciousness can be found in my research with Fránquiz. We found that a focus on dialogical education with Mexican/Chicano students contradicts and interrupts students' resistance or silence toward their own cultural resources; thus, new possibilities create permeable boundaries that allow for the development of biculturalism (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004).

Dialogical education poses problems for students about oppressive conditions, social inequities, and the process of transforming inequities to achieve social justice (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010; Gruenewald, 2003). Scholars assert that "by problematizing their collective experiences, they [teachers and students] employ the uniquely human capacity to be contemplative and have in-depth discussion to encourage reflection and eventual transformation" (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010, p. 99). Problem-posing education engages students and educators in critical inquiry and creative transformation and promotes student engagement with issues

of language, literacy, culture, ecology, democracy, and humanity (Bahruth, 2000; Schugurensky, 2011). Problem-posing education in classrooms encourages students to (a) connect their everyday lives to global issues, (b) think critically about actions they can take to make a difference within their own communities, (c) see connections between self and society, and (d) examine and challenge structural forces that inhibit humanization (Bigelow & Peterson, 2002; Schugurensky, 2011). As a case in point, Cammarota and Romero (2006) present research on a social justice course in a high school that provides students with opportunities to identify problems of social justice that are relevant to their lives, trigger self-transformation, and situate students as cocreators of transformative social change. The researchers have students write and present *I am Poems* about their identities in order to help students identify issues and problems that are relevant to their daily lives. Additionally, Bigelow and Peterson (2002) detail the importance of problematizing the social studies curriculum by having students rethink the myth of Christopher Columbus, which is often the first sanitized tale children are told about the encounter, or collision, between diverse cultural groups. Such an approach challenges surface-level approaches to teaching about diversity and places the humanity of those who are marginalized at the heart of social justice.

Freire suggests that developing critical consciousness and engaging in transformative dialogue requires teachers and students to become "subjects," rather than "objects," thereby creating reciprocity of teaching and learning. In Freire's words, "All educational practice requires the existence of 'subjects,' who while teaching, learn. And who in learning also teach" (Freire, 1998, p. 67). As a result, teachers and students are essentially critical beings working together to co-construct knowledge (Shor & Freire, 1987), and students can "feel they are knowledgeable Subjects that guide the educational process" (Cammarota & Romero, 2006, p. 20). Jennings and Da Matta (2009) concur that through a humanizing pedagogy, students become "subjects who actively make meaning of their own lives and the world around them, rather than objects who passively receive content knowledge from teachers" (p. 217). Cammarota and Romero (2006) provide an example of humanizing pedagogy in a high school classroom that allows Latina/o youth to dialogue about their experiences and oppressive language policies in their state that legitimize English and marginalize their native language. As a result of intense and critical dialogue on the issue, the students approached their local school board and presented recommendations to serve Spanish-speaking populations in the school district. In this case, the students were empowered to use their critical voice to challenge the prevailing authorities to reconsider disparate policies that provoke repression and intolerance.

For students to move from objects to subjects, Freire and Macedo (1987) point out that "the successful usage of the students' cultural universe requires respect and legitimization of students' discourses, that is, their own linguistic codes, which are different but never inferior" (p. 127). Legitimizing students' resources sets the groundwork for their ability to relate their own narratives and histories to the content of learning, locate themselves in the realities of their current lives, and critically interrogate and use

resources to broaden their knowledge and understanding (Giroux, 2010). Moreover, legitimizing students' resources requires shifting the emphasis from teachers to students and "making visible the relationships among knowledge, authority and power" (Giroux, 2010, para. 8).

Bartolomé (1994) adds that in legitimizing students' resources, a humanizing pedagogy "respects and uses the reality, history, and perspectives of students as an integral part of educational practice" (p. 173). Acknowledging and using students' heritage languages, and accessing their background knowledge, make good pedagogical sense and constitute a humanizing pedagogy for students (Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999). Thus, a humanizing pedagogy validates and values students' interests, experiences, and emotions and localizes curriculum to reflect the realities of students' lives (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010). Concomitantly, a humanizing pedagogy takes into account the cultural identities of all students and "encourages teachers to talk to the students and listen to what the students say and don't say" (Ybarra, 2000, p. 169). In my research, I provide an example of humanizing pedagogy that builds on immigrant students' resources through the creation of a material culture in the classroom that signals to students that their cultural and linguistic resources are welcome in the context of learning, including bilingual texts, posters, communications, and cultural artifacts that represent student diversity (Salazar & Fránquiz, 2008).

Scholars further note that in legitimizing students' resources, a humanizing pedagogy is contextualized to the "funds of knowledge" (Hornberger & McKay, 2010; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992) of a specific community. For example, in my research with Fránquiz, we identified a culturally based ethic of care as a humanizing pedagogy that reflects values and interactions in Mexican households as sources of strength students need to survive and thrive (Salazar & Fránquiz, 2008). I extend the idea of a culturally based ethic of care in a case study of one teacher's transformation through a focus on Mexican immigrant students' cultural funds of knowledge as resources for academic success (Salazar & Fránquiz, 2008). Svedman (2007) also contextualizes humanizing aspects of teaching Mexican immigrants in her depiction of lessons learned while she was immersed in a Mexican immigrant community in the United States.

Freire (1997) advocates for teachers to engage in humanizing pedagogy that legitimizes and values students' experiences, but he also insists that teachers understand these experiences in a historical, social, and political context. Freire stresses,

What I have been proposing is a profound respect for the cultural identity of students—a cultural identity that implies respect for the language of the other, the color of the other, the gender of the other, the class of the other, the sexual orientation of the other, the intellectual capacity of the other; that implies the ability to stimulate the creativity of the other. But these things take place in a social and historical context and not in pure air. (pp. 307–308)

A humanizing pedagogy includes an understanding of sociohistorical, sociopolitical, and sociocultural contexts of students' and teachers' lives (Balderrama, 2001;

Bartolomé, 1994; Huerta, 2011; Huerta & Brittain, 2010; Nieto, 2003; Nieto & Rolon, 1997; Salazar & Fránquiz, 2008). Rodriguez and Smith (2011) emphasize that humanizing teachers "interrogate their own histories and roles in oppression before engaging in the co-liberation of others" (p. 95). Moreover, a humanizing pedagogy requires the development of teachers' *political clarity*. Trueba and Bartolomé (2000) define political clarity as follows:

> The process by which individuals achieve a deepening awareness of the sociopolitical and economic realities that shape their lives and their capacity to transform them. In addition, it refers to processes whereby individuals come to better understand possible linkages between the macropolitical, economic, and social variables and microclassroom instruction. (pp. 278–279)

By engaging in the development of political clarity, educators interrogate their own power and privilege, recognize how these constructs affect others, reposition their work alongside the other, and remain vigilant to elements that constrain humanization (Renner, Brown, Stiens, & Burton, 2010). In research on humanizing education through intercultural service learning in Jamaica, Renner et al. (2010) immerse participants in experiences that distinguish charity, development, and social justice to make visible power and privilege and thus attempt to decolonize intercultural education and interrupt social and political hierarchies. Thus, the scholars claim to engage participants in a process of "unpacking the layers of injustice, and reorganizing, restructuring and re-humanizing systems of power" (p. 50).

In addition to the development of political clarity, *mutual vulnerability* is a key ingredient of humanizing pedagogy because pedagogical engagement is tied to *meaning-making frames*, or political, socioeconomic, cultural, and normative frames of reference, through which individuals and groups view themselves and their world (Keet et al., 2009). Scholars entreat educators to disrupt normative frames that reproduce hierarchies, asymmetrical power, and oppression (Keet et al., 2009). The implication is that educators need to interrogate their meaning-making frames in order to become vulnerable in questioning the cultural, economic, and political rooting of these frames. By engaging in mutual vulnerability, the oppressor and the oppressed unleash their humanistic potential by disrupting systemic inequalities and recreating new vulnerabilities that foster power from solidarity (Keet et al., 2009).

Scholars propose that teachers who practice a humanizing pedagogy "explicitly teach the school's codes and customs, and/or mainstream knowledge, to enable students to fully participate in the dominant culture" (Huerta, 2011, p. 39). Delpit (2006) refers to school's codes and customs of the rules of the culture of those who have power as *the culture of power*; these include "ways of talking, ways of writing, ways of dressing, and ways of interacting" (p. 25). Preparing students to participate successfully in the dominant culture equips students with the knowledge base and discourse styles privileged in society; however, scholars note that this process must be additive to students' existing cultural and linguistic resources (Bartolomé, 1994; Huerta, 2011).

In summary, a humanizing pedagogy engages students in the following ways: making personal connections to learning (Bell & Schniedewind, 1989), validating selves and others (Bell & Schniedewind, 1989), focusing on what they can do and achieve with the cultural and linguistic resources they bring (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004), expanding on their repertoire of possible selves (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004), strengthening cultural awareness and identity (Huerta, 2011; Nieto, 2002; Rumberger & Larson, 1998; Salazar, 2008, 2010; Suárez, 2007), intensifying consciousness of their own contribution and the contributions of society and schools to the hegemonic reproduction of oppressive structures (Allen & Rossatto, 2009; Huerta & Brittain, 2010), and instilling a belief in their own humanity (Cammarota & Romero, 2006).

4: Critical Reflection and Action Can Transform Structures That Impede Our Own and Others' Humanness, Thus Facilitating Liberation for All

Freire defines *praxis* as "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1970, p. 145). It is in the intersection of reflection and action that Freire proposes people become "more fully human" (Freire, 1982) and as a result, power is shared by students and educators and the continuous process of rehumanization occurs (Bartolomé, 1994; Glass, 2001; Gottlieb & La Belle, 1990; Huerta, 2011; Huerta & Brittain, 2010). A humanizing pedagogy is a model that combines the skills of humanistic educators with the perspective of critical theorists for the purpose of personal and collective critical awareness and change-oriented action (Bell & Schniedewind, 1989). Hence, a humanizing pedagogy is critical, dialogical, and praxical (Glass, 2001; Huerta, 2011; Huerta & Brittain, 2010; Jennings & Smith, 2002; Roberts, 2000).

Freire (1970) emphasizes that action and reflection occur simultaneously and can potentially transform structures that impede humanization and facilitate liberation. Furthermore, Freire adds that on engaging in critical reflection of reality, one may find it impossible or inappropriate to take immediate action; as a result, critical reflection can also be considered action.

A humanizing pedagogy is a liberating pedagogy whose aim is to "transform existing power and privilege in the service of greater social justice and human freedom" (McLaren, 1997, p. 46, as cited in Goduka, 1999). The ongoing and permanent task of liberation takes place in the actions of humans to transform existing structures that impede the pursuit of social change, global justice, and humanization (Roberts, 2000). Educators orienting toward a humanizing pedagogy engage in critical reflection of systemic inequities and take action to challenge the role of educational institutions, fellow educators, and themselves in maintaining inequitable systems (Bartolomé, 1994; Freire, 1970; Nieto, 2003; Salazar, 2008). As a case in point, in an interview with scholar Sonia Nieto, Fránquiz (2005) describes Nieto's quest to immerse educators in "profoundly multicultural questions that focus on access, equity, and justice" (p. 168) in order to engage educators in personal and collective actions that interrupt inequities.

Although a humanizing pedagogy promotes liberation for educators and students, educators often face obstacles for promoting a humanizing pedagogy in classrooms. For example, Cho and Lewis (2005) describe how the oppressed may resist humanizing pedagogies because of fear of freedom resulting from the internalized oppression that binds the oppressed to the oppressor. Cho and Lewis state, "Internalization and identification with the oppressive power relations constituted in a banking pedagogy may very well block the efforts of the critical educator to raise the consciousness of the oppressed to a level of revolutionary action" (p. 321). Despite the challenges, Freire (1970) insists that "to exist humanely is to name the world, to change it" (pp. 75–76), and he insists that the oppressed must name their own oppression so that they can disrupt inequity and demand social change. A humanizing pedagogy is intertwined with social change; it challenges students to critically engage with the world so they can act on it (Giroux, 2010). For example, curriculum design that is focused on social justice issues can develop students' consciousness of issues related to power, classism, sexism, racism, heterosexism, and ableism and provoke students to engage in project-based learning that challenges oppression (Adams, Lee, & Griffin, 2010). Additionally, through service learning projects that focus on social justice issues, students are able to differentiate between social service and social change (Warren, 1998).

5: Educators Are Responsible for Promoting a More Fully Human World Through Their Pedagogical Principles and Practices

Given that a humanizing pedagogy is a philosophical approach that fosters critical, dialogical, and praxical education (Glass, 2001; Huerta, 2011; Huerta & Brittain, 2010; Jennings & Smith, 2002; Roberts, 2000), educators may be perplexed about practical inroads to a humanizing pedagogy. Educators searching for pedagogical recipes critique Freire's lack of specific technical methods and describe Freire's concepts as vague, imprecise, generic, and oversimplified and unhelpful for practitioners on the ground (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2010; Schugurensky, 2011).

A tension exists in the chasm between the theory and practice of humanizing pedagogy. Gore (1993) summarizes the tension between theory and practice in her analysis of two distinct strands of pedagogy, *pedagogical practice* and *pedagogical project*. Gore describes pedagogical practice as offering concrete suggestions intended to help educators, in contrast to pedagogical projects that promote educational theory through abstract political rhetoric. Gore (1992) expresses the need to support classroom teachers in the application of liberatory ideals, and she challenges pedagogical projects that place "a requirement on teachers to do the work of empowering, to be the agents of empowerment, without providing much in the way of tangible guidance for that work" (p. 66).

Bartolomé (1994) attempts to find a synergy between a teacher's philosophical orientation and their instructional methods, and she asserts that both elements are instrumental in creating a humanizing experience for students. Bartolomé stresses

that educators should not reject the use of teaching methods and strategies, but rather, they should disavow uncritical approaches to teaching and learning in favor of reflection and action. This allows educators to "recreate and reinvent teaching methods and materials by always taking into consideration the sociocultural realities that can either limit or expand the possibilities to humanize education" (p. 177).

In heeding Freire's call for a humanizing pedagogy, educational scholars have conducted research over the past four decades to illuminate the application of humanizing pedagogy in an educational setting. The section that follows presents a synthesis of 10 principles and practices of a humanizing pedagogy. The principles and practices of humanizing pedagogy differ from the five aforementioned tenets in that these operationalize the theoretical assertions presented in this review to illuminate the perceptible dispositions, knowledge, and skills that educators need to humanize pedagogy. The principles and practices of humanizing pedagogy include the following:

1. The reality of the learner is crucial.
2. Critical consciousness is imperative for students and educators.
3. Students' sociocultural resources are valued and extended.
4. Content is meaningful and relevant to students' lives.
5. Students' prior knowledge is linked to new learning.
6. Trusting and caring relationships advance the pursuit of humanization.
7. Mainstream knowledge and discourse styles matter.
8. Students will achieve through their academic, intellectual, social abilities.
9. Student empowerment requires the use of learning strategies.
10. Challenging inequity in the educational system can promote transformation.

The Reality of the Learner Is Crucial

The reality of the learner is crucial to the development of a humanizing pedagogy and is inclusive of the sociohistorical, sociocultural, and sociopolitical contexts of students' lives inside and outside of school (Bartolomé, 1994; Huerta, 2011; Roberts, 2000). Educators who enact humanizing pedagogy commit to explore the varied macro- and micro-level elements that affect teaching and learning by interrogating multiple forms of oppression in their students' lives (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004). Moreover, educators actively inquire into students' identities inside and outside of school to further understand the diversity and multiple identities of their students and the cultural differences that affect teaching and learning (Salazar, 2010).

Critical Consciousness Is Imperative for Students and Educators

Critical consciousness is imperative for a humanizing pedagogy in that the development of critical consciousness provides educators and students with the opportunity to become more fully human (Bartolomé, 1994; Freire, 1970; Huerta, 2011; Salazar, 2008). Educators who orient toward a humanizing pedagogy critically evaluate their own beliefs and engage students in critical dialogue that problematizes reality (Bartolomé,

1994; Huerta, 2011; Schugurensky, 2011; Strobel & Tillberg-Webb, 2006). Students and educators develop critical awareness through the following: critique of oppression, questioning of prevailing values and ideologies, and examination of their own status, power, and choices (Bell & Schniedewind, 1989). In so doing, students and teachers engage in the pursuit of "ontological clarity, the why of becoming human" (Rodriguez & Smith, 2011, p. 98).

Students' Sociocultural Resources Are Valued and Extended

Students' cultural, linguistic, and familial resources are valued in a humanizing pedagogy. Educators who orient toward a humanizing pedagogy build on students' culture, history, perspectives, and life experiences (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Huerta, 2011; Huerta and Brittain, 2010; Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999; Salazar, 2008; Suárez, 2007); incorporate content and curricular resources that reflect students' experiences (Huerta, 2011; Salazar, 2008); build students' oral and written language and literacy skills in their bi- or multilanguage registers (Hornberger & McKay, 2010); and strengthen students' ethnic and linguistic identities to support bilingualism and biculturalism so that students develop pride in the strengths and contributions of their communities (Huerta, 2011; Salazar, 2008).

Content Is Meaningful and Relevant to Students' Lives

A humanizing pedagogy incorporates content that is meaningful to students' lives in that it draws on students' lived experiences (Huerta, 2011; Salazar, 2008). A permeable curriculum is essential for a humanizing pedagogy in that it "allows for inclusion of students' linguistic, cultural, and social resources" (Salazar, 2010, p. 120). Dyson (1993) describes a permeable curriculum as one that allows for an interactional space drawing on official school knowledge and students' cultural, social, and linguistic resources. A permeable curriculum serves as a bridge, bringing the worlds of educators and students together in instructionally powerful ways. Educators orienting toward a humanizing pedagogy foster permeability when they accept code-switching in student discourse, support heritage-language use as a means of fostering student comprehension, facilitate student input into the curriculum, provide opportunities for students to make personal connections to content, and include topics that reflect the diversity of students' lives (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Huerta, 2011; Salazar, 2010).

Students' Prior Knowledge Is Linked to New Learning

A humanizing pedagogy integrates students' prior knowledge and links this knowledge to new learning. By acknowledging students' background knowledge, the teacher legitimizes and communicates the value of students' languages and cultures (Bartolomé, 1994; Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004, Huerta, 2011). Additionally, a humanizing pedagogy is additive in that students are treated as experts of their own background knowledge and they are expected to add new content and skills to amplify

their knowledge base (Bartolomé, 1994). Moreover, a humanizing pedagogy creates learning conditions where all students can demonstrate their knowledge and expertise in a way that encourages students to "see themselves, and be seen by others, as capable and confident" (Bartolomé, 1994, p. 178).

Trusting and Caring Relationships Advance the Pursuit of Humanization

Freire's conceptualization of humanizing pedagogy is centered on the student and teacher relationship. Educators orienting toward a humanizing pedagogy build trusting and caring relationships with students (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Huerta, 2011; Salazar, 2008). Educators who care engage in the following: listen to students' interests, needs, and concerns; know students on a personal level and attempt to understand students' home experiences; acknowledge the challenges associated with the development of bilingualism and biculturalism; model kindness, patience, and respect; tend to students' overall well-being, including their emotional, social, and academic needs; create a support network for students inside and outside of school; build on the values and contributions of parents; create a safe learning environment where risk-taking and active engagement are valued; allow for native language support; and facilitate student connections to their communities (Bahruth, 2007; Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Huerta, 2011; Rodriguez, 2008; Salazar, 2008). Caring relationships are founded on mutual respect between students, families, and teachers, thus humanizing the context of schooling (Bartolomé, 1994).

Mainstream Knowledge and Discourse Styles Matter

A humanizing pedagogy not only builds on students' lived experiences and background knowledge but also teaches students mainstream or dominant knowledge and discourse styles (Bartolomé, 1994). Bartolomé stresses that teachers should act as cultural mentors to support students in accommodating to the culture of the classroom. This is imperative as the classroom culture is often representative of the dominant culture through the curricula and discourse styles that are privileged and reproduced throughout the educational system. By teaching students mainstream knowledge and discourse styles, a humanizing pedagogy provides students with "insider" knowledge that is needed to successfully navigate the educational system (Bartolomé, 1994); however, this process must be additive and not intended to replace students' prior knowledge and discourse patterns (Bartolomé, 1994; Huerta, 2011).

Students Will Achieve Through Their Academic, Intellectual, Social Abilities

A humanizing pedagogy is focused on what students can do and achieve with the cultural resources they bring to the experience of schooling (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004). Fránquiz (2003) describes the use of the concept of *capacidad* by Latina scholars Sonia Nieto and Maria Torrez-Gúzman to illustrate the responsibility and capacity of Latina/o students to achieve to their highest potential. Educators who orient toward a humanizing pedagogy believe in students' academic, intellectual, and social

capacities; hold high expectations; encourage students to think independently; incorporate a range of learning styles; and engage students in solving real-world problems (Bartolomé, 1994; Huerta, 2011; Salazar, 2008). Furthermore, humanizing educators guard against deficit views that are deeply embedded in educational thought and practice (Arias & Morillo-Cambell, 2008; Brown & Souto-Manning, 2008; Dudley-Marling, 2007; García & Guerra, 2004; Skrla & Scheurich, 2004; Valencia, Valenzuela, Sloan, & Foley, 2001; Wade et al., 2008).

Student Empowerment Requires the Use of Learning Strategies

A humanizing pedagogy is empowering though a focus on learning strategies, defined by Bartolomé (1994) as "an instructional model that explicitly teaches students learning strategies that enable them consciously to monitor their own learning" (p. 186). This model provides students with reflective cognitive monitoring and metacognitive skills that facilitate student independence and enable students to self-monitor their own learning and progress. By assisting students in identifying strategies that increase comprehension and learning, students can understand how to use their own meaning-making strategies with conventional academic strategies (Bartolomé, 1994). A humanizing pedagogy is also inclusive of native language support to extend students' metacognitive strategies in bilingual or multilingual spheres (Salazar, 2010).

Challenging Inequity in the Educational System Can Promote Transformation

A humanizing pedagogy requires educators to assist the oppressed in regaining their own humanity by rejecting internalized oppression and taking action to dismantle oppressive ideologies and systems (Freire, 1970). Concomitantly, humanizing pedagogues challenge the role of educational institutions, fellow educators, and themselves in maintaining social inequities (Bartolomé, 1994). Such educators "teach against the grain" (Cochran-Smith, 2001) of policies and practices that dehumanize students, parents, and communities. Additionally, humanizing pedagogues advocate for transformational and revolutionary approaches to improving the education of culturally and linguistically diverse learners, thereby humanizing the experience of schooling for their students and themselves (Salazar, 2010).

CONCLUSION: HOPE FOR HUMANIZATION

I began this chapter with a personal narrative of my journey to reclaim my humanity as a result of the dehumanization I experienced in U.S. public schools. The cost of an education is too high if students are required to divest themselves of their language, culture, and family in order to succeed in U.S. schools and society. Schools should be spaces where all students feel supported as their multiple identities evolve within a meaningful sense of achievement, purpose, power, and hope. This review of literature on humanizing pedagogy is ultimately a proclamation of hope that as educators we can reinvent the principles and practice of education as a journey toward humanization and

liberation. Hope is central to Freirean ideology in that it includes "both the denunciation of oppressive structures and the annunciation of a less oppressive world, and hence . . . not only critical but also hopeful and prophetic" (Schugurensky, 2011, pp. 72–73). Hope is also a "crucial precondition for both a healthy pessimism and a source of revolutionary imagination" (Giroux, 2004, pp. 6–7).

This review advances hope for the moral responsibility of educators to embrace a humanizing pedagogy that respects the dignity and humanity of all students. Macedo and Bartolomé (1999) challenge educators toward a moral conviction for humanization. They write,

The critical issue is the degree to which we hold the moral conviction that we must humanize the educational experience of students from subordinated populations by eliminating the hostility that often confronts these students. This process would require that we cease to be overly dependent on methods as technical instruments and adopt a pedagogy that seeks to forge a cultural democracy where all students are treated with respect and dignity. (pp. 160–161)

Given the literature reviewed in this chapter, one conclusion that can be reached is that it is the moral duty of educators to understand and enact humanizing pedagogy that is grounded in theory, possible in practice, and shaped by the realities of students' and teachers' lives. The moral duty of educators can begin through the following philosophy: "We find each other where we are in the human experience and go from there" (Rodriguez, 2008, p. 345). From this point on, a humanizing pedagogy must be grounded in the diversity of everyday life and interrogate the human experience in the context of power, privilege, and oppression to provoke action toward humanization and liberation (Freire, 1972; Keet et al., 2009; McLaren & Jaramillo, 2006). The moral duty of educators coalesces in what Simon (1992) describes as a space where educators, students, and their families "envisage versions of a world that is 'not yet'—in order to be able to alter the grounds upon which life is lived" (p. 375). This space that is "not yet" allows us to relentlessly strive for humanization, liberation, and transformation in education and society.

To trigger transformation toward humanization and liberation, it is imperative to explicitly name the beliefs and skills of a humanizing educator to support the development of a humanizing pedagogy that advances the humanity, dignity, and achievement of learners of diverse backgrounds. As such, educator preparation and development can instill the philosophy and practice of humanizing pedagogy in a new generation of revolutionary educators. However, although the role of educators and educator preparation is vital to advancing a humanizing pedagogy, this chapter concludes with an appeal for studies that engage the voices of the oppressed to better understand the need for, and the practice of, humanization in education. Currently, most studies on humanizing pedagogy describe the role of the teacher in creating a humanizing experience for students. Some would argue that scholars continue to privilege the experience of the "oppressor" and negate or exclude the agency of the "oppressed" by strictly focusing on the educator's role in a humanizing pedagogy.

Future research should therefore focus on the active role of students in cocreating a humanizing pedagogy in the classroom and beyond.

REFERENCES

Adams, M., Lee, A., & Griffin, P. (2010). *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Alexander, G. C. (2002). Interactive management: An emancipator methodology. *Systematic Practice and Action Research, 15*, 111–122. doi:10.1023/A:1015288407759

Allen, R. L., & Rossatto, C. A. (2009). Does critical pedagogy work with privileged students? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *36*, 163–180.

Arias, B. M., & Morillo-Cambell, M. (2008). *Promoting ELL parental involvement: Challenges in contested times*. Retrieved from http://www.greatlakescenter.org/docs/Policy_Briefs/Arias_ELL.pdf

Aronowitz, S. (1993). Paulo Freire's radical democratic humanism. In P. McLaren & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter* (pp. 8–24). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bahruth, R. E. (2000). Changes and challenges in teaching the word and the world for the benefit of all humanity. In J. E. Katchen & L. Yiu-Nam (Eds.), *Selected papers from the ninth international symposium on English teaching* (pp. 1–9). Taipei, Taiwan: Crane Publishing.

Bahruth, R. E. (2007, March 9). *Learning how to speak human* (Keynote). Kaohsiung, Taiwan: I-Shou University.

Balderrama, M. V. (2001). The (mis)preparation of teachers in the Proposition 227 era: Humanizing teacher roles and their practice. *Urban Review*, *33*, 255–267.

Bartolomé, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *64*, 173–195.

Bell, L., & Schniedewind, N. (1989). Realizing the promise of humanistic education: A reconstructed pedagogy for personal and social change. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, *29*, 200–223.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools Press.

Brady, J. (1994). Critical literacy, feminism, and a politics of representation. In P. McLaren & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *Politics of liberation: Paths from Freire* (pp. 142–153). London, England: Routledge.

Brown, S., & Souto-Manning, M. (2008). "Culture is the way they live here": Young Latin@s and parents navigate linguistic and cultural borderlands in U.S. schools. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *7*(1), 25–42.

Burke, C., Adler, M. A., & Linker, M. (2008). Resisting erasure: Cultivating opportunities for a humanizing curriculum. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *10*(2), 65–72.

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & Rivet, A. (2008). Creating hybrid spaces for engaging school science among urban middle school girls. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*, 68–103.

Cammarota, J., & Romero, A. (2006). A critically compassionate intellectualism for Latina/o students: Raising voices above the silencing in our schools. *Multicultural Education*, *14*(2), 16–23.

Carnoy, M. (2004). Foreword. In P. Freire (Ed.), *Pedagogy of the heart* (pp. 7–20). New York, NY: Continuum.

Cho, D., & Lewis, T. (2005). The persistent life of oppression: The unconscious, power, and subjectivity. *Interchange*, *36*, 313–329.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Learning to teach against the (new) grain. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(1), 3–4.

Cummins, J. (2001). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Dale, J., & Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2010). *Pedagogy of humanism* (*Explorations of Educational Purpose*, *Vol. 12*, pp. 71–104). New York, NY: Springer.

Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Policy frameworks for new assessments. In P. Griffen, B. McGraw, & E. Care (Eds.), *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills* (pp. 301–340). New York, NY: Springer.

de la Luz Reyes, M. (1992). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically different students. *Harvard Educational Review*, *62*, 427–446.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: New Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk*. Chicago, IL: McClurg.

Dudley-Marling, C. (2007). Return of the deficit. *Journal of Educational Controversy*, *2*. Retrieved from http://www.wce.wwu.edu/Resources/CEP/eJournal/v002n001/a004.shtml

Dyson, A. H. (1993). *Negotiating the permeable curriculum: On literacy, diversity and the interplay of children's and teacher's worlds*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Centrie, C., & Roberts, R. (2000). Educating beyond the borders of schooling. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *31*, 131–151.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of acting White. *Urban Review*, *18*, 176–206.

Fránquiz, M. (2003). Literacy reform for Latina/o students. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *38*, 418–430.

Fránquiz, M. (2005). Education as political work: An interview with Sonia Nieto. *Language Arts*, *83*, 166–171.

Fránquiz, M., & Salazar, M. (2004). The transformative potential of humanizing pedagogy: Addressing the diverse needs of Chicano/Mexicano students. *High School Journal*, *87*(4), 36–53.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1982). Education as the practice of freedom (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). In *Education for critical consciousness* (pp. 1–84). New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1984). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1997). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage* (P. Clarke, Ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Freire, P., & Betto, F. (1985). *Essa escola chamada vida—Depoimentos ao reporter Ricardo Kotscho* [This school called life: Testimonials to Ricardo Kotscho Reporter]. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Atica.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Freire, A., & Macedo, P. (1998). *The Paulo Freire reader*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Frymer, B. (2005). Freire, alienation, and contemporary youth: Toward a pedagogy of everyday life. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, *1*. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5wd2w4gs

García, S. B., & Guerra, P. L. (2004). Deconstructing deficit thinking: Working with educators to create more equitable learning environments. *Education and Urban Society*, *35*, 150–168.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). *The abandoned generation: Democracy beyond the culture of fear*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giroux, H. A. (2010, November 23). *Lessons to be learned from Paulo Freire as education is being taken over by the mega rich*. Retrieved from http://archive.truthout.org/lessons-be-learned-from-paulo-freire-education-is-being-taken-over-mega-rich65363

Glass, R. D. (2001). On Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and the foundations of liberation education. *Educational Researcher*, *30*(2), 15–25.

Goduka, I. N. (1999). Educating for democracy in South America: Lessons from Freire humanizing pedagogy. *Democracy and Education*, *13*, 42–48.

González, N., Moll, L., & Amantí, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gore, J. (1992). What we can do for you! What can "we" do for "you"? Struggling over empowerment in critical and feminist pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and critical pedagogy* (pp. 54–73). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gore, J. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gottlieb, E. E., & La Belle, T. J. (2009). Ethnographic contextualization of Freire's discourse: Consciousness-raising, theory, and practice. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *21*, 3–18.

Grande, S. (2000). American Indian geographies of identity and power: At the crossroads of indigena and mestizaje. *Harvard Educational Review*, *70*, 467–499.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*, *32*(4), 3–12.

Gutiérrez, K., Asato, J., Santos, M., & Gotanda, N. (2002). Backlash pedagogy: Language and culture and the politics of reform. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *24*, 335–351.

Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, & Activity*, *6*, 286–303.

Hornberger, N. H., & McKay, S. L. (2010). *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Huerta, T. M. (2011). Humanizing pedagogy: Beliefs and practices on the teaching of Latino children. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *34*(1), 38–57.

Huerta, T. M., & Brittain, C. M. (2010). Effective practices that matter for Latino children. In E. G. Murillo, Jr., S. A. Villenas, R. Trinidad Galvan, J. Sanchez Munoz, C. Martinez, & M. Machado-Casas (Eds.), *Handbook of Latinos and education: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 382–399). New York, NY: Routledge.

Jackson, P. W. (1990). *Life in classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Jennings, L. B., & Da Matta, G. B. (2009). Rooted in resistance: Women teachers constructing counter-pedagogies in post-authoritarian Brazil. *Teaching Education*, *20*, 215–228.

Jennings, L. B., & Smith, C. (2002). Examining the role of critical inquiry for transformative practices: Two joint case studies of multicultural teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, *104*, 456–481.

Keet, A., Zinn, D., & Porteus, K. (2009). Mutual vulnerability: A key principle in a humanizing pedagogy in post-conflict societies. *Perspectives in Education*, *27*, 109–119.

Kiros, T. (2006). Frantz Fanon. In K. Wiredu (Ed.), *A companion to African philosophy* (pp. 216–224). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Kirylo, J. D. (2001). *Paulo Freire: The man from Recife*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 465–491.

Macedo, D. (1994). *Literacies of power: What Americans are allowed to know*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Macedo, D., & Bartolomé, L. (1999). *Dancing with bigotry*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

McLaren, P., & Jaramillo, N. E. (2006). Critical pedagogy, Latino/a education, and the politics of class struggle. *Critical Methodologies, 6*(1), 73–93.

Milner, R. (2003). Teacher reflection and race in cultural contexts: History, meanings, and methods in teaching. *Theory into Practice, 42*, 173–180.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*, 132–141.

Moller, A. C., & Deci, E. L. (2009). Interpersonal control, dehumanization, and violence: A self-determination theory perspective. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 13*(1), 41–53.

Morrell, E. (2008). *Critical literacy and urban youth. Pedagogies of access, dissent and liberation*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Murillo, E. G., Villenas, S., Galvan, R., Sanchez Munoz, J., Martinez, C., & Machado-Casas, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of Latinos and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2007). *Collateral damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Nieto, S. (2003). Challenging current notions of "highly qualified teachers" through work in teachers' inquiry group. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*, 386–398.

Nieto, S. (2010). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities* (10th anniversary edition). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nieto, S., & Rolon, C. (1997). Preparation and professional development of teachers: A perspective from two Latinas. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), *Critical knowledge of diverse teachers and learners* (pp. 89–123). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*, 7–22.

Parker-Rees, R., & Willan, J. (2006). *Early years education: Major themes in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pizarro, M. (1998). "Chicano power!" Epistemology and methodology for social justice and empowerment in Chicana/o communities. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 57–80.

Price, J. N., & Osborne, M. D. (2000). Challenges of forging a humanizing pedagogy in teacher education. *Curriculum and Teaching, 15*(1), 27–51.

Quiroz, P. A. (2001). The silencing of Latino student "voice": Puerto Rican and Mexican narratives in eighth grade and high school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 32*, 326–349.

Renner, A., Brown, M., Stiens, G., & Burton, S. (2010). A reciprocal global education? Working toward a more humanizing pedagogy and practice. *Intercultural Education, 21*(2), 41–54.

Reyes, R. (2007). Marginalized students in secondary school settings: The pedagogical and theoretical implications of addressing the needs of student sub-populations. *Journal of Border Educational Research, 6*, 3–5.

Roberts, P. (2000). *Education, literacy, and humanization: Exploring the work of Paulo Freire*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rodriguez, A. (2008). Toward a transformative teaching practice: Criticity, pedagogy and praxis. *International Journal of Learning*, *15*, 345–352.

Rodriguez, A., & Smith, M. D. (2011). Reimagining Freirean pedagogy: Sendero for teacher education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, *9*, 91–103.

Rumberger, R. W., & Larson, K. A. (1998). Student mobility and the increased risk of high school dropout. *American Journal of Education*, *107*, 1–35.

Sadowski, M. (2003). *Adolescents at school: Perspectives on youth, identity, and education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing.

Salazar, M. (2008). English or nothing: The impact of rigid language policies on the inclusion of humanizing practices in a high school ESL program. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *41*, 341–356.

Salazar, M. (2010). Pedagogical stances of high school ESL teachers: "Huelgas" in high school ESL classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *33*, 111–124.

Salazar, M., & Fránquiz, M. (2008). The transformation of Ms. Corazon: Creating humanizing spaces for Mexican immigrant students in secondary ESL classrooms. *Journal of Multicultural Perspectives*, *10*, 185–191.

Sanchez, G. J. (1993). *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, culture and identity in Chicano Los Angeles 1900–1945*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Schapiro, S. (2001). *A Freirean approach to anti-sexist education with men: Toward a pedagogy of the "oppressor"*. Retrieved from http://www.fielding.edu/research/ar_papers/Schapiro.pdf

Schugurensky, D. (2011). *Paulo Freire*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Siddhartha. (1999). *Education as a liberalizing tool*. Retrieved from www.unesco.org/most/freirearticle.htm

Simon, R. (1992). *Teaching against the grain*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Skrla, L., & Scheurich, J. J. (2004). *Educational equity and accountability: Paradigms, policies and politics*. London, England: Routledge.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 23–44.

Souto-Manning, M. (2006). A critical look at bilingualism discourse in public schools: Auto/ethnographic reflections of a vulnerable observer. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *29*, 439–458.

Strobel, J., & Tillberg-Webb, H. (2006, June). *Applying a critical and humanizing framework of instructional technologies to educational practice*. Paper presented at the AECT Research Symposium, Indiana University, Bloomington. Retrieved from http://www.aect.org/events/symposia/Docs/critical%20and%20humanizing%20framework.pdf

Suárez, D. (2007). Second and third generation heritage language speakers: HL scholarship's relevance to the research needs and future directions of TESOL. *Heritage Language Journal*, *5*(1), 27–49.

Svedman, D. (2007). From me to you: Lessons from teaching in Segundo Barrio. *Journal of Border Educational Research*, *6*, 145–156.

Talbert-Johnson, C. (2004). Structural inequities and the achievement gap in urban schools. *Education and Urban Society*, *37*(1), 22–36.

Trueba, H., & Bartolomé, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Immigrant voices: In search of educational equity*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Valencia, R., Valenzuela, A., Sloan, K., & Foley, D. E. (2001). Let's treat the cause, not the symptoms: Equity and accountability in Texas revisited. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *83*, 318–326.

Valencia, R. R. (Ed.). (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. London, England: Falmer Press.

Valencia, R. R. (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Valenzuela, A. (Ed.). (2004). *Leaving children behind: How "Texas-style" accountability fails Latino youth*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wade, S. E., Fauske, J. R., & Thompson, A. (2008). Prospective teachers' problem solving in online peer-led dialogues. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*, 398–442.

Warikoo, N., & Carter, P. (2009). Cultural explanations for racial and ethnic stratification in academic achievement: A call for a new and improved theory. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*, 366–394.

Warren, K. (1998). Educating students for social justice in service learning. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *21*(3), 134–139.

Weiler, K. (1991). Freire and a feminist pedagogy of difference. *Harvard Educational Review*, *61*, 449–474.

Woodson, C. G. (2006). *The miseducation of the Negro*. San Diego, CA: Book Tree.

Ybarra, R. (2000). Latino students and Anglo-mainstream instructors: A study of classroom communication. *Journal of College Student Retention*, *2*, 161–171.

Yosso, T. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *81*, 69–91.