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Abstract:

Critical scholarship in the social sciences usually focuses on the social sphere outside of the academy. However, for higher education researchers, critical research is often undertaken within and for the academy, which in turn may endanger one’s career if the dominant power structures are threatened. How might we enact and perform critical research within the academy when the academy itself is our focus? In this piece, we script our dramaturgical relationship with critical theories, to question the meaning of these paradigms in our own work and in our field (of education) as well as to explore the potentials of and limits to the use of critical theories and paradigms that may move beyond critical.

Keywords: critical theory, praxis, performance ethnography

Characters:

We are eight scholars ranging from doctoral students to assistant, associate, and full professors of higher education. We come from a variety of epistemological and methodological worldviews, but the common threads that undergird our current work are the desires to advance theory, disrupt existing power dynamics, and find ways to free ourselves from the often oppressive and constraining spaces we occupy as academics.

Act I

Setting: Actors are on their respective campuses waiting to join a conference call.

(A dial tone crescendos as the lights come up. A chorus of key

1. This manuscript represents a truly collaborative effort—as such, authors are listed in alphabetical order by last name rather than by level of contribution.)
tones is heard as the actors dial the conference line. The phone
beeps and the call begins.)

JONATHAN

Is everybody with us?

(The phone beeps again.)

CHRISTIN

Hi, all. This is Christin. Sorry for the delay, technology was acting up.

Can everybody hear ok?

(A series of yeses floods the line. There’s a brief pause.)

GARRETT

Great! Let’s begin. So, how will we approach our conference session? In our proposal we stated that our aim in this symposium is to have a dialogue about how critical scholars do critical work. Critical theory necessarily includes an element of liberatory practice, however should not be thought of as a monolithic canon under which all revolutionary or change-based research is situated. We all agree that we are consumed in a world that seeks prescriptions for how to create justice and our goal is to more fully understand journeys and processes of critical knowing. Could we start with a question about how we engage in searches for liberatory cracks in the oppressive academy?

SUSAN

Maybe instead of just telling attendees what I do for research, I could offer a metaphor that I use in my teaching that helps to differentiate what I do from alternative (paradigmatic) approaches. Stemming from an assignment in my doctoral work, in which I was assigned to identify a metaphor to represent different theoretical or paradigmatic frames, I offer the metaphor of chocolate chip cookies. First, imagine those pre-packaged Toll House cookies as positivism. They come in a log and you just slice them up, put them on a tray, and you have uniform Toll House cookies. Or better yet, you can now buy them pre-cut for you on a cardboard tray; the pre-scored dough is ready to break apart and bake. The cookie is standardized, objective, uniform. This does not reflect my approach to research (or to baking, for that matter). Capital “T” truth was not how I viewed the world. However, critical theory and particularly feminism resonated. I can find myself (extending the chocolate chip cookie metaphor), asking, Who privileged the chocolate chip (over, by example, the raisin)? Why is brown sugar called brown sugar and white sugar is not labeled as white? Why is white sugar privileged as the standard sugar? Such questions make visible what is taken-for-granted. We might also look for what’s missing. Consider the story of Nestle capitalizing on the Toll House cookie recipe and the total erasure of Ruth Graves Wakefield from the history of the chocolate chip cookie.

---

A critical and feminist lens enables me to ask questions about power, and what constructs and sustains the status quo. Additionally, I draw upon poststructuralism, postmodernism, deconstruction, and particularly through Elizabeth Allan’s policy discourse analysis, enabling a deeper interrogation; I am able to ask questions about what is embedded within and perhaps taken-for-granted. Here, to further extend the metaphor, we may deconstruct the chocolate chip cookie to its dough; we ask questions about what’s within and we then have the potential to then make something anew—such as (to keep with the metaphor) chocolate chip cookie dough ice cream. We illuminate the givenness of existing structures that have become taken-for-granted; recognizing that it hasn’t “always been this way” affords me some possibilities for unthinking and rethinking.

**JENI**

Critical spaces are opportunities and it’s true, there are some possibilities, but we also exist in a constrained environment as academics, as scholars, however we want to identify. As a researcher, I have power.

**SUSAN**

What kind of power?

**JENI**

I choose the questions I am going to ask. I choose when the interview begins and when the interview ends and, while I’m hoping that there’s an open conversation, that people feel that they have agency in the interview process, I still hold the power. I hold the power in terms of how those data are analyzed and while there are mechanisms I can use to mitigate the severity of the power differential, the differential is still there and I’m not sure what to do with that. I want to know how I can continue to be part of the academic structure as a feminist when I know the structure best serves those who already have the power and continues to disenfranchise those who don’t.

(Tania nods aggressively but silently from behind the phone wanting to signal agreement but not interrupt, hindered by the technology of the conference call.)

**SUSAN**

I hear you struggling with different kinds of power. Power that is held, producing what Amy Allen refers to as “power over,” is a dominant conceptualization of power. However, I also hear that your aim is to give and share that power, thus empowering your participants’ voices in the research process—what Allen refers to as “power to.” Yet, can we ever really achieve shared power (or power with)? We are “always already” bound “into structures of coercion or domination.” Thus, as we draw upon critical theory to empower and liberate, might agency and autonomy “be nothing more than illusions”?

---

Indeed, I am reminded of Crotty who explains that “critical inquiry keeps the spotlight on power relationships within society so as to expose the forces of hegemony and injustice.” Thus, my search right now is for new frameworks in my scholarship. While I will always be a feminist and consider feminisms in my approach, I also need to consider complementary theories that push me to think differently and challenge existing power structures. I’m struggling with where to find those and how to adapt them into the work that I do. Theory should evolve. It’s not static and should not go without challenge. I think I have been prone in my work to just accept the theory as it is and while I want to advance theory, I don't think I’m pushing as hard as I could. As a result, I find myself identifying similar outcomes and recommendations for policy and practice. I reinforce one truth rather than finding new truths to advance what is known and what could be known.

(Christin leans back in her chair in relief, realizing that her mentors struggle with these questions, too. She starts to reflect upon the many times since becoming a faculty member when she's felt less than effective at pushing for change, especially through her teaching, constrained by her role as a non-tenured faculty member.)

I agree that advancing theory is necessary, and, for me, advancing critical theory is about moving towards critical practice. My use of critical theory is guided by an assumed responsibility for the public good and for truth-telling that disrupts the status quo. I want to move beyond the conversations theory generates and towards a praxis of engagement.

My research largely focuses on community engagement and service learning, and in the higher education context, service learning is the pedagogical practice of linking community service with classroom content. But the broader definition of community engagement extends to practices like internships and field experiences, co-curricular community based experiences as well as community based research. I came to the scholarship of engagement primarily because of a transformative experience in my own undergraduate education. This led me to believe that linking meaningful community work to the text and conversations of the classroom is a win-win. Meaning that good work happens in the community and that students learn more and better through the experience. While critical theory has given us the knowledge…

Susana (Interrupting)
Wait a minute, theory doesn’t “give” us knowledge. Instead, as Foucault suggests, I think we are "opening up the space for a possible transgression."
TANIA (Continuing)
Yes, critical theory invites us to be bothered and affords language to critique; however, I do not feel it has generally offered the strategies to change practice fully. So I do believe in the philosophies regarding community practice, that higher education institutions have an obligation to do work that matters, and I also believe that we can do work from a place of authentic engagement that recognizes and honors the lived experience and the expertise of the local community, and allows them to dictate the terms of engagement. Charles Phillips talks about the opportunity of queer theory to positively, dynamically, and creatively destabilize norms, to flip the script. And my hope for this project is that we’ll lay bare the norms of service learning pedagogy and practice and destabilize the field. I hope that we’ll create space to reimagine and revision a community engagement practice that seeks to, in the words of Cathy Cohen, “build a field of analysis and praxis that can help to transform the academy and perhaps the country.”

JONATHAN
This community engagement piece is particularly important for me as I work alongside undergraduate students to create queer inclusive spaces and serve as an educator on my campus. As a scholar practitioner, I often struggle with the integration of critical work within a system that historically excludes the LGBTQ community. My research has largely focused on campus climate in which I attempt to illuminate where and how institutions are continually marginalizing LGBTQ communities. Yet, my pursuit of implementing change in institutional policy and practice, while somewhat successful, still has me actively participating in and navigating the system that continues to marginalize these communities...

TANIA (Interrupting)
I really want you to unpack that.

JONATHAN (Continues)
I attempt to connect critical theory to practice through my role as a campus facilitator for queer oriented trainings and workshops. Joe Kincheloe suggests educators can subvert power through the advancement of marginalized voices in education. In these spaces I can advocate for LGBTQ equity, centering issues of social justice, but I wonder if I am truly doing critical work, serving a greater public good, if I am continuing to participate in the power structures of higher education and therefore support the status quo. In my position, I feel the expectation to diplomatically represent our programs to campus and community constituents that may lead to potential financial support. I experience this tension of disrupting normative expectations of queer programs, but maintaining certain expectations.

CHRISTIN
This deeply resonates with me as a scholar practitioner as well. I use service-learning and community engagement as ways to introduce critical theory and reflexive practice into the classroom to disrupt the ways my profession (dietetics) historically marginalizes and “others” through our

---

work. Yet, the realities of working within academia, and within professional boundaries, often leaves me questioning how legitimate my efforts are as a critical scholar, as I bend to conform to the constraints these institutions place upon me. I came to sit within a critical/feminist space, as sociologist Dorothy Smith did, by noticing that “when I looked for where I was in my discipline I discovered that I was not there.”\(^{11}\) Thus, I take up critical work—both as a researcher and an educator—as an intentional act of resistance.

(Other actors express verbal agreement.)

\textbf{JENI}

Christin, what are you resisting? Professional boundaries?

\textbf{CHRISTIN}

In a way, I suppose, I’m resisting—and hopefully teaching my students to question—the highly medicalized notion that health care and public health practitioners have expertise that gives them “power over” those with whom we work. This does speak to professional boundaries, as it directly relates to who holds sanctioned knowledge, which helps to script what is considered possible in the work that we do.

\textbf{SUSAN}

The challenge that you infer and to which I relate is how to work both within and against. I am currently a faculty member; however, I was a student affairs administrator for more than a decade, and during that time authored many policies and protocols seeking to address the problem of interpersonal violence on university campuses. I often facilitated meetings with individuals representing various campus departments and community agencies. People were quick to identify as allies in the effort to combat interpersonal violence; they were open to partnerships—in concept—but cautious about making changes in their daily practice; old habits die hard. For instance, a surge of energy to facilitate cross-departmental collaborations would stagnate as assumptions about programs, services, and who is being (or will be) served are left unstated and/or uninterrogated. Similarly, the introduction of new protocols for responding to incidents of interpersonal violence were embraced in concept, but would encounter numerous challenges as departments continue to execute old protocols. Administrators may replace existing procedures with a new document in a training manual; however, this did not ensure that practitioners’ habits and routines would be interrupted.

Still, in my daily practice, I strove to suspend a rush to judgment and instead remained at the threshold of certainty; in that buoyant moment we may reconsider how we operate, what we take-for-granted, examine embedded assumptions about our work and ourselves. It was in this space that I was working from within (the system) but also striving to push against and be critical of the status quo. Such “troubling” of (disciplinary) practices may generate a lot of anxiety, conflict, and even fear, and change may be more likely to emerge unexpectedly rather than be intentionally orchestrated. Further, to sustain these difficult dialogues demands time, emotional energy, and possibly money. It is then, instead, much easier to maintain reserve, terminate a difficult exchange,

or facilitate consensus; the alternative—a liminality—involves risks that practitioners are typically unwilling to take. With these reflections, I acknowledge the dissonance between these theoretical ideas and the practice of, in this case, policy-making (and social change).

JENI

Like Susan, I worked in student affairs for about 10 years before I became a faculty member. As part of my last position, I was the chief judicial officer. While there were opportunities to push against and shape policy, I don’t think I ever felt more constrained than in that role. I wanted to see myself as a socially just educator, and I tried to make every discussion about whether a student was responsible for a policy violation a learning opportunity. But I found it extremely difficult to move beyond binary thinking—it was a violation, or it wasn’t. I played a positivist by day, finding it hard to perform as my feminist self.

Perhaps the most creative and subversive sanction I gave was to a student who made derogatory statements about women. I asked him to read Only Words by Catherine MacKinnon12 and meet with me again to discuss it. However, in the end, I really was just a cog in the judicial machine and I have no idea whether MacKinnon and I made a difference for those marginalized by the student’s behavior in the first place.

TANIA

I think about this a lot. So much of our work is purposely aimed towards communities that are marginalized or in need, and we partner to illuminate the conditions that create need and hopefully—and I need to stress hopefully—do some work that contributes to change. But, so often service learning and community engagement involves students (and other stakeholders) in work that doesn’t truly address root causes of social problems.13 Rather than advocate for or build accessible housing, we serve meals in soup kitchens. And we do that work in compressed timelines responsive to the academic calendar that limit opportunities to invest deeply. How do I critique a practice when I know my own practice falls short of the change I want to see happen?

(A chorus of knowing “um-hmms” are heard.)

GARRETT

(Scratches head.)

These comments make me wonder what we are asking critical theory to do for us. It seems to me that here, acting critically within the academy means finding a liminal place in which to exist—remembering what it can be while working with what is. Are we engaged in a process of transformation, then? And what does it mean that there might be an endpoint we can theoretically conceptualize?

AMY
I do want to push a little bit on what critical and poststructural theories have given us. Increasingly, I feel that critical research is insufficient. By that, I mean that there seems to be an edge that we can never reach. It’s not doing the things we thought it would do for us, and it’s basically asking us to assert an interest and a claim towards the same thing that dominant groups already have. For example, first and second wave feminisms largely fought for parity, and yet we should ask ourselves, parity with what? We need to question the thresholds we aim to reach.

(Tania from behind her computer opens a new document on her screen typing “We need to question the thresholds we aim to reach!!!”

AMY (Continues)

Our point of reference is often the capitalist, white settler, heteronormative, patriarchal baseline. How do we move beyond that? How do we express that we want more than that? We need to unmap the territories of oppression, as Sherene Razack discusses. We need to unlearn the lies that have been told to us.

One way that I have been trying to unlearn and unmap in my research on higher education is to use visual methods as a new way of seeing. While it is popular among those using visual research methods, I am not very interested in replicating qualitative paradigms through visual means, such as the use of photo elicitation. Good work can be done that way, but I am more interested in an iconoclastic approach that breaks through our expectations of educational research and moves us toward new vision. The methods I have been working with, juxtaposition and repeat photography, create meaning in the spaces between images and ideas, to create something that hasn’t existed before. I use the techniques of observation that are common to the research process, but I utilize them for generative purposes. In a way it is an artistic vision, using the seen world as a platform for its critique but envisioning something new in the process.

GARRETT

Yes!

(Pumps fist in the air.)

I think we have to really interrogate what we mean by “education” or perhaps rather, the purposes of higher education. I do work surrounding the “achievement gap” and I believe that there is no way we are going to end educational disparities and gaps in access until academics allow ourselves as a field to be critical of the framework of higher education. When we say we are advocating for student “success” and “achievement,” what do we mean? Who defines those terms? What possibilities are even available for students? How does our white supremacist, heterogendered, capitalist education system constrain what students can become, who students can become, and what they can achieve? Does acting critically mean, in part, engaging in the process of interrogating what could be?

---

Further, how do the physical and organizational structures limit how we are able to conceptualize critical work in our field? How are we regulated by each other even (or perhaps especially) at a place like this conference? I am reminded, Garrett, of Bensimon’s article on the achievement gap, in which she delineates three cognitive frames: deficit, diversity, and equity. Our challenge is to do equity-minded work.

Do we have more power to subvert because we will be at a conference with generally strict guidelines on what is and is not appropriate? Are we developing an active subjectivity, as Maria Lugones discusses? We are well aware we are—and will be—under the “gaze” and are intentionally pushing against what it expects of us. To be sure, we’re pushing enough to get noticed, but not enough to get thrown out of the conference, for example. Maybe we should disrupt the traditional seating and format of the conference session, but will people—conference attendees—be uncomfortable sitting among us?

I like that idea—literally sitting with discomfort. It is a metaphor for much of what we have discussed, I think.

Yes, I think this tension is important to highlight. However, I'm not sure my work isn't better described as trying to fly under the radar, rather than getting noticed. But the notion that we, as scholars, can trouble "a little bit" yet still feel that sense of caution that results in our "holding back" due to disciplinary/professional boundaries, that is the tenuousness of being a critical scholar.

Right, so here we are intending to create a liminal conference space, if we define liminal as something that can exist within individual people. We are able to occupy a liminal space in that we are straddling the world of the conference/academia as well as spaces outside of academia, outside of the “gaze” inside of ourselves. We remember what it’s like outside and that remembering of being outside consciously informs our decisions within. To bring it back to Amy’s discussion of unmapping, I think we are currently spatially mapping where we can and cannot go, attempting to chart new territory. This is careful subversion.

But, Garrett, are we getting noticed? We’re on the conference program (though sometimes relegated to the final session of the conference, tucked down a corridor less traveled by attendees); however, I fear that I am the greater beneficiary of the “notice.” I will get a line on my CV so I will get “noticed” by my review committee, to earn my hierarchical assent within the academy.

---


feel at times like I push on the walls in the maze, but I am still within the maze; I’ve simply changed the route.

(Jay feels his chest tighten, emphatically agreeing with Susan while also acutely mindful of the need to obsess over CVs and tenure review.)

**GARRETT**

Perhaps all we can hope for is to make the maze bigger. What happens if we forge new routes? Denzin argues for a “social justice impact criteria” that would “celebrate resistance and engage radical critiques of social institutions.”

**AMY**

We too often forget that our normative spaces, such as peer review, are social constructions—powerful ones no doubt—but they are mutually agreed upon fabrications. We may need to “follow the rules” to achieve tenure and earn status, but then we must break things! Too often I think we try to work within the system without really tearing down the aspects of the system that we used to fight against. It is like we take our anger and pack it away because once we get to the high table, we don’t want to lose our seat.

**JENI**

In this way, then, we are socialized to maintain our “power over” those not at the high table, much like Susan was discussing earlier. We may critique those normative structures in private, but we are not truly being critical because we are not being autonomous and working toward emancipation for ourselves and our colleagues.

**CHRISTIN**

Being in a non-tenure track (NTT) position, I have no protection to be able to save up that anger for later to then unleash it unto the world. Denzin observes that I am one of the “victims” in this system; that I write the “resistance texts that did not get published.” Knowing that is an uncomfortable space for me. At least if I had the hope of tenure, I could tell myself that I'll get to it (truly doing critical work) someday. Instead, there's just a defeated feeling—like there will never come a day when I will have that protection to be as feisty as I need (or want) to be to enact change. This makes me wonder how the erosion of tenure track jobs and the influx of NTTs is going to affect the doing of critical work!

---


So does “being truly critical” then mean giving up our seat at the table? I’m trying to conceptualize holding positional power while simultaneously denouncing it. We can acknowledge the social construction of things like peer review but pretending like it is arbitrary when its enactment has consequences for everybody seems unethical. I guess my question is more about if we can be “truly critical” from our positions.

“We” need to not become “them.”

I don’t know. This is the place where I get really caught up, you know? My intention is to ask good questions, to encourage better practice, to do transformational work. Some days I recognize my power and privilege and question who is missing from the table that needs to be there. I wonder if and how I can do “truly critical” work in institutions that are so dependent on social stratification. At the same time, I feel like I’m claiming a space at the table that wasn’t meant for me and that feels disruptive too! I feel really lucky to be a woman of color who has a voice that is recognized and heard in the community engagement field. Maybe I need—too much—to believe that my positionality also creates opportunity for me to be critical...

CHRISTIN

I don’t know that you’re saying this, Tania, but does one have to occupy marginalized identity categories in order to do critical work? I grapple with this. My field is comprised of 93% women and 96% white, predominantly middle class students. As a white woman, I do not “appear” to have an "underrepresented" affiliation status. This can diminish my credibility talking with students. Yet, I am aware that I don't get the "you're just angry because you’re disenfranchised" comment either. An identity conflict that I do negotiate (since the birth of my son) is that I identify as a “fat dietitian” and I wrestle with the shift from a healthy body weight as a student to an unhealthy one as a practitioner. Does this positionality, as well as my contingency as a non-tenure track faculty member, align me with critical theory?

JONATHAN

Perhaps this mapping of identities, or careful subversion, still allows us to navigate within the historically oppressive system. Challenging and changing policy, reframing practice and engagement, or methodologically reconsidering how and what data we collect. To critically engage, we are not necessarily buying into these expectations, we are demonstrating our resistance. Utilizing our scholarly tools as mechanisms for truth-telling. Most of us are qualitative methodologists but how do we enact careful subversion using quantitative methods where there may be statistical constraints or, dare we say, the proliferation of more rigid ways of thinking?
JAY

As the quantitative methodologist in the group, I can try to tackle this question. What does it mean for me to problematize universal standards in education and question the regression of certain positionalities and subjectivities, while also standardizing truths and designing studies to optimize best-fit in a regression model? I am in a constant in-between, feeling as both an insider and outsider to critical truth telling and the public importance placed on quantitative research. Quantitative scholarship is essential in advancing institutional, state, and national policies and practices in higher education, yet institutional advocacy, policy reform, and resource allocation are all hindered by quantitative designs that essentialize truth and view public goodness through a grand narrative of “best-fit.”

From an epistemological lens, quantitative designs are perceived to be grounded in positivism and diametrically opposed to critical techniques. As a quantitative scholar, I am left wondering if critical theory can accommodate the restraints of quantitative methods rather than dismiss them entirely. In other words, are critical intentions and adaptive techniques enough for quantitative scholars to be included in conversations about truth and public good in education research?

JONATHAN

Jay, can you give us some examples of how these ideas manifest in your research?

JAY

Methodologically, certain techniques in quantitative designs challenge positivism and unearth emancipatory scholarship. One way is through continually encouraging scholars to reconceptualize quantitative analyses and the ways in which we collect demographic information so we can collectively advocate for systemic change in quantitative survey design. My work combines statistics and survey design with critical epistemological approaches, largely intersectionality and queer theory. The balance that I try to maintain is understanding the complex, fluid, and intersectional identities while also necessitating quantification of those identities in some way.

I am trying to consider ways in which we can understand identity besides static unidimensional constructs. For example, I strive to consider identity development, self-authorship or disclosure of identity, the saliency of identity and finding ways in which we can have a universal understanding of how to collect this information. Furthermore, I am interested in exploring the ways in which we ask demographic questions in surveys (e.g., “check all that apply;” “not listed, please describe”) to understand how question format may influence how we interpret students’ identities. Without reforming the ways in which survey methodologists include demographic variables, scholars will continue to perpetuate a culture of exclusion.

There are, however, some difficulties with criticalism in survey design from a methodological standpoint. First of all, there are politics and finances involved with survey design. For example,

adding several branched questions to specify students’ racial identities and saliences requires the deletion of other questions due to the need for parsimony and short survey completion time. Second, survey designers often adopt demographic questions from government surveys for federal and peer benchmarking, and government surveys do not quantify undocumented students, queer and trans* individuals, or other social identities in an adequate or consistent manner for critical researchers. And third, quantitative analyses utilizing critical paradigms are often difficult to perceive. When possible, I advocate for the categorical approach to intersectional research in survey design whereby researchers use demographic variables with main effects and interactions. If you have a complicated design, it gets quite messy and on the other end, if you have a small survey instrument with fewer than eight or ten thousand students, to be able to take an intersectional approach is decidedly difficult and we end up essentializing people to white and people of color or LGBQ and hetero, for example. And, there are other identity communities in terms of sampling where those analyses are not even possible, mainly for people with disabilities and trans* people.

I entered the field as a scholar because I wanted to enact social change to advocate with and for individuals across all social identities. I became immersed and obsessed with quantitative methods because I saw great potential for change in policy and practice. But questions that are coming up for me are: How does my work enact change? Am I too removed from the lived experiences of students by doing quant research? Might my work be more relevant and impactful in the policy sphere or in student affairs administration or for a nonprofit rather than as an academic? And is being a faculty member in higher education really a place for me to enact social change?

GARRETT
You bring up some difficult questions, Jay. I wonder, too, about the politics of quantification. Miranda Joseph questions the process of quantification and abstraction, arguing that these tactics make social problems impersonal and remove the material and social realities minoritized communities face, something your questions get at.24 Foucault, in fact, argues that statistics allow governmentality, the production and management of populations.25 As Joseph asks, how does quantification simultaneously create subjects and be used as a catalyst for transformation?26

JAY
Garrett, your inquiries are spot-on with regards to the juxtaposition for quantitative criticalism. In spring 2014, I had the opportunity to speak with Alexander Astin about his widely used Inputs-Environments-Outputs model for examining the impact of college on students.27 In discussing the limitedness of survey designs, he remarked that if scholars do not include variables, they are essentially saying that these qualities are not important and do not exist. I agree with Astin’s assen-

tions that survey methodologists must be inclusive and detailed with students’ identities and experiences; yet, I recognize the static unidimensionality of essentializing students’ selves at one specific point of data collection.

Although this juxtaposition is most illustrative with demographic information collection in survey design, I challenge that quantification occurs across all research methods and subjects. For example, assessing environments via survey design innately assumes that colleges and universities are static experiences that remain constant across time. In essence, survey methodologists remove the temporal material and social realities, reducing students’ lived experiences to a brief snapshot in time. However, the complexity of nested models and variable interactions enables quantitative scholars to qualify students’ unique positionalities with the goal of advocating for more identity-conscious environments. Taking the issue of temporal quantification further, I purport that other methods exercise the same time-laden restrictions as quantitative designs. In the same way that survey design captures static moments of students in their environmental contexts, other data collection techniques (e.g., focus groups, interviews, document analyses) also capture a static moment in time that, although likely continually altered and shaped, create subjects set in one temporal narrative.

As such, I am again drawn to the epistemological considerations of research beyond the often-discussed (and wrongly conceived, in my opinion) dichotomy between qualitative and quantitative inquiry. As Dubrow discussed, researchers must stop wondering whether quantitative analyses are appropriate for utilizing critical paradigms in research and instead strengthen the bond between critical inquiry and quantitative techniques.

**JONATHAN**

I think we are all engaging some great questions and it’s clear that our field is doing some very important critical and deconstructive work and I think along with this critical work, we are asserting a politic, which sometimes seems scary. I want to, however, bring us back to a question that Jeni asked: How does your work enact change? Maria Lugones states “Politics is a commitment to act differently in the present, to think and act against the grain of oppression.” We all come to critical work with, necessarily, an anti-oppression framework. With this in mind, how do you see your own work, research or otherwise, as enacting your politics keeping in mind Visweswaran’s call for a “commitment to thinking the political through its multiple guises?”

**GARRETT**

Jonathan, thanks for bringing this back up. Perhaps this is the question with which we start at the conference.

(As the lights fade, a series of beeps are heard as the actors hang up their phones.)

---

INTERMISSION

Act 2

(Lights are down. The silence is broken by the noise of an airplane flying overhead. The lights come up on the actors sitting at a breakfast table in a fancy hotel restaurant. Each actor’s plate is full. The actors are thinking about the ways in which their critical methodologies have a responsibility to move toward assertions and/or questions of truth or contributing to the public good and how critical work shies away from questions/assertions of truth and/or the public good.)

SUSAN
I’m anxious to pick up where our symposium conversation left off, but I am also apprehensive. We had a dynamic conversation at the symposium and I am energized to enact the theoretical possibilities we entertained. Yet, I am also aware that I am sitting in a space (yesterday’s session, this morning’s breakfast) that is underwritten by my privilege. I am about to eat my Belgian waffle from a buffet breakfast in an upscale restaurant in a fancy DC hotel.

(A waiter approaches the table and begins to refill coffee mugs. Momentary silence.)

WAITER
Everything okay here?

ALL
Yes!

(Waiter walks away. Actors’ eyes shift slowly back to Susan.)

SUSAN
(Clears throat.)

To my point, my meals, accommodations, and travel are subsidized by my university (employer), while the people who clear the tables and clean my room were possibly picketing with their unionized co-workers to protest working without a contract for 2 years.31 And these unionized hotel workers, who ultimately secured a new, 5-year contract, are the labor minority. Most service workers are unrepresented women, people of color, and immigrants who are being “nickel and dimed” by their hotel employers.32 So as we initiate (potentially esoteric) post-symposium dialogue about


how critical work enacts the public good, I feel rather discouraged or disenchanted. How does my use of critical methodologies, intended to disrupt norms and critique the status quo, really do anything? I am not putting my body on the picket line—whether with these service workers or with my contingent peers (adjunct faculty). Where is the critical praxis in my research? What (public) good is this critical work?

JENI
I am struggling with some of the same issues. I also come to this conversation with tremendous privilege. Among those privileges is that I am paid to produce “knowledge;” the workers Susan mentioned are producing knowledge too and have very real truths that deserve space. Yet, somehow within this academic place, my “truth” and “knowledge” are more legitimate.

Further, I write about feminist faculty activism and think about my own activist identity. I am primarily a professionalized activist, which means that I use tools of my profession (e.g., research, teaching, service) to critique the academy and disrupt the status quo. It is within this context, that I am having theoretical, methodological, and epistemological conversations that are only salient for other academics. How is that transforming the larger social world and how can I even compare these strategies and goals to the efforts of the unionized workers about whom Susan spoke? I am trying to convince myself that by considering critical theories and methodologies, I am doing my part—but is that really social change? Do these conversations we are having even matter?

SUSAN
(Reaching for the sugar bowl.)

I am mentally snagged on the notion of “transforming.” A tenet of critical theory is to transform. Yet, in what ways might I unwittingly reify aspects of the world that I am seeking to trouble? Who determines what we are to transform into?

JONATHAN
This is where I continue to struggle. Are my attempts toward criticality in a power driven bureaucratic system of higher education able to produce an impact toward equity? Should we be asking this from critical theory? Or will we get to a point where our ways of doing critical work reifies systems of privilege?

TANIA
I appreciate what you are raising, and I too wonder, does my research enact my politics? A lot of my research exposes my politics, but I am not sure it enacts my politics? I am not always sure how to enact my politics through research. It usually comes through the opportunities I have after my research to work on individual campuses or with groups of faculty or administrators where I think that change might happen. The questions I ask and, sometimes, how I approach answering them reveal my commitments to (uses her hands to gesture quotation marks) “act against the grain of oppression,” but journal articles and book chapters don’t feel like taking action. When I actually

---

feel like I am contributing to a movement for change is in workshop settings—coaching faculty, administrators, and community partners towards a more critical praxis that enacts their commitments to respond to and change systems and structures that create and sustain need.

JENI
I’m curious, does anyone feel like the classroom contributes to a movement for change? I definitely think it has the potential. I see teaching as one of many processes of knowledge production, just as research is. And, I hope that at the end of a semester, all of us are better equipped to act against oppression in our own ways.

CHRISTIN
I certainly see this in my work. I use the classroom as a space to create change—using critical theory to support the way I teach, what I teach, what I ask students to do with what I teach, and who/what I intentionally expose them to. Through the enactment of my teaching philosophy I aim to create a reflexive practitioner—one who is able to disrupt the status quo in their professional role.

SUSAN
It must be about more than just knowledge production, but also the development of skills to enact what one knows, and in particular, in the service of social change. Otherwise students possess knowledge that is reproductive of existing structures; they may have awareness of difference and inequities, but go about doing business-as-usual. To interrupt the routine, to stick a wrench in the machine, is a powerfully affective, embodied experience; one that few students have an opportunity to feel. While struggle in the classroom to cultivate both “safe and brave” spaces, I too often feel that this rationalist space, where the cognitive domain is privileged, undermines the potential for “feeling the subject.”

AMY
I hear what you are saying, Susan. I think at times it is my job to be unproductive, because that is more useful. I know that sounds ridiculous, but if I am always working toward producing “knowledge products,” the kind that are recognized and rewarded by the academic profession and my employing university, then I may be too focused on research dissemination pathways that are of little use to most people. We are in a productivity paradox, but not the kind that most administrators and managers describe. In the neoliberal academy, we must do more with less, but we are evaluated on our ability to produce value for our institutions, either literally in terms of revenue or figuratively in terms of prestige. In so many ways, I feel that the academy has shifted toward a version of the public good that equates “useful knowledge” with “commodifiable knowledge.” To make matters worse, we have affixed this new rationality on an arcane production cycle that is too often self-referential and self-serving.

**JAY**

I aspire to use tenets of critical pedagogy to explore connections between ideology, power, culture, curriculum, and pedagogy.\(^{35}\) In particular, the concept of power in academic spaces is continually at the forefront of my mind. For example, I have explicit pedagogical goals for deconstructing power imbalances between knower/learner, teacher/student, subject/scholar, and grader/gradee. I encourage a collaborative and critically conscious learning environment with hopes that students will connect their learning with social consciousness and community action. My curricular efforts allow for a re-shaping of classroom structures; yet, the impact often feels localized and to a limited contribution of the public good.

**GARRETT**

Jay, it sounds like you might be grappling with how to shift to a “power to” framework within a “power over” structure and it seems like “power over” is coded as “bad” or “undesirable” throughout our conversations. While I believe, to some extent, this is true, I’m wondering about how “power over” may actually be serving the public good.

(Jay nods in agreement with Garrett as his mind spins exploring these possibilities.)

**SUSAN**

I too approach my teaching with aspiration that I will help students “to think critically, take risks, and resist dominant forms of oppression.”\(^{36}\) I think I nudge this in small ways through the equity action projects that students are assigned.\(^{37}\) Yet, as students enact their projects “the institutional constraints and larger social formations that bear down on forms of resistance” slowly erode their confidence, efficacy, and commitment.\(^{38}\) They will come to me as their projects progress and share that a supervisor has expressed concern or is hesitant about the student’s efforts. The student, in turn, brainstorms with me what might be alternatives, safer routes to take, that could still “make a difference” (and earn the grade), but not be too disruptive. Thus, as the ripples move away from where the first splash occurred, they soften and slow, until they are no longer a ripple, but once more the placid surface. Yet, I must recall that “resistance is a multi-layered phenomenon” that “registers differently across different contexts and levels of political struggle.”\(^{39}\) More, bigger splashes and the possibilities for what critical approaches can contribute to the public good are renewed. I fight the “cynicism about the ability of ordinary people to take risks, fight for what they believe in, and become a force for social change.”\(^{40}\) Another semester, more students, ready to link their collective knowledge and social responsibility, I am revitalized.

---

39. Ibid., xxiv.
40. Ibid., xxiv.
I also wonder whether doing critical work is an act of resistance, as Petersen challenges us to consider.\textsuperscript{41} Doing this work, from Petersen’s view, then is to start with understanding power, which is what I think we have been alluding to in our conversations. And aren’t these conversations a methodological effort at questioning truth?

Of course, absolutely! But, as you noted previously, “I reinforce one truth rather than finding new truths.” Critical work could risk reifying an alternate Truth.

At the same time, why are we questioning truth—in so doing, are we really contributing to critical practice and the public good? We are contributing to knowledge production in a very formalized sense, within the academic structure; it is the structure that we are also critiquing and challenging, but are we using critical theory to participate in an academic conference or to publish in an academic journal? While we may be pushing on the structures with notions of multiple truths and critical methodologies, they are still tools within the hegemonic structure that is not accessible to all. So, I am complicit; thus, am I really an activist?

I think I am struggling with the distinctions between challenging and changing. I have always been motivated by the activist intentions of critical race theory. Delgado and Stefancic describe the work of critical race theorists as “not only [trying] to understand our social situation, but to change it...to transform it for the better.”\textsuperscript{42} Do we push structures or do we knock them down?

I think we wobble structures, with the goal that, over time, they will loosen and fall. Yet, I must be within the system to have access to the structures in order to try to topple them. What happens when I topple the structures that sustain my ability to topple them? Or maybe, as Audre Lorde reminds me, “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house;” thus, I will never do anything more than wobble these structures.\textsuperscript{43}

Right, so I will totally own my hypocrisy. There is so much to my question that is aspirational rather than actual. I do believe that some of my work shines a necessary light on the ways that community engagement in higher education serves to reify power rather than redistribute it, but my work also celebrates this practice for the impact and influence it has been shown to have on the lives of students. If I think about critique, challenge, and change on a continuum, I see the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\end{thebibliography}
critique and occasionally the challenge, but I want to figure out how to move the needle closer to change.

**SUSAN**

I sense that we are still grappling with various conceptualizations of power. The notion that we would “redistribute” power is rooted in a dominant assumption that power is held. And, central to critical theory is a distributive assumption of power, in order to empower and liberate. Yet, we then are complicit in the ‘possession’ of power. And, we are falling short in attention to the Foucauldian conceptions of power as circulating and thus available to be taken up.

**JENI**

Susan, is your point that we are complicit because we can never be completely outside of power, but still can critique it, resist it, and seek freedom from it?  

**JAY**

Considering my research efforts, I find small successes in combining my scholarship and teaching but there are procedural and cultural limitations for me as a pre-tenure assistant professor. My research and teaching pursuits are ideally meant to recenter truth and contribute to the public good, but my candidacy and marketability require me to center all of my efforts on my own self-promotion and singular contributions to the field. Quite literally for my tenure dossier, I must quantify my efforts via percentages to demonstrate my unique contributions to my scholarly field. In essence, I am required to repress my critical consciousness and reinforce my power as a faculty member in my scholarly and pedagogical pursuits. By being complicit to institutional and cultural dominance vis-à-vis my tenure reviews, am I promulgating exclusion in academia? (Tania and Christin begin snapping their fingers as Jay is talking, to signal their support for all he is saying.) Rather than quantifying my unique scholarly contributions, is there a way for me to demonstrate my shared push towards the public good? Of course as a quantitative scholar I must ask how to operationalize the quantity and quality of contributing to the public good and question whether academia should have a structure to demonstrate faculty advancement of the public good in addition to (or in replacement of) individual merit and contributions.

**SUSAN**

I look for the cracks and nooks in the structures, into which I might stuff something new, thus rebuilding from within. For instance, in the concluding recommendations of my dissertation—a policy discourse analysis of diversity action plans—I recommended that diversity policy-makers change the focus of their work from “diversity” to “equity.” I acknowledged that this was not simply a matter of executing “find” and “replace,” i.e., searching a policy for the word “marketplace” and replacing it with another (e.g., democracy) to produce different effects. At my current institution, I had an opportunity to influence the construction of a Diversity Action Plan, and I suggested that this new plan foreground equity, rather than diversity. Such a focus (on equity)

---


would shift attention to institutional practices and the production of unequal educational outcomes.\textsuperscript{46} The policy title was changed to Equity Action Plan. The content remained largely diversity-minded, but equity was “at the table;” we have had to keep fairness and justice at the forefront of our mind, even if it is to acknowledge the limitations of our work in achieving equity-minded outcomes. It is in this way that I believe critical approaches can arouse interest in socio-political problems and fuel collective action in the service of the public good.

\textbf{Garrett}

It seems to me that the tension between the public good and individual contribution/self-promotion are characteristics of the neoliberal influence on higher education where masculinist culture, individuality, and competition reign.\textsuperscript{47} We struggle against the system, to rebuild from within as Susan says, hoping that we can forge our own freedom in small ways. Who we are as academic subject depends on non-voluntary relationships to structures and conventions, although we do have agency to shape these structures. My hope is that through relationships, scholarly communities, and continued conversation we can continue these struggles.

\textbf{Jeni}

I am filled with gratitude for this collaboration. Thank you for such an invigorating conversation. I must head out but I look forward to continuing this conversation with you all.

(Feeling both energized and exhausted, Jeni pays for her meal and exits the restaurant. Tania and Jay follow closely behind.)

\textbf{Tania}

I have been fueled by this generative dialogue. I’m so thankful for you all and am leaving with many questions that I will continue to engage. Much love!

\textbf{Jay}

Yes indeed, I look forward to connecting again with everyone. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help us move forward together. Safe travels getting home everyone!

\textbf{Christin}

You know, I better head out myself. Does anyone want to share a cab?

\textbf{Amy}

I’ll join you. How do you feel about walking? I’d love some fresh air to decompress and process.

\textbf{Christin}

Sounds perfect, goodbye everyone!

(Christin and Amy thank everyone, give farewells, and head out together. Jonathan, Susan, and Garrett are left at the table, sipping their coffees and teas. Feeling resolved in the unresolved,


\textsuperscript{47} Henry A. Giroux, \textit{Neoliberalism’s War on Higher Education} (Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2014).
they enjoy each other’s company in several minutes of silence before leaving the restaurant.

**Director’s Notes**

This play was first performed in the planning for, and debrief after, a symposium at a scholarly conference in November of 2014. While our “experimental” format led to the disruption of the traditional conference format, the actors were still constrained by time, physical space, and modality. In the spirit of Denzin, we were “willing to take chances.”48 We hope that readers too will “dare to take chances”49—to interrogate other possibilities for the disruption of traditional academic spaces in their struggle for emancipation; that through “collaborative storytelling”50 and telling ‘resistance stories,’”51 marginalized voices will be centered and we will come closer to “the free and full participation of all members of a society in civic discourse.”52

Our intention of this play is to uncover the limitations and potentiality of critical theory. We explore multiple meanings of power, autonomy, and agency within the struggle for emancipation, democracy, and the public good. We pose as many questions as we answer, recognizing that understanding is fluid and on-going. Further, we encourage readers to produce their own scripts regarding the use of critical theories in educational research that take up the questions the actors raise here. Act II stops at a point where readers can choose to continue the dialogue off script or re-script what already exists. Finally, we encourage the use of this article as a pedagogical tool and offer the following questions as a beginning point: Have we moved toward contributing to the public good? If so, which or whose “public?” Who is un/mis-represented? How are the actors re/presenting their own truths and what are the implications of this? What does the use of critical theory mean for critical methodologies and praxis? How critical is critical theory? Is being critical an identity? A descriptor? A category? An act (or series of acts)? All of the above? We hope that the issues the actors grappled with in their scholarship and the questions we posed can serve as a catalyst for continued conversations about moving from critical theory to critical praxis and the responsibilities we have as academics to advance particular, contextualized, notions of truth and the public good.
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