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ABSTRACT

CHARMAINE J. SMITH-CAMPBELL
FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE IN P-12 EDUCATION: A THEORY-TO-PRACTICE INVESTIGATION
Under the direction of SHERAH BETTS CARR, Ph.D.

This theory-to-practice qualitative narrative study uses Freire’s (2005, 2011) ideas of pedagogical love to create a Freirean critical social justice approach (FCSJEA). This approach serves as a framework for comparisons, analysis, and discussions of emic themes from the study’s eight participants’ narratives, to etic elements of the study’s Freirean model. The purpose of these comparisons are to determine whether or not, and to what extent, parallels, areas of conversion, or areas of divergence exist between both as well as for identifying possibilities for theory-to-practice applications for this model in P-12 curriculum development, instruction, and learning in contemporary U.S. settings. The study utilizes a methodological bricolage that blends Stake’s (1995) qualitative instrumental design with the qualitative narrative approach found in Clandinin and Connolly (2000) and others. A criterion-based purposeful sampling determined selection of included participants. Findings indicate that the Freirean model offers a useful theory-to-practice approach for transformative P-12 education. There are two sets of recommendations. The first involves a need for scholarly theory-to-practice research similar to this study. This should include diverse participant pools and multiple voices
including students, parents and caregivers, teachers, policymakers, school leaders, as well as all other interested parties. The second set of recommendations calls for teachers, all educators, curriculum workers, and education policy makers to utilize Freire’s language of humanization education as starting points for transformative P-12 educational actions. These recommendations call on each of us to become morphogenetic change agents as described by Freire, this study, and Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) change process. These are the possibilities hoped for by Freire and the faith upon which this study stands.

*Keywords:* Freirean pedagogical love, Dewey, morphogenesis, postmodern theory, Freirean critical social justice educational approach (FCSJEA), dehumanization/humanization, transformative education, equity, justice, bricolage, instrumental-narrative design, pre-kindergarten to 12 grades (P-12), emic themes and elements, etic themes and elements.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This study builds on the critical social justice assertion that educating is neither neutral, harmless, nor inert, but leaves indelible imprints on those it touches. It is for these reasons that it offers a model of education grounded in Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love, which is not just cognitively uplifting, knowledge creating, and inventive but also socio-politically transformative and humanizing in nature and intent. This study argues that a certain type of education, such as the Freirean (2005, 2011) model grounded in pedagogical love, is an invaluable humanizing force—a point that Dewey (1997a, 1997b) also makes. Both Freire and Dewey point out that a special type of education is what identifies humans as historical beings, separating them from their animal counterparts. The Freirean (2005, 2011) educational framework this study uses can serve as a basis for helping to guarantee education as a basic human right as outlined by the United Nations (UN, 1948) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2016). It can help in guaranteeing the basic human need for education outlined by Foshay (1991).

Burgess (2016), Freire (2005, 2011), and Dewey (1997a, 1997b) point out that this type of education supports and sustains authentic democracies, with Burgess asserting that education affects a nation’s wealth in human capital and, [that] at individual levels, your education affects your earnings, your employability, and your chance of
succeeding in life. It also affects your health, future family structure, intellectual fulfillment, and other aspects of a good life. Burgess argues that:

At a national level, a country’s stock of skills matters hugely for its prosperity and growth rate. The distribution of skills is a big determinant of inequality, and the relationship of a person’s skills to their background is central to the degree of social or intergenerational mobility. (2016, p. 3)

These arguments make the historically dogged presence of persistent educational gaps such as ones reflected in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores, a dehumanizing force, a deprivation of a human need, and a human rights violation (United States Department of Education [ED], 2015). These gaps are sources of the poverty, economic and otherwise, of a nation’s inhabitants (Burgess, 2016).


This study offers Freire’s (2005, 2011) pedagogical love as an additional set of educational best practices capable of achieving humanizing educational outcomes that have been called for by previously mentioned authors and organizations. Pedagogical love does not describe fuzzy feelings and emotions, but actions that Sonia Nieto (2008) describes by saying,

I have found that the most effective teachers... ground their work in love. This is not a soppy, sentimental love... The love they speak about is a critical love, a love that demands, and expects, nothing but the best from students, a love that believes that students can engage with the world, and that they have a right and a responsibility to change it. (p. 129)
Nieto’s (2008) references to Freirean pedagogical love describe a knowledge-creating instructional and learning educational model that is cognitively inventive and socio-politically transformative. It is humanizing and empowering in ways that create citizens as agents of change for building and sustaining authentic 21st-century democracies, grounded in human justice and equity in nations like the U.S. (Giroux, 2009, 2017).

This study does not postulate as an all-inclusive, infinite, nor final truth for answering the myriad problems troubling education in this nation today. It is a relativistic response in the spirit of Freire’s concept of *reinvention* that offers options, viable alternatives, hopes, and possibilities as Freire argues. Even in an age of student-centered instruction and learning, where differentiation and individualized instruction are invaluable educational tools, the study acknowledges the presence of a myriad of injustices.

**Research Problem**

This study addresses problems associated with educational inequity, social justice education, and the dehumanizing effects most often reflected in NAEP achievement gap discussions. Scholars such as Noguera (2001, 2003a, 2008, 2009, 2012); Noguera and Wing (2006); Carter and Welner (2013); Spring (2011, 2014); Rothstein (2004, 2015); Ferguson (2008); Marable (2006, 2007); and Ladson-Billings (1994, 1995, 2004) highlight these problems in their works. More evidence of human injustices are evident in discussions of the *school-to-prison pipeline* found in works such as Nance (2016), Noguera (2003b), and Rocque and Snellings (2017) and is at the root of many
sociopolitical and economic injustices that stain this nation’s standing as a 21st-century global democratic example.

These educational inequities showed evidence of diminishing only once in this nation’s history during L. B. Johnson’s *Great Society* reforms (Ferguson, 2008; Marable, 2006, 2007; Noguera, 2009; Ravitch, 2013; Spring, 2014; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). These reductions did not occur because of beliefs about the human need and right to education but due in large part to Cold War contingencies and the scars this nation’s “separate and unequal” standards posed at that time. The launching of Sputnik during this period made such temporary reforms even more urgent. President George W. Bush references the persistence of educational inequities as a reason for implementing No Child Left Behind (NCLB), pledging to “confront another form of bias: the soft bigotry, of low expectations,” that continues to characterize educational inequity and injustice in this nation (Bush, 2000, July 10). Today the “American Dream” of a *good* education, the promise of a better life, and the sense of justice that this democratic system promises for all its citizens is a fleeting dream for socio-politically marginalized children and families (Noguera, 2001, 2003a, 2012).

This study seeks to address these problems, not on a macro level, but by approaching *one teacher, in one classroom, with one student at a time* at the most micro and localized levels described by Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) social morphogenesis, in hopes of becoming ultimate change agents. It offers both the philosophical groundings and practices of Freirean pedagogical love as one of many ways of finding multiple solutions.
This study broaches solutions for critical theory-to-practice research that includes the Freirean model called for by writers such as Amidon (2013), Gaztambide-Fernández (2003), Gottesman (2010), and Miedema and Wardekker (1999). While there are currently numerous studies that utilize Freire’s ideas on education as starting points, there is an absence of research specifically on the concept of pedagogical love in P-12 settings in the US. This study aims to contribute to filling the gap.

In addressing these problems, this study also broaches problems related to traditional language in conversations about students’ educational success and educational disparities. These categorizations described in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, geographic locations, and other differentiated human descriptors can be divisive by compartmentalizing thinking about children’s educational success (Ferguson, 2008, 2014; Gay, 2010, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2004, 2014; Noguera, 2001, 2003a, 2008; Ogbu 2002, 2014; Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014). By using Freire’s (2005, 2011) language of humanization, human rights, and the collective human need for education in discussions, this study frames the problem as a universal one. It frames the problem as one that affects the lives of all in a universal way, relatable to all members of the human species.

This is not to suggest that these categories and labels are not important in discussions on students’ successes because they are extremely valuable for the dissection, examination, and resolutions of these problems (Adams & Bell, 2016). However, as scholars previously mentioned like Paris (2012), Paris and Alim (2014), Gay, (2010, 2013), and Ladson-Billings (2014) point out, these categories and labels are problematic
and can, for instance, lead to stereotyping and other unfavorable and harmful generalizations.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this theory-to-practice qualitative study is to explore *emic themes* from eight participants’ narrative of experiences in U.S. P-12 settings and to compare them to *etic elements* of this study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) critical social justice educational approach (FCSJEA). Emic themes emerge directly from participants’ narrative of experiences as originally told (Stake, 1995). They are stories of “the actors” themselves, as Stake points out. Etic elements, on the other hand, emerge from the researcher’s interest and often lie in areas outside of the stories themselves, such as when theory is involved, as is the case in this study (Stake, 1995). Authentic retelling of emic themes in an ethical way that remains true to the narrative and theory is the core of this study’s approach.

In comparing emic themes from participants’ narratives with etic elements from the study, the purpose is to identify parallels, areas of convergence, as well as areas of divergence between the study’s Freirean model and practices described in participants’ narratives. This comparison determines whether or not, to what extent, and how the Freirean model—originally developed for adult education in Brazil during the 1960s and 1970s—applies to 21st-century U.S. P-12 education in these narratives. It also seeks to identify practical approaches emerging from this theory to experience comparisons that are useful for curriculum and instruction planning and implementation in ways similar to ones the narratives describe.
The findings offer possible insights into theory-to-practice applications of Freire’s cognitively inventive, knowledge-creating, transformative, humanizing, and socio-politically transformative ideas to the pool of possible best curriculum, instruction, and learning practices in U.S. P-12 settings. Findings apply only to the eight participants, their descriptions of educational experiences, research questions, and the overall study’s scope, nature, and contents. The boundaries limit the petite generalizations (Stake, 1995) made from these findings.

This study is similar in some ways to Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West (2015), Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016), Smith-Campbell (2017, 2018), and Smith-Campbell, Cain, Inchauste, Markert, and Betts Carr (2018). It has the same agenda as these cited works that explore Freirean (2003, 2011) pedagogical love as a transformative educational approach in P-12 and higher educational settings. Within the context of a PhD student’s experience in Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016), that student said this form of education allowed him to go “from being a bystander to being the expert in the room” (p. 40). The PhD graduate states that after an education grounded in elements of Freire’s (2005, 2011) pedagogical love, that, “I don’t feel like I need to fit anyone’s mold anymore. I can be myself, my authentic self because everything isn’t about school; it is also about what’s going on inside of me” (p. 40). This is an example of what transformative education looks like in that participant’s experience, and the expectation is that this study’s participants will reveal similar educationally transformative experiences of their own. This work is a conversation starter. It is not a blueprint of solutions to the
problem of students’ educational success in U.S. P-12 settings. Instead, it offers an approach based on data findings anticipated from participants whose stories are included.

Research Questions

This study has three research questions: (1) what emic themes of pedagogical love emerge from participants’ narrative of educational experiences in U.S. P-12 settings? (2) How do these emic themes compare to etic elements of this study’s FCSJEA grounded in pedagogical love? (3) In theory-to-practice applications, how do findings contribute to transformative and humanizing educational best practices in ways parallel to those in the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model?

Theoretical Framework

Knowing . . . demands a constant searching. It implies invention and reinvention in the learning process. (Paulo Freire, 2011, p. 82)

This study represents a critical, relativist, 21st-century postmodern approach indicated by Freire’s invitation of reinventing and constantly searching for new and diverse, yet responsible ways of increasing visibility of diverse, historically excluded, and silenced humans within the boundaries of empirical scholarship. This idea, also present in the concept of border crossings found in Giroux (2005); Kincheloe (2004, 2005, 2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); as well as Evans (2014) is at the core of this study’s approach.

Freire’s reinvention like the concept of border crossings describes not just the relativism called for by postmodern thinking, but it is also cognizant of a need to find new and viable ways to conceptualize, theorize, discuss, and analyze 21st-century
realities driven by influences never seen before as Giroux (2005, 2017) and others point out. What drives this study’s topic, methods and approach, theorizing, and other ways thinking is technology and flat world realities of globalization discussed by Giroux (2005), Kincheloe (2008), Evans (2014) and other critical postmodern theorists. Friedman (2006) describes it in detail.

This study’s theoretical framework found in its FCSJEA represents both a response to Freire’s call for reinvention referenced in the opening epigraph, as well as a responsible attempt at border crossing described by Giroux (2005), Evans (2014), Kincheloe (2004, 2005, 2008), and others. The FCSJEA offers another way at seeking to responsibly theorize and apply Freire’s ideas to U.S. P-12 education, a setting not originally intended for application when written in the 1960s and 1970s, but widely applied by responsible scholars in the field today.

In this venture, Kincheloe (2008) warns that applying Freire’s ideas to U.S. P-12 education does not indicate a movement to “promiscuously choose theories to add to the bricolage of critical theories/pedagogies” since such actions are “highly suspicious” and can be counterproductive or even hurt the movement for humanization, justice, and equity called for by Freire (p. 170). Kincheloe’s comments provide a backdrop for this study’s theoretical discussions and its offer of FCSJEA as a means of exploring Freire’s ideas to U.S. P-12 settings.

The FCSJEA theoretical framework emerges from Freire’s (2005, 2011) critical social justice ideas grounded in pedagogical love. These ideas attach in part to the critical traditions of Horkheimer and the Frankfurt School. The FCSJEA theoretical
framework also utilizes Dewey’s (1997a, 1997b) ideas on the sociopolitical value of a special type of education alongside the CSJET model it uses. Dewey’s ideas support a similar assertion about the sociopolitical transformative value of education by Freire and the FCSJEA. In addition, Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) *social morphogenesis* is a third element in the FCSJEA that helps in explaining how education operates as a sociopolitical change agent, as outlined by Dewey, Freire, and the study’s FCSJEA.

Use of the FCSJEA as a theoretical framework occurs while being cognizant of the problematic nature of this form of theorizing pointed out by authors such as Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Creswell (2007, 2011); Stake (1995); Thomas (2007); and Turner (2004). However, Kincheloe (2004, 2005); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); as well as Bruce Beuthin, Sheilds, Molzahn, and Schick-Makaroff (2016) recognize the value of using emergent 21st-century approaches for critical theorizing in areas where current ones are insufficient. This is part of the process of reinventing a U.S. 21st-century Freirean model, applicable to U.S. P-12 settings, an area where such a void exists as pointed out in Amidon (2013); Gaztambide-Fernández (2003); Kincheloe (2004, 2005, 2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); and Miedema and Wardekker (1999).

**Conceptual Framework**

While this study’s theoretical framework establishes epistemological and theoretical groundings for this theory-to-practice investigation, its conceptual framework provides a frame-of-reference and a construct that guides the research process, the data analysis, and discussions of data findings. Tables 2 and 3 outline the Freirean (2005, 2011) elements of this conceptual framework that have three broad educational
categories: (1) teacher characteristics (2) instructional elements, and (3) anticipated educational outcomes. All elements listed under these three categories, culled directly and exclusively from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011), are guides for thinking about the narratives, in organizing, comparing, analyzing, and discussing them as part of the study’s findings for addressing the topic and research questions posed.

**Research Methods**

This study utilizes a qualitative *bricolage*. A bricolage blends two or more methodological designs that writers such as Kincheloe (2004, 2005) and Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011) argue as best suited for critical theory research. This study’s bricolage blends a qualitative instrumental approach (Stake, 1995) with a qualitative narrative one (Caine, Estefan, & Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) and is described as an *instrumental-narrative* design throughout the study.

This instrumental-narrative bricolage and the instrumental approach facilitates handling of etic elements associated with the FCSJEA and the second research question in this theory-to-practice exploration. On the other hand, use of the narrative approach, facilitates handling of emic themes emerging from participants’ narratives that serves as a foundation for addressing all three research questions and the topic of investigation.

Eight participants ranging from 21 to 42 years old, selected through a purposeful criterion based sample, are the study’s data sources. The selection relied on a loosely structured pre-interview process involving questions shown in Appendix B; Tables 5 and 6 show participants’ details and other related information.

Justification

Findings from multiple database searches between March 2016 and September 2017 justified this research since none of the works found included students’ voices of P-12 educational experiences. These searches found that the only significant ones were Darder’s (2002, 2017) Reinventing Paulo Freire; Schoder’s (2010) Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of Love; Nieto’s (2008) Dear Paulo; the study on Doctoral Students’ Experiences by Esposito et al. (2017); Smith-Campbell (2017), Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West (2015); and Smith-Campbell, and Littles (2016). These searches involved over 1,000 results using the Mercer University digital and inter-library loan systems, ProQuest, and EBSCO/HOST. The paucity of critical and critical social justice theory-to-practice research also justifies this study. Authors such as Gatzambide-Fernández (2003); Gottesman (2010); Amidon (2013); and Miedema and Wardekker (1999) point to this shortage of works related to practical applications of theoretical ideas grounded in critical theory (CT) and CSJET.
In addition, this study represents a response for calls to “reinvent” rather than “represent” Freire, which Gaztambide-Fernández (2003); Gadotti (1994); Darder (2002, 2017); and Kincheloe (2008) speak about. Gaztambide-Fernández (2003) states that “After almost twenty years... few educational theorists and/or practitioners have taken to the task of ‘reinventing’ the ideas of Paulo Freire and applying his pedagogy to their own... contexts” (p. 95). This study’s venture into the area of Freirean pedagogical love seeks to open different doors with the FCSJEA, the Freirean language of humanization, and approaches emerging from participants’ narratives as different and new in a theory-to-practice representation of Freire’s ideas in a U.S. P-12 model.

Finally, this study answers a personal call by Nita Freire—Paulo Freire’s wife—made at a conference on Freire sponsored by the University of Central Lancashire held in Larnaka, Cyprus (Smith-Campbell, 2017). There, Nita Freire called on delegates and scholars to embark on research using Freire’s ideas that is supportive of “tolerance through dialogue.” This study is my personal response to this call.

Study’s Contribution

This study’s FCSJEA contributes by offering additional ways of thinking and theorizing about Freire’s (2005, 2011) instructional and learning methods, since they were not originally developed for 21st-century U.S. P-12 educational settings. It fills a void in this area of research discussed further in Chapter 2. These also show gaps in theory-to-practice research in critical pedagogy as well; scholars such as Gottesman (2010); Gaztambide-Fernández (2003); and Miedema and Wardekker (1999) point to this gap. This study hopes to add to this area of research. By utilizing the concept of Freirean
pedagogical love, and applying to it a theory-to-practice approach in P-12 settings, it hopes to add in a small way to works such as Darder (2002, 2017); Schoder (2010); Nieto (2008); Esposito et al. (2017), Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West (2015); and Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016) on this subject and approach.

In addition, although grand-generalizations (Stake, 1995) are impossible from a study like this, petite generalizations limited to the study’s sample are possible (Stake, 1995). These petite generalizations contribute by offering possibilities for practical curriculum and instructional applications that are capable of generating transformative, empowering, and humanizing educational outcomes in U.S. P-12 education. This study is a conversation starter that invites other similar ones, which collectively can make meaningful contributions to understandings of this phenomenon as Stake (1995) points out. By adding the seven students and one parental voice of the study’s eight participants, it also seeks to contribute by adding these voices to the pool. It is, as far as I know, the only theory-to-practice empirical work on Freirean pedagogical love that elevates these voices in P-12 settings. Most other work involves either teachers or higher educational learners. In addition, the three unique research questions is another contribution. These lines of inquiry facilitates answers that are unique to these questions and adds to understandings associated with them in a small way.

Finally, presence of storge-motherly love emerged in narratives of participants’ experiences of pedagogical love. This type of pedagogic love is not part of the original Freirean (2005, 2011) model the study uses. It might be possible that this type of pedagogic motherly caring could be relevant to Noddings’s (1984) care ethic or other
forms of educative love and caring; however, such discussions are beyond this study’s scope, topic, and research questions of interest. Even so, it is a valuable area for further research. This study opens doors to conversations and research on associations between pedagogic motherly caring and the study’s model of agape love grounded in the critical social justice tradition of Freire, Horkheimer (2002), and Kohlberg’s (1981) maxims of moral justice. These studies might explore possible ways in which both motherly love and caring operates alongside the transformative and humanizing Freirean models.

Audience

Theory and education philosophy are invaluable parts of just about all aspects of education, whether this is overt, covert, known, unknown, intentional, or unintentional. Because of this, the theory-to-practice research the study presents, is a possible practical guide for all constituents involved in the education process. It is invaluable to constituents such as curriculum developers, implementers, policymakers, and for everyday instructional references. It is valuable to classroom teachers, parents, and students who are mature enough to understand the implications and value of this content and the approach it advocates. Scholars and others interested in theorizing and research-to-practice studies may find this study useful. As an educator, I found this theory-to-practice research valuable and transformative to my professional and human growth. I believe it can be the same for others in similar fields and functions where the goal is to seek effective ways to enhance students’ learning and achievements in a manner that is socio-politically and cognitively uplifting, as well as beneficial to advancing 21st-century democratic goals grounded in humanizing justice and equity for all.
Limitations

The nature and scope of this study is limited to the topic, research questions, and researcher resources—inTELectually and otherwise included. It is limited to the number, nature, and pool of participants’ from a pool of only eight localized 18 years and older adults, connected indirectly to the author’s social network and circles. It is restricted to one small aspect related to Freire’s (2005, 2011) pedagogical love and lovelessness, which represents only a small part of Freire’s wider educational approach and associated epistemologies.

This study is further limited by including only two of over 40 works authored by Freire on education. They represent Freire’s earliest and most complete treatises on his educational approach and associated epistemologies; although inclusion of others could be possibly beneficial, their exclusion does not significantly affect the study. In addition, normal restrictions associated with the relativist-postmodern stance, prevents grand generalizations of a positivist kind as both Stake (1995) and Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe it and limits applications to other settings. This also holds true for limitations associated with the very nature of qualitative narrative research, which prevents such positivists’ truths and applications.

Another natural limitation of this qualitative narrative design relates to participant selection and data processing procedures that call for the researcher to be involved in decisions related to inclusion and exclusion, research questions and related processes, as well as activities related to the interpretation, theming and coding, and data analysis. Creswell (2007, 2014); Shenton (2004); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Stake (1995);
Merriam (2009); Denzin and Lincoln (2003); Lincoln and Guba (1985); and others point to this limitation and its effects in areas of validity and trustworthiness.

Practices of ethical conduct and responsible actions help in reducing the effects these limitations place on the study’s integrity, trustworthiness, and validity. Conforming to guidelines set by Mercer University and related training by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) assures ethical, trusting, and professional research conduct. In addition, mindful-awareness developed as part of the IRB process and adherence to ethical conduct required by standards of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Code of Ethics (2011) helps. Adherence to cautions and measures indicated by Shenton’s (2004) trustworthiness pointers keeps my own biases in check. Clear and intentional statements about these biases and conforming to Aluwihare-Samaranayake’s (2012) social justice principles of human rights and human respect, are research and methodological guidelines that align with my own Freirean critical social justice beliefs. With these safeguards in place, the effects of these limitations are limited and trustworthiness, ethical conduct, and a guarantee of the relative validly of contents are ensured.

There are also limitations associated with triangulation issues in this study. The intent was to use participant journaling as part of the triangulation process, but as the research progressed, processes associated with member checking demanded more time from participants than initially anticipated. I believed that this would be an unfair burden to them as working people in personally demanding careers and educational pursuits. This idea was never a part of the triangulation, but member checking and provisions for
thick-rich descriptions—called for by Shenton (2004); Stake (1995); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Merriam (2009); Creswell (2007, 2014); and Geertz (1973)—helped in reducing the effects of the absence of journal triangulations.

Finally, limitations related to inclusion of participants whose experiences are “success stories” that align with the study’s model is also another limiting feature. Ideally, involvement of experiences involving pedagogical love, where learners did not graduate are available as I discovered in conversations outside of this study. Some of these stories ended favorably, but one was not so. This proves, that despite the presence of elements of pedagogical love, transformative success, even on a cognitive level, does not always guarantee humanizing outcomes such as this study describes. There are many forms of exceptions to the stories told, but they were excluded due to time and constraints associated with the scope and nature of this dissertation study.

In spite of its limitations, this study is valuable for the perspectives it offers in the reflective experiences of teachers, whose practices indicate element(s) of pedagogical love and of the transformative educational success these participants believe they experienced as a result. It is in this small and significant manner and in hopes of finding ways in which Freire’s ideas are possibly applicable to education in P-12 settings, than this can become part of wider attempts at providing diverse routes to students’ educational successes in these settings.

In addition, purity and integrity of the data is ensured by keeping the language of emic themes for matters related to participants’ narratives and etic elements when they
were not. This language offered a clear delineation between participant story and areas of researcher interest related to theory as Stake (1995) argues.

Researcher’s Bias

The core of my philosophical beliefs is that effective and successful education should transform, empower, and contribute to a more complete humanization of all touched by it. Like Freire, I view education as a socio-politically transformative, empowering, and humanizing force. Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) was mandatory reading when I began teacher education training in Jamaica during the 1970s. Freire’s ideas align with my beliefs as an immigrant from the Caribbean, where education is part of the story of my “American Dream.” The influences of my father, grandparents, and Maroon ancestors, whose family traditions and appreciation for compassionate teaching align with the Freirean approach, are important ones. Additionally, other influences include my education in a *Sisters of Mercy* institution in Kingston, Jamaica, and my Puritan-Methodist beliefs about education as part of the human talent multiplication process found in the Biblical parable of the 10 Talents, and humanizing lessons of the Good Samaritan. These are maxims linked to Freire’s ideas. Like Freire, I am influenced by ideas associated with *Liberation Theology*, viewing education as part of a communal responsibility to others as well as a divine authority higher than me.

In addition, during the fall of 2017, I travelled to Larnaka, Cyprus as a delegate to a Freire Conference (Smith-Campbell, 2017). There I was humbled and motivated by Paulo Freire’s widow, Nita Freire, and her call on delegates and scholars to embark on
research using Freire’s ideas that is supportive of “tolerance through dialogue.” This is my personal response. This is my motivation.

Definition of Terms

Pedagogical Love

Freire’s use of love/lovelessness and etymologically related words in Pedagogy of the Oppressed (2005) and Education for Critical Consciousness (2011) is the origin of this term. Freire did not specifically define the word love itself (Schoder, 2010), but spoke about it in various forms as parts of the pedagogy founded in dialogue and dialogic learning. This study uses this word and related ones within contexts of Freire (2005, 2011). Tables 2 and 3 illustrate etic elements of the study’s conceptual framework grounded in pedagogical love. Tables 8, 10, and 11 through 18 illustrate emic themes emerging from participants’ narratives.

Steven Covey’s (2004) assertion that love is an action word, a verb and not an emotion described by adjectives, is significant to the study’s definition of love—pedagogical love. In some ways this aligns with the study’s model and related ones found in Darder (2002, 2017); Nieto (2008); Schoder (2010); Barrett (2003); Smith-Campbell (2017); Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West (2015); and Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016). This study’s use of the term pedagogical love conveys ideas of actions—not emotions necessarily—related to educational outcomes of humanization; sociopolitical and existential equity; and movements for democratic justice.
Transformative Educational Success

Transformative educational success links to Freire’s maxims in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011). Tables 2 and 3 and Tables 7 through 19 illustrate elements and applications of transformative educational success in this study’s Freirean model. These outcomes apply to both the study’s theoretical etic context and contexts associated with emic themes emerging from participants’ narratives.

Learners as “Subjects” versus Learners as “Objects”

Learners as *subjects* according to a translator’s footnote in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) are “those who know and act,” contrasting with learners as *objects*, “which are known and acted upon” (Freire, 2005, p. 36). In Freire, “learners as objects” links to the *banking* educational approach. The goal of Freire’s (2005, 2011) conception of education is to make learners empowered, transformative subjects evolving from naïve objects (“as things”), which are recipients of others’ knowledge and actions in the human historical process. Learners as subjects rather than objects are the *human historical vocation* as Freire argues and separates human beings from animals.

Generative Themes

Themes emerging from lived ontologies discovered by teachers as co-investigators, collaborating with learners and their community are what Freire calls *generative themes*. These themes become the foundations for curriculum, instruction, and learning. Freire (2011) states that, “generative themes—inaugurates the dialogue of education” (2005, p. 96), and that student’s, “view of the world,” is where “their
generative themes are found” (205, p. 97). Freire points out that generative words serve as instructional foundations and “should emerge from this field vocabulary research, [and] not from the educator’s personal inspiration no matter how proficiently” this may be constructed (2005, p. 44). This advice is applicable to 21st-century P-12 best instructional practices in the U.S. and most, if not all, educational settings.

Conscientizagao

*Conscientização* as written in Freire (2005, 2011) describes the conscious awakening to ones’ oppressive realities, leading to the desire to *act upon* (praxis) and transform them. Conscientizagao, as explained in a translator’s note in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005), involves “learning to perceive social, political and economic contradictions, and to take actions against the oppressive elements of that reality” (Freire, 2005, p. 35). Conscientizagao are outcomes of the study’s Freirean model grounded in pedagogical love. Tables 2 and 3 illustrate etic elements of conscientizagao in the study’s conceptual framework, while Tables 7, 9, and 11 Through 18 illustrates emic themes of conscientizagao emerging from participants’ narratives.

Praxis

The outcomes of conscientizagao is praxis—knowledgeable action to transform dehumanizing, unjust, and oppressive conditions. It is the endpoint of the education process and the starting point of working to re-create the transformative realities of democratic equity and justice such as ones called for by Freire, this study’s ideal, and the mandates and goals of the U.S. Department of Education (ED, 2011); the United Nations (1948); and UNESCO (2016). Tables 2 and 3 illustrate etic elements of praxis in the
Bricolage

The blending of two or more methodological approaches in the absence of one that effectively serves research purposes is the bricolage design (Hammersley, 2008; Kincheloe, 2004, 2005; Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011; O'Regan, 2015). Introduced in qualitative research by Denzin and Lincoln (2003); Hammersley, 2008; and McMillan (2015), a bricolage is best suited for postmodern critical and social justice research such as this study’s exploration of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love (Hammersley, 2008; Kincheloe, 2004, 2005; Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011; McMillan, 2015).

Emic Themes/Elements

The words theme and element have the same meanings, and often used interchangeably. Emic themes/elements emerge from participants’ narrative of experiences. They are naturalistic stories of “the actors” themselves without readjustments in the retelling, as Stake (1995); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); and Owen (2008) point out. Tables 7, 9, and 11 through 18 illustrate emic themes emerging from participants’ narratives.

Etic Themes/Elements

Etic themes/elements emerge from researcher’s interest and often relate to theory, texts, or researcher interests associated with the study’s purpose and goals (Stake, 1995). In this study, etic themes/elements emerge from contexts associated with the study’s
Freirean model and the three research questions posed and shaped in the instrumental
design as illustrated in Table 4. Tables 2 and 3 illustrate etic elements of the study’s
framework grounded in pedagogical love.

Acronyms

- P-12 settings—*Prekindergarten to 12th Grade Educational Settings*.
- U.S. P-12—*United States prekindergarten to 12th Grade (P-12) Educational
  Settings*.
  is the study’s theoretical framework. Figure 2 illustrates the study’s FCSJEA that
  combines elements of CT and CSJET grounded in Freirean (2005, 2011)
  epistemologies.
- CT—*Critical Theory*. A theory emerging from Horkheimer and the Frankfort School
  of Thought also represented in critical postmodern theories of scholars like Foucault,
  Freire, Giroux, McLaren, and evident in approaches like those of Critical Race
  example, as well as feminist theorists like hooks (1994, 2003).
- CSJET—*Critical Social Justice Theory*. A combination of both critical theory (CT)
  and social justice education theory (SJET) illustrated in Figure 2 that illustrates how
  they combine to create the study’s FCSJEA.
- SJET—*Social Justice Education Theory*. This is the broadest umbrella of social
  justice theory, under which categories of CT, CSJET, and the study’s FCSJEA falls
  including Dewey’s progressive model. Dewey’s progressive social justice model that
is a part of the study’s FCSJEA belongs to traditions of the British Reform Movement of the 1930s and not the Frankfurt model of Horkheimer and Freire.

- **CMfSJ**—*Critical Math for Social Justice* represented in the field of P-12 mathematics education in the U.S. in works by Stinson (2016); Stinson and Bullock (2012a, 2012b); Stinson and Wager (2012); and Larnell, Bullock and Jett (2016). It belongs to the categories of CT, CSJET, and SJET, all built on the assertion that education is never neutral or inert.

- **TLMSJ**—*Teaching and Learning Mathematics for Social Justice* is an approach found in Gutstein (2003) that utilizes ideas from Freire and other critical social justice theorists in education, including epistemologies associated with Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) CRT applicable to urban educational, U.S. P-12 settings.

**Chapter Summary**

This is an exploration of Freire’s (2005, 2011) instructional and learning model grounded in pedagogical love, applicable to U.S. P-12 settings. It fills a void in critical theory-to-practice research, as well as, research involving Freire’s ideas in U.S. P-12 settings. The study uses Freire’s (2005, 2011) concept of love in the many ways he employs it in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011). The study addresses problems of educational inequities and injustice, while seeking to fill a theory-to-practice void for critical approaches including that of Freire’s.
The study has three research questions that ask:

(1) What emic themes of pedagogical love emerge from participants’ narrative of educational experiences in U.S. P-12 settings?

(2) How do these emic themes compare to etic elements of this study’s FCSJEA grounded in pedagogical love?

(3) In theory-to-practice applications, how do findings contribute to transformative and humanizing educational best practices in ways parallel to those in the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model?

The study’s FCSJEA facilitates a theoretical framework that offers insights into Freire’s (2005, 2011) epistemologies and allows for application to P-12 settings. The conceptual framework identifies etic educational elements of the Freirean (2005, 2011) educational model used for discussions and analysis of emic themes/elements emerging from participants’ narratives. Findings indicate (1) parallels or areas of conversion, as well as, (2) areas of divergence between emic themes from participants’ narratives, and etic elements of the study’s Freirean approach. Findings also indicate (3) possibilities of theory-to-practice applications of the study’s model to U.S. P-12 settings. There is room for further empirical theory-to-practice research on Freirean pedagogical love involving students, parents, and teachers as in Darder (2002, 2017) and Nieto (2008). There is also potential for inclusion of empirical theory-to-practice research on Freirean pedagogy, including works outside of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011). Benefits of comparisons, possibly involving Noddings’s *Care Ethic* and Freirean *pedagogical love*, is another area for future empirical exploration.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In addition to describing the literature review research processes, this chapter serves four broad purposes. First, it establishes the study’s FCSJEA as its theoretical framework, placing Freire’s ideas within contexts of U.S. P-12 settings. These settings were not originally intended for direct application even though they are useful to these settings and widely applied in U.S. P-12 education research. In using the study’s FCSJEA in Chapter 2 to link Freire’s ideas to U.S. P-12 settings, it utilizes elements of CT and SJET, as well as, Dewey’s (1997a, 1997b) ideas on the sociopolitical value of a certain type of education. It also uses Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) concepts of how education operates as a sociopolitical change agent to develop this model. Figure 2 illustrates these connections and relationships in the FCSJEA. Figure 1 illustrates the study’s FCSJEA while Figure 2 illustrates connections between this model and the two forms of critical and social justice education theoretical approaches it includes.

The second purpose is to present the study’s conceptual framework. This framework guides the research processes, helping in data collection, analysis, and discussions. Like the theoretical framework, the conceptual framework allows for applications of Freire (2005, 2011) to U.S. P-12 settings. This framework consists of elements culled from the two Freirean works, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (2005)
and Education for Critical Consciousness (2011). Tables 2 and 3 show this framework and illustrate the conceptual framework.

The study’s third goal involves presentation of seminal works, scholarly peer-reviewed research, and dissertations that explore elements of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love. It examines these in relation to P-12 education, higher education in the U.S. and abroad, and other related or relevant settings.

The fourth goal of this study involves identification of current research on the subject of Freirean pedagogical love, with the intent of also identifying voids/gaps in this research that the study addresses. It is in seeking to address these gaps in a small but hopefully significant way that I hope to justify the work of this study.

The study’s three research questions ask: (1) what emic themes of pedagogical love emerge from participants’ narrative of educational experiences in U.S. P-12 settings? (2) How do these emic themes compare to etic elements of this study’s FCSJEA grounded in pedagogical love? (3) In theory-to-practice applications, how do findings contribute to transformative and humanizing educational best practices in ways parallel to those in the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model?

Search Strategy and Criteria for Inclusion

Searches for this chapter’s literature review aimed at identifying scholarly research, seminal, peer-reviewed works, and dissertations related to Freirean pedagogical love in contemporary U.S. P-12 settings. These searches were conducted mostly through Mercer University’s digital system, which includes a national inter-library loan, resources and access to ProQuest Dissertations, EBSCO/HOST, and other direct journals and
books. Google/Google Scholar searches also helped in identifying additional resources not found on Mercer systems. The search process lasted approximately 18 months, from the spring of 2016 through September 2017. Check-up searches occurred throughout the duration of this study up until the completion of this chapter’s review.

Most recent searches resulted from the notion that there had to be more work on Freire’s pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings. At this point, it seemed that Gottesman’s (2010) observation regarding underutilization of Freire’s ideas on education in Sitting in the Waiting Room, was relevant. Gottesman’s assertion that, “Despite Freire’s tremendous impact on thinking about education in the United States, no work has yet offered a sustained examination of the history of his relationship with the field of education in the United States” (2000, p. 378). This seems to be true, in spite of the work of Darder and Nieto on Freire’s pedagogical love, which has since filled some of this void.

In addition, recent searches sought to confirm if there were more recently published works related to this study’s investigation. These searches discovered the work of Esposito et al. (2017) on love as an element in doctoral students’ experiences. Although this work is not relevant to this study’s investigation, it signals that work on Freire’s pedagogical love is ongoing as an active area of research interest.

Searches related to the first section of this chapter covering the theoretical framework aimed at identifying works using Freire’s ideas and sources as points of reference for exploring pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings and abroad. The majority of these grounded in social justice and/or CT were not empirical ones but theoretical and
rhetorical. In the field of CMfSJ, Stinson and Bullock (2012a, 2012b); Stinson and Wager (2012); and Larnell, Bullock and Jett (2016), and Gutstein’s (2003) TLMSJ approach are examples. Other examples are works by theorists including Max Horkheimer, Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, Carlos Alberto Torres, Moacir Gadotti, Joe Kincheloe, Gert J. J. Biesta on German theorizing, John Dewey’s *Democracy and Education* (1997a), and Margaret Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) work on social morphogenesis.

Although this body of theoretical works offers invaluable insights into Freire’s epistemologies, none includes an exclusive Freirean focus applicable to the U.S. P-12 setting, required for this study’s exploration or research questions. Theorizing in the fields of CMfSJ and TLMSJ came closest but lacked the in-depth single-minded focus on Freire’s epistemologies this study requires. The FCSJEA fills this gap, allowing applications of Freire’s epistemologies to this study’s settings, research topic, and questions. Searches related to the second section covering the conceptual framework relies only on contents of Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011) as the source. Therefore, there was no further significant research necessary for this section.

Searches for the final section of this literature review for scholarly, peer-reviewed works and dissertations utilized Mercer University’s library resources and strategies similar to those earlier outlined for the first section’s theoretical framework. These searches utilized terms such as those illustrated in Table 1 and limiters, such as *author*, *title*, and *subject*. Where available, exclusion of limiters allowed for the widest results
possible, and examination of all results occurred if there were less than 100 items. If results were in the thousands, these were sorted by relevancy. The first 100 to 150 most useful ones were closely scrutinized. The first 25 to 50 summaries and abstract briefs were examined for relevancy and usefulness to this study’s investigation. Works for all three sections reflect a sum of relevant results from all these searches and filters.

Table 1

*List of Keywords Used in Searches for Literature Review Sources*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freire [and] education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Freire [and] teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freire [and] instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Freire [and] social justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freire [and] education</td>
<td>Freire [and] pedagogical love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Freire [and] classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Freire [and] classroom</td>
<td>Freire [and] school theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Freire [and] critical theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Freire [and] social justice theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Freire [and] social justice theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Freire [and] love</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Freire [and] learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Freire [and] critical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Freire [and] Dewey</td>
<td>Freire [and] love [or] transformative education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In almost all these searches, Darder (2002, 2017) and Schoder (2010) were almost always the most represented works on the subject of Freirean pedagogical love; Darder’s work turned up as the first in all searches followed by Schroder’s in almost all searches. In addition, Schroder’s work was mostly absent in the EBSCO/HOST results, even though it was prominent in all the searches such as ProQuest and Google/Google Scholar. In some cases, Google/Google Scholar searches produced results that were absent from both ProQuest and EBSCO/HOST searches. It seems necessary to utilize other more public and popular search engines such as Google, rather than exclusively relying on institutional sources like EBSCO/HOST and ProQuest. Final selections for closer readings came out of these last sets of searches and sorting.

Works by hooks (1994, 2003), though included, do not directly relate to this study’s investigation and are significant as seminal works on pedagogical love that references and cites Freire. In addition, hooks utilizes Buddhist perspectives represented in the ideas of Thich Nhat Hanh. Strong elements of a feminist African American approach are also present in hooks and are useful for insights into the varied ways in which Freire’s ideas on love are applicable within U.S. contexts.

Scholars such as hooks (1994, 2003); Schoder (2010); Johnson (2008); Fitzsimons and Uusiautti (2013); Määttä and Uusiautti (2013); and Horsfall (2008) are all useful in offering alternative conceptions of pedagogical love, while Jasinski and Lewis (2016) offer an invaluable critique in their interpretation of Freirean pedagogical love. Other works on pedagogical love and caring related to Noddings’s (1984) *Care Ethic*
were excluded unless elements of Freire’s work were also included. Goldstein (1995); Johnson (2008); and FitzSimmons and Uusiautti (2013) are examples of this inclusion.

Search results on pedagogical love suggest that there is still more room for research on the application of Freire’s ideas on pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 educational settings. Overall, works represented in this chapter offer a general oversight of the nature, scope of scholarship, and approaches to Freire’s concept of pedagogical love and its relatedness to U.S. P-12 settings. This study seeks to add to this body of literature.

Theoretical Contexts for Freire’s (2005, 2011) Pedagogical Love in U.S. P-12 Settings

The study created a FCSJEA as its theoretical framework for applications of Freire’s ideas to 21st-century U.S. P-12 settings. This is necessary because these ideas, originally intended for implementation in realities of adult education in Brazil in the 1960s and 1970s, had to be made applicable to the study’s settings, topic, and research questions. Freire’s extensive epistemologies illustrated in Figure 1 and ideas from Dewey (1997a, 1997b) on the sociopolitical value of a certain type of education contributed to the FCSJEA. This framework also uses Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) concept of morphogenesis, which explains how education becomes an agent of system-wide sociopolitical change indicated in both Freire’s and Dewey’s works. Also, ideas associated with CT and SJET uses Freirean epistemologies as their starting points and frames of reference. The FCSJEA blends all these elements, and Figures 2 and 3 illustrate their connections.

In developing and utilizing the FCSJEA as this study’s theoretical framework, the relativist postmodern ideas of scholarly border crossings in Giroux (2005); Kincheloe
(2004, 2005, 2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); and Evans (2014) are integral to this process. Border crossings describe not just the relativism of postmodern thinking but are also cognizant of a need to find new and viable ways to conceptualize, theorize, discuss, and analyze 21st-century realities. These are generated by never before seen technological developments in flat world realities of globalization as Friedman (2006), Giroux (2005), and others point out.

The relativist postmodern ideas of border crossings also connect to Freire’s invitation for constant dialogue and the reinvention in praxis this allows. This reinvention—Freire describes it as a “constant searching” for new, responsible, and diverse ways of increasing the presence of diverse, historically excluded, and voiceless humans within the boundaries of empirical scholarship—also supports this border crossing approach. These are the needs that shape this study’s approach, its theorizing, and overall understanding.

In this process of reinventing and theorizing, recognition of the problematic nature of this approach discussed by scholars like Thomas (2007) and Turner (2004) are at the fore of all considerations. However, more importantly, guidance provided by other scholars like Biesta (2013); Blackmore (2013); Higgs (2013); Irby, Brown, Lara-Alecio, and Jackson (2013); Kincheloe (2004, 2005, 2008), Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); Giroux (2005); Evans (2014); and Popkewitz (1998) make strong arguments in favor of those forms of theorizing and reinvention found in the FCSJEA. It is these guides that determine the study’s use of this framework since there is no other approach capable of meeting this study’s unique demands in this area.
Using Biesta’s (2013) statement as a point of reference, this study’s FCSJEA links its *object of research*—participants’ reflective experiences with teachers whose instructional practices reflect elements of pedagogical love—to a *wider object of interest* linked to sociopolitical equity, humanization, human rights, and the sustaining of healthy 21st-century democracies such as the US. These wider objects of interest presented in documents such as the U.S. Department of Education’s *Mission Statement* (2011), the United Nations’ (1948) *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, and UNESCO’s (2016) *Right to Education* become a part of this study’s link to the FCSJEA framework.

Freire’s (2005, 2011) Epistemological Influences

In discussing the depth and expanse of Freire’s epistemological grounds, Barrett (2003) said, “to read Paulo Freire . . . is to read the words of Jesus Christ, Emmanuel Mounier, Camilo Torres, Karl Marx, Che Guevara, Antonio Gramsci, Frantz Fanon, John Dewey...Celestin Frinet, and [the] many others [who] surface throughout his writings” (p.15). While this subsection does not do justice to such claims, it offers insights into Freire’s theoretical groundings, which although not originally developed for 21st-century U.S. P-12 settings, are invaluable for this study’s investigation of pedagogical love. These insights help in illustrating the depth and wide expanse of Freire’s epistemologies in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011). These epistemologies cross *epochal borders*—to use a Freirean term—and cross historical borders into times and spaces leading into its 21st-century applications in this study.
Figure 1. Sources of Freire’s (2005, 2011) epistemological influences.

Figure 1 illustrates Freire’s epistemological influences, especially ones related to this study’s two foundational works, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (2005) and Education for Critical Consciousness (2011). As Figure 1 indicates, Freire’s (2005, 2011) influences extend to the far reaches of ancient civilizations in Greece, Egypt,
Mesopotamia, and China, where emphasis on concepts such as dialogic learning and the sociopolitical value of a certain type of education existed. Closer to the modern period, Freire’s ideas on education connects to epistemologies of the German critical traditions of the Frankfurt school and ideas found in Horkheimer (2002) and Fromm (1956), for example.

Freire’s educational epistemologies also extend into South American culture with its Catholic traditions of Ignatian pedagogy and Liberation Theology and into the life experiences of the person of Freire as illustrated in Figure 1. This study does not seek to delve into these depths but provides enough insights necessary to link them to 21st-century P-12 epistemologies and U.S. settings in order to address this research topic and questions.

German theorizing and the critical tradition in Freire. Freire’s epistemologies connect to both the German traditions of critical theorizing associated with Horkheimer and the Frankfurt School, as well as ones linked to his South American ontologies of his time. Contemporary postmodern 21st-century thinkers like Giroux, McLaren, Torres, Kincheloe, Noguera, Nieto, Darder, and others discussed throughout this section continue the critical traditions of Freire and the Frankfurt School, applying them successfully to U.S. P-12 settings. By doing so, these postmodern critical and postmodern critical social justice theorists—using Freire’s ideas as their starting points—serve as bridges and connections of both Freire’s and the German critical traditions to U.S. P-12 settings. Figure 2 shows the connections between the German and postmodern CT tradition as well as its links to Freire and this study’s FCSJEA.
In discussing the German tradition of theorizing found in both CT and SJET, Biesta (2013) compared it to the Anglo tradition to which Dewey belongs, by utilizing the term Erziehung to describe and differentiate the German tradition. According to Biesta, the German tradition, rooted in Erziehung, is an intentional theorizing of education as a “political act,” which involves a humanizing goal and “interactions between human beings” as part of the process—a feature absent from the multidisciplinary English speaking tradition that had no specific theory of its own,” Biesta argues (p. 6). In explaining the characteristics of Erziehung, Biesta (2013) listed six features, four of which apply to this study. These four are (1) a theory of becoming a human being, (2) a theory of interpersonal interaction, (3) a theory of emancipatory learning, and (4) a theory of contemporary social life and its perspectives on the future (Biesta, 2013, p. 11). Biesta’s observations offer valuable understandings of groundings and the nature of Freire’s ideas as compared to those of traditional social theory educational approaches found in Dewey (1997a, 1997b), for example.

Education in Freire (2005, 2011), as in the German tradition of Horkheimer (2002) and the Frankfurt School, involves the elements listed in Biesta’s Erziehung that includes humanization, emancipatory learning, and the role of interpersonal relations such as that involved in dialogue as a part of the educative processes and anticipated learning outcomes (Popkewitz & Felder, 1999). Like the German tradition in Horkheimer (2002), Freire (2005, 2011) believed that the task of critical thinking and of education in general was a sociopolitical tool that shaped power relationships within
wider everyday societal contexts. This is also evident in critical theorists like Foucault, Giroux, McLaren, hooks, Nieto, Ladson-Billings, Darder, and Nieto.

Christian epistemology and Freire’s ideas on education. Freire’s ideas reflect elements of both Ignatian pedagogy and Liberation Theology (Barrett, 2003; Darder, 2017; Gadotti, 1994; Kennedy & Grinter, 2015). These two Catholic traditions are part of the Brazilian cultural context of Freire’s time and his worldview, shaping the ideas of both *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005), and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011).

Freire’s reference to pedagogical love as *loving, humble, and kind* for instance, echoes Biblical references on love in 1 Corinthians 13. While this researcher knows of no direct evidence that links Freire to this source, the similarities are worth noting. Freire’s ideas on pedagogical love are also the topic of a significant body research on Christian epistemologies as Kennedy and Grinter’s work indicates.

Connecting Freire to U.S. P-12 Settings

Figure 2 represents the study’s FCSJEA theoretical framework and its modifications to facilitate its use in this study. This framework is a bridge that connects Freire’s (2005, 2011) epistemologies, developed for applications to post-colonial Brazil, to this study’s U.S. 21st-century P-12 realities.

The study’s theoretical framework represented by the FCSJEA’s model and illustrated in Figure 2 uses ideas associated with Freire’s (2005, 2011) epistemologies and ones not associated with Freire. For example, Dewey’s (1997a, 1997b) ideas on the socio-politically transformative value of a special type of education emerges from the
British Social Reform Movement of the 1830s and not from the German traditions of Freire found in Horkheimer (2002) and the Frankfurt school. Although both hold similar beliefs in the sociopolitical power of education and support each other in this way, they both differ in their epistemological origins. In this study, the similarity of their assertions about the sociopolitical value of education is what is of value because it ties Freire’s ideas to the roots of U.S. P-12 philosophical groundings found in Dewey.

Figure 2. Illustration of study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) Critical Social Justice Education Approach (FCSJEA)
The FCSJEA also uses Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) concept of social morphogenesis, agency, and structure to explain the process by which education such as one grounded in pedagogical love is a change agent that can lead to macro level democratic transformations suggested by Dewey and Freire. Like Dewey (1997a, 1997b), Archer’s ideas do not directly reflect Freire’s epistemological groundings, even though they help to explain how they operate as change agents at the societal, macro level transformations that Freire and Dewey ascribe to education. In addition, elements found in extensive theorizing within CT and SJET adds to the FCSJEA, making it usable to connect Freire’s epistemologies to 21st-century U.S. P-12 settings.

Dewey—connecting Freire to U.S. P-12 settings. Despite differences in motivation and anticipated educational outcomes in both thinkers, Dewey’s ideas on education parallel Freire’s. These parallels allow comparisons to facilitate application of Freire’s (2005, 2011) ideas to U.S. P-12 settings and this study’s exploration of pedagogical love. Without being able to place Freire’s ideas within contemporary 21st-century U.S. P-12 settings, this study would lose credibility.

In discussions parallel to those of Freire’s banking model outlined in this study’s conceptual framework for example, Dewey (1997b) writes about miseducative experiences as having “the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience” (p. 25). Dewey states that miseducative experiences “produce lack of sensitivity and of responsiveness. . . [as they] tend to land him in a groove or rut” that makes learners “scatter-brained,” since they involve learning as “acquisition of what already is incorporated in books and in the heads of the elders (pp. 25-26). This
statement reflects the banking model that causes “narration sickness,” as Freire asserts in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, revealing similarities in these two approaches that makes Freire’s ideas useful for this study’s exploration.

Like Freire (2005, 2011) and Foshay (1991), Dewey (1997a) also asserts that education is a necessary humanizing force and human necessity, stating that education is “what nutrition and reproduction are to physiological life” (p. 9). Dewey points out that, “education, in its broadest sense, is the means of this social continuity of life” (1997a, p. 2), and without education of a certain type, “the constituent members in a social group...will cease its characteristic life” (p. 3). For Dewey, “education and education alone, spans the gap” between “bare necessities of subsistence and the continuation of civil democratic society (p. 3). These arguments—similar to Freire’s on the role of critical knowledge-creating education grounded in pedagogical love and its role in differentiating human-beings from animal-beings who are incapable of shaping their histories—offers grounds for comparisons of these two educational models, despite significant differences between both.

In addition, parallels drawn in this and other works exist and are extensively discussed in literature by authors like Gadotti (1994); Roberts (2015); Anderson (2004); Beckett (2013); Irwin (2012); Betz (1992); Boyte (2003); Darwish (2009); Glassman and Patton (2014); Hedeen (2005); Shyman (2011); Stinson (2016); and Vinson (1999). Writers such as Adams (2016); Bates (2013); Blackmore (2013); Shields (2013); Torres; (2008, 2014); Crick and Tavin (2012); and Williamson (2017) discuss these parallels. Figure 2 illustrates Dewey’s relationships in this study’s FCSJEA and helps in making
Freire’s ideas relevant to U.S. P-12 settings.

In writing about the sociopolitical value of education, Dewey (1997a) points to youth in P-12 settings, stating that as future citizens, “the young will at some later date compose the society of that period,” and that it was necessary to offer them an education grounded in “experience” to prepare them for these responsibilities (p. 41). This statement in some ways mirrors Freire’s faith in education. Where both thinkers differ is in the reasons for justifying this special education and the anticipated sociopolitical outcomes of this type of education. Both agree that education is of sociopolitical transformative value, and it is for this reason that Dewey’s ideas support those of Freire, contributing to this study’s FCSJEA.

Unlike Freire, Dewey’s cultural diversity resulting from industrialization, immigration, and “the development of modes of manufacture and commerce, travel, migration, and intercommunication” were the causes for oppressive conditions (p. 87). Dewey viewed “disruptions” to the homogeneity of pre-industrial society as the threat to democracy, and the solution required schools to be agents of change, working to eliminate these diversities, especially in children’s homes.

Dewey’s ideal democracy looked backward with a longing desire for a pre-industrial past where a monolithic White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, homogenous sociocultural democracy excluded groups such as those of African and Native Americans origins. With increased diversities from Eastern Europe and other hitherto familiar sections of European immigration, Dewey believed that there was a threat to traditional democracy. According to Dewey (1997a), “countries like the United States [in the
1930s] are composed of a combination of different groups with different traditional
customs,” and, “more than any other cause, forced the demand for an educational
institution which shall provide something like a homogenous and balanced environment
for the young” (p. 21). While Freire’s and Dewey’s educational models are not mirror
images of the other, two of the many works published by Dewey on education parallel the
sociopolitical value of a certain education and makes Freire’s ideas applicable for this
study’s U.S. P-12 settings.

Despite significant differences, Dewey’s educational model complements those of
Freire’s, making the latter thinker’s ideas relevant and applicable to 21st-century U.S. P-
12 settings. The need for further research on these two approaches exists and can
enhance 21st-century best practices capable of improving instructional and learning
models for successful transformative education in U.S. P-12 settings.

Archer’s Morphogenesis and Sociopolitical Transformations through Education

While Freire describes the processes and justifications for education leading to
“epochal” transformations within Brazilian contexts of that era, both Dewey’s and
Archer’s ideas explain how these processes operate within contexts of U.S. democracy.
Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) *morphogenesis* defined within etymological and
sociocultural contexts of the meaning of the word, *morph*, to transform, and *genesis*, as in
epochal new beginnings, explain how Freire’s model operate in real life, both in the U.S.
and elsewhere in the world.

Morphogenesis or epochal changes represent transformations of old sociopolitical
systems grounded in marginalization, inequities, injustices, and other oppressive realities.
into new ones, representing antithetical realities grounded in justice, humanization, equity, and elements of authentic 21st-century democracies. In explaining morphogenesis, Archer (1995) states that, “There is neither ‘isolated’ micro world–‘insulated’ from the socio-cultural system in the sense of being unconditioned by it, nor a hermetically sealed domain” (p. 10). For Archer, even “small-scale interactions between teachers and pupils do not just happen in classrooms” but do so within macro settings of wider educational systems, cultures, and historical realities that shape, direct, and transform them both on an agency and systems level (p. 10). In this symbiotic relationship, Archer argues, “Both pupils and teachers bring in with them different degrees of bargaining power (cultural capital as expertise) that is, resources with which they were endowed in wider society by virtue of family, class, gender and ethnicity” (1995, p. 10). Archer concludes by saying that, “systemic properties are always the (‘macro’) context confronted by (‘micro’) social interaction,” and that “social activities between people (‘micro’) represent the environment in which the (‘macro’) features of systems are either reproduced or transformed” (1995, p. 11).

In Archer’s model, teachers and students beginning in one classroom at a time evolve into a collective movement as agents of change to generate macro level systems changes. Transformative education in both Freire and Dewey anticipates the macro level’s sociopolitical effects on the democracy each argues in favor of and supports by this process. Archer’s morphogenesis contributes to this study’s FCSJEA by explaining how education in Dewey and Freire become the agents of democratic transformations each anticipated on the wider, macro, societal and epochal levels. Archer’s concepts like
those of Dewey’s operate as epistemological and ontological bridges that help in connecting Freire’s ideas to U.S. P-12 settings, making them relevant and useful for this study’s investigation of pedagogical love. Figure 2 illustrates location of Archer’s ideas in this study’s FCSJEA.

CSJET—connecting Freire to U.S. P-12 settings. In connecting Freire’s (2005, 2011) epistemologies to U.S. P-12 settings, a robust body of work in both CT and SJET serves as a major bridge that connects this study’s FCSJEA. Both CT and SJET—referred collectively in this study as critical social justice theory (CSJET). These connections illustrated in Figure 3 build on the shared belief in the intentionality and purposefulness of education in shaping sociopolitical realities, even when not explicitly stated or even denied.

The single-minded focus on Freire’s (2005, 2011) unique epistemologies indicated in Figure 2 also separates this study’s FCSJEA from the general categories of other CSJET approaches. Figure 3 shows these lines of demarcation between the FCSJEA and CSJET. Although included in this study’s FCSJEA approach, neither Dewey’s nor Archer’s epistemologies connects to the critical social justice traditions shown in Figure 3.
Figure 3. Connections between study’s FCSJEA and two forms of critical social justice education theories (CSJET)

CSJET epistemologies not grounded in Freire are not a part of this FCSJEA and include seminal works from giants in the field like Mthethwa-Sommers’ (2014) functional-feminism and the CSJET approach found in Adams (2016), Bell (2016), Blackmore (2014), Cochran-Smith et al. (2009), Cochran-Smith (2004), and others. The extensive work of Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) in CRT is also not included since they do not use Freire as sources and/or starting points.


Diversity issues and CSJET. Diversity issues are also relevant to this study’s exploration of Freirean pedagogical love and equity/justice issues in CSJET (Adams, 2016; Adams and Zúñiga, 2016; Carter & Welner, 2013; ED., 2011a, 2011b, 2015; Gay, 2010, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995, 2004; Marable, 2006, 2007; Nieto, 2013; Noguera, 2001, 2003a, 2008; Spring, 2011, 2014; Rothstein, 2004, 2015). In Freire, diversity issues are included under the umbrella of oppression that dehumanizes and marginalizes to benefit privileged and empowered elites. Like Freire, CSJET approaches used in this study’s FCSJEA model regards diversity issues as ones embedded in struggles against all forms of oppressive conditions. This also reflects the position in this study’s application of Freirean pedagogical love to U.S. P-12 education.

Relativism and definitions of CSJET. Relativism and the reluctance to offer finite, universal definitions of the critical and social justice theoretical approach is a dominant feature of CSJET (Adams & Bell, 2016; Adams & Zúñiga, 2016; Blackmore, 2013; Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Dehli, 2013; Shields, 2013; Stinson & Wager 2012; Torres, 2008; Williamson, 2017). Adams and Bell (2016) state that defining CSJET was “problematic,” and defies “any single set of terms to convey the complexity of human beings . . . [and] multiple social identity groups” touched by inequities and oppressive conditions addressed by CSJET (p. xiv). Other scholars such as Torres (2008, 2014); Adams (2016); Giroux (2005); Evans (2014); and Jackson (1997) also offer relativist, elastic definitions. Some like Giroux, Evans, and Jackson use the term border crossings to describe the diverse and multifaceted nature of these porous and elastic boundaries.
In addition, CSJET scholars like Stinson and Wager (2012) utilize the concept of “sliding signifiers” and “overarching themes” in definitions intended to “provoke more questions and to stimulate new discussions about the many meaning(s) of and possibilities for teaching social justice” (p. 5). Neither the FCSJEA nor the CSJET offer permanent or universal sets of truths. Instead, they offer frameworks, guidelines, frames of reference, and suggestions just like Freire (2005, 2011) that can be useful in creating successful transformative education that is humanizing and enriching to human rights and sustainable 21st-century democracies.

This study’s FCSJEA—Connecting Freire to U.S. P-12 Settings

The relativist and open-ended approaches of CSJET allows for inclusion of this study’s FCSJEA within the universe of CSJET. It also allows for the use of available definitions, approaches, and research in education that uses CSJET with Freire’s ideas as their points of reference and starting points in the FCSJEA.

This study’s FCSJEA consists of elements in the study’s conceptual framework illustrated in Tables 2 and 3 and CSJET approaches that use Freire as their starting points illustrated Figure 2. In addition, this FCSJEA approach also uses Dewey’s views on the sociopolitical value of a special type of education, as well as, Archer’s concept of morphogenesis in creating and defining its boundaries. While individually each of these elements do not by themselves illustrate this FCSJEA, collectively and in the way described in this section, they provide a framework for applying Freire’s (2005, 2011) epistemologies to contemporary U.S. P-12 settings for this exploration of Freirean pedagogical love, as illustrated in Figure 2. This study’s FCSJEA fills an
epistemological void and serves the need for exploration of Freire’s (2005, 2011) pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings. Utilization of the FCSJEA avoids the impossibility and difficulties involved in using established CT, SJET, and Dewey’s and Archer’s ideas in isolation.

Section Summary

Although a large body of work offering insights of Freire’s educational epistemologies exists, none discovered in the course of this research satisfactorily covered Freire’s unique epistemologies required for this study’s exploration of pedagogical love in contemporary U.S. P-12 settings. Theorizing in the fields of CMfSJ and TLMSJ came closest but lacked the in-depth single-minded focus on Freire’s epistemologies this study requires. It was necessary to create this study’s FCSJEA to fill this gap, to indicate the nature, depth, and extent of Freire’s (2005, 2011) epistemologies, and to apply them to U.S. P-12 settings. This is necessary because Freire’s pedagogical love, not originally intended for U.S. P-12 education, is a relatively new and rarely researched topic with no existing, usable approach. The study’s FCSJEA fills a gap by allowing applications of Freire’s epistemologies to this study’s settings, research topic, and questions. Figure 2 illustrates this study’s FCSJEA.

This study’s FCSJEA framework utilizes Dewey’s (1997a, 1997b) ideas on the nature of transformative education as a sociopolitical tool and helps to connect Freire’s ideas to P-12 U.S. settings despite differences in the endpoints of what/who entails citizens, citizenship, and the ideal form of democracy in the two thinkers’ works. Archer’s concept of morphogenesis allows for a similar connection by explaining how
Freire’s (2005, 2011) model applies to U.S. P-12 settings in making the macro level sociopolitical changes described in these two works.

In addition to Archer’s and Dewey’s contributions, the FCSJEA utilizes definitions and boundaries drawn from both CT and SJET that combined as one collective epistemology described in this study as CSJET. Figure 3 illustrates this relationship between CSJET and this study’s FCSJEA, which fills a void by facilitating applications of Freire’s unique epistemologies shown in Figure 1, to this study’s exploration of pedagogical love. CSJET that uses Freire’s ideas serves as an important bridge that connects Freire’s ideas to contemporary U.S. P-12 settings; therefore, it plays an important role in this study’s theoretical construct.


Elements in Tables 2 and 3 are foundations for discussions in each of this section’s subsections. These two tables and the conceptual framework they represent are important points of reference for etic elements associated with the Freirean (2005, 2011) model this study uses. They also provide an invaluable frame of reference for the three research questions posed and a guide for thinking about the data selection and other related processes involved in theming, coding, analyzing, and discussing participants’ narratives that serve as sources of data.

Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed (2005) and Education for Critical Consciousness (2011) are sources of information in these tables as well as foundations for the conceptual framework they represent. While Table 2 offers a broad and general guide for major ideas in this framework, Table 3 breaks these elements into 16
component parts. The component parts include elements from both Freirean pedagogical love and its antithesis, pedagogical lovelessness, associated with banking education as Freire asserts.

The Educational Model

In discussing his educational model illustrated in Tables 2 and 3, Freire argues in favor of a problem-posing/problem-solving educational approach grounded in dialogue and pedagogical love that is humble, loving, kind, trustful, and based on mutuality between teacher-as-learner and student-as-teacher. These approaches represent the repudiation of the traditional one Freire describes as a banking model of education later described in more detail in this section. In comparing traditional and Freirean educational models, Freire (2005) points out that,

The best philosophy student is not one who discourses, “ipsis verbis,” on the philosophy of Plato, Marx, or Kant but one who thinks critically about their ideas and takes the risk of thinking too. No philosophers, no scientists, develop their thought or systematize their scientific knowledge without being challenged and confronted by problems. While this does not mean that a person who is challenged automatically or necessarily becomes a philosopher or a scientist. It does mean that challenge is basic to the constitution of knowledge. Thus, when a scientist in search of one thing discovers something else, something not anticipated (this happens continually) the discovery originates in the attempt to solve a problem. It is this that I defend. (p. 112)

In these statements, Freire does two things. First, he criticizes the traditional or banking model of education, which “discourses ipsis verbis.” Freire argues that this banking model leads to “narration sickness,” resulting from mechanical memorization by students who, as “containers and receptacles,” that are “filled” with teachers’ knowledge as learning. For Freire this approach is counterproductive and incapable of developing
inventive knowledge-creation skills in learners, as does the Freirean method grounded in pedagogical love.

Secondly, the statements in this quote also indicate Freire’s endorsement of a problem-posing and problem-solving inventive knowledge creation educational model as the one he “defends.” This is a transformative 21st-century inventive knowledge-creating approach, grounded in pedagogical love, which this study also supports.

The Concept of “Love”

In this study’s discussions of Freirean pedagogical love and pedagogical lovelessness, a definition of the word love, benefits from Steven Covey’s descriptions of this as action word or verb, instead of as an adjective describing an emotion and feelings. This is one of the basic characteristics of the term love as a justice, humanizing, equity-seeking model, grounded in Freire’s ideas of authentic democracies, founded on principles of justice and equity, as many such as hook, Nieto, Ladson-Billings, Joel Spring, Pedro Noguera, Marable, and Rothstein argue.
### Table 2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS</strong></th>
<th><strong>INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES</strong></th>
<th><strong>ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agape</strong>—A Pedagogic Love that Gives and Expects Nothing Personal in Return from Beneficiary(s) Belief in the socio-political value of transformative education grounded in human justice (Kohlberg 1997, 1981), personal humility, and authentic democratic ideals of equity, justice, and human dignity, trust, hope, kindness, mutuality, and wisdom called for by Freire (2005, 2011). Epistemological and ontological understandings of dehumanization, humanization, and oppression in its diverse and subtle forms; and the idea that education can either maintain or transform these realities. Understanding of the human right, human need and humanizing force of a certain type of education—such as Freire’s, and the dehumanizing implications denial of this type of learning and understandings represents.</td>
<td>Generative themes” from students ontological—or lived realities and experiences, culled by teacher before first day of classes, and used as sources and frames of references for instructional and learning. Dialogic, critical, and reflective instruction and learning; grounded in pedagogical love, trust, hope, kindness, mutuality, wisdom, and acceptance of authentic (Freirean) human growth and empowerment. Critical dialogue between “teachers-as-learners and students-as-teachers,” grounded in pedagogical love, kindness, trust, humility, mutuality and wisdom. Teacher-as-learner instructional approaches. Project-based, collaborative, community-classroom building activities, as well as knowledge inventive-problem posing/problem solving educational practices and approaches.</td>
<td>EPISTEMOLOGICAL/COGNITIVE —Ability to utilize critical, reflective dialogic Freirean learning as an inventive, knowledge-growing process as lifetime practices. —To become knowledge creators and cognitively inventive thinkers—To develop “student-as-teacher” skills alongside those of “student-as-learner” skills. ONTOLOGICAL— To develop skills and competencies required for citizenship and as leaders in an authentic democratic system grounded in social justice, equity, authentic humanization, and creative inventive regeneration. —To become and an advocate and active participant in movements and other activities that help to maintain sociopolitical agencies that helps to develops and support human abilities to aspire and to live as authentic humanized beings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

Acceptance of the value of students’ ontological—lived realities and personal knowledge and experiences, as foundational tools for instruction and learning. Understanding and acceptance of the student-as-teacher, and teacher-as-learner model in Freire.

**BANKING MODEL/TRADITIONAL EDUCATIONAL APPROACH**

“Sage-on-stage” or lecturing approach where an all knowing teacher is the fountain of knowledge to be deposited in students’ brains as Freire states. Also the source of what Freire describes as “narration sickness,” lovelessness, inability to think critically in an epistemologically and ontologically productive way, and become originators of new forms of knowing, and for creating citizens for the practice and sustenance of authentic democracies grounded in equity and justice.

### INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES

Activities that intentionally empower and humanize students—as-teachers and students-as-learners—including building leadership competencies, self-efficacy, autonomy, and self-confidence.

**BANKING MODEL/TRADITIONAL EDUCATIONAL APPROACH**

A traditional educational that uses the “industrial factory,” standardized approach where the teacher leads students lined up in rows and columns of desks and chairs imbibing prescribed information as “True” knowledge. A model Freire states “discourses ipsis verbis, leading to “narration sickness,” and uses mechanical memorization by students who, as “containers and receptacles,” that are “filled” with teachers’ knowledge. This model of instruction and learning, based on “a relationship of domination, of exploitation, of oppression” that is “by definition violent, whether or not the violence is expressed by drastic means” or otherwise according to Freire (2011, p. 17).

### ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

**AXIOLOGICAL**—Development of humans who value agape love, kindness, loving and respectful dialogue, civility, a belief in justice, and a concern for authentic humanity of for all in an authentic democratic world.

**BANKING MODEL/TRADITIONAL EDUCATIONAL APPROACH**

“Naïveness,” dehumanization and oppression grounded in loveless ignorance. Inability to change the world and participate as Freire states, in the “making and remaking” of their world as subjects rather than as objects of oppressive conditions. Incapable of creative and inventing new forms of knowing either the “word or world.” Incapable of love, dialogue, and utilization of tools required for the maintenance and advancement of authentic, regenerative democracies at home and abroad.
Table 3

*Elements of Pedagogical Love and Pedagogical Lovelessness in Study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Lovelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Traditional Education—the Banking Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Oppression as Dehumanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Naiveté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) (Fromm) Necrophilia—Fear of Life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Love</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) (Fromm) Biophilia—Love of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Ontological Humanization, Transformative, Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Ontological Knowledge Creation Grounded in the Freirean Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Epistemological Humanization, Transformative, Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Epistemological Knowledge Creation Grounded in the Freirean Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Pre-Preparation for Day One Instruction—Teachers as Research Investigators, Curriculum Builders and Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Culture Circles [Learning Circles]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Criticality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Awareness—Conscientizagao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Action—Praxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Project Based Learning/ Problem-Posing/ Problem Solving Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Collaborative Learning—Learning Circles and Classroom-Community Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Teachers-as-Students and Students-as-Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Outside of Classroom (Extracurricular) Educational Related Activiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Socially Just Transformative Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Conscientizagao and Critical Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Praxis—or Knowledgeable Acti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Regenerative Sociopolitical System Grounded in Humanized Justice, Equity, and a Loving, Humble...and Critically Capable Citizenry Capable of Maintaining and Building Authentic 21st-Century Democracies in nations Like the U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although Freire does not directly define the term love specifically (Schoder, 2010), he defines it within contexts of its relations and uses in the transformative educational model outlined in both *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and in *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011). In these contexts, love is a part of the pedagogical practices, personal characteristics, and philosophical grounding of the teacher and the instructional approach illustrated in the conceptual framework model in Tables 2 and 3. For Freire, love is the means, the method, the approach, and the expected outcome of an education that is humanizing. Love, in this process, facilitates dialogue, critical thinking, and critical reflection. Freire emphasizes this point, and it is part of the pedagogic processes proposed in both works.

Oftentimes Freire does not use the term love in isolation. His discussion of the approach taken by “radicals” as change agents who use love instead of violence is an example. Freire (2011) describes this as one that is “critical, loving, humble, and communicative” (p. 9). In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) Freire uses similar terms: “loving, humble, and full of faith” and “love, humility, and faith,” (p. 91) in discussing the dialogic approach to learning and the “humble, loving, and courageous encounter with the people” by leaders and change agents in the transformative processes (p. 129). In all these and other occasions, Freire emphasizes love, not sadistic violence, lovelessness, sectarianism, arrogance and other loveless approaches.

Referring to love, and using the concept of oppressed and oppressors, Freire (2005) argues that only when the oppressor “stops making pious, sentimental, and individualistic gestures and risks an act of love” does true solidarity between both can be
found. . . and freedom truly exist (p. 50). Here Freire views an education rooted in love—in risking what he refers to as “plentitude” in acts of love,” can free the oppressed and establish foundations for authentic democracy rooted in equity and humanization.

This idea is transferable in many ways to U.S. P-12 education relational realities. They reflect, for example, real life U.S. P-12 testimonies of teachers’ experiences recounted in both Darder’s *Reinventing Paulo Freire* (2002) and Nieto’s *Dear Paulo: Letters from Those Who Dare to Teach* (2008). These ideas in Freire’s model of pedagogical love and the experiences narrated in both Nieto’s and Darder’s works ring true, especially for underserved and marginalized communities often represented in data such as the NAEP scores and achievement gaps (ED, 2015). It is the poor, marginalized, and often unrepresented in the seats of power and privilege in our U.S. society, who, like Freire’s oppressed, live these realities.

Pedagogical love. The study’s concept of pedagogical love represented in this study’s model as well as in Tables 2 and 3 aligns with ideas of human justice, human rights, human equity, and the humanizing functions outlined in Freire (2005, 2011). It is not emotional but attaches to sociopolitical, existential concepts found in Freire’s cognitively uplifting, knowledge-creating, humanizing, and transformative model. It supports equity and justice in ways called for by the U.S. Department of Education’s Mission Statement (ED, 2011); the United Nations (1948) *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*; and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO, 2016) *Right to Education*. 
Although Freire (2005, 2011) does not specifically use the term pedagogical love, he uses the term love and other etymologically related words beginning with the three specific letters, L, O, and V in this specific sequence order almost 60 times in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) as part of the pedagogic process he outlines and discusses. He uses these related terms at least 20 times in *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011) in words such as loving, lovelessness, unloved, and loveless as part of teachers’ characteristics, instruction, and anticipated educational outcomes. Freire (2005) writes about pedagogic love as a prerequisite for learning and instruction in a teacher-student relationship built “upon love, humility, and faith” (p. 91). This type of pedagogic relationship is the only one capable of producing a “climate of mutual trust, needed for dialogic learning and the close partnership required “in the naming of the world,” as Freire explains (2005, p. 91). It is the use of the term *love* and related words used by Freire in his pedagogic processes, which determines the study’s use of the concept of pedagogical love.

In addition, this study’s use of the term pedagogical love draws from traditions in seminal works on Freirean pedagogical love found in the works of Darder (2002, 2017); Nieto (2008); Schoder (2010); and Barrett (2003) on this topic and on Freire’s educational model in general. Use of the term pedagogical love in this study also describes instances related to Freire’s use of this and related words that begin with the three letters L, O, and V in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011). Related words such as loving, lovelessness, sadistic love, false love, and similar words are included in this concept of pedagogical love.
Pedagogical Lovelessness

Freire (2011) also discusses various types of lovelessness related to the education process. For example, in discussions of the traditional or banking approach, Freire writes that this model is based on “a relationship of domination, of exploitation, of oppression” that is “by definition violent, whether or not the violence is expressed by drastic means” or otherwise (p. 17). Freire argues in this type of relationship the “dominator and dominated alike are reduced to things—the former dehumanized by an excess of power, the latter by lack of it. And things cannot love” (p. 17). The student’s educational outcome is the opposite of that produced by pedagogical love and is hurtful to the human functioning in a democratic or any form of sociopolitical system in which humans live their daily lives.

In discussing the traditional instructional approach rooted in lovelessness that Freire describes as the banking approach to education, Freire (2011) wrote, “The teachers. . . merely memorize their lessons, must of necessity reject education as a gnoseological condition and can thus have no love for the dialogue of communication” (p. 134). Freire concludes that “education for them is the transfer of knowledge,” and a passive form of learning that prevents students “from experiencing the development of the active, participatory condition, characteristic of someone who knows” (Freire, 2011, p. 134).

Freire (2005) also writes about sadistic love, which he describes as a part of oppression and the traditional education approach in which “the pleasure in complete domination over another person” whether as a teacher or leader is the dominant form of
interpersonal communication approach (p. 59). Sadistic love in Freire is a “perverted love—a love of death, not of life” that is associated with oppression and oppressive conditions, capable only for transforming “a man into a thing,” Freire wrote (p. 59). Loving dialogue required the creation of new knowledge, critical thinking, critical reflection, and praxis rooted in all these activities. These cannot occur where sadistic love prevails in the education process.

False love is also another type of loveless situation that Freire (2005) said is “the anti-dialogics (sic) of the banking method of education,” which represents what Freire describes as “False love, false humility, and feeble faith in others cannot create trust,” (p. 91). Freire concludes by saying that false love as part of the pedagogy of the oppressed makes discourses for inventive, knowledge-creating education difficult if not impossible and only negates the people and is a “lie” (p. 91). These, Freire argues, are the weaknesses of an educational approach rooted in false love.

Humanization and the Purpose of Education in Freire

One of the hallmarks of the Freirean (2005, 2011) model of education grounded in pedagogical love shown in tables 2 and 3, is its attempt at creating liberated, authentic, humanized beings who are capable of actions grounded in criticality and who are able to participate in the “history making” processes of their lives, as Freire argues. As humanized beings, they are not just passive—but active participants, able to “intervene in [their] reality in order to change it,” Freire (2011) writes (p. 3). As humanized beings, successfully educated people are able to realize their full potential in the making, remaking, shaping, and reshaping of their everyday realities, “as Subjects, not as objects”
in these events (Freire 2005, p. 67). They are active participants and history makers to act-upon the epoch-changing” events of their lives rather than be acted-upon in these events, and this is what separates and identifies humans from other beings, such as animals. This is an argument present in both Freire and Dewey (1997a, 1997b) about the value of a good education.

Speaking further on the humanizing value of education, Freire (2011) argues that what separates humans from their animal counterparts is the capacity of the former to act beyond the “natural (biological) sphere” (p. 3). Humans, unlike animals, Freire (2011) argues, are active, intentional, critical thinking participants in creating and re-creating, integrating themselves in the epoch changing events of their historical contexts; the purpose of education is to develop the intellectual tools required to do so (p. 4). As humans relating to the world, education allows for “responding to the challenges of the environment, they begin to dynamize (sic), to master, and to humanize reality,” Freire (2011) states (p. 4). Education allows human beings, unlike animal beings, to “add to it [their world] something of their own making, by giving temporal meaning to geographic space,” Freire wrote, “thus shaping and reshaping, creating and recreating” and deciding as active, knowledgeable, and capable participants in events that shape their epoch (p. 4).

“Human beings unlike animals are active beings, capable of reflection on themselves and on the activity in which they are engaged” Freire (2011) writes (p. 96). According to Freire, successful education prepares them for this so that as humanized/beings they can actively work in the shaping, re-shaping, transformation, and making of their histories of the world they live in. This type of education, Freire argues,
needs to develop the type of thinking that is inventive and creative. The type of student it produces should be an autonomous thinker capable of the inventiveness required for their participation in the making, re-making, and shaping of history. This concept, when transferred to U.S. P-12 settings, indicates the necessity for teachers’ instruction geared towards developing autonomous creative students capable of critical thinking, critical reflection, and praxis, or action rooted in criticality.

Freire also describes this human cognitive ability emerging from an education rooted in pedagogical love as a “Reading [of] the Word and the World” (Freire & Macedo, 1998). It is an education that develops critical cognitive functioning through dialogic learning and interactions with real world situations—the word to the world—translation that Freire speaks of. In ways, Freire’s approach and instructional methods compare to those of Dewey (1926, 1930), where education is a holistic combination of “book-learning,” and it applies to lived experiences in the daily lives and society to which learners belong. Schooling, Dewey (1900) wrote, “Shall be made a genuine form of active community life, instead of a place set apart in which to learn lessons” (p. 27). Schooling and learning in other words should be applicable to the real world realities of students’ experiences in their daily lives.

When applied to U.S. realities, the goal of humanization in the Freirean model of education grounded in pedagogical love means that this type of transformative education is supportive of human equity—such as that called for in the Department of Education’s (2011) Mission Statement. It also addresses issues of justice and equity reflective of goals inherent in the Civil Rights and Affirmative Action Movements of the 1960s and

**Knowledge Creation in the Freirean Approach**

For Freire (2005, 2011) the co-creation of knowledge occurs within a teacher-as-student and student-as-teacher collaborative relationship. In the dialogic process of learning and instruction rooted in pedagogical love, hope, humility, and trust dominates. Neither teacher nor students are holders of knowledge, a characteristic of the traditional or banking method of instruction, an approach diametrically opposed to the Freirean method. The task of creating and re-creating knowledge, Freire (2005) states, involves a “reality through common reflection and action” in which both student-as-teacher and teacher-as-student, “Discovery themselves as permanent re-creators” (2005, p. 70). Tables 2 and 3 show these elements and their location in the study’s conceptual framework.

For Freire (2005) “Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” in a process that is humble, loving, kind, trusting, and based on mutuality (p. 71). Knowledge creation Freire (2005) argues is based “on reciprocity of action” between student and teacher in dialogue, and cannot be a mechanical act in which the educator prepares a lesson and present to learners as an intellectual “deposit,” as it is in traditional/banking model of rote and memorization instruction of the banking model described later on in this section. Freire’s approach is the antithesis of this banking model and is a cognitively uplifting, knowledge creating,
inventive, and conducive to education in U.S. P-12 settings that prepares students to be 21st-century citizens and leaders in 21st-century democratic governments. This is what this study’s exploration of pedagogical love seeks; this is what Freire’s (2005, 2011) pedagogical love offers.

Teacher Characteristics and Instruction

These are important factors in the study’s conceptual framework outlined in both Tables 2 and 3. Successful and capable teachers in the practice of pedagogical love, according to Freire, have to be loving, kind, humble, patient people who are trustful, wise, and able to work in “mutuality” before entering the classroom and instruction begins. This applies to relationships with students, parents, community, and other related persons and parties. This teacher has the responsibility to enhance students’ learning; these teachers also have the power to destroy the possibilities of providing students’ with a “good” education—a good education that is cognitively uplifting, individually empowering to students and socio-politically transformative and uplifting to an authentic 21st-century democracy.

Freire (2011) points out that, teachers’ beliefs also “determine [their] methods of action and forms of behavior” (p. 98). In other words, congruency has to exist between teachers’ character and behaviors on the one hand and teacher’s instructional and learning approach on the other. These two elements have to merge as one in the teacher’s everyday planning, instructional practices, and instructional approaches grounded in pedagogical love. They are the same in the Freirean approach. When applied to the Freirean method of education rooted in pedagogical love, teachers’ belief and instruction
are either socio-politically and cognitively transformative or rooted in the banking model that leads to unloving outcomes rooted in dehumanizing oppression. There is almost no middle ground in Freire’s methods.

The Freirean teacher. For the U.S. P-12 teacher in this study’s model, Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love calls on them to recognize evidence and impacts of oppression on effective functioning of 21st-century democracies in nations such as the U.S. This process involves with the belief, recognition, acceptance, and commitment to ending dehumanizing effects of oppression in its diverse forms on students’ lives. In describing the teacher, Freire (2011) states that this is a person who “refuses both despair and naive optimism” and one who believes that “human beings, by making and remaking things and transforming the world” are able at the same time to “transcend the situation [of] their state of being” (p. 129). These are the ideals of the teacher, who wishes to practice pedagogical love, and without these characteristics, their instruction cannot be cognitively inventive, knowledge-creating ones that produces ontological liberation, humanization, or be empowering and transformative to the oppressed and dehumanized learner.

Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love calls on teachers as part of the pedagogic practice to be agents of change; to recognize the realities of oppression in their diverse forms that their students encounter in their everyday lives; and to embrace the possibilities of education as a tool capable of alleviating oppressive conditions. Freirean love calls on teachers to use love—pedagogical love, as a means of empowering their
students to become change agents by developing critical skills, and using them in reflective praxis, to take actions on their own behalf.

The *unknowing* teachers as Freire (2005) describes, “are innumerable, well-intentioned bank-clerk teachers who do not realize that they are serving only to dehumanize;” their unawareness of the nature and relationships between education and oppression results in their failure to recognize and “perceive that the deposits [in the banking method] themselves contain contradictions about reality” (p. 75). Ignorance of the sociopolitical transformative value of education, even in the presence of the best teachers’ intentions in educating, can fail to provide the transformative educational success anticipated by a model rooted in pedagogical love and the Freirean (2005, 2011) approach (p. 75). By delineating and discussing how elements of pedagogical love with the unknowing teacher can jeopardize successful education such as this study’s model grounded in Freirean love.

The Freirean (2005, 2011) teacher’s beliefs and character are also important for dialogue, the starting point, middle, and ending outcome of this model. Freire (2005) writes that dialogue that is founded on “... love, humility, and faith” requires a “horizontal relationship of which mutual trust between the dialogues is the logical consequence” (p. 91). Freire writes that, “It is not enough “to say one thing and do another—to take one’s own word lightly” (p. 91). There has to be that congruency required between character, beliefs, and instructional approach if dialogue and learning is to take place. Without these, dialogue nor education in the Freirean approach, is possible.
In discussing dialogue that is the starting point of a Freirean (2005, 2011) education and the person acting as the teacher or leader doing the instruction, Freire (2005) states that, “Dialogue cannot exist in the absence of profound love for the world and for people” (p. 89). The teacher/leader Freire wrote, cannot lead in “the naming of the world, which is an act of creation and re-creation...if it is not infused with love” (p. 89). The teacher in Freire is described more like a facilitator, rather than an instructor who teaches students viewed “as an empty vessel to be filled” with teacher’s knowledge through lectures (2005, p. 79). In a model that leans heavily on dialogic learning, the Freirean teacher, as facilitator and guide in this process, needs to be intentionally aware of and devout practitioner of pedagogical love if this model is to begin to be a successful educational approach.

The teacher as a practitioner of pedagogical love is someone who is capable of not just love, but humility. Referring to humility and pedagogical love, Freire (2011) states teachers ought to “enter into” their students world and “continue to learn” from their students; the “humbler they are in this process the more they will learn” alongside their student as teacher-as-learners (p. 135). Teacher’s knowledge can only be “authenticated” by students’ learning; If students fail to be critical and creative thinkers, according to Freire, then the teacher has failed. Humility as part of pedagogical love, allows for the process by which, “The teachers’ thinking is authenticated only by the authenticity of the students’ thinking,” Freire (2005) wrote, “the teacher cannot think for her students, nor can she impose her thought on them” (p. 77). Humility is also required instead of leading or “dominating” the learning process. In a teacher-as-student relationship, teachers at
times become learners themselves involved in the process involving the “unveiling of the world” as Freire (2005, p. 169) writes. In this relationship the teacher is no longer an all-knowing other in a relationship with an unknowing other—the student, and in many ways reverses the overall power relations by U.S. P-12 educators capable of practicing Freirean pedagogical love.

Instructional approach. Tables 2 and 3 outline elements of the Freirean instructional approach. There are two instructional alternatives in Freire (2005, 2011): (1) the traditional model that Freire refers to as the banking approach and (2) its desirable antithesis, one grounded in pedagogical love that is cognitively uplifting, transformative, and humanizing.

The desired instructional model grounded in Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love, according to Freire (2011), aims at moving learners “towards a new way of thinking, and both as educator and educated” (p. 112). This instructional approach requires a “dialogical relationship between both teachers and students with both going in “both directions” as teacher and as student at various times Freire argues (p. 112). Freire also states that, “the best student in physics or mathematics, at school or university,” is not one instructed to “memorize formulae, but one who is aware of the reason for them,” and that instruction grounded in the latter is the one associated with pedagogical love (p. 112). Instruction that encourages “docilely,” and the simplicity of memorization and rote, ” in “which their teachers name knowledge,” according to Freire (2011) leaves students less “able to think,” and create the type of knowledge required for the
transformations and cognitive growth offered by pedagogical love (p. 112). This is the type of education, grounded in the banking model, which Freire abhors.

Freire also writes that the desired educational approach grounded in pedagogical love, involves “horizontal relationships.” Freire (2005, 2011) writes about horizontal relationships in two ways; one is historical relating to the making and re-making of epochal changes and the other relates to instructional processes this section describes. In the latter relationship, Freire (2005) points out that in the dialogic process of instruction “founded upon love, humility, and faith, dialogue becomes a horizontal relationship of which mutual trust between the dialogues is the logical consequence” (p. 91). Freire continues, pointing out that this horizontal dialogic instruction that “would be a contradiction in terms of dialogue—loving, humble, and full of faith—did not produce this climate of mutual trust, which leads the dialoguers into ever closer partnership in the naming of the world” (p. 91). Conversely, in the traditional banking anti-dialogic model, Freire argues that there is only lovelessness relationships, where trust, mutuality, hope for humanized transformations, justice, and equity are all absent.

Horizontal teacher-student relationships are vital for dialogue—the opening activity in Freire’s instructional approach—to occur. Dialogue takes students from their naïve state of unknowing and is part of what Freire describes as a problem-posing instructional process. “Problem-posing dialogue,” according to Freire (2011), facilitates criticality—critical thinking and critical reflection, which are the next steps in the learning and instruction process described by Freire (2005, 2011). In turn, critical reflection leads to critical action or Conscientizagao as Freire calls this stage when
students are able to take action rooted in praxis—or critical reflection and to actively work in transforming their personal situations in ways that are empowering and useful for sustaining an authentic democratic system. Praxis, rooted in Conscientizagao or critical action is evidence of the successful outcome of education rooted in Freirean pedagogical love.

_Pre-preparation for day one instruction._ Instruction begins long before the first day classes in the Freirean (2005, 2011) model. He asserts that “the dialogical character of education . . . does not begin when the teacher-student meets with the students-teachers in a pedagogical situation, but rather “when the former first asks herself or himself what she or he will dialogue with the latter about” (p. 93). It begins with a series of pre-preparation field studies that Freire describes as “investigations,” where teachers-as-researchers begin investigating the lived conditions of the students’ realities.

Pre-instructional planning includes what Freire (2005, 2011) describes as “generative themes” emerging from students’ lived experiences. In describing these investigations Freire (2005) notes that:

> This beginning (like any beginning in any human activity) involves difficulties and risks that are to a certain point normal, although they are not always evident in the first contact with the individuals of the area (p. 110).

Freire (2005) goes on and describe these pre-planning contacts as one in which:

> The investigators need to get a significant number of persons to agree to an informal meeting during which they can talk about the objectives of their presence in the area (p. 110).

In this meeting Freire describes how teachers as investigators and researchers in these preplanning activities should go about explaining “the reason for the investigation, how it
is to be carried out, and to what use it will be put” (p. 110). Freire points out that this process requires the love, trust, mutuality, humility, and other teacher characteristics and methods associated with pedagogical love—including dialogic, critically loving, and reflective practices. Freire also argues that these teacher investigators should call on community members to participate as co-investigators and assistants, saying that this is a good way to gather valuable and authentic data required for authentic instruction when lessons eventually begin. These suggestions are ones required and applicable to U.S. P-12 educators and may require modifications in approach but not in the intended purpose and instructional goals.

According to Freire, transformative educational success is thwarted and fails when educators as curriculum developers—even before the first encounters with students, develop a program of study without understanding learners’ ontological realities and learning needs; they do not use these as starting points in their instruction. These “top down” approaches that Freire (2005) calls the “banking line of planning program,” cannot produce successful outcomes since they fail to “respect the particular view of the world held by the people” (p. 96). Freire states that, “One cannot expect positive results from an educational or political action program which fails to respect the particular view of the world held by the people. Such a program,” he points out, “constitutes cultural invasion, good intentions notwithstanding” (p. 95). Investigators, Freire points out, should never force themselves and their ideas on the members of these communities from which their students are drawn but be “sympathetic observers with an attitude of understanding towards what they see” (p. 110). Freire (2005) makes the point that,
“During their visits, the investigators set their critical ‘aim’ on the area under study, as if it were for them an enormous, unique, living ‘code’ to be deciphered” (p. 111).

The statements, applicable and missing from most contemporary U.S. P-12 educational realities, are necessary ones for both inside and outside classroom activities geared to educating the “whole child” as contemporary best practices call for. These are only but a few on curriculum planning and instructional models that make Freire ideas relevant to 21st-century P-12 settings and are compatible with best practices in the field.

Dialogue. Tables 2 and 3 outline the role and place of dialogue in the Freirean framework. Dialogue is the engine that moves education towards its humanized, transformative, and cognitive inventive knowledge-creating goals. None of the other elements in this model can occur without loving dialogue. Freire (2005) points to this central role of dialogue, stating that a “preoccupation with the content of dialogue is really [a] preoccupation with the program content of education,” and is the door opener to all paths in this approach. In talking about pedagogical love in this process, Freire writes that dialogue “is not possible if it is not infused with love and that “love is at the same time the foundation of dialogue and dialogue itself” (p. 89). Love is therefore the core, the essence, and major element of the Freirean (2005, 2011) educational approach.

Loving dialogue takes students from the entry point in education that Freire describes as naïve thinking, characterized by a lack of criticality, an inability to “create and recreate” new knowledge, and a willingness only to accept “the myth of the ignorance” (2005, p. 133). At the stage of naïve consciousness before dialogue begins, Freire (2011) points out that a type of ignorance not limited to illiteracy prevails. Lack of
experience with dialogic learning and education rooted in criticality exacerbate learners’ “lack of experience at participating and intervening in the historical process,” a condition that the Freirean method rooted in pedagogical love seeks to address and eliminate (p. 37).

In supporting the use of dialogue in contrast to the traditional “banking” model of anti-dialogic education, Freire writes that, “when people are already dehumanized, due to the oppression they suffer, the process of their liberation must not employ the methods of dehumanization,” and the “correct method” of instruction“ lies in dialogue (2005, p. 67). When steeped in pedagogical love in horizontal relationships, instruction grounded in pedagogical love produces the educational outcomes anticipated by this mode, bringing hope for justice and equity in 21st-century democracies in nations like the U.S.

*Teachers-as-students and students-as-teachers.* This horizontal relationship grounded in mutuality, democratic relationships, and trust earlier described also relates to Freire’ (2005) concept of teachers-as-students and students-as-teachers. Freire (2005) writes that, “Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students” (p. 72). To resolve this contradiction, Freire (2005) argues that “Through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher [will] cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers” (p. 80).

Freire describes this reconfigured relationship as “The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach” both “becom[ing] jointly responsible for a process in
which all grow” (p. 80). When teacher and student enters loving, humble, trusting
dialogue rooted in mutuality, “arguments based on authority” are no longer valid. . . no
one teaches another, nor is anyone self-taught” Freire (2005) concludes (p. 80).
Horizontal relationships with teacher-as-students and teacher-as-students offers
opportunities for classroom relationships grounded in community, equity, and justice,
called for by the Freirean 21st-century model grounded in pedagogical love. These
opportunities and learning process also help to create the democratic citizen called for by
this model.

Problem-posing instruction. Freire also proposes the problem-posing educational
approach, which is not just a knowledge-creating method grounded in dialogue but is also
another way of resolving vertical anti-dialogic relationships of the traditional banking
approach. In a dialogic problem-posing education, Freire argues, that both teachers-as-
students and students-as-teachers teach each other in this process. According to Freire,
this dialogic problem-posing approach rooted in love, humility, trust, and hope causes
“the teacher-student and the students-teachers [to] reflect simultaneously on themselves
and the world” and collectively create new knowledge with which to decide on future
actions in the re-creation of their collective world and realities (2005, p. 83). Freire
(2005) asserts that in the problem-posing instructional approach, education “does not
dichotomize the activity of the teacher-student” (p. 80), nor does it regard cognitive
actions as belonging to the teacher and not students, “but as the object of reflection by
himself [herself] and the students” (p. 80).
Freire (2005) goes on to describe this instructional approach as one in which “the problem-posing educator constantly re-forms his reflections in the reflection of the students,” and students are therefore not “docile listeners” but “critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher” (pp. 80-81). In describing this method, Freire (2005) continues, stating that:

The students—no longer docile listeners—are now critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher. The teacher presents the material to the students for their consideration, and re-considers her earlier considerations as the students express their own. The role of the problem-posing educator is to create; together with the students, the conditions under which knowledge at the level of the *doxa* is superseded by true knowledge, at the level of the *logos* (p. 81).

As an instructional approach, Freire (2011) notes that “dialogue and problem-posing never lull anyone to sleep,” it only “awakens awareness” instead (p. 113).

Problem-posing instruction in Freire is rooted in love, humility, dialogue, and criticality. Unlike traditional banking instruction, in never “anesthetizes and inhibits creative power,” but instead involves an instructional approach that constantly unveils new realities and new knowledge as part of the process (Freire, 2011, p. 113). “In problem-posing education,” Freire (2005) argues that students “develop their power to perceive critically in relation to their existence in the world within which they find themselves” (p. 11). Freire further asserts that problem-posing education allows learners and teachers-as-students to “come to see the world,” not as a static reality but one they can change in the process of making and remaking the history of the epochs (2005, p. 11). Like all the other elements in Freire’s approach to education, problem-posing instruction enhances the dialogic knowledge creation process. It can also positively
contribute in enhancing education and learning in ways that better equip students as future adults, citizens, and leaders for authentic democracies in 21st-century communities like that of the U.S.

Criticality and critical thinking. Tables 2 and 3 outline the place of criticality in the Freirean framework the study uses. Criticality exists at all stages and at different levels of Freire’s (2005, 2011) instructional and learning approach. As learning progresses, the levels of criticality develops from an initial stage of naiveté to the stage of advanced knowledge creation and cognitive inventiveness characteristic of critical consciousness or conscientizagao as Freire describes it. Dialogue is central to the initiation and development of criticality, illuminated by Freire’s assertion that “Only dialogue, which requires critical thinking, is also capable of generating critical thinking” (p. 92). The critical thinker produced by the Freirean method facilitates “the continuing transformation of reality, in behalf of the continuing humanization of men,” as active participants in the making and re-making of history and new knowledge (Freire, 2005, p. 75). Criticality and dialogue goes along with a loving instructional approach, according to Freire, a point emphasized in both works.

Reflective practice. Like criticality, reflective practice is integral to the Freirean model Tables 2 and 3 outlines. Reflective practice is an intrinsic part of the dialogic process grounded in pedagogical love. Reflective practices are also foundations for what Freire describes as conscientizagao, or consciousness awakening involved in gaining new epistemological, cognitive, or ontological insights—in gaining new knowledge required for transformative actions. Freire (2011) points out that human separate themselves from
animals in the way they think. Human cognition involves “reflection” not “reflex, as do animals” in their thinking and their relations with the world” Freire (2011) states (p. 3). This is a position both Freire and Dewey take on the humanizing value of education and how this separates humans from other beings, such as animals. Since reflection is a human process, then it is a human activity in which both students and teachers engage in, whether this is done as individuals or in partnership with each other in a dialogic learning approach. In the Freirean (2005, 2011) educational process, reflection involves a partnership between both teachers and students in an atmosphere of humility, love, trust, and mutuality “grow” together because teachers teach and learn with students as “teachers-as-students.”

Reflection in the Freirean model of instruction and learning grounded in pedagogical love is the foundation for transformative action, or praxis, as Freire describes. Reflection without action is useless armchair philosophizing. Freire (2005) argues when he states that “reflection—true reflection—leads to action” (p. 66).

Conversely, Freire (2005) writes, “On the other hand, when the situation calls for action, that action will constitute an authentic praxis only if its consequences become the object of critical reflection” (p. 66). Action, or praxis without reflection, Freire would argue, represents an animal reflexive response as represented in the sonorous repetitions, the regurgitation of “facts” in a “motionless, static, compartmentalized, and predictable” pattern of traditional—or banking education (Freire, 2005, p. 71). For Freire, reflective practices and actions rooted in reflective practices increases efficiency, which in turn
improves realistic possibilities for learners’ transformative educational success as outcomes.

Traditional Education—the Banking Approach

Tables 2 and 3 indicate the position of pedagogical lovelessness in this model.

Describing this approach, Freire (2005) writes that, “with the teacher as narrator, leading students to memorize mechanically the narrated content . . . turns them into ‘containers,’ into ‘receptacles’ to be ‘filled’ by the teacher (pp. 71-72). These students as receptacles of teachers’ knowledge, Freire points out, display how well learning occurs by repeating “ipsis verbis.” In this approach, Freire (2005) elaborates, “the more completely she fills the receptacles, the better a teacher she is [and] the more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are,” (p. 72). In this the traditional or banking model of education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor—thus the banking model.

In discussing traditional banking model instruction Freire (2011) writes, “Our traditional curriculum, disconnected from life, centered on words emptied of the reality they are meant to represent, lacking in concrete activity, could never develop a critical consciousness” (p. 33). Freire posits that the traditional method of instruction and learning with a “dependence on high-sounding phrases, reliance on rote, and tendency toward abstractness actually intensified our naiveté” and fails to provide the type of creative and critical education required to function as active citizens in an authentic democracy (p. 33).
In describing rote and memorization in traditional or banking education, Freire writes that, “The banking concept [has a ] tendency to dichotomize everything” (p. 80). Freire delineates the two-stage process: First, the educator prepares the lesson in the staff-room without consideration of student’s input based, on a *deficit-model* of thinking; then the teacher imparts his/her knowledge to the students by making what Freire (2005) describes as a “deposit” into students’ knowledge pool through a method of rote memorization (p. 80). “Neither true knowledge nor true culture” is acquired by this method of instruction, Freire argues (p. 80). In describing this method of learning and instruction, Freire (2005) states that:

The more completely she [the teacher] fills the receptacles, the better a teacher she is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are. Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories, and the teacher is the depositor. This is the “banking” concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits (p. 72).

Below is a listed description of the “banking model” of traditional education as Freire (2005, p. 73) describes it. He writes that:

(a) the teacher teaches and the students are taught;
(b) the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing;
(c) the teacher thinks and the students are thought about;
(d) the teacher talks and the students listen—meekly;
(e) the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined;
(f) the teacher chooses and enforces his choice, and the students comply;
(g) the teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher;
(h) the teacher chooses the program content, and the students (who were not consulted) adapt to it;
The teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his or her own professional authority, which she and he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students; the teacher is the Subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects.

This type of education, Freire argues, is not creative, transformative, knowledge creating, or critical and is incapable of producing the type of citizens for an authentic and sustainable democracy rooted in humanization and humanizing equity. This traditional banking education prepares learners to “accept the passive role imposed on them” and makes them capable only of adapting to “the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them,” Freire (2005) points out (p. 73).

For Freire, traditional banking model of instruction involves what some today describe as the sage-on-stage approach of learning and instruction. These arguments, still relevant to education today, support the 21st-century best practices for deeper learning that challenges, rather than destroys the critical knowledge-creating processes described in the Freirean model.

Successful Transformative Education in Freire (2005, 2011)

Table 2 indicates elements of anticipated successful educational outcomes associated with the study’s Freirean model. Freire uses the terms conscientizagao and praxis to describe outcomes of a successful transformative education. Conscientizagao is a critical awakening or realization of one’s own deficits, or of oppressive and dehumanizing situations. These deficits can be cognitive, ontological, or epistemological in nature. Praxis is action and the outcome of conscientizagao; and aims at actively working towards making transformative changes in real meaningful ways—whether these are cognitive, ontological, or epistemological changes.
Conscientizagao and praxis happens not just as end-point terminating outcomes—like a final exam. Instead, conscientizagao and praxis occur throughout at each stage and throughout the learning process, leading to ever-higher levels of consciousness and/or praxis as part of the inventive knowledge-creation processes of this model for both students and teachers-as-learners.

Conscientizagao. For Freire, conscientizagao is the outcome of an education rooted in love, critical thinking emerging from all elements previously outlined and discussed in this study’s conceptual framework Tables 2 and 3 outlines. A translator’s note in Pedagogy of the Oppressed describes conscientizagao as a process in which the learners becomes aware of their realities of oppression. Conscientizagao represents intellectual or cognitive growth into higher levels of awareness and knowledge and leads to praxis, or knowledgeable and informed action/praxis grounded in pedagogical love—a love that is humble, loving, kind, trustful, and cognizant of the need for mutuality as Freire argues.

For Freire (2005) conscientizagao involves some measure of risk-taking when “the victims of injustice” move from passive oppression to an active participant in their own humanization. In this risk taking transition, lessons of pedagogical love allows for action/praxis, grounded in love, humility, trust, kindness, mutuality, and criticality in the use of dialogue, reflective practices, and actions grounded in these elements of pedagogical love. In addition to Tables 2 and 3, the bulleted list below illustrates examples of possible qualities of conscientizagao in transformed humanized being
educated under the Freirean (2005, 2011) model grounded in pedagogical love. This person would most likely be:

- Loving, hopeful, humble, trusting, peaceful, kind, and critical
- Empowered democratic citizens able to support, maintain, participate, shape, and reshape sustainable and authentic democracies
- Not restricted nor afraid of challenging or “limit” situations as Freire describes it
- Non-violent and able to resolve problems in a dialogic manner
- Able to be a creator and re-creator of knowledge, working with others in a loving, humble, critical, and dialogic manner as Subjects rather than as objects of learning
- Opposed to the “objectification” and oppression of others
- Transformers of their realities, active makers and participants in the epochal history making events of their time
- Able to operate as students-as-teachers and teachers-as-students

All these characteristics, compatible with contemporary best practices, make Freire’s model an ideal 21st-century model applicable to U.S. P-12 settings. It creates humanized citizens whose education prepares them to be deep thinkers and inventive 21st-century knowledge creators, problem-solvers, dialogic, collaborative, and capable of sustaining authentic democratic systems grounded in equity and justice.

The processes of conscientização or critical awakening, partnered with praxis, is cyclical, having no endpoint; since as Freire argues, the liberated has within them the seeds of becoming the new class of oppressors with the ability to recreate the conditions they hitherto opposed. There is therefore a continuous need in these cyclical realities to remain wide-awake to the realities of oppression and to be vigilant in preventing them, using in a relativist way, the methods outlined in Freire (2005, 2011). This is a reality applicable to questions of authentic democracy and equity in U.S. settings, therefore the need for the educational model grounded in pedagogical love.
Praxis. Tables 2 and 3 indicate the location and functions of praxis in the Freirean approach the study uses. Praxis is action grounded in the methods of pedagogical love. It is conscious, knowledgeable, loving, humble, kind, trustful, reflective, and informed action taken to institute processes for the realization of authentic humanization aimed at ending oppression in its diverse forms. Praxis results from action grounded in skills learned through the education process of Freirean pedagogical love and conscientizagao of the need to grow and move upward and forward in ways that are cognitive, epistemological, or ontological as illustrated in Tables 2 and 3. It is both the endpoint of this education, and the starting-point of new ontological realities and a platform for new growth aimed at securing goals associated with Freire’s Utopian ideal.

Freire’s Utopia, described in the introduction to Freire (2011) by Denis Goulet, is “no idealistic dream spun out of a mind ideologically enamored of dialogue of critical consciousness,” but one that “grows out of his practical involvement with oppressed in a process of struggle” (p. xii). Goulet points out that, “to theorize otherwise, for Freire, is to foster a particularly repulsive form of naive consciousness” (p. xii). In his own words, Freire describes praxis as “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it,” (p. 51), saying further that, “no reality transforms itself” (p. 54).

In discussing praxis within the Brazilian realities of that time, Freire (2005) states that this “cannot be a purely intellectual” process, but one that also includes “serious reflection” if actions are to be effective and transformative (p. 65). Transformative, emancipatory, and humanizing actions, according to Freire, are not wild, unthinking, or emotional responses based on “myths” and “superstitions,” but they are actions rooted in
a deeply reflective and cognitive process that involves critical reflection, prior to taking any form of action. Such a process is useful in academic, intellectual, and real-life settings, such as those required for democratic actions and decisions within a 21st-century context. A reflective citizen and student, educated in the Freirean method of dialogue rooted in love, humility, trust, critical thinking is by far a better human being than one educated in the loveless, uncritical, and anti-dialogic system based on rote and memorization that characterizes the traditional banking model that Freire describes.

An example of praxis as part of the educational outcome rooted in Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love emerges from the narrative in Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016) in which Steven, a graduate describes a point where he reflected, and eventually took action, or praxis, to transform his situation from an ABD to a PhD. At this juncture, Steven had not completed his dissertation and he states that:

Classes were about to end, and I had to focus on writing the dissertation. This was a point where I could see simultaneously who I was and who I needed to become. [Long pause]. After classes ended, Steven continued, I wasn’t ready to write. I did absolutely nothing. One day of inactivity turned into five. Five days turned into two weeks. Before I knew it, four or five months had passed. In this process, two events—one of them involving a “so what?” conversation with my professor, made the difference between being stuck in a place of inaction or going forward and getting this dissertation done (Smith-Campbell & Littles, 2016, p 16.).

Steven continued and stated that:

The second transformative event took place when my methodology professor invited me to a class she held in the evenings with the cohort two years behind mine. Two of my cohort members and I began going to her class, sitting in the back, and writing our dissertations. Coming to the other cohort’s class was hard because it was embarrassing,
but it was a liberating experience. The ironic part is that the three of us in the back of that class started a kind of tradition. Dissertation-writing doctoral students continue to sit in the back of that class and write while the newer cohorts are taught. I’m proud of that, and because of this type of assistance, I eventually graduated with my Ph.D. (Smith-Campbell & Littles, 2016, p. 16).

Although this is an example from adult education, it is transferable to P-12 settings where students’ ability to learn and advance intellectually can be accomplished by a similar process rooted in pedagogical love, dialogue, critical thinking, critical reflection, and action rooted in praxis as Steven did. The application of this situation rooted in pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings is the goal that this study seeks to achieve by asking the research questions it poses.

Section Summary

This section’s conceptual framework dissects and presents elements of Freire (2005, 2011) educational model in a way that makes it useful for this study’s exploration of pedagogical love. Elements in this framework includes ones related the Freirean model and the concepts of love, lovelessness, humanization, and knowledge-creating characteristics of this model. It also examines the teacher’s characteristics and instructional approach beginning before the first day of instruction, when teachers-as-researchers investigate students’ living experiences and realities as sources of first-day lessons. It ends with examining elements of successful educational outcomes and their implications for the Freirean educational model. Overall, this conceptual framework presents Freire in his own words, reconstructed to meet the needs of this study’s topic of exploration and the research questions it poses.
Scholarly Works and Research on Freire’s Educational Approach

This section offers samples of scholarly works and research on the topic of the Freirean educational model grounded in pedagogical love. Creswell (2014) points out that reviews of scholarly works and research like the one in this section, “adds to existing literature,” and “describes the past and current state of information on this topic” (p. 80). By presenting “about [the] topic” of Freirean pedagogical love and Freire’s overall educational approach, this section conforms to Creswell’s guidelines and discusses works emanating from the U.S. as well as from nations including Canada, Finland, Greece, and Australia. In achieving these goals, discussion occurs in three separate categories: (1) seminal works, (2) scholarly peer-reviewed works, and (3) dissertations. These discussions identify contributions, voids, and this study’s contributions in filling identified gaps.

Although empirical studies are preferred, many in this section are rhetorical/philosophical in approach, and are non-empirical based on Creswell’s (2011) concept of scholarly research. Creswell defined research as involving three steps: (1) the posing of a research question; (2) the collection of data to answer the question; and (3) the presentation of an answer to the question. Williams (2011) makes a similar point, stating that “research originates with at least one question about one phenomenon of interest,” and that use of research questions are valuable because they “help researchers to focus thoughts, manage efforts, and choose the appropriate approach, or perspective from which to make sense of each phenomenon of interest” (p. 65). Generally also, this type of research falls within the qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods approaches and
either within the traditional positivist or post-positivist scientific methods presented in Creswell’s guidelines.

The Nature of Research

This study’s approach to what constitutes scholarly research differs somewhat from the guidelines in Creswell (2011), taking a position closer to that outlined by Williams (2011). Unlike Creswell, Williams uses the two epistemological concepts of *posteriori* and *priori* knowledge to describe scholarly research. Posteriori describes Creswell’s form of empirical research, while priori knowledge describes non-empirical approaches (Baehr, 2017). Williams argue that, “non-empirical or a priori knowledge has been widely accepted within the realm of philosophical approaches to knowledge creation because it explains or justifies knowledge independent of the sensory experience” (p. 65). Williams goes on and points out that both posteriori or empirical and priori or non-empirical methods “are the theoretical underpinnings to quantitative and qualitative research methods,” and that “each research method is designed to explore specific research questions and attempts to address the post-positivist approach of challenging the traditional belief of absolute truth” (p. 65). Using this evidence, this study asserts that both empirical and non-empirical scholarly research has its place in literature reviews like this one. In addition, there is a scarcity of traditional, posteriori, or empirical research on the subject of Freire’s pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings, a situation indicated in this study’s search strategy and outcomes reflected in this section’s matrix.
This scarcity of empirical research is not just a problem associated with scholarship on Freire’s ideas of pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 educational settings but one generally present in the field of critical educational theory education research. Gottesman (2010), Gaztambide-Fernández (2003), and others like Miedema and Wardekker (1999) point to this scarcity and calls for theory-to-practice research in this field, one to which Freire’s works in education belong. Referring to this need Miedema and Wardekker point to the abundance of rhetorical theorizing not supported by empirical research that they argue leave practitioners in the field without practical examples grounded in research to draw from. This is a research void in the research scholarship on Freire’s work in P-12 settings, which this study addresses, and seeks to lessen. This study seeks to respond to calls by writers such as Miedema and Wardekker and hopes to support ideas found in seminal works like that of Darder (1994, 2003) and Nieto (2008) on application of Freire’s ideas on education in U.S. P-12 settings.

Seminal Works

Darder’s (2002, 2017) Reinventing Paulo Freire: Pedagogy of Love; Sonia Nieto’s (2008) Dear Paulo: Letters from Those Who Dare Teach; bell hooks’s (1994) Teaching to Transgress Education as the Practice of Freedom and (2003) Heart to Heart: Teaching with Love are seminal works included in this subsection. Both of Darder’s work that includes an introduction by Giroux, Nieto, and hooks, are landmark ones on Freire’s pedagogical love—with hooks offering a unique feminist-Buddhist combination not found in other works on this topic.
In Darder (2017), 15 participants’ narratives offer personal testaments and insights. Nieto (2008) includes almost 70 participants—such as Ira Shor, Maxine Greene, Michelle Fine, as well as ordinary teachers and university students from Nieto’s higher education classes. Only relevant narratives on Freirean pedagogical love in Nieto’s works are part of this chapter’s discussions. All three authors’ work in this section offers insights into interpretations and application of the Freirean model and pedagogical love in practice in U.S. P-12 and higher educational settings.

Darder’s *Reinventing Paulo Freire*. In Neo-Marxist language reflective of the Frankfurt critical tradition, Darder places Freire’s education within contexts of pedagogical love and practices in U.S. education. Using categories such as socioeconomic status, class, race, and ethnicity within contemporary U.S. contexts, Darder (2017) reiterates the point that, “Freire proposed a revolutionary vision of society that calls for the eradication of all forms of human suffering and oppression” (p. 36). Darder states that for Freire, “poverty, racism, sexism, heterosexism, and other forms of discrimination are not natural traits of our humanity;” in fact, “Freire was convinced that schools are significant sites of struggle [putting] teachers... in an ideal position to collectively fight for the reinvention of the world” (p. 36). Utilizing terms like “neoliberalism” in critiquing contemporary capitalism, Darder (2017) lays out an educational foundation for applications of Freire’s ideas grounded in pedagogical love and 21st-century U.S. realities, useful for connecting Freire’s ideas to these settings in this study’s investigation of pedagogical love.
Darder (2017) in a language reflective of this study’s approach states that, “Living a pedagogy of love in our classroom and our communities defies the prescriptive formulas and models of the past” and calls for a “‘reinvention’ of radical vision not only of schooling but of American society” (p. 35). Darder points out that, “Freire understood that any humanizing vision for democratic education and the transformation of social and material inequalities must be, indeed, fully contingent on educational priorities,” that “must be emancipatory’ (p. 35). For Darder, the idea that education is a sociopolitical tool that is cognitively uplifting and knowledge creating by nature, is a foundational belief, assumption, and educational objective, as in this study, Freire, and Dewey.

According to Darder, teachers practicing pedagogical love have to be “motivated by their passion for learning and teaching and their love for others;” and even more, they should be enthusiastic and “awakened” in their practices by a “commitment to the possibilities of education as an emancipatory force,” (2017, p. 81). A teacher committed to pedagogical love, Darder states, should understand that “Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed was not pedagogy solely for the classroom, but rather a living pedagogy that must be infused into all aspects of our [teacher’s] lives, including our personal politics” (p. 81). Darder continues and says that, “as teachers we cannot pretend that individual needs and concerns within the classroom beyond the intellectual domain are not significant to the development of students’ critical capacities” (p. 82). Darder argues that both dialogue, problem-posing education, and criticality requires love “as the cornerstone of Freire’s pedagogy of love” (p. 90); and that “Freire (1970) repeatedly stressed that dialogue could not exist without a teacher’s ‘profound love for the world’” (p. 93). In
Darder as it is in Freire, love was not just a prerequisite, a co-requisite, and the outcome of the dialogic process in transformative education, but it was a political process in which, as Darder states, “a loving commitment to our students and our political dreams,” are attached (p. 93).

Overall, Darder’s *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A Pedagogy of Love* is the most cited work on Freirean pedagogical love. This work is not only important in connecting Freirean pedagogical love to U.S. settings, but also because it contains narratives of first-hand experiences of teachers and higher education learners, grappling with these concepts, both cognitively as well as parts of their P-12 educational practices. These two works also offer insights into the nature of the teacher’s beliefs and instruction grounded in Freire’s pedagogical love, as well as identifying markers for students’ transformative success in this model, as indicated in the following subsections’ topical discussions. Darder’s (2002, 2017) *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A Pedagogy of Love* is valuable for the way it unpacks and repackages Freire’s ideas on education and links it to U.S. contexts.

*Teacher-power.* In unpacking, applying, and discussing elements of the Freirean educational practices grounded in pedagogical love, Darder addresses the topic of teacher power in classroom teacher-student relations. Darder (2017) writes about teacher’s “negotiating power and authority in the classroom,” stating that, “for a teacher to proclaim that she or he gives students all the power is simply not true;” in fact, teacher power, directive activities, authority, and non-neutral positions, are in fact necessary elements of the Freirean instructional process (p. 98). Darder cites Freire, arguing, “teachers must critically utilize their power in the interest of democratic life or ‘on the
side of freedom’” (p. 98). Darder writes that, “Freire argued that directivity is always at work in the process of teaching and learning,” because “no educational endeavor is ever a neutral affair” since teachers should be clear and intentional in their education and their sociopolitical goals and purposes in the pedagogic process (p. 99).

Like Freire, Darder (2017) differentiates between authoritarianism and authority in the instructional process, stating that, “similar to teacher directivity, teacher authority is always present, whether it be veiled or clearly articulated;” and it is critical for teachers to recognize the differences between both in their practices (p. 100). “Authority,” Darder illuminates, “refers to the power teachers possess to influence (direct) learning, thought, and behavior through their responsibility to educate students,” while “authoritarianism is linked to the expectation that students should and will blindly accept and submit to the concentration of power in the hands of the teacher as the exclusive knowing subject” (p. 100). Darder concludes that, “authoritarianism results when authority runs amuck,” and it is the responsibility of teachers as part of their instructional process to “recognize that there exists no human relationships, let alone educational practices, without the explicit or implicit existence of authority,” that need to be managed in the students’ best interests at all times (p. 100). Teacher power and power relations are under addressed issues in classroom instructional relationships that Freire’s student-as-teacher and teachers-as-students horizontal relationships address and pedagogical love seeks to resolve.

*Teachers and parents.* In addition, Darder (2017) also addresses the practice of pedagogical love and teacher-parental relationships. This issue is valuable to the investigation of pedagogical love that is absent in Freire (2005, 2011), since adult, not P-
education, is the topic of interest and focus. Darder’s example, draws from participant Alejandro Segura-Mora’s account as a kindergarten teacher. She points out their parents’ beliefs, dreams, goals, and aspirations are important factors shaping childrens’ perspectives; and attitudes to education and that school activities and learning that may sometimes be contrary to parents’ beliefs. In describing these issues, Segura-Mora says:

Parents often are concerned with sheltering their children from negative experiences, including those that would interfere with their family’s belief and value system. Some believe that we should not subject young naïve and innocent students to political and ideological issues. In addition, many of my students’ parents have internalized the belief that schools are neutral grounds of knowledge; hence, they perceive critical pedagogy as both openly political and anti-educational (Darder, 2017, p. 129).

It is at times like this that Segura-Mora and other teacher participants in Darder (2017) explain how teachers have to put aside fear in favor of doing justice. They take the risks of practicing pedagogical love and providing the humanizing transformative education they commit to advocate.

Segura-Mora also points out that “alongside parent concerns are school practices that, more often than not, promote sanitized versions of historical struggles,” at the expense of ‘higher-order thinking skills’: and “authentic critical inquiry [which] is widely discouraged and commonly prohibited altogether in many schools and classrooms” (p. 129). None of these teachers in either Darder (2017) or Nieto (2008) that is discussed later, “brainwashed” or penalized students with inauthentic thinking. As these teachers’ narratives indicates, they encouraged and open doors to these critical discussions and allowed students—even at the kindergarten level—to come to their own independent
personal decisions, even when they are contrary to those advocated by their teachers and Freire, as Segura-Mora’s narrative indicates.

Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love extends and includes the empowerment and humanization of parents also, and this is indicated in Darder’s (2017) narratives, where Maisie Chin, a director of a parent community organization tells her story. Chin says that, “We may not think of love as the language and pedagogy of parent engagement,” but, “if we are to believe in our human ability to co-construct new political realities,” then “we are fundamentally required to choose Freire’s pedagogy of love—loving parents and the humanization through praxis unconditionally” (Darder 2017, p. 179). Chin points out that, “It takes a special kind of love, a revolutionary one,” to enter into genuine relationships in solidarity with parents as “stakeholders in our public school system,” and exclusion of children’s parents and guardians in a process rooted in pedagogic love is not an option (p. 179). In its mission statement, the CADRE parenting organization in the south Los Angeles Unified school district. They identify their goal as one that seeks to, “solidify and advance parent leadership to ensure that all children are rightfully educated regardless of where they live,” and mobilize parent participation that will both “preserve and expand” equity and children’s rights to education (CADRE, 2017, para. 3).

As director of CADRE, Chin says, “We set out with a deliberate purpose, to ensure that parents are no longer manipulated to support educational institutions’ interests and practices that undermine their families’ capacities to ‘become more fully human’” (Darder, 2017, p. 179). Chin also explained that interactions with parents and guardians
operate under the same Freirean educational principles involving elements “that would support parents becoming the problem-posers, problem-solvers, and actors on the educational realities that their children face, both individually and collectively—to be the subjects of their lives as marginalized parents attempting to secure educational access for their children.” In other words, the humanizing transformative success anticipated from outcomes of the Freirean approach rooted in pedagogical love is as applicable and beneficial to parents as it is with students. It has similar goals that seek to humanize, transform, and empower loving, humble, and kind actions/interactions, rooted in criticality, and needed by citizens for the operation and advancement of authentic 21st-century democracies in nations like the U.S.

*Students’ voices.* Darder (2017) discusses the issue of including students’ voices as part of the anticipated transformative successful educational outcomes of the Freirean model rooted in pedagogical love. The author places this within the context of a dialogical instructional approach, writing, “teachers cannot legitimately talk about the development of voice outside of a dialogical context that nourishes and cultivates its development, movement, and full expression” (p. 94). From this process, Darder argues that students are empowered “to experience the power of decolonizing existence, the process of conscientização,” and to “discover themselves as politically reflective beings, where they develop their ability to give voice to their ideas and impressions,” (p. 94). Their transformative educational success, according to Darder, allows students to “practice the process of critique through speaking truth to power . . . becoming socially responsible subjects within their world” (p. 94).
Darder (2017) also writes of the successful transformative educational outcome of the Freirean model of instruction in which both teacher and student “grow,” as Freire (2005) also argues. Darder writes that the successful transformative educational process is “a continuous, purposefully motivated, and open exchange that provides teachers and students together a place to reflect, critique, affirm, challenge, act, and ultimately transform our collective understanding of the world” together (2017, p. 74). However, Darder did not describe the cognitive and knowledge creation details in a concrete way. Rather, the focus was more on the abstract process, describing what this would look like in a real-world situation. Darder’s focus is on the sociopolitical rather than on the cognitive knowledge creation process and benefits of an instructional approach based on Freire’s approach. There is also plenty of evidence drawn from teachers’ experiences and outcomes; however, there is an absence of students’ voices that are excluded from this work—expect as told by their teachers. This is a void this study seeks to fill, by offering students’ accounts of educational successes rooted in the Freirean (2005, 2011) instructional model of pedagogical love.

Nieto’s Dear Paulo. Also rooted in the critical social justice traditions in education, Nieto, in a bit more muted tone than Darder (2002, 2017), presented arguments, as well as participants’ narratives related to applications of Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings. In language similar to Darder, Nieto writes that “The New Right” that includes neoliberals has obstructed “progress in public education, particularly as such policies relate to social justice” in the United States (p. 4). Nieto cites Giroux and Apple in pointing out that while this book was initially an attempt at
helping her students grapple with the difficulties of reading *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, that “reasons beyond [this] personal experience make *Dear Paulo* . . . a worthwhile, and even necessary, project” (p. 4). It is also as Nieto argues, in response to the needs and feelings among “many liberals” who “are sincerely concerned about the long-term and seemingly intractable inequality in learning outcomes for the most vulnerable and marginalized students, particularly students of color and those who live in poverty” (p. 4).

For Nieto (2008), Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings is demonstrated in retrospective personal narratives in letters addressed to Freire himself. Participants in this project are mostly Nieto’s former students, but include education scholars such as Maxine Greene and Ira Shor. Almost all of these letters represent personal responses to readings of Freire’s *Teachers as Cultural Workers*, assigned by Nieto to most participants who were students taking courses the author taught. Each letter expressed areas of impact(s) of Freire’s instructional beliefs on each participant’s personal practices and beliefs as educators.

Nieto dedicated a section—*Part 7: Love*, to the concept of Freirean pedagogical love—even though concepts of love are evident in other parts of the book. Overall, both works are similar in presenting teachers’ voices on the Freirean practice of education in U.S. P-12 settings and are the two major works in this area. Nieto explains that 70 letters are organized by nine themes, but themes related to other ideas such as pedagogical love, exist in various groups not identified with the concept of love in its heading.

In introducing participants’ narratives of Freirean pedagogical love, Nieto (2008) states that, “the letters in this section describe in numerous ways what it means to love
one’s students” (p. 129). Nieto continues and point out that these teachers try to find ways and time to practice pedagogical love defined as “daring” love, “in spite of it all” (p. 129). Participants write of Freirean love “as both teacher and learner transformed” by Freire’s ideas on education (p. 130). They speake of doing “love” as part of their practice with students they are “excited to work alongside—“to learn with them” as one participant Alexis Nasdor-Jones states (p. 133). In a similar statement another participant, Ruth Harman, says, “I found myself being guided by my students,” in applying Freire’s ideas in her classroom, despite feeling “intimidated” after years in “the safe sanctuary of my university world of books and schooled students” (p. 134).

Some participants like Brahim Oulbeid express skepticism regarding the possibilities of Freire’s anticipated transformative outcomes from the educational model he proposes. Oulbeid states that “although, I am sure that your ideas about empowering students are the clue to the reform of education,” that it was uncertain to work in real world situations in the U.S. where “teachers still feel insecure about their abilities to bring about change, are afraid of their superiors; and stick to the prepackaged educational materials” (p. 181). Oulbeid concludes that, “with the collaboration of politicians and educational staff that reform in education will see the light of day and we will be able to build a democratic society” (p 181). Such a perspective exists, and reflects the dare, the hope, and the willingness to work past the difficulties towards authentic humanization that Freire points out is a difficult but possible task.
Teachers’ fear and practices of love. Nieto highlights how the theme of fear works on pedagogical love and critical social justice education. This is something that Freire was aware of as part of the difficulties teachers face in practicing pedagogical love as part of transformative practices. Freire (2011) points to this by saying that “the purely technical aspect of the procedure is not difficult,” but that the real “difficulty lies rather in the creation of a new attitude that [is] so absent in our own upbringing and education” (p. 45). One teacher, Angélica Ribeiro, states that “although I love my students, I can’t avoid feeling fear, especially during the first classes, when I’m still in the process of getting to know them” (Nieto, 2008, p. 23). Ribeiro continues hopefully by saying, “I believe this is a fear of somehow disappointing them [but] after reading in one of your letters that fear is normal and that we as humans have the right to feel it, I feel better now” (p. 23).

Not only do teachers practicing Freirean pedagogical love have to overcome the normal fear as novice educators, but they also face additional fears related to conflict, and antagonisms from school leaders and parents. Nieto’s (2017) narratives point to these conflicts and one preservice teacher, Laila DiSilvio states that, “I love history and social studies. . . I love these subjects also because I think they are where democratic teaching can thrive;” however, DiSilvio continues, “it also means covering controversial topics that loom large in students’ lives but are often pushed aside as nonacademic or secondary. I need to admit that I am scared of conflict,” (p. 28). DiSilvio concludes by pointing out that fear should not be a hindrance to practicing pedagogical love; Freire’s writings are a source of strength and support. DiSilvio says that she embraces conflict
when creating lesson plans because a failure to do so will cause her to “become increasingly complacent in [her] teaching” (p. 28).

Another teacher, Nancy Costa remarks about her acceptance of Freire’s ideas when she says, “I particularly like the idea of teaching as a political act and how [Freire’s ideas] “opened my eyes to another way of viewing education” (p. 28). Costa, Di Silvio, Ribeiro, and other teachers’ narratives in both Darder (2017) and Nieto (2008) indicate how Freire’s ideas on education shapes teachers’ practices grounded in pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings and of the fear, challenges, and difficulties they face. These narratives in Darder (2017) and Nieto (2008) offer insights into the real world challenges, fear, and isolation pointed out in Darder’s work, and the depth of commitment required in the practice of pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings.

In the end, participants in Nieto (2008) thanked Freire for the insights his ideas offered on transformative education. Jennifer Burk says, “thank you, Paulo. Thank you for showing me what it truly means to dare, and just how empowering such daring can be” (p. 138). Another teacher, Stephanie Doyle, writes to Freire, “Reading your letters has brought me to a better understanding about how to become a more effective, aware, and loving teacher” (p. 139). While another, Nancy Costa thanks Freire “for the inspiration to try.” Costa offers the following list from extracts of lessons learned about the Freirean approach to education rooted in pedagogical love:

These are some lessons I learned from you:
That it is not possible to be a teacher without loving your students;
That it is not possible to be a teacher without loving teaching....
....That if you need help in understanding something you should seek help;
That you should not run away from things that are difficult;
That after you have read something, you should critique it, discuss it, challenge it, question it, and then you will truly understand it; That teachers should assert themselves and view education as political; That teachers should be loving, courageous, humble, tolerant, decisive, secure, honest, competent, patient and impatient, and have a joy for living; That teachers need to fight for what they believe in; That teachers should learn from teaching and learn from their students; That teachers should be committed to social justice, liberty, and the individual rights of their students (Nieto, 2008, p. 25).

Costa closed by saying in the letter to Freire that, “Now it is time to try to incorporate into my practice some of the principles you have written about. It will be challenging, but exciting” (p. 25).

In some ways Nieto’s (2008) work is similar to Darder (2017) in that they both focus on reflective narratives of U.S. teachers, professors, teachers in training, and educators in general, who are either in training for or practicing in U.S. P-12 and higher education settings. Both Nieto and Darder also addressed common elements in Freire’s educational model, such as the role of love—pedagogical love, and instructional ideas involving dialogic education, reflective, humility, the sociopolitical nature of education, of conscientização, praxis, the role of theory in teachers’ instructional practices, beliefs, and related issues. Both utilized a critical theoretical orientation in naming the sources, nature, effects, and remedy that education offers to oppression in its various forma. Darder’s approach was more within the parameters of Marxist dialectics and emphasized the role of class and economic factors of oppression more than Nieto does. Both indicated the relevancy of race, ethnicity, and culture as influencing factors in U.S. oppression. Both works are useful for this study’s investigation of pedagogical love and in answering its related research questions. They both offer, for example, rich firsthand accounts of responses to Freire’s ideas of educators in training, and educators practicing
in the field. They offer in other words, research-to-practice evidence for this study’s investigation of Freirean pedagogical love in P-12 settings.

Both works are also different in some ways. For instance, while Darder’s (2017) work represents personal reflections on the actual everyday practice of P-12 classroom settings, Nieto’s (2008) participants offer a more abstract form of evidence, most of which were unrelated to the actual practice in the field. Nieto’s participants were also more diverse than Darder’s, and the former includes in their fields of professional practices in education ordinary teachers and notable scholars like Maxine Greene, and professors from intuitions like Amherst, UCLA, University of Georgia, and others. Nieto writes that this book, “consists of the reflections of classroom teachers, teacher educators, and other academics relating to Paulo Freire’s writings, specifically *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) and *Teachers as Cultural Workers*. . . from which it borrows its subtitle” (p. 6). Darder on the other hand states that, “the voices of 15 educators” whose narratives are presented in this work, “have worked for many years, in a variety of ways, to “reinvent” Freire’s philosophy of education within the context of their classrooms” “sought actively to integrate this understanding [of Freire’s ideas] in their teaching practice and everyday lives” (p. 128). It is the fact that these teachers are practicing the praxis, as Freire world say, that makes Darder’s work more useful than Nieto’s. This is not to suggest that Nieto’s work is not valuable to this study’s project—because it is.

hooks and a Feminist’s-African-American perspective. The value of hooks (1994, 2003) work is in its implications for application of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love to U.S. realities of oppression in their diverse forms, and specifically related to race,
ethnicity, and gender/sexual orientations. [Nieto and Darder also address issues related to race, ethnicity, and other forms of oppression, but in a way similar to Freire, where all forms of oppressions are viewed as similar in nature, effects, and remediation—rather than belonging to separate jurisdictions]. Hooks definition and use of Freirean pedagogical love is different in orientation from those of Darder and Nieto.

As in the case of Darder, hooks is often cited in works on pedagogical love such as in Johnson’s (2008) feminist-Catholic *Christian Brotherhood* perspective, speaks of Freire in personal ways. Both of hooks’s works (1994, 2003) are examples of diverse ways in which Freire’s ideas on oppression are applied. Freire was not concerned with specialized forms of oppression, but saw all oppressive conditions as rooted in the same sources of dehumanization he describes. Hooks, however was not just able to apply Freire’s ideas to the specialized jurisdiction of race, gender, and sexuality as they relate to oppressive educational contexts but also merged his concept of love with a Buddhist perspective represented in Thich Nhat Hanh and elements of a feminist African American approach. Hooks’s works are useful for understanding the varied ways in which Freire’s ideas on love are applicable within U.S. contexts.

In comparing hooks (2003) to hooks (1994), the latter work makes extensive use of Freire’s ideas on education. The subtitle of this work—*A Pedagogy of Hope* is similar to the title of Freire’s (1992) publication, *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Hooks begins this work with the quote, “It is imperative that we maintain hope even when the harshness of reality may suggest the opposite,” from Freire (p. v). Later hooks cites Freire on hope, saying, “Educator Paulo Freire reminds us: ‘The
struggle for hope means the denunciation, in no uncertain terms of all abuses . . . as we denounce them, we awaken in others and ourselves the need, and also the taste, for hope” (p. xiv). Freire’s ideas on education are sometimes not directly attributed to Freire but elevated through ideas like Parker Palmer’s. For instance, in referencing Palmer, hooks in a language reminiscent of Freire’s, states that, “Palmer contends that ‘the origin of knowledge is love’ . . . [and] the goal of a knowledge arising from life is the reunification and reconstruction of broken selves and worlds,” (p. 132). These ideas are not unlike those expressed in Freire (2005, 2011).

In defining pedagogical love, hooks (2003) cites an earlier work, *All About Love*, saying that, “I defined love as a combination of care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect, and trust,” and “all these factors work interdependently” (p. 131). Hooks points out that these concepts are the “core foundation of love irrespective of the relational context . . . even though there is a difference between romantic love and the love between teacher and pupil, these core aspects must be present for love to be love” (p. 136). Hooks also goes deeply into the emotional and psychological aspects that involves concepts like caring: “when we profess to love what we teach and the process of teaching, that [is a] declaration of emotional connection” (p. 127).

In defining pedagogical love hooks (2003) introduces the concept of *objectivism* and *teacher authority and authoritarianism*, the latter of which is a part of Freire’s (2005, 2011) discussions of pedagogical love. In discussing objectivism, hooks (2003) contends that the concept of objectivism is afraid of pedagogical love, and “. . . made synonymous with an unbiased standpoint, ”” (p. 128). Hooks further argues that the positivist stance of
objectivist teachers does not require listening and “no other points of view are
needed...and all that remains is to bring others into conformity with objective truth” (p. 128). This is a “domineering” stance, hooks asserts, and “where there is domination, there is no place for love” (p. 128). The domineering stance of authoritarian teachers in hooks as it is in Freire (2005, 2011) is anti-communicative, “often pathologically narcissistic” and works against the mutual knowledge creation dialectics found in settings where pedagogical love—the antithesis of the domineering and authoritative banking model is practiced by pedagogical love and the Freirean (2005, 2011) instructional and learning approach (p. 128). Using language quite similar to that in Freire (2005, 2011) hooks writes that, “authoritarian practices, promoted and encouraged by many institutions, undermines democratic education in the classroom . . . the practice of freedom . . . dehumanizes and thus shuts down the ‘magic’ that is always present when individuals are active learners. It takes the “fun out of study,” according to hooks, and makes education “repressive and oppressive” (p. x).

Pedagogical love in hooks also involves a strengthening of authentic democracies rooted in justice and the attainment of civil rights justice based on gender and race. According to hooks (2003), “those of us who have worked both as teachers and students to transform academia know that the classroom is not a site for domination,” but instead are sites where children and adults “learn to open their minds, to engage in rigorous study and to think critically” (p. xiii). Elsewhere hooks (1994) writes that, “Looking at anti-racist civil rights struggle, one of the most revolutionary movements for social justice in the world, it was clear that the focus on a love ethic was a central factor in the
movement’s success” (p. 51). In discussing the history of education apartheid and the civil rights movement in the U.S. hooks explains that, “the emphasis on education as necessary for liberation that black people made in slavery and then on into reconstruction informed our lives;” and, “Freire's emphasis on education as the practice of freedom made such immediate sense. . . [and] I took with me memories of black teachers in the segregated school system who had been critical pedagogues providing us liberatory paradigms” (p. 51). It was the “early experience of a liberatory education in Booker T. Washington and Crispus Attucks, the black schools of my formative years,” hooks states, which made her “forever dissatisfied with the education I received in predominantly white settings” (p. 51).

By integrating issues of race, the goals of authentic democracy, and civil rights in the conversation on Freirean pedagogical love as an instructional approach, hooks’s works places Freire’s ideas on transformative education success center stage in discussions of P-12 education in the U.S. It is for this reason that hooks’s ideas on Freirean pedagogical love are valuable to this study’s investigation and the research questions it asks about instruction and students’ transformative success in education.

Overall, along with Darder (2017) and Nieto (2008), hooks (1994, 2004) offers deeper insights in authenticating the applicability of Freire’s (2005, 2011) ideas on pedagogical love as a valid instructional approach, capable of students fostering educational success within U.S. P-12 settings. These three seminal works also to indicate the relativism of Freire’s ideas, the diverse interpretations, and applications they have in discussions on oppression in its diverse forms. They show how his educational approach
can be a panacea to these dehumanizing conditions that are destructive to the sustenance of authentic democracy in the U.S.

What is missing from the three seminal works highlighted in this section are P-12 students’ voices and perspectives on pedagogical love and their transformative educational successes that results from these practices. The same pertains to all the other works reviewed in this chapter of this study’s investigation on Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love and transformative students’ success. Searches of Mercer University Libraries, ProQuest Dissertations, EBSCO/HOST, and Google/Google Scholar for students’ voices/narratives on this subject over the period extending from June to October 2017 provided only few results, none of which relates directly to Freire’s instructional model rooted in pedagogical love. This study’s investigation, by including students’ stories of their transformative educational success, seeks to fill this void and add to the literature on this subject in this regard.

None of the seminal works discussed are empirical research in the strict positivist sense of the word (Creswell, 2011, 2014; Firestone, 1987; Maxwell, 2013; Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). There is no statement of a research problem; they do they pose related research questions, findings, or identify with any specific methodological approach, for example. In this regard, this study’s empirical research fills this void in studies on Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings—a limitation represented among seminal works reviewed in this section.

Limitations and gaps also exist in the nature and scope of these three seminal works by Darder (2017), Nieto (2008), and hooks (1994, 2004), in that one of the major
element, students’ transformative success, is absent as a point of major focus. The focus is on teacher instructions and beliefs. None of these three works systematically focused students’ transformative educational successful outcomes with the intentionality of this study’s investigation. Where this element exists in these works, they were asides and not the central issue of focus. The value of these three works come from the deep insights into teachers’ beliefs and instructional practices rooted in Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love, an area that is one-half of the focus of this study’s investigation.

Scholarly Peer-Reviewed Research

A broad range of works related to Freirean pedagogical love are reflected in contents of this subsection. They represent international and U.S. examples, from countries such as Norway, Finland, Greece, and Canada, offering varying perspectives and interpretations of pedagogical love, as well as a critique of the Freirean concept. What is blatantly missing from these and all other works discussed in this chapter are empirically grounded theory-to-practice research applications. Scholars such as Gaztambide-Fernández (2003), Amidon (2013), Gottesman (2010), and Miedema and Wardekker (1999) call for this type of investigation, and this is a gap this study hopes to address.

From Norway—agape, phronesis, and pedagogical love. In this work, Wivestad (2008) utilizes the concepts of agape and phronesis illuminate the concept of pedagogical love; agape in educational practices is important since “children as learners need adults who love them, even when the children are unable to give anything in return” (p. 307). In explaining the need for, phronesis—or wisdom, Wivestad contents that “adults should be
able to make wise judgements concerning what is good for the children” (p. 307). This definition is valuable since Freire did not define the term love, but instead explained how it operates within the educational system he describes; this definition is one this study utilizes. Wivestad writes, “children learn to be trustworthy, fair, honest, patient, generous, playful, inventive, humble, gentle, courageous, and humorous” (p. 308). According to the author, they develop these traits by “examples they are given;” since “no adults are perfect,” the challenge becomes one in which “persons” are needed as “leading stars” in this process (p. 308). Wivestad’s definition is in part similar to a model attempted in Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016) that seeks to define pedagogical love, something absent in Freire’s works as Schoder (2010) points out. An attempt at defining it is helpful in offering some greater understanding into the concept of Freirean pedagogical love, especially in applications related to U.S. P-12 education.

In addition to agape and phronesis, Wivestad discusses kindness and trust as vital to this approach to instruction grounded in love, citing the story of the Good Samaritan. This is the one used by Kennedy and Grinter (2015) to illustrate what loving kindness is all about. According to Wivestad, trust “is fundamental in a relationship” and helps us to become better human beings. “An educator trusting a child who has failed and will try again, needs . . . phronesis,” Wivestad, writes, because “when you decide to trust the child in spite of sound skepticism, you have to risk also a personal failure” since “this venture of openness makes you vulnerable to irony and laughter,” (p. 322-321). One should trust even when skeptical about trusting and be willing to exercise a sense of humility and humor in all this, according to Wivestad.
Trust, humility, kindness, utopian ideals of love, wisdom, common sense grounded in daily ontological realities are all elements supportive of Freire’s (2005, 2011) instructional and learning model of pedagogical love. Wivestad’s insights help to enlighten and elucidate them in this study’s exploration of Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings. Wivestad’s (2008) Educational Challenges of Agape and Phronesis is therefore an invaluable contribution to this study’s exploration and definition of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love.

From Finland—love instead of anger for social justice. Lanas and Zembylas (2015) brings to the fore a basic foundational assumption of Freirean pedagogical love. A sociopolitical transformative model seeking justice and equity does not have to involve hate, nor anger, or war, or any form of violent actions to reach its goal. This idea is inherent in the Freirean model, but explanations and discussion of these are beyond the nature and scope of this study.

In Towards a Transformational Political Concept of Love in Critical Education, Lanas and Zembylas argue that while anger, rage, and other “emotions constitute important political forces” in social movements working “to raise their voices against injustice. . . [and] inspire transformation and social change . . . anger [must be] translated into more creative and productive forces so [that we will not]. . . merely replace one tyranny with another” (p. 32). They went on to point out that, “when we build on anger, we get anger; when we build on love, love is what we get;” and that their goal in this article was to offer a critical theoretical perspective, using ideas including those of Freire, hooks, and Chabot (2008) to do so (p. 32).
It was interesting to have a perspective from Finland on Freirean pedagogical love that utilizes an African American feminist-critical perspective grounded in hooks’s (2003) *All about Love: New Visions* to define Freire’s pedagogical love. Lanas and Zembylas (2015) also reference six of Freire’s works including *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and cite hooks (2003) extensively in defining their interpretation of pedagogical love. In defining transformative pedagogical love, Lanas and Zembylas (2015) cites hooks, saying that there is a “commonly accepted assumption in patriarchal culture,” [that] . . . love cannot be present in a situation where one group or individual dominates another” (p. 35). The authors also cite Cabot (2008) who also utilizes hooks African American feminist approach, saying that pedagogical love is characterized by “voluntary acts of care, responsibility, respect, knowledge . . . [which] in turn, implies the ability and willingness to respond to the others’ needs” (p. 39). In their definition, emotions is a significant factor in Lanas and Zembylas, a feature Freire explicitly deemphasized in his work in favor of the more critical knowledge creating and sociopolitical focus.

The definition of pedagogical love by Lanas and Zembylas (2015), despite the emotional storge type of emphasis, is still to some extent congruent with Freire where the emotional aspects are assumed and implicit, though not centrally important, to the Freirean humanizing, transformative, socio-politically focused model. Lanas and Zembylas (2015) did not focus as Freire does on the critical social justice education role of love as part of a pedagogic process rooted in dialog, criticality, reflection, and other related elements in Freire. By not emphasizing the humanizing intentions related to
creating cognitively critical citizens for an authentic democratic system, these two writers could be considered as somewhat shifting the focus of Freire’s ideas about the value of pedagogical love.

In their conclusion, Lanas and Zembylas (2015) pose a challenge in a statement that links to this study’s investigation on Freire’s (2005, 2011) pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings. In this challenge, they state that in order to “further develop the concept of revolutionary love in critical education,” its transformative effects on teachers and students, and to distinguish this from other forms of love, there is a need for additional theorizing on this concept (p. 42). This is a challenge and the void in research on pedagogical love that this study seeks to address and intends in some way to make a small but meaningful contribution.

By promoting the concept of pedagogical love with evidence from participants’ narratives, this study hopes to help in clarifying how Freire possibly meant to define the concept of pedagogical love. This study intends to be a part of the movement to “reinvent,” in praxis, Freire’s ideas. Freire calls for this reinvention by recognizing the relativity of education and the diversity of contexts that concepts associated with pedagogical love applies. Inviting others to reinterpret or reinvent his ideas, Freire said, “I will be satisfied if among the readers of this work there are those sufficiently critical to correct mistakes and misunderstandings, to deepen affirmations and to point out aspects I have not perceived” (2005, p. 39). However, while this study does not seek to “correct mistakes” in Freire, what it does is seek to add to it, “aspects” that he might not have
perceived at that time in a way that remains authentic to the word, project, and principles of the icon, Paulo Freire.

From the U.S. Biblical examples of pedagogical love. Kennedy and Grinter (2015) offer a different perspective on pedagogical love, which uses Freire and the Biblical stories of *The Good Samaritan* and Ruth and Naomi. These are unusual examples in conversations seeking to define the concept of pedagogical love. Kierkegaard’s (1962) use of *The Good Samaritan* is notable.

Kennedy and Grinter (2015) endeavored to “provide an analysis of our educational practices and framework of love as scholarly educators in the 21st-Century” (p. 43). In achieving this, they offered the two Biblical examples as evidence in arguments that use both Freire’s and Darder’s (2002) interpretation of Freire’s ideas as the basis of their discussions on love. They also use hooks’s, *Teaching to Transgress*; Delpit’s, *Other People’s Children*; Ladson-Billings’s CRT approach in *Dreamkeepers*; and ideas from Gay’s *Culturally Responsive Teaching* as sources for these discussions about love.

The work of Kennedy and Grinter (2015) is valuable for both the diverse sources on Freire’s ideas on love and for the support this work provides to a Biblical definition of love. Kennedy and Grinter describes it as “radical love,” having the “empathetic, active, and passionate impulse to transform social relationships in ways that seek justice and freedom,” (p. 44). They point out that their definition connects to hooks’s concept of “radical pedagogy” in, *Teaching to Transgress*, that is influenced by factors such as “class, race, sexual practice, nationality, and so on” (p. 44). The authors argue that this
perspective, embedded in an interpretation that is “biblical, theological, and philosophical,” offers a “counter dominant” one to “White Christian practices (p. 44).

According to the writers, there is one in which an “African-American feminist and womanist standpoint,” is present (p. 44). They argue that such an interpretation, allows for a “description of love [that] grants us the opportunity to focus on scholarly voices that are most often marginalized in society and academia–African-American women” (p. 44).

As stated elsewhere in this paper, while such an approach is necessary, useful, congruent, and supportive of Freire’s “reinvention,” caution might be necessary to avoid the problem of inauthenticity in interpreting Freire’s concept of what entails “oppression.” This is necessary, since, again using Shield’s (2013) concept of specialized jurisdictions was not a feature in Freire’s original epistemology that viewed all forms of oppression as one rooted in dehumanization and is the target of elimination in his model of education rooted in pedagogical love. It is this universal concept of dehumanization and oppression, rather that the diverse specialized forms that this reality exists in known and unknown forms, that is the focus of Freire and this study.

Freirean love and dialogue—an example from Greece. Liambas and Kaskaris (2012) address the twinned concepts of dialog and love as one, arguing that, “notions of ‘dialogue’ and ‘love’ in Freire, endow pedagogy, didactics, the sociology. . . with a theory to be integrated in a more political and social manner towards a radical transformation of society” (p. 185). Liambas and Kaskaris continue and explain the role of dialogue in this process by pointing out that in Freire, dialogue “is considered as a pedagogic method” that is useful in molding socio-politically liberative reality (p. 185).
These statements reiterate the central importance of the intentional socio-politically transformative nature of Freire’s education that is highly emphasized in this work.

Liambas and Kaskaris (2012) also discuss the sociopolitical value of dialogue and love in Freire by pointing to the epistemological and knowledge-creating benefits of this model. They point out that dialog in Freire is “regarded as an epistemological category that constitutes the critical medium to associate individual consciousness with the individual critical possibility to anticipate entity as a collective ontological arrangement” (p. 185). This arrangement, the authors state, enables individuals “to form, express and change knowledge for the world and the relationships/associations within the real world,” a stance reflective of Freire in the word to world knowledge-creating analogy for education (p. 185).

This purely theoretical approach targets, focuses, and explores the twinned concepts of dialogue and love, even though the authors posed a theory-to-practice question at the end of this article. This question asks if “the notions of love and dialogue [can] inspire educational theory nowadays towards a radical re-appreciation of education (its content-curriculum, the pedagogic relation, the ethico-political (sic) foundations, a theory of the subject)?” A series of general statements follows on the sociopolitical value of education, which went unanswered and unaddressed in this work.

The work of Liambas and Kaskaris (2012) is valuable for its discussions of the philosophical concepts and educational value of love and dialogue and the brief question it poses on the theory-to-practice application of Freire’s works. Although it offers neither new definitions nor rare insights, this work is useful as a theoretical contribution to the
international literature on Freire’s concept of pedagogical love. This study’s theory-to-practice application of Freire’s ideas and the narratives it provides, as well as its exploration of elements of Freire’s educational model of pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings will be an addition to the literature on Freire’s model represented in Liambas and Kaskaris.

Empirical research from a Canadian example. *For the Love of the Child* by Mooney and Lashewicz (2015) offers both a theory-to-practice empirical research investigation, as well as insights into practices and beliefs related to Freirean pedagogical love in a case involving a disabled Canadian student (N=1). This is much needed and rarely available theory-to-practice research involving Freirean pedagogical love in P-12 settings. The authors state their theory-to-practice intentions, saying that, “through this instrumental case study, we enter the scholarly discussion about whether inclusive research should be philosophical or empirical in nature” (p. 20). They go on to state that this work “provides a niche illustration of inclusive education research at a philosophical/empirical intersection in applications of Freire’s concept of love in education (p. 20). This statement is important, because it is indicative of the recognition of a need to resolve this issue of empirical and non-empirical or philosophical approach to research, a phenomenon noted in the field of CSJET research by Gottesman (2010), Gaztambide-Fernández (2003), and Miedema and Wardekker (1999).

This study uses the vocabulary of Freirean throughout, asserting for example that praxis and reflective practice in education from parents’ and educators’ perspectives is explored, as it relates to the inclusive education of “a severely disabled” male student
called Oliver who was 17-years-old and in Grade 11 when this study was conducted. They also use empirical data on the student participant in this study that extends from the fifth to 12th grade, and they include information from interviews and classroom observations of the participant with interviews with the participant’s parents and teachers. Narratives and summary of conversations and observations are included in this empirical study, as well as profiles of the participants’ five teachers from grades seven to 11 and a principal from grades five through 11.

Empirical findings, the authors state, indicate that “Oliver’s academic progress is influenced by inconsistent inclusion beliefs and practices,” which resulted in Oliver losing “teaching/learning opportunities” (p. 11). The authors concluded that, “perhaps, love of a child may be used more intentionally to focus and propel the action and reflection necessary for progress” in education and in programs of inclusion involving students like Oliver with severe disabilities (p. 22).

The work of Mooney and Lashewicz (2015), although valuable theory-to-practice empirical research on Freirean pedagogical love, does not address elements of this study’s theoretical and conceptual framework outside of the brief glimpse it offers on the concept of Freirean love and praxis grounded in reflective practice. It does not, for example, discuss instructional and learning methods that were either rooted in love and/or lovelessness of the banking model that affected this student’s learning outcomes, nor is it a U.S. grounded study. These absences represent gaps in the research related to Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings that this study addresses and hopes to contribute.

Amidon (2013) offers a rhetorical/philosophical theorizing Freirean pedagogical love, which was “encouraged by the critical examination of mathematics education and mathematics teacher education at the *Privilege and Oppression in the Mathematics Preparation of Teacher Educators Conference* (p. 190). Amidon states that a challenge, approached from a personal position of power and privilege” by a young white male who queried, “What would it mean to teach mathematics as an act of unconditional love” was the source of inspiration for this work (p. 19). Amidon refers to concepts found in works like that of Ladson-Billings and Wivestad (2008) to argue that agape is opposed to eros in the Greek epistemology. Amidon states that love as *eros* and love as *agape* are opposed to each other, and only the latter is supportive to education. Agape, Amidon argues, is indicative and supportive of the idea of teachers’ willingness to love and “give knowledge,” irrespective of students’ merit or ability to reciprocate this love (p. 20). Amidon’s concept of agape love, like that of Wivestad (2008) that is also discussed is aligned and supportive of Freire’s pedagogical love, and helps to define this concept as used in this paper.
In addition, Amidon (2013) offers an interesting concept of “educational success” equated to scoring well on high-stakes tests” (p. 21). This position, reasserted in Amidon and Trevathan (2016), is not often present in literature on critical theorizing—especially in math education that utilizes the social justice approach reflected in Amidon’s work (p. 21). Amidon also identified success in education with “graduating from high school, being accepted to college, and/or being hired in a mathematically related profession, citing Frankenstein (1990) and Gutstein (2006) to support this position.

It is interesting to note the relatedness of Amidon’s (2013) ideas to those of Freire’s on education. For example Freire’s concept of the use of “generative themes” and pre-instructional community “research,” echoes in Amidon’s assertion that class activities should “incorporate the day-to-day lives of students to bring relevance to educational objectives and activities” in which Ladson-Billings and others than Freire cite. This idea is not exclusive to Freire, Amidon, or Ladson-Billings and is popular in the literature on indicators of students’ educational success. Another similar type of relatedness emerges in Amidon’s connections between mathematics learning and students’ participation “in the world,” where there is a “vision” to use the utopian ideal in education to “move toward a better world” in which Gutstein is cited, and is reflective of Freire’s word and world assertions (p. 23). Unlike writers like Ladson-Billings, Gutstein’s work directly cites Freire and is an indirect link to Freire’s ideas, making it relevant to this study’s investigation of Freirean pedagogical love.

Amidon (2013) concludes this article by stating that there is a need for theory-to-practice research to conjoin theorizing like that in this work to actual instructional
practices “in the classroom, [so that] the associated practices can be studied and compared to what is described as the ideal” (p. 25). Amidon closes by saying that “an appropriate step would be to study the facilitation of the described relationship, and the associated facets;” and that, “thus, the next logical question becomes: What does teaching mathematics as agape look like in practice? “Stay tuned. . . ,” the author said in the final words of this work (p. 25). Amidon’s (2013) last words could suggest the possibility of a follow-up theory-to-practice study.

Amidon and Trevathan (2016) present evidence from the authors as co-researches and co-participants in a study in which they tell “the story of a yearlong collaboration between a teacher (Morgan L. Trevathan) and a teacher educator (Joel C. Amidon)” (p. 289). This is an exploration of what the authors describe as experiences in “what it means to provide support for mathematics teachers to improve practice, given the increased expectations and the plethora of external pressures (i.e., high-stakes testing and value-added assessments of teaching)” in mathematics instruction (p. 289). Amidon and Trevathan document their activities through this journey and share this experience in narratives in which both authors offer perspectives on the pedagogical practices, processes, interactions with learners, and educational outcomes and lessons learned.

In discussions of lessons learned, Trevathan, a P-12 educator, made statements that point to approaches evident in Freire’s (2005, 2011) instructional methods rooted in pedagogical love—although Freire’s ideas were not used to shape this work. For instance, Trevathan states that as a teacher, “I now know that there is no need to address something that students can figure out for themselves” because each student learned as a
part of the instructional processes and outcomes how “to share, learn, and grow with while holding each other accountable in their community in class groupings” (p. 293). This is evidence reflective of student empowerment, human and educational transformations, and ability to function as student-as-teachers and leaders—approaches and concepts rooted in Freire’s pedagogical love in education.

Trevathan also speaks about evolving as a teacher [teacher-as-student in Freire], and of being able to “increasingly take myself out of the picture to increase student independence” (p. 293). In addition, like Freire argues, Trevathan came to the realization that “students can do much more than I thought they could,” and that as a community of learners they could collectively “do even more than the individual student...to combine forces to meet the rising standards without giving up in frustration or hopelessness” (p. 294). Trevathan also discusses conversations—dialogue in Freire—in which students came to higher and greater levels of learning.

The author discusses reflective practices—praxis in Freire—in which the realization that “my norms for what a classroom looked like and sounded like was not the only thing that needed to change,” but also many of the traditional practices rooted in the “banking” approach described by Freire (p. 292). These elements present in Amidon and Trevathan (2016) such as hope and hopeless, dialogic education, praxis rooted in reflective critical practices, and other related topics are all dominant themes in Freire’s pedagogical approach. In addition, Amidon and Trevathan’s observations on students as a “community” of learners has important implications for the sociopolitical outcomes for
democratic citizenship emphasized in Freire’s educational approach, and is important for
this study’s investigation of pedagogical love.

Without referencing Freire, Amidon and Trevathan (2016) are able to offer
parallels for both Freire’s pedagogical love and agape love described in Amidon (2013).
These methods, beliefs, challenges, and educational outcomes described in Amidon and
Trevathan are also very similar to those in Ladson-Billings (1994a, 1994b), although
Ladson-Billings work is not rooted in Freire’s ideas. These similarities indicate that
instructional beliefs, methods, processes, and anticipated outcomes rooted in Freirean
(2005, 2011) pedagogical love is not an anomaly or rarity even though the sociopolitical
and ontological goals related to citizenship and humanization in Freire sets him apart
from thinkers like Amidon and Ladson-Billings.

Both Amidon (2013) and Amidon and Trevathan (2016) are valuable to this
study’s investigation of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings
since they offer a rare theory-to-practice insight on methods similar to those rooted in
Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love. These works offer concepts similar to those of
Freire’s word and world relationships in education and in the teacher-as-learner or
teacher-as-student as Freire called this. There are also elements of student
empowerment, utilization of dialogic education, and development of critical thinking and
critical reflective practices, conscientization and praxis in practices of both teacher and
students. There is also evidence of Freire’s student-as-teacher. Most of all, elements of
Freire’s pedagogical love rooted in dialogue, humility, kindness, mutuality, and trust
between learner and teacher were present. In addition, there was evidence of
repudiations of the “banking” approach. All these important elements in the two works makes them invaluable models that are supportive of this study’s investigation of Freire’s educational approach to 21st-century U.S. P-12 settings.

This study’s investigation adds to the work of Amidon (2013) and Amidon and Trevathan (2016) by offering Freire’s sociopolitical emphasis on the ontological need of education for humanization, specific references to the value and functions of criticality in education and life, and of the value of a special type of education for development of authentic democracies. These elements are not specifically evident or directly discussed in the work of Amidon (2013), Amidon, and Trevathan (2016) but are the focus of this study’s investigation. There is also a greater focus on the concept of love itself as an instructional approach than that present in these two works. This study’s investigation of pedagogical love will also add the narratives of participants as learners, as opposed to teacher voices present in Amidon and Trevathan (2016), hooks (1994, 2003), Darder (2002, 2017), and Nieto (2008).

An example from adult education in the U.S. The idea of pedagogical love in a PhD student’s journey to graduation in Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016) and Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West (2015) in some ways parallel this study’s exploration. In those works, attempts at defining love as used in Freire (2005, 2011) with concepts of agape love in Kierkegaard (1962), Fromm’s (1956) maxim of neighborly love, and Kohlber’sg (1981) principle of Justice, are relevant—especially as they apply to teacher’s beliefs and instructional practices. Aside from the cognitive and ontological differences between adults as opposed to those of children; approaches and outcomes of Freirean
pedagogical love has the same goal: creating critical humanized beings working towards the elimination of conditions in which oppression and dehumanization thrive. Smith-Campbell and Littles, as well as Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West offer guidance on seeking to define the concept of Freirean pedagogical love, although this current one applies to P-12 realities.

A critique of Freire’s pedagogical love. In *Another Kind of Love in Education*, Jasinski and Lewis (2016) offer a very brief review of the literature on educational love. Works cited are related to the instructional and educative value of love, that includes Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, hooks’s (1994) *Teaching to Transgress*, and Noddings’s (1984) *Caring*. Other diverse works like *Pedagogical Love and Good Teacherhood* by Plato, Maatta and Uusiautti’s, *Pedagogy by Loreman*, and *Defense of Affective Pedagogy* by Patience are also notable. In citing these works, Jasinski and Lewis makes the point that, “love does indeed play an essential role in education (and pedagogy, in particular)” and that the perspectives cover a wide, diverse, and varied ways of interpretations and approaches on this topic (p. 430).

This work critiques three approaches to love in education including Freire’s, while at the same time, arguing in favor of the author’s own approach described as a Philosophy for Infancy (P4I). The authors describe the Freirean instructional approach as, “tough love,” and as a love that student success indicates that they are loved for what they “can and should become” (p. 431). A love the authors associate with current trends “of high-stakes testing, accountability and efficiency” (p. 431). The authors argue that models of instruction and measures of student success represents outcomes from “tough
love,” that they state is “not a new phenomenon in education,” and that “in fact, it could be considered the hallmark of traditional conceptions” of instruction and indicators of students’ success (p. 431). Instruction under the pedagogic practice of tough love, Jasinski and Lewis (2016) argue, makes students “do things against their will with the justification that it is for their own good in the long run,” in the spirit of ‘You will thank me later!’ (p. 431).

In addressing Freire’s instructional ideas as an example of tough love, Jasinski and Lewis (2016) state that, “even Paulo Freire’s oft-cited view of love fits into this category,” although noting that, “Freire is clear that the teacher does not lead the students, that the oppressed must liberate themselves, and that knowledge should not be given to the oppressed” (p.432). In spite of the exceptionality they just noted in Freire’s instructional approach and expected learning outcomes of pedagogical love, they conclude by saying, “nevertheless, there is a sense that Freire advocates a form of tough love that puts him within the philosophical lineage” of that conception of love (p. 432).

Jasinski and Lewis (2016) present the Freirean pedagogical love instructional approach as somewhat of a dictatorship of the teacher. The authors argue “to emphasize authority is to overly romanticize Freire’s critical pedagogy and the willingness of the oppressed to spontaneously liberate themselves;” and “for Freire, there is always a ‘fear of freedom,’” that the guided teacher authority—even in loving and critical dialogue, is present (p. 432). For Jasinski and Lewis the guided authority of Freire’s (2005) model, represents a process “guided by the tough love of the teacher who must help the oppressed overcome their fear of freedom and their resistance to transformation by
continually orienting them back to the ontological truth of human existence (as Freire sees it)” (p. 432). The Freirean pedagogical love instructional and learning model, Jasinski and Lewis argue, is about what the teacher wants student-learners to become, “loving the student for what the teacher wants her to become [and] not for what she is but rather for her ability to realize something that the teacher considers to be valuable,” (p. 432). It is all about the teacher’s ideal and not about the students’ individual “pure actuality” or “potentiality,” they argue, it’s the “teacher’s love of her ideal that makes her ‘love’ the student as someone who can help her realize that ideal,” (p. 433).

In place of these other forms of love—including Freire’s pedagogical love, Jasinski and Lewis (2016) offers the concept of P4I that they describe as “a particular educational instructional practice that enables us to love our students’ potentiality, as a pure means” (p. 431). This concept of love in education replaces what the authors describe as Philosophy for Children (P4C) applied to other models including that of Freire’s. These authors, citing arguments from “the perspective of Italian critical theorist Giorgio Agamben, states that “their approach, P4I enables teachers to “love our students’ potentiality; in contrast to Philosophy for Children [P4C],” that establishes “specific potentialities towards determined outcomes” (p. 429). The belief of Jasinski and Lewis that “since the focus of P4I is on potentiality,” it is their “wager that it has its own, distinctive take on love in the classroom that differentiates it from other forms of love,” (p. 431). They state that even though P4C and P4I may be similar or even identical in “procedures and the actual conversations,” that their P4I model offers one in which “the
voice of the teacher’ is rendered silent,” and that this differentiates their P4I instruction and learning approach to love in education (pp. 437-438).

The value of the P4I instructional and learning approach, Jasinski and Lewis (2016) argue, unlike Freire’s and other P4C models of pedagogical love, is that student-learners return to a state of *infancy*, where they do communicate any particular adult-teacher messages but instead experience “communicability itself (the potentiality for communicating without communicating anything beyond this potentiality). Student success in Jasinski and Lewis’s model allows them to “dwell in this space of infancy or communicability,” they argue, and that students, not teachers, are empowered in a process that renders teachers’ voices silent in the instructional and learning process (p. 438).

While these are important criticisms and valid food-for-thought on the Freirean instructional and learning approach to pedagogical love, the arguments of Jasinski and Lewis (2016), though relevant, do not distract from this study’s nor Freire’s (2005, 2011) approach. Like Freire, scholars like Dewey (1997a, 1997b); hooks (1994, 2003); Foucault (1997); Spring (2011, 2014); Ravitch (2013); Rothstein (2004, 2015); Noguera (2001, 2003a, 2008, 2012); Noguera and Wing (2006); as well as other critical theorists of the Frankfurt tradition, indicate that education is not a static inert, neutral, or apolitical process. That it has intentional goals and measures of success in the instructional and curriculum approaches chosen. In this regard, Jasinski and Lewis fail to invalidate Freire’s approach that is the basis of this study’s investigation of instruction and students’ transformative success.
Unlike Jasinski and Lewis (2016), Freire’s (2005, 2011) instructional model and indicators of students’ transformative educational success offers ontological alternatives to dehumanization, oppression, the sustenance of authentic democracies in nations like the U.S., democratic and inventive knowledge-creation processes in P-12 education, and other areas of sociopolitical concern that education relates to. This is the value of Freirean (2005, 2011) works on pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings; it is a problem-solving approach to dehumanization and other oppressive conditions plaguing contemporary 21st-century communities in the U.S. and other parts of the world.

Jasinski and Lewis (2016) provide valid arguments within a context, which assumes that education is inert and neutral. However traditional educational theorists like Dewey (1997a, 1997b); Spring (2011, 2014); Ravitch (2013); Rothstein (2004, 2015); Noguera (2001, 2003a, 2008, 2012); Noguera and Wing (2006); and critical theorists of the Frankfurt tradition like Freire argue about the sociopolitical implications of learning. As critical postmodern theorist Michel Foucault points out, “Every educational system is a political means of maintaining or of modifying the appropriation of discourse with the knowledge and the powers it carries with it” (Irvine, 2011, para. 11). This is the position assumed by theorists like hooks that uses Freire’s ideas as their starting points in discussions of pedagogical love.

Overall, the critique of Jasinski and Lewis (2016) like all other works in this section, offers diverse global perspectives on the application of Freire’s educational ideas, including those on pedagogical love in P-12 and adult educational settings. These representations of Freire’s ideas are examples of 21st-century border crossings described
in works by authors like Giroux (2005), Evans (2014), and Jackson (1997). This study represents this type of border crossing also because it continues the tradition of utilizing the elasticity of relativists’ approaches and the relatedness of Freire’s ideas and applying them to unfamiliar settings like P-12 education in the U.S.—an area of application that Freire might not have considered in these original writings.

Student voices are absent in these peer-reviewed works and is a gap this study addresses. By adding narratives of participants’ experiences, this study contributes by adding both the voices of students and adults about their reflective experiences with pedagogical love during their P-12 education in the U.S. In addition, elements included in this study’s research questions are not present in any of these works and is an additional area that this study’s exploration hopes to contribute by adding to the rich literature and scholarship on the topic of Freirean pedagogical love.

Dissertations

There are four dissertations that all share the common feature of utilizing and/or referencing Freire’s ideas on education. Two of the four, Barrett (2003) and Schoder (2010) are rhetorical/philosophical in approach. The other two, Goldstein (1995) and Johnson (2008) are empirical qualitative studies. Use of the term rhetorical/philosophical uses Firestone’s (1987) *The Rhetoric of Quantitative and Qualitative Research*, while the concept of empirical uses Creswell (2011, 2014) as the point of reference. No two dissertations were exactly alike even though they all shared a similar characteristic of referencing Freire’s work.
Schoder (2010) and Freire’s pedagogical love. In exploring Freirean pedagogical love, Schoder’s (2010) *Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of Love*, argues that although Freire’s concept of love is widely used, “none of these works have broached the question of Freire’s definition of love or how his pedagogical theory offers a theory of love” (p. 16). Schroder offers insights by defining this term in order to “place [Freirean] love in education in its proper philosophical context,” and to discover what the literature in two of Freire’s works—*Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education: The Practice of Freedom* (1976), “can help us understand [about] his theory” (p. iii). Schoder points out that this dissertation represents a “rhetorical analysis” that provides a “new perspective on Freire’s work and its place in educational philosophy” (p. 3). Schroder’s dissertation is important to this study’s investigation of Freire’s concept of love and the search for understanding epistemologies that shape Freire’s works on education.

Schoder (2010) utilizes ideas from the works of Mike Martin and Irving Singer to help in the definition of love in Freire’s works and to describe this love as “the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person” (p. 80). Unlike Schoder’s definition, this study uses Freire’s use of the words related to love in its varying forms in both *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011), as well as that offered in Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016) and Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West (2015) as its foundation. Like Schoder, this study seeks to offer theoretical insights into Freire’s concept of love and then to take this one step further, using participants’ narratives as a means of exploring applications of these ideas to U.S. P-12 settings, a task not undertaken in Schoder’s work.
Barrett (2003) on Freire’s approach. This is the only dissertation that does not address pedagogical love but is invaluable for the in-depth and expansive exploration of Freire’s pedagogical beliefs, epistemological groundings, and how they compare to others, including Dewey and Vygotsky. In a dissertation utilizing 14 of Freire’s published works on education, Barrett points out that, “Paulo Freire’s pedagogy is a multi-layered text that cannot be fully understood or appreciated without an investigation into the numerous people who influenced his thinking” (p. 15). Barrett’s approach to Freire’s epistemological influences is congruent to this researcher’s perspective and reflected in seminal works by giants in the field like Gadotti, Roberts, Torres, Darder, Noguera, Nieto, and the unmentionable others utilizing and writing about Freire’s pedagogical influences. This study is a benefactor to these traditions and contributes to them in its own small way.

Barrett’s (2003) dissertation also offers a biographical description of Freire’s birth, life, upbringing, and experiences as an adult educator. This description includes insights into this family, their backgrounds, Freire’s early childhood, his education as a lawyer, his doctorate in education, marriage to his first wife Eliza, work as a professor, directorship at the Brazilian Department of Education, his impressment exile, years living within the shadows of the Vatican II deliberations, and related events. Barrett is not the only author to provide this information; Gadotti (1994) and Torres and Noguera (2008) does the same. Barrett’s descriptions are vivid ones, and you can envision Freire as a young child who “grew up in a Catholic middle-class family [and] who briefly lived in poverty during the worldwide depression of the 1930s” (p. 2). Barrett brought to life
interactions between Freire and his wife Eliza who encouraged Freire to “[become] interested in adult education. . . and urged him to participate in Catholic Action” where he became active in the pedagogical practices he is known for (p. 2). Barrett’s work brings alive the human experiences and life that shapes Freire’s worldview and pedagogy. The work then goes on to give a summative overview before offering the details that characterize this work.

In addition, Barrett also states that Freire lived, worked, and wrote at a time when Sylvia Ashton-Wamer, Ivan Illich, and others offered instructional and learning alternatives to “experience-based education, student-centered learning.” Others like Dewey, Tolstoy, Vygotsky, and Rosenblatt who lived and worked in the generation before Freire also developed similar ideas. Barrett states that contemporary educational critical theorists like hooks, Greene, McLaren, and Giroux have taken Freire’s work into the present—the postmodernist era of practice. All these and more are described, interrogated, and illustrated in Barrett’s dissertation that focuses on the instructional practices, beliefs, and anticipated educational outcomes of Freire’s ideas on education.

In further describing details that characterize Freire’s pedagogical beliefs, practices, and educational outcomes, Barrett (2003) points to contemporary instructional methods using terms like codification, Freire’s generative themes, open-ended questioning, syllabification, free writing time, written conversations, and collective texts. Barrett also interrogates and discusses concepts like whole language philosophy and approach to reading, problem–posing education, silent reading, oral reading, K-W-L conscientization, which Barrett points out is “a term first popularized by Dom Helder
Camara, with whom Freire had worked in Catholic Action” (p. 8). In discussing Freire’s
generative themes, Barrett points to this pre-instructional “teacher research” earlier
discussed in this study, and contends that this approach allows for relevant instruction
related to learners lived realities in a close and intimate way. Barrett points to Freire’s
idea that education should involve not just a reading of the word but also a reading of the
world in an approach similar to Dewey’s and Vygotsky’s.

In discussions on experiential philosophy and education, Barrett (2003) compares,
Freire’s ideas within student-centered instruction and learning contexts: “For Paulo
Freire, the life experiences of the learners formed the basis of the program of study. . .
[and] came to read and write through active reflection on their experiences, what he
called “reading and writing the world” (p. 26). Barrett explains that, although this and
other methods in Freire, predate Freire, “The standard curriculum that dominates most
schools indicates that this advice has been largely ignored” (p. 26). Barrett cites
international examples like a Russian one, another involving Danish school children in
the 1800s, Leo Tolstoy’s work in the 1860s, Maori children in rural New Zealand, and
Celestin Freinet in France who Freire said was “one of the great contemporaries in
education for freedom.” It is examples in discussions like these that Barrett illustrates,
and analyzes to offer greater insights and deeper meanings and understandings of Freire’s
ideas on education, which is the basis and major focus of this study’s investigation that
makes this work relevant, useful, and enlightening.

Although this work is not as useful for discussions on the concept of pedagogical
love per se, it gives a rare insight into the groundings, associations, and theoretical
relevance of Freire’s instructional beliefs, approaches, and anticipated successful learning outcomes in education, even though it applies to adult literacy and not P-12 education in U.S. settings. This makes Barrett’s dissertation relevant to this study’s investigation of pedagogical love and the research questions posed. The author, who was born in Missouri, indicated an intention of returning to “Guatemala to resume his work in 2004.”

Barrett delved deeper and the details included are sometimes outside of the boundaries of this study’s scope and research questions. This deeper delving in Barrett’s work is possibly a result of the number of works utilized and the scope of that investigation on the broader topic of adult literacy in general, as compared to the limited scope covered in this study’s research questions. Although Barrett (2003) states that the lens of “hermeneutics and liberation theology” provided the framework for critical discussions and interpretations of Freire’s 14 books covering over 30 years of writings, Barrett’s work goes beyond that and offers an immensely deep and widely insightful look into Freire’s epistemology on education (p. 97). This study’s FCSJEA contribution is not anywhere near capable of beginning to do justice to either Freire’s works on education or to Barrett’s work in this area, but hopes to restart a conversation for doing so.

Barrett’s (2003) dissertation does not address U.S. P-12 educational settings although it is useful for understanding elements of students’ educational success and teacher’s instructional practices in this study. Students’ voices, except as reported by teachers, are absent in Barrett’s work and all the works reviewed in this section. These are two areas where voids exist in all but two of the dissertations included and a gap that this study seeks to fill.
Goldstein’s (1995) and Johnson’s (2008) diverse concepts of pedagogical love. Unlike Barrett (2003) and Schoder (2010), neither Goldstein (1995) nor Johnson (2008) focus exclusively on Freire’s epistemologies. However, unlike Barrett and Schoder, the latter two researchers utilize traditional empirical, rather than the rhetorical/philosophical approaches of the two former researchers. Goldstein’s and Johnson’s works are valuable as alternative ways of using Freire’s epistemologies about pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 and higher educational settings.

Goldstein’s (1995) *A Place for Love: A Feminist Contribution to the Education of Young Children* is a qualitative case study [N=1] focused on a feminist perspective of love in early childhood education, in which the term love is described as “passion to care, [or] concern” (p. 17). Goldstein’s work focuses on Noddings’s work—Noddings was the chair of that dissertation committee—although mention was made of Dewey’s and Freire’s ideas. This feminist approach also discussed ideas rooted in Delpit’s and Cochran-Smith’s works.

Johnson’s (2008) *A Pedagogy of Love* is a qualitative self-study [N=1] focused on the concept of Christian love at the university level, derived from an epistemology of a religious order of priests called *Catholic Christian Brothers*. Johnson offers an approach to Freirean pedagogical love that is compatible with other concepts of love found in scholars like hooks, Noddings, Freire, and the U.S. scholar, Mike Rose (p. 7). Concepts such as “emotional relationships” (p. 12), “emotional connections” (p. 25), and the goal of nurturing “the emotional and spiritual aspects of teaching” (p. 27), combined with concepts such as humanization and justice, defined Johnson’s approach to pedagogical
love. Johnson’s interpretation of Freirean pedagogical love is similar to others taking this Catholic Christian approach to education and is a widely represented genre for scholarly investigations and discussions of Freire’s ideas on education.

Overall, none of these four dissertations, like many of the works in this chapter, addresses Freirean pedagogical love in P-12 settings in ways parallel to the one this study proposes. Student voices and elements of this study’s research questions are also absent in these works. These are gaps in the research that this exploration of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love addresses and seeks to offer insights as a learning and instructional model, capable of transformative and humanizing education.

Chapter Summary

This chapter began by describing its search strategy and criteria for inclusion of works included under three broad headings: (1) Theoretical Contexts for Freire (2005, 2011) Pedagogical Love in U.S. P-12 Settings; (2) A Conceptual Framework Grounded in Freirean (2005, 2011) Pedagogical Love; and (3) Research on Freire’s Educational Approach. The theoretical and conceptual frameworks provide a context for understanding and application of Freire’s (2005, 2011) epistemologies to U.S. P-12 settings, which they were not originally intended for use—although valuable in these environments and in this study’s approach. While there is a robust body of work on Freire’s educational approach, there are few on the concept of pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings, a void this study seeks to address then in some small way.
CHAPTER 3

METHODODOLOGY

This qualitative study explores emic themes from eight participants’ narrative of experiences and compares them to etic elements of this study’s FCSJEA. Emic themes emerge directly from participants’ narrative of experiences as originally told (Stake, 1995). As Stake points out, they are stories of “the actors” themselves. Etic elements, on the other hand, emerge from the researcher’s interest and often lie in areas outside of the stories themselves, such as when theory is involved, as it is in this study (Stake 1995). Authentic retelling of emic themes in an ethical way that remains true to both narratives and theory is the core of this study’s approach.

In comparing emic themes from participants’ narrative of experiences with etic elements from the study, the purpose is to identify parallels, areas of convergence, and areas of divergence between the study’s Freirean model and practices described in participants’ narratives. These comparisons help in determining relationships between findings from the narratives and elements of the study’s Freirean framework in a theory-to-practice approach to answer the three research questions posed.
This chapter addresses data collection, data analysis, and other related processes involved with the study’s exploration of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love. It addresses ethical concerns, such as those related to confidentiality, trustworthiness, validity, and its limitations. It also explains its methodological approach and justifications for using it over against other methods. This chapter addresses the study’s limitations and explores ways to reduce their effects. In the end, all these actions help to ensure that the highest levels of ethical and scholarly standards were observed and that data collection and analysis processes possessed high trustworthiness levels. These levels of trustworthiness and scholarly conduct help in making the data useful for answering the three research questions and addressing the topic this study explores.

This study’s approach is similar in many ways to Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West (2015) and Smith-Campbell, and Littles (2016). In these two works, the phenomenon of Freirean (2003, 2011) pedagogical love as a transformative educational approach was explored within the context of a PhD student’s lived experience in which he “went from being a bystander to being the expert in the room” (p. 40). This PhD graduate went on and stated that, “I love myself a lot more. . . . I don’t feel lost. I don’t feel like I need to fit anyone’s mold anymore” (p. 40).

Pedagogical love is not a one-size-fits-all or a cure-all solution to the myriad sets of problems in educational success—transformative or otherwise. However, as Freire (2005) constantly reiterates, it offers “hope rooted in men’s incompleteness, from which they move out in constant search” as Freire said, “Hope leading to the incessant pursuit of the humanity denied by injustice” (pp. 91-92). As Freire emphasizes, pedagogical love
offers “new possibilities for experiences in democracy” (Freire 2011, p. 23), and “human creative possibilities...for a free society...where ever greater degree of individual freedom is created” (Freire, 2005, p. 137). These possibilities make the practice of education grounded in Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings worthwhile—and it is doable.

Research Questions

There are three research questions. They ask: (1) what emic themes of pedagogical love emerge from participants’ narrative of educational experiences in U.S. P-12 settings? (2) How do these emic themes compare to etic elements of this study’s FCSJEA grounded in pedagogical love? (3) In theory-to-practice applications, how do findings contribute to transformative and humanizing educational best practices, in ways parallel to those in the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model?

Research Design

Overall, this study’s methodological approach falls within the broad categories of qualitative designs. More specifically, it is a qualitative bricolage that blends an instrumental approach (Stake, 1995), alongside a narrative one (Clandinin & Connelly (2000). Both methods complement each other by addressing etic elements associated with the instrumental approach and addressing emic themes associated with the narrative method when used separately. When used together these two methods allow for comparisons between both, when needed. Figure 4 illustrates the instrumental-narrative bricolage that authors such as Kincheloe (2004, 2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and...
Steinberg (2011); McMillan (2015); O’Regan (2015); Paradis (2013), hayes, Steinberg, and Tobin (2011); and others argue as best suited for critical research.

Figure 4. Illustration of this study’s bricolage described throughout as an instrumental-narrative approach.

The Qualitative Method

This empirical study falls within the qualitative tradition (Bhattacharya, 2008; Creswell, 2007). Writing on the nature of empirical qualitative research, Bhattacharya states that, “the central goal of empirical qualitative research, is to observe phenomena in the social world so as to generate knowledge about these phenomena” (p. 254). Based on that definition, this study’s exploration of the phenomenon of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love seeks first to generate knowledge about the elements of pedagogical
love emerging from participants’ reflective narratives of their educational experiences as students in U.S. P-12 settings.

Postmodern 21st-century relativist thinking also guides this study’s qualitative design that uses ideas found in Creswell (2007, 2011, 2014); Stake (1995); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); Chase (2011); Riessman (2008); and Bruce, Beuthin, Shields, Molzahn, and Schick-Makaroff (2016). The study’s approaches are also cognizant of Giroux (2005); Kincheloe (2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); and Evans (2014) who call for scholarly border crossings that elicit viable ways to conceptualize, theorize, discuss, and analyze 21st-century realities. These are realities found in what Friedman (2006) describes as flat world or one-world technology driven realities and the global real-time effects it has that calls for new approaches to narrative and other research methods.

The Bricolage

The bricolage enhances this study by facilitating etic and emic issues as separate elements and as related ones when required as in the second and third research questions. Kincheloe (2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); and others point out that in the absence of postmodern methodologies to accommodate the peculiarities of critical and social justice research, it is necessary to utilize available methods and tools to accomplish the research goals. This is the purpose of the instrumental-narrative approach that ideally accommodates the needs for the emic issues that the narrative design facilitates, and the etic issues allowed by the instrumental approach.
In order to address emic and etic themes concurrently in an authentic and honest manner, the flexibility afforded by bricolage became a necessity. Kincheloe (2008) points to the value of the bricolage under these circumstances, saying that there is a need to move “beyond the blinders of particular disciplines and peer through a conceptual window to a new world of research and knowledge production” (p. 168). This idea is similar to the discussions of Clandinin and Connelly (2000) in what they describe as “Reductionistic (sic) and Formalistic” approaches. According to Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011), bricolage is an eclectic model, which “abandons the quest for [a] naïve concept of realism” and traditional positivist and post positivist thinking in favor of a postmodern relativism that focuses on providing clarifications “in the web of reality and social locations” involved in research (p. 169). For Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011) and others who support the use of this approach, bricolage “exists out of a respect for the complexity of the lived world, and the complications of power” that exist in these various realities (p. 168).

Use of the bricolage approach does not indicate a free-for-all situation where boundaries do not exist. In describing the need for elastic boundaries, Kincheloe argues for the need to address one of the “tensions” described by Clandinin and Connelley (2000) when the former author pointed to the need to “maintain theoretical coherence and epistemological innovation” (p. 2). Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013) made similar arguments, calling for the need for balance between established standards of the narrative approach on one hand, and the need for epistemological flexibility on the other—while at the same time remaining true to the ontological reality of the story as told. It is this
constant balancing act and these “tension” that Clandinin and Connolly (2000); Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013); and Kincheloe (2004) identify and call attention to. It is these tensions that force the need for a bricolage approach, while at the same time requiring a need to remain mindful of methodological rules and standards that characterize contemporary narrative research and analysis. In the end, authenticity of experience, rather than conformity to positivist standards and theories is what this study emphasizes in its exploration of Freirean pedagogical love. In this quest, use of a bricolage is the only way to maintain this authenticity, hence its application to this research design.

The instrumental approach and Stake (1995). In delineating the nature of qualitative instrumental studies, Stake (1995) creates arguments around qualitative case study designs involving *instrumental-etic* approaches on one hand, versus the *naturalistic-emic* approach on the other. Both approaches share the common feature of using participants’ lived experiences as data sources in research, but they differ in ways indicated in Table 4.

In discussing the instrumental approach and its relationships in allowing petite-generalizations, Stake (1995) goes beyond arguments of purists like Connelley and Clandinin (1999); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); and Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013) to make room for some type of generalization—petite ones in contrast. These types of generalizations such as that found in Stake, represents one of the “tension filled areas,” of Clandinin and Connelly, which they believe narrative researchers should best avoid.
Table 4

Illustration of Instrumental versus Naturalistic Qualitative Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTAL STUDIES</th>
<th>NATURALISTIC STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associated with “outsiders issues” emerging from researchers interests and those related to theory, and conceptual frameworks</td>
<td>Associated with “insiders issues,” emerging from participants verbatim statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded in etic or researchers interests</td>
<td>Grounded in emic or insiders issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theming, coding, findings emerging from emic information in data, guided by etic or extrinsic issues related to researcher interests, theorizing, and conceptual frameworks</td>
<td>Theming, coding, findings, and discussions guided by emic data contents that is intrinsic, or directly and solely emerging from data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small, or petit-generalizations about emic data, arranged around etic or researcher’s issues related to theory and/or conceptual frameworks</td>
<td><strong>Grounded theory</strong> emerging from data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study follows Stake’s lead instead of Clandinin’s and others. It uses the idea of elastic boundaries, bricolages, and the need for the postmodern 21st-century border crossings of Giroux (2005); Kincheloe (2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); Evans (2014); and others to enter this tension-filled area with the certainty of the relativism other critical authors allow. By taking Stake’s rather than Clandinin’s and others’ approaches, this study is able to separate and cross emic and etic boundaries to address the topic and research questions in a way that adds value to its quality in attaining its stated goals and purposes.
The narrative approach. Narrative research is concerned with participants’ telling and researchers’ retelling of human experiences, gathered through stories about lived experiences that occur within a three-dimensional space of time, place, and personal/social interactions (Bhattacharya, 2008; Bruce, Beuthin, Shields, Molzahn, & Schick-Makaroff, 2016; Caine, Estefan, & Clandinin, 2013; Chase, 2011; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Creswell, 2007; Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011). This three-dimensional space operates as boundaries for the narrative approach, and according to Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin, allows participants and the researcher to work together in the “living, telling, retelling, and reliving of stories of experience” (p. 574). Although their goal is not to “define” narrative research by utilizing the concepts of temporality, personal and social, and place, Clandinin and Connelly reiterated that the goal was to establish tension-filled elastic “boundaries” over against “reductionistic” (sic) or formalistic” ones.

The narrative research approach is suitable for adding the reflective voices of students about their experiences in this study’s exploration of pedagogical love. It adds authenticity found in the vivid “thick descriptions” described by authors like Geertz (1973), and “as a tool to convey how the story . . . can be made to come alive . . . in such great depth” that the reader develops a vicarious experience that gives audiences a sense of ‘being there” (Stake, 1995). Both Stake’s case study approaches and the narrative approach of Clandinin and Connelly benefit from Geertz’s inputs and perspectives taken from the field of anthropological research. They are valuable inputs to this study’s bricolage. Use of the narrative research is also valuable for this study’s attempt at
providing “bottom-up” perspectives—voices from “the trenches” of the day-to-day personal realities of education—available through adding students’ voices to those of teachers found in Nieto (2008), Darder (2017), and Ladson-Billings (1994b).

In addition, narrative research was developed specifically to meet the needs of education, as pointed out by Connelly and Clandinin (1999); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); and Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013). Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013) write that narrative research is valuable for describing stories of “the ways humans experience the world” (p. 2) through the telling of personal stories. This is an intention and a goal that directly aligns to this study’s exploration of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love and participants’ reflective narratives as data.

Memory in narrative inquiry. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) point out that, “In narrative inquiry, the distinction between fact and fiction is muddled,” and that “clear and certain answers are elusive” (p. 179). However, Clandinin and Connelly further clarify that “[f]act, in the text, is potentially fictional both for reader and author” due to both the subjective nature of the processes and decisions made in writing the facts of what is included and left out and how ideas are packaged and presented.

A similar blurring of the lines occurs in the readers’ interpretations of what is written in these words according to arguments presented by Clandinin and Connelly (2000). These authors point out “that everything, including autobiography and memoir is fact because everything is autobiographical” (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, pp.180-181). Clandinin and Connelly’s arguments are useful ones for establishing high levels of trustworthiness and that guiding the approach.
**Lived experiences.** This study uses the term *lived experiences* because it describes the very unique nature of narrative research. Writing on the nature of narrative research, Clandinin and Connelly (2000, 2006) argue that “people’s lives and how they are composed and lived out are what is of interest,” and that “our interest as researchers is lived experience—that is, lives and how they are lived” (p. xxii). Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013) state that narrative research “arises from puzzles around people’s experience,” that are “composed and re-composed in relations with others who are also living storied lives” (p. 575). The term lived experiences appears in *Narrative Inquiry: A Methodology for Studying Lived Experience* (Clandinin, 2006) and *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry* (Clandinin, 2007). Authors such as Creswell (2008) Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Denizen and Lincoln (2003) use this term in their works and is indexed as well.

The *Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (2008) has the term lived experiences as a topic related to qualitative research. Boylorn (2008) states that lived experiences “[lead] to a self-awareness that acknowledges the integrity of an individual life and how separate life experiences can resemble and respond to larger public and social themes” (p. 489). These assertions as well as the statement that, “lived experience allows a researcher to use a single life to learn about society and about how individual experiences are communicated,” (p. 489) resounds with the study’s FCSJEA and research questions. It is also a useful term for descriptions within these contexts.

An EBSCO/HOST (2017) search for the term “lived experience” in titles returned over 10,000 peer-reviewed works. A similar ProQuest (2017) dissertation search with the
word *qualitative* as a limiter returned 2,000 results. Therefore, lived experience is an acceptable term and concept in qualitative and narrative studies, making its use in this investigation of pedagogical love acceptable in these discussions.

Use of the term lived experience indicates that narratives studies like this are not just concerned with the mere telling and retelling of participants’ stories in isolation per se. Lived experience describes stories of lives lived in their totality within *rhizomatic* movements that look backward, forward, inwards, and in every conceivable direction, that data allows as Clandinin and Connelley (2000) argue. This type of inquiry and analysis, allows for deeper understandings within the three-dimensional space of time, place, and relationships described by Clandinin and Connelley (2000); Connelly and Clandinin (1999); and Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013).

**Participant Sampling Procedures**

Narratives of eight participants’ shared P-12 experiences with teachers whose practices parallel those of the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model grounded in pedagogical love and lovelessness are this study’s data sources. Three of these participants are male and five are female. All participants are over 21 years of age. This is a diverse participant pool, hailing from four different states and of differing ethnic, cultural, and immigrant/nonimmigrant backgrounds. One participant, David-Luke offers experiences as the parent of a son who was 12 years old at the time of the interview. He describes his experiences during his son’s first three years of schooling. It is the only parental perspective the study offers.
Originally, there were considerations for a sample size of three; however, difficulties in acquiring male participants after the IRB approval process made it necessary to apply for another modification that allowed inclusion of three male and one female participant from a pre-study sample. This made a total for eight. Moreover, since it was necessary to transcribe all eight interviews to decide which ones offered the richest data, the decision to use all did not require additional work; the unique richness of each warranted the inclusion of all. In all, there were 11 interviews, but three either did not meet inclusion criterion or did not have the rich data warranting inclusion.

Data Gathering Procedures

Creswell’s (2005) four-stage process guides the data gathering procedures that include use of a purposeful criterion based sampling method (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002; Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002). First, I sought ways of gaining access to the special type of participant who could provide the specific, rich data on pedagogical love the study calls for. Next, I made decisions about what types of data to collect and how to collect them. Then I thought about issues related to data storage and security, as Creswell advised. My final steps, following Creswell’s guidelines, related to developing ways to ensure vigilance at maintaining ethical boundaries and addressing trustworthiness issues, such as those related to confidentiality and researcher as instrument limitations. These four steps are at the fore of this study’s procedures, guiding all actions at each step of the data collection, and analysis process.
Gaining Access

Using Creswell guidelines, data collection began by seeking and subsequently gaining access to a criterion based participant sample pool. Gaining access utilization of personal and professional contacts provided leads to third parties who were included in the study’s participant pool. I solicited personal and professional acquaintances at a New York City area school where I worked for over 28 years, and I met one participant through a chance meeting on the NY City subway with his mother. In other cases, I approached student-educators in the doctoral program at Mercer, outlining the criterion for inclusion. After this, further selection procedures involved a loosely structured preselection interview using the questionnaire in Appendix A as guide.

Final participant selection of the eight participants resulted from responses to questions outlined in Appendix A in order to align participants with experiences alongside the study’s purposes and goals. The decision to use all eight involves consideration for the diversity in views and personal identifiers including gender, racial and ethnic identifiers, as well as diversity in geographic locations.

Participant diversity found in this study allows for representations of varied stories and settings. They allow for a variety of the three-dimensional space of time, place, and personal/social interactions of narrative studies such as this, which Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013); Bhattacharya (2008); Creswell (2007); and Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011) call for. Solicitation did not occur among family members, close friends, nor close acquaintances, and relationships with six of the eight exist only within contexts of the study and no further.
Interviews and Data Collection

Creswell (2007) points out that the second set of concerns in the data collection surround decisions related to types of data required and methods of accessing them. Interviews served as data sources and the collection process centered on arranging and conducting these with all eight participants. The original intent was to include participant journaling as part of the process to enhance triangulation goals, but as the research progressed, processes of member checking demanded more time from participants; these plans changed. I felt that asking for journaling would place unfair burdens to them as working people in demanding and involved careers, many attending college at the same time.

Exclusion of participant journaling is not a significant detriment since other triangulation methods, such as use of thick-rich descriptions using participants’ narratives and a focus placed on emic themes versus etic elements are helpful triangulation efforts that writers such as Clandinin and Connelly (2000), Creswell (2007), Denzin and Lincoln (2003), Geertz (1973), and Merriam (2009) argue help in building trustworthiness.

Initially I interviewed three participants, David-Luke, Ayele, and Matthew for a predissertation data sample. This occurred before issuance of an Internal Review Board (IRB) approval from Mercer University because I wanted to make sure the study was feasible and worthwhile. Later on these narratives proved information rich and served as examples from the only three male participants. A subsequent IRB modification allowed for inclusion of these as part of the final eight. Appendices C and D shows both the original as well as the modified IRB approval.
All interviews were conducted remotely because I found this method to be best for providing the honest, open, and relatively non-threatening and non-judgmental overt cues that face-to-face in-person ones can sometimes involve. I also tend to be much better focused and not as easily distracted by emotional and unspoken cues that can occur within the sensitivities of body language in face-to-face interviews. Most interviews averaged about an hour in duration, with Matthew’s lasting for over an hour and a half. Original tapes of interviews and transcripts, shared with my dissertation Chair and methodologist used pseudonyms and not participants’ real names.

Creswell (2007) suggests use of an interview protocol of a few pages that uses open-ended questions that allows participants to “open up and talk” about the lived experiences of interest in the research study (p. 133). Appendix B shows this study’s protocol in the form of a questionnaire guide for the loosely structured interviews. As suggested by Creswell, interviews are recorded and careful notes are taken.

Interviews sought to obtain biographical background information, e.g., life experiences, socioeconomic and cultural associations, family and community life experiences while growing-up as a child into adulthood. Additionally, they sought to access information related to educational, sociocultural, experiential, educational, and other personal background features that may contribute to shaping teachers involved in these experiences. This helped in identifying elements that shape these teachers’ practices of pedagogical love, helping to answer the first research question. This set of participants’ questioning also helps in addressing the second and third research questions.
that explore areas of similarities and differences between data findings, as well as identify best practices found in these narratives.

Loosely structured open-ended questions organized around the four areas of questioning framework just outlined seek to obtain information-rich or thick descriptions that writers like Geertz (1973); Creswell (2007); Denzin and Lincoln (2003); and Merriam (2009) describe. The interview style facilitates what Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe as a forward and backward set of movements in multiple directions of the three dimensional space of place, time, and relationships in narrative research. They facilitate Clandinin and Connelly “plotlines” or descriptions and story lines of the people, places, events, and other elements involved. These types of descriptions add to the “thickness” and “richness” and facilitate higher levels of trustworthiness, validity, and ethical strictures.

Throughout the entire data collection, analysis, and presentation processes, use of pseudonyms replace real names of all participants, their locations, names of institutions, and other individual identifying markers. This ensures protection of participants’ identity by promoting anonymity. This also helps to maintain ethical standards related to confidentiality. As Creswell suggests, I sent participants thank-you cards and called them immediately after the first interviews. I encouraged them to contact me if they had additional questions, concerns, or information related to the interview. This left the door open for follow-ups and member checking when necessary.
Data Storage and Security

Creswell (2007) expresses surprise “at how little attention is given to storing qualitative data” (p. 142). Creswell notes the popular use of computer and digital databases as secure storage spaces and highlights the value of this process. When considered alongside issues of confidentiality and the need for referencing, storing data is an important element. For this study, I used electronic storage of original interviews and transcripts in a double password-protected system. This allowed access to the computer system on one level and to the documents at another level in the interest of security. Back-up storage in Google Drive is also part of this double-protected password system. I am the only person with access to these interviews and original transcripts that are not included as part of this study’s presentation. Original electronic copies of interviews and transcripts stored at Mercer under the IRB Informed Consent guidelines in Appendix E are discarded after a period of three years. Participants are aware of these measures as part of the IRB and Informed Consent process.

Confidentiality and Ethical Issues

Ethical conduct and assurance of confidentiality are at the core of this study’s qualitative instrumental-narrative approach. As Clandinin and Connelley (2000) consistently argue, “narrative inquirers” need to pay particular attention to ethical standards,” in order to avoid the “risks, dangers, and abuses” particularly related to this feature in the narrative approach (p. 181). In this regard, this study utilizes standards of the AERA (2011) *Code of Ethics*, which offers detailed and comprehensive guidelines for
research in the field of education. Of special consideration to this study, is an
unswerving commitment to abide by the five basic principles in this Code.

As a critical researcher involved in the investigation of Freirean (2005, 2011)
ideas on education, Aluwihare-Samaranayake’s (2012) discussions on “principles of
respect, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice in a way that is mutually beneficial to
the participant and the researcher” are ones shaping this study’s approach (p. 64). As a
trained applied psychologist and critical social justice theorist, these principles hold
special meanings and importance to this researcher in this exploration of Freire’s
pedagogical love.

Like Aluwihare-Samaranayake, this researcher views participant as “co-
researchers” and partners in this process that seeks to involve ongoing contributions
grounded in trust, love, humility, mutuality and to work as collaborators in a partnership
in the shaping of participants’ words and their related discussions. This approach, as
Aluwihare-Samaranayake points out, adds “transparency of the ethical process and value
to building methodological and ethical rigor to the research” (p. 65). This approach,
Aluwihare-Samaranayake also points out, involves patterns that are Freire’s and includes
the dialogic processes and reflective, critical conscious-raising practices.

Data Analysis

The data analysis processes uses the guidelines of Creswell (2007) and Bazeley
(2013). Creswell (2007) points out that qualitative data analysis “consists of preparing
and organizing the data,” taking initial steps including highlighting and making notes in
order to sketch major themes and ideas emerging from the data, for both individual
participants, and for the collective group as a whole (p. 148). These were important steps that I took to ensure high ethical and trustworthiness levels.

Immediately after completion I reviewed by listening to each interview, which allowed for identification of gaps and needs for clarifications and follow-up activities while this was still fresh in the participants’ and researcher’s minds. This part of the process was part of my member checking and occurred throughout the data analysis and write-up of both Chapters 4 and 5. Member checking was an integral part of the data analysis process. This was necessary in order to maintain the integrity of these stories and was a reason for not including participant journaling as part of the data. The additional time needed for participant journaling would be an unreasonable request to participants who lived busy lives as full-time students and workers in most cases.

Coding. The steps involving coding began after completion of interviews, readings, and rereading, as well as follow-up check-in for accuracy, clarifications, corrections, and/or additional information, and other related activities. As Bazeley (2013) suggests, during the initial explorative reading, understandings from the participant’s perspective develops in a non-judgmental (emic) way that allows the intrinsic elements of individual “story-lines” to emerge freely. These were parts of the initial steps involved in my first two readings before I began to code. I was trying to get an overall “feel” of what Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe as the “story line,” or “plot,” in each narrative that emerged from these first two earliest readings. Listening to the interviews immediately after completion also helped in gaining insights into the plots
and story line. These emic themes add the unique character of each narrative as told in Chapters 4 and is the basis of Chapter 5 discussions.

I used Microsoft Word on legal sized paper as the only tool. I began with the original transcript illustrated in the three bottom images, where letters “Q” and “A” identify researcher and participant, respectively. I excluded participants’ names to protect their identities and to help maintain confidentiality. Headlines on coding sheets contain each participant’s pseudonym as an identifier in each transcript.

As I read and re-read through the first color-coded chunking, dominant themes began to emerge, and they reflected outlines from use of the interview protocol in Appendix B used as interview guides. Each emerging theme was color-coded—yellow, green, grey, blue, and mauve, representing major themes such as ones associated with personal background information in grey. Teacher and instruction related issues are green and yellow, etc. This use of a color coded system made related texts visible and helped in identifying related themes and topics for the retelling of these stories of experiences.

During the coding processes, I embedded bracketed keywords such as *pedagogical love, personal information, teacher practice, must quote, family background*, and other labels. These bracketed keywords helped in identifying individual themes—both etic and emic ones, making them easier to find later on when needed. In finding these words in the transcribed texts, I used the Microsoft Word search and find feature to locate and cut-and-paste them with similarly themed texts. These texts collectively create a block, which when collected and combined, become the emic headings illustrated in
Chapter 4. Use of keywords helped because they are limitless and can be devised in multiple flexible ways to make them relatable to the topic, processes, and research questions; using colors is limited to about five categories.

There was an average of four sets of coding and theming for each interview. The first interview had to be coded six times in all, but as I progressed, it became easier. As the coding process progressed, the number of codings gradually reduced from around six or seven for each interview, to about four in the last five interviews. Use of the interview protocol assisted in guiding interview content, making it easier to identify dominant themes in the initial chunking. Line-by-line coding occurred after initial readings and chunking, providing the sentence-by-sentence detail and the vivid pictures they provide for the retelling in Chapter 4.

For the final steps in the coding process, I grouped sets of related or similar themes. Next, I linked them to etic elements of Freirean pedagogical love, pedagogical lovelessness, and parental inputs, educational outcomes based on the specialized nuances of each interview, their individual contents, and story line. In some cases, there were seven sets of separate codlings for each interview, with the average being about five or so codlings. Variations in levels three, four, and five subheadings in this chapter’s Table of Contents reflect outcomes of the final coding process.

The data analysis process, although arduous, time consuming, hard on the eyes and neck was also one of the most creative and rewarding parts of the dissertation experience. These rewards, reflected in the beauty and richness of the narratives and
their contributions in this theory to experience investigation reflected in Chapters 4 and 5, is worth every bit of it.

Inductive coding and emic narrative issues. Indicative analysis is one of the major characteristics of qualitative and narrative coding (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Creswell, 2007, 2014; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Merriam 2009). In this exploration of Freirean pedagogical love, data and their emic themes played such a role; its power included validating or rejecting theoretical assumptions in etic elements of the study’s framework. It began by using inductive processes in initial codings, focusing on emic issues that are intrinsic to participants’ personal and unique experiences. This was in contrast with ones belonging to the researcher involving theories or other such issues in the second question, as Stake (1995); Creswell, Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002); and Clandinin and Connelly (2000) point out.

In the coding process, considerations related to theory and etic elements were secondary and valued only as so far as they related to the data. Ethic and theory elements by themselves were useless unless supported by data in the form of etic themes from participants’ narratives. If the data had no evidence of etic elements, for instance, rejection of assumptions associated with the Freirean model would be the outcome, making them null and void. As it worked out, this was not the case, and the presence of all etic elements emerged from the data, supporting the theory-to-practice assumptions and framework the study uses.

In addition, the presence of emic elements not associated with the study’s model, which emerged from the data and reshaped the original model. Presence of these emic
elements emerging from the inductive process of coding indicates the power of data in this study. The power of this study’s data shifted the original theoretical framework, introducing elements such as storge–motherly love that is not an explicitly stated part of the Freirean model—although love grounded in social justice is. Presence of this storge type motherly love in the data influenced the theory-to-practice focus in a beneficial way by making it more relevant as a reinvented model associated with the experiences this study describes. This is part of Freire’s relativism and call for new praxis and reinventions of his ideas, which this study represents.

Creswell (2007) points out that, data analysis is not an “off-the-shelf” activity, but rather it is a “custom built, revised, and ‘choreographed’” experience in which learning occurs ‘by doing,’” and the processes involved in these activities (p. 150). This statement best describes my experience of the data analysis processes. In transcribing these interviews, reading and re-reading them at least six or seven times—or more, and by going through the various numbers and steps of coding, I came to know the data and the people being them in an intimate way that as Creswell (2007) points out, I could only achieve “by doing.” In these processes, I came to understand when I initially read the descriptions of Clandinin and Connelly (2000) about the intimate way we enter participants lives and of how ours and theirs become intertwined. I thought the authors were somewhat overstating this, but in doing the analysis, I learned what they meant. I too became a part of their lives and stories.

I cried a number of times reading Matthew and Ayele’s stories. I felt the pain participants expressed and was deeply moved by it. I felt the joy in their success in
praxis and in the moments of conscientizagao, which they shared in these narratives. I laughed at the comical stories Oprah told—she was funny. I got angry at instances of lovelessness injustices, especially the one told in Ayele’s story. In the end, I met and got to know eight new humans I never knew before and thick-rich data that contributed to the study’s goal in a hugely positive and unexpected way.

Deductive coding and etic instrumental issues. This type of coding allowed for addressing etic elements of the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model. Stake’s (1995) arguments in favor of the instrumental method for addressing etic issues provides justification for this approach that others such as Merriam and Creswell also seems to support. This instrumental-narrative study’s use of the deductive coding processes is necessary to address etic and theory issues of the study’s Freirean model and the second and third research questions.

By using the deductive method in this qualitative narrative, it enters one of the tension-filled areas elucidated in Clandinin and Connelly (2000). However, the study’s relativist approach found in Creswell (2007, 2011, 2014) and others, that points to diverse ways of analyzing and interpreting qualitative data, allows this study to use this method with scholarly and ethical confidence. Creswell (2007) points out that analysis and interpretation of qualitative data using narratives, “can take many forms; adapted for different types of designs; and flexible to convey personal, research-based, and action meanings” (p. 200). It is this type of flexibility in Creswell that critical Freirean theorists like by Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011) call for, allowing for use of the
deductive approach and the instrumental method of data analysis in this study’s narrative bricolage.

This study’s data analysis approach embraces what Creswell (2014) as well as Bruce, Beuthin, Sheilds, Molzahn, and Schick-Makaroff (2016) call, “Emergent Design” in qualitative narrative analysis. These authors point out that, emergent designs in qualitative narrative analysis and re-storying is not clean-cut, nor longitudinal. They argue that these approaches do not seek to follow any set of predetermined spaces of operation but is elastic within the three dimensional spaces of narrative inquiry and analysis to follow the data on whatever “messy and circuitous” path it may lead” (p. 2). This path is necessary, as Beuthin, Sheilds, Molzahn, and Schick-Makaroff concludes, to allow for the “flourishing” and generating of “new knowledge” required for the continued relevance and adherence to ethical standards responsible of narrative inquirers and analysists (p. 1). Creswell makes similar statements, saying that in emergent designs, “the research process for qualitative researchers is emergent,” and that, “this means that the initial plan for research cannot be tightly prescribed, and some or all phases of the process may change or shift after the researcher enters the field and begins to collect data” (p. 186).

These arguments are ones that support use of the deductive instrumental approach this study employs in addressing etic and theory issues in the coding process, as well as using them to respond to the topic and research questions involved. While using this approach, I was constantly mindful in a critical way, using tools of self-reflection, research supervision, and participants’ check-in and other forms of inputs, in an effort to
remain true to the speakers’ stories as told. These are the goals, purposes, and ethical obligations that I seek to fulfill.

Limitations

There are two natural and intrinsic limitations associated with this qualitative-narrative study. The first relates to the relativist-postmodern stance of this qualitative narrative study that prevents grand generalizations of a positivist kind, as Stake (1995), Clandinin and Connelly (2000), and others point out. This study is limited to its overall scope, topic, research questions, related contents, and my overall resources as the researcher. In addition, the small pool of eight participants prevents grand-generalizations as (Stake, 1995) calls them, which are associated with quantitative approaches.

The second two natural and intrinsic limitations relates to the qualitative-narrative design itself as it relates, for example, to researcher as instrument, and what this means in decisions related to inclusion and exclusion, research questions and related processes, as well as activities related to the interpretation, theming and coding, and analyzing data. Creswell (2007) points this out by saying that, “researchers as instrument” requires that they are the “key instrument” not just in the collection of data, but also in activities such as “examining documents, observing behavior, and interviewing participants (p. 38). Other scholars in the field such as Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Merriam (2009); Creswell (2007, 2014); Lincoln and Guba (1985); and Patton (2002) also make similar statements.
With this in mind, this study holds no universal and timeless Truths and is not transferable to other populations and scenarios, even though they may be useful for comparisons to closely similar and related conditions. This is the room afforded by Stake’s petite naturalistic generalizations. Even then, further limitations on these petite naturalistic generalizations extends to only what is possibly left out or forgotten in these stories, and the processes involved in their retelling within this study’s frameworks.

A third limitation lies in the purposeful criterion based participant selection process ties to references from personal and professional friends and acquaintances within “arms-reach.” However, no prior relationships or knowledge of six of eight participants existed before the study began, and expectations are that relationships with all six will not extend beyond the time of this study’s defense. Consequently, this limitation is less impactful on the study’s contents and outcomes. All participants selected resulted from initial personal contacts I made: fellow students at the university, chance meetings at social events, a friend of a friend meeting, and a stranger met during the course of every-day activities on the part of the research. There was no randomness or positivist, non-personal, or scientific type of sampling to obtain participants for this study.

In addition, all participants represent “success-stories.” All are professionals including PhD candidates, except the child participant’s parents who are college-educated professionals. Although all participants credit teachers for their success, other positive-socioeconomic contributing factors exist and are assumed to play some significant role in these overall successes. In this regard, it would be beneficial to have a more diverse
educational and socioeconomic pool of participants to gain a more complete picture, but this was not available.

Voices of current P-12 learners, teachers, parents, peers and other significant parties that can verify and corroborate stories are also not included. Their inclusion could have improved the robustness of this study’s data; however, such an expansion in the number of participants, are beyond the limited scope and nature of this dissertation research. Moreover, P-12 students when approached in the selection process appeared in initial discussions, to have lacked the reflective and critical hindsight of these experiences. Their reflections and depth of knowledge at this stage in their lives were not yet adequately developed to provide the type of information this study requires. In a pre-research sample, aging and the related mature, reflective insights were missing from younger participants.

Since the original intent of using participant journaling as part of the process had to be excluded, there are also limitations associated with triangulation. This was due to the demand associated with member checking that required more time from participants than initially anticipated. I believe that this would be an unfair burden to them as working people in personally demanding and involved careers and in some cases attending college at the same time. These limitations associated with participant journal triangulation does not compromise the study’s trustworthiness, since thick-rich descriptions called for by Shenton (2004); Stake (1995); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Merriam (2009); Creswell (2007, 2014); and Geertz (1973) helps in reducing the effects of the absence of journal triangulations.
Finally, limitations related to inclusion of participants whose experiences are “success stories” that align with the study’s model is also another limiting feature. Ideally, involvement of experiences involving pedagogical love, where learners did not graduate, are available as I discovered in conversations outside of this study. Some of these stories ended favorably, but one was not so, proving that despite presence of elements of pedagogical love and transformative success, even on a cognitive level, does not always guarantee humanizing outcomes such as this study describes. Besides, time and other constraints associated with the scope and nature of this dissertation prevents such additional participants and their stories.

In spite of its limitations, this study is valuable for the perspectives it offers in these reflective experiences of teachers, whose practices indicate some element(s) of pedagogical love and of the transformative educational success these participants believe they experienced as a result. It is in this small and significant manner and in hopes of finding ways in which Freire’s ideas are possibly applicable to education in P-12 settings that this study can become part of wider attempts at providing diverse routes to students’ educational successes in these settings.

Practices of ethical conduct and responsible actions also help in reducing the effects of these limitations on the study’s integrity, trustworthiness, and validity. Conforming to guidelines set by Mercer University and related training by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) assures ethical, trusting, and professional research conduct also helps. In addition, mindful-awareness developed as part of the IRB process; and adherence to ethical conduct required by standards of the
Adherence to cautions and measures indicated by Shenton’s (2004) trustworthiness pointers keeps my own personal biases in check, so too does clear and intentional statements about these biases, conforming to Aluwihare-Samaranayake (2012) social justice principles of humanization, human rights, and human respect, and research and methodological guidelines that aligns with my own Freirean critical social justice beliefs. With these safeguards in place, the effects of these limitations are limited, and trustworthiness, ethical conduct, and the relative validly of its contents are guaranteed.

Researchers Bias

The innate nature of qualitative research and narrative methods this study employs involves the researcher as instrument element, which makes it near impossible to avoid the element of researcher bias from shaping its processes and outcomes. Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Merriam (2009); Creswell (2007, 2014); Lincoln and Guba (1985); and Patton (2002) point to this characteristic of qualitative and narrative research. Creswell states that as an instrument of the qualitative research process “researchers are the ones who actually gather the information,” and “do not tend to use or rely on questionnaires or instruments developed by other researchers” (p. 38). These statements show that researcher bias is unavoidable and a built-in element in this study’s qualitative narrative design.

With the inescapable nature of researcher bias, Clandinin and Connelly (2000) call for the intentional examination by remaining wide-awake to their presence. They call on researchers to utilize scholarly and ethical conduct, taking measures to reduce—if not
avoid their effects on a study’s validity and trustworthiness. Merriam and Creswell (2007) make similar statements, calling on researchers to clarify and clearly name these biases at the outset of the study. Creswell cites Merriam 1998, pointing out that, “clarifying researcher bias from the outset of the study is important so that the reader understands the researcher's position and any biases or assumptions that impact the inquiry” (p. 208). In this process, Creswell argues the researcher is obliged to “comments on past experiences, biases, prejudices, and orientations that have likely shaped the interpretation and approach to the study” at the outset, so that the reader understands their impact on the research itself.

It is with this in mind that I make visible and explicit here the explanations of my own personal-core philosophical beliefs in Freire’s educational ideas as a model for inclusion in any successful educational approach. Like Freire, I truly believe that education should transform, empower, and contribute towards a more complete humanization of all touched by it. Like Freire, I view education as sociopolitical, empowering, and humanizing.

The “Baggage” I Bring

Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed was mandatory reading when I began teacher education training in Jamaica during the 1970s, and I also believe that this work along with Orlando Patterson’s Children of Sisyphus (Udofia, 2011), shapes the worldview I bring to this study and its processes. These influences are foundations for my beliefs about education as an invaluable and necessary tool, not just for developing the essence of humanization and human dignity it promises, but also for the social and cognitive
advancement, which it allows. These beliefs, partly drawn from these readings, as well as influences from an island culture where education is intrinsically valued for education itself per se., but for the possible social advancement and empowerment it affords to this day. These beliefs are what in part drive my motivation and epistemological orientation of this study’s exploration of Freire’s pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings.

In addition, as part of my training as an oral historian, *bottom-up perspectives* such as those found in Jeff Kisseloff’s *You Must Remember This, Generation on Fire*), as well as Oscar Lewis two volume series on *Living the Revolution: An Oral History of Contemporary Cuba* are familiar and favored approaches. Works by others like Studs Terkel’s multiple volume oral histories, and Mormino and Pozzetta’s *Immigrant World of Ybor City*, are others, and are just a few examples of ones shaping my choice of the narrative approach. The narrative approach is one that I am both familiar and has high levels of personal comfort in using, and therefore is a possible reason for this choice.

Prior to this research also, an exploration of the concept of Freirean pedagogical love as related to a PhD student’s educational experience in Smith-Campbell, Littles, and West (2015), as well as Smith-Campbell and Littles (2016) was also a product of these beliefs and interests. In many ways, this is a continuation of that 2015 and 2016 research project. In addition, the desire to build a theory to instruction and learning foundation on the topic of Freirean pedagogical love, in part motivates this study. This study is therefore, part of a larger desire, a hope to establish these ideas as part a multiplicity of approaches required to deliver the “right type” of education to all learners. I believe this type of education should be humanizing, transformative, conducive to the development of
advanced critical thinking and knowledge creation skills, as well as productive to the
development, advancement, and sustenance of authentic 21st-century democracies rooted
in commitments to equity and social justice (Giroux, 2009). It is these deeper
sociopolitical and humanizing meanings of education that I advocate and firmly believe
in that motivates and drives this study’s investigation of Freirean pedagogical love.

Finally, during the fall of 2017, I travelled to Larnaka, Cyprus as a delegate to a
Freire Conference (Smith-Campbell, 2017). There I was humbled and motivated by
Paulo Freire’s widow, Nita Freire who called on delegates and scholars to embark on
research using Freire’s ideas that is supportive of “tolerance through dialogue.” This is
my personal response. This is my motivation.

Trustworthiness

In order to ensure highest levels of trustworthiness as well as scholarly and ethical
standards, I intentionally and consciously took measures to be objective and employ
measures that prevent my personal biases from jeopardizing this study’s trustworthiness
or elements that would compromise or invalidate it in any way, shape, or form.
Bracketing and referencing to the guidelines provided by AERA (2011) Code of Ethics
also helps to ensure abiding practices to keep researcher bias in check, and or corrupt
discussions, findings, and other aspects of this research.

Moreover, the strictures of Mercer University’s dissertation processes Supervision
from the Dissertation Committee ensures adherence to highest levels of scholarly and
ethical conduct and negative effects of elements like researcher’s bias. Additional
actions such as mandated member checking required in this process, that Creswell (2007)
suggest, helps in ensuring accuracy of transcript records, coding themes, and findings. These are other measures I used and the University requires, which limits negative and corruptive influences of researcher bias. All these measures, as well as my own social justice belief—found in Aluwihare-Samaranayake (2012) principles of beneficence, nonmaleficence humanization, human rights, and human respect in the research process—along with my own deep love and respect for Freire are safeguards against unethical and unjust scholarly conduct in this research project.

Credibility

Issues of trustworthiness also involves Shenton’s (2004) four model approach that addresses (1) credibility, (2) transferability, (3) dependability, and (4) confirmability provides further guidance. In relation to credibility, Shenton (2004) lists 14 ways researchers can work towards ensuring credibility, and this study utilizes seven of these: (i) utilization of established research methods, (ii) triangulation, (iii) use of methods to aid researcher as well as participants’ honest responses and questioning includes (iv) iterative questioning. It also utilizes (v) thick descriptions and (vi) supervisors debriefing as well as (vii) member checks-in.

This study uses all except for triangulation that is weak but offset by presence of all others. Creswell states that not all have to be present in a study, and at least three or so should be present at a minimum. This study uses six out of seven in Shenton guidelines and is a strong representation for the levels of trustworthiness represented.

Utilization of established research methods. This study’s purposeful criterion based sampling meets Shenton’s (2004) requirement for use of established research
methods as a means for establishing its trustworthiness standards. Scholars like Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Creswell (2007); Merriam (2009); and Shadish, Cook and Campbell (2002) regard purposeful sampling, as not just a credible approach, but also a means of collecting “information-rich cases strategically and purposefully,” as Patton (2002) states (p. 243). Patten points out that this established sampling approach is a good one, “that facilitates a focus on sources and informants that offers “in-depth” information, “from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of inquiry” (p. 230). Creswell makes a similar case.

Triangulation. Since the planned use of participant journaling is not a part of the final process, this is a weak area in this study. Other actions however, offset this weakness and those such as visiting Matthew’s community to explore locations and to get the “feel” of the community he describes was helpful for verification associated with triangulation efforts. I also spoke to David-Luke’s wife outside of interviewing her husband and followed Facebook postings of their son’s educational activities and accomplishments—including a speech he gave as valedictorian at David-Luke’s son’s graduation, which his father shared with me. I visited Oprah’s and Lenora’s school and neighborhood and met one of the teachers of Sister’s Keepers.

Extensive member checking and participants’ inputs in the coding and final organization of narratives as well as the thick-rich descriptions of Chapter 4 called for by Shenton (2004); Stake (1995); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Merriam (2009); Creswell (2007, 2014); and Geertz (1973) helped in the triangulation process.
Iterative questioning. This approach was integral to the interviewing process in this study, and as Shenton (2004) and other argue, helps in developing trustworthiness. During the interviews, in order to clarify/verify information, similarly, stated questions aimed at having participant explain or re-describe situations was a part of the process. At times, participants were asked to revisit parts of their story in a way that allowed for repetition of information, facilitating verification when and where needed. Overall, however, the authenticity in the telling of the story—the ways in which natural emotions and conversations flowed, indicated that these narratives were generally true to the experiences.

There were certain areas where participant reluctance to tell parts of their story emerged. For instance, David-Luke stated his desire not to want to speak about his son’s experiences of pedagogical lovelessness; when pushed a little and told of the need to hear this side of the experience, he reluctantly gave in. Another participant refused to tell parts of her story, indicating that this was not something she wanted to be a part of the interview because she was not into “negativity.” This participant’s desire had to be respected and iterative questioning was not attempted in this area of her experiences.

Thick-rich descriptions. Geertz (1973) uses this term and concept, also cited in works such as Denzin and Lincoln (2003), Creswell (2007), and Merriam (2009). The term and concept of thick description parallels that of rich-description that describes this same phenomenon, considered by both Creswell and Merriam as useful in developing trustworthiness in narrative and other forms of qualitative approaches involving stories of people’s lived experiences.
Geertz suggests that use of thick descriptions—an abundance of the finest and most detailed in-depth accounts—provides enough information for readers to make their own decision about the authenticity of the researcher’s or anyone else’s interpretation of the phenomenon described by tellers of these stories. This is an approach this study uses in its retelling and analysis of its participants’ experiences of pedagogical love with the goal of developing authentic, ethical, and trustworthy representations of the original telling of these stories.

Supervision. This is a supervised dissertation operating under the aegis of exemplary researchers and professors, which include my committee chair and methodologist, who both supervise, critique, and offer valuable guidance to ensure accurate use of established research methods and approaches. Approaches from recognized scholars of stature in the field like Creswell, Merriam, Stake, Clandinin and Connelly, Kincheloe, Shenton, and others referenced and cited in this chapter also help in meeting credibility standards.

I checked in with my committee on a regular basis meeting with my chair on average of about twice each month initially and later at the completion of each chapter for comments and general guidance. We worked on issues related to the theorizing and other processes in Chapter 2 and on ways of improving and correcting my drafts. I worked in a similar manner with my methodologist, initially working on issues like research question quality and the best methodological approaches suitable for this investigation. My methodologist and I worked especially close on Chapters 3 and 4 to ensure accuracy of my approach and arguments related to my design. Overall, my
committee supervision was one of the strongest elements building high trustworthiness levels and ensuring highest levels of scholarly and ethical conduct throughout—from initial concept of the idea of doing this topic, through its completion and defense.

Member checking. As indicated earlier in discussions detailing the reasons against including participant journaling as part of triangulation, extensive member checking occurred throughout the study. Immediately after the interview, these were extensive as I sought to fill-in information gaps and seek clarification. During the transcription process the same occurred when inaudible tape conversations, for example, clouded clarity of details described in these experiences. Participants received first and lasts drafts of Chapter 3, and asked for inputs in removing, clarifying, or modifying this chapter. None of the participants made these changes.

Transferability

Shenton’s (2004) second element of trustworthiness, *transferability*, requires providing “sufficient detail of the context of the fieldwork,” so that the reader can decide “whether the prevailing environment is similar to another situation with which he or she is familiar and whether the findings can justifiably be applied to the other setting” (p. 63). Merriam (2009) and Creswell (2007) use the parallel positivist concept of *external validity* to describe transferability, and these all serve as references for applications in this area, in this study.

By offering thick-rich descriptions and copies of coded transcripts of interviews, this study allows for the degree and levels of limited transferability allowed for qualitative narratives. This study’s levels of transferability are also limited beyond the
nature and scope of Stake’s (1995) petite generalizations it seeks, as well as by the critical-postmodern relativist stance it takes. However, as Stake points out, the desire is to have multitudes of similar ones from which larger, more certain generalizations are possible, and this study’s levels of transferability allows for that.

Dependability

The concept of dependability in Shenton (2004) requires researchers to conduct studies in ways that allow future researchers to “at least strive to . . . repeat the study,” which Shenton points out is often difficult to achieve in qualitative research (p. 63). Merriam (2009) and Creswell (2007) use the quantitative concept of reliability to describe dependability, and it involves the same goal.

Thick-rich descriptions for example, help in meeting its requirements. So too does detailed descriptions of steps involved in gaining access, data collection, the interview process, analysis, and presentation of data in this chapter are other helpful ways that meet dependability standards.

Confirmability

In discussing confirmability, Shenton (2004) calls for methods that ensure that, “findings emerge from the data and not their [researchers’] own predispositions,” and it is here that statements related to “researcher’s bias” become important (p. 63). This study utilization of Stake’s (1995) lines of demarcation in the use of emic and etic themes and elements help in separating and identifying them. Emic themes are ones from the narratives in the form of the study’s data, while etic themes, as Stake points out, belong to the researcher and involve issues such as theory exploration, as it is in this study.
As Creswell, Merriam, as well as Clandinin and Connelly point out, researcher bias is inescapable in the *researcher as instrument* element involved in qualitative studies such as this and is an intrinsic limitation in this approach. This study’s discussions of its limitations and presence of researcher biases, as part of the Introduction, this chapter, and Chapter 5, help in making these elements visible, meeting confirmability requirements established in Shenton (2004).

Chapter Summary

This is a *qualitative bricolage* representative of an *instrumental-narrative* study design. It has four components: (a) the *qualitative* approach found in Creswell (2007, 2011, 2014) and Merriam (2009); (b) and the *bricolage* approach in Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg; (c) Stake’s idea of an instrumental study; and (d) ideas regarding the *narrative* approach by Clandinin and Connelly (2000), Connolly and Clandinin (1990), and Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013). This research design emerges from a necessity to ethical and methodological address both *intrinsic-emic* issues and *instrumental-etic* ones embedded in this study’s research questions (Stake, 1995). Both the qualitative and narrative segments of this design are traditional ones.

There are three research questions. The first asks, what emic themes of pedagogical love emerge from participants’ narratives of educational experiences in U.S. P-12 settings? The second research question asks, how do these emic themes compare to etic elements of this study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) critical social justice educational approach (FCSJEA) grounded in pedagogical love? The third asks about theory-to-practice applications of findings contribution to transformative and humanizing
educational best practices, in ways parallel to those in the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model?

There are eight adult participants drawn from a criterion based purposeful sampling. This selection process attaches to needs of etic issues implicit to second question. Data in the form of loosely structured audio-interviews with participants recorded and transcribed are primary data sources. Participant created journaling of their reflective P-12 experiences with teachers is a secondary source. Data collection awaits completion of IRB approval, as well as acquisition of informed consent and other related documents. Verbal informed consents and ethical requirements of the data collection process is a part of all data collection activities.

Data analysis begins after interviews and transcribed within the first 24 hours of interviews. Initial coding, development of themes, and condensation of these takes place within these early stages, and clarification from participants sought if needed. Coding themes and patterns identified during reading and rereading offers general insights into participants’ perspectives and elements of pedagogical and learning practices that participants themselves identify as part of their experiences in this process. Coding and theming also reflects emic issues intrinsic to the telling of these experiences. The inductive method guides and shapes the analysis process at all levels—even when etic questions related to theory and pedagogical love are involved. The deductive method played a limited part in coding and was necessary for applications related to the study’s theoretical and conceptual frameworks. In the end, data was the star with etic elements playing supporting, but important roles.
Standards of AERA (2011) *Code of Ethics* guides this researcher; study practices and an unswerving commitment to the five basic principles in this Code help to ensure ethical practices. Bracketing and supervision are methods that reduce researcher’s known and unknown biases. In addition, trustworthiness related to elements such as researcher bias, confidentiality and its limitations, and adherence to ethical principles inherent in the IRB and Informed Consent process is at this study’s foundational practices. Outlining of this study’s limitations is also part of the process aimed at improving trustworthiness and maintaining high ethical standards. So too is the effort of making sure participants are aware of their rights to withdraw at any time of their choosing from this study. They were co-researchers in this project. Aluwihare-Samaranayake’s (2012) Critical Freirean approach to ethics and trustworthiness helps to guard against blunders and hindrances in these areas. Overall, in keeping the focus on the data itself and not on the etic issues as the primary focus, this researcher hopes to produce a study that is of high ethical standards, making it a valuable contribution to the little researched area of Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings. This is its goal and intention.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This theory-to-experience study compares *emic themes* from participants’ prekindergarten to 12th grade (P-12) experiences to *etic elements* of its FCSJEA grounded in pedagogical love. *Emic themes* are ones emerging from participants’ narrative of experiences as told. They are stories of “the actors” themselves. *Etic elements* on the other hand, emerge from the researcher’s interest, and often lie in areas outside of the stories themselves, as Stake (1995) points out.

In order to achieve these goals the study poses three research questions that ask:

1. What emic themes of pedagogical love emerge from participants’ narratives of educational experiences in U.S. P-12 settings?  
2. How do these emic themes compare to etic elements of this study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) critical social justice educational approach (FCSJEA) grounded in pedagogical love?  
3. In theory-to-practice applications, how do findings contribute to transformative and humanizing educational best practices, in ways parallel to those in the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model?  

The first question is an emic one related directly to participants’ P-12 educational experiences; while the second and third addressed etic elements of the study’s Freirean model.
A criterion-based purposeful sampling guides participant selection for this study. This sampling procedure facilitates specialized “information-rich” data (Clandinin & Connelly 2000; Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002) for the “thick” descriptions required to address the three research questions posed (Geertz, 1973).

Access to participants resulted from a purposeful criterion-based solicitation among professional acquaintances at a major northeast, urban city school where I worked for over 28 years. I also approached student-educators in a doctoral program at the school I attend in search for participants who met the study’s criterion. In addition, I approached potential participants through leads from fellow church members, friends of friends, friends of family members, and others that I believe may have experiences similar to ones of interest in the study’s investigation of pedagogical love. Family members or friends were neither solicited nor included as participants.

After initial contact, introductions, and explanations of experiences of research interest guidelines in questions listed in Appendix A helped determine eligibility for inclusion. Interviews of selected participants and other follow-up activities occurred afterwards, and when completed, coding began. After initial reading for overall understanding, coding began chucking major themes and story lines. Later readings allowed for identification of emerging categories of emic themes from each chunk, and subsequent readings reduced the numbers of themes into more general categories. All these readings and the coding procedure proceeded as prescribed by Bazeley (2013); Creswell (2007, 2014); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); and Merriam (2009). Tables 7 through Table 18 reflect outcomes of the final coding process.
The American Educational Research Association (AERA) Code of Ethics (2011) as well as Shenton’s (2004) guidelines related to trustworthiness and ethical standards including ones related to confidentiality, guided actions and relationships throughout the entire process. Methods such as member check-ins; open, honest conversations with all involved; and supervision by committee members throughout the dissertation process, also assured trustworthiness and alignment with ethical and professional standards. In addition, as Aluwihare-Samaranayake (2012) points out, social justice principles of humanization, human rights, and human respect dictate that as a social justice researcher, principles of human respect “beneficence, no maleficence, and justice in a way that is mutually beneficial to the participant and the researcher,” are also parts of this process that helps to build trustworthiness.

Overall, this research endeavor, as some participants indicated in their interviews, was a deeply touching, educative, humanizing, and transformative personal experience. I cried, laughed, and entered the personal spaces of the lives of the eight people, who so graciously agreed to a partnership and a commitment that helped me complete this project.

Participants

Use of pseudonyms instead of real names, locations, institutions, and other individual identifying markers protects the participant’s identity by promoting anonymity. This also helps to maintain ethical standards related to confidentiality. All participants approved of the pseudonyms and their individual meanings that were chosen because they embodied the essence of the participant. Ayele for instance means powerful. Zhihu means wisdom.
Amaryllis is a beautiful flower. Oprah represents the mirror reflection I saw in this participant and the popular bearer of this name. Lenora means shining light, and Isabella was the Spanish queen who sponsored Christopher Columbus’s New World voyages. Matthew and David-Luke’s Biblical names indicate their strong Christian connections. Shenton (2004) cites Guba and Lincoln who point out that member checking is, “the single most important provision” in bolstering a study’s credibility (p. 68); this study sought to meet a high threshold in this area.

All eight of the study’s participants are over 21 years of age. Among the participants is a parent, David-Luke, whose narrative as a parent of his son’s first four schooling provided the study’s only parental perspective. The other seven participants included two men and five women who gave accounts of their own personal experiences. Table 5 shows the ethnic, regional and other participant background information of this group. In addition, Table 5 shows that the study’s participants, a relatively diverse sample, came from varying ethnic, cultural, racial, and regional/geographic origins.
Table 5

Participants’ Biographic Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>AGE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW</th>
<th>ETHNICITY/ RACE/ GENDER</th>
<th>GRADE LEVEL EXPERIENCES DESCRIBED</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David-Luke</td>
<td>42 Year Old Father of a 12 Year Old Son</td>
<td>African-American Man of African-American and Caribbean Parentage</td>
<td>Kindergarten to 3rd Grade</td>
<td>Suburban Area of Large Southern Urbanized Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>African-American Man</td>
<td>Elementary and High School</td>
<td>Small Town of a Major Southern Tidewater Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaryllis</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>African-American Born and Raised Woman</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Major Inner City of Large Southern Urbanized Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oprah</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>African-American Born and Raised Woman</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Major Inner City of Large Southern Urbanized Cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 5 (continued)

Participants’ Biographic Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>AGE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW</th>
<th>ETHNICITY/ RACE/ GENDER</th>
<th>GRADE LEVEL EXPERIENCES DESCRIBED</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayele</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>First Generation East- African Immigrant Man</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Major Urban Mid-Atlantic Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhihu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>First Generation Mainland-Chinese Immigrant Woman</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Major North-East Urban City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>First Generation Latino South-American Immigrant Woman</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Major North-East Urban City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenora</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>African-American Born and Raised Woman</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Outskirts of Large Southern Urbanized City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Number of Teachers and Extracurricular Activities in Participants’ Narratives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN EXPERIENCES DESCRIBED</th>
<th>EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES IN EXPERIENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discovery Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaryllis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sister’s Keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oprah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sister’s Keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayele</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>After School North-East African Culture Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhihu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>After School Math Team Golf Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese Culture Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Concert Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Participants = 8

Total Number of Teachers Involved in Experiences = 26

Total Extracurricular Activities Described in Experiences = 8
Table 6 shows that although there are eight participants, 27 teachers and a wide range of educational and extracurricular experiences, which adds to the richness of this group. When considering of the totality of experiences represented, this study offers a relatively deep and rich description of people, places, settings, and interactions called for in qualitative narratives by Clandinin and Stake. Tables 6 and 7 also indicate that Oprah and Amaryllis as well as Zhihu and Isabella attended the same schools. However, their experiences differed. For example, Zhihu attended that school almost ten years before Isabella, and they all described experiences with different teachers and mentors. For example, although Amaryllis and Oprah participated in the *Sister’s Keeper* Program, both had separate sister-mentors and guides in this program. Overall, the experiences of these eight participants are sources of this chapter’s “thick and rich” data that helps in addressing the study’s research topic and questions posed. Narrative scholars such as Clandinin and Connelly (2002) call for such depth, variety, and richness in this type of research.

David-Luke

This narrative is the only parental perspective of experiences with teachers whose practices aligned with the study’s Freirean model. This parent’s son, Daniel-Luke, was a seventh grader in a public elementary school located in a suburban area of a southern city at the time of the interview. David-Luke’s narrative of his experiences occurred four years after the actual events described. This four-year lapse could possibly provide distance from original passions and emotions and can allow for more distanced and maybe even a more analytical telling of these events. This objectivity, if present, is
helpful for validating the authenticity of experiences described, all other factors considered.

David-Luke’s interview was initially a “test sample,” but proved information rich and subsequently added through an IRB modification process for inclusion in the final study. As the narrative indicates and Tables 8 illustrates, these experiences as told by his father, align favorably with this study’s model grounded in pedagogical love and its associated Freirean model. There were only two teachers and one extracurricular experience involved in David-Luke’s experience, and these occurred during the first five years of his son Daniel-Luke’s schooling as Table 6 shows.

Matthew

Unlike David-Luke, Matthew’s narrative involved five teachers, spanning an entire elementary school experience. It provides a picture of how elements of pedagogical love and pedagogical lovelessness operated in this young African American man’s life. This is the only narrative of this kind this study uses. Its unique insights in the theory-to-practice investigation are invaluable.

Table 5 shows Matthew’s biographical data. He is currently working on his doctorate and works at a major southern U.S. university located in that state’s capital, about 120 miles from where he lived the experiences he described in the interview. The small, tight-knit community where Matthew grew up and attended school has a population of 1,027 according to the 2018 census count. The community is mostly made-up of African American families. This contextual information for Matthew’s educational experiences offers deeper understanding, for example, of “close-knit family” relations
and direct kinship ties shaping his educational experiences.

Matthew did not report his high school experiences. He said the jump-start that the three teachers whose practices reflected pedagogically loving ones—especially from Mrs. Salmon and Dr. Bozeman—was all he needed to motivate him towards success to this day. Like David-Luke, Matthew’s interview was initially a “test sample,” but proved information rich for this study’s exploration. A separate IRB allowed for its inclusion in the final study.

Oprah and Amaryllis

Both participants, paired together because they attended the same high school for the three last years of their P-12 education, came from the same neighborhood with similar socioeconomic backgrounds and educational and familial experiences. Both Oprah and Amaryllis spoke about the value of church to their educational success, and came from families where their mothers were heads of households, where issues of housing insecurity was a part of the difficulties they experienced. Like Amaryllis, Oprah at the time of the interview lived on campus and were proud members of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated where their mentors from Sister’s Keepers continued to support them.

Highlights from Oprah’s and Amaryllis’s background information offers insights into some of the socioeconomic conditions associated with oppressive realities in urbanized U.S. inner-city communities. The following subsection serves as introductions to Oprah and Amaryllis, their socioeconomic realities, and their expectations of themselves as college juniors at the time of the interview, during the spring of 2018.
They expected us to get pregnant or dropout. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) indicates that in 2015, the number of pregnancy among Hispanic teenagers ages 15 through 19 were more than twice that of whites the same age; for Blacks, it was almost twice that of their white teenage counterparts in that year (CDC, 2017). The CDC indicates that, “Less favorable socioeconomic conditions, such as low education and low income levels of a teen’s family, may contribute to high teen birth rates.” These statistics serve as backdrops for Oprah’s introductory narratives.

Amaryllis states that her dad “actually, he graduated from high school way back.” She said that her mom did not graduate high school, and that, “she actually got pregnant with my oldest brother in the 11th grade and she had me in the 12th grade and then she and she didn't graduate. However, both Amaryllis and Oprah were able to beat the statistics and their mothers’ fates. Oprah states, “a lot of people turn the odds against us, expecting us to not go to college or get pregnant or dropout.” Like Amaryllis, they were the first in their family to make it to college with expectations of graduating. Oprah said that without her teachers and extracurricular support this would not happen, that “without that I don’t think that I would be in the place that I am because when I was in school they pushed me to do what I needed to do.”

Amaryllis said she “went to four different elementary schools,” and changed middle schools four times, as she said, “Because we moved a lot.” In spite of this and other hardships, Amaryllis is able to succeed academically and at the time of the interview was a junior in college, working on establishing a non-profit to give back to her community some of what she gained from her education and from the people who
contributed to her success in life.

Ayele

Born in a northeast African nation, Ayele came to the United States where he entered the eighth grade in a major urban, mid-Atlantic region middle school knowing no English. He said, “My parents came here as refugees because of a political situation in northeast Africa, and “was placed in level A-2.” Ayele stated that A-1 was the lowest and indicated illiteracy in both native language and English. He was highly literate in his native language, pointing out that he was a gifted student before coming to the U.S.

Ayele said:

*By 9th grade, I was in the higher level B-2. And that was when I started to take Math classes with the regular kids and English as a Second Language. And as I go along and my English got better. So by the time I transferred to the 10 grade in High School -- 10th grade, I went from all ESL classes to some ESL classes and had Math and Science with regular English speaking students—And by the time I went into the 11th grade I was doing so well that I received an award for outstanding academic achievement.*

Ayele pointed out that “Only three of us in the whole school received the award,” and that “by 11th grade he was no longer an ESL student, applying for college in eleventh grade. He graduated with a degree in biology from Johns Hopkins, continuing to become a physician, practicing in a major northeastern, urban city hospital at the time of the interview. Ayele, like all participants, began life without benefits of socioeconomic status, connections, and educational privileges these bring (Noguera, 2001, 2003; Noguera & Wing, 2006).
Like Amaryllis and Oprah, Zhihu and Isabella shared similarities in backgrounds and educational experiences. Table 5 indicates that they were both from a major northeastern, urban city and attended the same school. Although they shared the same experiences, they did not share teachers since Zhihu is almost ten years older than Isabella. They were both in the same ESL program in the same school where I worked for thirty-five years.

Both Zhihu and Isabella came as new immigrants to the U.S., Isabella at five years of age and Zhihu at seventeen years of age. Isabella attended elementary, middle, and high school in the U.S., but Zhihu attended the final two years of high school in the U.S. Zhihu spoke about feeling lost, lonely, sad, and isolated in her first years. For Zhihu, elements of pedagogical love involved overcoming these obstacles. She said it was the “good teachers” who helped her in what she described as “a process that made me more independent.”

Lenora

Table 5 shows that Lenora was twenty-nine years old at the time of the interview. She is an African American born and raised woman who lived in the outskirts of a major southern U.S. city. She stated that she is an only child of two “older parents,” and was “a shy kid.” She attended public school from first grade to twelfth and was a doctoral student at the time of the interview. She described the high school associated with her narrative, as “almost 100 percent black.”
Lenora’s high school experiences involving leadership training as a member of ROTC as well as with her teacher, Miss Forest, was the focus of her narrative. She said, “I would say my ROTC instructors in high school was [sic] my most influential as far as shaping the woman that I eventually became, and they were men.” Both ROTC and her teacher Miss Forest in the context of inside and outside class activities as Lenora describes them, were meaningful contributions to her educational experience as well as to the woman and teacher she is today.

Overall, all eight participants’ experiences offered unique life-stories and diverse perspectives of how the study’s Freirean model plays out in real educational experiences, both inside and outside of regular classrooms and how these benefitted students in ways that were humanizing, empowering, and transformative. As their narrative indicated, these were success stories and not all educational experiences involving practices of pedagogical love, turn out that way. It is possible that some students do not graduate high school despite experiencing pedagogical love.

Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Experiences

Since this explores prekindergarten to twelfth grade (P-12) educational experiences, this section reflecting participants’ memories, was included. Participant’s memories of the day-to-day teacher interactions were not available because generally, such memories do not exist at this very young age span of four to six years old. Six of the study’s eight participants had no significant memory of these years, and Isabella’s memories of prekindergarten and kindergarten experiences were very spotty and brief because she was very young. Isabella relayed her experiences of these years by saying,
“all my teachers were wonderful.” However, her education suffered because, as she pointed out:

_I wasn't able to speak English,” and that “they spoke to me in Spanish which really didn't help me later on because I went to summer school in first grade because I didn't learn English, when I was supposed to know English._

_No, I’m sorry. They were supposed to teach me English in kindergarten, but they didn’t. They spoke to me in Spanish._

Isabella also recounted an experience in which a teacher imparted cultural lessons, encouraging her to “always let people know that you are paying attention,” by looking “at them in the eyes, and let them know that you are paying attention to them and you actually care about what they have to say.” Isabella said that advice “stuck with me and I still look at people, like, deeply into their eyes when I speak to them.”

Offering additional insights on educational experiences at this level, the study’s sole parent participant, David-Luke, provided the most detailed recollections of his experiences as a parent, during his son’s educational journey from prekindergarten to the start of third grade during the time of his public school education. He said that his son’s prekindergarten and kindergarten teacher was the same person, and this teacher taught his son in the second grade. David-Luke described this teacher as “very good,” saying that she recognized his son’s giftedness and modified/differentiated lessons to suit his needs. David-Luke stated that this teacher recognized that all the kids in kindergarten classes were not the same and adjusted lessons where required—an act that aligns with this study’s model of Freirean pedagogical love. The next section discusses this teacher’s instructional approach in David-Luke’s experiences as a parent during his son’s schooling beyond the kindergarten years.
David-Luke’s Parental Experiences

Table 5 shows David-Luke’s biographical profile. He was 42 years old at the time of the interview and a parent of a 12-year-old son, who at the time of the interview was a seventh grader in a public elementary school located in a suburban area of a southern city. David-Luke’s narrative describes events four years after their actual occurrences. This four-year lapse could possibly provide distance from original passions and emotions and can allow for more distanced and analytical telling of these events. This objectivity, if present, is helpful for validating the authenticity of experiences described, with all other factors considered.

David-Luke believes that this child would have succeeded wherever he went for school and whoever taught him. David-Luke stated in the interview that, “He scores well. He exceeds all the benchmarks every year, [and that] in all his tests he has always scored in the high—in the 90th percentile.”

Pedagogical Love

When asked the question about the teacher (s) who best helped to shape his son’s successful educational outcomes, this parent had no doubt or hesitation in identifying the teacher. The parent responded to the question by saying, “Absolutely yes!” because it was “easy to recognize.” He said, “I can never forget her,” that “she is significant because she contributed to my son’s education and improved his performance in a meaningful way.”

This teacher, according to David-Luke, who taught his son in prekindergarten, kindergarten, and second grade “saved” his son from pedagogically loveless instructional
practices that almost “destroyed” this child academically and emotionally. In this case, pedagogical love and this teacher’s instructional practices, contrasted with the pedagogical lovelessness involving another teacher, which this parent later described.

Leadership empowering at five years old. In describing characteristics of this teacher’s educational approaches, this parent points out that, “This special teacher helped to alleviate this kid’s boredom that was destroying him.” He added that she did this “by allowing him to take on some responsibility as a leader in the classroom at five-years old,” and that “she recognized that he was bored and that he finished his work ahead of all the other students, and was bored and getting into trouble.” David-Luke points out that, “What she would do is give him responsibility to fill-up that gap when he was done ahead to the other kids. That:

She gave him a ruler to use as a pointer, and allow him to point to the words while the kids would say words. This was during reading time in the front of the class. She would be like, “OK Daniel-Luke, point to the word and help the students to say the word and read the word correctly.” She would put him in charge.

This teacher’s instructional approach aligns with Freire’s (2005, 2011) instructional model. Table 8 shows the presence of human empowerment, student-as-teacher opportunities, and a socially just way of dealing with what the loveless banking model teacher described as “a problem” related to David-Luke son’s disruptive behavior.

Table 8 illustrated that this teacher’s practices facilitated this student’s ability to lead and be empowered by “putting him in charge” as the parent states. Elements like this example, aligns with the Freirean student-as-teacher approach. It is a source of transformative empowerment that can help to build a student’s feeling of self-efficacy.
As David-Luke points out, this so-called disruptive misbehavior resulted from sheer boredom and inactivity due to the fact that he satisfactorily completed the assigned tasks ahead of other students. This, as David-Luke and the teacher he references in the narrative above, was not a student-initiated problem, but resulted from teacher’s instruction discussed later in this section associated with failure to provide differentiated tasks for each student’s needs and competencies.

Learning circles. In addition, this teacher also used learning circles—a method that in my experience seems popular among teachers in the lower grades from prekindergarten to about fifth grade. In describing how this element operated in his experience with his son’s schooling, David-Luke said:

\[
\text{So when it was reading time, she would let all the kids sit in a semicircle form with their legs crossed and the teacher would sit in front of them, read a book to the kids, and show them the pictures. So, she would give them the book, put them there in front of the kids and she would read to them.}
\]
\[
\text{This was the job my son took over and he would lead the circle in reading by pointing to the words with the ruler she gave him.}
\]
\[
\text{She made him the leader and gave him something useful to do rather than being bored and doing things that the other teacher called and complained was disruptive. He was just bored not disruptive like that other teacher said.}
\]

This teacher’s approach that “let the kids sit in a semicircle,” was more conducive to the Freirean dialogic learning and instruction than the traditional banking methods commonly observed in middle, high school, and higher educational settings, where desks and chairs are more often than not, lined up in traditional rows and columns.
Freire also uses the term “culture circles” to describe the learning communities and the instructional approach he offers. This was like this teacher’s circle that facilitated face-to-face dialogue as a means of the type of learning Freire advocates. Table 8 shows these relationships and the associations of use of these ‘circles’ with collaborative classroom-community building processes, another socially just approach linked to Freire’s educational model.

Recognizing all children are different. David-Luke points out that in recognizing his son’s unique response to “boredom” this teacher recognized also that the one-size-fit-all- approach of the banking model was not sufficient, and introduced an individualized differentiated approach—one associated with 21st-century instructional best practices. In recognizing this teacher’s effort, here is some of what David-Luke said:

She had a technique of using different methods for each child unique ability and potential, and she also recognized that he met the criteria of being gifted, so she had him go into the class for gifted kids. They call it, "Discovery".

This parent’s reference to the Discovery Program, a differentiated instructional approach in his son’s educational experiences with this teacher, is important because it offered an experimental model of education that was not just cognitively inventive and knowledge creating but included many elements of the Freirean model, as Tables 7 and 8 indicate.

The Discovery Program. The Discovery Program, administered by a nonprofit organization, provides enrichment education such as that David-Luke describes. This father said that this program, “met once a week for 45 minutes. All the gifted kids would go to this one teacher's classroom and would work on a project that lasts the entire semester.” He added that when his son “...was in the first grade, he was the only first
grader that was part of it,” and that teachers “who run the program are certified Gifted Teachers,” and that they “get to pick their curriculum. David-Luke said that his son “really liked it, and looked forward to it every week.

This parent describes instruction in the Discovery Program, saying, “So each student was given a project. They would work on the project. They spend the entire semester working on it. The parent continued and explained that:

So on one of the projects they had; they had to build a bridge. And they had to build a bridge strong enough to support not just the Bridge itself, but the traffic. And the kids, in order to come up with the bridge building they had to build model cars and trucks and so on.

And they had to make it so that it could actually cross the bridge to make sure that it was strong enough to support the objects coming across.

He was six. He was in first grade so he was six years old. I don’t know exactly what they did but I think they used Popsicle sticks and some other materials to make it strong enough to be able to support the cars that they wanted to cross.

They were able to do it because these kids were a little more advanced and they worked as a team on the project—all of them as one.... And he worked well with the older kids because of the projects.

Table 7 and Table 8 illustrate relationships between David-Luke’s account of his experiences of his son’s involvement with the Discovery Program and its associated project based model of the bridge building project with the transformative and humanizing Freirean model grounded in this study’s pedagogical love. According to David-Luke, his son’s involvement in the Discovery Program allowed this child a number of educational benefits associated with this model, including collaborative and community classroom building benefits associated with Freire’s problem posing and
problem solving educational model. This is also an example of a socially just learning style best suited for the transformative Freirean educational model illustrated in Tables 8 and 9.

In addition, hands-on project based learning like the bridge building assignment is a popular Science, Technology, Engineering, the Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) activity in P-12 settings including high school advanced science classes. This assignment and similar ones are also considered as some of the very best examples of 21st-century instructional and learning practices for all levels of learners—P-12 and beyond.

Pedagogical Lovelessness—A Teacher can make or Break a Child

Loveless pedagogical practices are ones associated with traditional *banking* education. In Freire is the source of dehumanization. Dewey’s concept of miseducative approach is another way of describing this traditional approach still widely used in P-12 and other higher educational settings despite the vast body of research denouncing the complete ineffectiveness of this method. David-Luke states this method hindered his child not just educationally but spiritually and emotionally as well.

Sending home notes about being disruptive. As part of the loveless banking experiences, David-Luke states that the teacher would send “red notes” about what the teacher perceived as a behavioral problem. Here is what David-Luke said, “Well, when he was in the first grade he had a different teacher. And she was always complaining and sending home notes about him being disruptive, time after time.” He further pointed out that, “...we as parents, we know our children. We don't look at him through rose-colored lens,” and that they would listen to their son and that they would say to him, “you have to
stop all this talking; whatever it is that you want to talk about is not that important, wait until after class—after school or whenever.” David-Luke also added that as parents, “We both knew differently in our heart.” He said that:

Once we realized what was going on—because, the previous year the kindergarten teacher—she took the time to see that he and other children were different from each other in her kindergarten class. However, after a while, we recognized that it wasn’t so much that he was disruptive, it’s just that he was bored. And I don’t know if she recognized it and chose to ignore it and chose to describe it as something else.

In describing his parental experiences, David-Luke said he and his wife realized that this first grade teacher unlike the kindergarten teacher, placement of blame on their sons behavior, was misguided, and a stark contrast to the other teacher, who the parent said “took the time to realize the source of the problem and used it to help him.”

In addition, had these been different parents, sending home negative reports could lead to stressful educational home-school experiences. In cases where some parents blindly agree with teacher’s allegations like these, at home conflicts, resulting from these incidents, could be very harmful. Some parent’s believe in the adage that “teachers are always right” and punish their children in response to unfounded allegations like this. This is what pedagogical lovelessness does; it disempowers, dehumanizes, and hurts the educative process even at David-Luke’s son’s age in the first-grade experiences David-Luke describes.

The work is not challenging enough. David-Luke and his wife as parents, thankfully, identified the source of this loveless teacher’s incorrect conclusions drawn from his son’s in-class so called “disruptive” behaviors. In describing the source of the
problem that the loveless teacher did not recognize, David-Luke said that, “This first grade teacher was constantly negative and didn't approve of his behavior,” and that, “in fact that was not the problem.” David-Luke points out that the teacher:

Did not care to take the time to recognize that this kid is not a disruptive child. He was talking to the child next to him because he was done with the assigned work before the other kids were finished with their. Sometimes he even told us that he was helping other children—that sometimes they asked him for help because she was busy. But she just said he is a problem.

The educational injustice described in this narrative corresponds with the loveless; dehumanizing traditional banking model described by Freire, as grounded in “sadistic” love—the very worst and most destructive kind of “necrophilic behavior” that destroys life.

The loveless teacher. Freire (2005, 2011) describes pedagogic acts of lovelessness, which opposes those of representing ‘acts of love,’” saying that, “If children reared in an atmosphere of lovelessness and oppression, children whose potency has been frustrated,” then, outcomes associated with dehumanized behaviors can be expected (2005, p. 155). In David-Luke’s narratives of his experiences as a parent of a young son, he indicated this element by pointing to experiences with a teacher whose actions he regarded as “loveless.” When asked to compare both the pedagogical loveless teacher and the teacher’s whose practices aligned with Freirean pedagogical love the parent said:

Let me see. I would much rather tell you how he responded to the teacher who gave him the leadership role versus the other one who just labeled him as a problem child.

David-Luke continued and said that that this loveless teacher, “just needed to look at his school records; speak to the other children he helping, or something like that,” and
“Maybe then, she would recognize and build on his God-given strength versus the other one who try to beat him down. He said,

She would tell us things she said, like; “he always wants to be first. He always wants to be at the front of the line. He never gives other children a chance to answer questions. He always wants to be the first one to finish his work. But she didn’t allow this. She wouldn’t even think about giving him a chance, to build his potential and let him grow, let him improve, let him just prosper and realize his potential.

In describing this almost Freirean sadistic type of pedagogical lovelessness—in the first grade, the earliest and most formative years of a young African American man’s life—Freire (2005) writes, that “The pleasure in complete domination over another person (or other animate creature) is the very essence of the sadistic drive” (p. 59). Freire ends by writing that this is “a perverted love—a love of death, not of life” (p. 59). David-Luke said his son’s teacher may not have been aware of the error nor effects of her actions, but such is the power and destructive influence of the Pedagogy of the Oppressed.

He would be sad sometimes. In telling of his experiences with his son’s education, David-Luke told of instances of pedagogical lovelessness, pointing to the emotional and dehumanizing effects this had. David-Luke pointed out these effects by saying that, “when he was with the teacher who was labeling him as being disruptive, we would pick him up from school and he would be very down.” He continued and said, “Thinking about it now, I wonder, maybe even if this was a little depressing for him.
David-Luke said that:

_“I mean, first, for the teacher to give these color notes, right. She would send these negative notes home with him, putting him down, and trying to make him look and feel bad.—when he would get those codes, those codes—“reds” for his conduct, he would be a bit sad, broken. His enthusiasm would diminish. He was down. He felt that there was no approval, according to the teacher’s standards. Yeah. So, looking back now, I recognize that a teacher has the ability to either build or tear on a child’s self-esteem.”_ 

David-Luke pointed out that by the teacher, “Labelling them as disrespectful and disruptive, really put that child down in a negative way like that...because they-give him a mark, a negative stain on him and his record and his personality.” These examples illustrate the devastating dehumanizing effects of teachers like this, and it deprives students of opportunities to love, grow, and have hopes for “possibilities” grounded in freedom, justice, equity, and the Freirean outcomes anticipated.

Outcomes—Parental Conscientizagao and Praxis

In the Freirean (2005, 2011) educational model *conscientizagao*—critical awareness and realization of the causes of one’s oppressive conditions and *praxis*—informed knowledgeable actions, are learner-centered outcomes. However, since Freire’s model, created for adult education, this operated a bit differently in David-Luke’s case. In this regard, these actions and their relationships with the original Freirean model, indicate necessary adaptations for P-12 settings, especially for children as young as David-Luke son was during the years of these experiences. In these narratives, David-Luke as a parent, was the one manifesting outcomes associated with Freirean outcomes of conscientizagao and praxis. It may be possible that his son could have had similar
experiences, however, since his son was not interviewed, this fact is unknown and unavailable to this research study.

Parental awareness. In taking actions reserved for adult learners in the Freirean model illustrated in Table 7, and Table 8. David-Luke as a parent was the one involved in Freirean educative activities—as an advocate for his son, that involved critical aspects of dialoging, reflecting with teachers. It was David-Luke as a parent and not his son Daniel-Luke, who ultimately became critically aware, taking actions grounded in these critical elements shown in both tables 8 and 9. According to David-Luke, by the time his son was ready to enter the third-grade he realized that the new standardized, banking instructional model, which he believed was not supportive of his son’s education, was set in place for implementation for the upcoming school year. David-Luke said he and his wife realized that the public school system in his district was set to offer what Dewey refers as miseducative experiences for the new school year. Here is what David-Luke said:

And when the second grade year was coming to a close we had a meeting with the 3rd grade teacher. And they were telling the teachers, or telling the students what they expected nothing of the children or the parents the following year. And one of the things that the teacher said to the parents is that, we are asking parents to not show children a different way of solving a math problem.

So, and I said to her, what difference does it make? Shouldn’t I offer a simple way to arrive with the same answer? Why not teach them this? Okay? And her response was, we are the school. We don’t want you to do that. We want you to only use the way we teach them because we don’t want to confuse them.
David-Luke said, when his wife came home, “we talked about it. She said you know what, we're gonna have to find someplace else to send him because they are out of their mind.”

Here the parent is clearly involved in practicing Freirean criticality grounded in this dialogue, the reflections involved, and conscientizagao, the critical awareness that they had “to find someplace else to send him because they are out of their mind.” The parent said:

_Not only are they teaching according some standardized way that doesn’t seem to make any sense at all. But they also wanted to have the children take this stupid standardized test at the end of the year. And they want the kids to learn specific methods rather than other simple solutions to problems like in subtraction. The problem with their method was that it was too convoluted._

_And they are telling parents; don’t show your child another way that could be a better one that we are showing them. Use ours, because the one we using is the only one that’s acceptable—_

The situation this parent describes occurred during the period of implementation of the policies of No Child left Behind (NCLB). Some districts, schools, and teachers implemented the policies of this program, originally intended to help students like David-Luke’s son. This was indicated by Chapter 2 discussions of NCLB as reflected in George W. Bush’s July 10, 2000 speech to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).

This teacher’s assertion, as this parent indicates, was not just faulty and damaging to his son, but was bad pedagogic practices, grounded in lovelessness and dehumanizing outcomes associated with Freire’s banking approach. Evidence from this parent’s
experiences indicates that the best policies failed at this level. Even when created with the very best of intentions for the population and the needs they serve, these practices can hurt and dehumanize children.

Parental action. In the Freirean model that this study uses, conscientizagao leads to praxis or knowledgeable action grounded in criticality and the associated dialogic processes. In exercising praxis, what action to take based on the knowledge gained about the unfavorable realities of their son's education, as David-Luke pointed out that when his son was about to end second grade and start the third grade; that, “that’s when we pulled him from public school” and sent him to an online school. They did this because he said, “Me and my wife were having trouble understanding methods introduced with standardization and new rules about how we—must—teach our children in one predetermined way and no other.” He said, “We felt this was crazy...it was counterproductive for learning.”

In making the decision about the next school choice, David-Luke said:

He [his son] was still gonna school here and I was watching TV one morning and I saw this commercial for, you know—it says, Parents, you have a child that's gifted and looking for an alternative education school system where your child is free to utilize his or her learning style? This was about 6:30, 7 o'clock on a Saturday morning. I went to the computer and start looking and I was immediately impressed so I contacted the school. And we went and we went with some teachers and some students and parents and we like, this is the right fit.

With this realization, David-Luke and his wife took action, removing their son from the public school system and into an online homeschooling experience described in the following subsection.
David-Luke’s experiences involving his son’s educational outcomes are not yet complete, and his son enters the eighth grade in the fall of 2018. This section narrative, unlike others in this study, describes a work in progress. Outcomes described in this subsection reflect David-Luke’s parental journey at the time of the interview when he was 12 years old and in the 7th grade. This means that the experiences reflect four years in this alternate educational setting and not the final educational outcome of experiences aligned with the Freirean model. This reflects the uniqueness of this child’s experience, and therefore warrants separation from the other participants’ stories this study uses.

Again, David-Luke’s experience differs in some ways from both Freire’s model and other narratives of experiences this study describes. For instance, David-Luke’s son is a minor child, but David-Luke’s experience indicates how parental involvement can fill gaps between pedagogical love and pedagogical lovelessness in cases similar to children like his son, Daniel-Luke. It also adds a unique parental perspective, not present in the other study’s other seven narratives. Unlike the other seven participants, David-Luke’s son has also not completed his P-12 journey, something that makes his unique experiences beneficial to this study and to the Freirean model.

**Alternative school settings.** Parental action grounded in Freirean praxis illustrated in Table 7 and Table 8, involves discontinuation by David-Luke of his son’s public schooling. David-Luke describes the critical thoughts leading to this action by saying that “the fact that the lessons [in the new educational settings] are customized for each child,” was definitely an educational asset that attracted he and his wife’s attention and
shaped their decision. David-Luke said, if the child has the ability to work at a higher-grade level, that they should accommodate that,” continuing and pointing out that it was similar to the use of teleconferencing, “just like what happens in Corporate America where they have web conferencing. Where the student will sit in their seat and the teacher would interact with them as a group or individually sometimes.” He said:

Students are sharing what the teacher is saying and the teacher also has a blackboard, and they also share with other students but they are not physically in the same place even though they are interacting as a class on the web.

David-Luke points out that his experiences with his son’s new online classes, “students are assigned lessons as they would in a normal school, and interact with each other by typing in the question or typing in the answer.” He said that as part of the instruction, “They write on the blackboard. It shows up on the screen for the students and the students take their notes just like a classroom,” adding with a chuckle, “A well-run one,” to indicate an unspoken ironic comparison with the public school model his son experienced.

In describing details of this instructional model, David-Luke points out that in addition to the traditional core subjects such as English, math, social studies etc., that art, music, and physical education are also part of the curriculum. He said that for physical education for instance, this involves physical exercise, “physical activity that they're supposed to complete for the week and their supposed to complete and show evidence for it,” such as involvement in supervised sporting activities. David-Luke said that his son is involved with sporting activities, mostly soccer that he currently “practices two days a week. One day during the week and one day Saturday.”
David-Luke said that opportunities to build physical relationships and friendships existed. Saying that the school, “got them together sometimes, and that, “there are other activities that we have him involved with—like church and sports.” David-Luke pointed out that he is aware that some of these activities and of the nature and scope of his son’s involvement; saying that they do involve significantly high levels of time, dedication, responsibilities, activities, as well as deeply involved interpersonal relationships.

*More leadership empowerment in new school.* Opportunities for leadership experiences are also part of this alternative school model, which the parent said were “real positions,” even though the school was a virtual one. David-Luke said these activities involved situations “like being in a classroom, being in a conference room with the students while talking to each other through the computer. “He said, “They would also have Committees for various activities and so on.”

David-Luke stated that his son’s sports activities also provide further leadership opportunities with David-Luke pointing out that at the time of the interview that his son “got his referee certification granted by the U.S. Soccer Federation—two weeks ago, so he’s gonna be working kids' soccer games. Saying, “This is—this is really a job. He will be working. He will be working at youth soccer games; that his son was “working a real job.” Asked if this is normal for this type of certification granted to children his age, David-Luke said, “Yes,” that there are “age level certification [that] goes all the way up to the adult level,” and that this is a national program under the auspices of the U.S. Soccer Federation.
Section Summary

David-Luke’s narrative, the only one of a parent’s perspective, offers valuable insights into Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love and pedagogical lovelessness. Table 7 lists the 13 *emic themes* emerging from this narrative, showing how they align within each of four Freirean elements—(i) pedagogical love, (ii) pedagogical lovelessness, (iii) conscientizagao and praxis, and (iv) educational outcomes. This four-category Freirean model, created especially for David-Luke’s narrative, includes a place for parental actions related to conscientizagao and praxis, since these actions came from David-Luke the parent, and not his son the student-learner, as is the case for the other seven participants in this study.

In addition to Table 7, Table 8 illustrates etic Freirean elements within the original four categories labelled A through D, associated with David-Luke’s narrative. It indicates an additional 15 etic Freirean elements linked to this narrative. It supplements Table 7, by illustrating additional etic Freirean elements associated with David-Luke’s narrative. Table 8 is valuable because it indicates further alignments of David-Luke’s narrative with additional Freirean ones—15 in all out of the original 16 represented in the study’s conceptual framework in Tables 2 and 3. Item number 16 in Table 3 is the only one missing, since David-Luke’s son has yet not exited P-12 education. This 15 Freirean elements identified in David-Luke narrative of his experiences represent a high level of alignment with the study’s Freirean model. This suggests a positive alignment between the study’s model in the second research question associated with etic elements, and their relationships with emic themes emerging from narratives of participants’ experiences.
Table 7

*List of 13 Emic Themes from David-Luke’s Narrative within Study’s Freirean Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS</th>
<th>PARENTAL FREIREAN CONSCIENTIZAGAO AND PRAXIS</th>
<th>FREIREAN EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Leadership Empowering at Five Years Old</td>
<td>(6) Sending Home Notes About Him Being Disruptive</td>
<td>(10) Parental Awareness — <em>The problem with their method was that it was too convoluted.</em></td>
<td>(12) Alternative School Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Learning Circles</td>
<td>(7) <em>The Work is not Challenging Enough</em></td>
<td>(11) Parental Actions—<em>We're gonna have to find someplace else to send him</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) “Boredom” as a Source of Humanization</td>
<td>(8) The Loveless Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Recognizing all Children are Different</td>
<td>(9) <em>He would be Sad Sometimes</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The Discovery Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

List of 15 Etic Freirean Elements from David-Luke’s Narrative Shown within Study’s Freirean Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>(B) ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Transformative Human Empowerment</td>
<td>(6) Traditional Education—the Banking Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Teachers-as-Students and Students-as-Teachers</td>
<td>(7) Oppression as Dehumanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Collaborative Learning—Culture Circles and Classroom-Community Building</td>
<td>(8) Naiveté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Project Based Learning/ Problem-Posing/ Problem Solving Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The Socially Just Transformative Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(C) ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO PARENTAL CONSCIENTIZAGAO AND PRAXIS</th>
<th>(D) ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9) Critical Thinking</td>
<td>(14) Transformative Human Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Critical Dialogue—Dialogic Learning</td>
<td>(15) Outside of Classroom (Extracurricular)Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Critical Reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Conscientizagao and Critical Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Praxis—or Knowledgeable Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matthew’s Elementary School Experiences

She said to me, that the world is really yours, it’s really yours. How far you get in life is dependent upon you and what you put in. You gonna have to work hard for whatever you want because the color of your skin is definitely gonna be a contributing factor to how to people view you and your ability without even knowing you. She said you’re always gonna be in a competition to improve yourself. Because I was looked at as a problem child and in all actuality, I really was not a problem child.

These words from Matthew’s narrative serves to introduce this participant, whose elementary school experiences with this, as well as two other teachers, launched him for life. Practices of pedagogical love sowed seeds that flourished for the rest of his educational career, and as Matthew said, he needed no other motivation to succeed, because these teachers gave him all he needed, and it served him for life—from elementary school through high school, college, and to his current position as an educator and doctoral student.

Matthew as well as the six remaining participants’ perspectives represents students’ first-hand accounts and not that of their parents as it was in David-Luke’s case. In this way, Matthew and the other six participants’ narratives offer contrasting students’ points-of-views, which alongside David-Luke’s parental voice helps in building arguments around the subject of pedagogical love. In addition, in contrast to David-Luke’s narrative, Matthew’s involves five teachers and covers the entire elementary school experience and not two teachers and part of the elementary experience, as it was David-Luke’s case.
Pedagogical Love

Matthew said two teachers influenced his elementary success. He said that these two teachers, his third grade teacher Mrs. Salmon, and Doctor Bozeman his seventh grade teacher, laid a foundation, which lasted for the rest of his educational career to the present as a doctoral student. Their contribution was like a lever, launching him in a way that he needed at this time, and sustaining him to the present time.

Matthew teachers’ pedagogical practices also align with the Freirean model this study uses. In addition, they also had elements pedagogical storge love or *motherly caring* that could be similar to that in Noddings (1984). However, the expectations associated with the study’s critical social justice model, it differs from that of Noddings model in significant ways, and is outside of the scope, content, topic, and research questions of this study’s focus. Associations between storge-motherly love, Noddings care ethic, and Freirean pedagogical love are three possible related areas for further research and discussions. Such discussions are beyond this study’s scope, content, topic, and research questions.

Third grade humanizing transformations. Matthew experienced pedagogical lovelessness during the first and second grades. These experiences discussed later in this subsection, contrasts to those with his third grade teacher, Mrs. Salmon, who Matthew describes as “the first teacher” to show interest, to encourage, and who “pushed,” a humanizing education that contributed towards his lifelong educational success. Matthew said he was “dealing with the divorce [of his parents] and all that stuff,” and
although he was a child who “could do my work nut I never really applied myself.”

Matthew said:

It was in the third-grade was when I met Miss Edna Salmon and I remember. . . .She was the one that took the time to look beyond, just a misbehaved child and take extra initiatives to make sure that he understands he does have the potential to be someone great” or to do well in your classes.

He continued and said, she looked “into that little boy that was crying out for help; that was crying out for attention,” and that he “never had a teacher ever do anything like that before.”

After experiencing the pedagogical lovelessness and miseducative experiences with both with his first and second grade teachers, Mrs. Salmon’s experience appears to have been a breath of fresh new air of humanizing and transformative practices, that fueled, this African-American student’s success. These effects, Matthew said, “jump started me on my path, my academic prowess of me wanting to be the best in my academics” to this day as he pursues his doctoral studies. Mrs. Salmon, and as later revealed, his fourth to six grade teachers, pedagogical practices, rescued Matthew from a life that could have been completely different, than his turned out to be.

Mrs. Salmon. In describing Mrs. Salmon’s personal characteristics and instruction, Matthew said that “a lot of teachers don’t understand how to help students [but] but she did.” He continued by saying, “And I think that’s what kept her in the school system for just so long because she produced scholars.” Matthew closed this part of the conversation, saying, “And if you adhered to here message then you didn’t have any choice but to be successful.”
In further describing the characteristics and instructional methods, Matthew pointed out that Mrs. Salmon, “Simply believed in her students.” He pointed out that teaching was “just an occupation to her.” Saying that:

She was definitely passionate about all of her students; my sister even had her. And, like she told me, I saw something in you that you didn’t see in yourself and because of the fruits of her labor, because she believed in me, that set me on my path of becoming a great student.

As Matthew said, “she believed in her students, and the statement above, reinforces this about Mrs. Salmon. He continued by saying:

She was never one to actually talk down to students. She was firm in her approach but it wasn’t ever a thing where it made you leave her feeling dumb. It was always, and she had a way where, I’m gonna tell you what I need to tell you but I’m gonna to also encourage you in that same breath.

Her instruction. Mrs. Salmon—“Mrs. Edna Salmon,” as Matthew sometimes refers to her, did not seem to have embraced details of the Freirean classroom approach outlined in Chapter 2. Her instruction seems, based on Matthew’s account, to have been traditional with elements of African-American rhyming and cultural elements, as well as elements that are reflective of motherly, storge love, or caring blended into this mix. According to Matthew:

Miss EDNA SALMON had her own style in teaching. I think being—because as African Americans, we love music, we love, you know, I don’t want to say loudness, we love music. . . and I remember the way that she taught. And she would have her ruler, and she would say, [using a rhythmic tone] one times one is, and we should say one, two times one is, and we world say, two. . . and so on. . . .
In response to the question as to whether Afrocentric rhyming was a part of this instructional approach, Matthew replied by saying, “Right, rhythm. And she would dance away in the class and then it stuck with us. Like, I remembered that.” He said, “she would really go to look and feel and to make us wanted to actually look like and learn it in the book and the thing that in real life.”

Matthew describes her instructional approach as “really hands on,” and that” even down to her disciplinary actions,” knowledge creation educational elements were emphasized. Matthew said, “When you had to be disciplined, it was like, okay, you go in the corner and hold a dictionary in your hand, because the dictionary represented education and knowledge.”

So, everything about her was intentional. Like with the times table because math, you know, for young people math is a subject that you struggle with. She used to give us times table sheet that we would have, I think it was about five minutes.

And the times table sheet would have 100 problems on it, and to see how many you can get right out of those 100 in those five minutes. And that really taught us to think on our feet and to think fast.

He added that to this day because of her instructional approach, He can still “remember those times table tests.” Although these rote methods are traditional ones, they worked for Matthew, and with the storge love/caring and confidence-building relationships this teacher had with Matthew, helped to build the transformative and empowering relationship he describes.
Graduation tears in her eyes. Matthew’s relationship and shaping influences of Mrs. Salmon lasted through high school, college; he describes a touching and telling scene from his high school graduation where he said:

She came to my high school graduation and when I walked across, you know, when I was walking off the field I looked to my right and she was standing on the fence bowing with tears in her eyes. It was like; this is a part of my hard work. And like I tell, like all of my family, everybody that knows me know my connection with Miss Edna Salmon. Like, it’s not secret, it’s not like, you know, you have those teachers you forget all the time but everybody knows my connection with her. So, that was Miss Edna Salmon.

Matthew continues of visit her on breaks from graduate school. Describing one of these visits, Matthew said Mrs. Salmon told him, “Matthew, I saw something in you that you didn’t see yourself.’ and she was right.”

Discussing Mrs. Salmon’s contribution to his educational success, Matthew said,“we forget a lot of stuff from our childhood, but things like that you never forget.” He said, “I’m forever, in my heart, I’m forever indebted to her because she took those steps and took the initiative to help me realize my own. “ Matthew’s way of describing his experiences are vivid, clear, and convey the feelings, tone, tendencies, and emotions associated with them. As the researcher, there is little to add, except by way of analysis and associations to the study’s Freirean model.

Fourth and fifth grade maintenance. Mrs. Salmon’s effectiveness is evident in Matthew’s continued references to her shaping influences even up to the time of his current doctoral level. In referencing her influences spilling over into his third and fourth grade performance with Mr. Bowie, Matthew said, “But at that point [in the fourth and
fifth grade] after Miss Edna Salmon, that’s when I really got serious about my work and serious about my education.” Matthew continued, pointing out that:

I remember. We were like the black kids in elementary school that were the ones that were doing their work and the ones that were getting all the awards and doing all of this and doing all of that. And we were like academic superstars. After third-grade, we three were always smart; we were always on top of everything.

In describing his fourth and fifth grade experiences with Mr. Bowie, Matthew points out that, “he was, I think—was really really hard on me because here again he saw my potential as a student.” Seeing his educational potential, Matthew said that Mr. Bowie “made sure” that he as a student was “gonna work for what you’re trying to get,” that “yes you are smart, yes you are good, but I’m gonna make you work,” Matthew states in describing Mr. Bowie’s tough love approach.

“Looking back on it now,” Matthew reflects, “I appreciate Mr. Bowie for who he was as an instructor and as one that differed than his other white teachers then [long pause]: He said Mr. Bowie “really, really, took the time with the black children to make sure we got what we needed in his class.” Matthew regarded this as both pedagogical and necessary “tough love,” a term and educational approach that in Chapter 2 of this study used by Jasinski and Lewis (2016) to describe the Freirean pedagogical love approach.

Mr. Bowie tough love. In responding to a question about what in Mr. Bowie’s background, life, or experiences that made him the person and teacher he was, Matthew responded by saying, “Mr. Bowie was a Caucasian male,” and that “his lover was a black man. And I think a lot of that had to do with his respect for black people.
Matthew continued and said:

Mr. Bowie was really, really, really, unusual and unusual for that time for a white person was definitely a white person that really cared for black people. And I think a lot of it, because he was like one of the first people to be like openly gay back in that time.

These statements about Mr. Bowie’s background is important in this theory-to-practice study because as Freire (2005, 2011) constantly point out, that a good educator is one who practices in an “human, empathetic, loving, communicative, and humble” attitude” (2011, p. 171), not “for the people,” “with the people,” as one of them—the oppressed.

Mr. Bowie emphatic and loving approach similar to that Freire describes, and as Matthew points out, might have resulted from his personal status and experienced, as a member of an oppressed people struggling to emerge from the shadows of marginalization and dehumanization in contemporary 21st-century American society. Empathy, as Matthew later points out as an element separating a pedagogically loving teacher, from all others, and is required in this study’s Freirean model.

Sixth grade social justice transformative education. Although the educational relationships between Matthew’s third to fifth grades teachers reflected pedagogically loving approaches, their instructional methods and dialogues did not include intentional elements of this study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) critical social justice educational approach (FCSJEA). This changed with his sixth grade teacher, Doctor Bozeman who Matthew said:
She taught us to love our Blackness. That as African American students that there was nothing above us, we weren’t beneath anybody but we held the same potential as anybody else from another race. And if we actually put our minds and used our resources we could achieve anything possible within the world. And she was such an empowerer (sic) to where, if you felt like you were inadequate in anyway, she would build you up.

In response to a question as to whether or not she discussed race within the classroom instructional contexts. Matthew replied, “Not in particular, not in front of the class.” However he continued, saying:

I can remember her, you know, her telling me, you gonna have to work hard for whatever you want because the color of your skin is definitely gonna be a contributing factor to how to people view you as the world will view your ability without even knowing you. She said you’re always gonna be in a competition to improve yourself. And I remember like it was yesterday when I sat had that conversation with her. Never allow nobody to limit you to the color of your skin or your ability.

Matthew stated she pointed out that” everything you needed is in that head of yours,” and that he “remember pointing to my heart, because the heart is where passion comes from. And you gonna have to work for these things to be great.”

Doctor Bozeman. Matthew states, “literally sent me to college with $500.00 [He choked up. Is emotional as he talks about this topic] saying, “I think she kept me under her wing as protection as well. Because I had other people that were literally, in my opinion, were out to get me. “He said Dr. Bozeman told him

They’re gonna be confused so don’t give them what they’re looking forward because she said they’re looking they’re prowling for you to mess up or to start talking in class. So, didn’t give them what they are looking for, go in to class, do your work, answer questions and leave.
In response to a question as to whether or not Doctor Bozeman in this and other similar conversations, was making sure that he would not become another fatal statistic of the education and social system, Matthew replied, “I really do believe that she was, and I’ve never thought about it that way until you actually said it. But I really do believe that she was.” He said, “I’m really trying to keep it together because she was an amazing, an amazing person and I think about her often because it’s like she really cared. Matthew reflected, on her passing by saying that her legacy keeps him going, saying:

_I know she’s watching down on me, but she wasn’t able to witness, to see like the hard work that she put in for me and having the conversation with me even outside of elementary school. Like, your work and your time and your effort and your investment in me wasn’t in vain._

This statement, the message, its meaning, significance, and intensity speak for itself, and as Matthew said it sticks with him and shapes what he does both on a personal and professional level.

Matthew states that Doctor Bozeman was the type of teacher who “would stay after school a lot of time and help students that were struggling in her class.” That she was different than “most teachers,” who “if they weren’t a part of the after-school program” would leave at “2:30 PM—3:00 PM were out of the door,” once their required obligations ended.

Matthew also said that Doctor Bozeman was not just a Howard—HSBCU graduate, but “came from New Jersey”, possibly Newark, saying, “I think she grew up in the inner city when she was coming up.” He said, “I think that allowed her to have a love and a passion for education, especially, you know, a lot times we would get places up North. Matthew believes that Doctor Bozeman and others like her who “come up, you
know, like in the streets and things like that, had to “get her education and wanting to
better herself with the way that she got out of the hood, basically.” That this is possibly
what shaped her social justice outlook.

Matthew describes Doctor Bozeman as being “just A1 in everything, pristine.”
He said she was this way in “her speech, her etiquette, the way she carried herself, the
way she annunciated her words” he concluded by saying in an emphatically impressed
way that” It was just like, oh, my goodness, this is a new world. Matthew speaks also
about philanthropic donations to school and local Baptist church, saying, “Her and her
husband, made many monetary donations. . . like for getting for the science classes, like,
whatever grade it was they made a large monetary donation to where, you know, we
would have little kits and things that we needed. Her husband is a doctor as well

What my mom said about her. Matthew spoke of his parents and grandparents
involvement in his educational experiences with both pedagogically loving and loveless
teachers. In describing Doctor Bozeman’s conversation with his mom, Matthew said:

“I remember she even had a conversation with mom and
she said to my mom, Mrs. Matthews, I’ve heard about them
saying things about Matthew. That Matthew talks too
much, this, this, and this and that.
But she said, these people just understand that Matthew
operates on a whole different level than his peers.
I remember her saying to my mom that, ‘He has a brilliant
mind, he has the making of a leader. And a lot of them they
don’t understand that.

Matthew states that hearing this, was another enlightening moment for me, I can’t even
really describe it, she was just like a breath of fresh air, in a sense. He said, he “felt as if
finally have somebody that understands me on another level. And I’m about to go in to
my teenage year, I have somebody that understands me.”

These are more profound statements from Matthew’s narratives of his educational
experiences that points to the humanizing, empowering, and transformative value of this
type of education grounded in Freirean pedagogical love and the FCSJEA. Matthew uses
the term “enlightening movement” to describe the Freirean conscientizophrenia—the
awareness of his human value, that he was not the talkative, disruptive, dehumanized
person his loveless teachers had him believe he was.

Matthew’s words, in this theory to experience and pedagogical practice research
study, said it all. They speak to Freire’s assertion that with education, educators can
create two ontological possibilities—the dehumanization that his pedagogically loveless
teachers created in this young human being; or the humanization caused but the critical
awareness emerging from Doctor Bozeman’s conversations with Matthew and his
mother.

*Her instruction.* In describing Doctor Bozeman’s instructional approach,
Matthew describes a traditional approach that he found empowering: She “taught straight
from the book, he said, describing a traditional instructional model, “but you literally felt
like you were in a college classroom. You literally felt like you weren’t in elementary
school anymore,” he said making this an empowering experience for Matthew as a
learner.

In addition, as Matthew said, “the way that her classroom was set up, to the way
that she walked in, the way that she closed the door, the way that she. . . . Was definitely
on a whole other level of instruction,” an elevating one in Matthew’s perspective. So although this may seem like “banking” education on the surface, the empowering experience Matthew had, made it both empowering and transformative within the context of his overall education with Mrs. Bozeman—and Mrs. Salmon also.

Matthew said, even in elementary school, and reflecting on it almost 20 years later made him say, “She treated us like young adults and she really made like the text and really made like what we was learning come alive, in a sense.” That these educating experiences were “so eye opening...and to know that she was a doctor and that she went to Howard University,” made it even more so. Here it is the fact that the methods she used elevated them as learners, making them feel as if they were not in elementary school as Matthew said; like they were in college being taught by a professor like Doctor Bozeman. The pride associated with her educational credentials, place of origin in the North, being a Howard HSBCU graduate and all that made these students feel worthwhile as human beings and learners.

Matthew states that their small community did not get the best teachers, that those sent to adjoining communities of privileged and well off families, were better trained and educated. He said, “I think a lot of teachers, when my grandma told me about the certification program, they were put in those low-income minority type schools.”

Matthew points out “she was ostracized by many of the other teachers because they had not experienced the like of her caliber before and they really feared for their jobs.” That:

*I think because number one, a lot of them did not have a Doctorate. Number two, she was not that type of close-
minded because she came from New Jersey, she went to Howard, she got her Bachelor’s, her Master’s, and her Doctorate from Howard.

She was “an AKA and I don’t even know if any of them actually knew what an organization was. Everything about her was foreign to them. And you know, a lot of time when you live in a smaller town and you don’t even venture out, we equate different as bad or different as intimidating. And all in all, all she wanted to do was help the people.

Doctor Bozeman’s presence was therefore, more than a “breath of fresh air” for her students and their families, as Matthew described it.

Although not significantly reflecting the Freirean inside-of-classroom instructional elements in the strictest applications of Freire’s instructional model, Matthew’s experiences with Doctor Bozeman, represents a critical social justice educational approach. Within contexts of Freirean Relativism, and his invitation for “reinvention’ of his ideas to suit the peculiarities and needs of diverse peoples, places, and times, Mrs. Bozeman’s is an acceptable approach for this study’s model. It involves Freirean dialogic relationships—not in the cognitive knowledge inventive formal classroom situation of instruction, but in informal outside-of class conversations leading to the reflective transformative, and humanizing conscientization, which Matthew describes. It for these reasons therefore, and as illustrated in Tables 9 and 10, that Matthew’s educational experiences, are considered as ones aligned Freirean critical social justice approach this study uses.

Her passing. Matthew considered himself Doctor’s Bozeman’s surrogate child.

Recounting a conversation with her husband after her passing, he said:

And I remember it was my spring semester 2009 when my mom called me and told me Miss Bozeman had passed and
I remember breaking down [He chokes up. Becomes emotional and sad]. She died, she had stage four cancer and I remember I was a freshman in college and she was another one that came to my graduation. And she literally sent me to college with $500.00.

And I hadn’t seen her husband since I was like in high school and I was able to see him and I talked to him. And he was like, Matthew, —oh, my goodness, I need to get myself together—He was like, Matthew, Marcia loved you so much. If she had never loved any other person he said, Marcia loved you so much.

Matthew states that her husband continued by saying he was proud, and that his wife would have been so also, had she been alive. Her husband, Matthew said, told him that, “to hear the things your mom and your grandma and your grandfather said about you when I asked about you, her teaching and her living really was not in vain.” Matthew said, “Yes. [A few seconds of silence]. Yeah. She is an amazing person, an amazing person [long silence]. Matthew continued and said, “A part of her is always gonna be a part of me, even though she was never my blood kin.” He said that “And even when I write my dissertation, she is gonna to be one of the people that I’m gonna pay homage to because she was definitely that one.”

Matthew’s statements are powerful, cited because they reflect storge pedagogical caring, which although possibly supportive of the transformative and humanization education, does not operate the same way, nor intentionally seek the social justice Freirean outcomes. Matthew’s experiences serves as an example of possible ways that a storge form of pedagogical love, can operate, unintentionally or otherwise as it was in Doctor Bozeman’s case, to transform and humanize in the Freirean sense.
Pedagogical Lovelessness

Matthew’s educational experiences with pedagogical lovelessness occurred during the first two foundational and formative years of his education in grades one and two. He said, his first grade teacher, Miss Booker-Washington, “was the one that jump-started the talks too much, and the misbehavior” complaint, and that, “once one teacher says this, it, it follows you through your whole career at that specific school.”

First grade kinship, class, privilege. In describing this first grade teacher, Matthew had to be nudged into providing details during the interview. He seemed reluctant, and when asked why, like David-Luke, said he preferred talking about teachers who made positive impacts. Describing his first grade teacher Miss Booker-Washington’s classroom instruction, Matthew said:

As a teacher she got her information out to the class. She made sure that we were ready to move on to the second grade. That’s simply what she was a teacher. She was not an educator.

Asked what was missing from her as a teacher that qualifies her as an educator; Matthew said, “I think what was missing from her as an educator was definitely empathy, was one of the things.

Matthew continued and described Miss Booker-Washington as, “an African American woman.” And that his “elementary school was 85 percent and maybe even 90 percent African American. He states that “a lot of the teachers,” including Miss Booker-Washington, were “either from the small close-knit communities of either Iroquois County or from the larger town of Breezy Hill County where they were all like close knit family.” He said her attitude and others were:
Like, oh, well if you’re not one of my direct kin I’m gonna do what I need to do to teach you but I’m not gonna push you to your full potential. And she was kind of the one where, if you weren’t one of the straight A student, you didn’t really get any shine in her class.

Matthew said that sometimes he still sees her in the community, and “I see her and, and a lot of times when they see you now, it’s kind of like, oh, we knew you were special, and were gonna do great things.” However, Matthew points out that she was probably “just saying that because [she] can now see my accomplishments.”

Matthew’s statements about his being a “close knit family” and that direct “kinship” ties shaped Miss Booker-Washington’s pedagogical practices, played out in a community of about 1,000 residents I shown in the 2010 census. The adjoining community where this teacher lived and favored was the seat of government with a wealthier population of about 21,000 in 2010, according to the census. Matthew describes his community as one that is about “90 maybe 93 percent black,” and the larger Breezy Hill County as “predominantly white,” and socioeconomically better off.

As asked about her classroom instructional approach, Matthew said, “She was definitely one that did not know how to engage student.” That:

Number one, I wasn’t one of her kin; Number two, if you weren’t one of the upper echelon, so to speak, black children because we did have white kids in my class, then you were not in her good books. She did not value you as highly. Now, the others she valued were treated like princes and princesses. Everybody knew that the Hillsworth came from a prominent white family and they were extremely smart children.

Matthew added that, “I heard my parents refer to her all the time, even when they were coming up with her, as an Uncle Tom.”
Saying I misbehaved and talked too much. As in David-Luke’s experience, Matthew also faced a pedagogically loveless situation involving completing assignments ahead of other students, with idle time leading to boredom, and teacher-initiated accusations that followed him through elementary school, as being a “talkative and disruptive child.” Echoing David-Luke Matthew said:

\[
\text{A lot of that, the bad behavior was attributed to me being bored and I don’t think that she understood me as a child. But she was never one of the ones to try to, it’s just, oh, you just talk too much, you just talk too much. I’m gonna put you in the corner, I’m gonna—blah, blah, blah. I’m gonna write you up. So that was my first-grade.}
\]

Like David-Luke also Matthew states that, “a lot of times I used to finish my work early and I just wouldn’t have anything to do so I would be bored. So, of course, you have a child that’s done with their work, bored, I’m gonna talk.”

Second grade with Miss Blond. In describing his next teacher, Matthew said, “So, my second-grade teacher was a white lady, Miss Blond.” Matthew said she was an outsider who was unfamiliar with his small community, and like Miss Booker-Washington, lived in the socioeconomically better off neighboring community of Breezy Hill City. Matthew said that, “I think, in so many words, she was oblivious to our surroundings and she really did not know how to reach minority students.” Matthew described as being “a very very very quiet, very soft spoken lady, but she did not know how to reach minority students.”

Matthew states that because Miss Blond “couldn’t control her classroom, at all,” allowing students, as he said, to “get-over” on her and take advantage of her as a human being acting as their teacher. Her presence as a teacher in Matthew’s educational
experiences did not add value to his life at that time, nor for future growth and accomplishments. Her incompetence as an educator, as Matthew describes it, —no matter the cause, was not beneficial to the students she served, and therefore considered as pedagogical loveless practices in this study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model.

_Cultural incompetence and pedagogic lovelessness_. In response to the question of whether her incompetence, from his perspective, came from racial alienation or pedagogical inefficiency; Matthew said he believed it was “a little of both since as he said, “she knew her information as an educator but she did not know how to reach minority students, at all.” She did not remain long in that school as Matthew points out, saying, “I think it was like a year later, she left and she went to Breezy Hill City Elementary, which is a more predominantly white elementary school.”

Matthew added that his grandmother told him that it was unusual for white teachers to work in the school community, and that “a lot of those teachers that were at Iroquois County Elementary, is that they just had certificates, they really didn’t have degrees.” He said, “They lacked education and lacked training,” that in his opinion, contributed to them not being able to adequately educate as educators, not just merely be able to be teachers.

In further discussions of Miss Blond’s pedagogical shortcomings, Matthew said that cultural unknowingness of her part might have been a problem, since she probably “didn’t understand black kids struggle or cultural differences in an African American home versus the white home, to where she could actually bring it as an asset to the classroom” instruction and learning process. Matthew points out that he believes that,
“the expectation of some elementary teachers, is that their culture of privilege
sometimes” disrupt their competencies with students outside of their culture, and that
teachers like Miss. Blond, “taught from a place of privilege.” In describing the effects of
her pedagogical practices on his education, Matthew states that:

I don’t think, I remember vividly a lot of stuff in her class.
Not understanding, and that year I did not do good, at all.
I made it to third-grade but I didn’t do much I think that
was probably my worst year in elementary school, was my
second-grade year.

Matthew ended by saying, “Miss Blond was very different from Mrs. Salmon.”

Outcomes—Conscientizagao, Praxis, and Giving Back

Although Matthew’s instructional experiences does not reflect the Freirean
dialogic, knowledge creation methods; the outcomes from his educational experiences
parallels ones from the Freirean model grounded in pedagogical love. Outside-of-class
conversations and actions like those with Mrs. Salmon and Doctor Bozeman for example,
resulted in the critical reflective outcomes of conscientizagao and praxis, as this section
illustrates.

The lightbulb came on and something just clicked. This subtitle, taken from
Matthew’s narrative, is an expression that reflects the critical awareness of
conscientizagao and praxis. It is an almost—if not perfect example of this Freirean
element that is an anticipated outcome of a successful education associated with this
study’s Freirean model. Matthew sates that he had fallen behind in his reading because
of his experiences with first grade and second grade teachers who either did not, or could
not effectively educate him.
On entering the third grade, Matthew states, things began to change when Mrs. Salman gave him a book, The Call of the Wild, and as he said, “it was a struggle because I was one of the ones that would not, I was missing my reading.” On observing Matthew’s response to the assignment, he said, “I remember her pulling me to the side and she was like, Matthew, I put you in this group because of your potential, please don’t disappoint me.” It was in that moment, Matthew said:

\begin{quote}
The lightbulb came on and like something just, clicked. And I think at that moment it was like, I really need to get serious about my studies. And that’s when I really started making those steps to better myself as a student.
\end{quote}

Matthew said that’s when things began to change, saying, “And I think that year in her class I got all As in all of my different subjects, and I made the honor roll of fourth quarter that year.” Something Mathew states, “I had never done before. He said he “went on to “the AB Honor Roll every quarter that year and from then on out to where I graduated from sixth-grade. I made the AB honor roll every year—a transformative empowering educational path, which did not just humanize Matthew, but propelled him on a lifelong path of educational growth and success.

She was such an empowerer (sic). Matthew uses a word related to empowerment used as this sections heading, in describing existential outcomes of his education grounded in elements associated with the Freirean model of pedagogical love. Matthew states that Doctor Bozeman was “such an empowerer (sic) to where, if you felt like you were inadequate in anyway, she would build you up.” He said:

\begin{quote}
She instilled so much in me, and me, I would literally go have my lunch with her... just to sit and soak up the wisdom and to talk to her. And to glean from her, like to learn, like this lady is amazing.
\end{quote}
She taught me, number 1 about life, life is what you make it. Don’t be afraid to try something different.

He continued, pointing out that she taught him that, “if we actually put our minds and used our resources we could achieve anything possible within the world.” Later he said to him, “Matthew is not a bad student, he’s not a bad student. He’s a bored student but he’s not a bad student,” and made him feel worthwhile and was one of the many occasions when the “lightbulb came on and something just clicked.”

These moments, to use the Freirean term, are ones of “conscientizagao—where critical awareness gained through dialogue and reflective practice occurs, leading to realizations similar to those Matthew describes. The next steps in both the Freirean model and in Matthew’s life, was praxis” to take knowledgeable action—praxis, to make those meaningful empowering and transformative changes called for in this model.

I’m doing it to show my other Black brothers it is possible. Matthew’s actions, as an educated, empowered, and transformed adult, involves working with Black men like himself at the University level. His opening statement that serves as the subsection’s heading, speaks for itself. Matthew said:

*I’m not doing this just for me but I’m doing it to show my other Black brothers, it is possible, there is a better way and you can attain it if you work hard enough and you do what you have to do.*

He said, he does this in a purposeful way, that:

*I do that on purpose to show my other black brothers on the campus there is another way and there is a better life now. You have to make, and being an African American male, I’m brought up to understand, I have to make the opportunities for myself.*
This is the outcome of an education grounded in Freirean pedagogical love. It gives back what it receives. It is regenerative. It becomes a transforming, humanizing, and empowering legacy passed on to new generations, improving and benefitting those “touched by it,” as Freire states. Matthew said, “That keeps me going. I keep striving for the best, and to do what I have to do and to get where I wanna get.”

Section Summary

Table 9 lists the major emic themes as emerging from Matthew’s narrative as they appear in the Table of Contents outline for this subsection. It shows that although Matthew’s mother and grandparents are a part of this experience, that the teachers, Mrs. Salmon and Doctor Bozeman were major influences on his educational journey through elementary school, laying the foundations for his lifetime educational successes and motivations. As with David-Luke emic themes from Matthew’s narratives, align with the study’s Freirean framework that includes three categories, since the fourth related to parental involvements does not play a significant role in Matthew’s experiences, as it did for David-Luke’s parental experiences with his son.

Table 10 shows a summary of etic Freirean elements emerging from Matthew narrative of his elementary school experiences. Noticeably absent from Table 10 are Freirean elements associated with in-class instructional approaches, since these reflected more traditional ones—though not having a complete banking effect on Matthew’s overall experiences.
Table 9

*Emic Themes Emerging from Matthew’s Narrative*

### (A) EMIC THEMES RELATED TO FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE

1. Third Grade Humanizing Transformations:
   - *Mrs. Salmon*
   - *Her Instruction*
   - *High School Graduation Tears in Her Eyes*

2. Fourth and Fifth Grade Maintenance
   - *Mr. Bowie Tough Love*

3. Sixth Grade Social Justice Transformative Education
   - *Doctor Bozeman*
   - *What my Mom said about her*
   - *Her Instruction*
   - *Her Passing*

### (B) EMIC THEMES RELATED TO FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS

4. First Grade, Kinship, Class, Privilege, and Miss Washington’s Approach
   - *Saying I Misbehaved and Talked Too Much*

5. Second Grade with Miss Blond’s Cultural Incompetence and Pedagogic Lovelessness

### (C) EMIC THEMES RELATED TO FREIREAN EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES OF CONSCIENTIZAGAO, PRAXIS, AND GIVING BACK

6. The Lightbulb Came on and Something Just Clicked

7. And She Was Such an Empowerer (sic)

8. I’m Doing it to Show My Other Brothers it is Possible
**Table 10**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS</th>
<th>ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES OF CONSCIENTIZAGAO, PRAXIS, AND GIVING BACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Grade—</strong></td>
<td><strong>First Grade—</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Lightbulb Came on and Something Just Clicked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) <em>Storge</em> Motherly pedagogic caring</td>
<td>(1) Sadistic Love</td>
<td>(1) Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Outside of classroom educational related activities involving dialogue, criticality, and transformative and outcomes</td>
<td>(2) Pedagogic Naiveté</td>
<td>(2) Epistemological humanization, transformative, empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Freirean transformative and humanizing outcomes</td>
<td>(3) Student dehumanization</td>
<td>(3) Epistemological knowledge creation grounded in the Freirean model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) A socially just transformative education</td>
<td>(4) Student oppression related to social status, family connections, social economic status, class and privilege</td>
<td>(4) Criticality in all areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Student reflective practices</td>
<td>(5) Epistemological knowledge creation grounded in the Freirean model</td>
<td>(5) Reflective practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Student conscientizagao</td>
<td>(6) Conscientizagao and critical awareness</td>
<td>(6) Praxis—or knowledgeable action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Epistemological knowledge creation grounded in the Freirean model</td>
<td>(7) Praxis—or knowledgeable action</td>
<td>(8) A Socially just transformative education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Student praxis—or knowledgeable action</td>
<td>(8) Epistemological knowledge creation grounded in the Freirean model</td>
<td>(10) Ontological and epistemological transformative, empowerment and humanizing outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10 (continued)

**Etic Freirean (2005, 2011) Elements Emerging from Matthew’s Narrative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS</th>
<th>ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES OF CONSCIENTIZAGAO, PRAXIS, AND GIVING BACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth and Fifth Grade—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Freirean <em>tough love</em> (Jasinski &amp; Lewis, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Epistemological and ontological Freirean transformative learner, humanizing outcomes and empowerment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) A socially just transformative education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Student critical reflective practices</td>
<td>(5) Student conscientizagao</td>
<td>(6) Student praxis—or knowledgeable action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Grade—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Racial social justice education</td>
<td>(2) Outside of classroom (extracurricular) education related activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Epistemological Freirean transformative learner, humanizing outcomes and empowerment.</td>
<td>(4) A socially just transformative education</td>
<td>(5) Student reflective practice (6) Student conscientizagao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Student praxis—or knowledgeable action</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) I’m Doing it to Show My Other Brothers it is Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See # 1 to 8 above. Actions contributive to a creation of the type of citizen capable of contributing to a regenerative form of democracy grounded in humanized justice, equity, critically, and elements supportive of creating capable citizens for authentic 21st-century democracies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements of pedagogical love, pedagogical lovelessness, as well as educational outcomes illustrated in Table 9 and Table 10 suggest high levels of alignment with the study’s Freirean model. This suggests positive relationships between this narrative and the study’s model, as well as positive indications for responses to the study’s second research question associated with emic themes and etic elements in the study’s theory to experience investigation.

Table 10 also indicates presence of “mother’s” or storge love, an element not associated with the Freirean (2005, 2011) model this study uses. Elements of storge care ethic emerged, not just in Matthew’s but in almost all the study’s narratives. This presence of motherly-like storge caring not problematic, since, as Table 10 indicates, it did not alter the Freirean focus that is this study’s foundation and approach. The core of motherly storge love, though present, is different from Freire’s pedagogical love grounded in the critical sociopolitical groundings of the Frankfurt School and does not preclude existence of the former.

In Matthew and other participants experiences, presence of motherly storge love and caring, supported rather than disprove or substitute outcomes from the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model. In Matthew’s and other participants experience, the absence or presence of non-Freirean elements did not mean that ontological and epistemological transformative, empowering, and humanizing outcomes did not emerge from the educational experiences involved—because it did. It did for example emerge from contents associated with conversations and their impacts indicated by Matthew’s Third Grade Humanizing Transformations, Sixth Grade Social Justice Transformative
Education, items numbers six, seven, and eight listed in Table 9, and those all listed in Table 10 associated with pedagogical love.

None of Matthew teachers’ in-class instructional approach fully embraced the dialogic knowledge-creating and cognitive approaches associated of this study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model. For example, the in-class collaborative problem posing community-building methods such as one similar to Freire’s culture circles and elements of David-Luke’s Discovery Project was missing from Matthew’s experiences. Freirean pedagogical love in Matthew’s case emerged primarily from the interpersonal relationships and conversations—not necessarily, Freirean dialogic in approach, with these teachers; rather than from their instructional models utilized. Again, absence of the in-class activities does not indicate that educational and existential outcomes associated with the study’s model of pedagogical love did not occur, because they did, as previously noted adding to the Freirean outcomes listed in both Table 9 and Table 10.

Amaryllis and Oprah’s Middle School Experiences

Like Matthew and David-Luke’s narratives, Amaryllis and Oprah’s provide similar ones for middle school experiences of pedagogical love. Oprah’s experiences are especially valuable for what they reveal about what is popularly described as middle school adolescent angst, and how her teacher helped her in overcoming what she describes, as “a smart mouth, always had something to say,” and as her dad told her, having to “get the last word in” with her teachers and other adults.” Elements and themes emerging from these two middle school narratives offer a small glimpse into participants’ entire P-12 experiences.
I Kept Getting Into Trouble

Oprah states that she has always attended elementary and high school outside of her district, because of neighborhood’s gang problems, and her parents desire to keep her out of that environment. stayed in that district but that wasn’t a good school because there was a lot of fights, it didn't have good teachers, it didn’t have good test scores. Oprah said that teachers in that school “actually got in trouble for a cheating scandal.”

Despite her parents efforts, Oprah said, “I feel like, in middle school, after I kept getting in trouble,” and that her parents were very frustrated with her behavior, telling her, “if you go to the juvenile hall or alternative school, it’s on you because we tried to tell you and it is what it is. Oprah improved during the eight grade, and was able to reflect on those years as a high school student, saying:

*I stayed to myself. That is how I am now. I’m not real open as I used to be in, like, middle school. I didn’t get in trouble. I didn’t know anybody to get in trouble.*

She said that in high school, ninth grade when she got angry once with a teacher, “It took me back to middle school, and I just went off on her.” She said she caught herself in that moment and “didn't say anything. I just went back to my work.”

I Don’t Want My Dad to Come Up To School So I Do My Work

When asked about the major reason for her middle school transformations, Oprah pointed out that Mrs. Barrett—her teacher and her dad were major influences. She said he was an important supportive and shaping influence in her entire P-12 educational journey, and that it was he, rather than her mother who showed up to school to check-in on her. Oprah said during middle school he dad chided her for getting in “the last word”
with teachers, that “He would just come up to our school, be waiting, and to go talk to our teachers;” that she “didn’t want my dad to come up to my school, so I’m going to do my work.” Although Oprah did not live with her dad, he remained in her life as a stabilizing force in face of her mother’s frequent evictions and housing insecurities that resulted. Oprah said her dad attended college; is an architect at the city; and is in school while working, although she is not sure what course of study he is pursuing.

Pedagogical Love

As Oprah’s experiences indicate, it was a combination of efforts by her teachers; her father and his family; and that of the church, which collectively accounted for her educational success. However, as Amaryllis narrative will show below, in-class instruction is also a critical element of students’ educational success, both in the Freirean model, and otherwise. Although elements of pedagogical love in Amaryllis and Oprah’s middle school experiences were not significantly different from ones emerging from their high school experiences, their inclusion in the study, serves to offer insights as well as to make a more complete representation of the P-12 experiences it explores.

My middle school teacher’s advice. Oprah said that changes in her behavior resulted from a conversation with her middle school teacher, Mrs. Barrett. She said, “In middle school I was trying to follow my best friend and fell into the wrong crowd. That year, after 7th grade, my teacher told me to slow down.” She said Mrs. Barrett told her, “I know your family and I know they don't approve of you acting like this, so why are you acting this way?” Oprah said, “I just broke down and was, like, you know, I’m trying to follow my friends, or my friends are following me, and I’m trying to keep up
appearances.” Oprah said her Mrs. Barrett told her that:

*You don’t have to do that. If they’re your real friends, they’re gonna follow you regardless. They’re still going to be there for you. That’s what real friends do. So you don’t need to be skipping with them, fighting with them, cussing out teachers together, or anything like that.*

Oprah said she felt ashamed, but “that’s what made me realize, since seventh-grade, that I gotta change. After this conversation with her teacher, Oprah said, “And after that, eighth grade was my best year. I got honor roll because that’s how it was since I was elementary, I was always on honor roll.” Oprah believed that this conversation was a turning point, and that “I think that was one of the reasons why I didn't get kicked out of school because of all the stuff.”

*Instruction.* In a manner similar to Matthew’s experiences with Mrs. Salmon’s use of Afro-centric rhythms as a part of her effective in-class instruction, Amaryllis teacher Mr. Ricketts and Ms. Sampsonite’s utilized similar approaches with similar educational outcomes. All three are examples of as *culturally relevant* pedagogical practices, described by scholars such as Gloria Ladson-Billings, Lisa Delpit, Sonia Nieto, and Geneva Gay. These instructional approaches are also a part of the Freirean (2005, 2011) model this study uses. In Freire (2005, 2011) approach culture and other related sociopolitical elements from learners’ lived realities become part of instruction and education, as what he describes as, are “generative themes” emerging from the learner’s “universe.” In Amaryllis’s experience these generative themes associated with “rap music,” was one such effective in-class instructional strategy that worked for her.
Mr. Ricketts raps, games, and little slogans helped us to remember. Amaryllis said, “In middle school, I had this social work teacher, his name was Mr. Ricketts and he was amazing.” She said he had a hard time understanding social studies, since she “was just not a good person to remember a whole bunch of dates and historical moment.” Mr. Ricketts she points out, helped her overcome this difficulty and for the first time she was able to understand and retain information in this subject area.

Ms. Sampsonite hands-on approach in Science. Amaryllis also had a similar experience with science teacher Ms. Sampsonite, who she said, used “hands-on approaches. She said, “A lot of kids are not just books, books, books. Like me, I’m a hands-on and visual learner’;” and Ms. Sampsonite, “just made sure that with science we did a lot of hands-on activities in the book. She “made sure that we understood, and why we understood what we actually were reading.”

Although Amaryllis narrative does not indicate presence of dialogue, a follow-up discussion indicates that both dialogue, criticality, problem-posing/ project based learning, as well as all associated elements such as community building associated with these cognitively inventive-knowledge creating methods, were parts of Ms. Sampsonite’s approach. Amaryllis said she arranged her room in a U-shape and sometimes used groups,” and that “a lot of teachers did so,” because she thinks, “it was something that the school enhanced in the program...so that the kids can retain the information instead of just reading it and testing.
Section Summary

Table 11 shows a summary of both the 5 emic themes emerging from Amaryllis and Oprah’s middle school experiences as well as their alignments with elements associated with the Freirean framework this study uses. It shows that there was no associated element of pedagogical lovelessness or outcomes associated with Freirean conscientizagao and praxis, as they were in David-Luke and Matthew’s experiences.

Overall, as Table 11 suggests, there are significant alignments between emic themes emerging from these participants’ narratives and etic ones of the study. This is a positive indication for the study’s model and its research questions that seeks answers to the presence, the nature, and the scope of themes from participants’ reflective narratives of educational experiences as students in U.S. P-12 settings, with elements of the Freirean (2005, 2011) model of pedagogical love. These findings from the middle school experience is also similar to the positive alignments in David-Luke experiences, Matthew’s experiences, and as will be revealed, in narratives of high school experiences described in this chapter’s next subsection.

There is also a strong presence of parental influence especially in Oprah’s case where her father’s active, consistent, and strong-visible presence was evident throughout her entire P-12 experience described in her narrative, and which made a positive difference in her educational outcomes. These two middle school narratives also suggest the presence of almost all the Freirean elements used in this study’s model shown in Table 3. The most notable absence is that associated with the humanizing regenerative
giving-back outcomes, which as earlier indicated, awaits completion of these two participants experiences related in the next subsection.

Table 11

*Emic Themes from Middle School Narratives within Freirean Etic Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMIC THEMES FROM MIDDLE SCHOOL NARRATIVES</th>
<th>ETIC ELEMENTS RELATED TO FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE FROM MIDDLE SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) I Kept Getting Into Trouble</td>
<td>(Fromm) Biophilia—Love of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I Don’t Want my Dad To Come Up To School So I Do My Work</td>
<td>Epistemological and Ontological Humanization, Transformative, Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) My Middle School Teacher’s Advice</td>
<td>Pre-Preparation for Day One Instruction—Teachers as Research Investigators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Mr. Ricketts Raps, Games, and Little Slogans Helped us to Remember</td>
<td>Criticality in all Areas; Socially Just Transformative Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Ms. Sampsonite Hands-on Approach in Science</td>
<td>Conscientizagao and Critical Awareness; Praxis—or Knowledgeable Action; Humanization; Epistemological Knowledge Creation Grounded in the Freirean Model; Project Based Learning/ Problem-Posing/ Problem Solving Education, Collaborative Learning—Learning Circles and Classroom-Community Building; Socially Just Transformative Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High School Experiences

The strong parental presence in David-Luke’s account of his son education and in Oprah’s middle school accounts are noticeably absent in all high school accounts. This could indicate reduced dependence on parental guidance, or as Oprah indicated, that parents pull back, telling her towards the end of middle school that they have done all they can and she was old enough tofigure out right from wrong. That “it is what it is; that if you go to there and get into any more trouble, you end up in an alternative school, and if you go there, it’s on you because we tried to tell you and it is what is.” As an educator, I also found that after the ninth grade parental involvement diminishes with student maturity in the upper grades from 10th through 12th. Oprah also indicated that as she aged out of middle school, “I started to know better,” as the effects of teenage angst diminishes with the passing of puberty in the early teenage years.

In addition to Oprah and Amaryllis, Ayele a northeast African immigrant, Zhihu a Chinese immigrant, and Lenora who was born and raised by African-American parents in a large suburban Southern city, shared stories of their high school experiences. In all six of the eight participants conveyed high school narratives, only David-Luke and Matthew did not. Table 5 biographic information as well as cultural, regional, and other situational details reveals noticeable diversities.

Pedagogical Love

Experiences described in narratives of teachers whose practices align with this study’s Freirean model, were similar in many ways to those described in elementary and middle school experiences. These high school experiences include both inside-classroom
activities with teachers, guidance counselors, as well as well as outside-of-class extracurricular activities associated with mentoring programs like *My Sister’s Keepers*, ROTC, cultural clubs, sporting and other activities. Tables 12 Through 18 outlines emic themes from these high school experiences and activities and their locations within the study’s Freirean mode; they indicate the diverse ways that these operated in individual ways within each of the six high school experiences described.

‘Mama Charlestone’ checked to make sure things were OK. Table 12 shows emic themes from Amaryllis’s high school experiences, and how she attended three different elementary schools due to her family’s housing issues; however, it also indicates that a teacher she calls “Mama Charlestone” always “checked to make sure things were OK.” Amaryllis describes Mrs. Charlestone, as someone responsible for her educational success by making sure that not just school and educational needs were satisfied, but that home and other non-school needs were OK as she said. Amaryllis said she had Mrs. Charlestone for both 10th and 11th grades and that she continues to be a guiding, supportive, and significant presence in her life at the time of the interview.

In describing Mrs. Charlestone’s educational contribution, Amaryllis said that, “even though she was a science teacher, she made sure that we were okay in and outside of the classroom.” She continued and said:

> She made sure that things were okay at home. She made sure that if we weren’t getting the information then she stated to tutor us after school. She made sure that if there were methods that she was teaching and we didn’t get it. She made sure that we were in AP classes. She would call your mom and make sure if there was anything that she needed to do to make it easier for the parents.
Amaryllis said Mrs. Charleston “made sure that she instilled in us the importance of not just school life, everyday life,” and that she was more than just a teacher. She said, “We use to call her ‘Mama Charleston’ because everybody considered her, like, one of their moms. She just used to always come with such support and love about her.” Amaryllis’s reference to Mrs. Charleston as Mama Charleston reflects strong elements of storing or motherly caring in ways similar to that in Matthew’s experiences. As in Matthew’s case, speculations about implications of the presence of this type of pedagogic love lies outside of this study’s scope, topic, and research questions of interest, and posits that further research in this area, is a recommended topic for further research.

*She helped prepare us for the outside world.* In addition to making sure that school related activities were in place, according to Amaryllis, Mrs. Charlestone prepared them for the world outside of school and for life after high school and college. Amaryllis said this was important in high school, especially in the earliest years “where teenagers are finding themselves. She said:

So she [Mrs. Charlestone] would just teach us how to act in public. Instilling in us the importance of how we’re looked at in society as African-American kids. She made sure that we basically got out of our comfort zone and did everything that we thought we could not do. She made sure that she instilled in us the importance of not just school life, everyday life. And we took that and ran with it. And I really loved her for that.
Table 12

**High School Experiences—Emic Themes from Amaryllis’s Narratives within Study’s Freirean Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS</th>
<th>FREIREAN CONSCIENTIZAGAO AND PRAXIS</th>
<th>FREIREAN OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMIC THEMES</td>
<td>EMIC THEMES</td>
<td>EMIC THEMES</td>
<td>EMIC THEMES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amaryllis

— *I went to three different elementary schools*—(1) Mama Charlestone’ checked to make sure things were OK—(2) She helped prepare us for the outside world —(3) Church was important—(4) They do things to help the community

— Extracurricular and enrichment programs—(5) My Sister’s Keeper

—(1) My mom just instilled in us the importance of not getting C’s*
—(2) My Sister’s Keeper’s Big Sister*
—(3) My teachers’ taught me that they can’t take away my knowledge and education*
—(4) It makes me humble to know that I succeeded because I tried *

—(1) I’m drawing up a vision plan for a non-profit organization within my community

*Note. (*) Asterisk indicate topics and subtopics not included in Chapter 4, but included in original transcripts of interviews.*
These statements reflect Freire’s *word to world* assertion in which as he states the purpose of education to allow humans as humanized and critically aware beings to “engage with others and the world” (Freire, 2011, p. 3). They also show how this played out in Amaryllis’s high school experiences. This is an indication of what Freirean pedagogical love looks like in U.S. P-12 classrooms and related educational settings.

Ms. Barnett kept me in check all the time. Like Mrs. Charlestone in Amaryllis education, Ms. Barnett was the teacher making the difference in Oprah’s transformative education. Table 13 shows this as part of the pedagogical love experiences in the study’s model. In a way similar to Mrs. Charlestone, Oprah said Mrs. Barnett, “kept me in check all the time,” recounting the day she visited Oprah’s neighborhood. Oprah said:

*One day she took me home, and my neighborhood is actually right next to a penitentiary, the city penitentiary, and she was just looking at me, and she was like, wait, you stay right here? And I was like, yeah, I’ve been staying right here all my life. And she was like, I would never imagine someone like you, someone with your intelligence, your attitude, would come from a place like this, that’s literally right next to a prison.*

Oprah responded, saying, “Ms. Barnett, just because I stay here doesn’t mean I act like the other children,” and Ms. Barnett responded, telling her, “exactly. You know the saying; don’t let your income affect your outcome. Don’t let that be how people define you.” This dialogic conversation, Oprah said, was a monumental one in her life, and was not only memorable and profound, but also transformative in a Freirean humanizing way.

This conversation contains Freirean instructional elements associated with not just dialogic learning, but critical thinking, critical reflection, critical awareness—or conscientization associated with the model grounded in Pedagogical love even though
this did not occur as part within the formal classroom learning environments. The outcome of this model, praxis—or knowledgeable action—became evident later in statements Oprah made regarding her choice of teaching as a career and life vocation. This is an example of the Freirean model operation even while outside the classroom walls with a teacher who choose to visit by taking home Oprah on this occasion. This is pedagogical love in practice in a real P-12 U.S. setting for this theory-to-practice application used in this study.

Church was important. Tables 12 and 13 shows that the church was a part of both Oprah and Amaryllis’s educational experiences, and although religious institutions like churches are not explicit elements of the Freirean model, within U.S. neighborhoods they sometimes serve community building and sociopolitical empowering purposes. This theme emerged as a strong element in shaping the educational outcomes in both Amaryllis and Oprah’s narratives, and was in both cases, unsolicited during each interview held separately.

Inclusion of church as an emic theme in Amaryllis’s and Oprah experiences although not a part of the original Freirean model, aligns with the reinvented Freire framework this study’s uses to apply these epistemologies to U.S. P-12 settings. It reflects the study’s Relativist response that makes Freire’s invitation to perennially invent and reinvent knowledge by applying old ones to new “concrete existential situations,” as they emerge and warranted. Inclusion of the church as a source of humanizing and transformative education is part of this reinvention called for by Freire.
They do things to help the community. To Amaryllis family, church was, and still is important in her life. She, her mother, and her siblings attended church in the various neighborhoods they lived, and she said that the church tried to “help to get a better outlook of the community.” She also states the church was involved with the kids in a “constructive” way so that they do not become just another statistic or, “a product of their environment.” Amaryllis said that Church leaders, “made sure that we stayed out of trouble, went to school, did our homework, and participated in the church;” and that this was helpful to her education and staying on track with her life. There were also “afterschool-tutoring programs at the church,” Amaryllis points out.

The church in my neighborhood and they do things to help with the community and have the kids involved in stuff that was constructive, other than being a statistic and other than being a product of their environment.

So they were very involved in my life. They made sure that we stayed out of trouble and went to school, did our homework and participated in the church. We used to have tutoring and that really helped me a lot.

We would actually take our report cards to church. Oprah said that in addition to her teachers, that her dad, and the church traditions of his family influenced her. She said that she and her brother that shared the same father for the first five years of their life went to a “family based” church. Oprah said, “Everyone there was related in some kind of way, aunties and cousins and uncle.” She said:

And we would actually have to take our report cards to church and if you didn’t get good grades you couldn’t go outside, we couldn’t go outside to play, couldn’t get snacks. We would be there all day at church. And you know, at the time, you want snacks, you want cookies and Kool-Aid, and juice. He would try to motivate us to do our work. And also my dad, he was raised like that.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE EMIC THEMES</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS EMIC THEMES</th>
<th>FREIREAN CONSCIENTIZAGAO AND PRAXIS EMIC THEMES</th>
<th>FREIREAN OUTCOMES EMIC THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oprah</td>
<td>—They Expected Us to Get Pregnant or Drop out—(1) Ms. Barnett kept me in check all the time—(2) Church was important—(3) We would actually take our report cards to church — Extracurricular and enrichment programs—(4) My Sister’s Keeper</td>
<td>—(1) Middle school teacher’s advice* —(2) Ms. Mastick in the third grade* —(3) Made a U-turn in the eighth grade* —(4) Ms. Barnett, the first teacher I met when I started school at W. E. B. Du Bois [9th grade high school first year]* —(5) My Sister’s Keepers* —(6) They took us on a college tour</td>
<td>—(1) On becoming a teacher myself *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. (*) Asterisk indicate topics and subtopics not included in Chapter 4, but included in original transcripts of interviews.*
Classroom instruction. More traditional, rather than the Freirean (2005, 2011) in-class critical dialogic knowledge creating method described in this study’s Chapter 2 emerged from narratives of high school experiences. However, this does not mean that it was a banking model void of the outcomes associated with the study’s Freirean model as Matthew’s case as well as others such as Zhihu’s experiences outlined in Table 14, for example, illustrates.

*It’s the relationships you’ve built.* Although this teacher did not fully utilize the Freirean (2005, 2011) instructional approach, Zhihu said her teacher, Mr. Leibowitz, gave her “voice,” saying, he “encouraged me a lot to speak in front of the classmates,” and that he made her “build a connection with you, and with the class.” Zhihu also said she appreciated Mr. Leibowitz instructional approach pointing to “discussion, not just about the textbook but more in general, like, you were willing to exchange ideas and to talk with me.” She closes this part of the conversation by saying Mr. Leibowitz, “made me feel like a thoughtful adult.” These outcomes are congruent with the study’s Freirean one, because it empowered and transformed and humanized her and made her “believe that they’re teachers who are interested in students’ overall lives by actually making a difference.” Table 14 illustrates this relationship between this narrative and the study’s Freirean approach.

In discussing how Mr. Leibowitz influenced her Zhihu said that “in terms of cultures. I used to be a very reserved because I was coming from another culture.” She points out that she “was never confident to share my different background with other people who didn’t share my Chinese background,” and that Mr. Leibowitz helped to
build “the confidence to be more comfortable to share with other people. She said “I think that was very important factor in my life, because, here you can be around all types.” She concluded this by saying “He gave me the feeling that people from all different backgrounds they can be in mature conversations,” that he gave her “more experience with the various ways of seeing the world” a diverse one—in diverse ways.

This was particularly important to Zhihu coming as a mature 17 year old from a mono-cultural environment in China, to the diversities in that school where every language representing major cultures of the world was present in a 1989 school census, and currently has a diversity score of almost twice of that for the major northeast, urban city itself. I worked at the school for 28 years until I retired in 2011.

*Nurturing tough love, dialogic circles, and character meetings.* In her relationship with her teacher, like Zhihu, Lenora’s teacher, Miss Forest, also generally used traditional instruction with some elements of Freirean criticality and dialogue, which produced transformative, humanizing, and empowering educational outcomes. Lenora’s experiences outlined in Table 15 shows that Miss Forest who she describes as a “tough cookie,” was part of the study’s model of Freirean pedagogical love. Lenora said that what she “loved about her was the fact that she taught me how to write, and she was very critical for the details.” In describing Miss Forest, Lenora said, “she had a personal rapport with her student, because we trusted her. “ She states that students could talk freely, and that as a teacher she “could challenge us without us being offended or . . . being sensitive or not really perceiving her feedback in a negative way.”
### Table 14

*High School Experiences—Emic Themes from Zhihu’s Narratives within Study’s Freirean Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Participant</th>
<th>Freirean Pedagogical Love Emic Themes</th>
<th>Freirean Pedagogical Lovelessness Emic Themes</th>
<th>Freirean Conscientizagao and Praxis Emic Themes</th>
<th>Freirean Outcomes Emic Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhihu</td>
<td><em>(1) My first days in the U.S. school system</em></td>
<td><em>(1) My guidance counselor was probably overwhelmed</em></td>
<td><em>(1) Feeling more confident and involved</em></td>
<td><em>(1) I’m helping kids apply for college</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(2) Feeling lonely and isolated</em></td>
<td><em>(2) She seems indifferent and probably overwhelmed</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(3) It’s the relationships you’ve built—(12) Mr. Leibowitz—Giving me voice</em></td>
<td><em>(3) Here you can be around all types</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(4) Joining the math team</em></td>
<td><em>(4) A diverse golf club</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(5) Meeting my husband on the math team</em></td>
<td><em>(5) Running for president of the Chinese club</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(6) The winter concert</em></td>
<td><em>(6) My college advisor helped me</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(7) A diverse golf club</em></td>
<td><em>(7) Feeling more confident and involved</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(8) Running for president of the Chinese club</em></td>
<td><em>(8) A diverse golf club</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(9) Feeling more confident and involved</em></td>
<td><em>(9) A diverse golf club</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(10) My college advisor helped me</em></td>
<td><em>(10) A diverse golf club</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(11) A letter to my college advisor</em></td>
<td><em>(11) A letter to my college advisor</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(12) Mr. Leibowitz—Giving me voice</em></td>
<td><em>(12) Mr. Leibowitz—Giving me voice</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. (*) Asterisk indicate topics and subtopics not included in Chapter 4, but included in original transcripts of interviews.*
This was not the case with other teachers, because as Lenora points out, “In a lot of ways it would not have worked had we not had – If we hadn’t have trusted her the way we did.” With other teachers according to Lenora, a lot of students were distrustful of them, and I don’t think they had that same level of rapport,” as they had with Miss Forest.

Lenora continued, saying:

*“I can honestly say her race was negated by how she loved these black children. She would be the poster child for what a white teacher in urban education should look like. . . . You are not a savior, but you can still get black kids to where they need to be by loving them and supporting them, and not treating them like an ‘other.’”*

“She could be the poster person for that,” Lenora said.

In describing Miss Forest’s use of small groups described as “learning circles,” Lenora said, they “Would be given some type of reading material. . . and over a couple of days, over a week, depending on the depth, or the timing, or even the scheduling,” and that they “would then come back in, and we would sit in a circle.” In that circle Lenora said, “we would have to come up with questions based on the assumptions that were generated in particular literature, like whatever it was, whether it was history, actual European literature, whichever.”

These instructional approaches contain elements similar to Freire’s “learning circles” where Miss Forest, as Lenora states, “would serve as a facilitator, in the search to challenge us, but a lot of times.” Lenora points out that there were times Miss Forest “would allow us to work in groups to discuss and build further our understanding, based on what our peers also thought.” Lenora describes Miss Forest as” amazing,” and that this teacher’s practices now shape hers, now that she is a teacher herself.
Lenora also describes what she refers to as Miss Forest’s *Character Meetings* where she “‘taught us outside of English’ as part of her after-school activities with students. These meetings as Table 15 indicate, falls within practices described by the study’s model of pedagogical love. Lenora said, she was motherly, nurturing, and loving, at these meetings even though she reprimanded them in motherly ways. She said:

*We called her model for that ‘motherly,’ She was very nurturing. She was very loving. She always said that we were her babies. It was very motherly, and I think, because yes, I’m allowed to nurture you, do all that, but I’m also gonna give you that tough love as well, and we were very receiving of that part of how she handled us.*

“She was very loving, she was very patient. But she actually treated us like her children,” Lenora said.

Table 15 also shows that elements of storqe type motherly love associated with teacher instruction in Lenora’s experiences with Miss Forest; as it did in Matthew’s and Amaryllis’s reference to Mrs. Charlestone as *Mama Charlestone*. Presence, of this non-Freirean element, based on their educational outcomes, aligns with the study’s Freirean model, despite their absence from Freire’s original model, which addressed different ontological realities, from those present in this study’s population. This divergent form of pedagogic love, were supportive, rather than conflicted, with the reinvented Freirean model in this study’s applications to U.S. P-12 settings.
Table 15

High School Experiences—Emic Themes from Lenora’s Narratives within Study’s Freirean Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE EMIC THEMES</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS EMIC THEMES</th>
<th>FREIREAN CONSCIENTIZAGAO AND PRAXIS EMIC THEMES</th>
<th>FREIREAN OUTCOMES EMIC THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lenora</td>
<td>—Raised as an only child—</td>
<td>—(1) Benefits of ROTC experience*</td>
<td>—(1) Carrying on, mentoring, teaching, educating</td>
<td>—(2) From ROTC to Spelman and teaching *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart, mature, but shy*—(1)</td>
<td>—(2) So now I am a teacher*</td>
<td>—(2) So now I am a Teacher*</td>
<td>—(3) Looking forward and giving back*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introducing Miss Forest*—(2)</td>
<td>—(3) So now I am a teacher*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motherly, nurturing, and loving*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom instruction*—(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry, dialogue, and criticality*—(4) Learning circles*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extracurricular and enrichment programs—(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROTC leadership empowerment—(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeing the leader in me*—(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching me to lead from the head and heart*—(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowing and implementing policies*—(9) Learning about teamwork and team leadership*—(10) Tact and good interpersonal skills*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—(11) Male influences*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. (*) Asterisk indicate topics and subtopics not included in Chapter 4, but included in original transcripts of interviews.*
Her room was not just lined-up, stacked. The theme of storage love and caring emerged from Ayele’s narrative of experiences. Table 17 shows emic themes from Ayele’s narrative, and indicates that his teacher, Ms. Morrow’s practices he describes, falls within the category of this study’s pedagogical love framework. Ayele describes Ms. Morrow instructional practices as being “different from the other teachers because she was very kind;” as being “very different—unorthodox,” and “different in the way she carried herself, not too dressed up, very natural and simple in her ways,” and not fitting “e traditional teacher conservative style—more like a rebel,” as he said.

Ayele said Ms. Morrow’s instruction, by saying “Her Room was not just tables lined up and stacked. It looked chaotic, but it was organized in a different ways,” since as he said, “we all learn, but it was different. This description, characterizes best practices approaches associated with differentiated student-centered learning, a models that parallels the Freirean (2005, 2011) one this study uses. Describing her instruction, Ayele said:

It was more discussing and interacting, like in a workshop or something like that. She conversed very well with everybody. The seats were sometimes organized in a way to usher a group discussions. They weren’t just lined up like tables, stack, stack, stack. It wasn’t like you know, here is the lecture, I’m gonna talk the whole time, sit back and relax

We were like in groups and teams, having discussions, giving our opinions—debating and things like that that made us learn in a different way. It was very easy and not boring like other classes. . .

Ayele points out saying, “I think students appreciated that and they liked that it t was something that was different about her from the others.
He gave me voice and tried speaking Spanish. Table 16 shows emic themes emerging from Isabella’s narrative. Among these experiences, pedagogical practices by her teacher Mr. Bronwitz, aligns with the study’s pedagogical love framework shown in Table 16. Isabella educational experiences with Mr. Bronwitz, as described in her narrative, were humanizing, transformative, and empowering. He gave her voice for example, by allowing her to speak in front of the class. She said other classroom activities such as letting her, “pass out the folders, collect this, collect that, and sometimes taking the attendance—and he went to check it after class to see if everything was okay,” were empowering and humanizing in-class activities. Isabella points out that:

Writing on the board and things like that helped me out a lot because other people wouldn’t do that. I would see that as a leadership. Speaking in front of people or asking them for the folders or other stuff.

In Isabella’s experience, her teacher, Mr. Bronwitz, utilized approaches that made her feel a sense of cultural acceptance that is a source of Freirean humanizing education. She said, “He was different. He tried speaking Spanish with you,” and that this “was different, other teachers complain about us speaking Spanish, but he tried to learn so he could communicate with us.” Describing the instructional approach Mr. Bronwitz uses, Isabella said was an important outcome for her. She said:

He also use to ask me to volunteer to speak in front of the class, readings things out loud. So that helped me with speaking in the public. And also writing on the board and not to be shy or nothing like that. So that's how Mr. Bronwitz helped me to become a better student, actually.
Table 16

*High School Experiences—Emic Themes from Isabella’s Narratives within Study’s Freirean Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS</th>
<th>FREIREAN CONSCIENTIZAGAO AND PRAXIS</th>
<th>FREIREAN OUTCOMES EMIC THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>(1) Sargent Santos and the “toolbox” was something that we kept. *</td>
<td>(2) Classroom instruction</td>
<td>(3) Giving students a voice*</td>
<td>(4) He gave me voice and tried speaking Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. (*) Asterisk indicate topics and subtopics not included in Chapter 4, but included in original transcripts of interviews.*
### Table 17

*High School Experiences—Emic Themes from Ayele’s Narratives within Study’s Freirean Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>FREIREAN LOVELESSNESS AND PRAXIS</th>
<th>FREIREAN CONSCIENTIZAGAO AND PRAXIS</th>
<th>FREIREAN OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayele</td>
<td>―My parents came here when I was in the 8th grade as refugees* —(1) Classroom instruction and pedagogical love —(1) Ms. Morrow* — (2) Her room was not just lined—up, stacked —(3) She was different* —(4) She was willing to admit a mistake* — (5) She advocated and cared* — (6) Her instructional approach* —Dialogue, like exchanging Ideas* — Motherly love * —Extracurricular and enrichment programs—(7) She [Miss Morrow] helped me to be a leader*</td>
<td>―(1) So I spoke to my guidance counselor*—My guidance counselor laughed at me when I said I wanted to be a doctor</td>
<td>―(1) Failure was not an Option*</td>
<td>—(1) A humble physician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. (*) Asterisk indicate topics and subtopics not included in Chapter 4, but included in original transcripts of interviews.*
In response to a question regarding ways in which Mr. Bronwitz improved her life, Isabella said he taught her, “To not be afraid to speak our minds and not to be afraid to ask questions in front of class, and in front of everyone.” She said he taught her how “to speak in public better, Isabella said:

\[
I \text{ was kind of nervous and I didn't believe in asking questions to the teacher in front of the other students. So with Mr. Bronwitz, I learned that I could speak my mind, that others would listen, and that I should not be afraid.}
\]

Isabella pointed out that “other teachers didn't allow you to do that. No. They never encouraged me to, like that.” Isabella added that, “Other teachers put their own stuff on the board, but Mr. Bronwitz he gave you the opportunity to write things on the board.”

As the narrative indicates, simple tasks such as writing on the board, passing out folders, and taking attendance are empowering and transformative to students like Isabella. This approach helps teachers by having students as classroom assistants and helpers, releasing teachers from these mundane activities. At the same time as indicated in Isabella’s narrative, this means a lot to students, and is empowering and transformative in ways she describes.

Extracurricular and enrichment programs. Tables 12, 13, and 14 shows extracurricular activities being a part of all six high school experiences, and that these aligned with the study’s model of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love. In addition to classroom activities such as those described, extracurricular activities such as The Discovery Program in David-Luke’s experience, My Sister’s Keeper in Amaryllis and Oprah, ROTC in Isabella, and after school clubs in the cases of Ayele and Zhihu
experiences, are important transformative, humanizing, and cognitively uplifting educational resources.

_Amaryllis, Oprah, and My Sister’s Keeper._ In both Oprah and Amaryllis experiences, an extracurricular program, *My Sister’s Keeper* also known as MSK played such an empowering, humanizing, and transformative educational experience. Tables 12 and 13 shows this relationship with the study’s model and its placement as part of the practices of pedagogical love, this study describes. My Sister’s Keeper is a locally based metropolitan women’s foundation that seeks to uplift and support women, moving them, as they state, from “average to excellence” (My Sister’s Keeper, n.d.). Teachers from Amaryllis and Oprah’s high school participated, and at one time, Amaryllis was president of her school chapter. Oprah states that about eight students and teachers participated in the program during the time she and Amaryllis attended the same high school and they both participated from 10th to 12th grade, and currently receive support from members who continue to mentor them as Big Sisters in their Sorority. Describing her experience with Sister’s Keeper, Oprah said:

*It was called MSK, My Sister's Keeper. The teachers were there to mentor us and make sure that we stayed on track. We went to the nursing home and we volunteered there. We partnered with the ROTC, and we did the empty stocking fund, we stood outside of the stores. What else did we do? There’s an elementary school right behind our school and we went and we helped out with the field day. We went and were help to the students. And we did the entrepreneurship—Yes, Junior Achievement. And we did that with another school that was around the corner from us.*
Amaryllis, who at one time was the President of the school chapter of My Sister’s Keeper pointed out that made similar statements, and pointed out that Mrs. Charlestone and other teachers who were members of the program, “connected with us as girls in the school at any grade level. And basically, it’s like, lifted them up, and was someone to talk and to be there for you.” She said that they were “basically [doing] like what your sister would.

Describing her experiences on a college tour sponsored by the teachers of My Sister’s Keeper, Amaryllis said, “They showed us that there is more than the HBCU [Historically Black College and Universities], and that just because you’re Black, you don’t have to go to a HBCU.” She said, “we went to schools, you know, Duke and we went to Davidson, George Washington University. We went to Howard. We went to University of North Carolina,” as a result found that:

*Yes. There’s more to the world than just W. E. B. DuBois [her high school] and the HBCU, because that’s all my district was about. It was just stuck on. And usually a smart kid that’s been out in the world were making 27 and 28 on their ACT and it was kids was making 1600 – 1800 on the SAT. There were all types of internships and it was really different. And I like that, I learned a lot from that.*

Both Oprah and Amaryllis experiences with My Sister’s Keeper speak of pedagogical love. There is also evidence of storeg caring—whether intentional or not—that contributed to the social justice outcomes associated with humanizing and transformative goal of Freire and this study. Emic themes from these two narratives associated with experiences with Sister’s Keeper, aligns it with the Freirean model as Table 12 and 13 indicates.
Lenora and Isabella ROTC leadership empowerment. Amaryllis mentioned that My Sister’s Keeper collaborated with the ROTC in an Empty Stocking Fund project. Both Lenora and Isabella’s experiences indicate that ROTC, like My Sister’s Keeper, was a source of extracurricular Freirean empowering educational transformative experiences for high school learners. In describing this experience, Lenora said that her “ROTC instructors in high school was my most influential as far as shaping the woman that I eventually became.” She added, “and they were men; 10th through 12th grade,” and that “I’ve always found to be really interesting that they were all men.”

For Lenora her ROTC high school experiences, “forced me out of my comfort zone – because I was a really shy kid.” She said this was exacerbated by the fact that she was “an only child; so I’m already make me an introvert,” and that “they forced me out of that shell and by doing that they had me instruct other cadets and lead them.”

Lenora pointed out that part of her ROTC high school training also taught her the importance of knowing and implementing policies as a leader. Saying, “You can’t lead if you don’t know what you’re talking about because that invalidate you if they ask you a question and you don’t know the answer.” Lenora also said he learned how to be tactful, teamwork, and how to develop and maintain good interpersonal skills as part of her ROTC leadership training and experiences. She points out that these skills now serve her as an adult, as a teacher, and in all spheres of her life.

Isabella made similar statements regarding her ROTC experience in high school. She explained how ROTC activities allowed her to go “back to middle school to speak to the other kid about the program that we were in and things like that.” Table 16 shows
how this aspect of their experiences aligns with the study’s model of Freirean pedagogical love practices. She said these Middle school students “asked us for some advice of the school as well, like, what to do after middle school like for college since at the time, we were sophomores,” Isabella said:

\[
\text{So we ended up speaking with the students, with the teachers and all of that was wonderful. The feeling was great because we have, like, little kids, I mean, it was middle school. But then going into high school and then actually coming back and being in the same school with the ROTC and made it nice.}
\]

Isabella said this extracurricular high school activity “was a good experience” that made her life a better one.

\textit{Ayele and Zhihu after-school clubs and activities.} Like the ROTC program, Ayele and Zhihu experiences proved to be empowering, humanizing, and transformative. As newly arrived immigrants, these activities helped both in social adjustments as well as in ways that are humanizing and empowering to both. In describing her first days in the U.S. education system, Zhihu said, she felt sadness, loneliness, confused, and feelings of isolation. She said, that she felt “very lost because she “didn’t know the school system.” She said she had trouble understanding things “like the daily schedule here as far as switching classes every period,” and that she had a class schedule “but I didn’t really know where to go,” that she “was really confused; and that joining the Math Team helped in this transition. She said:

\[
\text{Actually, at the time I was a junior and a senior introduced me to the math team. This is like a period of doing extracurricular work like in math. It made me feel more relaxed in the school. I felt like this class, actually is different. You know—You’re really taking classes for, like,}
\]
extra activities and so you build relationships with others.
It wasn’t really the class environment.

She said that “a lot of times regular classes was not that challenging for me,” that at times it was “a little bit boring because, you know, you’re not being challenged enough.”

Zhihu said she had similar experiences that parallels this study’s transformative, humanizing and empowering model, by participating in “a diverse golf club,” that helped her to build confidence that led later to her running and becoming President of the Chinese Club. She pointed out that, “Actually, at the time I didn’t know where I can get the courage to run,” but that she did and “ended up having a position, and then I started getting more into more activities.”

Ayele made similar statements regarding the humanizing, transformative, and empowering experience starting a cultural club he led in the ninth grade, in which one of his teachers who practices elements of the study’s model of Freirean love, facilitated. Ayele said, this teacher, Ms. Morrow, “helped me in so many ways that changed me and helped me to adjust when I came here.” Ayele said:

When I told her that I was interested in having a group, you know a [cultural] group that could meet after school, socialize, and get to know each other outside of class and the classroom environment. She helped me. He helped me set it up and supported me all the way [and] that helped me to become like a leader in that group.

Ayele and Zhihu, as well as David-Luke, Amaryllis, Oprah, Lenora, and Isabella, all found that involvement in extracurricular activities beneficial to their successful educational outcomes.
Pedagogical Lovelessness

Table 14 and 17 shows an outline of emic themes associated with the study’s model of pedagogical lovelessness emerging from Ayele and Zhihu’s narratives of experiences. Tables 13 and 14 indicates that Amaryllis, Oprah, Lenora, and Isabella did not report experiences in this category, and during the process of interviews, when pressed about this absence, either said they would rather not speak about them, or said that they never experience these practices.

David-Luke made statements similar to the former—about not wanting to speak about them, but did so when pressed. I did not pursue subject in order to conform to these four women wishes and to not disrupt the relationships. In the case of David-Luke, his resistance was less absolute, and I was able to push the boundaries a bit, and obtain the rich-thick information reflected in his narratives. In addition, pedagogical love, rather than pedagogical lovelessness is the study’s focus, and it was not absolutely necessary to force the point, especially narratives from the other four participants included these.

My guidance counselor laughed at me when I said I wanted to be a doctor. This case of pedagogical lovelessness is painful to Ayele as he said, and to me as the researcher. It was even more painful, because it came from a guidance counselor who had ethical responsibilities to provide a nurturing, safe, and helpful environment where practices associated with principles of beneficence rather than malfeasance is a professional, human, and ethical mandate. Ayele’s experience represents, not just lovelessness, Sadistic Love as Freire describes it. This is horrible. However, incidents like this are parts of students’ lived realities I have found, and exposing them, as well as
presenting them as part of this study, I hope is a part of the healing and corrective process needed.

Ayele said he spoke to his guidance counselor, “because growing up in a poor neighborhood no one knows anything about gonna college enough to give me the advice I needed at that time.” He said this happened in the ninth grade, and that “I told him, I told him about my desire—that I want to be a doctor, and what steps I should take?” Ayele said his “counselor wouldn't help me, he just laughed, because I barely spoke English.—I didn't really know. He discouraged me,” Ayele pointed out.

These painful words describe Freire’s sadistic pedagogical love. They speak for themselves, and no words need to be added. Ayele told his family’s story of what led to his desire for being the physician he now is. He continued talking about this experience, adding:

You see I have always wanted to be a doctor because in North-West Africa where I lived, there was no doctors for good medical care and my mom lost her first boy—before me because they broke his skull at the delivery—the midwife, because there was no doctor. And that almost happened to me, I have the mark on my skull to show it. So I promised myself when I came to this country to be a doctor, and to go back there and help.

Ayele added that this guidance counselor was the only one for his school, and that “He was our guidance counselor,” that this counselor was “the only person that could help me who was in that position.” Fortunately, he had Ms. Morrow, his teacher described as a practitioner of Freirean pedagogical love, and she helped in developing some of the sills that took him on his successful journey to being a Doctor in a Major
North-East Urban City today. This is what pedagogical love seeks as a transformative, humanizing, successful outcome.

She seems indifferent and probably overwhelmed. Sometimes it can be as Zhihu said guidance counselors are sometimes overwhelmed and therefore maybe seen as indifferent. In her experience, she said, “the school tends to assign the same language-speaking people to the same guidance counselor,” and as a result, “she’s probably overwhelmed because we have a lot of students and it’s probably all the Chinese were assigned to her.” Zhihu describes her situation, saying, “It’s just like a doctor’s appointment, sometimes, even though they spend the same 10 minutes with you, some doctors say different thing.” She said some doctors “make you feel like they care about you, but other doctors just seem to do the routine work and once their done they kick you out of their office.” Her guidance counselor she indicated fell in the latter category, saying that she was “just putting in work and I felt like she would make sure that I would graduate and she doesn’t really mind any other business.” That seeing her guidance counselor felt “like it’s just a regular check-in—just not anything special that she cares a lot about.” Zhihu also indicated that guidance counselors are humans, so like everyone else they err.

Outcomes—Conscientizagao, Praxis, and Giving Back

As indication of how conscientizagao—conscious critical awareness that leads to praxis or knowledgeable action operates within the Freirean model grounded in pedagogical love, Amaryllis experiences serve as but one example. Amaryllis as well as other participants’ experiences bears evidence of the applicability and usefulness of the
Freirean approach within P-12 U.S. 21st-century educational settings.

As an indication of conscious critical awareness, Amaryllis points to the transformative, empowering, and humanizing effects of her education. She states, “I was the first generation to graduate from high school,” and therefore consciously aware of this new path she created as a new vision in her family’s tradition. This new family tradition represents the successful transformative, empowering, and humanizing educational outcome grounded in her achievement of a high school diploma and the hopes and possibilities of college education and bigger dreams associated with these accomplishments that Freire speaks of.

In reflecting on her education—in exercising what Freire describes as conscientizagao emerging from a critical awareness, Amaryllis said her teacher’s influence and the education they gave, Amaryllis credited her teachers for this success saying, “My high school teachers would make sure that we went make every school day.” She also said, her teachers “made sure that we basically got out of our comfort zone and did everything that we thought we could not do. And that she plans to pay it forward, by giving back some of what she gained from this educational journey through high school to college and beyond.

As evidence of praxis, all seven adult participants are actively involved with paying-forward and giving back to society. Amaryllis for example points out that she was the first of her generation or any other family member as far as she knows, to graduate from high school. She added that she takes her teacher’s advice that “they told us that everything in life could be taken away from you except for your knowledge,” and
that she plans to pass that on as she mentor in a way that she was by her teachers, especially those of Sister’s Keepers.

I'm drawing up a vision plan. As part of praxis, Amaryllis said, “Right now I am actually working on getting a non-profit organization within my community. And it’s basically gonna be what my teachers and my counselors instilled in me. As part of the process, she states that “I am tutoring, and a Big Sister’s and Big Brother programs, and I'm gonna have computers on the weekend, homework days, and times where we do mock interviews and build resumes.” Part of this Amaryllis points out is to, “Just basically show them that there are more choices, there is a bigger world.” She said, “And it’s basically going to be what my teachers and my counselors instilled in me, I’m going to put that into my organization.”

Amaryllis said, “I’m drawing up a vision plan because I don’t want to just step out there and fail.” She said, “I’m drawing up a vision plan with one of my social work [college] teachers. He's helping me.”

A humble physician. Ayele is a physician practicing in an underserved Major North-East Urban City hospital, researching and work with minority patients. Ayele said becoming a physician emerged from his mother’s grief resulting from his brother’s death in childbirth, because there was none where he lived in northeast Africa. In addition, his experiences in the U.S. as ninth grade new immigrant student, not knowing much English, and how he felt when his guidance counselor laughed at him when he told him his desire to become a doctor, are indelible memories he said, which make him humble and “aware of how the poor live and how people sometimes treat them.” Ayele’s
humility, compassion, and humanized attitudes and behaviors, are all responses—
outcomes of an educational approach grounded the Freirean transformative educational
model, grounded in pedagogical love, which is the focus of this study’s exploration.

Mentoring, teaching, educating. Lenora is a certified teacher currently perusing
studies towards a doctorate in education. When asked what will be her dream position
after graduating she said:

A dream position for me would be on staff at a university, focusing on making policies and developing curriculum and programs for first- and second-year students, which ensure that they did graduation. That would be ideal.

As a current high school teacher part of her pedagogic practices with her 18 and 19-year-old “babies” as she calls them, involves methods she learned from Miss Forest, her teacher whose practices reflects elements of this study’s Freirean approach. She said: Miss Forest taught me something that I adopted as an educator,” that “it’s something that I push probably more than anything,” the concept of critically. She said, referring to her students that if they “Don’t know how to critically think; and that if:

You don’t know how to defend your thought, and you don’t know how to speak out information available, and to support what it is that you think. Or if you don’t know how to question your own thought—because a lot of times, we feel the way we feel because of our upbringing, not because it’s actually how we process the world—

Here the emphasis on critical thinking within a dialogic process was what Miss Forest taught Lenora, and in a regenerative way associated with the Freirean method, she passes this on to the next generation as a teacher in a generative, loving, humanizing, and transformative approach.
Like Lenora, Oprah plans to be an educator who said that, “as long as I can remember, I wanted to become a teacher,” and that “Everything that I've learned and my background,” have prepared her for this professional vocation. Her opening epigraph to this section in which she points out that, “As a teacher it’s your job to go out and learn more about the student,” about not talking or looking “down to them,” “is a telling statement of her commitment and approach to a model like that grounded in Freirean pedagogical love.

In a similar tone, Zhihu speaks of her current mentoring activities, saying that she is helping high school apply, prepare, and walk alongside them on their college journey. Zhihu states that her educational experiences taught her that, “Sometimes very little things can definitely change other people’s lives without knowing.” Saying:

*And right now I’m like helping high school kids to apply for college. And whenever I’m with a student, I think of when they [her teachers] were helping me. So it just makes me be a better person and be helpful to other people as well. I think the purpose is the same aspect when I was in that college program. Making sure the students have all the resources and are available for them to go to college and make sure that they can stay on track.*

Zhihu, this show, as a recipient of pedagogical practices associated with the Freirean model, is, like Matthew, Ayele, Lenora, Oprah, and Amaryllis carrying on, mentoring, teaching, educating, giving back in a regenerative way associated with Freirean pedagogical love.

These are outcomes of the regenerative, transformative, and humanizing educational success of the Freirean model, this study explores. David-Luke and Isabella are not there yet, but there is hope in the possibilities, that when their turn comes around
later in life, that they too will represent this model, and the journey associated with. This is what Freirean pedagogical love, the hope, the possibilities, this model offers as replacement for a “climate of hopelessness,” that dehumanization and oppression brings, as Freire (2005) states.

Section Summary

As in Matthew’s middle school narrative, the six high school experiences in these high school reflections uses students’ voices as a source of valuable-deep insights into how elements of this study’s Freirean model operates in U.S. classrooms represented. It offers insights into how out-of-school institutions such as the church in both Oprah and amaryllis’s experiences are part of the “educational village,” that supports positive learning outcomes—validating Freire’s learning to community connections.

Although direct parental influences are not present in these high school experiences, teachers like Mrs. Charlestone and Ms. Barrett maintained these connections by staying in touch with both students’ parents. Examples of parental-like support by these teachers emerges from Ms. Barrett’s parental advice to Oprah about her behavior and how it interfered with her realizing her full personal potential, about not making career choices only for the money but to “Do what’s in your heart.” A similar parent-like relationship also emerged from Amaryllis and her teacher she describes as “Mama Charlestone.”

The importance of extracurricular activities, offering opportunities for cultural adaptations for Ayele and Zhihu is notable. So is the role of after-school activities from agencies like ROTC as a sources of leadership training, experience, and the
transformative, humanizing empowerment this afforded in both Lenora and Isabella’s experiences. In addition the presence of in-class dialogic, inventive knowledge creating cognitive-building approaches, present for example in Ayele’s experiences with Ms. Morrow; Isabella’s with Mr. Bronwitz; and Zhihu Mr. Leibowitz, all help in positively enhancing this study’s theory to experience investigation.

Overall emic themes from these high school experiences positively align with all of those listed in the study’s Freirean model shown in Tables 2 and 3 frameworks. This differs from the elementary or middle school experiences described where one or more element was absent. This alignment is another positive one that supports the theory to experience alignment this study proposes in three research questions posed.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented extensive excerpts from eight participants’ coded narratives of P-12 experiences with teachers’ whose practices reflected elements of the study’s model of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love outlined in Chapter 2. Table 18 offers a summary of emic themes emerging from these findings and their alignment with the study’s Freirean model.

All participants, except David-Luke, describe experiences as students. Participants’ biographic information in Table 5 outline varying levels of ethnic, regional, and other diversities represented in the study’s population. Although there are eight participants, Table 6 indicates that there are 27 teachers and a wide range of educational and extracurricular experiences represented.
Table 18

Summary of Emic Themes from Participants’ Narratives Within Study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS &amp; OTHER EMIC ELEMENTS</th>
<th>EMIC THEMES OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES, CONSCIENTIZAGAO, PRAXIS, AND GIVING BACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten to Elementary</td>
<td>— Leadership Empowering at Five Years Old — Recognizing all Children are Different — The Discovery Program</td>
<td>— Sending Home Notes about Being Disruptive — The Work is not Challenging Enough — The Loveless Teacher — He would be Sad Sometimes</td>
<td>— Parental Awareness and Parental Action — Sending Son to Non-Public Alternative School Setting — Son Experienced Educational Leadership Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David-Luke, Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Elementary | Pedagogical Lovelessness — First Grade, Kinship, Class, and Privilege; \textit{Saying I Misbehaved and Talked Too Much} — Second Grade with Miss Blond Cultural Incompetence and Pedagogic Lovelessness — Other Emic Themes — Non-Freirean Transformative Element of Storge or Motherly Love Possibly Associated with Noddings (1984) Care Ethics | — The Lightbulb Came on and Something Just Clicked — And She Was Such an Empowerer (sic) — I’m Doing it to Show My Other Black Brothers It is Possible | |
| Matthew, Student | | | |

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>PEDAGOGICAL LOVE</th>
<th>PEDAGOGICAL LOVELESSNESS &amp; OTHER EMIC ELEMENTS</th>
<th>EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES, CONSCIENTIZA GAO, PRAXIS, AND GIVING BACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oprah and Amaryllis, Students</td>
<td><em>They Expected us to Get Pregnant and Drop-out</em>—My Middle School Teacher’s Advice—<strong>Instruction:</strong> Mr. Ricketts Raps, Games, and Little Slogans Helped us to Remember—Ms. Sampsonite Hands-on Approach in Science</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Themes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayele, Student Zhihu, Student Isabella, Student Lenora, Student Oprah, Student Amaryllis, Student</td>
<td><em>The Teachers</em>—Mama Charlestone Checked to See That Things were OK—She Prepare us for the Outside World—Ms. Barnett Kept Me in Check—<strong>Church was Important</strong>—They Do Things to Help the Community—We Would Actually Take Our Report Cards to Church—<strong>Classroom Instruction</strong>—It’s the Relationships You’ve Built—Nurturing Tough Love, Dialogic Circles, and Character Meetings, Her Room Was Not Just Lined—up:—<strong>Extracurricular, Mentoring, and Enrichment Programs</strong>—Amaryllis, Oprah, and My Sister’s Keeper—Lenora and Isabella ROTC—Ayele and Zhihu After-School Clubs</td>
<td>Pedagogical Lovelessness—My Guidance Counselor Laughed at me—She Seems Indifferent and Probably Overwhelmed—<strong>Other Emic Themes</strong>—Storge or Motherly Love Maybe Linked to Noddings (1984) Care Ethics—ROTCA as a Source of Leadership Empowerment—Non-Freirean Transformative Extracurricular, Mentoring, and Enrichment Programs—The Church</td>
<td>I’m Drawing up a Vision Plan—A Humble Physician—Mentoring, Teaching and Educating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter’s findings are sources for addressing the study’s three research questions. In addressing these questions, information shown in Table 18 indicates positive alignments and areas of convergence between emic themes from all participants’ narrative, and etic elements from the study’s Freirean model. Contents of narratives in this chapter outlined in Table 18 also suggest that in the area of conscientizagao, praxis, and giving back as parts of participants’ educational outcomes, this type of education can create adults with tools necessary to operate in regenerative ways as citizens in authentic democracies. Their awareness and desire for involvement in activities and careers associated with working to humanize, lift-up, and empower others in their varying ways, are positive indications. These suggest that these participants and this model can create citizens for the ontological movement towards humanizing those who are dehumanized. Presence of non-Freirean etic elements emerged from participant’s narratives as Table 18 indicates. The last column in this table shows presence of: (1) storge or *motherly love*. It also shows (2) ROTC as a source of transformative leadership empowerment, (3) transformative power of extracurricular, mentoring, and enrichment programs, and (4) the educational transformative element of the church in community education support. The presence of these four non-Freirean elements in participants’ narratives speaks to the power of emic themes from narratives shaping and reshaping the study’s etic direction. It helps in authenticating the preference given to data over theory and other epistemological frameworks such as the study’s FCSJEA.

Overall, this chapter’s findings suggest significant alignments between emic themes emerging from these participants’ narratives and etic ones of the study. This is a
positive indication for the study’s FCSJEA, and responses for the three research questions that seeks answers to the presence, the nature, and the scope of themes from participants’ reflective narratives of educational experiences as students in U.S. P-12 settings, with elements of the Freirean (2005, 2011) model of pedagogical love. Contents of this chapter’s findings proved very useful for positively responding to these questions and for addressing the topic of Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is about possibilities of theory-to-practice applications of Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 education. It uses elements from two of Freire’s works, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005), and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011) as its foundations. It identifies *emic themes* emerging from eight purposefully selected participants’ narratives of their P-12 experiences and compares them to *etic elements* of the study’s FCSJEA that serves as a framework. Emic themes emerge from participants’ narrative of experiences as originally told (Stake, 1995), and etic elements emerge from the researcher’s interest, appearing in areas outside of the stories themselves as evident in this study’s use of the FCSJEA as a theoretical framework.

The purpose of these comparisons is to identify parallels, areas of convergence, and/or areas of divergence between emic themes and etic elements in order to determine applicability of Freire’s model to U.S. P-12 settings. This is necessary because Freire’s ideas, originally applied to adult education in post-colonial Brazil of the 1960s and 1970s, have not been theorized for U.S. settings and applied in this way before. These comparisons also allow for identifying possibilities of practical ways of implementing elements from the study’s findings in a theory-to-practice approach to successful U.S. P-12 strategies for humanizing and socially just educational outcomes among students, especially those identified as failing in the educational achievement gaps (ED, 2015).
Works by authors such as Noguera (2001, 2003a, 2008, 2009, 2012); Noguera and Wing (2006); Carter and Welner (2013); Spring (2011, 2014); Rothstein (2004, 2015); Ferguson (2008); Marable (2006, 2007); Ladson-Billings (1994, 1995, 2004); and many others describe these educational gaps and their dehumanizing effects on students represented in them.

This study utilizes relativist-postmodern ideas of scholarly border crossings, found in Giroux (2005); Kincheloe (2004, 2005, 2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); and Evans (2014). This type of thinking is cognizant of needs for new and viable ways to conceptualize, theorize, discuss, and analyze 21st-century realities driven by technology and flat world globalization that writers like Friedman (2006), Giroux, and others describe. These realities call for new ways of thinking, such as ones found in this relativist approach.

These relativist-postmodern ideas connect to Freire’s reinvention and the call for a “constant searching” for new, responsible, and diverse ways of increasing presence of historically excluded and voiceless human beings within the boundaries of empirical scholarship. These philosophical underpinnings are overall guidelines for ways of thinking about the study’s topic and the three research questions it addresses.

The study uses a qualitative bricolage (Kincheloe, 2004, 2005; Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011), blending a narrative methodology (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) with an instrumental design (Stake, 1995). Results indicate real possibilities for applications of the study’s Freirean model for P-12 applications that are humanizing.
transformative, cognitively uplifting, and inventive in a knowledge-creating model that is beneficial to 21st-century democracies grounded in justice and equity.

Research Questions

There are three research questions:

(1) What emic themes of pedagogical love emerge from participants’ narratives of educational experiences in U.S. P-12 settings?

(2) How do these emic themes from participants’ narratives compare to etic elements of this study’s FCSJEA grounded in pedagogical love?

(3) In theory-to-practice applications, how do findings contribute to 21st-century P-12 transformative and humanizing educational best practices in ways parallel to those sought by the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model?

Summary

In Chapter 1, the study introduced major goals, elements, approaches, and other foundational information. Next, the literature review in Chapter 2 established the study’s FCSJEA as its theoretical framework. This framework places Freire’s ideas within contexts of U.S. P-12 settings for which they were not originally intended for direct applications, even though they are useful to these settings and widely applied in P-12 U.S. education research. In using the study’s FCSJEA in Chapter 2 to link Freire’s ideas to U.S. P-12 settings, it utilizes elements of CT, SJET, and Dewey’s (1997a, 1997b) ideas on the sociopolitical value of a certain type of education. It also uses Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) concepts of how education operates as a sociopolitical change agent to develop this model.
The literature review in Chapter 2 also presented the study’s conceptual framework. This framework guides the research processes, helping in data collection, analysis, and discussions. This framework consists of elements culled from the two Freirean works used as the study’s foundation, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (2005), and Education for Critical Consciousness (2011).

In addition, the literature review of Chapter 2 presented scholarly works and research on Freire’s educational approach and on the concept of Freirean (2005, 2011) pedagogical love. This conceptual framework highlights current research as well as voids in the research on the topic of Freirean pedagogical love in P-12 settings.

Next, Chapter 3 covered issues related to data collection, processing, and analysis. This chapter discussed ways of maintaining ethical standards and related issues such as confidentiality and trustworthiness (Shenton, 2004). It presented the study’s bricolage approach that blends a qualitative narrative (Clandinin & Connelly, 2002) and an instrumental approach (Stake, 1995). Scholars like Kincheloe (2004, 2005) and Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011) argue that a bricolage is best suited for critical research.

Chapter 4 presented narratives of all eight participants’ P-12 experiences with teachers whose practices in some way aligned with the study’s model of Freirean pedagogical love. Contents of these narratives are the study’s data sources and sources of information that directly relate to the first research question that calls for descriptions of naturalistic emic themes from participants’ narratives as told, as Stake (1995), Clandinin and Connelly (2000), and others like Creswell (2008), Lincoln and Guba
(1985), and Denizen and Lincoln (2003) call for. In relation to the second research question, each experience in this chapter was unique, despite positive alignments with the Freirean model the study uses. The presence of non-Freirean themes not associated with the study’s model also emerged as important findings and warrants further exploration in theory-to-practice research. There was also important theory-to-practice indications associated with the third research question emerging from this chapter’s contents.

This final chapter, Chapter 5, offers a summary and discussion of major findings, limitations, and recommendations for future research on the topic of Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings related to the investigation of this study’s topic and related research questions. Although findings are not generalizable beyond the study’s population, possibilities of Stake’s (1995) petite-generalizations are possible. Figure 5 illustrates possible applications of these petite-generalizations in relation to 21st-century best practices in the classroom associated with this study’s Freirean model discussed in Chapter 2, its conceptual frameworks in that same chapter, as well as this chapter’s recommendations.

Discussions

While there is an abundance of research and theorizing on Freire’s ideas as applied to U.S. P-12 settings, not many explore the concept of Freirean pedagogical love. There is also absence of empirical theory-to-practice research reflecting students’ voices in these experiences. Most noteworthy works on Freirean pedagogical love either theorize without practical applications, to adult and not P-12 settings—such as Barrett
This study adds participants’ voices as well as P-12 experiences and practices described to the pool of theory-to-practice research on Freirean pedagogical love. It contributes by offering the study’s FCSJEA theorizing as an additional way of thinking and applications of Freire’s model in the experiences and settings described. It also hopes to contribute by addressing the three unique research questions, as well as indicating possible practical curriculum, instruction, learning strategies, and approaches shown in Figure 5.

Research Question #1 and the Study’s Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

The first research question asks about emic themes of pedagogical love emerging from participants’ narratives of educational experiences in U.S. P-12 settings. Findings related to this question indicate that collectively, emic themes emerging from participants’ narratives parallel etic elements of the study’s Freirean model. Findings indicate that although emic themes from each participant’s experience varied and were not carbon copies of each other, collectively they all have the 16 etic elements of the Freirean model illustrated in the study’s conceptual model.

Variations in the ways emic themes of pedagogical love emerge from each participant’s unique narrative are not necessarily a negative outcome, but rather a positive one indicating presence and support for the study’s relativist posture. These variations indicate possibilities of accommodations for individual differences and realities played out in this model. It indicates opposition to positivists’ assertions of the banking
approach, which seeks standardized, uniform, and one-size-fits-all approaches that Freire, critical social justice theorists, and educators argue against.

Storge love and motherly caring. In relation to the first research question, not all emic themes parallel nor converge with etic elements of the study’s original Freirean model. The presence of storge or motherly love is an important example. In Matthew’s experiences described in relation to Mrs. Salmon and Doctor Bozeman, for example, he speaks about this by referring to the pedagogic relationship as one of a mother and son. Matthew said she had no children of her own, and in her eyes, he felt that she treated him as if he was her own child. He cited the fact that she and Mrs. Salmon came to his high school graduation even though they were his elementary school teachers. Near tears, he also recounted that Doctor Bozeman “literally sent me to college with $500.00.” After completing his education to the doctoral level, he remarked, “I know she’s watching down on me, but she wasn’t able to witness, to see like the hard work that she put in for me and having the conversation with me even outside of elementary school.” Doctor Bozeman’s husband alluded to this in his conversations with Matthew, saying his wife would be proud of his educational and life achievements if she were alive.

Similar presence of motherly and storge caring emerged from Oprah’s and Amaryllis’s experiences with teachers of Sister’s Keeper. Amaryllis’s reference to Mrs. Charleston as Mama Charleston, Lenora’s references to Mrs. Forest’s “motherly” reference to her students as “her babies,” and Ayele’s reference to Miss Morrow’s “mothering” are examples. The presence of these elements in participants’ experiences were not problematic to the Freirean framework used to discuss and analyze them.
Although present, these different types of pedagogic love and caring did not alter the social justice outcomes present in these experiences. Moreover, The Freirean relativist and accommodating model does not preclude existence of this type of love, since they too, based on the findings, support educational outcomes of the study’s Freirean love.

ROTC, clubs, teams, and student empowerment. Like the presence of emic themes involving pedagogic love of the store or motherly type, the presence of student empowerment through their involvement with extracurricular activities including ROTC also represents a divergence from the original Freirean model illustrated in the conceptual frameworks of Tables 2 and 3. The telling of experiences of leadership empowerment from involvement in extracurricular activities—Lenora and Isabella’s involvement with ROTC, as well as Ayele’s and Zhihu’s participation in cultural clubs, teams, and other afterschool activities—serves as these divergent non-Freirean (2005, 2011) examples. In some cases transformative experiences associated with these educational experiences resulted from being in the programs and activities alone and not from actions of any particular teacher. This was Lenora’s experience.

Lenora made it clear that there was no memory of any special teacher’s actions in the ROTC program and reiterated this in iterative questioning during the interview as well as in follow up questions as part of member checking. A similar situation emerged from Isabella’s experience, although mention of an example from one teacher—Sargent Santos “tool-box” lesson was mentioned as important. In Zhihu, Ayele, Oprah, and Amaryllis’s experiences, it was both teachers and programs combined that made them empowering, educative, humanizing, and transformative.
The presence of additional non-Freirean (2005, 2011) elements is a significant finding and warrant deeper investigations and discussions, possibly using the study’s and other similar forms of data. Such explorations also, though significant, are outside the study’s topic, scope, and research questions. To address them adequately, requires answers to larger questions than those the study is able to address.

It is also important to note that the existence of these non-Freirean elements is not problematic within boundaries of its relativist critical social justice stance; a stance that embraces new inventions and reinventions, such as those emerging from this study’s participants’ experiences. Their presence and its cohesion with the study’s model indicates the elastic boundaries of this model and its ability to accommodate unique themes associated with individual journeys of pedagogical love in these diverse P-12 settings.

Overall, in relation to the first research question, this theory-to-practice exploration indicates emic themes aligned positively with etic ones illustrated in the study’s conceptual framework. Despite the presence of divergent elements such as storge-motherly type caring practices, these did not conflict but supported outcomes of the study’s model. These are positive indications for this study’s theory-to-practice exploration of the Freirean model within the study’s relativist, differentiated, and provisional approach.

Research Question #2 and the FCSJEA Conceptual Framework

Research question number two seeks to take emic themes from participants’ narratives associated with research question one and compare them to etic elements of
this study’s FCSJEA approach. This second research question links to the first by extending the search beyond merely identifying emic themes in participants’ narratives *per se*, to a broadened goal of comparing these elements of the study’s FCSJEA. Since they positively aligned with etic elements of the study’s FCSJEA and its conceptual framework, discussions of the first research question touched on the second question.

This alignment between emic themes in narratives with etic ones of the study’s FCSJEA was a bit surprising. Outside of the purposeful selection criterion selection and purposeful directing of questions seeking to draw-out participants’ authentic experiences, there was no other attempt at shaping the data to fit the study’s model. Coding occurred in an organic way, making themes emerge in the naturalistic way Stake (1995), Clandinin and Connelly (2000), Owen, (2008), and others describe—without considerations of the study’s framework at this stage. It was the initial coding related to the first question for example, that divergent themes of storge love and extracurricular leadership empowerment flowed from the data. All attempts at maintaining the purity of the emic nature of the data was made in this study in a Freirean justice sort of way found in Aluwihare-Samaranayake (2012); Bazeley (2013); Geertz (1973); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013); and Creswell (2007, 2014).

The FCSJEA and humanizing pedagogical love. Consistent with findings for research question one, research question two indicates significant parallels and areas of convergence between emic themes from participants’ narratives and etic elements of this study’s FCSJEA model. Etic elements of the study’s FCSJEA, for example, aligned with etic themes emerging from Matthew’s social justice conversations with Doctor Bozeman.
In these conversations, Doctor Bozeman raised Matthew’s awareness—conscientization, making him realize the dehumanizing injustices of his teachers’ talk about him misbehaving and being disruptive. This helped Matthew develop the ability to take action—praxis in the Freire model, that ultimately led to his successful educational and life outcomes.

Evidence of pedagogically loving practices of social justice that aligns with the FCSJEA grounded in pedagogical love also emerged from Isabella’s and Lenora’s ROTC experiences, as well as Oprah and Amaryllis’s experiences with teachers and mentors of My Sister’s Keepers. In Isabella’s case, Sergeant Santos toolbox lessons, as “something that we keep always with us,” and is useful whenever “you approach something new or difficult in your life,” for digging in, taking out, and using in that new experience. This is not just a metaphor for life, but a lesson in this discussion, which parallels dialogic, critical awareness and action oriented movements associated with praxis, in the Freirean word to world approach of the FCSJEA the study uses. “It was great,” as Isabella, said.

In the examples of Sister’s Keepers, Oprah’s statement regarding Mrs. Barnett visiting her home next to the prison and sharing the advice to never let “income affect your outcome,” is another of the many poignant experiences linked to the social justice model of the FCSJEA and the second research question. Mrs. Barnett’s adage that even though you “stay [sic] next-door to a prison or a zoo,” it should not define you is a life lesson that points to the social justice of the FCSJEA. This along with later steps involving college tours, guidance through applications, and providing useful word to world tools for life as part of the P-12 education process for both Oprah and Amaryllis,
makes Sister’s Keepers and their role as part of the education process valuable models for the theory-to-practice applications of the FCSJEA. All these actions helped in ensuring that these students’ journeys ended as successful transformative and humanizing ones. These are outcomes rooted in the equity and social justice-seeking model, making these teachers of the year exemplars for this approach.

Similar and equally profound examples emerged from Ayele’s and Zhihu’s experiences with Ms. Morrow, Mr. Leibowitz, and their after school clubs and team activities. Zhihu’s acknowledgement that her education made her “a better person, helpful to other people,” in ways beneficial to toleration and social justice diversity associated with the FCSJEA was indicated in this question. Zhihu points out that this type of education “was [a] very important factor in my life.” Additionally, all participants except David-Luke’s son—who is too young—had outcomes associated with giving back in ways similar to those grounded in the study’s FCSJEA.

Overall, in relation to the second research question, findings from seven of the eight participants indicate significant parallels and areas of convergence between emic themes from participants’ narratives and etic elements of this study’s FCSJEA model. The eighth participant, David-Luke, whose son’s experiences he describes, has not concluded in the adult outcomes indicated by the other participants and is therefore, not available. This suggests that this study’s FCSJEA grounded in the transformative, humanizing, knowledge creating, social justice, and equity seeking model of Freire’s pedagogic practices of love is a useful one for these participants’ experiences. It indicates that these transformative experiences, as a part of the P-12 education of these
participants, supports the assertions that this study’s model is a useful one for a *Word to World*—theory-to-practice approach, it argues in favor of.

The FCSJEA and dehumanizing injustices of pedagogical lovelessness. In relation to the second research question that compares emic *themes* from participants’ narratives to *etic elements* of this study’s Freirean model, findings indicate an unexpected larger than anticipated presence of *pedagogical lovelessness* in these narratives. This element, though present in the study’s Freirean model grounded in pedagogical love, is not a major focus of the study, its framework, or research questions. Its appearance in all except Lenora, Isabella, Oprah, and Amaryllis’s narratives was cause for a closer examination of this phenomenon.

A re-examination of narratives suggests that discussions of pedagogical lovelessness were juxtaposed against experiences of pedagogical love. In these narratives, experiences of pedagogical lovelessness by themselves were unimportant, and were of value only because they clarified experiences of pedagogical love by serving as reinforcing-contrasting experiences. For example, David-Luke made it clear that he had no interest in talking about the loveless teacher; however, this was necessary for the researcher to gain deeper understandings of experiences and the role pedagogical love played in the overall big-picture. The same was the case in Ayele’s experience where hurt and pain associated with the loveless experiences resulted in only short, hesitant, and brief mentions, valued only because they enlightened understandings of the place Miss Morrow’s practices held in his education and life experiences that led to his transformative, empowering and humanizing outcomes.
This juxtaposition of these two opposing elements—(1) pedagogical lovelessness, the source of the problem; and (2) pedagogical love, its antithesis and the solution of the problem, brings the Hegelian dialectic into focus. It brings the importance of not just a need for critical awareness of the solutions found in pedagogical love—the thesis and solution, but also an equally critical awareness of the need for knowing and learning about the problem itself—the antithesis as Hegel, Marx, and Freire argue. This was a philosophical piece missing from original discussions of the study’s frameworks and emerge quite clearly from the narratives and the data they produced. This is also important for practitioners seeking solutions without first seeking understanding of the problem, a flaw this study is reveals, and is a source of serious limitations had it not emerged in these narratives.

One of the extreme cases of pedagogical lovelessness was reflected in Ayele’s experience. Ayele explained how his guidance counselor laughed at him when he expressed the desire to become a doctor, saying his English was too poor to pursue this career. This case of pedagogical lovelessness is painful for Ayele and even as the researcher, I felt his pain and sense of revulsion. It was even more painful, because it came from a guidance counselor who had ethical responsibilities to provide a nurturing, safe, and positive environment where practices associated with principles of beneficence rather than malfeasance is a professional, human, and ethical mandate. Ayele’s experience represent, not just lovelessness, sadistic love, as Freire describes it. This is horrible. However, incidents like this are parts of students’ lived realities I have found,
and exposing them, as well as presenting them as part of this study, I hope is a part of the healing and corrective process.

_A Hegelian pause._ The larger than expected presence of pedagogical loveliness calls for this Hegelian dialectical pause since this Hegelian element is central to Freire’s epistemology and is not included as part of this study. It was considered irrelevant and distanced from the subject of discussion; however, its appearance now makes it relevant and worthy of this moment’s discussion. In recognizing this element, I considered the way participants juxtaposed pedagogical love in relation to pedagogical lovelessness in order to bring light to the former. David-Luke pointing out that he would rather talk about pedagogical love in his son’s experiences is an example. In order to bring light to that issue, he had to juxtapose this against actions of lovelessness in order for pedagogical love to shine.

The presence of pedagogical lovelessness emerged not because it was the focus but because both participant and myself as the researcher had to delve into the very antithesis of our subject of focus in order to understand the phenomenon of focus, i.e., pedagogical love. To understand pedagogical love, an understanding of its antithesis, pedagogical lovelessness, is necessary. This emerged from the ways that the stories were told, as well as possibly, unintentional iterative questioning of experiences of pedagogical lovelessness.

As a researcher, I delved into these experiences even when participants, such as David-Luke’s narrative of his son’s experiences, explicitly state they would rather spend time talking about practices of pedagogical love rather than lovelessness. This was not
feasible since that would be insufficient to describe the full details of his son’s experience. The same was the case in Matthew’s experience. Focusing only on pedagogical love to the exclusion of pedagogical lovelessness would result in a skewed version of these rich experiences.

Following this line of thought, as educators, scholars and policymakers, knowledge of what hurts education is necessary in order to develop adequate solutions. Similar to understanding lovelessness, a knowledge and understanding of sources of education dehumanization and other oppressive conditions are vitally necessary. Discussions of these are outside of this study’s scope and content but widely discussed by scholars such as Manning Marable, Diane Ravitch, Joel Spring, Pedro Noguera, Prudence Carter, Richard Rothstein, Ladson-Billings, and others too numerous to mention here.

Research Question # 3 and Word to World Implications

In Freire, knowledge gained through studies like this is of no significance or value if it does not translate into real world applications (Freire & Macedo, 1998). Freire (2005, 2011) also uses the less cited term of “theory of action” to describe this praxis found in theory-to-practice—word to world applications, which links learning and the knowledge creating processes to usable humanizing actions of educational transformations. These ideas link to the third research question, which asks about theory-to-practice applications and how findings contribute to transformative and humanizing educational best practices in ways parallel to those in the study’s Freirean (2005, 2011) model.
Caveats to the third research question. Answering this third question calls for three caveats related to Freire’s relativism and the nature of petite-generalizations associated with qualitative narrative studies like this (Stake, 1995). The first caveat relates to the philosophical relativism of Freire and the critical social justice approach this study uses. This makes answers to the third research question provisional and ripe for other Freirean reinventions and border crossing adaptations and interpretations, which scholars like Giroux (2005); Kincheloe (2004, 2005, 2008); Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011); and Evans (2014) call for. This is therefore no positivist, one-size-fits-all standardized response but more like philosophical and practical guidelines for practices seeking the sociopolitical and humanization outcomes the Freirean model.

The first caveat also involves mandated differentiation involved in student-centered approaches that requires and understanding of the multiple realities of students we teach. Freire’s call for the teacher-as-researcher investigations before instruction begins is a vital and necessary part of this process and a practical 21st-century best practice for gaining necessary insights for this approach. It also helps to bring teachers-as-learners as advocates and activists into the community of the children they serve. This is vital to 21st-century U.S. P-12 education where disconnections between schools and communities are often the lived realities.

The third caveat involves the inability of a qualitative study like this to offer positivist or grand generalizations that Stake (1995); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Creswell (2007, 2014); Shenton (2004); Merriam (2009); Denzin and Lincoln (2003); Lincoln and Guba (1985), and many others experts in the field point out. However, in
using Stake’s petit-generalizations and Shadish, Cook, and Campbell’s (2002) assertions about possibilities of the sufficiency of qualitative generalizations on “on rare occasion,” this study takes the leap of posing and addressing the third research question. It is about exploring and challenging new boundaries in the field as Giroux and Kincheloe explain. With this said, keeping these three considerations in mind and realizations that this is neither easy nor comfortable—as narratives in Nieto (2008), and Darder (2002, 2017) shows—this study offers practices associated with ones illustrated in Figure 5, as possibilities for answers to the third research question.

The need for the FCSJEA in U.S. P-12 classrooms. In offering suggestions of best practices, this study also reiterates the need for this method as discussed earlier in this chapter and in Chapter 4. The presence of emic themes of pedagogical lovelessness in the four narratives—Ayele, Matthew, Zhihu, and David-Luke in the telling of his son’s experience—has critical social justice implications for the study’s FCSJEA. They point to the need for the study’s critical social justice agenda and pedagogic practices it recommends and advocates for by using the Freirean model illustrated in Figure 5.

These ideas and approaches are necessary in the face of the injustices and dehumanizing educational experiences associated with pedagogical lovelessness in these four narratives. Ayele’s experience of having a guidance counselor laugh when he expressed a desire to pursue medicine as an immigrant learning English serves as a heartbreaking example that should never happen in a child’s schooling. Ayele is now a physician in a major inner-city NY hospital. As a student and as a parent, I have experienced the same type of discounting and disregard.
Like David-Luke, my husband and I intervened to ensure educational justice for our children in the first grade and again at the start of middle school. Pedagogical love is a possible way of working to eradicate these injustices against vulnerable children and all children. It is a model that contributes, as narratives indicate, to successful transformative outcomes of democratic justice, human rights education, and the humanization in education called for by Foshay (1991); Freire (2005, 2011); the UN (1948); UNESCO (2016); and the U.S. Department of Education (ED., 2011).

Challenges of implementing the FCSJEA in U.S. P-12 classrooms. In offering these guidelines, the study understands that this is neither comfortable nor easy. Obstacles and retaliations by school leaders as well as parents against at these attempts at implementing FCSJEA do lead to violent acts such as the fires at the Berkeley school project described by Noguera (2003) and Noguera and Wing (2006). Teachers’ fears of retaliation including loss of their jobs when taking these actions are real possibilities as Nieto (2014, 2016) describes. Freire noted these possibilities and lived them. He was exiled and imprisoned for taking these actions as an educator.

These fears and associated actions against providing what this study regards as a good education calls for critical questioning, dialogue, and reflections that include questioning of the historical dogged presence of U.S. educational gaps and failures at resolving them. If Pedro Noguera’s experiences with the Berkeley project is an example, then the answer is obvious—education justice and education equity is a threat to privilege, even as we claim to be the bastion of democracy in the 21st-century. This is an indictment on the system and the source of its resistance to the education called for by
this study, Freire, and so many others. Education of a certain kind, it seems, is subversive where authentic democracy does not exist.

Some suggestions for practical P-12 instruction. The study offers no universal solutions even within the defining boundaries of the topic, data from the eight participants’ narratives, and three research questions of concern. Moreover, nothing replaces Freire (2005, 2011) for guidance on approaches associated with this educational model grounded in pedagogical love. Suggestions for practical P-12 instructions in this subsection therefore represent possibilities, as Freire calls it, for Stake’s (1995) petite-generalizations related to the study’s third research question. These possibilities and their petite generalizations are the contents of Figure 5 and Table 19.

Figure 5 illustrates suggested 21st-century best practices associated with the Freirean model, while Table 19 shows their alignments with ones emerging from participants’ narratives of P-12 experiences. These illustrations represent the theory-to-practice, or word-to-world relationships called for by not just Freire, but by writers such as Amidon (2013), Gaztambide-Fernández (2003), Gottesman (2010), Miedema and Wardekker (1999) who identify this void in critical social justice education research and related literature.

The contents of Figure 5 relates to issues associated with the third research question which asks about theory-to-practice applications and how the study’s findings contribute to transformative and humanizing educational best practices in ways parallel to the Freirean (2005, 2011) model. Supported by information in Table 19, information in this figure suggests positive theory-to-practice applications for the P-12 Freirean model.
Figure 5. Suggested 21st-century best educational practices aligned with study’s Freirean model.
Table 19

*Alignments Between Study’s Suggested 21st-Century Best Practices Alongside Examples from Participants Narratives of P-12 Experiences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTED 21-CENTURY BEST EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES ALIGNED WITH STUDY’S FREIREAN MODEL</th>
<th>EXAMPLES EMERGING FROM PARTICIPANTS’ NARRATIVES OF P-12 EXPERIENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Community Building Pedagogical Practices</td>
<td>All participants, for example outside of school activities such as Sister’s Keepers, ROTC, Clubs and teams, as well as David-Luke’s account of the Discovery program and learning circles experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogic Practices of Student-as-Teacher and Teacher-as-Learner</td>
<td>David-Luke’s account of leadership empowerment at five years old, the Discovery program and learning circles experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue, Criticality &amp; Reflective Practices</td>
<td>All participants, for example Matthew’s conversation With Doctor Bozeman, David-Luke’s conversations and actions associated parental conscientizagao, Zhihu reflections on cultural experiences with diversity, Isabella’s conversation with her ROTC sergeant, Oprah’s actions associated with conversations with her middle school teacher, as well as her and Amaryllis’s experiences with the extracurricular activities of Sisters Keepers, Ayele and Lenora’s experiences with Ms. Morrow and Ms. Forest and their instructional approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Based and Problem Posing Education</td>
<td>All participants, for example David-Luke’s account of the Discovery program, Ayele, Zhihu, Amaryllis, Oprah, Lenora, and Isabella’s experiences with after school clubs, teams, and ROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educationally Grounded in Student’s Ontologies, Life Experiences, &amp; Realities</td>
<td>Teacher visiting Oprah’s neighborhood and using it as an educative point-of-reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated, Individualized, Student-Centered Instructional Approaches</td>
<td>All participants, for example all of the unique experiences each narrative describe even when they attended the same school at the same time as in Oprah and Amaryllis’s experiences, or same school at different times as Zhihu and Isabella’s experiences show. David-Luke’s direct reference regarding the teacher’s failure to recognize that all children are different points to this also</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Table 19 (continued)

**Alignments Between Study’s Suggested 21st-Century Best Practices Alongside Examples from Participants Narratives of P-12 Experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTED 21-CENTURY BEST EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES ALIGNED WITH STUDY’S FREIREAN MODEL</th>
<th>EXAMPLES EMERGING FROM PARTICIPANTS’ NARRATIVES OF P-12 EXPERIENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practices that Enhances Students’ Leadership Skills and Experience in a Word to World Model (Freire)</td>
<td>All participants, for example leadership empowerment associated with David-Luke’s experiences of his son’s student-as-teacher education, as well as Zhihu, Oprah, Amaryllis, and Ayele after school clubs and teams leadership experiences, and Isabella and Lenora’s ROTC leadership experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Experiential Learning (Dewey) | All participants’ outside-of-class and extracurricular activities such as those involving Amaryllis and Oprah in Sister’s Keepers, David-Luke experiences with his son’s alternative school experiences and the Discovery program, Zhihu and Ayele after school clubs and teams activities, Isabella and Lenora’s ROTC experiences |

| Mentoring By Members of The Village it Takes to Raise a Child—Including Churches | All participants, example, Dr. Bozeman and Mrs. Salmon’s above-and-beyond outside-of school support for Matthew; Amaryllis and Oprah in Sister’s Keepers, Ms. Morrow’s mentoring of Ayele and support for establishing and leading after-school cultural club, Zhihu teacher helping with college application and college advice although this was not a required part of her job or duties, as well as Isabella and Lenora’s ROTC experiences |

| Inside and Outside Classroom—Extracurricular Involvement of Student-as-Teacher and Teacher-as-Learner Model | All participants, for example, all outside-of-class and extracurricular activities such as those involving Amaryllis and Oprah in Sister’s Keepers, David-Luke experiences with his son’s alternative school education, Zhihu and Ayele after school clubs and teams activities, Isabella and Lenora’s ROTC experiences, and Oprah’s teacher taking her home and discovering her “lived realities” |
Table 19 indicates alignments in 10 areas of best practices in Figure 5 examples drawn from participants’ narratives of P-12 experiences. These experiences discussed in Chapter 4 include the church’s involvement, leadership experiences associated with extracurricular activities with clubs, teams, and mentoring groups such as Sister’s Keepers and ROTC, and the presence of motherly storge-type caring. All these elements represent non-Freirean (2005, 2011) ones and their presence is significant evidence of Freire’s *reinvention* in applications to 21st-century U.S. P-12 education.

Information in Table 19 indicates that David-Luke’s experience was the only one in which pedagogic practices of *student-as-teacher* and *teacher-as-learner* emerged. Similarly, Oprah’s experience of having her teacher visiting her home and neighborhood was the only one that provided evidence of education grounded in students’ ontologies, life experiences, and realities that Freire’s and this study’s model call for.

Table 19 also indicates that there are areas of best practices emerging in *all*—not just *some* participants’ educational experiences. For instance, all experiences involved teachers whose commitments and practices extended beyond classroom instruction to include extracurricular activities such as those found in Sister’s Keepers, ROTC, and clubs and teams. This is significant in the theory-to-practice, word-to-world applications of the third research question.

In addition, Table 19 shows alignments and presence of practices associated with differentiated, and individualized, student-centered instructional approaches called for by Freire, emerging from *all* participants’ experiences. This table also revealed practices and mentoring associated with *all* participants’ experiences. These outside-of-classroom
instructional methods helped in enhancing students’ learning, leadership skills, and experiences in word-to-world ways that Freire describes. Dewey’s experiential learning involves this and these methods relate to the third research theory-to-practice question.

Overall, it appears that teachers’ commitments go beyond traditional, banking classroom instruction. They involved extracurricular outside-of-classroom activities that seem critically important to the operation of this model grounded in pedagogical love. This achieves the humanizing, cognitively uplifting, and transformative outcomes the eight narratives in this study describe. These best practices represented in Table 19 and Figure 5, are neither new nor unique to Freire. For example, strategies such as dialogue, criticality, reflective practices, collaborative instruction grounded in student-as-teacher and teacher-as-learner approaches, as well as problem-posing and problem-solving educational strategies go back to times of ancient civilizations in Plato, Aristotle, and Confucian approaches. These are still good 21st-century best practices even though ontological contexts have changed drastically since those times.

Practicing these approaches requires building communities of like-minded teachers for scholastic and moral support. Teacher collaboration is an important component not discussed in this study because of its nature, focus, and scope, but it is essential to pedagogic practices involving the Freirean approach. Nieto (2008) and Darder (2002, 2017) are the only two works to date that focus on Freirean pedagogical love in U.S. P-12 settings. They are useful starting points in word-to-world instructional practices. In addition, related works not involving the study’s FCSJEA or the Freirean elements of pedagogical love are also useful supplements. Geneva Gay’s (2018)
Culturally Responsive Teaching is an example. Although using the language of race, guidelines found in Ladson-Billings’s (1995) But That’s Just Good Teaching is another. A practical guide for building classroom communities for example, found in Gibbs’s (2001) Reaching All by Creating Tribes Learning Communities is another good starting point.

Self-study resources related to Freirean elements shown in Figure 5 is also useful for implementing this model in P-12 instruction and learning. Collaborative team teaching or meetings with likeminded teachers are also other possible approaches. Books and instructional guides—preferably ones in the critical social justice traditions, are useful guides. Instructional guides associated with elements such teaching and learning in groups, developing autonomous student learning, student-centered, individualized, differentiated as well as collaborative community building practices found in problem-based project learning are also great starting points. Finally, mentoring and involvement in after school activities—not going home when the end-of-the-day bell rings as one participant states—allows for the type of transformative pedagogic practices associated with the study’s model. These outside-of-classroom extracurricular activities were critical in the narratives of Ayele, Zhihu, Oprah, Amaryllis, and David-Luke account of his son’s involvement in the Discovery program.

Practicing this type of education calls for the intentionality of beliefs outlined in this figure, and found in the critical awareness of the social justice educational model in Nieto (2008), Darder (2002, 2017), and in this study’s narratives. This purposeful, deliberate intentionality is a foundational requirement and awareness that education is
neither neutral, harmless, nor inert. Without this purposeful and intentional awareness shown in Figure 5, movements from naïve inaction or pedagogical lovelessness to those involving practices of pedagogical love is naught—nothing, zero, it cannot exist as Freire and this study argues. Without this, the whole system falls apart, failing to achieve any of the anticipated outcomes this study describes.

The FCSJEA and hopes for possibilities in Freire (2005, 2011). By presenting this study and instructional guidelines in Figure 5, this study hopes to both contribute in some small but significant way to conversations on these best practices. It invites others to enter these conversations in hope of expanding the literature on this subject, and generate the morphogenesis changes that Archer (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) describes, and Freire (2005, 2011) calls for. This study also hopes to invite others to increase the velocity and volume of this research by engaging larger numbers of participants and voices to levels that adds more certainties of theory-to-practice applications. This would add more relativist certainties needed for applications that operate as change agents, generating outcomes that significantly affect successful educational outcomes in a humanizing and transformative way. This would create citizens and the type of society grounded in equity and justice needed to face 21st-century realities. The desire is to indicate clearer paths for practical usefulness of this model as a transformative and humanizing one, which is capable of building clear paths to democratic justice and equity called for by Freire and others.

In addition, this study hopes it can in some way answer Nita Freire’s call at the Larnaka, Cyprus in September 2017 for use of Freire’s ideas in ways that supports
“tolerance through dialogue.” It also hopes to answer scholarly calls, in a small way, for more research to practice applications of Freire’s ideas and critical social justice ideas in general for P-12 settings in the U.S. made by writers such as Amidon (2013), Gaztambide-Fernández (2003), Gottesman (2010), and Miedema and Wardekker (1999). It hopes to keep the conversations of education as a knowledge-creating tool, a cognitively uplifting and inventive tool, a human right, a humanizing force leading to roads of more authentic, and a loving, just, and equitable 21st-century democratic systems at the fore. This is the hope. This is the legacy of Freire. These are the possibilities this study seeks.

Limitations

The study’s limitations link to its relativist, postmodern, 21st-century border crossings stance, which prevents positivists’ generalizations and limitations associated with the very nature of qualitative narrative studies like this, where positivist generalizations are almost never allowed. Writers such Kincheloe (2008); Shenton (2004); Merriam (2009); Creswell (2007, 2014); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Denzin and Lincoln (2003); and many others in the field also points to these restrictions. Stake’s (1995) petit generalizations are ones possible.

Findings from this type of research are localized, provisional, and limited to the experiences described by the participants. It is also limited to the three research questions and elements directly related to the study’s scope and content. This study claims no certainties beyond that included, nor applications beyond the experiences of the eight participants.
Another limitation relates to researcher as instrument, another inherent quality of the qualitative narrative method this study uses. This is a problematic area that writers including Shenton (2004); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Caine, Estefan, and Clandinin (2013); Creswell (2007, 2014), and Merriam (2009) argue pose threats such as ones related to validity and trustworthiness, linked to the human element of researcher’s bias. As the researcher I am responsible for decisions starting with selection of the topic, research questions, participant selection processes including who and under what circumstances serves as participants, as well as activities related to the interpretation, theming, coding, analysis, and data presentation.

In these processes, supervision by my dissertation committee, provisions, and requirements of the Mercer IRB processes that incudes training by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) raised my awareness and need for mindful and responsible actions in these areas. In addition, mindful adherence to ethical conduct required by standards of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Code of Ethics (2011) and Shenton’s (2004) trustworthiness pointers help to keep my own personal biases that would alter this study in an unethical or unscholarly manner. Aluwihare-Samaranayake’s (2012) social justice principles of humanization, human rights, and human respect, are research and methodological guidelines I followed. My own Freirean critical social justice beliefs are additional constraints to unjust, unfair, or unethical conduct. Collectively, these actions all contributed to building both validity, trustworthiness, and a guarantee of ethical conduct throughout all processes of this research.
There are also triangulation limitations to this study’s approach. The original intent was to use participant journaling as part of the process, but as the research progressed, processes of member checking demanded more time from participants than initially anticipated. I felt that asking for journaling would place unfair burdens on them as working people in demanding and involved careers—many attending college at the same time.

Offsetting this limitation was the fact that I visited Matthew’s community and explored the places involved in his story. I also spoke to David-Luke’s wife outside of interviewing her husband and followed Facebook postings of their son’s educational activities and accomplishments—including a speech he gave as valedictorian. I visited Oprah’s and Lenora’s school and neighborhood and met one of the teachers of Sister’s Keepers. In addition the study’s use of extensive member checking and participants’ inputs in the coding and final organization of narratives, as well as the thick-rich descriptions of Chapter 4 called for by Shenton (2004); Stake (1995); Clandinin and Connelly (2000); Merriam (2009); Creswell (2007, 2014); and Geertz (1973) are parts of the triangulation and validity process.

Finally, restrictions associated with inclusion of participants whose experiences are “success stories” that aligns with the study’s model is also another limiting feature. Ideally, involvement of experiences of academic “failures” of participants for example who did not graduate high school would be useful for presenting a more balanced or realistic picture. However, limits on the study’s scope and content, as well as what can
be realistically included within the time-frame to complete this study, made these inclusions, though valuable, not possible.

Despite these limitations, this study is valuable for the insights it offers from the eight participants’ reflective narratives of P-12 teachers’ practices of pedagogical love and the transformative educational success they reflect. It is in this small and significant manner and in hopes of finding ways of possible theory-to-practice applications of Freire’s ideas of pedagogical love to P-12 education in U.S. settings, that this study seeks to offer. Employing the language of *emic themes* for matters related to participants’ narratives; and *etic elements* when they were not, are ways of maintaining the study’s integrity and trustworthiness by clearly separating, and identifying these two sets of influences, which shapes the study’s discussions and outcomes.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

One area for further research involves the presence of non-Freirean (2005, 2011) elements as Table 18 indicates. The last column in this table shows presence of: (1) storge or *motherly love*. It also shows (2) the ROTC as a source of transformative leadership empowerment, (3) the transformative power of extracurricular, mentoring, and enrichment programs, and (4) the educational transformative element of the church in community education support. These presences are significant findings, and warrant deeper investigations and discussions, possibly using the study’s and other similar forms of data. Such explorations also, though importantly significant, are outside the study’s topic, scope, and research questions. To address them adequately, requires answers to larger questions than those the study is able to directly address.
There are also recommendations for research called for to fill gaps associated the paucity of theory-to-practice research using critical approaches such as Freirean pedagogical love. This is another void that needs to be addressed. This research is important in the face of a persistent historical presence of P-12 educational injustices, most often presented as achievement gaps in NAEP scores (ED, 2015). Discussions on these gaps by scholars such as Noguera (2001, 2003a, 2008, 2009, 2012); Noguera and Wing (2006); Carter and Welner (2013); Spring (2011, 2014); Rothstein (2004, 2015); Ferguson (2008); Marable (2006, 2007); and Ladson-Billings (1994, 1995, 2004) also point to this need.

There is also need for additional research on pedagogical love involving Freire’s works on education outside of Pedagogy of the Oppressed and Education for Critical Consciousness. Barrett’s (2003) dissertation, although including valuable insights into 14 of over 40 works by Freire, does not include exploration of pedagogical love nor does it address U.S. P-12 education. Barrett’s dissertation also focuses on adult education and not P-12 settings.

Based on Barrett’s (2003) work, there is indication for additional research linking Freire to other P-12 educational philosophers such as Dewey and Vygotsky who Barrett indicates, share epistemological groundings in the Frankfurt Post-Marxist traditions. Vygotsky’s ideas in research, I believe, could complement and strengthen both adding greater insights into ideas of the Frankfurt traditions and applications to U.S. P-12 education.
Finally, as indicated in discussions of this study’s limitations, room for further research—particularly case studies involving school, classrooms, or related communities of families could be beneficial for greater understandings of Freirean pedagogical love and its operation within these larger frameworks. These can be useful expansions of this study’s petite generalizations, providing as Stake (1995) argues, additional examples, that can be multiplied into larger numbers of research on the same phenomenon. This can help in making more general conclusions similarly to those Stake’s (1995) petite generalizations describe.

Reflections

My most surprising outcome in this study, relates to the presence of pedagogical lovelessness operating in the Hegelian dialectic manner it presented in these narratives. Hegelian dialects, although relevant to the Freirean and critical traditions of the Frankfurt School, were not considered as part of this study. Its presence, I believe, is justification for arguments of this philosophical approach and emerged naturally and unintentionally in this study.

In addition, as a student myself, and as a parent of two children who faced pedagogical lovelessness as part of their educational journeys, I could relate in a very personal and painful way. Listening, reading, rereading, and writing about these stories, made me aware that these are not isolated cases. I have heard ones like these too often, unfortunately, repeated by parents who are not necessarily poor, uneducated, or unknowing, but ones the public school system and society find ways of marginalizing. David-Luke and Matthew’s story resonates in this way. Hopefully in the long run and in
tandem with Archer’s (1995, 2013a, 2013b, 2016) metamorphosis model—starting with one teacher, with one student, in one classroom at a time—democratic social justice changes will emerge, one of these days, soon. Overall, the journey of embarking, conducting, and completing this dissertation has been one of personal, professional, and spiritual growth. I am transformed, humanized, and enlightened by this process of reinventing Freire and self.
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APPENDIX A

LOOSELY STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SELECTION OF STUDY’S CRITERION-BASED PURPOSEFUL PARTICIPANT SAMPLE
Date________

**Question # (1):** Who are what is the primary person or reason that significantly contributed to your current life success?

**Question # (2):** Would you be where you are in life without this teacher’s contribution?

**Question # (3):** Apart from this teacher, whom else would you ascribe as a contributor to your life successes?

**Question # (4):** Have you experiences any form of marginalization, discrimination, or any form of oppression or dehumanization based on your personal or family attributes or choices?

**Question # (5):** Would you be willing to participate in a study by telling the story of your experiences with this teacher?

**Justification for Question #1:** Goal of asking question is to identify first instinctive response without giving hints or prompting. If the first answer is anyone one other than “a teacher,” then this person would not have met the criteria of experiencing a memorable teacher contributing to their life success, a first requirement for study participation.

**Justification for Question #2:** Follow-up iterative question for validation.

**Justification for Question #3:** To identify other contributors to prospective participant success, and verify scope and extent of teacher’s influence.

**Justification for Question #4:** To identify whether or not this person considers themselves as falling within categories of marginalized groups Freire (2005; 2011) describes as “The Oppressed.”

**Justification for Question #5:** To obtain initial pre-interview verbal consent.
Protocol Guide

For Loosely Structured Interview about Participant’s Experiences with Teacher

Credited for Contribution to their Transformative Educational Success

(1) Participant’s Biographical, Cultural, Social Economic & Related Background Information and Life Experiences Growing-up as a Child Through Adulthood

(2) Participants Current Life Situation

(3) The Transformative Educational Experience Teacher(s) Credited for Contributing to Participant Education and/or Life Success(es)

(4) Characteristics of the Teacher as a Human Being

(5) Characteristics of the Teacher’s Instructional and Educational Approach(s)

(6) Comparisons with other Teachers

(7) Role of Family, Parents, and or/other Caretaker(s)

(8) Instructional Methods and Approaches

(9) Impact on Participant Learning & Education Success

(10) Impact on Participant’s Current Life Situation

(11) Personal Reflections on Overall Experience and Impacts of Current Life Situation(s)
(12) Invitation to Journal on Experience and/or Write Reflective Letter of Thanks to Teacher, Explaining How him/her Transformed Participants Life, and Laid Groundwork for Current Life Success(es)

(13) Wrap Up and Concluding Remarks Including Thanking Participant for Allowing Interview and Sharing Experience
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INITIAL IRB APPROVAL
Friday, June 1, 2018

Ms. Charmaine Smith-Campbell
Mercer University
Tift College of Education - Atlanta
3001 Mercer University Dr
Atlanta, GA 30341

RE: Freirean Pedagogical Love: A Pre-Kindergarten to 12 Grade (P-12) Theory To Experience Exploration (H1803078)

Dear Ms. Smith-Campbell:

On behalf of Mercer University’s Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research, your Modifications for Expedited Review submitted on 28-May-2018 to the above referenced protocol was reviewed and approved on 01-Jun-2018 in accordance with Federal Regulations 46.110 and 46.111(b) under category(ies) 07 for expedited review.

Changes Approved:

A modification application that request to use 3 interviews from participants from the IRB was approved on March 27, 2018.

NOTE: The approval date of this modification does not change the annual renewal date of your protocol which expires on 28-Mar-2019

We at the IRB and the Office of Research Compliance are dedicated to providing the best service to our research community. As one of our investigators, we value your feedback and ask that you please take a moment to complete our Satisfaction Survey and help us to improve the quality of our service.

It has been a pleasure working with you and we wish you much success with your project! If you need any further assistance, please feel free to contact our office.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Avia Chambers-Richardson, Ph.D., CPR, CIH
Associate Director of Human Research Protection Programs (HRPP)
Member
Institutional Review Board

“Mercer University has adopted and agrees to conduct its clinical research studies in accordance with the International Conference on Harmonization’s (ICH) Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice,”
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MODIFIED IRB APPROVAL
Friday, June 1, 2018

Ms. Charmaine Smith-Campbell
Mercer University
Tit. College of Education - Atlanta
3001 Mercer University Dr
Atlanta, GA 30341

RE: Freirean Pedagogical Love: A Pre-Kindergarten to 12th Grade (P-12) Theory To Experience Exploration (H1803078)

Dear Ms. Smith-Campbell:

On behalf of Mercer University's Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research, your Modifications for Expedited Review submitted on 10-May-2018 to the above referenced protocol was reviewed and approved on 01-Jun-2018 in accordance with Federal Regulations 46.110 and 46.111(a) under category(ies) 07 for expedited review.

Changes Approved:
A modification application that request to use 3 interviews from participants from the IRB was approved on March 27, 2018.

NOTE: The approval date of this modification does not change the annual renewal date of your protocol which expires on 26-Mar 2019.

We at the IRB and the Office of Research Compliance are dedicated to providing the best service to our research community. As one of our investigators, we value your feedback and ask that you please take a moment to complete our Satisfaction Survey and help us to improve the quality of our service.

It has been a pleasure working with you and we wish you much success with your project! If you need any further assistance, please feel free to contact our office.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Ava Chambliss-Richardson, Ph.D., CI, CIIM
Associate Director of Human Research Protection Programs (HRPP)
Member
Institutional Review Board

"Mercer University has adopted and agrees to conduct its clinical research studies in accordance with the International Conference on Harmonization's (ICH) Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice."
APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
Informed Consent Document on Mercer Letterhead

Mtcher
University
Tift College of Education
3001 Mercer University Dr.
Atlanta, GA 30341
Tel: 678-547-6330

Informed Consent

**Topic of Study:**
FREIREAN PEDAGOGICAL LOVE
A PRE-KINDERGARTEN TO 12-Grade (P-12) THEORY TO EXPERIENCE EXPLORATION

**Investigators:**
- Charmaine Smith-Campbell: B.A. History; M.A History; M.A Counseling Psychology.
- University Affiliation: Mercer University Tift College of Education
  3001 Mercer University Drive, Atlanta, GA 30341.
  Telephone 678-547-6084
- Faculty Advisor: Sherah Betts-Carr Ph.D.

**Purpose of the Research:**
The purpose of this qualitative narrative research is to identify elements of pedagogical love emerging from participants’ reflective narratives of educational experiences with prekindergarten to 12th-grade (P-12) teachers who participants credit for transforming their lives, and ultimately contributing to their current successes in their varying individual forms. The concept of pedagogical love emerges from its use by Paulo Freire in two works, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2005), and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2011).

Reflective narratives from 3 to 5 to five participants ages 18 years and older, as sources of data, are compared against elements in this study’s theoretical and conceptual framework grounded in Freire’s ideas on education. These comparisons seek to identify points of intersections and/or divergences between data and frameworks. These findings are bases for this study’s discussions, conclusions, and recommendations for further research on Freirean pedagogical love in P-12 United States educational settings.

This study is a “theory to experience comparison,” which seeks to make what Stake (1995) describes as *petit-generalizations* confined to this study’s research sample, and its two research questions. The study contributes to ways of finding additional instructional models that can enhance students’ educational success, as well as offering additional instructional approaches, usable as differentiated student-centered learning and instruction in 21st-Century U.S. realities.
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Procedures:
- If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to allow me to interview you about your experiences at any stage of your prekindergarten to 12-Grade (P-12) educational journey, with teachers who you believe influenced your life in a way that contributes to your current education and life successes.
- You will be asked to give me permission to record our conversations; as well as to allow for follow-up interviews and recordings to ensure accuracy and/or provide additional information.
- I will also ask you if you are willing and able to, to journal about your memories and reflections on the experiences; or to write an imaginary reflective letter of thanks to the teacher(s) expressing gratitude and telling them how their contributions shaped your successes. These journals and letters will not be shared with anyone except the researcher and members of the Dissertation Committee.
- I will need your written agreement to audiotape our conversations and if you would like to use your real name for purposes of this paper.

Your signature at the end of this statement will suffice as evidence of this agreement

Signature
Print Name

Your participation will take approximately 2 hours over a five-day period
- If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be purposively selected, and will be invited to assist me in obtaining primary information for my study on the Pedagogical Love and its implications for transformative educational success in middle and high schools

Potential Risks or Discomforts:
There are no foreseeable risks associated with the study

Potential Benefits of the Research:
This study contributes to me—the researcher—meeting the requirements for obtaining my Ph.D. degree in Curriculum and Instruction from The Tift School of Education at Mercer University in Atlanta, GA.

Confidentiality and Data Storage:
The collected data will be stored and maintained under strictly confidential conditions and the researcher will be the only person with access to this data throughout the study. Once the study is completed, the documentation will be stored at Mercer University-Atlanta in the research advisor’s office for the next three years after which all raw data (data recording forms) will be destroyed unless otherwise requested by the researcher.
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Incentives to Participate:
None

Participation and Withdrawal:
Your participation in this research study is voluntary. As a research subject you may refuse to participate at any time. To withdraw from the study please contact:

Charmaine Smith-Campbell

Dr. Sherah Betts-Carr  Ph.D.
Tift College of Education
Mercer University Atlanta
3001 Mercer University Drive,
Atlanta, GA 30341
Telephone: 678) 547-6064
Email: carr_sbc@mercer.edu

Questions about the Research:
If you have any questions about the research, please speak with either Dr. Sherah Betts-Carr or myself (Charmaine Smith-Campbell), at the address and/or telephone numbers provided above.

This project has been reviewed and approved by Mercer University’s IRB. If you believe there is any infringement upon your rights as a research subject, you may contact the IRB Chair, at (478) 301-4101.

I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and these have been answered to my satisfaction.

Signature of Investigator_________________________ Date_________________________
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