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ABSTRACT

The pervasiveness of injustices is rooted in structures and ideology that reinforce and reinvent oppression; there is a need to engage in transformative change to dismantle systems of domination and subordination. Educational leadership is essential in the social transformation of educational settings and the wider society. In the collective responsibility for transformative change, educational leadership preparation programs serve as spaces to encourage the development of students’ capacity to address issues of oppression and create new power relations for social justice. Faculty play a role in preparation programs to enact teaching that uncover to power dynamics of oppression and domination for social emancipation.

The purpose of this critical qualitative study was to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs teach to encourage students’ capacity development to engage in transformative leadership. The guiding question for this study is: How do faculty engage in teaching to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform social oppression affecting education? Using an interview methodology, data is generated through relational interviewing using artifacts. The conceptual framework of critical pedagogy, transformative criticality, and transformative leadership development guides a sociocultural approach to the analysis of the data. There were four major findings: The participants (1) integrated critical frameworks into curriculum and pedagogical approaches, (2) established spaces in and outside of the formal classroom to engage students, (3) centered student-faculty relationships for support and collaboration, and (4) evoked students’ transformative activism
through academic practice. This empirical study will contribute to the research on critical perspectives in educational leadership preparation programs with a focus on faculty teaching as an expression of transformative power.
CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

“I’m no longer accepting the things I cannot change…I’m changing the things I cannot accept.” - Angela Davis

Social oppressions exist in the wider society, and educational systems have reflected similar power dynamics (Bogotch & Reyes-Guerra, 2014). As educational demographics shift to include visible and invisible marginalized bodies. Thus, Foster (1989) claimed that leadership can enact transformative practices that result in emancipation from economic, racial, sexual, gendered, religious, and all forms of oppression and domination. The call to engage in transformative action, combined with the constant struggle for freedom within education and educational leadership is not new, for the expression of oppression is a deeply rooted legacy of our society. Similarly to the Black Lives Matter (2013) movement, educational leadership can be an ideological and political intervention in systematic oppression supported through collective agency that exposes the roots of uneven power dynamics and domination. Given, the deadly cost of oppression, including in education, intentional interrogation of educational leadership preparation programs is needed to understand what teaching does to help develop leadership for social transformation.

Critical paradigms in education aim to promote democracy through critiques of hidden power structures of oppression and work toward social transformation. More specifically, embedding critical paradigms in the curriculum and pedagogy in preparation programs can provide deeper knowledge necessary to explore distinctive historical and social legacies of
injustice that result in social oppression. For instance, an analysis of power relations can help to uncover the complexities of oppression and make visible the struggle of people who are vulnerable to racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, etc. The use of critical paradigms can serve not only as a tool to understand and analyze educational systems beyond the preparation program, but can be a tool for critique of the social and political context of teaching and learning within such preparation for the development of transformative leadership.

Educational leadership preparation programs can be essential spaces for leaders to grapple with issues of injustice and oppression in education and society.

**Background of the Study: Beyond Traditional Leadership Preparation**

Since the end of the 19th century, higher education has been responsible for educational leadership preparation through advanced degrees such as the Doctor of Philosophy in Education (Ph.D.) (Young & Brewer, 2008). Traditionally, educational leadership preparation programs have focused on training in management and administration (e.g. instructional planning, financing, scheduling, supervising), to lead in various educational settings (Berkovich, 2017; Jean-Marie, Normore, Brooks, 2009; McDaniels & Magno, 2015). Historically, the field of educational leadership has celebrated efficiency, rationalism, and neutrality (Dantley, 2002), and continues to transmit and reinforce a dominant culture that also privileges some social identities while oppressing others. These traditional approaches in preparation programs are structured around mainstream views of leadership and maintaining the status quo.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, there has been an increased focus on social justice and educational leadership, with an emphasis on intervening in practices and policies that reinforce the oppression of marginalized students (Bogotch & Reyes-Guerra, 2014; Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006). Additionally, it is important to note that social justice can be
infused into preparation programs’ mission and values in various ways. Given the influx of educational leadership preparation programs seeking to infuse social justice into programs via curriculum and pedagogy, there continues to be a need to prepare leadership to acknowledge and intervene in the face of injustice. Yet, educational leadership preparation programs have come under scrutiny for failing to develop leaders with leadership knowledge and skills to enact social justice (Black & Murtadha, 2007; Normore & Jean-Marie, 2010).

There is limited research on the role faculty play in educational leadership preparation programs and their negotiations of contexts and factors as they attempt to develop leadership that is prepared to challenge social injustice (Berkovich, 2017). This includes how they help learners develop critical perspectives, critical social consciousness, and understandings of differences in social categories and dimensions of power related to social injustice. Developing a transformative capacity to lead often involves an internal gaze into the personal social locations from which people are teaching and learning.

Problem Statement

In recent years, the interest in developing educational leaders’ capacities to address injustices in various educational settings has been expanded. Educational leadership preparation programs with a social justice oriented curriculum and pedagogical approach guide educational leaders toward the development of knowledge, analytic skills, dispositions, and praxis to transform injustices in education. Recent literature on preparation programs elude to issues of injustice are avoided or reduced to a single axis of difference and one-dimensional analysis of power within curriculum and pedagogy (Diem & Carpenter, 2013; Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2002). Therefore, reinforcing the status quo that privileges some groups while oppressing others.
To develop transformative educational leadership, students need opportunities to interrogate injustices on both a personal and structural level that result in the development of being, relating, and leading for social change (Shields, 2013). Moreover, an over-emphasis of a single axis of difference neglects how social categories influence each other in the manifestation of privilege and oppression and reinforces a hierarchy of oppression. The avoidance of social injustices and single axis approach to difference in educational leadership preparation programs maintain systems of oppression. Thus, preparation programs fail to prepare leaders with the capacity to address the complexity of injustices in education and society. While much has been written about the development of capacity for social justice in educational leadership preparation programs, less is known about how such capacity is developed through faculty interactions.

Faculty are in a sociopolitical position to play an important role in the socialization of doctoral students for social justice, whether as an instructor in the classroom, chair or advisor for the research process, committee members for dissertations, or mentor. They influence curriculum and pedagogy, both in and outside of the classroom, serve as gatekeepers and/or gate-openers for doctoral students, and often face issues associated with injustice within education (Guerra & Pazey, 2016). Additionally, their dispositions, values, and skills on social justice and injustices can influence their curriculum, pedagogy, and student-faculty relationship approaches. Scholars have noted faculty discomfort and lack of knowledge and skills to facilitate learning on social justice and injustices (Aguilar, 2017; Edwards, Loftin, Nance, Riser, & Smith, 2014). Research on strategies faculty employ to facilitate learning on social injustice for transformative leadership development is needed in order to understand the barriers and opportunities they face when attempting to develop student’s transformative leadership capacity for today’s educational context.
**Purpose Statement and Research Question**

Faculty are essential players in the implementation of transformative teaching and learning. They provide an entry point to understanding capacity development in educational leadership preparation programs. Some faculty may see themselves in a dialectical process of developing others, while creating self through critical self-reflection on their social identities and positionalities. Thus, this study will involve examining the multidimensional aspects of teaching (i.e., facilitation) in higher education as a complex practice involving the negotiation of students’ and faculty knowledge, experiences, emotions, and environments.

The purpose of this study to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs teach to encourage students’ capacity development to engage in transformative leadership. The guiding question for this study is: How do faculty engage in teaching to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform social oppression affecting education?

The focus of this study is on the emotional, physical, cognitive, social spaces and interactions in educational leadership preparation programs. The research question aim to answer what are faculty doing, why are they teaching in a certain way, what enables faculty to teach in this matter. Although the spaces and interactions outside of the university are important to understanding how students enact the knowledge and skills acquired in doctoral programs, this study is designed to pay particular attention to relational interactions of teaching, learning, and developing that inspire such praxis. Thus, the research purpose and question are concerned with what occurs in teaching and under what conditions.
Rationale for the Study and Its Significance

This study has the potential to contribute significantly to the field of educational leadership by adding to the growing body of research on preparation programs by providing a more nuanced understanding of faculty experiences related to transformative leadership aims, goals, and capacity building. Educational leadership preparation programs are not exempt from systems of oppression and injustices. Instructors, advisors, and mentors influence student academic experience and professional practice. More is needed on the opportunities and barriers they face and pose when developing transformative leadership. This empirical study adds to the literature on how faculty teach and develop transformative leadership toward a more just system of education.

Researcher Positionality

As the researcher, I bring my own bias to the study. The subject of critical perspective in teaching and learning for the development of transformative leadership has been of scholarly and professional interest. Due to my lived experiences, social identities, and knowledge, I bring specific perspectives and premises about educational leadership, leadership development, and social justice. As a student affairs professional in the functional area of residential education, I have worked with undergraduate student leaders to create inclusive residential communities through ongoing social justice training. Recent events of violence against Black and Brown bodies have prompted me to consider how student leaders who are responsible for creating safe spaces and responding to issues of exclusion are trained around power analysis to understand and challenge interconnected injustices on both the micro and macro level.

After the election of President Donald Trump, I was privileged to engage in conversations among faculty and scholars calling for action to address discrimination in
education and society. It was the election of Trump – a wealthy, White, heterosexual man – that united a roaring call for social resistance, when only murmurs for justice occurred when Black bodies are policed and killed that left me with questions of the purpose for social transformation and higher education preparation. There was a call in higher education from classrooms to residential halls for social action, and I wondered how training and development prepared leaders to enact a radical praxis that would create a lasting social change that went beyond the neoliberal approach to social justice.

Inspired by these events and my critical consciousness development, critical perspectives as analytical tools has provided me a way to understand historical and current systemic social injustices and oppression. My scholarly exploration of critical power analysis has connected me to the intellectual legacy of Black women scholars and critical pedagogues, and their unapologetic pursuit of social justice. More specifically, I hope teaching and learning for transformative leadership development can be reimagined for social change both in and out of the academy.

**Assumptions**

The assumptions I bring to this study are informed by current, available empirical research and professional experience. The first assumption I bring to this study is the development of capacity in transformative leadership can be fostered through the relational process of teaching and learning that engages in critical reflection and analyses of power relations to disrupt social injustices. As such, I engaged in data generation that exposes the opportunities and barriers faculty use to develop this capacity for them and provide such opportunities to others. Therefore, this study is not only with concerned about how faculty
encourage others’ learning around issues of injustice, but their ongoing critical teaching development as part of transformative leadership.

My second assumption is that leadership can advance social justice when informed by critical reason, reflection, analysis, and action. For instance, complex issues of injustice that can become more clear through the use of critical analytical tools to expose uneven power relations, allowing leadership to become transformative (i.e., exhibiting ethical and moral decision-making that advances social justice). Such tools can be used in the research process as well. I provided opportunities (i.e., interviews, artifacts) for participants to share how they reason, reflect on and analyze the outcomes of their practice and development, and act to further develop their clarity on the teaching/learning relationship they intend to foster when developing leadership that is transformative.

My third assumption is that identities and power relations bear upon what is taught, how it is taught, who is taught, and who is teaching. As such, when generating and analyzing data, I took into account that the environment in which people teach, learn, and lead, is influenced by power dynamics.

My fourth assumption is that education can serve as a site of social transformation. Therefore, I sought out faculty who presented beliefs and dispositions towards a critical approach to leadership development in preparation programs was necessary to challenge inequities and the reproduction of oppression in education. In this study, I considered and asked questions on the social and political context of higher education that faculty navigate to engage in transformative teaching, learning, and leading. Thus, education for students and faculty can be a site of resistance to promote social justice through teaching and learning that raise questions about power, privilege, and oppression.
Definition of Key Terms

The following key terms are frequently used throughout this study to frame the purpose and research questions.

*Adult Development* refers to the development process where individuals understand that social categories, culture, and power relations mediate their sense of becoming for social change (Brookfield & Holst, 2011).

*Capacity* refers to the development of knowledge, practical skills, and dispositions related to social justice (Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006).

*Critical Learning* refers to learning how to perceive and challenge dominant ideology, unmask power, contest hegemony, overcome alienation, pursue liberation, reclaim reason, and practice democracy (Brookfield, 2005).

*Critical Teaching* refers to teaching for the development of skills, knowledge, habits of inquiry, and critical curiosity about society, power, inequities, and change (Brookfield, 2005).

*Curriculum* refers to specific content that should be taught that combines thought, action, and purpose (Null, 2011).

*Educational Leadership Preparation Program* refers to a university-based accredited program that prepares doctoral students for leadership in schools, universities, communities, and government.

*Facilitation* refers to managing the group dynamics and guiding participants through critical conversations and the learning process (Bell, Goodman, Ouellett, 2016).
Facilitates: In this study *facilitates* denotes a collective journey for both students and faculty that highlights the process of self-actualization for faculty and attempts to avoid social indoctrination.

*Injustice* refers to unequal conferment of power, social, and economic advantages, institutional and cultural validity to social groups based on their positionality (Bell, 2016).

*Pedagogy* refers to the delivery of instruction (Crabtree, Sapp, & Licona, 2009).

*Social Justice* refers to both a goal and process of equitable participation of all individuals or groups to meet their needs regardless of social categories (Bell, 2016).

- Radicalized notions of social justice refer to a strategic process for critical self-reflection and acknowledgment of multiple covert and overt structural power relations have marginalized students, parents, teachers, and communities that are outside the mainstream (Dantley & Green, 2015).

*Social Oppression* refers to the relationship of dominance and subordination between social categories in which one group or individual benefits from the systematic abuse, exploitation, and injustice directed toward another group or individual (Bell, 2016).

*Transformative Leadership* refers to leadership praxis that challenges uneven power dynamics associated with privileges and oppressions that perpetuate inequities and injustices (Bang & Vossoughi, 2016).

*Relational Teaching (advising, mentoring):* Efforts and aims to teaching and learning are dialectical processes that involve multiple actors and relationships (i.e., student and faculty interactions, and departmental, institutional, and societal relationships) that influence teaching/learning. Additionally, advising and mentoring are herein understood as interactions between faculty and students that are related to teaching and can affect leadership development.
Conceptual Framework

Rooted in critical theory, the conceptual framework for this study is grounded in critical pedagogy, criticality for social transformation, and transformative leadership development. As strands of critical theory, this conceptual framework is to be understood as a related emancipatory project. This conceptual framework guides my analysis of faculty teaching toward the development of transformative leadership.

The goal of critical theory is to critique social order and power relations for emancipation (Brookfield, 2005). In adult teaching and learning, critical theory through pedagogy builds social and political awareness and action. Critical pedagogy, criticality, transformative leadership development shares similar philosophical assumptions about oppression, power, and social justice as critical theory. In the following section, I explored critical pedagogy to understand the teacher-student relationship for the collective development of critical consciousness and social agency. Following, I drew on criticality for the formation of critical praxis through critical reasoning, analysis, reflection, and action. Last, I outlined elements of transformative leadership development, which provide the connection of critical pedagogy and leadership.

Critical Pedagogy

Inspired by Paulo Freire (1970) notion of education as an exercise of freedom that requires a critical approach to knowledge and reality, critical pedagogy views teaching as a political act and rejects the notion that knowledge construction is neutral. Thus, critical pedagogy is grounded in critique and analysis that interrogates uneven power relationships and domination within educational institutions and society (Giroux, 2011). This form of pedagogy provides opportunities for resistance through the connection of teaching for personal and structural transformation. Furthermore, critical pedagogy aims to develop a microcosm of democracy.
within the classroom, a dialectical understanding of the world, and a critical understanding of the hidden effects of power and privilege on a society that reproduces oppression (Giroux, 2011). bell hooks (2014) writes, “the classroom becomes a dynamic place where transformation in social relations are concretely actualized, and the false dichotomy between the world outside and inside of the academy disappears” (p.115). In other words, educators and learners are actively participating in critical consciousness through a collective engagement. Critical pedagogy places an emphasis on change through collective action.

Critical pedagogy explores the relational aspect between teaching and learning, drawing attention to who has control over knowledge production, values, and classroom practices. In other words, critical pedagogy provokes questions such as: How do we teach? Under what conditions do we teach? For what purpose do we teach? For whom do we teach? Thus, challenging the teacher-student hierarchy. Giroux (2011) posits that the instructor and students need to actively transform knowledge that rejects the passive banking model approach. In *Teaching to Transgress*, bell hooks (1994) confronts the traditional role of faculty in formal classrooms and put forth the call for faculty to participate in engaging pedagogy that values all voices.

The language of critique in critical pedagogy requires instructors and students to analyze systems of power and injustices that goes unchecked in traditional pedagogy, norms, values, and standards. Thus, such a dialectical analysis allows for a critique of oppression and privilege and an understanding of how power relationships interact affecting lived experiences. Moreover, Giroux (2011) offered the language of hope and possibility of critical pedagogy to transform students’ capacity to act for social freedom. The language of hope goes beyond the recognition of power dynamics but rather offer opportunities to imagine power relations working for justice.
and freedom. The main goal of critical pedagogy is for social transformation of both instructor and students to connect theory to practice (Giroux, 2011). Thus, critical educators must be intentional in honoring students’ lived experiences and knowledge, encourage power analysis, participate in reflection, initiate critical dialogue, and develop strategies for social justice.

In critical pedagogy, space is not neutral or where things happen. Instead, space is socially constructed and produced by social relationships. Peter McLaren’s (1998) called for the development of critical pedagogy of space that explores the social and history of knowledge and power that mediate human lived experiences. Therefore, students and teachers need to learn how space is filled with power and ideology. McLaren explained “The critical pedagogy to which I am referring needs to be made less in- formative and more per-formative, less a pedagogy directed toward the interrogation of written texts than a corporeal pedagogy grounded in the lived experiences of students ... (McLaren, 1999, p. 452). In other words, spaces are used as tools of domination and exclusion. Morgan (2000) outlined critical pedagogy of space in the classroom that interrogates power relations that “empowers and disempowers, authorises and de-authorises, recognises and mis- recognises different social groups and their knowledge and identities” (p.282). Therefore, students and teachers analyze the ways space is used in power, privilege, and oppression.

**Transformative Criticality**

Grounded in critical theory, criticality centers on an individual’s ability to critique and challenge uneven power relations in everyday life and conscious seeking justice (Brookfield, 2005). More specifically, criticality can be understood through the domains of formal knowledge, the self, and the world, which are engaged through critical reason, critical self-reflection, and critical action (Johnston, Mitchell, Myles, & Ford, 2012). According to Johnston
et al., (2012), the transformative potential of critical education is in developing awareness of self in the context of wider social relations for political engagement. The development of transformative criticality consists of students becoming critical beings who critique dominant knowledge, engage in reconstruction of self, and engage in action for collective reconstruction of the world (Johnston et al., 2012). Ultimately, new term “critical transformers” redundant seek justice and emancipation for society; thus, requiring high levels of knowledge, skills, and experience in challenging injustice.

The developmental path towards criticality includes, (1) Entry into the critical process; which entails the nature and degree in which students engage in critical tasks of reading, listening, discussion, analysis, and action to develop an understanding of social emancipation. (2) Solution searching, which includes the use of explanatory theory and data that links knowledge, self, and action for reflection to construct a case for challenging dominant oppressive proactive. (3) Rationale-building, which is the representation of thought and action to challenge and shape established practices, and (4) Understanding the territory, which entails understanding power relationships, challenging the status quo, and engaging in social change. (Johnston et al., 2012).

In conclusion, criticality involves the development and application of critical consciousness, knowledge, and skills for social transformation. The development of adult learners toward criticality is consistent with the literature on transformative leadership.

**Transformative Leadership Development**

Transformative leadership involves critique and disruption of dominant ideology, power relations, and systemic and structural inequities that results in oppression. Shields (2010) notes, “transformative leadership focuses on improving organizational qualities, dimensions, and effectiveness; and transformative educational leadership begins by challenging inappropriate
uses of power and privilege that create and perpetuate inequity and injustice” (p. 564). Consequently, this approach to leadership connects education and educational leadership to the wider societal context for emancipation with examination of society’s manifestation of disparities and inequities. Transformative leadership is grounded in Freire’s (1970) call for critical awareness, critical reflection, critical analysis, and activism to challenge social injustices (Shields, 2013). Critical reflection and analysis are essential for action that challenges oppression and creates new, just systems.

From a critical tradition, Shields (2014) outlines eight tenets of transformative leadership that include: (1) a mandate for deep and equitable change; (2) the need to deconstruct knowledge frameworks that perpetuate inequity and injustice (3) the need to address the inequitable distribution of power; (4) an emphasis on both individual and collective good; (5) a focus on emancipation, democracy, equity, and justice; (6) an emphasis on interconnectedness, interdependence, and global awareness; (7) the necessity of balancing critique with promise; and (8) the call to exhibit moral courage. Ultimately, transformative leadership in educational leadership aims, “to create learning contexts or communities in which social, political, and cultural capital is enhanced in such a way as to provide equity of opportunity for students as they take their place in contributing members of society” (Shields, 2010, p. 572).

Leadership development is focused on building interpersonal competence that is the ability to make connections with others (Day, 2000). Elements of interpersonal competence include social awareness (e.g., empathy, service, and developing others) and social skills (e.g., collaboration and cooperation, building relationships, and conflict management). Day (2000) described leadership development as a relational approach that is rooted in social interactions.
The conceptual framework of critical pedagogy, transformative criticality, and transformative leadership development addresses the relational aspects of the environment, interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships, content, and material delivery that assist in creating learning spaces to interrogate injustices and imagine new socially just systems.

**Figure 1**: Teaching to Develop Transformative Leadership: Critical Pedagogy (Critique & Hope), Transformative Criticality (Becoming), and Leadership Development (Relational)

Critical pedagogy provides the broader context of transformative learning, while transformative criticality delves deeper in the ongoing process of self-reflection and analyses for collective questioning, criticism, and creativity for social transformation. The incorporation of transformative leadership development provides a focus on leadership as a relational praxis and assist students with connecting personal transformation with potential structural transformation. The framework is intended to be useful in the examination of the multidimensional aspects of teaching in educational leadership preparation programs to make sense of how faculty encourage the development of students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership.
Delimitations of the Study

This study focuses on curriculum and pedagogy, and excludes program assessment. Program assessment could provide information on student outcomes, but as a result of the program overall, and the influence of various faculty. However, program assessment is beyond the scope of this study focused on understanding how individual faculty teach to develop students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. Another delimitation to this study is the exclusion of faculty outside of educational leadership and educational leadership doctoral students. Studies of faculty in various programs also teach coursework (i.e., elective courses) to doctoral students in educational leadership programs. Faculty in educational leadership programs are more likely to serve students in key roles such as advisor or dissertation committee member than faculty teaching outside the program.

The participants for this study were tenure-track faculty members at the doctoral level with teaching experience of more than two years. Faculty with more than two years of teaching experiences are likely to have experiences teaching, advising, and mentoring. Faculty with less than years of teaching experiences on the tenure track priority may be on researching and publishing. Moreover, limiting the number of study participants to 5-7 faculty members allows for a deep and nuanced understanding of teaching for capacity development for a critical perspective. More study participants in this study may not permit an in-depth exploration into the inquiry due to sheer volume of data that need timely and critical analysis.

Dissertation Outline

In this chapter, I presented an overview of the study. Chapter two will include a review of the relevant literature concerning educational leadership preparation program curriculum and pedagogy approaches, particularly in relation to social transformation. In chapter three, I
describe the critical qualitative methodology employed in conducting the research, including the
description of participants and data sources, the data collection process, and the data analysis.
Then, in chapter four, I report the findings of the study. Chapter five includes a discussion of the
findings, implications for who/what, and recommendations for further practice and research.
CHAPTER TWO
Review of the Literature

“Universities should be about more than developing work skills. They must also be about producing civic-minded and critically engaged citizens - citizens who can engage in debate, dialogue and bear witness to a different and critical sense of remembering, agency, ethics and collective resistance.”- Henry Giroux

In the field of education, particularly educational leadership, preparation programs are being positioned as essential spaces for teaching and learning on topics of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice and tasked with the development of leadership that challenges injustices while enacting anti-oppressive practices and policies in various educational settings (Brown, 2006; Dantley & Green, 2015; Diem & Carpenter, 2012; Furman, 2012; George, 2017; Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010; Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks, 2009). Understanding the ways in which educational leadership develops capacity to understand issues of injustice and promote social change means revealing the influence of teaching and learning in graduate preparation programs. There is limited information on how faculty facilitate engagement with issues of social justice in educational leadership preparation programs (Diem & Carpenter, 2012). The purpose of this review is two-fold: (1) To examine research on teaching approaches in educational leadership preparation program for transformative learning and teaching, particularly for capacity development in relation to equity, social justice, diversity, and/or inclusion. (2) To examine research on the role of faculty in transformative learning and teaching and educational leadership preparation programs.
Peer-reviewed journals were identified through electronic databases such as Google Scholar, ERIC, and Education Source, using the search terms: transformative learning theory, transformative teaching, adult education transformative learning, transformative leadership for the first strand of the literature review. Literature for the second strand of the review was identified using the search terms: educational leadership preparation, higher education preparation, curriculum, pedagogy, and social justice, equity, or transformative related to educational leadership preparation. There were a total of 52 articles found through this search process. The total number of articles was reduced to 41 after excluding literature that was not empirically based, such as essays. Furthermore, I excluded literature on educational leadership preparation programs' admission processes, program design, and assessment to further focus the review.

I organized the review according the following themes: (a) transformative learning, teaching, and leadership (b) issues of injustice in educational leadership graduate preparation programs, and (d) roles and responsibilities of faculty in teaching and learning around issues of injustice. These three themes and identified gaps in the literature helped to focus this dissertation.

I begin with transformative learning and teaching in adult education to provide background on the process of transformation rooted in a critical perspective. In addition, I explore transformative leadership to connect teaching and learning for critical praxis. This section is followed by a discussion of the educational leadership literature discussing curriculum and pedagogy in the development of leadership for equity and justice. The educational leadership literature includes school leadership and higher education preparation programs. Next, I highlight studies that examine the role and responsibility of faculty facilitating on issues of injustice. I pay particular attention to studies on the influence of faculty members’ social
identities, location, skills, and knowledge on how they facilitate learning and leadership. I conclude with a summary of the literature gaps that impact the strategies used by educational leadership faculty to facilitate the development of students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership.

**Transformative Education in Higher Education**

Transformative learning and teaching approaches are employed to capture the meaning making-process of adult learners that leads to a deep shift in perspective, which thinking, action, and discourse become more open to new ways of being. In a study of women returning to college after a significant amount of time away, Jack Mezirow (1978) identified ten phases of transformative learning for the process of changing one’s frame of reference. The ten phases of meaning Mezirow found included: (1) a disorienting dilemma; (2) self-examination with feelings of fear, anger, guilt or shame; (3) a critical assessment of assumptions; (4) recognition that one’s discontent and the process of transformation are shared; (5) exploration of options for new roles, relationships and action; (6) planning a course of action; (7) acquiring knowledge and skills for implementing one’s plans; (8) provisional trying of new roles; (9) building competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships; and (10) a reintegration into one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s new perspective. Transformative learning theory in adult learning highlights the process of recognizing and assessing assumptions and expectations shaped by lived experiences on thinking, feeling, and acting.

Influenced by Freire’s (1970) “conscientization”, transformative learning theory has two major elements: critical reflection to assess ones frames of reference, and critical discourse-validation of judgment for emancipatory praxis (Mezirow, 1997, 2003). The process of transformation is predicated on critical reflections on ways of thinking and acting to alter one’s
frame of reference. In a concept analysis of critical reflection, Mezirow (1998) identified two taxonomies of critical reflection, which includes objective reframing and subjective reframing. Reframing in critical reflection centers on examining ones’ knowledge paradigms and pausing to consider possible problem solutions. Meanwhile, subjective reframing in critical reflection entails an intentional focus on individual assumptions and beliefs for raising consciousness. The two critical reflection taxonomies can occur through an individual insight or within discourse. In the same study, Mezirow (1998) connected critical reflection to discourse as experiences where alternate views can be validated. “Validating a belief through the widest possible agreement is a developmental process, not a one-shot effort at securing consensus” (Mezirow, 1998, p.197).

Mezirow’s (1998) transformative learning theory has been critiqued for the lack of attention to power relations that influence emancipatory praxis in adult learning. In a phenomenological study, McDonald, Ronald, Bradley (1999) took a critical perspective on the role of power in adult education for social transformation. These authors found that the learning process was affected by normative and systematic structures that could not be avoided within the activities of critical reflection and discourse. Therefore, “any theory of transformational and emancipatory learning must be primarily concerned with power” (McDonald et al., 1999, p. 18).

Lange (2004) and Brookefield (2012) expanded this theory and named critical transformative learning as learning that takes into account how one is socially constructed. In addition, it aims for personal transformation as well as societal transformation. Transformative learning remains a seminal framework for describing how adults learn. In a qualitative study, Lange (2004) suggest the hybridity of restorative and critical transformative learning that allows for adult learners to become aware of unconscious ways of being, critique dominant ideology, and embrace new worldviews and social relations. Critical transformation is the enactment of
agency for personal and society change. According to Lange (2004), the facilitator’s role is no longer merely to provide opportunities for participants to disrupt the integrity of taken-for-granted values and beliefs, but focus on restoration of participant’s foundational ethics of being. The hybridity of restorative and critical transformative learning takes into account the process of disillusionment, fragmentation, and exploitation of transformation that threatens new knowledge and realities. Transformative learning not only includes a change individual’s frames of references, but also structural change in the social world.

**Social Transformation and Leadership**

K-12 and higher education institutions are experiencing shifts in demographics, with an increase of accountability for enacting socially justice practices and policies, thus challenging the traditional articulation of leadership. Consequently, the renewed focus of leadership is called to create social transformation through intentional, socially just practices. Scholars have studied the experiences of educational leadership for social justice in various educational setting with differing interventions on liberation (DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2014; Santamaría, 2014; Theoharis, 2007). For example, in a critical qualitative study, Theoharis (2007) found principals who enacted social justice created environments that enabled the raising of student achievement, improving school structures, re-centering and enhancing staff capacity, and strengthening school culture and community. The value of providing a quality education for all students required the study participants to challenge structures and traditions that reproduced injustices. Moreover, Theoharis highlighted the need to prepare leaders with a capacity to develop resistance to barriers and challenges that stop or pause socially just practices, which illustrate the socio-political challenges educational leaders face in the pursuit for justice.
DeMatthew and Mawhinney (2014) conducted a cross-case study of two urban school principals who enacted leadership for social justice, despite resistance and challenge. With the goal of transforming their school culture to embrace inclusion, the authors found that the study participants had to make challenging decisions around enrollment, budget, community involvement, and discipline that centered social justice. Thus, DeMatthew and Mawhinney noted the tension of leadership for social justice when considering multiple stakeholders (e.g., teachers, parents, and district) and the various needs of these groups. Moreover, in this study, the authors focus on educational leaders who were committed to social justice for those with disabilities. The focus on a single social identity issue creates a unique dialogue around leadership for social justice that transforms an educational culture.

These two studies illustrate the socio-political nature of leadership, particularly in relation to social justice. Leaders who enact leadership towards a disruption of injustice and a promise for socially just practice should possessed the capacity to identify inequities and act accordingly. The recognition and action for justice require understanding and navigating of political and social spaces. It is important to note, both of these studies highlighted the study participants’ disposition towards enacting leadership towards social justice. For the educational leaders in these studies, social transformation had to occur on the personal level to have a commitment to structural transformation. Moreover, these studies highlighted the resistance educational leaders face when enacting a social justice practice. Educational leadership preparation programs are crucial to developing students’ capacity for social transformation that includes navigating political environments and creative strategies for action.
Educational Leadership Curriculum and Pedagogy

Critical perspectives embedded in the curriculum and pedagogy of educational leadership preparation programs provide an opportunity for transformative learning and teaching. Some of the critical approaches, such as critical race theory (Gooden & Dantley, 2012), anti-racist curriculum (Diem & Carpenter, 2012), communitarian public pedagogy (O’Malley & Capper, 2015), transformative pedagogy (Brown, 2004, 2006), queer theory (Jean-Marie, Normore, Brooks, 2009), and feminist theory (Dentith & Peterlin, 2011). From an analysis of the literature on educational leadership preparation program for social justice, Jean-Marie and colleagues (2009) found that grounding leadership preparation curriculum and pedagogy in critical theory allows for the consciousness-raising that involves both the deconstruction of injustices and reconstruction of just practices. The various strands and interpretation of critical theory offer different teaching and learning methods for the development of transformative leadership.

Crow and Whiteman (2016) posited that educational leadership preparation programs do not exist in a vacuum, but are influenced by internal and external forces. In society, there exists social, political, and economic discrimination and injustices that are reflected in educational practices and outcomes in K-12 and higher education. Therefore, various educational settings are changing as a result of diverse student demographics and stakeholders and increased accountability measures. In other words, educational leaders both in K-12 and higher education are being held accountable for taking an active role in mediating injustices in a way that transforms various educational settings and the wider society (Berkovich, 2017; Bogotch & Reyes-Guerra, 2014; Dantley & Green, 2015; George, 2017; Guerra, Nelson, Jacobs, Yamamura, 2013; Kemp-Graham, 2015). The following sections explore studies of curriculum and pedagogy approaches in school leadership and higher education preparation programs on equity and social
justice. Most of the educational leadership literature explores curriculum and pedagogy in the formal classroom. Therefore, to conclude I examine educational leadership literature on mentoring as curriculum and pedagogy.

Curriculum

Scholars have noted educational leadership preparation programs provide students with limited curriculum attention to issues of social justice and equity (Berkovich, 2017; Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Diem & Carpenter, 2012; Hawley & James, 2010; Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010; Marshall, 2004; Rusch, 2004).

In a review of 18 programs with an educational leadership preparation programs, Hawley and James (2010) found that most diversity-related education was offered in a single course and focused on broad issues of social justice. More specifically, these individual courses focused on societal sources of injustice, rather than providing learning opportunities to equip students with leadership skills to confront social injustices in their everyday educational context. Hawley and James concluded that educational leadership preparation programs should decide on the essential elements of a, “diversity-responsive curriculum” that assists in students developing knowledge and skills to address social injustice (p. 4). This study highlighted the inconsistency and disparity of social justice being incorporated into educational leadership preparation programs. Moreover, the authors call for a shift in the field to address diversity rather than solely leaving it to individual preparation programs.

Ultimately, issues of equity and social justice should be integrated throughout the program rather than isolated to single courses (Brown, 2004, 2006; Dantley & Green, 2015; Diem & Carpenter, 2013; Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2002; Rodríguez, Chambers, González, & Scheurich, 2010). In a qualitative study on a student affairs program centering social justice, the
researcher-participants recall the importance of social justice being integrated across the curriculum, which allowed them to engage with a variety of topics through multiple and critical lenses (Edwards et al., 2014). The consistency of social justice themes throughout the curriculum provided intellectual space that invited students to develop their own ideas and value around social justice and injustice. Thus, providing students multiple opportunities and various entry points to engage materials and others in the process of dismantling oppression.

Some of the critical elements argued as being needed in educational leadership preparation programs’ curriculum for building knowledge and skills around issues of injustice include developing critical consciousness (Brown, 2006; Capper et al., 2006; Diem & Carpenter, 2012; Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010), connecting theory with actions (Capper et al., 2006; Dentith & Peterlin, 2011), developing cognitive dissonance (Guerra et al., 2013), and identifying critical praxis for social change (Furman, 2012; Guerra et al., 2013; Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2002). In content analyses of syllabi from 16 educational leadership preparation courses, Trujillo and Cooper (2014) noted that the majority of the courses with a social justice curriculum included elements of critical consciousness, knowledge, and practical skills.

Meanwhile, Guerra et al., (2013) found that programmatic elements for developing social justice leadership included awareness of identity, reading literature that heightened understanding of injustices, participation in dialogue that challenged students’ thinking and leading and implementing an action research project. Findings from both studies illustrate that even when curriculum focuses on social justice, students need to be able to connect course materials to their everyday life for critical reflection and action to occur. Knowledge and critical consciousness equip students with learning opportunities to make sense of their social location and the world around them for social change (Boske, 2011; Distefano & Tiner-Sewell, 2016).
This approach in the curriculum, centering on equity and social justice, builds students’ self-confidence to engage in critical analysis and synthesis.

As Capper et al. (2006) noted, curriculum focused on building administrative skills has the potential to neglect social injustices. These authors concluded that preparation programs’ curriculum must address the social construction of power dynamics that privilege some individuals and groups while oppressing others to equip leaders with skills needed to enact social change. In other words, students must be able to position themselves and the communities they serve within systems of injustice to enact lasting social change (Boske, 2011; Capper et al., 2006; Diem & Carpenter, 2012).

A common theme found in the literature is that educational leadership preparation programs’ curriculum should allow teaching and learning opportunities to deepen understanding regarding the intersection of personal and professional leadership development. However, missing from these studies is the discussion of social injustices that get at issues of uneven power, privilege, and oppression. Pedagogical strategies within educational leadership preparation programs need to reflect the calls for the curriculum to support consciousness-raising, knowledge acquisition, and social change to increase social justice and decrease social injustices.

**Pedagogy**

Several scholars have provided a pedagogical model for educational leadership preparation programs encouraging the development of knowledge and skills around issues of equity and social justice (Black & Murtadha, 2007; Boske, 2011, 2012; Brown 2004, 2006; Capper et al., 2006; Hafner, 2010).
In a mixed methods study of forty graduate students, Brown (2006) used an interwoven framework of adult learning theory and development, transformative learning theory and process, and critical social theory to propose social justice pedagogical strategies. For example, Brown found that critical reflection, rational discourse, and policy praxis in preparation programs resulted in growth in students’ awareness, acknowledgment, and action around social justice and equity. She concluded by suggesting eight social justice and equity pedagogy strategies for preparation programs: cultural autobiographies, life histories of people who attended school in a different era, prejudice reduction workshops, reflective journals to which professors respond, rational discourse based on critical incidents, cross-cultural interviews, educational plunges, and diversity panels. Brown (2004) argued:

by being actively engaged in a number of assignments requiring the examination of ontological and epistemological assumptions, values and beliefs, context and experience, and competing worldviews, adult learners are better equipped to work with and guide others in translating their perspectives, perceptions, and goals into agendas for social change. (p. 87)

Consistent with Brown, other scholars suggested that critical self-reflection and discourse are crucial in educational leadership preparation programs for students to develop the necessary knowledge and skills to change the way people see themselves and the world (Black & Murtadha, 2007; Boske, 2010; Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Dantley, 2008; Furman, 2012; Jean-Marie et al., 2009). For example, in a grounded theory study Boske (2011) used a reflective process by using audio and/or video software to examine how fifteen graduate students understood issues of social justice and equity. She found that the use of audio and video equipment were valuable tools for increasing the study participants’ awareness and responses to addressing oppressive school practices as leaders for social justice. More specifically, Boske
claimed that as students, “gain insight to understanding the influence of identity, emotions, and lived experiences, they utilize technology as a vehicle for developing new ways of knowing, which support processes aligned with transforming their willingness and ability to interrupt oppressive school practices” (p. 80).

Structured critical reflection pedagogy strategies provide students with opportunities to be both concerned with, and responsive to, issues of injustice, enhancing the awareness of and commitment to social action (Boske 2011; Furman, 2012). When tackling issues of injustice, educational leadership preparation programs’ curriculum and pedagogy are to actively address social justice problems through an exploration and reflection of race/ethnicity, culture, language background, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability, and more.

**Racism, Sexism, and Heterosexism**

Curriculum and pedagogy that center issues of injustice engage students in examining social identities its and power relations that create, “isms” (e.g., racism, sexism, and heterosexism) on both personal and structural levels. Scholars of educational leadership preparation programs advocate for curriculum and pedagogy that centers social justice and equity but miss opportunities to explore specific discrimination topics or how discrimination cuts across multiple oppressions (Capper, Alston, Gause, Koschorek, Lopez, Lugg, McKenzie, 2006; Marshall & Hernandez, 2012). In the following section, I explore educational leadership preparation program literature on issues of race and racism, gender and sexism, and sexual orientation and heterosexism. It is important to note that there are other, “isms,” but due to lack of literature on other equity-related issues, I have chosen to limit this review of the literature to race, gender, and sexual orientation. Furman (2012) argues that social justice is concerned with the margin; therefore, preparation programs’ commitment may be demonstrated by the extent to
which the program addresses marginalized social identities and the everyday experiences of uneven power relations. I pay particular attention to how these, “isms” are incorporated in curriculum and pedagogy in educational leadership preparation programs.

**Race and Racism.** Scholars have criticized preparation programs for failing to adequately address issues of race and racism (Boske, 2010; Brown, 2006; Carpenter & Diem, 2013; Diem & Carpenter, 2012, 2013; Gooden & Dantley, 2012; Hawley & James, 2010; Kemp-Graham, 2015; López, 2003; Rusch, 2004; Rusch & Horsford, 2009; Young & Brooks, 2008; Young & Laible, 2000). López (2003) states that issues of race in preparation programs’ curriculum become a, “theoretical footnote within the larger discourse of educational leadership” due to the priority of providing traditional or technical courses that focus on school finance, organizational theory, and educational law (p. 70).

In their study, Gooden and O’Doherty (2015) explored how racial autobiographies serve as a pedagogical tool for students to examine their own racial identity. Particularly, these authors found that racial autobiographies provide opportunities for students to increase their racial awareness through self-reflection of significant racial events in their lives, and required the study participants to move beyond the episodic to the critical inquiry that evokes courage and vulnerability (Gooden & O’Doherty, 2015). Gooden and O’Doherty concluded that racial autobiographies encouraged students’ racial identity development, which allowed them to be better prepared to interrupt their assumptions about race relations and be open to the perspectives of others.

Similarly, Boske (2015) found that through the use of narrative inquiry, study participants increased their critical consciousness by becoming more aware of institutionalized racial practices. For example, Boske notes that study participants identified through self-reflection of
their experiences, beliefs, and ways of knowing about race influence a critical inquiry of self and their roles as educational leaders. These studies highlight how sense making of one’s racial identity, experiences, beliefs, and ways of knowing influence the manner in which educational leaders understand and analyze institutionalized racial practices and policies at various educational levels. Assignments such as racial autobiographies support students and professors have a dialogue about race and racism with each other (Carpenter & Diem, 2013; Gooden & O’Doherty, 2015).

Carpenter and Diem (2013) highlighted pedagogical strategies faculty used to facilitate dialogue about race and racism that include possessing a racial identity, purposeful planning, facilitating conversations, and engaging colleagues. The study participants discussed incorporating activities throughout the curriculum that emphasizes the importance of racial identity and the connection to privilege and oppression on the individual and institutional level. Consequently, a study participant’s note:

"Providing students with an opportunity to engage with the origins of race reflexively and exposing them to the critical examination of the historically contingent depths of racism presents powerful learning experiences where students and professors are forced to grapple with the variety of race-related problems that continue to shape society” (p. 21).

Using this approach of incorporating dialogue around race and racism, faculty considered course curriculum, pedagogy, and class community. Based on findings from his qualitative study, Boske (2010) stressed students’ and professors’ racial identity and experiences influence their interaction in classroom dialogue around race relations. Students of color in these preparation programs experience frustration with White classmates and faculty for the lack of understanding of how deeply seated race and racism are within American society (Boske, 2010).
In other words, there is a need within educational leadership preparation program curriculum and pedagogy to address and understand white privilege rather than solely situate racism in communities of color (Bogotch & Reyes-Guerra, 2014; Carpenter & Diem, 2013; Boske, 2010).

Diem and Carpenter (2013) expanded on race-related silences by examining how both student-related and structural silence shape dialogue around race and racism in a preparation program. First, student-related silence occurred during structured conversations where students intentionally decide not to speak. They categorized this student-related silence as either privileged or veiled silence. In this particular study, the authors note privileged silence is when a White student decides not to speak after viewing a film on race to be respectful of the people of color. They claimed that the White student choosing silence validates his/her white privilege and perpetuates the power that Whiteness holds in society. Meanwhile, structural silence in this study was found as a result of the programmatic structure of the educational leadership preparation program that limited, or avoided, racial dialogue in courses. The manifestation of silence around issues of race and racism in preparation programs significantly influence how students and faculty understand race relations in various educational settings (Boske, 2010; Carpenter & Diem, 2013; Rusch, 2004).

Ultimately, the lack of educational leadership literature on curriculum and pedagogy approaches of how to prepare leaders in education to address issues of race and racism in various educational contexts is alarming. As Gooden and Dantley (2012) posited, “paying attention to pedagogy and facilitating this important content in a way that can help leaders (and professors) to become reflective, action-focused, and able to address issues of diversity in their practice” (p. 245). Therefore, when transformational learning occurs in educational leadership
preparation programs on racial injustices, students develop critical leadership capabilities and willingness to make decisions that challenge systemic racism.

**Gender and Sexism.** There were limited studies that focused on gender and sexism in educational leadership preparation program curriculum and pedagogy. One particular study by Rusch (2004) found that discussion on issues of gender was infrequent or caused uncomfortable conversations. Rusch associated the limited discourse on issues of gender to faculty’s lack of knowledge and ability to incorporate issues of injustice into curriculum and pedagogy. When students were exposed to issues of gender through readings and writings, Young, Mountford, and Skrila (2006) reported that students resisted and lacked experiences of transformational learning. For example, Young et al. (2006) described, "majority of the students shared that the lack of forums for conversation about the materials and inadequate time for reflection on the materials were key barriers to their ability to internalize the material" for transformational learning (p. 275). Both Rusch and Young et al. do not offer curriculum or pedagogical suggestions for integrating issues of gender and sexism in educational leadership preparation program. However, Dentith and Peterlin (2011) suggested that preparation programs take a feminist ethos throughout the curriculum and pedagogy. Through a feminist theory approach to teaching and learning activities and discussions “highlight issues of identities, self-reflection, awareness, and action” across courses (Dentith & Peterlin, 2011, p.41). In their study, the authors found that the incorporation of a feminist ethos provided graduate students opportunities to engage with the issues of sexism and other social justice issues.

**Sexual Orientation and Heterosexism.** There is a lack of educational leadership preparation literature focusing on sexual orientation in the development of social justice leadership (Capper et al., 2006, Marshall & Hernandez, 2012; O’Malley & Capper, 2015).
Marshall and Hernandez (2013) and Capper, Alston, Gause, Kosechorek, Lopez, Lugg, and McKenzie (2006) identified curriculum and pedagogical strategies of including issues of sexual orientation in preparation programs. These recommendations were course readings, equity audits, reflective analysis journals, educational plunges, diversity panels, videos, and case presentation and analysis (Capper et al., 2006, Marshall & Hernandez, 2012). It is important to note, these authors recommend that sexual orientation be explicit in the curriculum and pedagogy, rather than a footnote in issues of equity and social justice. For example, Capper and colleagues (2006) examine syllabi and course readings of the authors’ courses that included Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Ally (LGBTQA) topics with the goal of raising consciousness about homophobia and heterosexism.

Within the literature, when sexual orientation is added to curriculum and pedagogy, there was a focus on having students reflect on how homophobia and heterosexism are present in everyday interaction including policy and law (Capper et al., 2006, Marshall & Hernandez, 2012; O’Malley & Capper, 2015). Moreover, both Marshall and Hernandez and Capper et al. wrote about the emotional response sexual orientation may bring about to engage students in critical consciousness and knowledge acquisition. In fact, Marshall and Hernandez (2012) posit, “it makes pedagogical sense to try to access students’ affective responses before asking them to engage in an analytical one” (p. 475). Due to the emotional work, the literature highlights that the inclusion of sexual orientation, homophobia, and heterosexism should take place throughout a course, or across the program, rather than a lesson topic to provide students with time to reflect, make meaning, and form analysis. Ultimately, educational leadership preparation programs’ curriculum and pedagogy that address issues of equity and social justice use an intersecting approach that takes into account interlocking identities and experiences of privilege and
oppression across race, ethnicity, gender, class, ability, belief, language, sexuality, and gender identity. O’Malley and Capper (2015) warn to not position difference as a hierarchy, but seek social justice across differences. Mentoring can serve has another curriculum and pedagogical tool to assist students with issues of equity and inequity.

**Role and Responsibility of Faculty in Higher Education**

The facilitation and teaching role of faculty in educational leadership preparation programs on social justice have been found to be important, since the approach they take to dismantle social injustices can serve as a model of transformation and critical consciousness in learning environments (Aguilar, 2017; Berkovich, 2017; Boske, 2011; Cambron- McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Capper, et al., 2006; Collay, Winkleman, Garcia, Guilkey- Amado, 2009; Cambron- McCabe, 2003; Guerra & Pazey, 2016; Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010). Related to teaching about equity and social justice, Guerra and Pazey (2017) argue that faculty, “must possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to address the challenges inherent in leading socially just educational programs” (p. 1752).

Other scholars have found that faculty engaging in critical reflection of their own social identities, positions, values and beliefs that influence their day-to-day decision-making and responsibilities (Aguilar, 2017; Cambron- McCabe, 2003; Collay et al., 2009; Guerra & Pazey, 2016). In a study on the inclusion of gender and race in leadership preparation, Rusch (2004) found that faculty’s social identities and sense of privilege or dominance are key to factors of their level of comfort in the discourse around social injustice, especially race and racism. For example, a faculty member from the study stated, “those in privileged positions –no matter how well intended— are not likely to willingly make changes that result in the loss of privilege” (p.
Rusch (2004) continued by quoting a study participant on the normalization of White men and how this may cause tension for these faculty members to understand other lived experiences. Similarly, scholars have found that some faculty in educational leadership preparation programs do not have the social justice skills, knowledge, or dispositions to facilitate curriculum and pedagogy for leadership development on social injustices (Carpenter & Diem, 2013; Guerra et al., 2013; Hawley & James, 2010; Hay & Reedy, 2016; Rusch, 2004; Trujillo & Copper, 2014). Furthermore, the lack of knowledge about social injustice issues may cause fear or avoidance on the part of faculty. Guerra et al. (2013) and Marshall (2004) agree that even faculty with the skills and knowledge to facilitate social injustice issues often do not challenge the traditional views or practices that maintain dominant status quo within preparation programs. Consequently, faculty continue to face challenges of creating learning spaces in which students can develop capabilities and willingness to enact leadership that dismantles injustices in education.

Studies have found that faculty’s interpretation of what it means to teach and develop students for a social justice orientation varied and affected how they infused social justice-related issues into the curriculum (Guerra et al., 2013; Hawley & James, 2010; Hay & Reedy, 2016; Trujillo & Copper, 2014). For instance, in a study of a private South Florida university educational leadership program aiming to prepare socially just leadership, Hay and Reedy (2016) found that faculty took a constructivist theory approach to teaching, relying on students to drive dialogue and depth of conversation around issues of social justice. This study illustrates an approach to the infusion of social justice in the curriculum that does not assure topics of injustices are addressed. The authors noted, “the professors felt more comfortable with leaving the curriculum open-ended to allow the interests of the students to guide both the dialogue and
Carpenter and Diem (2013) found that professors who created a classroom environment that provided space for students to engage in dialogue on racism through structured activities were willing to engage in dialogue. For instance, a professor commented that in teaching, “revealing of oneself allowed other students to be open to the process of actively participating in race-related conversations” (p. 17). This illustrates the role of faculty as facilitators and participants who co-create spaces with students to engage in curriculum and pedagogy around issues of injustice.

In a qualitative methodology, Edwards and colleagues (2014) highlighted the relational nature created by faculty who are committed to social justice through teaching in and outside of the classroom. The commitment to social justice was evident in faculty’s teaching, research, service, relationships, and mentorship. Edwards et al. (2014) found that faculty served as role model for engaging with social justice and significantly influenced the socialization of a social justice culture within the program. The findings of this study point to the relational aspect of teaching and learning in the development of a collective consciousness and sense of community that creates space for personal and professional transformation.

**Mentoring and Advising as Curriculum and Pedagogy**

The terms mentoring and advising are often used interchangeably within the education literature that notes the faculty-student relationship (Barnes & Austin, 2008; Barnes & Austin, 2008; Jones, Wilder, & Osborne-Lampkin, 2013). Nettles and Millett (2006) offered that the role of advisor within the doctoral educational experience involves serving as the middle person between the university and student, such managing program of study and degree completion.
Meanwhile, mentoring involves a deeper personal relationship that guides students throughout the doctoral process (Nettles & Millett, 2006).

**Mentoring**

In educational leadership preparation programs mentoring serves a way of socialization or transformation within the academy for academic and career success (Felder, 2010; Hackmann & Malin, 2018; Young & Brooks, 2008; Welton, Mansfield, & Lee, 2014). Most educational leadership literature on mentoring focused on doctoral students of color or/and women. In a qualitative study, Young and Brooks (2008) found that doctoral students of color benefit from mentorship that assist them in navigating racism and sexism within academic institution. Similarly, other scholars offered that mentoring centering equity and inequity is helping marginalized students feel included in the academy and assist them with understanding the “rules of the game” in academia (Felder, 2010; Grant, 2012; Grant & Ghee, 2015; Mullen, Fish, Hutinger, 2010).

In a case analysis, Felder (2010) identified pedagogical strategies of mentoring that included connecting students to research networks, spending time developing research skills and “demystify” academy barriers, and fostering collaborations opportunities. Mentoring can be tool to assist students in their capacity building around academic practice that encourage active learning, collaboration, and communal power-sharing (Mullen, Fish, Hutinger, 2010). As a recommendation to their quantitative study, Welton, Mansfield, and Lee (2014) suggested a feminist approach to mentoring that “extends beyond the analytical and technical skills necessary for research and writing by providing graduate students with encouragement and nurturing” to transform the academy and traditional roles. There are barrier to mentorship being a transformative curriculum and pedagogy. These barriers center around faculty being
disconnected from the student experience, unwillingness to mentor beyond advising, and lack of skills in fostering mentoring relationship (Felder, 2010).

**Advising**

A review of the literature of advising in doctoral education program indicates the importance of the doctoral advisor with doctoral students throughout the degree program (Barnes & Austin, 2008; Jones, Wilder, & Osborne-Lampkin, 2013). Through in-depth interviews with doctoral advisors, Barnes and Austin (2009) found advisors perceived their responsibilities as helping advisees be successful, develop as researchers, and develop as professional. The advisor within this study spoke of achieving a successful advisor relationship with students through the functions of collaborating, mentoring, advocating, and chastising. Meanwhile, Barnes, Williams, and Archer (2010) offered doctoral students’ perception of advisor attributes that entailed four positive attributes. Students expected advisors to be accessible, helpful, and caring that provide advisees guidance and answer all questions that develop their personal and professional well-being. These authors also found that students identified socializing as a positive attribute in which the advisors aided advisees with creating professional networks, and academic habits for professional development.

**Context of Higher Education**

Higher education has been marked by neoliberalism that values market-driven competitiveness while disregarding the development of critical analysis, moral judgment, and social responsibility (Giroux, 2010). In other words, universities’ commitment to the creation of knowledge for public good is being lost. Thus, programs with a social justice orientation are challenged in their teaching methods and learning goals that contradict the neoliberal reform of higher education (Preston & Aslett, 2014). The marketization of universities creates an obsession
with efficiency and outcomes that result in programs to be concerned with the size of classes and increase output (Olssen & Peters, 2005; Preston & Aslett, 2014). In school leadership preparation programs, English (2006) noted that as a result of neoliberal reform has caused programmatic reductionism and development of leadership skills that are antichange and anti-democratic. However, Bondi (2012) posited that educators for social justice cannot ignore institutional history, policies, and practices steep in exclusion and oppression. Giroux (2011) argued, “classroom learning embodies selective values, is entangled with relations of power, entails judgments about what knowledge counts, legitimates specific social relations, defines agency in particular ways, and always presupposes a particular notion of the future” (p. 6).

Consequently, doing social justice work in the neoliberal academic environment has been a challenge in higher education graduate programs. Osei-Kofi, Shahjaham, and Patton (2010) wrote that

“to engage with social justice work in the academy, one must contend with biases—against women, people of color, people with disabilities, and gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and queer individuals—that are embedded in institutions, either because they are designed with the lives and perspectives of the privileged in mind and/or because their structure still reflects the subordination that formal legislation has outlawed” (p.327)

In a study on creating a social justice concentration in an educational leadership program, Osei-Kofi et al., (2010) encountered institutional structures that resulted in constraints, which included power relations between and among faculty, and faculty-student relationship that affect the decision making on the implementation of a social justice program. Also, the institutional process of tenure, grant-funding, and scholarly publishing pose a challenge for centering oppositional in classroom teaching (Osei-Kofi et al., 2010). Hence, there must be an awareness
of how institutions practices and policies create issues of social injustices for faculty and students in and outside of the classroom. Meanwhile, Byrne-Jimenez (2010) called for systemic overhauling of programs “require faculty to rethink underlying assumptions, actions and policies, roles and relationships, pedagogical approaches, and levels of preparedness that challenge current modes of operation and force faculty to answer ‘why’ and for ‘whom’” (p. 6). Educational leadership preparation programs are embedded with power dynamics that neglect aspects of social justice in teaching, learning, and leadership development. Guerra et al., (2013) added that critically evaluating programs for power, privilege, and oppression and restructure all action and components of injustices.

**Classroom Power Dynamics and Teaching for Social Justice**

There is an assumption that higher education classrooms, especially teacher education and educational leadership, are neutral and value-free enterprise. According to Applebaum (2009) classrooms are never neutral sites for the production of knowledge; thus, teaching and learning the centers challenging the status quo is perceived as an imposition. Teaching for social justice can create challenges in the classroom that result in microaggression and emotional triggers for faculty and students.

**Microaggressions.** Microaggressions occur in higher education classrooms as subtle unintentional and intentional verbal comments, behaviors, and environmental indignities toward individuals of underrepresented status. Using focus group data, Sue, Lin, Torino, Capodilupo, and Rivera (2009) found that microaggression in the classroom leads to difficult conversations around the topic of injustices, especially race. The participants in this study reported classroom conversation being “emotionally charged” that result in misunderstanding, hostile dialogues, and hurt feelings (p.183). Thus, microaggressions in the classroom create “hostile and invalidating
learning environment(s)” that usually silence underrepresented students (Sue, 2010b, p.235). In a qualitative study, Boysen (2012) reported that teachers who taught diversity course responded to microaggression in college classrooms compared to teachers in non-diversity courses. However, this study found that classroom microaggressions are often ignored.

Faculty experience microaggressions in the classroom that result in challenging their authority and expertise, enduring negative behaviors and attitudes of students, and worrying about complaints being made to senior faculty and administrators about their teaching (McGowan, 2000; Stanley, 2006). In a narrative study, Stanley (2006) found that teaching becomes more complex with faculty with marginalized identities as they had to prove themselves to not only colleagues but also to students.

**Triggers.** Teaching and learning for social justice can cause triggers- word, behaviors, experiences, or content that result in an emotional response, which include hurt, confusion, anger, fear, surprise or embarrassment (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2010). According to Adams et al. (2010) there several ways to respond to emotional triggers that include leaving space, avoidance, silence, release, attack, internalization, rationalization, confusion, shock, name, discuss, confront, surprise, strategize, misinterpretation, and discretion. These responses influence the learning environment around the topic of social justice and injustice. Adams et al. (2010) suggest that educators discuss with students triggers and ways to respond to create a safe learning environment for all students.

**Summary**

This literature review provides an overview and synthesis of three literature strands on transformative teaching, learning, and leadership, and curriculum and pedagogy for social justice in educational leadership preparation program. In the sections above, the three themes of
literature explored were (a) transformative learning, teaching, and leadership (b) issues of injustice in educational leadership graduate preparation programs, and (d) roles and responsibilities of faculty in teaching and learning around issues of injustice.

In this literature review, transformative learning is defined as a process by which adult learners examine problematic frame of references through critical reflection and discourse (Mezirow, 1978). Teaching for transformative learning is providing students with an environment that provoked various types of reflections. Teaching for the development of transformative leadership is rooted in critical transformative learning that critiques dominant ideology and embraces social change. Educational leadership preparation programs can serve as a space for students and faculty where they can consider alternative perspectives in relations to enacting transformative leadership.

The literature revealed that curriculum in educational leadership preparation for social justice is inconsistent; thus, higher education should incorporate issues of injustice across the curricula for capacity development (Brown, 2004, 2006; Dantley & Green, 2015; Diem & Carpenter, 2013; Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2002; Rodríguez, Chambers, González, & Scheurich, 2010). Scholars have provided the outcomes of a curriculum with a social justice focus; however, through the literature review, it was unclear how curriculum in education leadership preparation program encourage the development of students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership.

Similarly, the pedagogical approaches for developing students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership were unclear in the literature. Although given more specifics on pedagogy than in curriculum, there remained a lack of details within the pedagogical approaches. A common pedagogical strategy revealed through the literature was the practice of self-
reflection, which assists students in making meaning of individual lived experiences, society, and possible social action (Boske, 2011, 2012; Brown 2004, 2006; Capper et al., 2006; Furman, 2012; Hafner, 2010).

In a review of specific injustices such as racism, sexism, and heterosexism, there was limited literature on how educational leadership preparation programs incorporate these topics into curriculum and pedagogy. Nevertheless, the scholars who focused on these topics suggested that curriculum and pedagogy on racism, sexism, and heterosexism must highlight the marginalized lived experiences through explicit language around power relations and oppression on both the personal and structural level (Boske, 2015; Capper et al., 2006; Carpenter & Diem, 2013; Dentith & Peterlin, 201; Gooden & O’Doherty, 2015; Marshall & Hernandez, 2012; O’Malley & Capper, 2015). However, there is a gap in the literature that connects teaching and learning for capacity building that includes personal and social transformation.

Ultimately, the role and responsibility of faculty in the facilitation of curriculum and pedagogy was essential throughout the literature. Faculty’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions around equity and social justice influence the incorporation of these issues into course curriculum and pedagogy (Aguilar, 2017; Guerra et al., 2013; Carpenter & Diem, 2013; Cambron- McCabe, 2003; Collay et al., 2009; Edwards et al., 2014; Guerra & Pazey, 2016; Rusch, 2004). In other words, faculty must provide spaces for discussion of these topics, role model anti-oppressive leadership, and participate in self-reflection for the development of critical consciousness in the learning environment.

**Trends and Gaps**

Several scholars have exposed broad pedagogical strategies (e.g., cultural autobiographies, life histories, prejudice reduction workshops, reflective journals, critical
incidents, cross-cultural interviews, educational plunges, and diversity panels); however, what prompts or guides these activities within the context of leadership development for social transformation are unknown. In addition, the literature on curriculum and pedagogy in educational leadership has focused on the formal classroom, which raises the question of how does mentorship and advising of faculty outside of the classroom encourage the development of capacity to engage in transformative leadership.

There appears to be a focus on a single social issue or social justice as an overarching term for all injustices with any specifics. For example, the literature on teaching and learning issues of injustice focused on single axes of difference and one-dimensional analysis of power relations. Identity, social location, oppression, and social action, when examined in isolation, become organized hierarchically and maintain the status quo. This unique gap connects to DeMatthew and Mawhinney’s (2014) study of leadership for social justice, particularly for students with disabilities. Moreover, there was a focus on personal transformation without the connections to structural oppression. The roles and responsibilities of faculty in educational leadership preparation programs are essential for co-creating curriculum, pedagogy, and space for leadership development around social justice to emerge.

There is a need for more research on how educational leadership faculty engages social justice within their teaching and learning approaches for leadership development for students and themselves. Additionally, it became evident from the review of literature that there remains a need for studies that explore more specific curriculum and pedagogical approaches in and outside of the classroom in educational leadership preparation programs geared toward developing the capacity of students to address issues of injustice.
Moreover, the literature limits critical teaching to formal classrooms, which misses opportunities to understand how advising and mentoring influence leadership development. This study seeks to address these gaps in the literature. I inquire into transformative teaching for capacity development to engage in transformative leadership.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

“Critically intervene in a way that challenges and changes” - bell hooks

The purpose of this qualitative study was to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs teach to encourage students’ capacity development to engage in transformative leadership. The qualitative data obtained from this research provides insight into teaching and learning influenced by critical theory in educational leadership preparation programs. This chapter describes a critical qualitative approach used to answer the research question that anchors this paper. In addition, this chapter contains information of the participant selection, methods for data generation, and data analysis technique. This chapter concludes with the trustworthiness and limitations of this study.

Research Design

To conduct this study, I used a critical qualitative research design in order to gain an understanding on teaching that takes into account environments and interactions, and considers how the research process makes visible injustices or potentially reinforces social injustices. The rationale for a critical qualitative research design is multifaceted: (a) to understand teaching for the development of transformative leadership in greater depth; and (b) inquiry that attempts to uncover and confront injustices. In this critical qualitative study, there was a focus on how faculty constructs and make sense of teaching approaches for transformative social change on both an intrapersonal and interpersonal level.
Paradigm and Philosophical Underpinnings

According to Crotty (2012), a critical research perspective seeks to critique and challenge current hegemony and injustices. Research within the critical paradigm moves beyond just describing lived experiences to critiquing, revealing, and challenging systemic oppression stemming from power relationships with the goal to transform, emancipate, and empower. The critical paradigm guides researchers to uncover oppressive power relations, Philosophically, this critical qualitative study was grounded in critical epistemological and ontological assumptions.

Lange’s (2004) statement is reflective of my ontological stance on teaching as a transformative process to support transformative leadership development, “Transformation is not just an epistemological process involving a change in worldview and habits of thinking; it is also an ontological process where participants experience a change in their being in the world including their forms of relatedness” (p. 137). The critical paradigm and underlying philosophical assumptions I brought to this study supported inquiry into the dynamics between me and the participants, and critiqued of how participants respond to barriers and opportunities to advance capacity building needed to bring about social change.

Furthermore, the epistemological and ontological assumptions within my chosen research paradigm were that knowledge and reality are socially constructed and mediated through power relations (Merriam, 2009). Individual perceptions of knowledge and reality are largely influenced by structural and historical systems of society. Thus, a critical qualitative approach values critique of the dialectical relationship between structures and individuals to bring about social transformation (Merriam, 2009). In this study, my axiological stance is rooted in social critique of teaching and learning that centers critical perspective for consciousness-raising of the study participants and myself. I strived to expose and critique the ways that oppression and
related power to injustices have manifested; thus, affecting study participants’ socio-political aspects of teaching for social transformation. The ongoing process of consciousness-raising requires reflexivity that makes meaning of unconscious values and beliefs that reinforce social injustices. Therefore, my axiological stance values the pursuit of liberation for conscious and unconscious oppression. My epistemological, ontological, axiological stance assisted me to make explicit connections between the process and outcomes of research that further a critical transformative research agenda.

**Research Approach**

A qualitative interview methodology approach was chosen for this study to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs encourage the development of students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. The use of interviews assisted in gathering real-life descriptions and narratives through the researcher's interpretation of a phenomenon. In this study, an interview methodology approach was taken to evoke the lived experiences of the participants in relations to developing students’ capacity to understand social oppressions affecting education (Patton, 2015). Within the traditions of the critical paradigm and philosophical underpinning this study, an interview methodology invited study participants to reflect and make meaning of their teaching experiences to uncover oppressions that are in embedded in historical, structural, and ideological contexts, discourses, and power relations.

**Sampling**

The study participants for this study were tenure track faculty in educational leadership at four-year, United States universities or colleges. Faculty had teaching responsibility in a program with face-to-face courses or a hybrid or face-to-face and online. None of the study participants
teach or advise students exclusively online. Study participants expressed a commitment to developing transformative leadership among their doctoral students.

The study participants were selected through purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling in qualitative study emphasizes information-rich for an in-depth study (Patton, 2015). The aim for purposeful sampling of participants was to provide a detailed understanding of faculty’s experiences with the multidimensional aspects of teaching to develop students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. Due to the critical nature of this critical qualitative, the sample was kept small to focus on rich, in-depth data collected to understand the phenomenon of teaching for capacity development in transformative leadership and educational leadership preparation programs. Moreover, purposeful sampling allowed me to select study participants based on specific criteria. The invitation to participate resulted in ten-interested faculty, but only two participants completed the process, including the questionnaire and two interviews. However, there was a third participant who completed the questionnaire and one interview, but did not continue in the study due to most of her teaching was with master students. After showing interest in the study, most faculty did not follow through when asked to complete the questionnaire due to time commitment and access to requested documents. Therefore, the sample size of this study was 2 participants, which provided an in-depth analysis of documents and interviews.

**Participant Recruitment**

Upon IRB approval, to recruit the sample, a solicitation letter (Appendix A) for participants was shared through the listserv of American Educational Research Association’s (AERA) special interest groups: Leadership for Social Justice (LSJ) and Critical Educators for Social Justice (CESJ). These organizations are specifically chosen due to their connection to
educational leadership faculty members who teach in doctoral programs with a social justice orientation. In addition, participants were recruited through social media: Facebook and Twitter. The inclusion of social media for recruitment was to reach faculty who were not members or active in LSJ and CESJ. The solicitation letter and informed consent letter provided information about the study, researcher’s contact information, explain the intent of the study and request voluntary participation. Additionally, the informed consent form explained that access would be restricted to secure participants' privacy and maintain confidentiality of data provided. The invitation to participate was emailed via listserv and posted on social media several times to encourage faculty to participate in the study. The recruitment invitation was open for three months before the first data generation and remained open throughout the study.

**Participant Selection**

The following five criteria were used to recruit participants. First, participants must have primary responsibility in a doctoral educational leadership program, including teaching courses, advising program students, overseeing dissertation committees, contributing to program design, and participating in department activities such as faculty recruitment and selection, program admissions, and other committee work.

The context of this study was specific to teaching and learning in educational leadership preparation programs for leadership development; therefore, it was appropriate to set this as a criterion for inclusion/exclusion. Furthermore, educational leadership preparation programs were not limited to school leadership but may include higher education, student affairs, and community leadership. The name of such programs may vary but must have a mission statement aligned with the development of educational leadership.
The second criterion, participants must teach doctoral students. The focus of this study was on the doctoral level due to the opportunities faculty and students have to interact in and outside of the classroom and the extended time period needed to complete a doctoral degree. Unlike Master’s programs that are focused on career advancement (e.g. licensure), doctoral programs foster the development of theoretical and conceptual knowledge to inform practice and policy. Additionally, the time commitment to complete such a degree (3 to 8 years) is more substantial compared to Master’s programs (1 to 2 years). The requirement of original research illustrating a mastery of knowledge, faculty advisors are essential for the completion of a doctoral degree as dissertation chair or committee member and coursework advisor. Participants must be have 4 or more years of being a faculty member. The rationale for this criterion is that faculty with 4 or more teaching experience faculty may have the language to express how they have navigate the multidimensional aspect of teaching and have more time to dedicate to teaching, advising, and mentoring upon which they can reflect.

The third criterion was that faculty must teach in an educational leadership preparation program with an explicit mission, vision, or values statement of social justice, equity, transformative social change, or expose students to critical social theories. Or faculty should teach or have taught course(s) that include social justice, equity, or critical theory as frameworks. The mission and vision statement and course learning objectives and outcomes communicate the purpose of the program/course, particularly what the program expects its students to learn and how that learning can be used to benefit society. It is important to note, faculty may not have control over the program’s mission and vision or course objectives or outcomes, and may also be influenced by contradicting institutional values and interactions in and outside of the classroom.
Additionally, their way of teaching may depend in part on what they are teaching, which also may be influenced by the goals of the program and course(s).

For the fourth criterion, study participants were asked to complete a pre-interview questionnaire about their teaching and personal demographics. In this questionnaire, participants were asked to upload a course syllabus, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vitae to gain insight into their teaching goals and experiences. Participants were given 2.5 weeks from the release of the recruitment letter to complete the 15-20 minute survey. This time period allowed for participants to complete the questionnaire and upload documents without being a significant time commitment. The rationale for this criterion is that faculty who were seriously interested in the study completed the questionnaire, while others will self-select out of the study through not completing the questionnaire. Furthermore, the questionnaire provided preliminary data to understanding the faculty teaching approaches. All completed questionnaire were reviewed for appropriateness of participating in the study.

The fifth criterion for inclusion in this study is that participants must demonstrate evidence of a commitment to the deconstruction of knowledge frameworks that perpetuate injustice, critique inequitable distribution of power, and focus on emancipation, democracy, equity, and justice in these documents. Study participants were excluded after a review of their course syllabus, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vitae, if not connected to the purpose of the study. Following the tradition of transformative leadership as articulated by Shields (2010), faculty should aim, “to create learning contexts or communities in which social, political, and cultural capital is enhanced in such a way as to provide equity of opportunity for students as they take their place in contributing members of society” (Shields, 2010, p. 572). More specifically, in the curriculum vitae I reviewed for publications around development of social justice, equity, or
transformative leadership. This was not be limited to conceptual and empirical scholarship involving graduate students, but may include previous, current, or future educational leaders. In addition, the curriculum vitae was used to understand faculty’s service activities connected to social justice, equity, and leadership development. The teaching philosophy was examined not only for a critical approach but the inclusion of teaching beyond the formal classroom. For instance, the teaching philosophy should include their advising and mentoring approach. This is important to note, as teaching in this study included in and outside of the classroom interactions. All submitted documents were reviewed with close attention to power relations and social justice in connection to leadership development. In the case that the sample was larger than 7, the questionnaire will be used to make a diverse study participants pool (i.e. years, affiliated positions, type of institution, personal demographics). A diverse pool allows opportunities to understand teaching to develop students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership from various lived experiences and positionalities.

Methods and Procedures

Data Generation

Qualitative studies often rely on a variety of data sources to understand the multiple facets of a phenomenon (Patton, 2015). In this study, a creative qualitative narrative data generation approach was taken to offer participants various modes of communicating their experiences in teaching to develop transformative leadership. A triangulation strategy for data collection included semi-structured, one-on-one interview, artifacts, and document analysis. Baxter and Jack (2008) noted that each data set could be bound together to deepen the understanding of the phenomenon. Moreover the triangulation of data allowed the phenomenon of the study to be explored from multiple contexts of the participants. It is important to note that
the use of triangulation in the study is not for convergence or seeking for one truth through the use of multiple sources, but rather provide rich data from which to analyze.

The purpose of the data generation process was to build a relationship between participants and researcher. Due to the dialectical relationship that is essential in this study, data was co-created by the study participants and me. Hydén (2014) called the partnership between the researcher and participants to be a, “dance of balancing involvement” with shared responsibility of constructing knowledge (p. 8). Thus, data generation was appropriate for this study due to the reflective nature of data methods. The data generation occurred over a month time period for all study participants.

**Pilot Interview.** Prior to seeking Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, a pilot interviews were conducted in order to develop and refine the protocol guiding the interviews, namely how the questions, artifacts, and document analysis will be generated. One faculty member was part of the researcher’s educational leadership preparation program, while the other faculty member was a methodologist in the education methods department. These faculty members were asked to provide artifacts to illustrate their teaching. This approach was to ensure clarity, appropriateness, and effectiveness of data collection methods in connection with the research question. After piloting the interview protocol, modifications were made to the communication of the use of artifacts. One suggestion was to provide examples of the type of artifacts participants may consider.

An additional suggestion was around my role as the interviewer from a critical paradigm and philosophical perspective. The suggestion was not to be afraid to insert critical follow up questions on issues of power throughout the interview process. My hesitation of asking follow up questions around issues of race, racism, and privilege were evident in my journal memos of the
pilot study. I feared that the participants may interpret my probing as an attack on them as people and their teaching. I included in my journal memos topics that caused me to hesitate or an emotional response, which included the use of only Black doctoral students in examples, the explicit disclosure of the race of only Black students during the interview, and the interviewee being uncomfortable around issues of race and racism. It is important to note, these topics became difficult for me when the participant was White, due to my race being one of my salient identities. Thus, I created a chart in my journal of other social issues and oppressions to ensure I did not solely focus or reflect on issues of race and racism.

The pilot study revealed the usefulness of the course syllabus, teaching philosophy, curriculum vitae, and artifacts to elicit information about teaching goals and experiences. The use of documents provided a level of familiarity with faculty teaching approaches and allowed for specific and deeper questions. Due to the relational aspect of the interview process, this approach allowed for me to enter the conversation with knowledge to converse with the study participants throughout the interview process. All necessary changes to techniques and protocols were made prior to submission of the study for approval.

**Document Analysis**

Prior to the interview faculty’s course syllabus, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vitae were analyzed to gain insight into their teaching goals and experiences to develop students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. Bowen (2009) noted that document analysis provides the researcher context into the spaces participants occupy and how they operate within these spaces. Documents of course syllabus, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vitae were analyzed with close attention to language and groups of words that indicate the deconstruction of dominant knowledge and realities that perpetuate injustice, critique uneven power relations, and
focus on the development or goal for emancipation, democracy, equity, and justice. These elements must be explicit within these documents for the purpose of the study. Moreover, the document analysis were used to generate additional interview questions and used within the interview. The documents were used as an elicitation technique during the interview to focus on how faculty have articulated their commitment to the development of students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. An underlying assumption with the documents analysis was it allowed me with opportunities become familiar with participants in hope to develop a relationship in the interview by connecting their course syllabus, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vitae to the interview questions. Therefore, document analysis supplement the interview process.

The original data collection strategy was modified to retain study participants throughout the process. Since the questionnaire seemed to be a barrier of participation, it was moved from the invitation to participate and became part of my initial contact to schedule the first interview. Thus, the uploading of a course syllabus, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vitae became optional. Only one study participant completed the questionnaire and provided documents (course syllabus, and curriculum vitae) prior to the first interview, while the other study participant verbally completed the questionnaire during the first interview. However, for the participant who did not provide documents, I was able to locate a curriculum vitae on their department’s website. The semi-structured interview protocol remained the same with personalized follow up questions related to specific experiences, feelings, attitudes, and thoughts connected to the examples and artifacts the participants provided on their teaching.

**Interview with Artifacts.** In a critical qualitative, interviews are an important data source for in-depth response to people's lived experiences (Crotty, 2012). This interview
approach was taken to capture the multidimensional nature of teaching that is both interpersonal and intrapersonal. The study consisted of two interviews. The interview protocols (Appendix C & D) were based on the review of literature regarding educational leadership preparation programs and social justice, transformative teaching and learning, and leadership development for social change. The first interview was a total 120 minutes that focused on in and out the classroom teaching and faculty dispositions and experiences. The second interview was a total of 45 minute and used artifacts to demonstrate faculty’s teaching, advising, and mentoring. One-on-one interviews was conducted in order to gain an understanding of the participants' experiences and interpretations of how they teach (facilitate learning) to develop students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. Rooted in a critical approach, a relational process of interviewing centers conversations that provides a deeper understanding of the participant’s experiences, without sacrificing the integrity or uniqueness of the interview. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim by a third party. For confidentiality purposes, all participants’ names and institutions will be changed to pseudonyms.

This semi-structured interview approach was oriented towards narration that provided opportunity for the participant to reconstruct actions and context related to the research questions (Hydén, 2014). More specifically, a narrative approach during interviews used stories to highlight place, time, motivation and the participant’s interpretation of event. It was crucial in this study for the participants to tell their stories related to teaching in order to gain an understanding of the complexities of teaching as critical engagement. Furthermore, this approach enabled reciprocity between the researcher and participant (Kallio, Pietila, Johnson, & Kangasniemi, 2016; Hydén, 2014).
Artifacts were interwoven throughout the interview process as an elicitation technique to ground the interview through the study participants explaining the significance of the artifact in relations to their teaching. According to Barton (2015) the use of elicitation techniques make the interview setting more comfortable and honors the voice of the participant through giving them more control over the constructing, naming, and explaining of their own artifacts. Participants were asked to share documents, objects, pictures, videos, art, and metaphors that demonstrate their teaching to develop students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. These artifacts included how faculty engage in their advising and mentoring approaches around transformative leadership development. The sharing of artifacts invited participants to reveal specific experiences of their teaching. This method assisted participants with recalling experiences and revealing the complexities of their teaching in and outside of the classroom. Furthermore, artifacts served as a visual for me to engage with participants in meaning making of their experiences. For instance, I used the artifacts to pose questions and generate conversations around power, social justice, and development. The underlying assumption was that the elicitation techniques of artifacts and documents allows for relationship building through the respect of exploring lived experiences. Study participants were asked to provide three to five artifacts for the second interview and select the order in which artifacts will be shared. Artifact sharing was used in conjunction with interviews to generate information-rich data, and the artifact question protocol will guide inquiry.

**Journals and Memos.** I wrote memos to document my decisions, reactions, questions, and interpretations throughout the research process to maintain self-awareness and critique of my role. All memos I became part of the data generation and analyses to preserve the integrity of the
narratives. Through the research process, my goal was to identify sources of inequities and make visible power relations for social transformation.

**Data Analysis**

The critical paradigm and its philosophical underpinnings influenced the data analysis process by paying close attention to injustices and power relations throughout the data, including the language used to describe the social practice of teaching. Moreover, this approach to the data analysis allowed for honoring the voices of the study participants, while asking questions of the data. Some of these questions that emerged were focused on the connection between power dynamics and analysis, discussions of oppression and privilege, relational aspects of pedagogy, the role of previous knowledge, training, or prior experiences, and the types of social action invoked. In a qualitative case study, data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, and tabulating to make sense of the data (Saldaña, 2016). After all interviews were transcribed by a third party, I coded the data and place them into categories. Coding is a systematic process for identifying patterns in the data analysis (Tracy, 2013). Patton (2015) noted that using qualitative analysis software facilitates data storing, coding, retrieval, comparing, and linking. In the following section is a discussion of the data coding process.

Preliminary data analysis consisted of becoming familiar with participants’ interviews through reading and re-reading transcriptions of interviews. This approach was used to remain open during the initial data analysis to allow for codes to emerge related to the study purpose and research question. I used an *en vivo* coding method as well; seeking the words and phrases participants used allowed me to create first-level subcategories as they describe their teaching and related experiences. In addition, a sub-coding method was used to assign second, deeper, order codes to the first-level of subcategories to support a more refined data analysis (Saldaña,
2016). After the preliminary data analysis, code mapping and landscaping were used for categorizing and organizing the codes.

The data were analyzed three times, with each coding cycle streamlining and updating subcategories through analytic memo. An analytic memo writing served as a journal reflection to note the coding process, code choices, emergent patterns, categories and subcategories, themes, and concepts in the data (Saldaña, 2016). Then, in the second cycle of coding, the subcategories were reorganized and condensed through focused coding. According to Saldaña (2016), focused coding is searching subcategories for most frequent or significant codes based on thematic or conceptual similarity. Lastly, the codes were analyzed to identify themes responsive to the purpose of the study.

**Trustworthiness**

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) trustworthiness in qualitative research centers on truth-value in which the researcher is confident based on the findings. In critical research the truth is based on human experiences that result in multiple truths. Therefore, as the researcher I am not attempting to capture an ultimate truth or reality. Instead I aimed towards a dialectical process of unveiling reality, critically analyzing it, and recreating that knowledge between the study participants and me with the goal for transformative social change. Trustworthiness in critical research centers on authenticity that embraces subjectivity of both the study participants and researcher, and as praxis, comes through connecting critical theory to practice through research (Morrow, 2005). To further ensure trustworthiness in this study, I demonstrated reflexivity throughout the research process.
**Researcher Reflexivity**

Both the study participants and researcher affect the research process (Patton, 2015). Reflexivity provides opportunities for me to understand how my positionality and worldview affect the research process (Morrow, 2005). In this study, I considered the power relations in which participants’ are situated, namely their socio-political positions as faculty and scholars in the field as well as my position as a graduate student and emerging scholar. My goal was to build a relationship with the study participants that challenge the faculty/student hierarchical relationship.

Furthermore, reflexivity in a critical qualitative research required me to critique my positionality, lived experiences, beliefs, biases, privileges, and oppressions, which impacts the collection, analysis, and reporting of data (Patton, 2015). Thus, I engaged in reflexivity throughout the research process to understand and critique my role in the creation of knowledge. Due to my lack of experience in teaching graduate students, the use of reflexivity assisted me in socially and emotionally situating myself with the study participants to hear and convey what the faculty members shared rather than what I think or believe. Thus, in trying to understand how faculty facilitate the development of students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership, I took a learner disposition that is oriented towards a dialectical relationship with the study participants. These trustworthiness strategies were employed to ensure my analyses and interpretations represent the phenomenon of the study and not merely my perspective.
CHAPTER FOUR:

FINDINGS

“Teachers and students (leadership and people), co-intent on reality, are both Subjects, not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge. As they attain this knowledge of reality through common reflection and action, they discover themselves as its permanent re-creators.” -Paulo Freire

The purpose of this critical qualitative study was to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs teach to encourage students’ capacity development to engage in transformative leadership. The research question was: How do faculty engage in teaching to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform social oppression affecting education? This chapter includes the findings derived from rich descriptions and analysis of the data from multiple sources: interviews, artifacts, documents, and journal memos. In the following section, I provide a brief overview of demographic information on the study participants. Then, I introduce and present a thematic report of the findings, which derived from shared themes I identified through analysis of the data. In alignment with the critical paradigm and philosophical perspectives underlying this study, I offer a thematic report that provides space for the unique aspects of each participants’ teaching. I conclude this chapter with a summary of the findings that were: The participants (1) integrated critical frameworks into curriculum and pedagogical approaches, (2) established spaces in and outside of the formal classroom to engage students, (3) centered student-faculty
relationships for support and collaboration, and (4) evoked students’ transformative activism through academic practice.

**Thematic Report of Findings**

From a critical conceptual framework that guided this study, questions of power relations of social and positional privilege and oppression were asked of the data. I was attentive to power-over, power-to, and power-with. More specifically, I focused on relational power between people, structures, intrapersonal, and knowledge production. Lastly, I noted power relations that were disrupted for social transformation. The first finding, integrating critical frameworks into curriculum and pedagogical approaches, were themes of teaching philosophies forced on consciousness raising, critical readings and reflections, and dialogue on power, privilege, and oppression. Under the second finding, establishing spaces in and outside of the formal classroom to engage students, were themes of in classroom spatial arrangements and management, home visits, and other informal spaces. The next finding detailed themes of advising and mentoring, centering student-faculty relationships for social and political support and collaboration. The last finding, evoking students’ transformative activism through academic practice, included themes of knowledge production and academic exercise for social transformation.

**Participants**

Dr. Smith is a full professor in an Educational Leadership and Policy Studies department that offers a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) with a focus to develop policymakers, academic faculty, and other areas of practice that demand theoretical research expertise. She currently teaches at a predominately-white, urban public research university in the Midwest. The institution has received the highest Carnegie Foundation rating
for research intensiveness and community engagement. There are 7,710 graduate students with
1,371 graduate students in the College of Education.

**Table 1: Findings, Themes, and Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Experiences</td>
<td>Teaching philosophies</td>
<td>Integrated critical frameworks into curriculum and pedagogical approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformed Intellectuals</td>
<td>forced on consciousness raising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional Knowledge</td>
<td>Critical readings and reflections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Possible Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges and Barriers</td>
<td>Dialogue on power, privilege, and oppression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Space</td>
<td>In classroom spatial arrangements and management</td>
<td>Established spaces in and outside of the formal classroom to engage students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Faculty power relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other spaces (Conference, coffee shop, and</td>
<td>Home visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>Centered student-faculty relationships for social and political support and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-constructors</td>
<td>Mentoring for personal transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action in K-12 and Higher Education</td>
<td>Knowledge production</td>
<td>Evoked students’ transformative activism through academic practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>Academic exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Smith's doctoral students are school leaders (i.e., Principals, Superintendents, District Administrators, Teachers) who are mostly students of color from local school districts.

According to Dr. Smith, the majority of her students are Black or Middle-Eastern. She is a White woman who has taught educational leadership for 23 years. Dr. Smith’s research agenda focuses on inclusion, equity, excellence, and social justice. She teaches courses such as Leadership Theories and Research and Seminar in Educational Leadership that focus on leadership in education.
Dr. Moore is an assistant professor in higher and postsecondary education and serves as a faculty affiliate in ethnic studies. He teaches educational leadership at a predominately white, large, public metropolitan research 1 university in the southwest. There are 12,630 enrolled graduate students with 268 doctoral students in the College of Education. According to Dr. Moore, the majority of his students are White.

Dr. Moore's doctoral students yearn to become higher education leaders (i.e., Students Affairs, University Administration, and College Faculty). His research agenda focuses on the status and experiences of racially minoritized students across postsecondary educational settings using critical frameworks. Dr. Moore identifies as a Black man who has been teaching in higher education for four years. He teaches courses such as Race and Equity in Education and Student Development Theory through a hybrid approach. Dr. Moore’s doctoral student load includes one dissertation chair, co-chairing two dissertations, and committee member for another dissertation.

Table 2. Study Participants Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Participant (Pseudonym)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Institution Type &amp; Preparation Educational Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Smith</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Large urban public research 1 university in the Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Leadership (Principal, Superintendent, District Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Moore</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Large public metropolitan Research 1 university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Education (Students Affairs, University Administration, Faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrating Critical Frameworks into Curriculum and Pedagogical Approaches

The first finding of this study highlighted the study participants’ commitment to integrating critical frameworks into their curriculum and pedagogical approach. Although, the use of critical frameworks to encourage students to engage in critical reading, reflection, and dialogue is covered in the literature, the participants provided details of such teaching approaches. The themes within this finding were rooted in the participants being attentive to issues of power, privilege, and oppression for social transformation. In other words, the participants sought to ask questions of relationships between knowledge and power, with the belief that social injustices exist. The participants did not claim neutrality in their teaching and held a firm position on the existence and meaning of social injustices in education and society. The final theme in this finding addressed the resistance and barriers the participants encountered as part of their teaching that focused on power, privilege, and oppression.

Teaching Philosophy

The first theme of this study was the participants’ teaching philosophy on the development of transformative leadership among doctoral students. A teaching philosophy grounds the objectives, methods, and evaluations to which an educator approaches teaching and learning. Both of the participants were explicit about including issues of power, privilege, and oppression in their written teaching philosophy, syllabus, publications, and relationships with students and colleagues. How the participants defined terms such as social justice, injustice, equity, transformation, and critical coupled with their belief of what it means to teach and develop students, influenced their teaching approach.
For example, Dr. Smith discussed how she conceptualized social justice and injustice with her students,

“I talk about it as a theory as having basically two components because when you think about a theory you think about what do manipulate and if you change what variable and those qualitative terms what are the outcome that you anticipate. I think about it as if you have a warm welcoming inclusive respect learning environment, so the kids don't have to be afraid of being bullied or ashamed of who they are or trying to hide who they are. Then they are better able to concentrate on their learning and therefore they will have better academic promise. Second half of that is that if we actually focus on democratic citizenship and civic responsibility then our society will benefit. I think about it in terms of power, justice, the dialectic between the individual and the collective and I try and help them to see that. It’s addressing inequities where ever they appear and paying attention to the marginalized populations of not just our own society but globally.”

Dr. Smith conceptualized social justice and injustice by providing an understanding of power relations that considered privilege and oppression. For instance, when discussing academic opportunity for low-income students, Dr. Smith claimed students must not just consider how to engage the oppressed group in rectifying uneven power of domination, but also the need to engage the privileged group as part of the democratic citizenship. This was evident in the artifacts she provided of guided questions that asked students to think through such relationships with social justice and injustice in theory and practice.

Meanwhile, Dr. Moore focused on the term, “critical” within his teaching to develop doctoral students that centered on humanizing marginalized groups. He continually asked students to consider the power dynamics of various social positionalities, for instance issues of
class, gender, and race for consciousness-raising. It was important to note, Dr. Moore was not concerned with meeting students where they were but rather focused on moving student forward in their thinking of power, privilege, and oppression. The majority of students with whom Dr. Moore worked had little exposure to teaching and learning about social justice and injustice; therefore, their knowledge for liberation may be rooted in oppression (i.e. racism, sexism).

For Dr. Smith, centering social justice and injustice in her teaching for transformative leadership was necessary,

"Because I think if we ignore that [social justice and injustice], we focus on technical change rather than deep cultural and social economic change. And if we really want change that results in equity then we need to do something beyond the technical”.

Both participants connected their teaching philosophy to the purpose of leadership development being to responded to issues of injustice and seek justice for all people. For Dr. Moore, the development of transformative leadership was not only career practice, but also a moral responsibility to address structural injustice. The participants were committed to guiding students through their thinking about social justice and injustice within leadership. Their teaching was not merely aimed at the indoctrination of students, but was aimed at intentionally engaging students in critiques of power relations to expose privilege and oppression within education, leadership, and society.

The participants demonstrated a personal commitment to social justice by exposing injustice through their engagement in the academy. The participants’ lived experiences, values, beliefs, and knowledge shaped their teaching approaches. In other words, the participants did not separate who they were as individuals from their teaching approach. The participants served as role models for students in the development of consciousness –raising to support justice seeking
as a sense of being. For example, Dr. Moore described his process of self-reflection to he shared
students as his way of practicing humility and patience on the journey to critical consciousness.
He recalled,

I look at my own start growing up in the Bible belt South, many of the views that I hold
now are not things that I held before. I was raised to be very homophobic; even when I
thought I wasn't being homophobic, you know what I'm saying?

Both participants were transparent about their social and positional privilege and the need to be
vulnerable with students about their continuous journey of development around social justice and
injustice. Carpenter and Diem (2013) suggested that faculty revealing of oneself allowed for
students to be open to the process of actively participating in tough dialogue and self-reflexivity.
For instance, Dr. Smith offered, "I talk about privilege. I share my own background. I share how
it is privileged. And then I always say first of all that I didn't recognize it for a long time. Which
other people [students] then said I didn't realize it either". Therefore, the participants teaching
approaches invited students to make meaning of their personal privilege and consider how they
were complicit in the production and reproduction of oppression. The participants did not discuss
how teaching students to recognize their privilege might re-center privilege in ways that erased
narratives of oppression. For example, when exploring issues of racism, the dialogue became
about White people, “buy-in” rather than about the conditions of structural oppression and the
material manifestation experienced by people of color.

Both participants’ definition of social justice, injustices, and critical invited students into
the critical process of analyzing power relations through readings, assignments, discussions, and
action to understanding of social emancipation in education. Thus, the participants described
their teaching as providing students with materials and experiences to become aware of and
consider how social injustices manifested within educational policies and practices with opportunities for transformation. The social oppressions the participants spoke of were racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, xenophobia and nationalism. For example, Dr. Smith stated, “I don’t shy away from talking about things like racism or homophobia or xenophobia”. She explained that she was explicit about social oppression at the onset of classes to notify students that they will engage in tough conversations around these issues. Furthermore, both participants spoke of engaging students in how social oppressions interlocked, therefore needing to analyze the complexity of power relations. The participants did not debate the existence of social oppressions (e.g. racism, sexism, classism), which may be a barrier for students who did not agree with social justice and injustices or had limited knowledge of such information.

**Critical Readings**

The participants’ critical approaches to teaching aimed to understand the dialectical relationship between theory and practice. It was important to understand how the participants approached theory within their respective fields to develop students’ knowledge around practice, especially seminal theoretical frameworks. For Dr. Moore, students were engaged in the learning theories before conducting analysis of their possibilities and limitations. He offered, “We don't need to throw anything away theory wise. For me, I'm like, take what you need”. Meanwhile, Dr. Smith used critical frameworks alongside seminal literature pieces to engage students in criticality around power, privilege, and oppression. Both participants asked students to consider issues of race, gender, sex, and other social categories addressed within seminal literature. Such an approach to seminal work attempted to address dominant knowledge production that enabled oppressive educational conditions, while engaging students in the historical context of the
respective field, thus, teaching students to understand the historical and current context of
education.

To challenge dominant knowledge production, the participants spoke of including literature from
diverse authors to provide students with various ways of knowing, theorizing, and conducting
research.

Table 3: Course Information and Pedagogical Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Theories</th>
<th>Pedagogical Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Smith</td>
<td>Transformative Leadership</td>
<td>Small &amp; Large group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand some of the history and development of research in educational leadership</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Reflective Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to describe and critique several current leadership theories</td>
<td>Distributive Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine their practice in the light of leadership theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand their roles as educational leaders in their organizations</td>
<td>Radical Servant Leadership</td>
<td>Local, regional, national, and international current events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine their personal philosophy of leadership appropriate for diverse contexts</td>
<td>Critical Race Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the role of the leader in promoting student learning</td>
<td>Critical Pedagogy</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the role of the leader in promoting educational change,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the leadership role in facilitating courageous and difficult conversations</td>
<td>Critical Spirituality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the leadership role in acting to overcome inequities in the status quo wherever they may be found (related to class, race, ethnicity, ability/disability, religion, etc.)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Moore

Explore the historical and ongoing relationships between race, education, and society from a wide range of disciplinary perspectives across the P-20 educational pipeline. Analyze key public debates and legal issues concerning social policy and educational equity. Explore traditional and alternative research methods on diverse populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Moore</th>
<th>Critical Race Theory</th>
<th>Class activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore the historical and ongoing relationships between race, education, and society from a wide range of disciplinary perspectives across the P-20 educational pipeline. Analyze key public debates and legal issues concerning social policy and educational equity. Explore traditional and alternative research methods on diverse populations.</td>
<td>Intersectionality</td>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black feminist Thought</td>
<td>Small and Large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queer Crit</td>
<td>Student Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other critical theories</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scholars recommended course readings as a tool to expose students to topics of social justice and injustice (e.g., racism, sexism, heterosexism) (Capper et al., 2006; Marshall & Hernandez, 2013). In her interview, Dr. Smith claimed to choose readings from a diverse group of authors (e.g., race, gender, nationality). In analyzing her syllabus and reading list, it was impossible to decipher the races, genders, or nationalities of the authors. However, after a review of Dr. Smith’s artifacts, I identified diverse perspectives on leadership theories she asked students to engage with throughout the course. Upon closer review, I found that more than half of the class readings were “critical” works, meaning they were centered on issues of power, privilege, and oppression. This did not necessarily present varieties of theoretical perspectives, but rather multiple approaches to leadership in relation to overcoming injustices and the status quo. The readings provided students with oppositional knowledge to develop, understand and intervene when issues of social oppression were presented.

Similarly, Dr. Moore aimed to engage students with diverse scholars in developing their critical consciousness. He invited scholars into the classroom to share their knowledge and experiences. Students were able to see visible diversity and hear scholars share their stories firsthand. The selection of scholars invited to the classroom shared similar critical views as Dr. Moore, which may have imposed and reinforced certain viewpoints and opinions on students. For example, Dr. Moore used inviting White scholars to guest lecture to confront Whiteness and challenging white privilege.

“Cause I teach mainly White students. So I always bring in a White scholar who does critical work around Whiteness somehow. It might not be center of their work, but they're going to make comments. I think it allows White students, as their going through their
own development in class and consciousness raising, to see another White person who has a progressive stance on race that doesn't... who are just regular people.”

Both participants spoke of diverse scholarship through the identities of authors and not via theoretical approaches. This is important to note, as the authors could be diverse in their social identities but similar in theoretical and methodology approaches. Therefore, it seemed that identity politics mattered in constructing oppositional knowledge when developing students’ capacity to intervene in social oppression.

**Critical Dialogue**

Mezirow’s (1998) transformative learning theory highlighted that adult learners entered the educational environment with lived experiences that influenced their worldview. The participants used students’ personal and professional lived experiences, theory, readings, faculty written feedback, group activities and conversations to provoke dialogue on issues of social justice and injustice. Guerra et al., (2013) found that critical dialogue challenged students’ thinking, leading, and researching around social injustice. Dr. Smith explained the philosophy underpinning her approach to critical dialogue, “dialogue isn't for one thing. It's ontological; it's not just talking, it's a way of life. So it's an openness to other perspectives and other people, and its goal isn't agreement. But understanding. And I think that's really important.”

The use of dialogue as a pedagogical strategies invited students and faculty to share their lived experiences and interpretations of the literature to create what Giroux (2011) called a democracy classroom that moved away from a banking model and allowed for students and faculty to co-construct knowledge. Both participants used probing questions in journal reflections, small group activities, and group discussions. Such questions included defining key terms, identifying scholars’ arguments, recognizing literature gaps, synthesizing multiple
literature readings, analyzing for oppression and privilege, and connecting concepts and theory to lived experiences and real-world application. Dr. Smith used local and national events to provoke dialogue. Such events included school district and state decisions, incidents of discrimination, national issues and politics, and global happenings. Dr. Smith insisted that helping students to understand what was happening locally was vital because it was their lived experiences. She stated “I ask them to really unpack them and think critically about them. I think once they begin to do that they get that mindset”. This approach provided students with opportunities to participate in various dialogues that included theoretical, personal, and real-world contexts, where students worked through issues of power and inspired action.

Students were able to work through what Johnston et al., (2012) posited as a developmental pathway that included entry into the critical process, solution searching, rational-building, and understandings of power relationships. Drs. Smith and Moore both incorporated questions about the multidimensional manifestation of privilege and oppression within educational theory, practices, and spaces that encouraged student to engage in a practice of critique. For instance, according to Dr. Moore, teaching students how to ask critical questions exposed them to power relations of oppression and privilege. He explained,

“The takeaway for me is how do you always ask the additional question, so if we're talking about gender, how do we like… how this so different we talk about class, we talk about class what if we add sexuality. So this is always to add additional question it's not in a way to create this long list, but how can we be more conscious of being more exclusive.”

He further declared,
“We're not trying to check out the boxes you're just trying to have a mode of being and practices, that ask the additional questions and there's never satisfied with just one kind of topic.”

The art of questioning assisted students in developing the capacity to uncover the invisible and the complexities of injustices. It was important to note that both participants spoke of not lecturing as a pedagogical strategy but rather a way to create an environment of co-construction.

**Challenges and Barriers**

Both participants spoke of challenges and barriers they encountered in their teaching for developing students’ capacity to understand social oppression. For Dr. Moore, it was students who were resistant to wrestling with concepts and not engaging in critical consciousness. He described two types of resistance. The passive resistors were students,

“who's going to be disengaged, they're like ‘this class is seven weeks, I'm just here to get my whatever grade and move on.’ You can see it on their face; they're not wrestling with it. They kind of always know the right thing to say, but they're not pushing themselves.”

These students did not appear to be a threat to the classroom environment, nor were they disruptive to classmates’ learning. However, they were a hindrance to their personal growth. In other words, regardless of the faculty’s curriculum and pedagogical approaches, students had to be willing to engage in learning that may be uncomfortable.

Second, Dr. Moore spoke of students who were outright resistant and disruptive to the learning environment. When describing these students, Dr. Moore seemed to make it personal. He stated,
"Their privilege is being called out, and they're not comfortable with it, especially coming from a black man who's relatively young. They think whatever. And I'm also pretty chill; you know what I'm saying? I'm not the person who's coming in like, "let me prove how smart I am to you."

This is not a new phenomenon, as literature on faculty of color highlight how they face challenges to their authority and expertise by White students with negative behaviors and attitudes (Stanley, 2006). Despite Dr. Moore’s positional role, the uneven power of racial dynamics created tension around authority. In fact, Stanley (2006) posited that African American male faculty are often challenged more by White male students. Dr. Moore spoke of inviting these students to his office in the hopes of being able to convince them to engage in the learning. He shared a conversation he had with another White male student,

"there's agency that you have in this, and agency comes with responsibility. In part that's what it means to be a human being, you have responsibility for some things in your life, you have a choice to make. So you can choose to disengage, and you'll be fine. You can trash me in an evaluation, that's cool, I'm not tripping. But, you could choose to engage, and maybe on the other side of this there's learning!"

As the only Black male faculty in the college, Dr. Moore did not appear to fear complaints made to senior faculty and administrators that may be perceived as him verbally attacking White students or of teaching evaluation. The fear of being the "other" did not hinder Dr. Moore from engaging with students who were resistant to the course assignment and his presence as faculty.

Dr. Smith spoke of student resistant but claimed that by the end of the course, students said, “you’ve changed my life. You’ve changed the way I think”. In fact, I asked her why she thought students had such a reaction to her courses. She contributed it to her pedagogical
strategies of dialogue and her building relationships with students. However, she did admit to wrestling with how to make sure students who disagreed with social justice or did not come from a social justice perspective did not feel marginalized.

She provided an example of an incident that occurred in class after the election of President Trump:

"Last year I was teaching a doctoral seminar right after Trump was elected. Most of the students were really anti-Trump and really brought in several injustices and all of the awful things he was doing immediately after being elected. After about three weeks and I had known this from the student because she had written in the journal that she was a Christian that she voted for Trump. At the end of the next class or a couple of class after I learned that she said, "I don't feel safe to express my opinion in this class. She said this to everybody. I want you all to know that I'm a conservative Christian, I'm republican, I voted for Trump, and I don't feel that that perspective is respected in this class". I said at that time we do need to be careful to make sure we are critiquing ideas and not people. Other people in the class said thank you for sharing”.

Dr. Smith followed up with the student to make sure she felt affirmed in the space. In reviewing this portion of the data, Dr. Smith feared unintentionally isolated a student. It seemed to be difficult to separate ideas of oppression from the bodies it regulated but a necessity to disconnect privileged ideas from people.

The participants spoke of being the only faculty in their department who used critical frameworks and explicitly focused on issues of social justice and injustice. They did not mention this as a challenge but spoke of how they navigated the department concerning teaching. Dr. Moore warned students by saying,
“look at the faculty, we're not a critical faculty. Critical in like the ways... gender, class, sexuality, type of way. It doesn't mean people aren't doing good work, we have a lot of people doing good work. You're just not going to have a lot of people who are going to be able to support your development [critical perspective]”.

Similarly, Dr. Smith stated that her college “is very positivist and very quantitative still. I’d say those are the dominant perspectives”. Although they had the support of their college and department, they spoke of being the faculty members students sought out for a critical perspective. Therefore, the participants seemed to have a sense of responsibility to provide students with not only a foundation on issues of social justice and injustices, but skills in analysis of power and application to utilize these skills in other classes.

Contrary to the literature, faculty with the skills and knowledge to facilitate social injustice issues often did not challenge the traditional views or practices that maintained dominant “status quo” within preparation programs (Guerra et al., 2013; Marshall, 2004). The participants in this study challenged the "status quo" in their teaching by inviting students to co-construct an environment for collective consciousness and not letting institutional culture affect their commitment to social transformation.

**Establishing Spaces In and Outside of the Formal Classroom**

The second finding of establishing spaces in and outside of the formal classroom emerged as how faculty engaged in relational teaching to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform education. Oblinger (2006) claimed that learning spaces could inspire exploration, collaboration, discussion, silence, disconnectedness, and norms of interactions on both the individual and group level. Space is both dynamic and complex and may impact adult learning and teaching, especially in curriculum and pedagogy around social
justice and injustices (Bright, Manchester, & Allendyke, 2013; Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006; Oblinger, 2006).

**In Classroom Spatial Arrangements and Management**

Both participants spoke of managing their physical classroom to encourage critical reflection and dialogue. Soja (1989) noted, "We must be insistently aware of how space can be made to hide consequences from us, how relationships of power and discipline are inscribed into the apparently innocent spatiality of social life, how human geographies are filled with power and ideology" (p. 25). Dr. Smith believed that space mattered when working to engage students in meaningful dialogue. She said,

“Space is important. If I go to a new place to teach and the desks are in rows or you can’t move them around, I find it really frustrating. I always grim, I want to seat in a square so we can all see each other and we are all sort of equal again.”

It was not how the space is arranged that made this comment unique; it was the reason for the layout of such space. Although space alone could not promote equity, the spatial arrangements reinforced who was included or excluded. There was a notion that everyone sitting at the “table” was visible and invited to engage. And not just the students, Dr. Smith sat with students and engaged in dialogue without being in front of the room. This was an attempt to disrupt teacher-student hierarchy and allow for more than one voice in the room. However, the spatial arrangement does not eliminate injustices in the classroom environment. Dr. Smith believed in creating a community in the classroom through the use of space and the feeling of inclusivity. Dr. Smith's word choice of "inclusivity," did not seem convey social transformation in the classroom, but rather a sense of assimilation into academic practice or decorum that privilege some voices while oppressing others. The use on "inclusivity" highlighted her goal of creating a
learning spaces where students can share lived experiences and take risk to explore issues of injustice.

For Dr. Moore, he sought to create safe spaces within the classroom. He clarified,

"My job is to manage a safe classroom. To me, a dangerous classroom is when something is said that could be very traumatic and also reproducing trauma and oppression for a member. My job is to make sure the learning and raising consciousness for someone who, we all hold privileged identities, don't come too much at the expense of someone who holds that marginalized identity."

Creating “safe” classrooms in the literature has been critiqued for the impossible task of removing risk and discomfort around controversial issues (Cook-Sather & Woodworth, 2016). Often, a “safe” classroom is an attempt to protect privileged students. However, Dr. Moore’s articulation of a “safe” classroom protected marginalized students from continued oppression. He discussed how it was his job to, “try to read that thin line of giving someone room to grow, without letting them just go off the rails and say something oppressive,” which required him to intervene during conflict or oppressive conversations. It was important to note, Dr. Moore did not “call out” or shame students in the classroom but either asked questions or redirected the conversation. Applebaum (2009) called for teachers to create safe classrooms for systemically marginalized students instead for students who are systemically privileged. However, such an approach may isolate students with privilege identities. In the teaching philosophy artifact Dr. Moore provided, he articulated the importance of co-constructing an educational place to achieve personal transformation with students. Brown and Sekimoto (2017) argued that a student-centered approach to critical pedagogy allowed for the classroom to be a site of individual and collective change.
Dr. Moore invited students to work through conflict in the classroom. For example Dr. Moore wrote within his artifact that relations to classroom space,

“In order to actualize these goals, it is important to co-construct an educational space in which students feel safe, empowered to challenge and be challenged, and share from their personal and professional experiences. In part, this is achieved by allowing students to articulate their expectations for the course: particularly me as an instructor. Ultimately, I aim to co-construct a space of mutual respect where students not only acquire skills and competencies to practice a profession or conduct rigorous research, but also experience personal transformation through dialogue and deep self-reflection.”

Knowing that he could not control all dialogue, Dr. Moore provided students with suggestions of how to navigate difficult conversations that may occur in class. He instructed students,

“...rush towards understanding. Listen to understand, instead of to respond. So what I say is, ‘when someone says something that triggers you, which probably will happen, ask a follow-up question first.’ And I was like, ‘cause you may have heard something, and they may be just using different language, right? So ask them first what do they mean. Then, if they still say the same thing, then you should be critical of what they said, but give them an opportunity to be on the same page with you before you respond”.

Teaching students this skill assisted with the relational aspect of the development of transformative leadership that called for collaboration. Moreover, this could help students in advocacy work that challenged injustices. In other words, it does not need to be the marginalized person who speaks against oppression, but others who are empowered to disrupt such conversations.
Giroux (2011) argued, “classroom learning embodies selective values, is entangled with relations of power, entails judgments about what knowledge counts, legitimates specific social relations, defines agency in particular ways, and always presupposes a particular notion of the future” (p. 6). Throughout the data analysis, participants did not mention confronting or challenging invisible power relations of oppression that constructed the learning process socially within various teaching spaces. The focus on formal classroom space was on the spatial arrangement and the management of dialogue. Questions such as, "who gets to talk?", "what topics get talked about?", "who are excluded from the conversation?", "who is outing or forced to speak for a group in class?", "who does the faculty member give attention to?", and so forth were absent from the participants’ reflections. Hackman (2010) suggested that educators continuously engage in self-reflection to be more cognizant of social and positional power in the classroom.

The importance of being aware and confronting the uneven power of oppression in the learning space provides faculty and students a site to take transformative action, rather than waiting to leave the space. The participants implied an acknowledgment of power relations when they spoke of various spaces, but failed to deconstruct power relations as it related to their learning space.

**Home Visits**

Both participants discussed having students over to their homes for fellowship. For Dr. Smith, having students over to her home was a way of challenging the teacher-student hierarchy and used to build personal relationships that allowed her to extend students’ knowledge, disposition, and skills around social justice and injustices. She explained, “I think it changes the power of relation, especially if they can have a glass of wine then the next time they come sometimes they bring wine or they bring snacks or something. It’s a much more equal
conversation”. She continued, “And we generally talk for a couple of hours instead of a half an hour that you’re putting in the office.” The meetings at her house created a neutral space that attempted to disrupt the teacher to student power relations.

The use of the house as a space seemed to be Dr. Smith’s personal preference to build relationships with students. Since the beginning of her career, Dr. Smith has invited students to her house. Trying to understand her reasoning, I asked if it was a strategy for students who did not feel welcome in the physical building at the university to have a welcoming space. She insisted that it changed the power relations, but she was not clear as to which one: positional or social. During our conversation, it seemed that Dr. Smith used her home to show care for her students. Dr. Smith spoke of her students working full time at local schools and driving to the university in the evening. This was often an inconvenience, and her house was not only closer to where students lived, but also a place for fellowship. Such fellowship consisted of a friendly environment where there was mutual interest through meaningful communication. Dr. Smith spoke of all of her students being welcome to her home, whether in small groups or individually. Dr. Moore described having students engage in formal and informal conversations to promote a community or a “village” of support for students of color they may not have had at the PWI. The invitation did not seem to be open to all of his students, but to students of color as part of a social and political strategy to reaffirm them in higher education and socialize them to enter into the faculty positions. Dr. Moore sought to create an affinity group of students of color and other faculty of color to have dialogue on personal and professional experiences (Douglas, 2008). Therefore, the issue of social justice and injustice was about their very being rather than an external factor.
Dr. Moore added the importance of students of color having access to his office and making it their space. He spoke of the aesthetics of the office and normalizing students being in there beyond having an issue or a formal meeting. Interestingly, the renegotiation of office space and invitation to fellowship at his house seemed to be another way for Dr. Moore to undermine the traditional teacher-student hierarchy and serve as a resistance to racial oppression or gate-opener. Therefore, informal spaces became a site of resistance and shelter for Dr. Moore and students of color. When considering how Dr. Moore’s approach to space encouraged the development of students’ capacity to understand social oppression, he offered a perspective of how to preserve and create a community with students who experienced the oppression they were expected to eliminate. In the book, *The Souls of Black Folks*, W.E.B. Du Bois (1903) discussed the tension of Black bodies being the site of oppression. In the words of W.E.B Du Bois, “How does it feel to be a problem?” (p.1). This unspoken question may make developing capacity for transformative leadership for students of color who have to eliminate the social oppressions that render them to the margins of society. According to Morgan (2000), space serves as a medium through which relationships are produced and reproduced.

**Centering Student-Faculty Relationships for Support and Collaboration**

The finding of centering student-faculty relationships as social and political support and collaboration emerged as relational teaching strategies used to encourage the capacity development to understand and transform education. The participants spoke of developing three types of relationships with doctoral students: advising, mentoring, and collective growth. The various faculty-student relationships related to transformative teaching in that the faculty used these interactions to engage students in questions and dialogue on power, privilege, and oppression. Often, the participants spoke of being content experts who guided students in
academic practices but welcomed students’ voices into conceptualizing their research projects. Scholars noted the importance of the faculty-doctoral student relationship in academic success, graduation program socialization, research development, and career preparedness (Barnes & Austin, 2008; O’Meara, Knudsen, & Jones, 2013). In the context of the participants’ universities, students were able to select advisors and mentors without being assigned through a formal process guided by the university. Therefore, the participants preferred to work with students who were interested in doing work focused on social justice or from a critical perspective.

**Academic Advising**

Dr. Smith described her relationship with students through development advising, which was a mutual process of shared responsibility for social and academic success. A development advising approach focused on the process of promoting student’s consciousness throughout the doctoral experience. Dr. Smith spoke about wanting to be friends with her students. And through this relationship, there was mutual learning and talking about issues of social justice and injustices. Dr. Smith claimed that the relationship pushed the students in their critical consciousness raising. When she described her relationships with students, it was in the context of academic exercises, such as dissertation writing and publications. She said,

“I do try and engage them in all sorts of different ways. I stay in touch with them. They come to the house in groups. So that as groups we talk about their research interests and what's happening. Really always try to have students go to conferences with me. To the extent that they want to when they're also working full time, I'll publish with any of them. Either they can work on my projects or I’ll help them with their own papers.”

The teacher-student power relationship became reimagined and allowed for a relational approach to learning. For transformative leadership development, students need to have social
skills (e.g., collaboration and cooperation, building relationships, and conflict management).

Moreover, Dr. Smith spoke of helping students learn how to, “network” and to become affiliated with national associations mentoring groups that exposed them to other scholars and aided in the development of skills to enter the professoriate.

When asked, “How would you describe developing doctoral students' capacity to engage in transformative leadership?” Dr. Smith said, “excellent with appropriate guidance.” Her "appropriate guidance" entailed asking critical questions and setting the expectation of excellence with their work. In situating her relationships with students as friendships, she quickly reminded me,

“I also have a conversation with them really early about how when I'm in a professor-student role, regardless of our outside relationship as tough as I need to be and as critical as I need to be to ensure the excellence in their work.”

Dr. Smith seemed to feel the tension between being friends with doctoral students and being an advisor based on colleagues’ perception of inappropriateness. Therefore, her focus on academic performance justified being friends with students. Dr. Smith used the traditional educational process to develop students’ criticality by providing them with opportunities for collaboration and guidance. Dr. Smith connected students to opportunities such as networks, research projects, and academic success. She referred back to her doctoral advisor who not only set high expectations, but also provided her with guidance that ultimately lead her to becoming a professor and influenced her approach to teaching through personal relationships.

**Critical Mentoring**

Dr. Moore spoke at length about developing a mentorship relationship with the students he advised. In fact, his approach to mentoring was inspired by his own experience of critical
mentorship with a doctoral advisor. Throughout the data generation, he would highlight the strategies he learned from his mentor, such as building a student-faculty relationship that allowed for disagreement, collective growth, and celebration. He mentioned that his mentoring relationship with students began with the identification and discussion of the roles he and the student would take in the process. Dr. Moore said, “This is going to be a relationship that we're going to build over time to build trust and understanding.” All of his mentees were working on critical dissertations that centered on marginalized people’s lived experiences in oppressive structural systems. Due to the critical nature of his students’ dissertations, Dr. Moore mentored students on structural power analysis through the use of critical frameworks.

To support his students, Dr. Moore assisted them in their creation of a team of mentors from other institutions who had similar research interests and could provide guidance and collaborations. A team of mentors echoes Mullen et al. (2010) argument for a doctoral student to have multiple mentors due to the complexities of the emerging scholars’ experience. He explained, “I try to kind of outsource it but make it more collaborative team of mentorship.” Dr. Moore acted as a sponsor and assisted students with creating a network to support their critical inquiry. Through the mentorship network, students were developing the eight tenets of transformative leadership (Shields, 2014) and learning the relational aspect of social change.

Students sought out Dr. Moore to advise them on such research projects because of his critical orientation. He was unapologetic about his critical stance, so I continued to wonder if this approach was welcoming to students who may not be aware of injustices. For example, Dr. Moore stated that when doctoral students asked him to be part of their dissertation committee, he reminded them of the critical lens in which he did his work. On the other hand, Dr. Moore’s approach invited students to engage in teaching and learning within a particular context. He
explained how conversations with a student might go around their work, "you make adult
decisions, and I have to support you in that. But I'll let you know this is what I worry about as it
relates to some of the consequences." He added,

“But you know, I've had students who were like, "I don't want to do race in a way that
you do race." It's like, "whoa!" I mean I understand, I was like, "I'm going to let you
know now where the field is, and your work is probably not going to be well received in
this particular time."

There seemed to be tension around the voice that may silence students because Dr. Moore was
adamant about sharing his point of view, but also offered students who were interested in a
critical perspective appropriate guidance.

Mentoring as actualized by Dr. Moore centered on teaching doctoral students, especially
students of color, about the process and politics that shaped how opportunities are created and
distributed at the university level. Universities and colleges have a history of exclusion,
exploitation, and dehumanization practices and policies that center white supremacist ideologies
that affect the work and presence of faculty of color (Patton, 2016). Coached by his mentor, Dr.
Moore spoke with passion when he explained how his mentor socialized him to be in the
academy not of the academy (Moten & Harney, 2004). As a Black man, Dr. Moore would have
to learn how to leverage such a space for liberation without becoming part of this system of
oppression. Moreover, Dr. Moore’s approach to capacity development for students included
understanding their relationship with the university as marginalized people and how to navigate
such spaces as resistant to social change. Dr. Moore’s approach was to teach students how to be
in the academy not of the academy within the faculty role.
Table 4: Advising and Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising and Mentoring</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Smith</td>
<td>• Dissertation Chair</td>
<td>• Probing Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-publications</td>
<td>• Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Network Connector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broad: Focused on academic success and degree completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social/Friendship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Moore</td>
<td>• Dissertation Chair</td>
<td>• Probing Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-publications</td>
<td>• Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher of process and politics of the university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Narrow: Development of scholar, academic success, and career readiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Network Creator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positional Power.** The participants' positional power was ever present throughout the data when they spoke of engaging students both in and outside of the classroom. For instance, Dr. Moore made the bold statement of, "And I let them know too, you know I do critical work... if you want to work with me, you're going to get the most out of me if your work is more critical". I thought this was a fair comment to make to students who were looking for the most appropriate advisor or mentor, which gave them the opportunity to be clear about Dr. Moore’s mentoring and advising style. I did not view this as Dr. Moore being inflexible, but rather stating his position or the lens through which he did his work. He added,

"when it comes to work, what I tell them is that "it's my job to figure out what is your [students] voice, what it is that you want to do, and how can I help you actualize that; instead of imposing my own view. But, if I have a view of something I'm not going to shy away and say... I'm not going to be hands off like I don't know. I'm going to say, "I feel very strongly about you should do it this way, because I think this will be beneficial for you moving down the road."
There seemed to be tension between student voices and faculty guidance. In other words, these participants had stringent views on work related to social justice and injustices but still aimed to develop students’ voices within the confines of their research interest. Therefore, the question remained: "are students learning the orientation of the faculty or are they learning to operate criticality for social transformation"? Such an approach to teacher-student relationships could be interpreted as power over. However, closer examination of the transparency the participants offered of their teaching allowed for the roles in the teacher-student relationship to become a co-generative dialogue that honored the experience, skills, and perspective of everyone (faculty and students) to play an important role in the teaching, learning, and developing process. According to Tobin (2006), the process of co-generating of faculty and students must allow for continuously examining and reexamining ground rules, roles, and responsibilities of each other.

Similarly, Dr. Smith did not relinquish her positional power over students. While discussing having students over to her home, Dr. Smith explained a situation where a student was not invited. Dr. Smith shared:

“I have a student who wrote a proposal but she really didn’t do what she knew she should do and we are going to meet and go back through the proposal. I was thinking would it make more sense to meet her at the university. In the sense that sometimes I think it might be important for her to see that I do have a little bit of power at least where her dissertation could serve and she needs to do what she has been asked to do.”

The faculty member who left little room for student input controlled this policing of space. Once again, the student-faculty relationship power dynamics remained intact. Rethinking of power must consist of both social and positional power that excluded some people while including others.
**Reciprocal Relationships**

The participants detailed how their relationships with students were reciprocal. Dr. Moore spoke with enthusiasm of being challenged and inspired by his students' critical work, such as incarcerated post-secondary students and undocumented Latino/a students. Meanwhile, Dr. Smith declared that she constantly learned from her students and used their stories and examples in her teaching as pedagogical resources. She provided an example,

“About three years ago one of my students said well I think of inequity as playing monopoly. And if everybody is there and you’ve got all the properties bought up and somebody else wants to come and play, there’s no way you can say okay here it’s your turn because all they can do is go to jail and that’s fine. And there’s no way they can be property owners. There's need for redistribution that it's a really good example of that.”

Dr. Smith used the metaphor of monopoly in her teaching about injustices inspired by students thinking of issues of power, privilege, and oppression. Both of the examples provided by the participants illustrated the relational aspect of teaching. The faculty-student relationship allowed the participants to continue to develop their criticality around social justice and injustices with students.

Although the faculty-student relationship was essential to students' capacity development to understand social oppression, Dr. Moore was adamant about building student-to-student relationships for a collective consciousness. In considering the development of criticality and transformative leadership, various relationships could assist students’ understanding of social justice and injustices from different perspectives. Dr. Moore insisted on a learning process where there was a collective change. A relational approach to capacity development could influence transformative action. Dr. Moore modeled the peer-to-peer mentoring through his collaborations
in the field, not just for publications but also as support systems. For example, he provided
several incidents where colleagues in the field provided words of wisdom about how to navigate
the professorate through the tensions of seeking social justice and the tenure and promotion
process.

**Evoking Students’ Transformative Activism through Academic Practice**

The final finding of this study was evoking students’ transformative activism through
academic practice that highlighted how faculty encouraged students’ capacity development to
understand and transform social oppression affecting education.

Donna Mertens (2017) argued that transformative research had the potential to result in
transformation on both personal and societal levels through the pursuit of justice. The
participants spoke of action through an academic practice of research projects and dissertations
that centered on topics of social justice and injustice. The act of research as critical praxis sought
to critique and understand social oppression. For example, Dr. Smith described how a student
used class readings, critical reflection, and conversations to understand the inequities unpinning
school discipline that influenced his critical dissertation topic:

“Four weeks later and he came to class and you could tell just by the way he walked in
that something was different. He came up after and he said I’ve been thinking about our
readings and our conversations and I was at a conference and I realized that my parents
are university educated and I’ve often thought well why can’t these other black kids be
like me and he said I realized now how wrong that was. He totally changed. He changed
his interest, his dissertation topic.”
The student began to realize and embody social transformation on a micro level through the connection of theory and practice. It was noted that the participants did not provide any evidence that students were transformative in their practice outside of the doctoral program.

Dr. Moore asked students to consider the role research played in critical praxis for social transformation. He stated:

"I always ask them one way to think about I guess criticality is who your audience is? Who are you talking to? Who aren't you talking to? How do you center the people that you say you care about the most? And how do you work overtime to make sure that the voice and the way that you write, where you publish aligns with those things?"

Transformative research consciously addresses injustices from various positionalities and cultural lenses. Thus, the student’s development of criticality and transformative leadership assisted in creating research questions and methods that aimed to interrogate power relations that resulted in oppression.

Dr. Moore continued speaking about engaging students in a discussion about the researchers and authors they cited in their writing. “Citation is very political as we know. Only certain people get cited from certain institutions. Certain genders. Certain racial or ethnic backgrounds. I do think that citing people becomes very important.” Through the praxis of citations, and being intentional about the research audience, the academic practice could be transformative on the personal level. Students were engaged in transformative research at the doctoral level with assistance provided by a faculty member.

Both participants spoke of co-publishing with students on topics of social justice and injustices. Therefore, students could hone their academic practice skills for optimal transformation. It was important to note that the academic practice did not need to follow
traditional practices, but could challenge the status quo. This could be seen in the type of journal submission, research methods, critical frameworks, co-author or participant choices. Academic practices of creating knowledge using critical approaches challenge the academy's ways of knowing and could inform educational practices and policies.

There was limited evidence in the data of students being encouraged to enact transformative action in schools and universities beyond research and scholarship. The enactment of transformative leadership beyond the program was theorized, where students could reimagine how to disrupt social oppression but they were not provided specifics on how to implement change. Preparation programs are to develop students’ knowledge, skills, and disposition around issues of social justice and injustice. In other words, students learn how to know, relate, and be for the possibility of leading for social transformation. Dr. Moore provided a line of questions to assist mentees in reflecting on how transformation appeared in practice from a possible faculty position. Dr. Moore asked,

“What does transformation look like working within the institution and finding allies across other lines? Does transformation look like starting something that is ... I mean, outside of the system. Something that's more separate from what you've been a part of? Does transformation look like starting, for instance, does it look like starting your own journal? As open access? As more open to these type of theories? Or does it look like joining the editorial boards of traditionally conservative journals and work it from the inside to be an associated editor who is a gatekeeper? Or an editor who is a gatekeeper who gets to select reviewers?”

This statement illustrated the criticality skills needed for students to not only define transformative leadership, but also work through institutional contexts, understanding risks and
rewards, navigate relationships, strategic action planning, and different modes of action. Dr. Moore’s line of questions highlighted the personal approach to action for social transformation that may require the faculty-student relationship of advisor and mentor to get at the nuance of possible action. Although doctoral students spend significant time in preparation programs, they may not have time to develop this level of social and political skills for action.

Additionally, Dr. Moore discussed how he mentored a student in scholarly activism concerning a faculty job search. Dr. Moore shared:

"One of the graduate students that I work with, who does work on undocumented queer students, he was in his final year my first year here. He wanted to be at a teacher university; he's a teaching scholar, scholar-activist at heart, him being at a research one university would not make him happy."

The above statement by Dr. Moore spoke to spaces students choose to present action and how they might navigate connecting their critical research agenda to their practice of intervening in social oppressions affecting education. Dr. Moore offered this critique about scholarly activism,

“I would say for folks who do work on marginalized communities, I think we have an obligation to always push ourselves to be more committed and more progressive than what our rhetoric says. I think our rhetoric is always a little bit further than where we are in our actions”.

Therefore, the development of the capacity to understand social oppression is a life journey. Transformative research and critical academic practice were appropriate social actions, but Dr. Moore asked scholars to connect to the people it assumed to assist in their liberation through actions other than academic practices.
Limitations

There are several limitations to consider concerning the results of this study. The small sample size limited the teaching perspective. A larger sample size might have included a more diverse participant pool, including institution type, doctoral student status (full-time, part-time), program mission and vision, faculty identities and values, and curriculum and pedagogical approaches.

The inclusion of both higher education and school leadership faculty was a limitation for this study. The context of university and college, compared to K-12, created unique goals for the need to engage in transformative leadership and call for interrogating preparation programs differently. Although the reason for the development of transformative leadership does not differ, the methods and systems of interrogation vary. The benefit of understanding the two preparation programs separately was to understand the teaching and learning possibilities within a specific history and context.

Another limitation was the data collection generation. With the advancement in technology, online interviews have become an effective tool to overcome geographical, time, and financial constraints (Sullivan, 2012). Face to face interviews may have created a more relational environment for the participants and me. Being in the participant’s teaching spaces (office, class, home, etc.) could have assisted with the elicitation of artifacts. With regard to the data generation, the study was further limited by the elimination of observations. The opportunity to observe faculty teaching could have created a holistic narrative of their approach and provided events/moments to critically reflection on for interviews.

Lastly, the timing of participant recruitment was a limitation of this study. Asking faculty to participate at the end of a semester and near a national conference was not fruitful, as time
commitments became a barrier. Recruiting participants at the start of a semester may have resulted in an increase in faculty participation.

**Summary**

This chapter included information collected to address the following research question: How do faculty engage in teaching to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform social oppression affecting education? I provided a brief overview of demographic information of the study participants. Then, I presented a thematic report of the findings. The findings included were: The participants (1) integrated critical frameworks into curriculum and pedagogical approaches, (2) established spaces in and outside of the formal classroom to engage students, (3) centered student-faculty relationships for support and collaboration, and (4) evoked students’ transformative activism through academic practice.
CHAPTER FIVE:
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

“All of us in the academy and in the culture as a whole are called to renew our minds if we are to transform educational institutions—and society—so that the way we live, teach, and work can reflect our joy in cultural diversity, our passion for justice, and our love of freedom.” - Bell Hooks

In this chapter, I summarized the study, including the problem, purpose statement, research question, methodology, and findings. In the following section, I discussed the findings which were: The participants (1) integrated critical frameworks into curriculum and pedagogical approaches, (2) established spaces in and outside of the formal classroom to engage students, (3) centered student-faculty relationships for support and collaboration, and (4) evoked students’ transformative activism through academic practice. Based on the findings, I then suggested implications for educational leadership preparation program instruction. I offered recommendations to extend this research project, including study samples and methods. Finally, I concluded the chapter with my researcher reflexivity statement on the research process.

Summary of Study

In today’s social, political climate, there is an interest in developing educational leaders’ capacities to address injustices in a variety of educational settings. Educational leadership preparation programs are crucial sites where doctoral students acquire knowledge, analytical skills, dispositions, and praxis to transform injustices affecting education. The literature on preparation programs alludes to an understanding that issues of inequities are avoided or limited
to curriculum and pedagogical theorizing (Diem & Carpenter, 2013; Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2002). While much has been written about the need for capacity development around social justice and injustice in educational leadership preparation programs, less is known about how such knowledge, analytical skills, dispositions, and praxis are encouraged and engaged through faculty interactions.

The purpose of this study was to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs teach to encourage students’ capacity development to engage in transformative leadership. The guiding question for this study was: How do faculty engage in teaching to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform social oppression affecting education? The conceptual framework of critical pedagogy, transformative criticality, and transformative leadership development highlighted the multidimensional aspects of teaching. Through the merging of these concepts, a sociocultural approach to data generation and analysis was used to make sense of faculty teaching.

Using a critical qualitative methodology, data was generated through relational interviewing. A triangulation strategy for data collection included semi-structured, one-on-one interviews, artifacts, and document analysis. The participants in this study were two faculty members who taught doctoral students in educational leadership preparation programs with a focus on higher education and K-12. These participants teach or have taught a course(s) that include social justice, equity, or critical theory as frameworks. Each of the participants demonstrated a commitment to the deconstruction of knowledge frameworks that perpetuated injustice, critiqued inequitable distribution of power, and focused on emancipation, democracy, equity, and justice through their teaching, mentoring, and advising.
Two significant findings emerged from the participants’ sense-making regarding their teaching to encourage the development of students’ capacity to understand social oppression. The four major findings in response to the research question were: (1) integrated critical frameworks into curriculum and pedagogical approaches, (2) established spaces in and outside of the formal classroom to engage students, (3) centered student-faculty relationships for social and political support and collaboration, and (4) evoked students’ transformative activism through academic practice.

**Discussion**

Presently, there is limited research on the role faculty play in educational leadership preparation programs and their negotiations of contexts and factors as they attempt to develop students’ capacity to enact transformative leadership that is prepared to challenge social injustice in various educational contexts (Berkovich, 2017). Gleaned from the findings was a relational approach to teaching to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform social oppressions affecting education. The in-classroom curriculum and pedagogy employed by study participants were aligned with the literature regarding topics of social justice and injustice. The participants engaged students in building their knowledge and skills around issues of injustice, including a focus developing critical consciousness (Brown, 2006; Capper et al., 2006; Diem & Carpenter, 2012; Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010), connecting theory with possible actions (Capper et al., 2006; Dentith & Peterlin, 2011), and developing cognitive dissonance (Guerra et al., 2013). The participants spoke of dialogue and question probing as the pedagogical strategies used most frequently to develop students’ knowledge, disposition, and skill to address issues of injustice. Thus, the theorizing of educational leadership curriculum and pedagogies literature are aligned with how the participants in this study approached courses that centered
issues of social justice and injustice. Limited in the literature on educational leadership was the specifics of curriculum and pedagogical approaches, inclusion of power analysis across multiple social oppressions, role of student-faculty relationships, and the how faculty are able to navigate higher education context to teach about issues of social justice and injustice.

**Socio-Political Context of Higher Education**

Many scholars now call for educators to enact leadership practices that aim to address issues of injustice and insist that preparation programs can be sites for leaders to develop knowledge, disposition, and skills for such leadership. Yet, scholars note the tension of critical teaching with indoctrinating students with a particular viewpoint on social justice and injustice. Graff (1997) offered the critique of double standard in higher education around social justice education, “teachers who raise questions about power and injustice are being ‘political,’ ‘partisan,’ and thus ‘imposing’ an ideology, while those who ignore or reject such questions presumably are not” (p.1). Faculty who teach to challenge power, privilege, and oppression are not neutral, but neither are faculty who support dominant viewpoints. The participants did not claim neutrality in their teaching when developing students’ capacity to enact transformative leadership. This was important to note, as the field of educational leadership calls for leaders to move beyond transactional leadership that transmit and reinforce a dominant culture that privileges some social identities while oppressing others, so must teaching in preparation programs. The participants displayed a professional and personal disposition toward social justice in and outside of the classroom that invited students to consider how power, privilege, and oppression mediated interactions in education and society. As gatekeepers and/or gate-openers for doctoral students, faculty’s dispositions, values, and skills on social justice and injustices influenced their curriculum, pedagogy, and student-faculty relationship approaches.
The tension between critical teaching and indoctrination creates social and political barriers for developing students for transformative leadership. The participants spoke of being the only critical faculty at their respective universities and being aware of oppressive practices within their department that may limit students’ critical learning within the program. However, the participants did not suggest these issues to be a barrier to their critical teaching but sought out various ways to engage students for critical development. One participant claimed that teaching at the university level is individualistic, therefore, providing flexibility in teaching and learning. For the participants, relational teaching in the higher education context was with students and occasionally with colleagues, but not situated in the department’s mission, vision, and program design. The participants in this study displayed a commitment to critical teaching that was mindful of the university context but resisted reducing their teaching on social justice and injustice. This is not to suggest that the faculty did not have to negotiate their position within the university. It simply suggests that they were strategic that their service in the department and university created space that did not hinder their critical teaching approach.

Both participants worked at a research 1 university in a tenure track faculty position that was predicated on tenure and promotion. Within the tenure and promotion process at research-driven universities, teaching is less valued when compared to research. The participants in this study did not speak of the pressure of tenure and promotion, their publication productivity, or teaching evaluations. One participant was a full professor Dr. Smith who had been tenured and promoted, while Dr. Moore was an assistant professor on the tenure track. Both participants focused on their teaching and developing students’ leadership capacity and seldom discussed teaching in relationship to the tenure and promotion process. For example, one participant dismissed the teaching evaluation when challenging a White student who was disengaged from
the learning and using defiant language. It is well documented that teaching evaluations are biased and marginalized faculty received low ratings (McGowan, 2001; Stanley, 2006). Within this context of challenging white privilege, for the participant to adjust their teaching due to the teaching evaluations is to assimilate to status quo that upholds white norms.

**Learning Environments and Power Relations**

The participants claimed to engage students in various spaces and attempted to create a safe and inclusive environment for critical consciousness raising. Capper et al. (2006) noted that when a learning environment provides emotional safety, students are more likely to take risks in challenging their bias and lived experiences and are more open to personal transformations. Although the participants were attentive to the learning environment, they did not discuss the invisible power relations that mediated such spaces. Daloz Parks (2005) noted that learning environments (especially classrooms) are social systems “inevitably made up of a number of different factions and acted on by multiple forces” and provide “an occasion for learning and practicing leadership with a social group” (p.7). In short, faculty and students can use the dynamics occurring within various learning environments through collective reflection and power analysis as a means to practice transformative leadership. Therefore, the class or relationship becomes a case study that honors the “here and now” as the power dynamics are unfolding. In these learning environments faculty and students come to understand themselves in relation to space and people and how social systems play a role within oppression and liberation (Daloz Parks, 2005). Participants spoke of students engaging with a theory to practice confronting issues of social justice and injustice beyond the learning spaces. Students and faculty may need to “unlearn” traditional systems of learning in graduate programs and be explicit about how social power relations operate in learning spaces deemed to promote social and collective
transformation. The consideration of power relations in the learning spaces is important in how faculty engage in teaching as to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform social oppression affecting education.

There is a call for educational leadership that challenges inequities and enacts socially just practices (Brown, 2006; Dantley & Green, 2015; Diem & Carpenter, 2012; Furman, 2012; George, 2017; Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010; Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks, 2009). The participants committed to engaging students in readings, writing, reflecting, and dialogue to develop knowledge and skills that made critical action possible. However, there was a focus on systems beyond the learning spaces. For instance, how might we change the opportunity gap in K-12 or how do we ensure all students have access to universities? An intentional analysis and engagement of privilege, oppression, and power of the learning spaces of preparation programs allow both students and faculty opportunities to grapple with collective actions that disrupt injustices. Within the literature, social transformation action referred to systemic practices students enacted once out of preparation programs. Although enacting social change beyond the learning spaces and after completion of the program was necessary, we must not stop there.

As a researcher, I argue for the interrogation of uneven power relations in learning environments in preparation programs as part of developing students’ capacity to understand social oppression. This is not to suggest an absence of interrogation in K-12 and higher education spaces, but an approach to power analysis of all educational settings, including the preparation program. The participants spoke of multiple spaces, including informal environments (e.g., homes). Therefore, there remains a need to be conscious of injustices in these informal spaces. For example, one participant used gathering at their home as a political strategy, while the other participant was focused on challenging the teacher-student hierarchy. Therefore, there was an
acknowledgment of both positional and social power relations but lack of solutions that rectified the cause of injustice. This study illustrated that space matters in capacity development for transformative leadership. An explicit exploration of how power, privilege, and oppression mediated these learning spaces informed students of the pervasiveness of injustices and imagined possible social change. Not only could preparation programs be sites where students and faculty grappled with issues of social justice and injustice, but they could also serve as arenas for personal and social transformation through purposeful learning relationships informed by critical theoretical underpinnings that worked toward collective activism against structural oppression.

**Relationships and Power Relations**

The participants expressed the importance of relationships with students as essential for engaging students in capacity development to understand social oppression. These relationships included advising and mentoring students’ academic and personal growth. Educational leadership preparation program literature on advising and mentoring is strongly focused on marginalized students (e.g. students of color, women, and/or LGBTQA) (Curtin, Malley, & Stewart, 2016; Crow & Whitemen, 2016; Grogan & Crow, 2004; Patton, 2009; Patton & Harper, 2003 Welton, Mansfield, Lee, & Young, 2015; Young & Brooks, 2008). Only one participant discussed mentoring specifically students of color as a strategy of resistance against oppression. Meanwhile, both participants spoke of mentoring and advising as a relationship that assisted students in the development of critical consciousness and a way to apply critical perspectives to academic work. Issues of power, privilege, and oppression were explicit in these relationships, as both participants spoke of a preference of working with students whose work centered on social justice and injustice. There is limited literature on mentoring and advising with suggestions to develop student’s capacities to understand oppression. However, in this study, these relationships
were vital in allowing faculty to continually engage with students in the development of their criticality and transformative leadership through critical pedagogy of mentorship, advising, and space. Therefore, faculty served as gate openers to new knowledge and skills sets.

In the advising and mentoring relationship, the teacher-student hierarchy remained intact, which exhibited a power-over approach. The participants possessed an authority, which centered the faculty’s knowledge and perspective as superior to students. Such an approach reinforced normative advising and mentoring relationships that suggested students take a position of passivity rather than as an active facilitator of learning and knowledge production. The authority role of the “teacher” in Western, Euro-centric educational institutions of determining degree completion impedes in the creating equitable faculty-student relationships (Mitchell & Edwards, 2010). Moreover, faculty remain gatekeepers and gateholders not only for physical bodies, but of knowledge as well.

While considering the role mentoring and advising played in engaging doctoral students, attention must be brought to both the social and positional power relations. For example, Margolis and Romero (2002) warned that mentorship could reproduce oppressive social norms in the academy and was not a cure for structural liberation. Conversely, the participants attempted to reimagine mentoring and advising for student development that was relational and provided space for students’ agency in the relationship, with a focus on social justice and injustices. There continues to be a need for analyzing power in centering student-faculty relationship to encourage students’ capacity development to engage in transformative leadership.

**Critical Frameworks and Social Oppressions**

The findings supported the work of researchers, who claimed that reflections, lived experiences, theory to practice and discourse in educational leadership preparation programs was
necessary for students to develop the knowledge and skills needed to change the way people view themselves and the world (Black & Murtadha, 2007; Boske, 2010; Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Dantley, 2008; Furman, 2012; Jean-Marie et al., 2009). The participants offered strategies employed to assist students in attempting power analysis on various levels. The assignments and dialogue made students aware of structural injustices, and they engaged with these injustices on the local level (e.g., their school, their university). The participants engaged in relational teaching to encourage students’ capacity development to understand and transform social oppression affecting education must use frameworks that invite students to analyze power on multiple levels. Although, structural power analysis was limited, both the structural and local analysis of power allowed students to understand how injustices are connected and manifested in various modes.

The participants in this study spoke of the interlocking of social oppressions that made decision-making and leadership in education complex around seeking social justice. Therefore, relational teaching in this study expanded to disrupting hierarchically of social oppressions by considering how social oppressions influence each other. The participants did not debate whether social oppression existed but engaged in teaching that explored how privilege and oppression were manifested historically and currently. The demand for social justice and injustice and the lack of defining social oppressions may silence student who may hold opposing view or have limited knowledge.

**Action and Power Relations**

According to Patricia Hill Collins (2013), analyzing power relations that only analyze injustices “leave it to students to figure out appropriate action strategies on their own” (p. 71). In this study, the participants spoke of action in relations to academic practice through research and
dissertation processes. Academic practices are embedded within institutional structures that produce and reproduce subordination, discrimination, and hegemony through individualism, competition, and a normative process. Although the participants claimed to encourage doctoral students to use critical frameworks and research methods, the possibility of action remained in knowledge production for the academy.

Furman (2012) pointed to five dimensions for social justice leadership as praxis: the personal, interpersonal, communal, systemic, and ecological. The participants invited students to reflect on issues of injustices from a theoretical perspective to increase their awareness but did not discuss action. The persistent injustices in education demand new approaches for transformative action within educational leadership. The field of educational leadership has provided promising literature on transformative leadership in theory; however, there is limited scholarship on transformative action strategies being taught in preparation programs.

The use of academic practice as the only critical actions developed presents a disconnect between the current educational leadership preparation programs literature that calls for action in the education field. Perhaps the outcome-driven market within higher education created such tension that preparation should equal effective actions. However, the participants spoke of courses and relationships that were both theoretical and philosophical. The academic practice of writing became the space for students to connect theory to practice through the application of real-life context. This was not to suggest that scholarship could not transform educational practice but students were still left with limited social and political skills for transformative action within various contexts. In other words, the participants provided students with opportunities to develop their capacity or to have potential for action. Transformative action can
be unique to the person’s positionality, disposition, knowledge, skill set, and goal for action in various educational settings and contexts.

Moreover, the participants limited academic practice as critical actions to dissertation and research projects needed for degree completion and career readiness. There are opportunities to use research and scholarship beyond the academy and journals that include white papers, blogs, and social media. These outlets can be a medium to share transformative academic work with communities, policymakers, and practitioners. The participants did not speak of radical approaches to transformative teaching and learning that engaged students in various action strategies beyond the academy. Perhaps, to inspire radical action in K-12 and higher education that understand social oppression teaching, preparation programs will need to be reimagined with action beyond theorizing to learning experiences where students engage in social organizing and activism.

Implications

The findings of this study have implications for the field of educational leadership by adding to the growing body of research on preparation programs by providing a more nuanced understanding of faculty’s role in teaching to develop doctoral students to enact transformative leadership. First, this empirical study expanded and connected literature on social justice curriculum and pedagogy with students-faculty relationships and out of classroom learning to highlight the multidimensional aspect of teaching for capacity development. Understanding the multidimensional aspects of teaching in preparation programs allows for faculty in various university and college contexts to leverage critical teaching approaches in numerous spaces. Therefore, teaching in educational leadership preparation programs can be reimagined to consider how to engage students in analysis of power, privilege, and oppression that inspire a
social movement within education. Perhaps when preparation programs challenge traditional ways of teaching and learning beyond formal classrooms, students and faculty can be creative in enacting transformative leadership for lasting change.

The findings of this study have implication in discussing faculty development and socialization to teach and develop students’ capacity to enact transformative leadership. Scholars have claimed that faculty do not have the knowledge, disposition, or skills to teach on issues of social justice and injustice; therefore, creating tension for preparation programs to develop leaders that understand and transform social oppression in education. However, this study offered that faculty do in fact have the capacity to teach social justice and injustice by centering student-faculty relationships, negotiating spaces, using critical frameworks, and encouraging transformative activism in academic exercise. Scholars have offered adjustments to curriculum and pedagogy without the consideration of faculty; therefore, a lack of action remains. An intentional focus on faculty approaches to critical teaching can provide insight to the disconnection between preparation and practice. Perhaps this study encouraged an interrogation of the purpose of faculty and program design in higher education in educational leadership preparation programs with the aim for transformative education.

Additionally, the participants of this study demonstrated a resistance to reduce teaching in order to complete the university tenure and promotion process. This was not to suggest that tenure, promotion and research are not important, but teaching has to be priority if the goal of preparation programs is to develop leadership grounded in social justice and injustice. Faculty research can be transformative but how do they enact transformative teaching with students in the local programs and universities?
Finally, the findings in this study have implications for considering teaching in preparation programs as a relational and collective that involves many actors and relationships. There is a need to refocus from individual transformation and responsibility to a collective commitment to capacity development for social justice. To transform social injustices in education and society, there is a demand for a collective moment for lasting social change not maintained by the leadership of an individual. Thus, transformative teaching is not solely the faculty’s responsibility but a shared obligation between students, departments, universities, and communities. Once again, research on educational leadership preparation programs must reimagine teaching for not only the capacity development of doctoral students, but of faculty and programs to unapologetically challenge social oppression and seek justice.

Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs teach to encourage students’ capacity development to engage in transformative leadership. There are several recommendations I would suggest to extend this study.

First, I would recommend a longitudinal study of how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs encouraged the development of students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership that would have the potential to illuminate the development of relationships and critical consciousness of both students and faculty. Due to the short time period of the current study, the data was based on faculty’s sense-making and contextualized in the current time period. A longitudinal study may have the potential to utilize in-depth interviews with faculty and students, document analysis (e.g., reflection journal, teaching philosophy, emails), and observations to allow for a deeper understanding of the nuances of educational
leadership preparation programs within a higher educational setting. Also, a longitudinal study may provide information on the process of knowledge, disposition, and skill development.

With regard to the participants, I would recommend including in-depth interviews with doctoral students at various levels within the graduate experience. These would serve to illuminate students’ expectations of teaching and understand how they make sense of teaching to encourage the development of their capacity to understand oppression. For example, do the questions faculty provide to guide classroom discussion or dissertation advising sessions create transformative learning opportunities? It would be beneficial to include students of the faculty interviewed to understand teaching, leading, and developing from additional perspectives of the same events.

Future research is needed on advising and mentoring within the faculty-student relationship. More specifically, research on how these relationships encourages students’ capacity development to understand oppression. The understanding of the responsibilities, functions, characteristics, and behaviors of such relationships would expand the field conception of teaching and learning for social transformation.

It is also important to examine faculty socialization or development towards transformative leadership. Johnson (2001) defines faculty socialization as values, norms, knowledge, and skills individuals acquire during graduate school or within the organization. Faculty play important role in students’ critical perspective development; however, less is known about how the faculty socialization process provide opportunities for critical teaching development. Therefore, a critical perspective applied to faculty socialization may challenge oppressive universities’ structures, policies, and practices and move beyond the goals of the organizational (i.e. universities).
Researcher Reflections on the Research Study

I am fascinated by the ways in which the processes of individual and collective transformation through teaching and learning push, pull, and press against power dynamics in the microcosm of educational leadership preparation programs, which led me to this research questions and process. Throughout the research process, I had several apprehensions. First, I wondered if I was asking the most appropriate question about preparation teaching for capacity development of doctoral students. Especially, when I struggled to get study participants to participate throughout the process. I realized the need to use everyday language instead of academic terms to invite participants to the study across the school leadership and higher education preparation programs.

As I struggled to get participants and lost hope in the topic, critical approaches to teaching in educational preparation programs seemed to be essential in conference presentations, workshops, and literature I came across. Therefore, I had to expand what I believed teaching was and why it was important in the field of education. I even drafted paper on my learning experiences in the doctoral program as part of my individual transformation and my hopes of how I would understand and transform social oppression affecting education. These reflections were useful when speaking with participants as I was able to offer my experience and sense-making around teaching and learning.

I came to this research project with the assumption that education could be a site for personal and societal transformation, including doctoral preparation programs. I wondered if the participants would be able to articulate transformative teaching or will line of savior verse ally complex be blurred. In other words, for faculty with privilege identities teaching becomes about saving the “other” but disguised as an ally, which reinforce systems of privilege and oppression.
Throughout the research process, I learned that I had to be open and less stringent in my conceptualization of teaching. I shared this apprehension with the participants throughout the process that allowed me to be less afraid to ask critical questions. Although, the topic of race I still could not bring myself to boldly ask critical questions in fear that I may disrupt the lines of communication with my participants.

The relationships I built with the participants through my learner disposition provided a unique experience. There were times where the participants led me through their teaching practices without considerable probing. Other times, however, I led them through their teaching, connecting their comments and documents to ask additional questions. The magic of the relationship during the interview process would happen when the participants and I had a conversation about teaching with developing students’ leadership capacity to understand social oppressions affecting education. It seems similar to what Hydén (2014) called a “dance of balancing involvement” with shared responsibility of constructing knowledge. At times, the participants would ask me questions about my interpretation of their teaching, which made me feel less like a student and more like a colleague. I was able to be less intimidated by their position and willingness to participate, which allowed me to be myself filled with skepticism and curiosity around teaching for capacity development. Although, at times I found myself getting lost in their stories and missed opportunities to probe deeper into examples. In the analysis of the data, my lack of follow up with some questions left me with gaps that could have provided more depth to the study. I struggled with creating a balance of relationship building with a critical lens.

In addition, in my reflection of the study I though perhaps if I had focused the study on critical incidents the participants would have been able to provide more in-depth response. Through the data analysis the participants’ responds were scattered throughout their experiences
in teaching with little attention of specific moments. Perhaps, focusing on teaching as instructions, advising, and mentoring were too broad and resulted in the participants not providing much depth.

During the analysis and reporting of the data, I struggled with the tension of wanting to honor the participants’ stories with my interpretation of the data through a critical lens. I wanted to be fair and thought given more time with the participants the questions that haunted me in the analysis and reporting could have been worked out with the participants in another interview. More specifically, I struggle with critiques and analyses of the data and felt responsible that perhaps I did not ask all the right questions. My position as a student could not be hidden in the analysis process. I found myself thinking through the data as a student and the participants as faculty; thus, reflecting on how I would respond to their teaching approach from my positionality. I had to be conscious to remember by role as the researcher and the purpose of the study to ground the analysis process. After reading and re-reading and writing and rewriting chapter 4, I found that the relationship that I built with the participants permitted me to engage in a balance critique that extends the field’s understanding of faculty interactions to develop students’ capacity to understand social oppression. After this study, I believe, more than ever, that teaching, advising, and mentoring are essential in educational leadership doctoral programs through the development of a personal and collective capacity to envision new socially just educational systems.

Throughout the research process, I struggled with defining capacity in relationship with action. More specifically, I wondered about the development of skills and skills to do what. In the interviews with the participants I assumed that action had to be “in the field” but the participants offered the actions of students shifting their frames of reference and beginning to
challenge oppression in their thinking through academic practices. Thus, making capacity
development for action complex and multifaceted. I needed to be clear about how I defined
capacity to engage with the participants on for what purpose of the development of
transformative leadership to serve in addressing injustices and enacting social justice.

At the conclusion of this study, I still worry about if I asked the most appropriate
question about preparation teaching for capacity development of doctoral students. Have I fully
expressed the relational and multidimensional teaching in relations to power, privilege, and
oppression? As I develop in my capacity to understand oppression affecting education, the
academic practice of transformative research remains a skill set I need to embrace as a form of
action in my activism.

**Conclusion**

There have been numerous events in the United States and globally that have resulted
in death and dehumanization of certain bodies that promoted public attention and dialogue about
the interconnectedness of human oppression and conflict. What is the responsibility of
educational leaders in both K-12 and higher education, including faculty in engaging in a
collective process of teaching and learning that address social injustices? Similarly, to social
movements led by Millennials and Generational Z leaders, preparation programs need to
consider new radical ways of teaching for a collective organizing that interrogate systems of
oppression in various settings in education.

Faculty are in sociopolitical positions to play an essential role in the socialization of
doctoral students for social justice, whether as an instructor in the classroom, chair or advisor for
the research process, committee members for dissertations, or as a mentor. They influenced
curriculum and pedagogy, both in and outside of the classroom, serve as gatekeepers and/or gate-
openers for doctoral students, and often faced issues associated with injustice within education (Guerra & Pazey, 2016). Additionally, their dispositions, values, and skills on social justice and inequities can influence their curriculum, pedagogy, and advising approaches. In this study, I sought to understand how faculty taught to develop students’ leadership capacity to understand social oppressions affecting education. The findings that emerged were: The participants (1) integrated critical frameworks into curriculum and pedagogical approaches, (2) established spaces in and outside of the formal classroom to engage students, (3) centered student-faculty relationships for support and collaboration, and (4) evoked students’ transformative activism through academic practice. Ultimately, a relational approach is taken to invite students into partnership with faculty to reimage ways of knowing, being, relating, and leading for educational leadership to be an ideological and political intervention to systematic oppression affecting education and society.
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Seeking participants for a research study titled: The Power to Transform: Teaching in Educational Leadership Preparation Programs. The purpose of this study is to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs develop students’ capacity to (1) perceive and unmask dominant ideology, (2) challenge power relations, and (3) pursue leadership practices for social transformation.

I am seeking full-time faculty who currently teach and advise doctoral students in a university-based program focused on educational leadership development (educational leadership/administration, higher education, student affairs), and whose teaching, research, or service is guided by a philosophy or ethic of social justice. Participants should have 5 to 10 years of experience teaching, advising, and mentoring doctoral students. Also, participants should at least teach in a program/course with explicit goals from social justice, critical perspective, equity, or transformative leadership.

Participation in this research include completing a questionnaire 15 to 30 minutes, two (2) interviews, that will take approximately 90 to 120 minutes for the first interview and 30 to 45 minutes for the second interview. The identities of participants will be protected and kept confidential in any resulting research presentations or publications.

If you are willing to participate or would like more information, please contact me, Ericka Roland, at eroland@mail.usf.edu.
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Informed Consent to Participate in Research Involving Minimal Risk

Pro # Pro00033890

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Research studies include only people who choose to take part. This document is called an informed consent form. Please read this information carefully and take your time making your decision. Ask the researcher or study staff to discuss this consent form with you, please ask him/her to explain any words or information you do not clearly understand.

We are asking you to take part in a research study called:
The Power to Transform: Teaching in Educational Leadership Preparation Programs

The person who is in charge of this research study is Ericka Roland. This person is called the Principal Investigator. However, other research staff may be involved and can act on behalf of the person in charge. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Vonzell Agosto.

The research will be conducted at face to face at participant’s choice location or online (skype or google hangout).

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to understand how faculty in doctoral educational leadership preparation programs develop students’ capacity to (1) perceive and unmask dominant ideology, (2) challenge power relations, and (3) pursue leadership practices for social transformation.

Why are you being asked to take part?

We are asking you to take part in this research study because you are a full-time faculty who currently teach and advise doctoral students in a university-based program focused on educational leadership development (educational leadership/administration, higher education, student affairs), and whose teaching, research, or service is guided by a philosophy or ethic of social justice. Also you have 5 to 10 years of teaching and teach in a program/course with explicit goals from social justice, critical perspective, equity, or transformative leadership.

Study Procedures:

If you take part in this study, you will be asked to:
- Questionnaire - Participants will be asked to complete questions and their experience and demographics. In addition, participants will be asked to upload a course syllabus, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vitae. Questionnaire: 15-30 minutes
- Participate in semi-structured 2 interview in the location of the participants chose or online. 1st interview 90 - 120 minutes, 2nd interview 30-45 minutes.
- Artifacts collection - Participants will be asked to share documents, objects, pictures, or videos that demonstrate their teaching to develop students’ capacity to engage transformative leadership.

The interview will be audio recorded. Only the Principal Investigator and faculty advisor will have access to these recordings. The data will be maintained for at least five years in data format that is accessible only to team of investigators (researchers). Locked storage systems will be used for electronic data (i.e., recordings, visual data).

**Total Number of Participants**

About 5-7 individuals will take part in this study at USF

**Alternatives / Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal**

You do not have to participate in this research study.

You should only take part in this study if you want to volunteer. You should not feel that there is any pressure to take part in the study. You are free to participate in this research or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this study.

"Your decision to participate or not to participate will not affect your job status, employment record, employee evaluations, or advancement opportunities"

**Benefits**

You will receive no benefit(s) by participating in this research study.

The potential benefits of participating in this research study include: Opportunities to reflect on teaching approach to develop doctoral students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership.

**Risks or Discomfort**

This research is considered to be minimal risk. That means that the risks associated with this study are the same as what you face every day. There are no known additional risks to those who take part in this study.

**Compensation**

You will receive no payment or other compensation for taking part in this study.

**Costs**

It will not cost you anything to take part in the study.
Privacy and Confidentiality

We will keep your study records private and confidential. Certain people may need to see your study records. Anyone who looks at your records must keep them confidential. These individuals include:

- The research team, including the Principal Investigator and study faculty advisor.
- Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study, and individuals who provide oversight to ensure that we are doing the study in the right way.
- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research.
- The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, including staff in USF Research Integrity and Compliance.

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your name. We will not publish anything that would let people know who you are.

A federal law called Title IX protects your right to be free from sexual discrimination, including sexual harassment and sexual violence. USF’s Title IX policy requires certain USF employees to report sexual harassment or sexual violence against any USF employee, student or group, but does not require researchers to report sexual harassment or sexual violence when they learn about it as part of conducting an IRB-approved study. If, as part of this study, you tell us about any sexual harassment or sexual violence that has happened to you, including rape or sexual assault, we are not required to report it to the University. If you have questions about Title IX or USF’s Title IX policy, please call USF’s Office of Diversity, Inclusion & Equal Opportunity at (813) 974-4373.

You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints

If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, or experience an unanticipated problem, call Ericka Roland at (561) 670-7164.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or have complaints, concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, call the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638 or contact by email at RSCH-IRB@usf.edu.

Consent to Take Part in this Research Study

I freely give my consent to take part in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to take part in research. I have received a copy of this form to take with me.

______________________________  ______________________________
Signature of Person Taking Part in Study                   Date

______________________________
Printed Name of Person Taking Part in Study

Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have carefully explained to the person taking part in the study what he or she can expect from their study.
participation. I confirm that this research subject speaks the language that was used to explain this research and is receiving an informed consent form in their primary language. This research subject has provided legally effective informed consent.

Signature of Person obtaining Informed Consent

Date

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent
Appendix C: Interview One Questions

1st Interview Protocol

Introduction: First, thank you for volunteering to participate in this study. Your time, experience, and perspective are very valuable, and your contribution is appreciated. There are no right or wrong answers. I am interested in your experiences, and your individual, unique perspective on teaching to develop students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. This is an open conversation, so I encourage you to ask questions, clarify, and engage as you feel comfortable.

Phase 1:

1. Tell me about yourself, and how you came to become a college professor of educational leadership?
2. Tell me about what you believe you prepare your doctoral students to do and your teaching philosophy?
3. What do you believe is the enactment of transformative leadership? And for whom?
4. Tell me a little bit about you’re in class (course materials, activities, assignments, & feedback) teaching strategies as it relates to facilitating students’ capacity development to understand social oppressions affecting education?
5. Tell me a little bit about you’re out of class (advising, mentor, & sponsorship) strategies as it relates to facilitating students’ capacity development to intervene in social oppressions affecting education.

6. Can you tell me what the reason behind this approach in your teaching is?

7. What are some of the barriers and successes of your teaching approach for developing students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership?
Appendix D: Interview Two Questions

2nd Interview Protocol

Introduction: First, thank you for volunteering to participate in this study. Your time, experience, and perspective are very valuable, and your contribution is appreciated. There are no right or wrong answers. I am interested in your experiences, and your individual, unique perspective on teaching to develop students’ capacity to engage in transformative leadership. This is an open conversation, so I encourage you to ask questions, clarify, and engage as you feel comfortable.

Artifacts:

1. You were asked to bring five artifacts that demonstrates your teaching for capacity development to intervene in social oppressions affecting education?

2. Please tell me about your artifacts, and you may present them in any order.

3. Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your teaching?
Appendix E: Questionnaire

Power to Transform

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Q3 Thank you for volunteering to participate in this study. Please answer the following questions. All responses are strictly confidential. This questionnaire should take 15-20 minutes to complete. For more information, please contact Ericka Roland, at eroland@mail.usf.edu.

Q6 The section below is about your teaching (mentoring/advising).

Q31 In no more than 50 words, How would you describe developing doctoral students' capacity to engage in transformative leadership?
Q7 How many years have you been teaching doctoral students in educational leadership?

Q8 What is your position title?

- Assistant Professor (1)
- Associate Professor (2)
- Full Professor (3)
- Clinical Professor (4)
Q32 Please identify the educational context in which you prepare leaders to work? (Select all that apply)

☐ K-12 (1)

☐ Higher Education/Student Affairs (2)

☐ Community (3)

☐ Non-profits (4)

☐ Government (5)

☐ Other (6) ________________________________

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Q25 Please describe your current institution. (Select all that apply)

☐ Research University  (1)

☐ Comprehensive University  (2)

☐ Liberal Arts College  (3)

☐ Minority-Serving Institution  (4)

☐ Private  (5)

☐ Public  (6)

Q9 Please upload or provide link (next question) to the course syllabus that demonstrate a commitment to the development of transformative leadership.

(The course does not need to exclusively be on transformative leadership or social justice, but have outcomes/objectives that encourage the development of transformative leadership)
Q10 **Link to course syllabus** demonstrate a commitment to the development of transformative leadership.

________________________________________________________________

Q11 **Please upload or provide link** (next question) **to teaching philosophy.**

________________________________________________________________

Q12 **Link to teaching philosophy.**

________________________________________________________________

Q13 **Do you serve as a dissertation chair for educational leadership doctoral students?**

- [ ] No (1)
- [ ] Yes (2)
Q14 Are you an affiliate faculty in another department?

- No (1)
- Yes (2)

Q15 If you are an affiliate faculty, please list department below.

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Q16 Please upload or provide a link (next question) to your curriculum vitae.

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Q17 Provide a link to your curriculum vitae.

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Page Break

Q26 The section below is about the study. This study consist of two (2) interviews. First interview will be 90 to 120 minutes and second interview will be 30 to 45 minutes.
Q28 Please provide an email address.

Q33 Are you attending AERA?

▼ Yes (1) ... No (3)

Q29 For the 2nd interview you will be asked to bring 3 to 5 artifacts that express your teaching, advising, and mentoring approach to developing doctoral students' capacity to engage in transformative leadership. These artifacts can include, but not limited to:

Course Assignment, Assignment Feedback, Student Feedback, Dissertation Topics, Presentations, Publications, Research Project, Metaphor(s), Pictures, Song(s), Quotes, Video, Art
Q30 Thank you for volunteering to participate in this study. For more information or questions, please contact Ericka Roland, at eroland@mail.usf.edu.