INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

CANADIAN RADICAL HUMANITIES:
BEYOND DISCOURSE

JAMES M. CZANK
FACULTY OF EDUCATION,
LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY

Abstract

Worldwide there is a growing interest in improving access to higher education for non-traditional adult learners, as Hyland-Russell and Groen (2011) have argued. This paper focuses on the results of a study funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) that profiles two Radical Humanities programs for non-traditional adult learners. Treating these programs as a practice best expressed through the experiences of the people involved, as a means of understanding the fit between the ideas informing the programs and the realities and practice of the programs, this paper argues that current offerings of such programs are delivered as extensions of formal education in that they support objectification of students and asymmetrical power relations. This contrasts with the usual characterizations of such programs as relevant and life-changing, capable of transforming students' ideas of themselves. The programs proved deficient in achieving what they aim to do. I will articulate the barriers to achieving what they aim to do and offer suggestions, based on an analysis of data, for change.

Keywords: Canadian Radical Humanities programs, non-traditional adult student, power, emancipatory education, liberatory education

CANADIAN RADICAL HUMANITIES: BEYOND DISCOURSE

> Poverty [is] an absence of reflection and beauty, not an absence of money. It [is] comparable to the experience of people chained to the wall of the cave in Plato's Allegory of the Cave. . . . They see shadows on the walls and assume that is all there is in the world. (Shorris, 1997, as cited in Vitello, 2012, p. A24)

The foci of this paper is two Canadian Radical Humanities programs for non-traditional adult learners. Radical Humanities programs are distinguished from "typical" educational approaches for adult students, like vocational training and work preparation, because the focus is on autonomy, empowerment, and involvement. They purport to provide non-traditional adult students with the means to get along in the world through thinking and reflection. Egan et al. (2006) said that such programs communicate to the adult students that they are worthy and capable, and Groen and Hyland-Russell (2010a) said they are about joining the active life and escaping lives of impoverishment and marginalization. The goal of such programs, in a broad sense, is to better the lives of adult students through the liberatory and emancipatory potential of university-level education (Pfieff, 2003; Duncan, 2002; Howard, 2000; Culbert, 1998).

Such programs have been offered in several places across the United States, Canada, Australia, and Mexico (Groen, 2005). Here in Canada, these programs are typically referred to as Humanities 101, although programs have also been called Discovery University and University in the Community. They arise in opposition to narrowly conceived conceptions that link adult learning with economic advancement. They advance notions of success tied to "strengthening local communities" and "social and community justice" (Groen & Hyland-Russell, 2009, p. 101).

The students of Canadian Radical Humanities programs are often typified as socially or educationally disadvantaged and marginalized beings (Groen & Hyland-Russell, 2010b, p. 10), with characteristics that often include "an experience with homelessness, low-income, social isolation, long-term physical or mental illness and/or past nega-

tive experiences with the formal learning environment" (Groen & Hyland-Russell, 2007, p. 1). The students of the two Canadian Radical Humanities programs focused on in this paper were confirmed as such even before entering the programs since they came as referrals from social service agencies that deal with people with the above characteristics. Thus, on a very factual level, the terms "disadvantaged" and "marginalized" have become accepted as descriptors of the students. They must be identified as such to participate.

Each of these two programs was offered one night a week over the course of a semester. They both ran for approximately three hours per week as a series of lectures, with the topic and the instructor changing every week. The classes took place in the larger and more encompassing space of the university and within the socio-political-cultural realities of the communities involved. The programs each had a director who was aided by additional staff. These people organized and assisted in the supports put in place to help the adult learners overcome some of the hurdles they faced in attending. For example, transit fare, childcare, and course materials were provided, and classes typically started off with a meal to encourage student participation.

This paper focuses on the results of a study funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) that profiles the above two Radical Humanities programs for non-traditional adult learners (Czank, 2018). In the study the two Radical Humanities programs were treated as a practice best expressed through the experiences of the people involved, as a means of understanding the fit between the ideas informing the programs and the realities and practice of the programs. Contrary to the idea that such programs better the lives of adult students through the liberatory and emancipatory potential of education, this paper argues that current offerings of such programs are delivered as extensions of formal education in that they support objectification of students and asymmetrical power relations. They proved deficient in achieving what they aim to do.

MY POSITION AS A RESEARCHER

Our research and writing interests emerge from and reflect our lives (Richardson, 2001). Like many of the students in the Canadian

Radical Humanities programs involved in my study, I first entered university as a non-traditional mature student. I enrolled when I was somewhere around 30. I came from poor, working-class roots, which comes with "its own set of social symbols, feelings of political (in) significance, dispositions, and values, stemming from a perceived subordinate position in society" (Dunk, 1991). I grew up thinking of the university as a place where I did not belong, as a place only for privileged and super smart people. I have lived around the poverty line, and I know what it is like to feel insignificant and subordinate on both a cultural and social level.

My life experiences provided me with a certain amount of "cultural capital" when it came to my study. Pierre Bourdieu (1986) referred to cultural capital as "the disposition(s) of one's mind and body" (p. 243). It comes at us in an objectified form as cultural goods—the pictures we associate with, the books we read, the instruments we use, and the institutions we take part in. An extension of this would be the people we associate with, the stories we tell, the things we value, and the institutions we do not take part in. It is through our culture that reinforcing properties are conferred upon us. This is not to claim that I could identify with every participant's situation and location. Still, my life experiences helped to break down barriers between me and many of the research participants.

I am involved with one of the Canadian Radical Humanities programs addressed in this article. Albeit, during the data gathering phase of my study I took a step back from my usual duties in the program. I became involved as part of my university education. I volunteered with the program, fulfilled my graduate assistance hours through it, taught classes, and assigned projects. In my time with the program, I have served both as a program assistant and as a program director. During my involvement I have encountered tragic personal stories and shared in the sense of accomplishment and success the students felt when they completed the program. I have pushed students to use their voices and to tell their stories, and I have shared my own. Therefore, on a couple of levels, I am an insider to this study. Dwyer and Buckle (2009) suggested that a researcher is an insider when she or he shares with the participants the characteristics, roles, and/or experiences

being studied: "Insider research refers to when researchers conduct research with populations of which they are also members, so that the researcher shares an identity, language, and experiential base with the study participants" (p. 35).

RELEVANT LITERATURE

The Canadian Encyclopedia explains adult education as a body of organized educational processes reflecting a "specific philosophy of learning and teaching based on the assumption that adults can and want to learn, that they are able and willing to . . . and that the learning itself should respond to their needs" (English & Draper, 2013, para. 3). In the broadest sense, adult education is the experience by which adults acquire knowledge, skill, and understanding. It is a way to provide adults with technical and practical skills.

Adult education has been viewed as a means of social reform and criticism (Cincinnato et al., 2016; Carpenter & Mojab, 2013; Nesbit, 2013; Nesbit et al., 2013; Meredith, 2011), a venue for liberation (Groen & Kawalilak, 2014; Meredith, 2011), an opportunity for citizenship education (Schugurensky, 2013; Meredith, 2011; Nussbaum, 2009), and an ongoing event in "transformative learning" (Groen & Kawalilak, 2014; Hyland-Russell & Groen, 2008; O'Sullivan et al., 2002; Kegan, 2000). These characterizations of adult education form the background and delivery model of Canadian Radical Humanities programs for non-traditional adult learners.

Canadian Radical Humanities programs grew out of Earl Shorris' Clemente Course, which was to create for the poor and marginalized "a political life" (Shorris, 2000, p. 4), that is "activity with other people at every level, from the family to the neighborhood to the broader community to the city/state in which [they] live" (p. 127), and active reflection on the affairs that concern them. It was the proper sense of politics Shorris felt the poor needed to be learning. This meant "knowing how to negotiate instead of using force... knowing how to use politics to get along, to get power... it presented them with a more effective method for living in society" (p. 127). It is this complex formulation that Canadian Radical Humanities programs have sought to replicate.

All the programs in Canada offer a unique interpretation of delivery and content, but all seek to provide non-traditional adult learners with access to "significant texts, ideas, professors and classroom dialogue" (Meredith, 2011, p. 8). Most of the Canadian Radical Humanities programs resist the use of the traditional humanities canon, recognizing the value of incorporating feminist, indigenous, and postmodern perspectives into the curriculum (p. 9). Meredith referred to the Canadian Radical Humanities programs as "nourishing learning environments," in a unique position to "counter neo-liberalism and lend their experiential knowledge to a struggling public education sphere that is being overwhelmed by the forces of capitalism" (p. 58).

"A reflective opportunity that reframes students' worldviews in ways that encourage them to reconsider their relationships to themselves, to others, and to the world" is how Hyland-Russell and Groen (2011, p. 75) described Canadian Radical Humanities programs. They attribute to it the "maieutic method" (p. 76) of Socrates, facilitating a space of rigorous dialogue and intellectual skills:

> Radical Humanities provide a unique reflective space in which students can begin to renegotiate their beliefs about themselves in relation to the rest of the world—particularly in terms of structures and systems—and then apply new ideas to inspire and catalyze agential responses. (Hyland-Russell & Groen, 2011, p. 78)

The philosophy and praxis of Canadian Radical Humanities programs is about "gaining insight into oneself, learning to open up to dialogue, [and] becoming aware of oneself in relation to others in society" (Groen & Hyland-Russell, 2010c, p. 106). In Hyland-Russell and Groen (2011), such programs are described as a protected intellectual space where the rigors of dialogue help students develop the intellectual skills necessary for civic participation. The dialogue, whether it is about philosophy, art, literature, or history, provides a multitude of perspectives on the human experience and condition. They engage both the past and present and offer non-traditional and marginalized adult learners a horizon of hope and possibility, connecting the experiences and lives of the learners with the structural and systemic contexts of the programs.

Canadian Radical Humanities programs are fashioned as education for citizenship and portrayed as a means for a more inclusive citizen. They appeal to the development of critical awareness, and the danger and destabilization that informs critical theory. They are also portrayed as transformative because of the transformative and significant shifts they are expected to elicit in the students (Meredith, 2011). They represent an institution. Not a specific institution but a concept with many concrete institutions as part of it. Just as there is the idea of "school" and there are specific schools, there are Canadian Radical Humanities programs, that is, the approach of offering an entry-level education in the humanities to non-traditional adult students, and there are specific examples being offered in different places. They are constructed from a distinctive landscape, informed by precepts about adult education, and it is not just a way to bring people into mainstream society; it is inextricably linked to concepts of emancipation and societal reform.

METHODOLOGY

My Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) funded study was an institutional ethnography. This method of research is a study of interactions which have been institutionalized. Not to be confused with an ethnography of specific institutions or organizations, it is an ethnography of the relations that structure people's lives, through the ways that they interact with one another in the context and how their interactions are confirmed institutionally. In this way, an institutional ethnography makes ordinary daily activity the site of investigation, allowing for an "emergent mode of inquiry" (DeVault & McCoy, 2006, p. 16) as opposed to the implementation of a strategy to test a hypothesis. The emphasis was on discovery of what already existed.

It was important to avoid imposing interpretations upon the participants in my study. Instead, I elaborated on what they said as a mode of discovery. This allowed for an investigation of the social organization of knowledge, where knowledge was treated as ideology and unpacked as a distinctive epistemological perspective. I was intrigued by what Campbell and Gregor (2008) called the "radical potential" of institutional ethnography. Rather than replicating previous findings and what is taken for granted about Canadian Radical Humanities programs, like

the tenets that typify the programs and approach, institutional ethnography is a process of discovery. It rethinks the setting by taking the inherent power relations into account. The guiding query of institutional analysis becomes, "What does the data tell me about how this setting happens as it does?" (p. 85).

The direction of the inquiry for an institutional ethnography is never entirely random. The institutional ethnographic thematic shares with Foucault an interest in discourse (DeVault & McCoy, 2006), which manages to "displace the traditional basis of knowledge in individual perception and locates it externally to particular subjectivities as an order which imposes . . . it [regulates] how people's subjectivities are coordinated" (Smith, 2005, p. 17).

Institutional ethnography (and subsequently my study) is erected upon Foucauldian notions of discourse and power. According to Foucault, discourse is a collective of statements and ideas that produce networks of discursive meaning. The defining characteristic of Foucauldian discourse is that it is hierarchical in the sense that it arranges and reinforces certain identities or subjectivities, including things like gender, status, and class, and "gives rise to a certain organization of concepts, certain regroupings of objects, [and] certain types of enunciation" (Foucault, 1972, p. 64). Discourse provides a conceptual framework and classificatory model for understanding the world around us, shaping how we think, and how we produce knowledge. Discourse structures possibilities for thinking, talking, and acting.

In institutional ethnography power is treated as a "materiality" or "technique" that operates on the subjects involved. Power is "a way in which certain actions modify others . . . [and] less a confrontation between two adversaries or the linking of one to the other than a question of governance" (Foucault, 1983, p. 219). While not always explicitly identified, power is always present within the ensemble of discourse, operating most of the time as a matter of perspective. Power in this sense is not something that one simply has or does not have—and in this sense it exceeds the Marxian sense of power as something that can be seized, or that from which one can be alienated. Power is productive and dynamic in the sense that it structures, rather than something that one holds on to, or conversely allows to slip away. Power is treated as a thing co-constituted by the people who support it.

Two programs were chosen as representative sites for the institutional ethnography of the Canadian Radical Humanities programs. The two programs operate in two separate cities and were run by two different directors. There were two groups of participants at each site: the adult learners enrolled in the programs (students) and the people providing the program (institutional participants). All the research participants received a formal invitation to participate.

As mentioned earlier, the students enrolled in the Canadian Radical Humanities programs were recommended by community service agencies. They were selected because the people at the agencies believed that these potential students were people able to benefit from the opportunities and structures afforded by the experience. Once selected, the students were provided with course materials, transit fare, a meal at each meeting, and the cost of childcare to remove financial and social barriers to learning and ensure that the students had the opportunity to participate. The only other condition for enrollment was that the students be at least 17 years of age and able to read a newspaper.

Further to that selection process of my research, the students who were invited to participate in this research were also vetted by the representatives of the social agencies. They were recommended as people that would be willing to participate without the participation in the study reflecting negatively on their learning experience. Eventually, nine students volunteered as study participants in my study.

The institutional participants (instructors and a program director) represented the primary link between the adult learners and the program. These were the people who worked with "the messiness of everyday circumstances so that it fit [with] the categories and protocols of the regime" (Smith, 2006, p. 27). As intermediary actors in the institutional complex, these were the people speaking from within the ruling discourse (p. 28). Seven institutional participants volunteered to participate.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA SOURCES AND ANALYSIS

The data were sourced from program documents, interviews, and personal reflections on personal observations as recorded in a journal. Data collection was an ongoing and interactive process and was used to construct a representation of how things worked. I worked between

and among the different sources of data and analysis. I coded these data sources according to the perspectives and positions I discovered. I used preset or *a'priori* codes (e.g., Student identity, Empowerment, Education) derived from what the texts had to say about Canadian Radical Humanities programs, and emergent codes (e.g., Strength, Potential, Opportunity, Enabling). I considered the purpose of my study in setting these codes. The coded data eventually led to groupings and more advanced levels of conceptual analysis, including patterns in the data, inconsistencies and disjuncture, and connective threads among the participants. This is presented as my analysis of the discourse around the institution of Canadian Radical Humanities programs for non-traditional adult learners.

My analysis was intended to make visible the primary narratives of the students and the institutionally orientated accounts of the instructors, director, and programs themselves. Mirroring an approach already established by John McKendy (2006), I was on the lookout for times in the data where disjuncture resided, where differing perspectives on Canadian Radical Humanities programs rubbed up against each other. I was interested in where such disjuncture was occasioned within the flow of the interview, and what types of issues such disjuncture identified (DeVault & McCoy, 2006, p. 39). As in any institutional ethnography, I brought under scrutiny relations that were not peculiar to any one individual, rather relations that were part of a complex reaching beyond and coordinating the individuals in relation to each other (Smith, 2005; Smith et al., 2006). This qualitative methodology does not limit itself to the settings but rather expands into the realities of how the local is penetrated by the trans-local reality of power. I addressed explicitly the character of the institution as a form of organization that is constituted externally to people and places (Smith, 2005, p. 42).

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Canadian Radical Humanities programs are informed and forever aligned with the idea that the best education for the best is the best education for all. Higher education is privileged and treated as emancipatory, liberatory, transformational, and citizen building. The programs are offered for people who lack the resources to achieve their fair share

in society, those suffering low income and marginalization. Students are characterized as marginalized and disadvantaged. This is the prevailing discourse of Canadian Radical Humanities programs.

This discourse gives a definition to situations and events and reinforces the identity of the programs. It pressures and modifies patterns of meaning and regulates the classroom and the people in it by establishing orders of truth and influencing what is accepted as reality. It situates the programs and gives them historical meaning. A discourse that contextualizes and regulates, modifies. In a very pragmatic sense, the Canadian Radical Humanities programs involved in my study and the experiences of the people involved with them never really stand outside the discourse. This is important. To paraphrase Fiske (1996), to make sense of something is to exert power over it (p. 3). To circulate that sense in the social context of Canadian Radical Humanities programs is to exert power over all those who use it as a way of coping with their world.

Most of the institutional participants (instructors and a program director), the program materials, and the literature involved in my study spoke of the value of the programs in terms of what they needed to do for the students. It was maintained that the programs are not meant as a recruitment tool for the university. However, the presumed value of university or academic education remained at the forefront of the accounts and the programs. The spell of the academy was *sui generis*. The university and its culture were treated by some as beneficial. Some called it enabling. The institutional participants and literature attributed to it the power to provide students with the confidence and opportunity they needed to get on with their lives. One of the institutional participants even invoked the notion and benefit of having an "academic voice." The Canadian Radical Humanities programs connected personal growth to integration in society using the vehicle of a transformative and liberal education but stopped short of revolutionizing society through education. One seldom found any privileging of what the students already knew. The programs focused on what the students did not have rather than what they could bring to the programs and how the students would benefit from the experience of being in a university setting or sampling its particular flavor. There were

references to cultivating the type of thinking that empowers people to change their lives, and to enabling people to think differently about themselves. Complex interaction with the world was made synonymous with academics and university education.

Within the programs the term "student" was used to categorize a group of people assumed to belong to a certain homogenous group. They were people lacking ability, and capacity, and desire. The students were people caught in the system, without opportunity, and suffering, sick, or challenged. Or they were perceived to be people without opportunity, and people who failed to make the best choices in life, and, it follows, people in need of rescuing. Some of the institutional participants were hesitant to describe the students as marginalized, instead using words like "fallen" and "disabled." Others described the students as "significantly challenged" and "coping," although others suggested they were "interesting" and "neat" people.

Throughout the study this sort of discourse came up against the students' sense of self and the ideas and expectations they had for themselves and the programs. For example, not one of the students referred to himself or herself as marginalized. Nor did any of them use the word oppressed, outside of a class that had oppression as one of its topics. They did not treat academia with the same reverence as the institutional participants, and they did not see themselves in the same way as the programs did. Their views did not concur with the ideas informing Canadian Radical Humanities programs and the expectations of the people responsible for actualizing it in the classroom. What constituted truth in the Canadian Radical Humanities programs was a perspective aligned with its own values and mandates, like the quality of the university experience, and not truth in itself. The Canadian Radical Humanities programs were situated juxtaposed with the lives and experiences of the students. The difference reflected more than a difference in views or even priorities; it was rooted in a fundamental difference in how people treated and understood the world and themselves, and it was more than semantics.

The institutional participants and the programs operated in keeping with standard and traditional notions of education and classrooms. People adopted traditionally accepted classroom protocol: Raise your

hand if you wish to speak, do not interrupt, talk about the topic introduced and controlled by the instructor. The conventions were adhered to by both students and instructors, but the topics chosen by the instructors were not necessarily the ones the students wished to explore. Some of the students demonstrated a more insurrectionary perspective. The empowerment they were looking for was not empowerment as reified and fixed upon by the institutional elements of the program, as the capacity of the institution to rescue and recuperate their lives. Perhaps on some level they recognized what Lankshear (1994) described as the "hollow, nominal, and empty terminology" (p. 164) of institutionalized notions of empowerment. Rather, it was empowerment in a much more real and meaningful sense. The programs not only failed to map neatly onto the life and experiences of the students. The Canadian Radical Humanities programs remained an extension of the formal learning environment that failed the students to begin with.

An education that helps overcome isolation and powerlessness is less about academics and more about the people involved. To paraphrase Giroux (2010), within the Canadian Radical Humanities programs there was little proof that pedagogy was treated as anything but status quo (p. 191). Genuinely critical education, as a deeply civic, political, and moral practice—that is, pedagogy as a practice for freedom, evaded it. There were few opportunities that allowed students to tell their stories based upon their experiences, and there were very few manifestations of these stories and experiences in the classroom. Many of the interchanges between the students and the programs had the accepted dynamics of power as a constraining feature, implicit in language, framework, and perspective. The delivery and structure were reminiscent of education in the standard format of transmission of knowledge from an individual to a group. The result of this for the students, to paraphrase Smith (2006), is that within the space of the classroom their actuality became accountable to the overarching discourse of Canadian Radical Humanities programs.

The Canadian Radical Humanities programs were a space not easily navigated. They were coordinated by an idea of Radical Humanities, and in practice they were a collection of individuals who came with different needs, understanding, and knowledge. While they purported

to be an example of learning that liberates and transforms beliefs, values, and underlying assumptions, programs leading to a dissolution of barriers and the promise for radical change and empowerment, the data showed they really were not—at least, no more so than any other postsecondary classroom. The Canadian Radical Humanities programs did not engage with the collection of quite definite perspectives that were present in the classroom. Instead, they remained tied to just one—the power of postsecondary institutions and content—viewing and treating it as a magical path to emancipation. Put simply, if a genuinely critical education—pedagogy as a practice for freedom and emancipation—is about the people in the classroom, critical education is not what Canadian Radical Humanities programs are about. According to Nietzsche (1968), a look at any space is a look at what is active behind the ideas that inform it. This makes conflict encountered in difference, including between epistemological scruples, conflicts between quite definite perspectives. This is what the study revealed.

I believe in the potential of Canadian Radical Humanities programs—I advocate for them, and I am still involved with one such program. I also work at expanding them in my community. Now that I have outlined the barriers to achieving what they aim to do, I have suggestions, based on an analysis of data, for change.

CONCLUSION

All learning and research projects that enter new ground open the possibility for an examination by new fundamental principles (Meredith, 2011). The study and the results highlighted a great deal about the theories associated with Canadian Radical Humanities programs. They exist in a space between liberal, transformative, and critical theories of education. While the wider question of the relationship between these fields is open to debate, they are conflated in the literature dealing with Canadian Radical Humanities programs. What they have in common is a cultivating and empowering view of education. My findings identified Canadian Radical Humanities programs, and by extension these educational theories, as fields that perpetuate the entrenched habits of objectification and asymmetrical power relations that plague traditional and formal approaches to education.

It is clear from the study that the barriers which existed for the student participants of Canadian Radical Humanities programs go well beyond those commonly associated with a non-traditional student. Things like homelessness, poverty, social isolation, physical or mental illness, and past negative experiences with formal learning environments are normally thought of and ascribed to the students, and in many cases, these were accurate descriptors. But the barriers also included the language, framework, literature, and perspectives that inform the programs. These became implicit and constraining factors, and through them Canadian Radical Humanities programs remained a fundamental expression of power and politics, as Giroux (1988) described more formal forms of education.

To counter this, students need to be involved in the classes and material. The students' point of origin, socially or educationally, needs to be accepted. The formal and constraining dynamics of power, as a feature of the institution implicit in language, framework, and perspective, need to be overcome. Instead of writing the students lived experiences out of the space of the classroom, program developers and instructors need to appreciate how their actual stories, voices, and experiences can contribute to the conversation. The program developers and instructors need to know their audience, and the espoused needs of their audience. Canadian Radical Humanities programs need to be geared toward allowing social groups to gain autonomy and for members to be given opportunity to exert independence as social actors.

Change for Canadian Radical Humanities programs means an alteration of mechanisms within the structure, characterized by changes in culture, rules of behavior, organization, and value systems. With this in mind, I recommend the following three pillars for Canadian Radical Humanities programs (these recommendations can be applied to other programs as well):

1. Change focus: As it presently stands, Canadian Radical Humanities programs are about facilitating the integration of people into the logic of our present system. The normal dynamics of power are at play in the classroom. To overcome this, help the students engage the "right" form of resistance. Make the classes about their experiences, as an unpacking

of the knowledge they already have. Also, include more former students and community members in the programs. Include people who know what opportunity means for the people in the room and have intimate knowledge of the espoused needs of the students themselves.

2. Address resistance: The programs should be helping individuals develop their voice, to name and identify their world, rather than reaching down to draw them up to "ours." The context of classes should be directed to these ends. As part of the program, explore opportunities for understanding resistance and make peaceful change an overarching theme of the individual topics being addressed within the program.
3. Connect to community: The community needs to be tied into the classroom. This could mean exploring and extending the relationship between Canadian Radical Humanities programs and community partners. Connecting to the community could also mean extending Canadian Radical Humanities programs into the community. There is some context for this. For example, the program at the University of Alberta runs a course at a shelter. This brings university-level learning into a different environment, and it is centered on themes of home and community. A change in setting would change the dynamic of the "classroom" by changing whose "backyard" the programs take place in. The students would not be venturing into a foreign and intimidating setting, and the community would become part of the program.

Changes in focus could really change the dynamics of the classroom and the potential of Canadian Radical Humanities programs.

REFERENCES

Czank, J. (2018). *People in discursive spaces: Entry-level humanities education for non-traditional adult learners* [Doctoral dissertation, Lakehead University]. http://knowledgecommons.lakeheadu.ca

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Publishing.

Campbell, M., & Gregor, F. (2008). *Mapping social relations. A primer in doing institutional ethnography.* University of Toronto Press.

Carpenter, S., & Mojab, S. (2013). What is critical about critical adult education? In T. Nesbit, S. Brigham, N. Taber, & T. Gibb (Eds.), *Building on critical traditions. Adult education and learning in Canada* (pp. 160–170). Thompson Educational Publishing.

Cincinnato, S., De Wever, B., Van Keer, H., & Valcke, M. (2016). The influence of social background on participation in adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *66*(2), 143–168.

Culbert, L. (1998, December 5). Humanities courses enrich the lives of the needy. *The Vancouver Sun.*

DeVault, M., & McCoy, L. (2006). Institutional ethnography: Using interviews to investigate ruling relations. In D. Smith (Ed.), *Institutional ethnography as practice* (pp. 15–44). Rowman and Littlefield.

Duncan, K. (2002). No ordinary class. *Perspectives*.

Dunk, T. W. (1991). *It's a working man's town: Male working-class culture*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Dwyer, S., & Buckle, J. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *8*(1), 54–63.

Egan, L., Butcher, J., Howard, P., Hampshire, A., Henson, C., & Homel, R. (2006). *The impact of tertiary-level humanities education for homeless and marginalized people.* Australian Association for Research in Education.

English, L., & Draper, J. (2013). Adult education. *The Canadian encyclopedia*. http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/adult-

education/

Fiske, J. (1996). *Media matters: Race and gender in U.S. politics*. University of Minnesota Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge.* Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1983). The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 214–232). University of Chicago Press.

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

Giroux, H. (2010). Bare pedagogy and the scourge of neoliberalism: Rethinking higher education as a democratic public sphere. *The Educational Forum*, *74*, 184–196.

Groen, J. (2005). The Clemente Program and Calgary Alberta's Storefront 101: Intuitive connections to the traditions and practices of adult education. *Convergence*, *38*(2), 65–75.

Groen, J., & Hyland-Russell, T. (2007). One size fits all? Reflecting on local program planning processes among three iterations of the "Clemente" Program. In *Learning in community: Proceedings of the joint international conference of the Adult Education Research Conference (AERC) and the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education* (pp. 259–264). Halifax, NS, Canada.

Groen, J., & Hyland-Russell, T. (2009). Success: The views of marginalized adult learners in a radical humanities program. In *Spaces/places: Exploring the boundaries of adult education 28th annual conference proceedings of the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education* (pp. 101–107). Ottawa, ON, Canada.

Groen, J., & Hyland-Russell, T. (2010a). Humanities professors on the margins: Creating the possibility for transformative learning. *Journal of Transformative Education*, *8*(4), 223–245.

Groen, J., & Hyland-Russell, T. (2010b). *Radical humanities. A pathway toward transformational learning for marginalized non-traditional adult learners.* Canadian Council on Learning.

Groen, J., & Hyland-Russell, T. (2010c). Riches from the poor: Teaching humanities in the margins. In M. Alfred (Ed.), *Learning for economic self-sufficiency* (pp. 29–47). Information Age Publishing.

Groen, J., & Kawalilak, C. (2014). *Pathways of adult learning*: *Professional and education narratives.* Canadian Scholars' Press.

Howard, C. (2000, July 15). Plato and poetry for the poor. *The National Post.*

Howard, J., Risman, B., & Sprague, J. (2005). Series editor forward. In D. Smith (Ed.), *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people* (pp. ix–xii). Altamira Press.

Hyland-Russell, T., & Groen, J. (2008, July). *Non-traditional adult learners and transformative learning*. Standing Conference on University Teaching and Research in the Education of Adults (SCUTREA): Whither adult education in the learning paradigm? Edinburgh, Scotland.

Hyland-Russell, T., & Groen, J. (2011). Marginalized non-traditional adult learners: Beyond economics. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, *24*(1), 62–79.

Kegan, R. (2000). What "form" transforms? A constructive-developmental approach to transformative learning. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3–34). Jossey-Bass.

Lankshear, C. (1994). Afterword: Reclaiming empowerment and rethinking the past. In M. Escobar (Ed.), *Paulo Freire on higher education: A dialogue at the National University of Mexico* (pp. 161–188). State University of New York Press.

McKendy, J. (2006). I'm very careful about that: Narrative and agency of men in prison. *Discourse Society*, *17*(4), 473–502.

Meredith, L. (2011). *Creating spaces for dialogue: Participatory action research in free humanities programs in Canada* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Calgary].

Nesbit, T. (2013). Canadian adult education: A critical tradition. In T. Nesbit, S. Brigham, N. Taber, & T. Gibb (Eds.), *Building on critical traditions. Adult education and learning in Canada* (pp. 1–15). Thompson Educational Publishing.

Nesbit, T., Brigham, S., Taber, N., & Gibb, T. (2013). The continuing imperative of Canadian adult education and learning. In T. Nesbit, S. Brigham, N. Taber, & T. Gibb (Eds.), *Building on critical*

traditions. Adult education and learning in Canada (pp. 355–360). Thompson Educational Publishing.

Nietzsche, F. (1968). *The will to power* (W. Kaufmann, Ed.; W. Kaufmann & R. Hollingdale, Trans.). Vintage Books.

Nussbaum, M. (2009). Education for profit, education for freedom. *Liberal Education*, *95*(3), 6–13.

O'Sullivan, E., Morrell, A., & O'Connor, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Expanding the boundaries of transformative learning*. Palgrave.

Pfieff, M. (2003, August). Humanities 101. *Reader's Digest*.

Richardson, L. (2001). Getting personal: Writing stories. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *14*(1), 33–38.

Schugurensky, D. (2006) Adult citizenship education: An overview of the field. In T. Fenwick, T. Nesbit, & B. Spencer (Eds.), *Contexts of adult education*. *Canadian perspectives* (pp. 68–80). Thompson Educational Publishing.

Shorris, E. (1997, September). On the uses of a liberal education: II. As a weapon in the hands of the restless poor. *Harper's*, 50-60. https://harpers.org/archive/1997/09/ii-as-a-weapon-in-the-hands-of-the-restless-poor/

Shorris, E. (2000). *Riches for the poor. The Clemente Course in the humanities.* W.W. Norton and Company.

Smith, D. (2005). *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. Altamira Press.

Smith, D. (Ed.). (2006). *Institutional ethnography as practice*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Smith, G., Mykhalovsky, E., & Weatherbee, D. (2006). Getting hooked up. An organizational study of the problems people with HIV/AIDS have accessing social services. In D. Smith (Ed.), *Institutional ethnography as practice* (pp. 165–179). Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Vitello, P. (2012, June 2). Earl Shorris, 75, dies; Fought poverty with knowledge. *New York Times*, p. A24. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/03/us/earl-shorris-who-fought-poverty-with-knowledge-dies-at-75.html