

Hate Studies Through a Constructivist and Critical Pedagogical Approach

James M. Mohr

Most of us are probably familiar with the child's lament made during dinner: "I hate vegetables." If you are a teacher, you may have heard students announce with conviction, "I hate homework." It seems that everyone hates someone, something, or some action; so what value is there in a field of hate studies? Hate, when discussed as a strong feeling toward something one dislikes, appears simply as an emotion that does not deserve the special recognition of having an entire field committed to its research. However, this narrow focus on this one aspect of hate leaves ignored the very real impact of hateful attitudes and actions on local, national, and international communities. In fact, hate is a common experience of people throughout the world (Bayley, 2002; Waller, 2004).

Hate as an inspiration for individual and collective action related to murdering, terrorizing, or oppressing another individual or group is neither a unique nor a new phenomenon in today's world. Throughout history, acts of hate have been perpetrated by one group against another group based on a perceived element of difference in the "other," whether it was be culture, race, religion, gender, sexuality, or another characteristic (Bayley, 2002; Sternberg, 2003). Though hate and the acts associated with it are not new, what has changed is that our society has become less tolerant of such acts. This new attitude toward hate has led society to seek ways to confront hate in a manner that lessens its impact and permits everyone to develop to his or her fullest potential without fear of reprisal.

Establishing a field of hate studies has been proposed as one means of analyzing hate and developing effective methods of understanding, combating, and controlling it (Blitzer, 2006; Stern, 2004). If we understand the growth and consequences of hatred, we will be better able to develop effective remedies and strategies to counter it (Sternberg, 2003; Yanay, 2002). Proponents of the field are not interested in studying why people hate vegetables, but rather, in developing a deeper understanding of the acts of hate that are weakening the social bonds that form the foundations of a pluralistic society. Specifically, Stern (2004) defined hate studies as "inquiries into the human capacity to define, and then dehumanize or demonize an 'other,' and the processes which inform and give expression to, or can curtail, control, or combat, that capacity" (p. 11). This definition focuses the field of hate studies on the very real issues of hate and its effect on individuals and society.

This paper examines the purpose of a field of hate studies and the development of a curriculum using constructivist theories and critical pedagogy. A comprehensive curriculum is needed to give the field structure and to meet the task set out by Stern (2004) of integrating multiple conceptions of hate as represented in different academic disciplines to better “understand this phenomenon [of hate], and to identify testable rather than gut-instinct and ‘feel-good’ remedies” (p. 7). A curriculum will also help provide research methods, strategies, and focus for examining hate.

THE NEED FOR HATE STUDIES

External and internal forces have historically influenced the development of higher education curricula (Stark & Lattuca, 1997). “The curricula of American colleges reflect the concerns of the general society and of the institutions that shape them” (Carnegie Foundation, 1977, p. 30). Government and foundations have exerted enormous influence on the development of higher education (Coleman, 1973; Seymour, 1988). Issues of hate, domestically and internationally, have become a major concern for society, government, and foundations. All three spheres are seeking ways to lessen the impact of hate and improve the ability of people to relate to a broad spectrum of humanity, as can be seen by the increase in diversity and cultural programs in K-12 schools, diversity courses in higher education, diversity training in businesses, and the passing of hate crime legislation. As society is seeking solutions to hate, institutions of higher learning have the opportunity to test theories and develop explanations and strategies related to limiting hate’s impact on society. In essence, just as higher education is influenced by general society, it likewise has the opportunity to influence society.

By creating a field of hate studies, higher education is able to positively affect society. This field is concerned with the lack of shared information and insights among different academic disciplines studying hate, which makes it difficult to develop a coherent set of responses to hate as it is socially and culturally exhibited. This isolation of the disciplines allows only a narrow understanding of hate, and therefore generates limited methods for challenging and overcoming it. Stern (2004) briefly explained how the different disciplines of history, psychology, sociology, religious studies, political science, law, journalism, and education would enhance our understanding of and responses to hate. By connecting these disciplines, the field “represents a synergistic whole that encompasses more than a mere sum of its academic parts” (Blitzer, 2006, p. 139) and provides a comprehensive understanding of hate, allowing us to develop practical benefits from the theories, knowledge, and insights found within these disciplines.

When connections are made between disciplines, students gain a deeper knowledge of hate theories, ideas, and models, giving them the skills to engage in broader, deeper, and more holistic thinking about hate and how it impacts individuals, groups, and society. Such integrative learning experiences are of great value in educating students (Carnegie Foundation, 1977; Davis, 1995) and expose them to cultural diversity, initiate personal development, and help students discover, analyze, produce, and use new information (Davis, 1995).

Another reason for creating a field of hate studies is the harm hate inflicts on individuals, communities, and societies. Acts of hate generate serious friction between cultural groups, leading to further conflict. This conflict increases tension, fear, and violence in these communities and is responsible for weakening the bonds that bind a culturally diverse society, causing a breakdown of social cohesion (Weiss & Ephross, 1986).

An intensive interdisciplinary study of hate can provide answers and remedies for domestic and international expressions of hate. In the United States, according to the National Uniform Crime Reports (FBI, 2004), in 2002 over 7,462 hate crime incidents were committed, accounting for 8,825 offenses and involving 9,222 victims. Of these offenses, 49.8% were racially motivated, 17.9% were religiously motivated, 16.6% were related to sexual orientation, 15.2% were due to ethnic or national origin bias, and .5% were due to disability bias. Over 67.5% of the crimes were committed against persons, while 32% of the crimes were against property and .5% were against society. As hate crimes continue to threaten individuals, the number of hate groups recorded in the United States also continues to grow (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2005). A strong hate studies curriculum can provide the research needed to develop effective programs to counter this increase in actions motivated by hate.

Internationally, acts of terrorism, genocide, and massacres are rooted in hate (Sternberg, 2003). Throughout the twentieth century, terrorist attacks have increased (Glasser, 2005) and genocidal acts are considered a defining characteristic of the century (Bartrop, 2002; Verdeja, 2002). Though defining hate is difficult, just as defining terrorism (Maskaliunaite, 2002) and genocide (Rubinstein, 2004) is problematic, a hate studies curriculum can bring disparate views on hate together to expand our understanding not just of hate, but also of terrorism and genocide so that we can develop holistic and effective methods to combat them.

Expressions of hate, whether expressed through hate crimes, terrorism, genocide, or propaganda designed to humiliate others, need to be researched so effective programs and responses can be designed to counter such expressions. Blitzer (2006) explained that a field of hate studies facilitates “sustained and concentrated interest in studying hate—in gathering case

studies, in thinking abstractly and theoretically about hate (its causes and effects), and in solidifying definitions of hate that are useful and up to date” (p. 140). By encouraging the study of hate, researchers can create theoretically grounded responses to acts of hate that assist individuals, activists, and governments in their work to limit the spread of hate to a new generation of people.

Stern and Blitzer have begun the process of establishing a field of hate studies through presenting the rationale for it, creating a framework, and providing questions for the field to research. However, there is another component needed for the field to be incorporated by universities, and that is an explanation of the type of course work and research that practitioners and students in the field will be conducting.

Through the creation of a hate studies curriculum, the field offers the opportunity for much more than a simple uniting of different disciplines. The hate studies curriculum encourages students to challenge injustice and oppressive tendencies within themselves, others, and the community. It prepares students to be active participants in democratic processes. A hate studies curriculum engages in “educational practices that help students look at issues in broad social contexts, hone their abilities for deep and critical inquiry, constructively consider multiple viewpoints and perspectives in dialogue with others, and engage in socially just actions” (Nagda, Gurin, & Lopez, 2003, p. 166). Through such practices, students will be prepared as citizens who understand, appreciate, and acknowledge their role as social change agents. For if students do not become change agents through the study of hate, then such study is irrelevant and meaningless.

To create a curriculum that rises to the challenge of creating socially aware and active students who are willing to challenge hate, it is necessary to use theories of learning and education that are based on how students learn and are concerned with providing students with the skills and abilities to question the underlying assumptions and biases of what they have learned or are currently learning. By focusing on students, it is possible to create an effective and holistic curriculum. Constructivism and critical pedagogy, as explained below, provide the guidance, rationale, and structure for the teaching strategies and class structure of the curriculum, as well as giving the study of hate a justice-oriented, socially transformative, and oppression-challenging focus.

CONSTRUCTIVISM AND CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

A. *Constructivism*

Constructivist learning theory explains how students learn (Brooks &

Brooks, 1993) and assists with determining how best to teach students the interdisciplinary ideas of a hate studies program. Constructivism is concerned with guiding students in developing concepts and coming to a deep understanding of the material, rather than focusing only on skills and behaviors (Fosnot, 1996, p. 10). Given an understanding of the *how* of learning, it becomes possible to implement dynamic learning opportunities in the classroom that will challenge students to think more holistically and systematically about the issue of hate.

Constructivism is not a method of teaching; rather, it is an explanation of how people learn. Through the understanding of this process, new and different teaching strategies can be applied that will allow the learner to develop concepts and understanding. Through its focus on the process of learning, constructivism can serve as a guide for curriculum development because it does not make sense to think about a curriculum without considering the learners (Tobin & Tippins, 1993, p. 9).

Constructivist pedagogy informs the teacher that instruction must begin with the knowledge, attitude, and interests that students bring to the classroom, and that instructional strategies must provide activities and experiences that bridge these prior attitudes and beliefs with the new ideas introduced in the classroom (Howe & Berv, 2000). A deeper understanding of new knowledge can be formed only when learners are able to bridge their former knowledge with newly introduced concepts, and this bridging is considered one of education's primary roles.

Fosnot (1996, pp. 29-30) provided five principles to keep in mind when connecting constructivist thought to education. She stressed that learning is development and that the learner is an active participant in the process through organizing prior and new ideas. As such, learner errors are not something to be avoided, since they represent the learner's conceptions. If we understand and utilize these ideas and provide a space where the learner can engage in open-ended investigations in a meaningful context, we can produce new knowledge and a deeper understanding.

To truly learn new information, the learner needs to engage in reflection. Each learner is perceived as a meaning-maker and must be given the time to reflect on his or her experiences. Though reflection is important, learning is a social process in which the classroom is a community that provides learners with the opportunity to dialogue. Learners in such a community are "responsible for defending, proving, justifying, and communicating their ideas to the classroom community" (Fosnot, 1996, p. 30). Finally, Fosnot stated that the new ideas and structures developed by the students are learner-constructed and come out of their attempts to organize and reorganize new and prior information.

Constructivist ideas have successfully been incorporated into college

classes in science (Leonard, 2000), math (Inch, 2002; Morrone, Harkness, D'Ambrosio, & Caulfield, 2004), biology (Lord, 1994), and history (Henry, 2002). Teachers of classes committed to bridging the interdisciplinary nature of a hate studies curriculum can learn from these uses of constructivist theories in the classroom. Students must be given the opportunity to connect their beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge with the information they are learning in the class. These opportunities allow the students to engage in personal growth as well as to increase their knowledge base concerning hate.

From a constructivist viewpoint, a curriculum is a set of all learning experiences in which knowledge is recognized as being embedded in the learner and in the culture in which learning occurs (Tobin & Tippins, 1993). Practitioners of a hate studies curriculum will honor students as knowers and not see them as empty vessels to be filled. Yet in the process of this honoring, there is an understanding that students are bound by their personal identity, and by cultural, historical, and political forces which they may not recognize. These forces may prevent the student from seeing the oppressive attitudes and structures that maintain and promote hate. Critical pedagogy provides a framework for addressing these blind spots.

B. *Critical Pedagogy*

Along with understanding the way in which students learn, it is necessary for students and teachers to recognize and to question the system and process regarding what is being and what has been taught. A critical pedagogical approach, which is rooted in the liberation of the student, in challenging oppressive structures, and in developing critical thinking skills, is the underlying theory that provides students and teachers with the guidance to think about their intentions, to challenge and question their own practices, and to understand themselves as participatory agents responsible for the construction of societal ideals, values, and structures. Constructivism challenges teachers to provide experiential methods of learning, while critical pedagogy provides the critical thinking skills to ask challenging questions that deepen the students' investigation of self, knowledge, and the world.

Equality, justice, freedom, and democracy are innately connected to the study of hate; therefore it should be expected that the teaching style reflect the same characteristics as the subject matter. A critical pedagogical approach to learning meets this need. It heightens students' consciousness and exposes them to the historical, political, social, and economic realities of their lives, their communities, and the world (Freire, 2000).

Freire (2000) described two types of education, the "banking method"

and the “dialogic method.” Practitioners of the banking method believe that teachers are the repositories of all knowledge and that students are empty vessels waiting to be filled. This method is not compatible with a hate studies curriculum. It is the dialogical method, as outlined by Freire, which provides the principles underlying the curriculum and the teaching methodology. This pedagogy recognizes and honors the experiences, knowledge, perspectives, and values of the students and teachers. Both students and teachers are considered central to the learning process.

Critical pedagogical practices espouse a commitment to “citizenship, affirmation, possibility, and hope” (Kanpol, 1994, p. 134). Through the democratic processes that exist within a hate studies curriculum, students have “the right to express appropriate anger against injustice, against disloyalty, against the negation of love, against exploitation, and against violence” (Freire, 1998, p. 45). These appropriate expressions of anger reflect the aforementioned commitments when transformed into just action against the oppressive forces in society.

This transformation of anger into action happens when students make connections between their classroom learning and their out-of-class experiences, between their past actions and their newly developing consciousness, and between their position in society and the position of others. If the opportunity to make these connections is denied, students cannot develop the critical consciousness necessary to challenge the norms that permit hate to continue. The hate studies curriculum, if it is truly to be just, democratic, and caring, must provide the opportunities to make these essential connections, for it is through these connections that students can expose the problems within society and create new ways of living together that are free of false constraints such as racism, sexism, homophobia, ableism, or ageism.

Critical pedagogy helps students to uncover connections between apparently disparate areas that may not be immediately discerned. Reflection and dialogue are processes central to the educational endeavor (Nagda et al., 2003). When reflection and dialogue are used within the classroom, the learning process changes so “control shifts from me, the teacher, the arbiter of knowing, to the interactions of students and myself with the subject matter” (Tetreault, as cited in Sleeter & Grant, 1993, p. 152). By shifting the process to the interactions among the student, the teacher, and the subject matter, the idea of teaching as the simple transfer of knowledge is removed, so as “to create the possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge” (Freire, 1998, p. 30). Knowledge is no longer given from the teacher to the student, but is uncovered through jointly conducted reflective and dialogical practices.

Through constructivist approaches to learning and critical pedagogy, the core principles and outcomes of a hate studies curriculum are revealed.

PRINCIPLES OF A HATE STUDIES CURRICULUM

Shapiro stated that advocates of critical pedagogy adhere to the ideals of “democracy and human empowerment, the validation of human dignity and human worth, the vision of a society and a world that’s based on people helping each other and not trying to beat each other” (as cited in Kanpol, 1994, p. 164). These ideals are connected to the purposes and vision of a hate studies curriculum. Through constructivist and critical pedagogical thought, it is possible to discern a few key principles essential to establishing and implementing a hate studies curriculum.

A holistic approach adds texture. The student is seen as a complete entity and not just as an intellect anxiously waiting for knowledge to satiate its appetite. It is understood that the student and the teacher will both bring their background, experiences, and knowledge to the learning process and that these variables will impact the learning process.

Interdisciplinarity provides depth. Those studying hate consider the research from all the disciplines investigating this phenomenon to provide a deeper understanding of the issue. The separation of hate into multiple disciplines is an artificial construction and one in need of revision. By removing this artificial division, hate studies can assist individuals and communities in effectively challenging and combating hate. Students are encouraged to question, investigate, and research all aspects not only of hate, but also of societal structures that maintain oppressive forces.

Change comes from within. This principle reflects the notion that educators will not change the students; rather, students will take responsibility for their own change and growth. The students will create their own understandings, develop their principles, set their priorities, and change their values as they see fit as they jointly construct and produce new knowledge with the teacher and peers. Transformation is possible if the teacher and the students engage in difficult, emotional, personal work (Lewis, 1992, p. 172). Change is a joint venture and not something to be imposed.

Dialogue leads to wisdom. Burbules commented that dialogue represents a “continuous, developmental communicative interchange through which we stand to gain a fuller apprehension of the world, ourselves, and one another” (as cited in Boys, 1999, p. 132). Dialogue is an important teaching strategy, as it involves listening to persons and not just to words. It can lead to wisdom in ways that argument cannot (Boys, 1999), and the movement toward wisdom is an inherent piece of the hate studies curriculum. Wisdom involves “balancing the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and

extrapersonal interests to attain a common good, a good that transcends the group or groups of which one is a member” (Sternberg, 2003). The wisdom needed to work through issues of hate comes from the interdisciplinary nature of this study and through the recognition that the individual has a responsibility to the larger society of which he or she is a part.

Learning and teaching are relationship-centered. Learning takes place through a focus on the process of the interaction between the teacher and the students, and how the background of each impacts individual meaning-making and the development and incorporation of new knowledge. It goes beyond being student-centered and considers all of the participants in the educational process—teacher, student, peers, school, community, and culture. “The practice of education revolves around the teacher-student relationship, as an interchange, a bringing together of particular subjects, and on a wider scope, an encounter of the educator or educators with a community” (Guevara-Niebla, 1994, p. 28).

Critically Reflective Teaching provides credibility. Reflecting on one’s experiences, assumptions, and attitudes is an important component of presenting a hate studies curriculum, but the reflective process must go beyond this reflection so it can be considered critical. Brookfield (1995) explained that there are two distinct purposes that make reflection critical. First, the teacher must “understand how considerations of power undergird, frame, and distort educational process and interactions” (p. 8). By understanding the power dynamics in the classroom, teachers can recognize unintentional, oppressive characteristics of their teaching style or of student-to-student interaction and take the appropriate steps to make their classrooms more empowering and democratic.

The second purpose of critically reflective teaching is to question hegemonic assumptions about teaching that work against the long-term interests of the teachers (Brookfield, 1995, p. 8). Having once accepted these assumptions, teachers may be less likely to challenge oppressive structures at a university or college because those structures are assumed to be part of good teaching, even when they are detrimental to the teachers and potentially to the students.

These six principles can guide the development of a hate studies curriculum and the formation of the individual classes that rise from the curriculum. The principles also serve as the core values of the program and act as guides for teacher-student and student-student interactions. From these principles, four main curricular outcomes as informed through constructivism and critical pedagogy are determined.

OUTCOMES OF HATE STUDIES

Through their involvement in a hate studies curriculum, students will experience these four major outcomes related to personal, knowledge, and skill development. Students will experience the personal development of a critical curiosity and a critical consciousness that permit them to learn more about who they are, how they interact with the world, and how they exist as political, social, and ethical beings. They will experience a sense of empowerment rooted in the formation of a deep knowledge of hate and its processes. Finally, they will learn new ways of acting to challenge the status quo and to serve as social change agents.

Through studying hate, students are infused with a critical curiosity that is bold, adventurous, and ceaselessly questioning (Freire, 1998, pp. 37-38), causing them to feel a moral imperative to improve the world. By achieving this first outcome of developing a critical curiosity, students will become emboldened and enlivened in their search for understanding about not only the expression of hate, but also the strategies and remedies that can be applied to it. Without critical curiosity, creative innovations become impossible and society becomes stagnant, unable to dream, change, or be transformed.

The second outcome is for students to develop a critical consciousness in evaluating and understanding the world. Shapiro described this critical consciousness as meaning

focusing our critical capacities, our questioning capacity, on the everyday world in which we find ourselves with a purpose. And that purpose is rooted in a moral vision. It has to do with looking at the world, questioning the world as to whether, in fact, it treats people with dignity and respect; whether the world is one in which certain groups of people or individuals are limited or dominated, or whether the world that we live in, in fact, lives up to its democratic and humanistic promises. (as cited in Kanpol, 1994, pp.167-168)

A hate studies curriculum shifts critical consciousness from an abstraction to the concrete engagement of working to solve the very real problems of hate. At this level, theory meets and guides practice, and students are empowered to critically question cultural assumptions and social structures.

A third outcome is the development of students who have a deep and rich understanding of the human capacity for hatred, its development, and the processes to reduce, control, or oppose it. Students are empowered by this understanding to engage in transformative actions to build a world without cultural degradation, exploitation, enslavement, and oppression.

Finally, students will integrate their personal development and knowl-

edge acquisition to create new ways of being and interacting with society and the world. Students will perceive themselves and act as social change agents who have a responsibility to challenge the established order when such order is founded on oppressive and hateful principles.

COURSES IN A HATE STUDIES CURRICULUM

The principles and outcomes of a hate studies curriculum can now guide us into the development of meaningful courses and research efforts for students. The following discussion is only a brief overview of courses that could be offered through this new curriculum. Some of the courses mentioned already exist at various institutions, while others are suggested courses that need to be developed and taught.

Foundations of Hate – A review of historical, psychological, and sociological theories of hate. The class involves the examination of the ways in which these theories overlap and the ways in which they are different. Students will review case studies, literature, and documentaries to explore how hate develops, is perpetuated, and harms the individual who hates, the group being hated, and the community.

Hate in Cross-Cultural Perspectives – This anthropology course examines hate as a cultural practice around the globe, in the United States, and within the state of Pennsylvania. This class challenges students to examine hate from a social scientific perspective, through readings, research, and discussion. Guest speakers, documentaries, and fiction films are used to further understanding of the cultural underpinnings of hate (Schlegel, 2006).

Communicative and Social Cognitive Foundations of Hate - The purpose of this class is to expose students to the nature of hate in American life. As students attempt to understand the essential quality of hate, they will learn that hate is made possible through communication (sometimes in the form of hate speech) and human perception (sometimes in the forms of stereotypes and bias). Students will also learn that hate may be resisted through communication. In this course, students will learn how communication may serve to teach respect and tolerance, rather than hate. Through the development of the knowledge of the essence of hate, students will be in a position to fight hate when they encounter it in their own lives (Waltman, 2006).

Psychology of Hate - The primary objective of this course is to further understanding of hate. Students will study the leading and most recent theories of hate, as well as examine both the utility and futility of hate. The course will cover such topics as in-group/out-group bias, self-esteem, aggression, history of hate groups, hate on the internet and in the media,

pop culture's representations of hate, hate-crime legislation, First vs. Fourteenth Amendment issues, hate speech, implications for victims, and motivations of perpetrators of hate-motivated crimes. Additionally, students will debate controversial topics in the areas of race, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity or expression, and religion. Students will also examine one man's transformation from a hater to a teacher (Bisconti, 2005).

Sociology of Prejudice and Violence – This course examines the sociological underpinnings of hate. It explores hate crimes and their types, as well as the roots of prejudice, hate, and violence, and responses to hate. Individual and group work is used to help students understand the concepts presented in class (Levin, 2004).

Ethics of Power and Racism – This theologically-based course explores how the articulation of ethical norms within a field of power constructs a moral/immoral binary which marginalizes individuals and generates categories of behavioral and moral “deviance” and abnormality, effectively constructing morality's “other.” Students will examine the numerous ways in which white northern Europeans in particular managed to create and sustain norms that resulted in various forms of colonization and enslavement of those who were defined as “other,” thereby forming, shaping, and sustaining racism. Recognizing that racism is manifest in spatial, individual, institutional, and internalized forms, this course will also explore some of the personal dynamics that sustain racism in our day. By examining moral and doctrinal themes, students will locate the contributions of our institutions and traditions that undergird racism, and their potential for uprooting racism (Nothwehr, 2006).

Leadership for Social Change – Students will explore ways in which leaders can initiate social change. Guest speakers involved with social change organizations will be invited to speak to the class. The following questions are examined: How do you determine what needs to be changed? How do you start a process of change? How do you lead an organization concerned about change? Students will explore their own leadership styles and ways in which they can be most effective in leading positive social change.

Hate Crimes - This course focuses on hate crime as a specific type of violent conduct and criminal activity, as well as on social control efforts designed to curb such violence. Students will examine the causes, manifestations, and consequences of hate crimes, as well as the larger social context within which they occur, are reacted to, and seem to be proliferating. Throughout the course students will treat the study of hate crimes as a window through which a variety of social structures and processes can be rendered visible and amenable to examination, especially those related to social stability, social change, and social control. Specifically, this course

addresses a timely set of interrelated questions about the politics and dynamics of intergroup violence born of bigotry and manifesting as discrimination. Students will explore the nature of hate crimes, who commits them, and the efforts to curb these crimes. The constitution and relevant laws will be examined (Jeness, 2004).

The eight classes provided as examples demonstrate only a few of the possibilities of knowledge that students can attain through a hate studies curriculum. Classes on overcoming racism, hate and literature, government-sanctioned hate, and internships connecting students with social justice organizations would also expand the knowledge and awareness students have about how hate permeates a culture and drives laws, acts, and societal structures to oppress groups classified as the “other.” Pilcher and Whelehan (2005) commented that in the early days of Women’s Studies, courses began to be taught spontaneously without prior organization at many colleges and universities. The subject of hate is inspiring a similar phenomenon. Courses are being developed at colleges and universities across the country. The field of hate studies can help to organize the development of these courses, connect practitioners to one another, and ensure that research related to hate is rigorous in its methods.

CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the need for a field of hate studies and the ways in which constructivist theories and critical pedagogy can help develop the outcomes and curricular content of the field. Research and education concerning hate is taking place on a national scale at multiple universities, but in a way that is unconnected and fragmented. These divisions prevent a deeper understanding of hate, isolate researchers, and keep theory from being connected to practice. When theory and practice are kept separate, theory does not go as deep as it could, and practice is left without any guide to help it grow in effectiveness.

The hate studies curriculum unites theory with practice and will be implemented under the premise that knowledge acquisition builds on personal development and that both types of development lead to behavioral changes and the development of skills. These interdependent elements of development contribute to the emergence of the student as a social change agent having the knowledge, skills, and drive to engage in positive action leading to personal and societal transformation. Due to the curriculum’s focus and its university origin, “it must have a vision that is not content with adapting individuals to a world of oppressive social relations but is dedicated to transforming the very conditions that promote such conditions” (McLaren, 1994, p. xxxii). Those involved in hate studies will not just

examine hate or how persons are oppressed, but will also reflect on each student's process of meaning-making and how that process has been informed by societal influences. Through understanding how they make meaning, students can more critically question hegemonic structures and work toward personal and societal transformation.

When the research, study, and understanding of hate are categorized as belonging exclusively to different disciplines, the connections needed to create meaningful and effective practices to combat hate are severed. Creating a hate studies curriculum emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary study bringing together the disparate methods by which the topic is researched and understood. Students engaged in this curriculum will undergo personal, knowledge, and skill development. To achieve these developments, this article provided a framework for learning and teaching strategies, principles, outcomes, and suggested course work for a hate studies curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Bartrop, P. (2002). The relationship between war and genocide in the twentieth century: A consideration. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 4(4), 519-532.
- Bayley, D. H. (2002). Policing hate: What can be done? *Policing and Society*, 12(2), 83-91.
- Bisconti, T. L. (2005). *Psychology of hate syllabus*. Retrieved September 1, 2006, from <http://guweb2.gonzaga.edu/againsthate/syllabus.html>
- Blitzer, J. (2006). Toward an interdisciplinary field of hate studies: Developing a framework. *Journal of Hate Studies*, 4(1), 139-149.
- Boys, M. C. (1999). Engaged pedagogy, dialogue, and critical reflection. *Teaching Theology and Religion*, 2(3), 129-136.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Carnegie Foundation. (1977). *Mission of the college curriculum: A contemporary review with suggestions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Issued by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Coleman, J. S. (1973). The university and society's new demands upon it. In C. Kaysen (Ed.), *Content and context: Essays on college education* (pp. 359-401). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Davis, J. R. (1995). *Interdisciplinary courses and team teaching: New arrangements for learning*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

- FBI. (2004). *Hate crimes statistics, 2003*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Fosnot, C. T. (1996). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In C. T. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (pp. 8-33). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Friere, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1994). Curriculum and social reality. In M. Escobar, A. L. Fernandez, & G. Guevara-Niebla (Eds.), *Paulo Freire on higher education* (pp. 71-131). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage* (P. Clarke, Trans.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Glasser, S. B. (2005, April 27). U.S. figures show sharp global rise in terrorism. *Washington Post*.
- Guevara-Niebla, G. (1994). Education and power. In M. Escobar, A. L. Fernandez, & G. Guevara-Niebla (Eds.), *Paulo Freire on higher education* (pp. 27-71). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Henry, M. (2002). Constructivism in the community college classroom. *The History Teacher*, 36(1), 65-74.
- Howe, K. B., & Berv, J. (2000). Constructing constructivism, epistemological and pedagogical. *Constructivism in Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Inch, S. (2002, Summer). The accidental constructivist: A mathematician's discovery. *College Teaching*, 50(3), 111-113.
- Jenness, V. (2004). *Hate crimes syllabus*. Retrieved September 1, 2006, from <http://guweb2.gonzaga.edu/againsthate/syllabus.html>
- Kanpol, B. (1994). *Critical pedagogy: An introduction*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Levin, J. (2004). *Sociology of prejudice and violence syllabus*. Retrieved September 1, 2006, from <http://guweb2.gonzaga.edu/againsthate/syllabus.html>
- Lewis, M. (1992). Interrupting patriarchy: Politics, resistance and transformation in the feminist classroom. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and critical pedagogy* (pp. 167-191). New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc.
- Leonard, W. H. (2000). How do college students best learn science: An assessment of popular teaching styles and their effectiveness. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 29(6), 385-388.
- Lord, T. (1994, May). Using constructivism to enhance student learning in college biology. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 23(6), 346-350.
- Maskaliunaite, A. (2002, June). Defining terrorism in the political and academic discourse. *Baltic Defence Review*, 8(2), 36-50.
- McLaren, P. L. (1994). Foreward. In M. Escobar, A. L. Fernandez, & G. Guevara-Niebla (Eds.), *Paulo Freire on higher education* (pp. ix-xxxv). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Morrone, A. S., Harkness, S. S., D'Ambrosio, B., & Caulfield, R. (2004). Patterns

- of instructional discourse that promote the perception of mastery goals in a social constructivist mathematics course. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 56(1), 19-38.
- Nagda, B., Gurin, P., & Lopez, G. E. (2003, July). Transformative pedagogy for democracy and social justice. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 6(2), 165-191.
- Nothwehr, D. M. (2006). *Ethics of power and racism syllabus*. Retrieved September 1, 2006, from <http://guweb2.gonzaga.edu/againsthate/syllabus.html>
- Pilcher, J., & Whelehan, I. (2005). *50 key concepts in gender studies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rubinstein, W. D. (2004). *Genocide: A history*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Schlegel, J. (2006). *Hate in cross-cultural perspective syllabus*. Retrieved September 1, 2006, from <http://guweb2.gonzaga.edu/againsthate/syllabus.html>
- Seymour, D. T. (1988). *Developing academic programs: The climate for innovation*. ASCHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1993). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class and gender*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Southern Poverty Law Center. (2005, Spring). Intelligence Report. Retrieved August 10, 2005, from <http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?pid=882>
- Stark, J. S., & Lattuca, L. R. (1997). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in action*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stern, K. (2003/04). The need for an interdisciplinary field of hate studies. *Journal of Hate Studies*, 3(1), 7-35.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2003). A duplex theory of hate: Development and application to terrorism, massacres, and genocides. *Review of General Psychology*, 7(3), 299-328.
- Tobin, K., & Tippins, D. (1993). Constructivism as a referent for teaching and learning. In K. Tobin (Ed.), *The practice of constructivism in science education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Verdeja, E. (2002). On genocide: Five contributing factors. *Contemporary Politics*, 8(1), 37-54.
- Waltman, M. S. (2006). *Communicative and social cognitive foundations of hate syllabus*. Retrieved September 1, 2006, from <http://guweb2.gonzaga.edu/againsthate/syllabus.html>
- Weiss, J. C., & Ephross, P. H. (1986, March/April). Group work approaches to "hate violence" incidents. *Social Work*, 132-136.
- Yanay, N. (2002). Hatred as ambivalence. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(3), 71-88.