



Reconceptualizing the Role of an Educational Researcher: A Critical Multicultural Educator's Perspective

Dilys Schoorman, Florida Atlantic University

Abstract

Critical multicultural educators' concerns about the oppressive and/or emancipatory potentialities of curriculum extend to the preparation of educational researchers. By framing one's scholarly life as curriculum, this personal phronesis of the author's scholarly journey as a multicultural teacher and researcher, highlights the implications for the knowledge construction process in the preparation of researchers as leaders for social justice. A personal and collective agenda for re-conceptualizing research as a public good is offered.

Keywords: *critical multicultural education, educational research, doctoral education*

Critical multicultural educators have been particularly cognizant of the oppressive and/or emancipatory potentialities of education.¹ While these potentialities have been highlighted in educator preparation for primary and secondary educational contexts,² they also exist for tertiary education, particularly in the education of future educational researchers.³ Based on the injunction of Kincheloe and McLaren (2005) to recognize the role of research in perpetuating hegemony, this paper draws on my insights as a critical multicultural educator to underscore crucial implications for the preparation and practice of educational researchers, especially in doctoral programs.

By and large, the field of multicultural education has focused on the roles of educators in the advancement of educational equity. Researchers and scholars in the field have engaged in research *about* these struggles, but these studies have less frequently focused on the role of researchers themselves. Drawing on previous work that asked, "What is a critical multicultural researcher?"⁴ and the significant bodies of work that comprise multicultural education and critical approaches to research, the role of the educator and the researcher are integrated in this discussion of doctoral education as a social justice undertaking. An overview of what it means to be a multi-

1. This idea was advanced by Freire (2000) in the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. It has been central to the perspectives of critical multiculturalists such as Au (2014), May and Sleeter (2010), Spring (2013) and Vavrus (2015).

2. For example, Grant and Sleeter (2011) in teacher preparation and Marshall and Oliva (2006) in leadership preparation in the K-12 contexts.

3. See Denzin, Lincoln and Smith (2008), Tobin and Steinberg (2015) and Torres and Reyes (2011) for discussions of the oppressive v. emancipatory potentiality of educational research methodology.

4. Schoorman and Bogotch (2010).

cultural educator, particularly within the current context of neoliberal assaults on equity *and* education⁵ sets the basis for how this role might be understood in the context of doctoral education and the preparation of researchers. Adopting an autoethnographic stance, embodied in the notion of our lives as curriculum, I explore my role as an educator and the insights that this analysis generates about teaching and research.

Framed as a personal phronesis, this article offers a critical reflection on my role as a critical multicultural educator and its particular implications for my work as a researcher and that of the students whom I mentor as instructor, advisor, dissertation chair and doctoral coordinator. It draws on Freire's (2000) principle of conscientization and Greene's (1978) exhortation to us to be "wide awake"—both morally and politically—to our own values and commitments, the conditions that frame/limit them, and to our own agency, as we navigate our roles and obligations as professionals—as teachers and researchers, as community members and, simply, as human beings. Consequently, conscientization operates on multiple levels in this analysis. First, it requires being aware of (and, consequently, being intellectually awake to) the underlying power dynamics in curriculum, pedagogy and research design and practices, who it is they serve and who is marginalized by our decisions in these contexts. Such conscientization is informed by the knowledge of the histories of marginalization in the arenas of education⁶ and research.⁷ The legacies of these histories are exacerbated by neoliberal economic values in contemporary contexts, where competition for scarce resources drives educational and research agendas.⁸ Being "wide awake" in these contexts (i.e. being fully and critically aware) requires agentive action in minimizing or subverting these deleterious practices. The ability to do so will require a form of "double consciousness": seeing how hitherto marginalized epistemologies are framed by mainstream/traditional approaches, naming such marginalization and forging pathways for alternative, emancipatory epistemologies.

What does it Mean to be a Critical Multicultural Educator?

Although the field of multicultural education in the USA was formed in the context of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, its roots run much deeper in US history, drawing on centuries of daily intellectual, psychological, social and political struggle for equality and the role of education in that pursuit. Concerns about the structural injustices evident in this history distinguish critical multicultural education from other forms such as liberal multiculturalism that focuses primarily on cultural differences rather than on the structures grounded in white privilege that maintain unequal opportunities for particular groups.⁹ Dedicated to the education and well-being of all student groups, critical multiculturalism is more than curriculum, pedagogy or the academic achievement of particular groups; it is a philosophy, an ideal and a way of being.

5. Apple (2012; 2006) and Sleeter (2015; 2008) address how neoliberalism undermines education in general but particularly the concerns with equity.

6. For more on the history of marginalization in education, see Ladson Billings (2006); Spring (2013).

7. For discussions of marginalization through research practices, see Denzin, Lincoln and Smith (2008); Lopez and Parker (2003); Taylor, Gillborn, and Ladson Billings (2009).

8. See Giroux (2002; 2011a; 2011b) where the author raises concerns about rampant corporatization and its underlying values and logics particularly in higher education, and where faculty and members of society seem relatively oblivious to this trend and its impact.

9. May and Sleeter (2010) draw a distinction between liberal v. critical approaches to multicultural education.

Freire's (2000) classic text, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* has etched into the consciousness of critical multicultural educators the grave consequences of traditional education practices and the need for the pursuit of education as emancipatory, rather than as oppressive. Central to Freire's principles of critical pedagogy is the process of humanization, grounded in concepts of radical love, faith and hope. This is achieved through praxis—reflection and action—that surfaces a process of conscientization based in dialogic and dialectical engagement. As Freire (2000) notes, "True dialogue cannot exist without critical thinking... For the critic, the important thing is continuing transformation of reality, in behalf of the continuing humanization of men [sic]..." (p. 92).

Freire's call for conscientization through praxis and the naming of oppression as a crucial starting point for emancipatory pedagogy, parallel the notions of phronesis and parrhesia deemed central to critical methods. Phronesis, a deliberative process grounded in moral action that yields practical wisdom on how to act, and its resultant parrhesia, truth telling that interrupts received hegemony¹⁰ are evident in the commitment of the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME) in the USA. They are embodied in the organization's logos that consist of the image of the Sankofa bird, a symbol representing learning from the past in order to build a future, and the inverted red triangle, the symbol assigned to educators and "wrong thinkers" who engaged in unpopular truth telling against the Nazis. Thus, my positionality as a multicultural educator in the USA, is one that engenders the need for border crossing and double consciousness. In the context of the subjugated and erased histories of groups, it is crucial that multicultural educators and researchers become cognizant of the patterns of marginalization that frame current knowledge, so that such intellectual oppression might be interrupted. We traverse not only temporal and cultural borders, but institutional and political ones as well. We must recognize harsh truths and the possibilities about education's role as potentially emancipatory on the one hand and, on the other, its propensity to be a tool of oppression in the form of colonization, stratification or assimilation.¹¹ In so doing, we act as outsiders within the "belly of the beast."¹² That means, rather than becoming socialized within what Lorde (1984) referred to as "the master's house" where hegemonic practices might be either deliberately or inadvertently enacted, we remain loyally critical (i.e. as critical friends) of such efforts. We frame our practices as genuine efforts to make the entire institution more egalitarian and inclusive. Our positions as outsiders within, interrogating and/or disrupting the very institutions that give us the legitimacy to do so, must be undertaken with responsible deliberation, care, reflexivity and transparency.

The curricular principles of critical multicultural education are deeply relevant in the education of future researchers. Similar to the curriculum critiques of K-12 or educator preparation curriculum, scholars grounded in indigenous epistemologies, critical race theory, feminist/womanist stances, queer theory or postcolonial perspectives (among others) have consistently critiqued the hegemonic stranglehold of dominant research epistemologies and methodologies in mainstream educational research courses and practices. Paradigm dialogues such as those advanced by Guba (1990) have highlighted the tensions between assumptions of researcher neutrality v. subjectivity, the social and intellectual purposes of research, and measures of validity in divergent approaches.¹³

10. This definition draws on the work of Birmingham (2004); Freund (2009); Kristjansson (2014); Torres and Reyes (2011)

11. Spring (2013) addresses how colonization, stratification and assimilation were evident in the history of educational experiences of diverse groups in the USA.

12. Drawing on the story of the Biblical character, Jonah, who was swallowed by a whale, Bogotch (2007) used this term in the context of engaging in educational leadership praxis.

13. See also Lincoln, Lynham and Guba (2011)

More contemporaneously, neoliberal economics have begun to shape what has been accepted as “research,” further demarcated in university settings as “grant funded,” a framing that explicitly links the generation of new knowledge to fiduciary interests. This represents academia’s experience of neocolonialism (i.e. the transfer of ownership/profits to those with the money). It raises concerns about intellectual property, patents, and researcher autonomy in the pursuit of large grants that often constrain research, delimiting it to large samples, generalizable findings and broad-based replicability (more ‘bang for the buck’). Conversely, un-funded small-scale studies of particular contexts, often contextualized in and with marginalized populations are relegated to the title of “scholarship” instead. That is, of course, until those populations become the “draw” for funded research. As a multicultural educator involved in projects with marginalized groups, I have become sensitized to how these populations are preyed upon by large grant seekers, who use them largely for cosmetic purposes to attract funding. Often, grant seekers attempt to forge partnerships with communities of underserved backgrounds in order to appear multicultural and attract grant funding, although the goals and purposes of the projects may not address the structures that marginalize these populations. While diversity-conscious in their grant applications such projects often turn diversity-blind in their implementation. Researchers committed to multiculturalism will need to remain vigilant within these contexts to ensure that neither the goals nor the methodologies proposed in grant-funded research undermine the communities they ostensibly serve.

It is into this historic and contemporary arena that the multicultural educator steps, both as a teacher and as a researcher. I enter the inquiry process with a heightened awareness of a history of intellectual and institutional practice too long dominated by colonial White male supremacy, its impact on the present, and the imperatives for corrective action as we look to the future. Reflecting on my own institutional experiences and history, I foreground my efforts to extend the principles of critical pedagogy which have inspired my work as an instructor, to my work as a researcher. In re-framing the role of the educational researcher through this introspection, I seek to highlight the patterns of marginalization and privileging that have demarcated what is accepted as “research” and the role of the educational researcher. In so doing, my intent is to identify the interconnections between the principles and praxis of critical multicultural education and the imperatives for educational research for social justice. I seek to recast the role of the educational researcher away from compliant methodologist towards a purposeful and ethical advocate for social justice and the public good in all aspects of one’s professional undertakings.

Foregrounded in this paper is a discussion typical in multicultural education with reference to curriculum and classroom settings—the political process of knowledge construction - extended to understanding the role of the researcher. Too often, these contexts are seen as separate and unrelated, where the critical consciousness employed within the classroom is turned off with respect to the protocols, assumptions and methodologies adopted in one’s role as a researcher. As noted in a previous publication, “In order to be multicultural/ social justice practitioners, we can and should model the principles of critical multicultural education/ social justice in *all* aspects of our work. We need to continue to find ways to integrate the principles we teach in the classroom into our research and service work.”¹⁴ What follows are efforts to build this bridge between critical consciousness raising within the multicultural classroom setting and our roles as researchers. Doctoral education, which integrates both the classroom and the research contexts as we prepare students as future researchers, offers an appropriate site within which to forge this bridge building. In so doing, I hope to highlight ways in which the educator can work to constantly interrogate issues of power and possibilities for change in all roles that s/he inhabits.

14. Schoorman and Bogotch (2010, p. 261).

Knowledge Construction as Contested

In early work that charted the course of multicultural education as a curricular field, Banks (2004) identified five dimensions of multicultural education that needed to be pursued within an education system. Among these was the knowledge construction process: understanding the biases in how knowledge was generated, what was accepted and what was not. The knowledge construction process was linked to three of the other dimensions identified: content integration (who was represented in the curriculum), equity pedagogy (how lessons were taught) and prejudice reduction (a crucial outcome of multicultural education in the 1960s and 1970s). Today, the aim of multicultural education has morphed to encompass broad-based social injustices, typically perpetuated in the education system.¹⁵ The fifth dimension, an empowering school culture, requires us to move beyond merely addressing the more micro level of individual classes, teachers, or topics to examine the role of programs, schools, and colleges of education, at the meso level, as they interrogate the macro level concerns of social (in)justice and the public good evident in district, state and national policies and practices.

Educators of diverse backgrounds have long recognized education as spaces of contestation and the knowledge construction process as political. They have called on educators to identify the biases of what and whose knowledge is accepted as official knowledge.¹⁶ Such critiques have highlighted the role of the privileged curriculum as cultural genocide,¹⁷ intellectual colonization,¹⁸ mis-education,¹⁹ assimilationist and homogenizing. These concerns are echoed by critical researchers about “accepted” research paradigms within higher education institutions.²⁰ They also emerge in our own doctoral programs where future researchers are educated,²¹ but are also shaped by norms and values undergirding promotion and tenure guidelines and deliberations, policies governing Institutional Review Board applications and approvals for Human Subjects Research. As a coordinator of a doctoral program, doctoral advisor, faculty member and a former doctoral student, I see doctoral programs as an important “frontier” for new and emerging critical work. I draw on my own experiences in this journey, as well as the insights developed in the implementation of multicultural education to consider approaches to disrupting monolithic and limiting approaches that obstruct critical research for the public good.

Knowledge Construction in Doctoral Programs

As a doctoral student, I was fortunate to be in the midst of a departmental paradigm shift marking a departure from a view of curriculum as a technology to questions about its politics and

15. May and Sleeter (2010); McLaren (2007); Vavrus (2015) each calls for the need for a conceptualization of critical multiculturalism that addresses social injustices.

16. Zittleman and Sadker (2002) building on previous work, identified seven forms of curriculum biases, while Loewen (2008) in *Lies my Teacher Taught Me* identified examples of lies in US History textbooks. Apple (2014) raised consciousness about the myth of neutrality in the curriculum, where the “Official Curriculum” privileged particular, mainstream knowledge. Anyon (2006) noted similar biases in educational research calling for what *should* count in research.

17. Lomawaima and McCarty, 2002 ; Spring (2013).

18. Villenas (1996).

19. Woodson (1933).

20. See Ladson Billings and Tate (2006); Lather (1986); Lopez and Parker (2003); Tobin and Steinberg (2015); Winkle-Wagner, Hunter and Ortloff (2009).

21. See Berry (2015); Torres and Reyes (2011).

purposes. I experienced relative congruence between my own graduate coursework that introduced me to critical theorists (e.g. Freire, Giroux, McLaren, Aronowitz, Apple) and in the opportunities to explore these perspectives as a graduate teaching assistant in a recently developed undergraduate teacher preparation course in multicultural education. As an instructor in multicultural education for pre-service teachers, I was well-versed in critiquing the “dead white male” curriculum²² of public schools; yet, while I valued the contribution of White men to my own conscientization about White male privilege, I was simultaneously struck by the paradox of the absence of scholars who were female and/or of color in my own education.

I also experienced the paradigm shift in methodology through the strong endorsement and support of the use of qualitative data. Required courses in both qualitative and quantitative data analysis sent clear messages about what was permissible in doctoral work. Progressive scholars who embraced ethnographic work, introduced us to new and fascinating concepts, exposed us to works of key scholars whose ‘authority’ became our guides, affirmed the value of purposefully selected small groups of research participants or case studies, and served as worthy bridge builders between competing paradigms. However, it was curious that those of us opting to use qualitative data were the only ones who tended to have to label the epistemological basis for our designs, whereas those who used solely quantitative data and operated from a positivist perspective appeared to enjoy the privilege of not having to clarify the paradigmatic bias of their study. Similarly, feminist perspectives or Black/Latino/Indigenous perspectives had to be acknowledged as such, whereas “mainstream” perspectives required no such announcements further “marking” critical scholarship as “different” or marginal vis-à-vis the range of “acceptable” or “typical” research paradigms and approaches.

This is a trend that continues in current scholarship where theoretical and epistemological assumptions of critical perspectives are typically explained with an underlying purpose of “justifying” their use and their validity, whereas similar critical reflexivity of epistemological bias is not typical of the scientism of dominant paradigms. This reality has required us, as critical scholars and educators, to develop for ourselves and within our students an epistemological double consciousness: being aware of the culture of power (or the canon) in accepted epistemologies and methodologies, while simultaneously facilitating culturally relevant approaches that constitute epistemological shifts away from frameworks that distort, towards those that are transformative and emancipatory, particularly for research grounded in concerns about/historically marginalized communities.²³ Doctoral students need to be conversant in the language of multiple paradigms if they are to be successful in gaining acceptance for their more critically oriented designs. Epistemological double consciousness, like cross cultural competence, allows student researchers to understand and dialogue with committee members (or related audiences) who adopt positivist epistemological values and/or to recognize and circumvent such biases even in ostensibly critical or constructivist research designs. This double consciousness typically results in stronger conceptual work as students begin to link ideology, theory, standpoint, epistemology, design and methodology with meticulous conceptual care, simultaneously making explicit the knowledge construction process of their research.

The role and purpose of research methodology courses in doctoral programs (as required v. elective; present v. absent; regularly scheduled v. intermittently offered; well-enrolled v. under-enrolled) often lay the groundwork for the privileging of positivist research approaches, revealing

22. Sadker (2001).

23. See also Carter (2003) and Tyson (2003).

institutional patterns of marginalization for critical approaches. Doctoral programs in education have traditionally privileged a culture of positivism where statistical analysis that supported researcher objectivity and neutrality, predictability, and generalizability but (initially) not any alternative research approaches was prescribed. Although over time, while courses in qualitative data analysis, action research and/or critical approaches to research have been integrated into programs, first as electives and then as requirements, Kincheloe and Tobin (2015) caution us about “crypto-positivism”—hidden values and assumptions grounded in positivism—that nevertheless undergird our discussions of what can be known.

Knowledge Construction in the Professoriate

Similar epistemological socialization occurs within the professoriate as well. As an assistant professor of color, initially one of few who used qualitative data in my research or explicitly critical perspectives in my teaching, I was advised in my annual evaluation by a department chair that I needed to “do more quantitative research” in order to be successful in promotion and tenure (P and T). It was advice that revealed a bias typical, if anachronistic, of many institutions. Consequently, rather than changing the trajectory of my work, I worked with the chair of the college P and T committee to issue a college-wide clarification that quantitative data was not privileged over qualitative data in P and T deliberations. A decade later, I found myself in a related discussion with the P and T committee, when questioned about my work being “advocacy” rather than “research” (a false dichotomy). This afforded me the opportunity to claim that we could not engage in effective advocacy without simultaneously pursuing research that was rigorous and meticulous (however one defined it). It was a response well received and paved the way for future critical work to be positively evaluated.

I mention these discussions for two reasons. The field of multicultural education had sensitized me to interrupting “business as usual” approaches to education that perpetuated one-sided perspectives of knowledge and knowing. Nevertheless, engaging in discussions of alternate perspectives with department chairs or P and T committees could also be risky. The intervention of senior advocates such as the chair of the P and T committee, and my knowledge, as an assistant professor, about needing to seek this out, interrupted a potentially vicious cycle of the silencing of alternate views in the perpetuation of the status quo. Although well-intended, what my chair was unable to do was to create the spaces for multiple research approaches to co-exist. This was what I attempted to forge a decade later as a tenured professor. Knowing that we had assistant professors and doctoral students who wished to engage in critical research it was crucial for me to be open and explicit about my own critical epistemologies so as to expand the spaces within which such investigations could occur. My own socialization as a doctoral student both as a multicultural educator engaged in advocacy and as a researcher had allowed me to understand the politics of knowledge construction and enabled me to create new paths (and critique those that were limited or limiting). These are crucial insights for doctoral students that will empower them in the context of future epistemological tensions.

Another site of such epistemological tension, especially in the framing of what “counts” as educational research within the academy, are Institutional Review Boards. Despite their crucial mission for supporting ethical research practices, especially among vulnerable populations, their grounding of research within a biological research paradigm and tests of generalizability renders much of the work of critical educators largely “non-scientific.” Although committed to doing no

harm, the epistemological ‘template’ woven into research protocols fails to interrupt studies designed by those in the ivory tower and imposed on external subjects. They resurface the concerns of historically marginalized populations for whom externally derived research was offensive and oppressive. Inadvertently, such a monolithic epistemological template yields dialectical tensions in devising community-based research committed to the public good in the form of collaborative designs, such as participatory action research. Critical educators’ call for collaborative research which, while is still possible within the current protocols, requires a keen epistemological double consciousness to recognize how one traverses the borders between established traditions of research hierarchies and more egalitarian, if non-mainstream approaches.

Most critical educators in the professoriate are deeply mindful of the macro contexts of social injustice in which our work is situated and work on the micro level as individuals and/or groups to address these concerns through our research and teaching. Either by design or default, however, we often pay less attention to our potentiality at a more meso level of agency: the analysis and transformation of programs of study, particularly at the doctoral level where increased specialization facilitates largely isolated (and isolating) work. Aided by the substantive work in curricular and program analysis in the field of multicultural education, integrated with multicultural critiques of mainstream research approaches and epistemologies, what follows is a discussion of how we might conceptualize a more systemic approach to supporting critical doctoral education.

A Typology of Educational Research Curriculum

Typologies of multicultural education curriculum²⁴ that have facilitated the critique of traditional domesticating curriculum allow for insightful analysis of the curriculum for educational researchers. Each of these typologies begins with models of curriculum that they wish to avoid and moves through a continuum that reaches the curriculum model of desired practice. Sleeter and Grant (2003) advocated against “business as usual” approaches that reflect and perpetuate the patterns of inequity in society. Nieto (1994) identified the undesired as a monocultural, popularly dubbed the “DWM” (dead white male) curriculum, that Grande (2004) termed “whitestream.” Within the context of educational research, this would refer to programs where only dominant traditions of research were represented or required. Scholarly critiques focus on the monological ways of seeing the world and the dangers of its Eurocentric bias.²⁵ Scholars of color have typically found these approaches to be colonizing and alienating²⁶ serving as reminder of how the purposes and methods of research could perpetuate racism. Kincheloe and McLaren, (2005) concur that these mainstream research practices, are generally “implicated in the reproduction of systems of class, race, and gender oppression” (p. 304).

Tyson (2003) and Carter (2003) warn about the role that academia plays in conservatively maintaining this status quo that privileges the needs of the academy over those of the community and that confuses knowledge (e.g. the generation of information about communities) with understanding (e.g. perception of community perspectives). Carter (2003) cites Stanfield who notes, “The exclusionary practices of academic social sciences along racial lines have maintained a cultural hegemony that has monopolized the construction and legitimation of methodological perspectives” (p. 29). For Tyson (2003) such race-blind views have failed to legitimate perspectives

24. For example, Banks (2004); Gorski (2009); Sleeter and Grant (2003).

25. Kincheloe and Tobin (2015).

26. Bishop (2005).

that are not beneficial to White society warranting a radical transformation of research practices within the academy.

On the other extreme of the typology lies the approach advocated by critical multicultural researchers. Very much like the desired approach to curriculum variously titled the social action approach,²⁷ social reconstructionism²⁸, curriculum for social justice,²⁹ or anti-racist,³⁰ the desired approach to educational research curriculum includes a conceptualization of research as rooted in concerns about democracy, social justice, structural equality and the public good. Programmatically, this entails a commitment to research that is grounded in social justice concerns of the community. Thus conceptualized, according to Hostetler (2005),

Good education research is a matter not only of sound procedures but also of beneficial aims and results; our ultimate aim as researchers and educators is to serve people's well-being... Researchers must be able to articulate some sound connection between their work and a robust and justifiable conception of human well being. (p. 16)

Calling for emancipatory epistemologies, Tyson (2003) noted the importance of purpose and of methodology.

If educational researchers are to operate from epistemologies of emancipation – with frameworks that are transformative (as opposed to accommodative) in nature – and engage in methodologies that encourage the participants to challenge and change the world, then the purpose of data collection in educational research would be fundamentally different. Rather than collect data for data's sake, research would become a conscious political, economic and personal conduit for empowerment. Educational research could then be a catalyst to support and complement larger struggles for liberation. (p. 24)

Research committed to the public good transforms the role of researchers to being the supporting actors with the researched as protagonists, moving from being the “object of my research” to “the subject of our research.”³¹ Torres and Reyes (2011) identified three principles underlying this conception of research as praxis: Radical participatory democracy; collective action for transformation towards a better world; and a commitment to work for social justice in solidarity with marginalized communities. Programs that represent this model in the typology would require that all students be exposed to this perspective of research to facilitate critical consciousness about the role of educational research in the perpetuation or interruption of hegemonic practices and for the democratizing of research practices, and decolonizing methodologies grounded in a commitment to social justice and the public good.³²

In between these extremes lie (at least) two curriculum models, one of which multicultural educators identify as tokenistic, additive or tolerance.³³ This model is paralleled in educational research curriculum along two strands. One is where students (and faculty) are “allowed” to draw

27. Banks (2004).

28. Sleeter and Grant (2003).

29. Peterson (2007).

30. Sleeter and Bernal (2004).

31. Torres and Reyes (2011, p. 54).

32. Schoorman (2014).

33. See: Sleeter and Grant (2003); Banks (2004); Nieto (1994).

on critical theoretical perspectives but are discouraged from integrating research designs (e.g. action research; autoethnography) and methodologies consistent with those views into their research. As such, emerging scholars have attempted studies theoretically grounded in critical race theory or Freirean pedagogy but forced-fitted into the very methodological approaches critiqued by those theories. This gives rise to Lorde's (1984) famous question about whether one can "use the master's tools" (traditional research methods) to "bring down the master's house" (to challenge received knowledge that perpetuates racial, gendered, classed etc. hierarchies.) The other strand that exemplifies a tokenized presence is offering elective classes or permitting scholarship in "alternative" forms of inquiry as long as they "conform" to the "standards of rigor" or theoretical models that pertain to the dominant paradigm exemplified in required classes. This curriculum model might also increasingly feature what Kincheloe (2015) noted as the backlash against critical approaches. Discussing the work of Kathleen Berry, Kincheloe points out,

She has felt as if she were thrust back into the middle of the paradigmatic wars many thought were over. The rise of crypto-positivism in its evidence-based guise placed Berry and her students in situations where colleagues demanded a single methodology—rejecting in the process an effort to employ a more rigorous, more theoretically savvy mode of knowledge production, and the dominant power's ability to covertly infiltrate such process in a way that promotes its own interest. (p. xiv)

Grande (2004), a scholar who writes from an indigenous perspective, illustrates this by noting, "teachers, schools and western frames of intelligibility still desire to 'kill the Indian and save the man'" (p. 5). This is also exemplified when researchers engage with qualitative data in positivist terms, where interview protocols become rigid scripts, action research is rendered inflexible, and autoethnographic studies are designed to minimize the researcher's voice.

The third model included in extant typologies is termed in multicultural curriculum contexts "a transformation approach"³⁴ or a multicultural approach³⁵ that calls for the integration of divergent perspectives into the curriculum. Within the context of educational research curriculum and program requirements this would be analogous to exposing students to the range of available research paradigms and theoretical approaches pertinent to educational research and the contexts of their study. This is particularly salient to bricolage, a central construct in critical methodologies (the desired model). As explained by Berry (2015)

Using bricolage to do research requires a wide and deep knowledge of multiple *theories* and *methodologies*; multiple ways to collect, describe, construct, analyze and *interpret* the object of the research study; and finally multiple ways to *narrate* (tell the story about) the relationships, struggles, conflicts, and complex world of the study that maintains the reality and integrity of the subjects. (Italics in original; p. 83)

As critical educators try to make in-roads into the established curriculum, such paradigmatic co-existence that sparks intellectual debate and dialogue, is a worthy curricular goal. At times, mutually exclusive spaces are carved out for such existence (e.g. feminist studies) whereas

34. Banks (2004).

35. Sleeter and Grant (2003).

in other contexts they reside within the same program (even if in pockets). Programs and curriculum that embrace knowledge of multiple traditions support the development of epistemological double consciousness (and for not only critical researchers) and enhance the opportunities for successful and effective bricolage in designing research.

Typologies of curriculum, such as this, are meant to stimulate analysis and critical reflection about the underlying purposes and biases of programs of study that prepare future researchers for meaningful and rigorous scholarship in diverse contexts. It is intended that readers consider how their programs reflect or deviate from the ideas presented and their own roles in the perpetuation or interruption of the approaches discussed. It is this process of personal phronesis that will provide insights for the ongoing epistemological dialectic that could serve to dislodge hegemonic research practices within the programs in which future researchers are prepared.

An (Individual and Collective) Agenda for Personal Phronesis and Parrhesia

A crucial facet in my own conscientization as a critical researcher has been the recognition of my own biography as central to my role as a researcher. Far from a “researcher-as-neutral” stance, awareness of one’s own subjectivity and agency as a researcher moves towards addressing the claim that “to know is not enough” and that research should be used “to improve education and serve the public good.”³⁶ What this means for us, then, is that our own lives become both “data” and “curriculum” to be examined in the pursuit of emancipatory frameworks in research. How do our own struggles reveal tensions and opportunities that yield an individual and/or collective agenda for critical research? What follows are insights that emerge from my own phronesis and ongoing conscientization, offered as a starting point for individual and collective agenda setting among colleagues and students engaged in critical scholarship in conservative contexts.

Our Lives as Curriculum: A Case for Research as Praxis

Multicultural scholars emphasize the importance of professors’ lives serving as authentic exemplars of critical multicultural research praxis³⁷, highlighting the importance of our own lives as curriculum, as—together with our students and colleagues—we “read” our “world”³⁸ in a dialogic process of conscientization.³⁹ The purpose of doing so is not to place anyone on pedestals or to tear down practitioners struggling in difficult circumstances. Instead, in order to understand alternate ways of and contexts for doing critical work, we turn our lens on our own work. In so doing, we also provide voice to the struggles we encounter, while taking up Stovall’s (2013) challenge to analyze our own practice to identify successes and failures in interrupting or perpetuating social injustice, thus making ourselves the object of study rather than constantly “doing” research on “others” within hegemonic and hierarchical research arrangements.

Analyzing our own practices facilitates the reflection entailed in the Freirean (2000) notion of praxis—the ongoing cycle of reflection and action in the pursuit of emancipatory and generative processes of education that affirm everyone’s humanity. Praxis also underscores the need for consistent critical consciousness of our positions and actions in the multiple contexts of our work,

36. Ball (2012, p. 198).

37. Kumashiro (2014); Prashad (2011); Stovall (2004; 2007; 2013).

38. Freire and Macedo (1987).

39. Freire (1970).

especially as teachers, researchers and community members. For me, this consciousness emerges over time. I will explore this process of conscientization through reference to three critical incidents that served as catalysts in my own praxis. In this exploration I highlight two insights that have been particularly salient in my own work: the recognition a) that our lives and work are texts read by our communities of practice, and b) the institutional fragmentation of our lives and work.

“Reading” our Lives in Communities of Practice

Early in my career, at the end of an undergraduate class in multicultural education, a pre-service teacher who had experienced difficulty with the reading and writing assignments in English told me, “I may not be able to give you the perfect definition of critical pedagogy, but I know that if I just model what you have done in class, I will be OK.” My instant reaction was to ask myself, “What *did* I model?” This question came up again when I volunteered in a family literacy program that served Guatemalan Maya immigrant families. The director welcomed me into the program with the words, “Welcome to the University of the Poor” and reassured me that “the Maya read people well.” Contemplating the “gaze” of the Maya parents significantly re-framed my role as a critical ethnographer working with these families, especially in the context of the historic role of university-based research/ researchers in indigenous contexts. It allowed me a “bottom up” view of the school system, perceiving school policies and practices from the perspective of the families who were frequently recipients of, rather than participants in the decisions about their children.⁴⁰ These two incidents, in turn, allowed me to frame my own position as a faculty member who publicly opposed the university’s acceptance of corporate sponsorship from a private prison company. I justified my opposition as recognition that, for the students “reading” us as faculty members, what we do, speaks louder than anything that we can say in class.

The acknowledgement that our lives are curriculum that can and will be read within our communities of practice have strengthened my roles as a teacher and as a scholar and have built crucial bridges among those roles. It has brought the community into my classrooms and allowed the community to be my own classroom. Conscious of the power of the hidden curriculum in potential readings of my own modeling as a teacher, I have become more intentional in connecting the experienced curriculum with the formal curriculum. Through explicit course objectives pertaining to emancipatory pedagogy (something that must be *experienced* by students not just taught to them), I view the facilitation of such experiences through modeling in teacher and researcher preparation as central to interrupting the academic genocide (the systematic eradication of a meaningful education for entire groups of people) hitherto experienced by many communities in our public school systems currently “under siege” (Katz and Rose, 2014).⁴¹

My work with the Maya has allowed me to re-read my own life, highlighting my own illiteracies and those of educators in general, as well as the multiple contexts of literacy/illiteracy that emerge within our life stories. For instance, how do we account for the trilingual communicative abilities of the Maya who have not had the privilege of formal schooling as compared with our own? Could I have escaped genocide and found my way from a rural village in Guatemala through Mexico and all the way to Florida on foot without the ability to read print? What does it mean that it is the supposedly “illiterate” immigrant Maya women who taught me crucial lessons needed to be able to lead a doctoral course on critical research? The opposition to the corporate sponsorship of the prison company yielded praxis at the grassroots level that worked its way

40. Schoorman (2016).

41. Katz and Rose (2014).

through faculty governance systems. It taught us that individual and collective agency can reverse institutional decision making that had been framed as a “done deal.”⁴² The recognition that our lives (not just our words) are text to be “read” by those around us is a catalyst for authentic multicultural praxis. This praxis facilitates the integration of the often-fragmented aspects of teaching, research and service in our lives, and links micro level engagement with macro level concerns. Reflecting critically on our own actions as teachers, professors, researchers, community members and their necessary interconnectedness in our lives, offers us knowledge and insights that extend and deepen the “book” learning and/or methodological skills we acquired as we prepared to become teachers and researchers.

Moving Towards Ontological Authenticity

The notion of our lives as curriculum that many will “read” and from which they will learn (for better or worse) makes us constantly aware and committed to the importance of moving beyond methodology (in our teaching, research or service) to examining the axiology, ontology, and epistemological positions that give rise to our methods/actions. The pursuit of research as a public good acts against the fragmentation of our lives as professionals, prompting us to connect the tripartite facets of teaching, research and service in our professional commitment to social justice. When the public good becomes central to our lives as researchers, teachers and community members, such a pursuit becomes more integrated into our professional *raison e'tre*, and no longer is it ‘just’ something about which we teach or write. Kincheloe (2015) draws attention to this idea as ontological authenticity and Torres and Reyes (2011) refer to it as *vivencia*, “a philosophy of life and work” (p. 53). This parallels the definition of multicultural education as a personal ideology, an ongoing, multifaceted counter-hegemonic process, integrated into all aspects of professional practice.⁴³ However, as Torres and Reyes (2011) caution, this approach “clearly clashes with the academic establishment itself that calls for a separation of research, teaching and service activities, and most importantly with separation of reason from moral commitment and social responsibility as part of research activity” (pp. 53-54).

The pursuit of ontological authenticity thus described should not be undertaken in isolation. A significant insight about the fragmentation of our professional lives that has emerged in my own conscientization has been the need for professional integration to occur on a more systemic level within programs, departments and higher educational institutions in general. This became particularly evident in the discussions around the role of faculty, and academia in general, in the context of the corporate sponsorship decision at our university and the initial administrative resistance to faculty and student opposition. A senior level administrator central to this decision (from the natural sciences) noted that it was “only faculty in the social sciences who worried about these kinds of moral issues”; a perspective lent credence by subsequent faculty senate debate on the moral role of the academy. While it did surprise me that many faculty members appeared unperturbed by the moral implications of the prison sponsorship decision, it was not surprising (if disappointing) that others felt powerless and/or apathetic about reversing a course of action regardless of whether or not they agreed with the outcome. Furthermore, many were concerned with the sheer economic realities facing the university, while others (including the senior decision makers) were unaware of the deep concerns about the social injustices surrounding the actions of the sponsor.

42. Schoorman (2013).

43. Banks(2011); Schoorman and Bogotch (2010).

The fragmentation of our knowledge bases and isolation of divergent perspectives, in this case, supported university decision making against the public interest. The opportunity to debate these issues and thereby integrate perspectives served to uphold the academy's commitment to the public good. These opportunities will not only raise the critical consciousness of individual faculty members/researchers at the micro levels but will also facilitate a collective consciousness at the meso level that will, ultimately be necessary to address social injustices at more macro levels. An important insight that has emerged for me has been my relative failure in the past to recognize my colleagues and administrators (not just my students) as vital constituents in critical consciousness raising. Moving beyond the isolated silos in which we engage in critical research towards coalition building among colleagues represents an important next step in the work of critical scholars.

Our Role as Researchers: Advocates and Leaders in Difficult Times

For too long, educational researchers have been socialized as dutiful followers of methodological prescriptions. However, the many concerns, both historical and contemporary, related to equity and social justice in education warrant that educational researchers review, renew and/or rethink their role as professionals vis-à-vis these troubling realities. As Kincheloe and Tobin (2015) observe:

The last half of the first decade of the twenty-first century [was] a strange time for educators. Many of the gains many of us thought we had made twenty years ago are under assault and many of the epistemological fights for the benefits of multiple ways of doing research in which we were forced to engage in the 1980s are breaking out again...A re-education of the public to accept Eurocentric and often male ways of both being and seeing has shaped everything from the corporatization of the public space, the social positioning of poor people and people of color, the politics of public knowledge to the ways we reconceptualize and validate research about education. (p. 3)

Whether this reality is fueled among educational researchers by a lack of awareness and conscientization, apathy, fear, comfort in the habituation of professional "ivory tower" privilege, and/or discomfort in the conflation of morality and "science," we must question the social responsibility of such positioning and the raise the possibility that faculty members' insulation from broader community concerns may well undermine the very privilege of their current disengagement. In addition to the troubling legacies of race and gender-based exclusions in research, contemporary critical scholars face an added challenge in the guise of neoliberalism that has engulfed policy making at the national level and virulently attacked the public education system, including institutions of higher education.⁴⁴ This represents a new front on which all faculty members are called upon to act. How we, as professors/scholars, respond at multiple levels of the educational system has crucial consequences for the public good. As neoliberal market values, intellectually indefensible funding policies, de-professionalization of educators, standardization and assessment regimes subvert democratic education, it is imperative that educational researchers use their scholarship to safeguard democratic values and practices in education.

44. See Giroux (2010; 2002).

Engaged Public Intellectuals or Academic Bystanders?

The analysis of my own experiences has helped me to recognize how my advocacy for the community was understood by colleagues. In addition to being questioned as appropriate research, such advocacy was often framed as “courageous” rather than merely being “normal”—i.e. part and parcel of how we are expected to engage in research. The “courageous” label is deceptively marginalizing, highlighting the fact that what one does is “unusual” and not to be expected. Such a label emerges when educational researchers, as a collective, fail to place the welfare of the public ahead of their individual research agendas and when doing so becomes the exception rather than the rule.

Redefining what is “normal” or the “expected” role of educational researchers will require that we acknowledge, at one level, our collective failure or inability to lead. Our work as scholars has had limited impact on the attack on K-12 public education in the guise of higher standards through high stakes testing and accountability. These practices have further exacerbated existing disparities, serving to profit mostly the private testing companies that undertake the assessments while deriding teachers for “failures” that were inevitable in the flawed system.⁴⁵ While many educators have raised the alarm and compiled the data to demonstrate their concerns, their warnings remain largely unheeded by educational decision makers.⁴⁶

More recently however, we have seen evidence of school boards, superintendents and other school leaders advocate based on research. For instance, in 2014, a school board in one of our service districts whose student population is predominantly non-White, passed a resolution on accountability that acknowledged that “the over-reliance and lack of consistent data on high-stakes standardized testing in state and federal accountability systems is undermining educational quality and equity in U.S. public schools.”⁴⁷ A year later, the Obama administration acknowledged that our children were being over-tested.⁴⁸ While some might applaud these leadership efforts as appropriate, we must also ask: What took the school board and the Obama administration this long? How do we justify the fact that so many were bystanders as the education of so many was eroded? And, as many schools and teacher preparation programs gear up to be evaluated (and paid) on Value Added Model (VAM) scores, to what extent have key decision makers paid attention to AERA’s (2015) statement on concerns about VAM’s scientific and technical limitations?

Multiculturalists aspire to an ongoing role as engaged public intellectuals, truth tellers, bridge leaders and scholar practitioners. Thus it is prudent that I raise questions about why educators like myself, in colleges of education around our nation, did not have more of an impact within our own institutions and communities with regard to the deleterious impact of standardized tests on children in our public schools? Where have we—and our institutions—been and how do we make up for the lost time, education and love of learning for the generations of students who went through this system and were scathed?

45. Katz and Rose (2014); Watkins (2012).

46. American Educational Research Association (2000); Kohn (2000); Nichols and Berliner (2007); Ravitch (2010).

47. School Board of Palm Beach County (2014).

48. Zernike (2015).

Needed: A Collective Awakening and Accountability

Torres and Reyes (2011) begin their discussion of research as praxis for democratizing education epistemologies with a quotation from Marx and Engels that reads: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it” (p. 1). For Greene (1978), change requires being intellectually wide awake as a moral responsibility.

The opposite of morality, it has often been said, is indifference a lack of care, an absence of concern. Lacking wide-awakeness, I want to argue, individuals are likely to drift, to act on impulses of expediency. They are unlikely to identify situations as moral ones or to set themselves to assessing their demands. (p. 43)

However, it is apparent that the change we desire - teaching and research for the public good as a matter of institutional policy and practice—remains seemingly light years away. Commitments to social justice, seem relegated to particular professors, programs or courses while the dominant trend favors the compliant support of the status quo, regardless of the ethical implications for doing so. How might change occur?

The call for educators to be engaged public intellectuals outside of the ivory tower, requires us to fulfill a similar role *within* our institutions where dialogue and bridge building must occur.⁴⁹ Our ability to effectively interrupt practices that subvert the public good, engaging in what Gay (2011) termed a pedagogy of resistance, will require moving out of our own disciplinary and professional silos. Separation undermines the development of collective agency that will be central to effectively challenging practices that are detrimental to students and teachers, particularly in historically underserved communities. What good is it that we might be well published if the focus of our scholarship is something about which our colleagues are largely oblivious, and by which our institutions are unaffected?

Having “awakened” our colleagues to the value of critical research, a vital step in transforming the epistemological biases of academic institutions and concomitant programs of study for educational researchers will require that critical approaches to research outgrow their current marginalized positions within the curriculum. Per the principles of critical multicultural education that frames our scholarship as a moral undertaking, the preparation of future researchers for critical scholarship will be as much about mindset as it is about methodological procedures.⁵⁰ Thus the role of research in addressing social injustices or the public good becomes foundational, rather than optional, to the research undertaking. Concomitantly, the curricular arrangements for achieving such a goal will need to be critically reviewed. While expanding curricular spaces through a review of “required” and “elective” courses in our graduate programs, it is also helpful to examine the “null” curriculum: what is not taught and why? How do our programs facilitate the critical and moral awakening of future researchers?

For those charged with the development of courses or programs of study it is important that we use the limited curricular opportunities we have to effectively engage students’ critical consciousness, facilitate emancipatory epistemologies and develop well-conceived critical methodologies. My work in the community (real world experiences), combined with extant scholarship (book learning) has been invaluable in my own conceptualization of critical research summarized

49. Giroux (2010); Tierney (2013).

50. See also Ladson Billings and Donner (2005).

as follows for students in the first doctoral class in critical research to be offered in our program, first as an elective, then as a requirement.

- A rationale for the study grounded in extant social injustices with the purpose of minimizing/ eliminating the injustices or the conditions that give rise to them;
- Research questions that emerge from the interests of the researched who are marginalized by injustices;
- An epistemological stance that reflects research *with* the researched not simply research *on* them;
- Research design and methodologies that reflect multiple loci of expertise (where the researchers are not perceived as the sole “experts”, and where community members’ value as co-researchers is recognized);
- Participation in the research process is viewed as beneficial or emancipatory by both the researcher and the researched.⁵¹

Our own accountability as individuals in this collective journey is pertinent. For instance, although I was fortunate to be introduced to critical perspectives as a graduate student, narrative research, autoethnography and the methodological implications of theory grounded in critical pedagogy were research experiences that I undertook more recently as a faculty member. In so doing I grew as a scholar, learning from others, as we collectively opened up spaces for more to pursue this work. This has facilitated of a wider range of scholarship among students, including dissertations considered for departmental and college-wide awards, as well as (if more gradually) in the criteria for promotion and tenure. Nevertheless, these epistemologies are still “othered” within the institution, with students and faculty still reluctant to engage with certain designs and methodologies, so there is considerable work yet to be done.

Critical consciousness and wide-awakeness about our collective role in the perpetuation of an inequitable status quo must be facilitated within the mainstream of our institutional culture. Critical multiculturalists have pursued this through ongoing critical questions about whose knowledge is central to our curriculum, who benefits, and what values underlie our curricular decisions. These questions are pertinent to our education of future researchers as well.

Conclusion

Drawing on the extensive curriculum development and analytical work in the field of multicultural education and on the critical perspectives of a range of race-based and gender-based researchers, this paper argued for the inclusion of critical approaches to research and scholarship in the education of future educational researchers. The justification and methodology of such an inclusion emerged from a critical reflective analysis of my own struggles as a scholar, educator and community member committed to the principles of social justice and the central role of education in achieving (or denying) such outcomes. At a time when racism is on the rise in national rhetoric, when the increasing diversity among our communities is accompanied by growing disparities in educational achievement and opportunity, and when rampant neoliberal policies con-

51. Schoorman (2014).

strain democratic public education, multicultural researchers face both a challenge and an opportunity. Might educational researchers make a difference? Critical scholars argue that such is possible only through radical democratic praxis that significantly alters the current trajectory of research approaches and epistemologies. This could be achieved if a wide range of faculty, both current and future scholars, became critically conscious about the socio-political dynamics we face, their broad-based consequences and our role in perpetuating/ interrupting them. Although the status quo is currently challenged by a diverse range of committed individuals, professional and interpersonal bridges that will facilitate collaborative and collective response must be built. Ultimately, educational institutions, including colleges of education themselves, will need to address our own institutional responses to the challenges to equity, social justice and the public good. Will history attest to our role as by-standers or as active agents of social stratification and educational necrophily, as wide-awake or half asleep to our social responsibility to the challenges around us, or as a collective of professionals who used our profound knowledge in a concerted effort to address deep concerns about the public good?

Bibliography

- American Educational Research Association. 2015. Position statement on use of Value Added Models (VAM) for the evaluation of educators and educator preparation programs. Accessed November 30, 2015. <http://edr.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/11/10/0013189X15618385.full.pdf+html>.
- American Educational Research Association. 2000. Position statement on high-stakes testing in pre-K–12 education. Accessed November 30, 2015. <http://www.aera.net/AboutAERA/AERARulesPolicies/AERAPolicyStatements/PositionStatementonHighStakesTesting/tabid/11083/Default.aspx>.
- Anyon, Jean. 2006. "What Should Count as Educational Research: Notes Towards a New Paradigm." In *Educational Research in the Public Interest: Social Justice, Action, And Policy*, edited by Gloria Ladson-Billings and William Tate, 17-26. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Apple, Michael. 2006. "Understanding And Interrupting Neoliberalism and Neoconservatism in Education." *Pedagogies: An International Journal* 1(1): 21-26.
- . 2012. "Foreword." In *The assault on public education: Confronting the politics of corporate school reform*, edited by William Watkins, ix-xiv. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- . 2014. *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Au, Wayne. 2014. *Rethinking Multicultural Education: Teaching For Racial And Cultural Justice*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- Ball, Arnetha. 2012. "American Educational Research Association 2012 annual meeting call for submissions." *Educational Researcher*, 40(4): 198-220.
- Banks, James. A. 2004. "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice." In *Handbook of Research in Multicultural Education*, edited by James. A. Banks and Cherry M. Banks, 3-29. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Berry, Kathleen. 2015. "Research As Bricolage: Embracing Relationality, Multiplicity, and Complexity." In *Doing Educational Research: A Handbook*, edited by Kenneth Tobin and Shirley. R. Steinberg, 79-110. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

- Bishop, Russell. 2005. "Freeing Ourselves From Neocolonial Domination." In *The Sage Handbook Of Qualitative Research* edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 191-216. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Birmingham, Carrie. 2004. Phronesis: A Model For Pedagogical Reflection. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55 (4), 313-324.
- Bogotch, Ira. 2007. "Social Justice And Educational Leadership: A Critique Of Research Designs, Measures And Methods." Paper presented at the annual conference of the University Consortium of Educational Administrators, Alexandria, VA, November, 15-18.
- Carter, Melanie. 2003. "Telling Tales Out Of School: What's The Fate Of A Black Story In A White World Of White Stories?" In *Interrogating Racism In Qualitative Research Methodology*, edited by Gerardo. R. Lopez and Laurence Parker, 29-48. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Denzin, Norman K., Yvonna. S. Lincoln, and Linda T. Smith, 2008. *Handbook Of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Freire, Paulo. 1970. "Cultural Action and Conscientization." *Harvard Educational Review*, 40(3), 452-477.
- , 2000. *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Freire, Paulo, and Donalddo Macedo. 1987. *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Freund, Margaret. 2009. "Me At University Doing Teacher Training – What A Big Laugh": Narrative and Parrhesia." *Educational Action Research*, 17(4), 523-536.
- Gay, Geneva. 2011. "Our Children Need Education For Resistance." *Journal of Educational Controversy*, 6 (1). Accessed July 1, 2015: <http://www.wce.wvu.edu/Resources/CEP/eJournal/v006n001/a010.shtml>.
- Giroux, Henry. 2002. Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425–463.
- Giroux, Henry. 2010. "The Disappearing Intellectual in the Age of Economic Darwinism." Accessed May 8, 2013. <http://archive.truthout.org/the-disappearing-intellectual-age-economic-darwinism61287>.
- , 2011a. *Zombie Politics And Culture In An Age Of Casino Capitalism*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- , 2011b. "Once More With Conviction: Defending Higher Education As A Public Good." *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and the Social Sciences*, 20(1), 117-135.
- Gorski, Paul. C. 2009. "What We're Teaching Teachers: An Analysis Of Multicultural Teacher Education Coursework Syllabi." *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 309-318.
- Grande, Sandy. 2004. *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*. Lanham, MR: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Grant, Carl, and Christine Sleeter. 2011. *Doing Multicultural Education For Achievement And Equity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Greene, Maxine. 1978. *Landscapes of Learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Guba, Egon. 1990. "The Alternative Paradigm Dialogue." In *The Paradigm Dialog* edited by Egon Guba, 17-27. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hostetler, Karl. 2005. "What is 'Good' Educational Research?" *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 16- 21.

- Katz, Michael, and Mike Rose. 2014. *Public Education Under Siege*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Kincheloe, Joe. 2015. "Foreword: Pearls of Wisdom." In *Doing Educational Research: A Handbook*, edited by Kenneth Tobin and Shirley R. Steinberg ix - xxxviii. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kincheloe, Joe, and McLaren, Peter. 2005. "Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research." In *The Sage Handbook Of Qualitative Research* edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 303- 342. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kincheloe, Joe L., and Kenneth Tobin. 2015. "The Much Exaggerated Death of Positivism." In *Doing Educational Research: A Handbook* edited by Kenneth Tobin and Shirley R. Steinberg, 15-32. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kohn, Alfie. 2000. "High Stakes Testing As Educational Ethnic Cleansing." *Education Digest*, 66 (4), 13-18.
- Kristjansson, Kristjan. 2014. "Phronesis And Moral Education: Treading Beyond Truisms." *Theory and research in education*, 12(2), 151-171.
- Kumashiro, Kevin. 2014. "Troubling The Politics Of Engagement, Ethics And Educational Research: Reframing Our Work." *Diaspora, Indigenous and Minority Education*, 8(1), 44-54.
- Ladson Billings, Gloria. 2006. "From The Achievement Gap To The Educational Debt: Understanding Achievement In US Schools." *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria, and Jamel Donner. 2005. "The Moral Activist Role Of Critical Race Theory Scholarship." In *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, edited by Norman. K. Denzin, and Yvonna. S. Lincoln, 279-301. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria, and William Tate., 2006. *Education Research in the Public Interest: Social Justice, Action, and Policy*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lather, Patti. 1986. Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 257-277.
- Lincoln, Yvonna. S., Susan. A., Lynham, and Egon. G. Guba, 2011. "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences, Re-Visited." In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman. K. Denzin and Yvonna. S. Lincoln, 97-128. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Loewen, James. W. 2008. *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Lopez, Gerardo. R., and Parker, Laurence. 2003. *Interrogating Racism In Qualitative Research Methodology*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Lomawaima, Tsianina, and Teresa McCarty. 2002. "When Tribal Sovereignty Challenges Democracy: American Indian Education and the Democratic Ideal." *American Educational Research Journal*, 39, (2), 279-305.
- Lorde, Audra. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches by Audre Lorde*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.
- Marshall, Catherine, and Maricela Oliva. 2006. *Leadership For Social Justice: Making Revolutions In Education*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- May, Peter, and Christine Sleeter. 2010. "Introduction." In *Critical Multiculturalism: Theory and Praxis*, edited by Peter May and Christine Sleeter, 1-16. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McLaren, Peter. 2007. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the foundations of education*. (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Nichols, Sharon. L, and David C. Berliner. 2007. *Collateral Damage: How High Stakes Testing Corrupts America's Schools*. Boston, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Nieto, Sonia. 1994. "Affirmation, Solidarity and Critique: Moving Beyond Tolerance in Multicultural Education." *Multicultural Education*. (Spring), 9-12, 35-37.
- Peterson, Bob. 2007. "Teaching For Social Justice: One Teacher's Journey." In *Rethinking our classrooms; Teaching for Equity and Justice, Volume 1*, edited by Wayne Au, Bill Bigelow, and Stan Karp, 28-34. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- Pillow, Wanda. 2003. "Race-Based Methodologies: Multicultural Methods or Epistemological Shifts?" In *Interrogating Racism In Qualitative Research Methodology* edited by Gerardo R. Lopez and Laurence Parker, 181-202. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Prashad, Vijay. 2011. "This Concerns Everyone." Presentation given at the annual meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME), Chicago, November 4, 2001. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 14(2), 103-106.
- Ravitch, Diane. 2010. *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Sadker, David. 2001. "Introduction to Award Presentation—Myra Sadker Equity Award." Accessed February 1, 2016 at <http://www.sadker.org/awards/NWHP.html>.
- Schoorman, Dilys. 2013. "Resisting The Unholy Alliance Between a University and a Prison Company: Implications For Faculty Governance in a Neoliberal Context." *Cultural Studies & Critical Methodologies* 13(6), 510-519. DOI: 10.1177/1532708613503777.
- , 2014. "How Should Researchers Act in the Context of Social Injustice? Reflections on the Role of the Researcher as a Social Justice Leader." In *International Handbook of Social [In]Justice and Educational Leadership* edited by Ira Bogotch and Carolyn Shields, 217-232. New York, NY: Springer.
- , 2016. "From the 'Ivory Tower' to 'The University Of The Poor': A Professor's Educational Journey." *Urban Education*, 5(7), 797-823. DOI:10.1177/0042085914549362.
- Schoorman, Dilys, and Ira Bogotch. 2010. "What is a Critical Multicultural Researcher? A Self-Reflective Study of the Role of the Researcher." *Journal of Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 5(3) 249-264.
- School Board of Palm Beach County, Florida. 2014. Resolution on Accountability. Accessed October 29, 2014 at <http://www.flstopccoalition.org/files/0C1D9C09-6BE4-4C73-A5D0-4F94E25AC059--AEFCBA12-88C0-48A5-853E-1D1FA7336A23/pbcsresolution-on-accountability-2.pdf>.
- Sleeter, Christine. 2005. *Un-Standardizing Curriculum: Multicultural Teaching In Standards-Based Classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- , 2008. "Equity, Democracy and Neoliberal Assaults On Teacher Education." *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1947-1957.
- , 2015. "Multicultural Education vs. Factory Model Schooling." In *Multicultural Education: A Renewed Paradigm of Transformation and Call to Action* edited by H. Prentice Baptiste. 115-136. San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap.
- Sleeter, Christine, and Dolores Delgado Bernal. 2004. "Critical Pedagogy, Critical Race Theory, and Antiracist Education: Implications For Multicultural Education." In *Handbook of research on multicultural education*, edited by James A. Banks and Cherry McGee. Banks, 240-258. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sleeter, Christine, and Carl Grant. 2003. *Making Choices For Multicultural Education: Five Approaches To Race, Class And Gender*. New York, NY: John Wiley.

- Smith, Linda. T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research And Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Spring, Joel. 2013. *Deculturalization and the Struggle For Equality*. (7th. ed) Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Stovall, David. 2004. "School Leader And Negotiator: Critical Race Theory, Praxis, And The Creation Of Productive Space." *Multicultural Education*, 12 (2), 8-12.
- 2007. "Towards a Politics of Interruption: High School Design as Politically Relevant Pedagogy." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(6), 681-691.
- 2013. "Against The Politics Of Desperation: Educational Justice, Critical Race Theory, and Chicago School Reform." *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(1), 33-43.
- Taylor, Edward, David Gillborn, and Gloria Ladson-Billings. 2009. *Foundations of race theory in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tierney, William. 2013. "Beyond The Ivory Tower: The Role of the Intellectual in Eliminating Poverty." *Educational Researcher*, 42(6), 295-303.
- Tobin, Kenneth and Shirley Steinberg. 2015. *Doing Educational Research: A Handbook*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Tyson, Cynthia. 2003. "Research, Race and an Epistemology of Emancipation." In *Interrogating Racism In Qualitative Research Methodology* edited by Gerardo R. Lopez and Laurence Parker, 19-28. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Torres, Myriam N., and Loui V. Reyes. 2011. *Research as Praxis: Democratizing Education Epistemologies*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Vavrus, Michael. 2015. *Diversity and Education: A Critical Multicultural Approach*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Villenas, Sofia. 1996. "The Colonizer/Colonized Chicana Ethnographer: Identity, Marginalization, and Co-Optation in the Field." *Harvard Educational Review*, 66 (4), 711-731.
- Watkins, William. 2012. *The Assault On Public Education: Confronting The Politics Of Corporate School Reform*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Winkle-Wagner, Rachelle, Cheryl A. Hunter, and Debora H. Ortloff. 2009. *Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Practice in Educational Research: Methods at the Margins*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Woodson, Carter G. 1933. *The Mis-Education of the Negro*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Zernike, Kate. (2015). "Obama Administration Calls For Limits On Testing In Schools." *New York Times*, October 24. Accessed November 1, 2015. <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/25/us/obama-administration-calls-for-limits-on-testing-in-schools.html>.
- Zittleman, Karen, and David Sadker. 2002. "Gender Bias In Teacher Education Texts: New (And Old) Lessons." *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 168-180.

Dilys Schoorman, Ph.D. is a professor and the Chair of the Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry at Florida Atlantic University where she teaches courses in Multicultural/Global Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and Critical Approaches to Research. Her scholarly interests include critical multiculturalism in the preparation of educators and researchers, immigrant education, and democratic decision making in the university governance context.