MID-WESTERN
EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCHER

• Official Publication of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association •

Ursuline College

On the Cover

Founded by the Ursuline nuns in 1857, Ursuline College is one of the oldest Catholic women's colleges in the United States and the only one remaining in Ohio. The school is committed to providing a superior liberal arts education with its nationally acclaimed core curriculum, the Ursuline Studies program, as well as programs focusing on specific careers.

Ursuline College, located in the Cleveland suburb of Pepper Pike, offers personalized education with small classes. One of our campus features includes our state-of-the-art Pilla Student Learning Center which is where our Education Department is housed. Ursuline is proud of its strong Education Department which educates undergraduate students in early childhood, middle childhood, adolescent/young adult, multi-age art, and special education as well as graduate programs in education and educational administration.

Information for Contributors to the Mid-Western Educational Researcher

MID-WESTERN
EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCHER

Research, Race and an Epistemology of Emancipation

Cynthia Tyson
Ohio State University

As an African American female researcher, I address the topic of race-based epistemologies with a continuation of an earlier question I raised (Tyson, 1998) in response to the Scheurich and Young (1997) *Educational Researcher* article titled *"Coloring Epistemologies: Are our Research Epistemologies Racially Biased?"* The question is: if a race-based epistemology can be African American (or feminist, or gay/lesbian, or First Nation), what is it that makes this epistemology different when developing a formalized research methodology?

My answer was then, and is still rooted now, in the "specificity of oppression—the response to which is not based solely on victimization, but also on struggle and survival" (Tyson, 1998, p.22). The specificity of oppression made it necessary for the creation of a specific theory of knowledge in response to distinctive kinds of nationally-sanctioned inhumanity. To be black in America, for example, specified historically, and continues to specify, the ways in which systemic forms of racism—from enslavement through Jim Crow and onto racial profiling—manifests themselves in our experience. Across these historical periods, what counts as knowledge about racism has changed, as attempts to redress problems have yielded continued oppression. In other words, the ending of slavery drove racism, and the disposition to enslave, into different arenas.

For example, the legal and social addressing of Jim Crow laws and practices were deeply entrenched in the varieties of racism that characterized early times. Even challenges to the constitution and later amendments were only yielding returns that were reflective of the legal system from which they grew. Critical Race Theory (Crenshaw, Gotanda Peller, and Thomas, 1995; Delgado, 1995; Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, and Crenshaw, 1993; Parker. 1998), a counter-theory of critical legal studies, began to deconstruct the mainstream legal ideology which ignores racial oppression, and placed at its center the endemic racism in law and society that is often devoid of contextual and historical examinations.

In other words, Critical Race Theory (CRT) involved the examination of external practices—such as laws and policies—that restricted African Americans from full participation and citizenship in society. It accomplished this though a series of counterstories that kept race as the center unit of analysis. In this regard, counterstories and storytelling functioned as a type of counter-discourse; a means of analysis to examine the epistemologies of racially oppressed peoples. Under this framework, the meta-narrative shifts to identify and account for the continuing anguish of racism in the face of legal and social "fixes." It is this very ignoring of

the role of race and racism that CRT aims to challenge, attempting to analyze the traditions, "presuppositions and perceived wisdoms that make up the common culture about race that invariably render African Americans" (Ladson-Billings, and Tate, 1995) and other disenfranchised groups powerless.

During a discussion about racism, a friend once asked me: "Why do black folks want something special? I answered, in the words Dr. King,, "Because something special has been done to us." It is this specificity of oppression that has a collective and empirical impact on the epistemological backdrop of research. As I stated in my earlier work:

> I reflect on the experience of being Black in America, I weave together the African tribal and American familial, community, and religious traditions—folk tales, foods, medicine men, priest and priestesses, Black churches—but I must also weave in the thread or realism in the politics, economics and so-called intellectual thought that allowed for the atrocities perpetuated by the Nazis in the holocaust, for the Middle Passage and the enslavement of millions of Black Africans, for Japanese interment camps, and for the annihilation of indigenous peoples. (Tyson, 1998, p 22)

My theory of knowledge connects with these accounts of the threads of racism in politics, economics, and so-called intellectual thought, that allow and sustain a full range of oppressions.

It is the understanding of lived oppression—the struggle to make a way out of no way—which propels us to problematize dominant ideologies in which knowledge is constructed. Post-colonialism and the so-called "standpoint" positions highlight the role of racism in societal ideology as endemic to the theoretical frameworks that underpin research epistemologies. These research frameworks represent blindness to the ways of knowing that come from the specific experience of oppression.

It is my contention that such experiences set the stage for inquiry from a different plane. In other words, the experience of racism and oppression moves the oppressed "Other" into a paradigm of survival creating a view of the world that is not shared by those gatekeepers who legitimatize academic discourse and research.

A new question then arises: How do we begin to analyze the pervasiveness of race and the need for it to move from the margin to the center of our research paradigms? In answering this question, the initial challenge is to understand the complexity of such epistemological moves—moves

that will require a multifaceted lens, much like a kaleidoscope, in an attempt to understand the implications for inquiry. For example, a small ball, when viewed with the naked eye, has discernable elements—e.g., color, shape, and texture. The same ball, when viewed through a kaleidoscope, is no longer a single color but may take on a prism of colors. Moreover, the once-smooth round edges may now be flat in places and appear to have different textual properties.

In like fashion, racism, when viewed through different lenses, may also have different properties than the one deeply established in the consciousness of American society. These different perspectives engender many possibilities, particularly opportunities to transform an ideology of enslavement and oppression, to one of economic, political and social equality.

Such a transformation, however, requires work on two fronts. First, we must systematically and consciously resist the injustices of racism. Secondly, we must work constructively to improve the ways in which the racism surfaces in the vocalized assumptions of those in power—i.e., who have the power to make generalizations "stick." In essence, we simultaneously attack the causes and heal the effects. We must work at both the macro- and micro-levels—with systems and with individuals—in order to have an impact on ideology.

Working at two levels, however, raises yet another question: What effect does this rhythmic alteration have on researchers of color? The unending "dual consciousness" that DuBois[1] (1903) spoke of, places enhanced demands on marginalized researchers—most often African American, Chicanas(os), Latinas(os), Asian American/Pacific Islander, American Indian/First Nation, Gay/Lesbian/Transgender[2]—on the development of our research agendas with, and in relation to, our community responsibilities (see also Abu-Lughod, 1990; Behar, 1993; Behar and Gordon, 1995; Delgado Bernal, 1998; Nayaran, 1993; Trinh 1990; Villenas, 1996).

To awaken this stance and enact racial realism, to move race from the margin to the center of our research paradigms, entails a deconstruction of the White racial ideology as the normative stance. In other words, the status of being "White" is not necessarily superior; rather, all "others" are measured against it in terms of their "differences." While Whiteness, on the surface, has politically shifted from a claim of supremacy to the role of victim (as in reverse affirmative action suits), it retains, and potentially gains, power through being the standard against which everything else is compared. Whiteness remains the center and retains its control through "othering," a process that demeans the efforts of "others."

In discussions amongst educational researchers (e.g., López, 1997), the question has been asked, "Shall the masters tools dismantle the master's house?" (Lorde, 1984). To accept the colonial codification of the master and his tools in relation our work, suggests that we are, in essence, workers on "data plantations" (Irvine, 1997): enslaved, and in need of emancipation. This is not to suggest that scholars of color are trapped by the research machine or that we can never transcend our subordinate position because we rely on the master's toolbox for our livelihood. Rather, as Ladson-Billings (1998) suggests, all we can do is "add different voices to the received wisdom or canon." (p.230). By offering counterstories, and different ways of viewing the world, emancipatory research is generated.

Emancipatory research

The ways of White folks, I mean some White folks, is too much for me. I reckon they must be a few good ones, but most of em ain't good leastwise they don't treat me good and Lawd knows, I ain't never done nothing to em nothing a-tall. (Hughes, 1933, p. 171)

In his 1933 book from which the above quote was taken, Langston Hughes reveals the protagonist's knowledge of race, while defining the dominant White ideology from a non-White perspective. This definition "from the outside" renders visible the thinking and actions that stem from assumptions made invisible by their pervasiveness within the ideology. In other words, these assumptions cannot be "made visible" from within the ideology itself. The invisibility of these principles arises from a blindness that fails to legitimate perspectives that are not beneficial to White society (Bell, 1995).

Visibility, when achieved, is therefore an optional matter. What remains invisible are the epistemologies and "ways of White folks"—mores and practices that have been institutionalized throughout our history. They continue to exist across a variety of venues regardless of place and space. As is commonly known, wherever there is a dominant truth or story that is widely unquestioned, such a truth is always accompanied by the to need to set the proverbial record straight.

Such an act requires us to create emancipatory epistemologies from which liberatory research methodologies are born. If liberation achieved by individuals at the expense of others is an act of oppression, then, educational research achieved by individuals at the expense of others, is also an act of oppression. It is incumbent upon researchers, therefore, to stop "trying to hide in¼the neutrality of scientific pursuits, [or be] indifferent to how findings are used, [or]¼uninterested in considering for whom or for what interest they are working" (Freire, 1998). In other words, if we are to engage in emancipatory research, we must stop trying to benefit ourselves, and engage in the process of researching for the greater good of our communities.

If our goal is to do emancipatory research, we must ask ourselves "Who really benefits?" The reward(s) of the academy can deceive us in to believing that our work is emancipatory when it is not. Emancipatory research can not be built on the "participant's backs," but must have a simultaneous commitment to radical social change as well as to

those individuals most oppressed by social cultural subordination.

As long as liberatory research can be interpreted as methodologically distinct, but not critically different in its ability to improve, challenge, and alter traditional forms of academic research in general—or social and cultural consequences specifically—then it will continue to be "tolerated" as a "variation" and "alternative" research stance. It will continue to be an "other" within the larger educational research community.

Liberatory or emancipatory research is likely to be viewed this way by White researchers who tend to call into question all inquiry that provides researchers with the opportunity to use their own race-based reality as theoretical grounding for epistemological and methodological moves. Such questioning constitutes a paradigmatic "backlash" which leaves race-based research and scholarship in a proverbial abyss.

Conservative backlashes notwithstanding, emancipatory research has been accepted in educational circles—but only as a means to offer a sanitized and depoliticized "reading list" in graduate qualitative research courses and/or opening conversations to discuss epistemological considerations related to the intersections and/or conflicts with qualitative research methodology (Denzin and Lincoln, 1997). Too often, however, the role of race and racism becomes little more than a critique of the traditional research epistemologies, never questioning the "normality" of White research forms. In essence, academic research that is situated in raced-based, gender-based, social class-based, and post-colonial-based ways of knowing, tends to be blocked by empiricisms, scientisms, and normalisms that remains methodologically oppressive.

Epistemologies of emancipation

Research is formalized curiosity. It is poking and prying with a purpose. (Hurston, 1994, p. 687)

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 compliment larger struggles for liberation. The very nature of radical thought and liberatory action is that it has far-reaching effects and comes with the heightened sense of responsibility for researchers whose work is based on a commitment to defy historical and contemporary racial oppression.. For scholars of color who have experienced the specificity of oppression their entire lives, such a move provides the basis for research that unapologetically places discussions of race, gender, class

and sexuality as part of a larger political and epistemological struggle for a better and just future.

The emancipatory researcher

[W]e have to think seriously about linkages between research and activism, about cross—racial and transnational coalitional strategies, and abut the importance of linking our work to radical social agendas. (Davis, 1994, p.231)

Emancipatory research is generally recognized as most effective when undertaken by—or in concert with—the community, organizations, or peoples that are most impacted by its analysis and dissemination. As such, research born at the intersections of the specificity of oppression can become a catalyst to fundamentally change the conditions of oppression (Davis, 1994, Freire, 1970). There are however, certain challenges that will continue to arise as we move forward with this effort.

As researchers of color, the ability to do emancipatory research potentially creates an alienated life. Indeed, the trauma of independence exacts much from those who build their research agendas outside dominant educational research circles. We survive on the margins and take pride in the uniqueness of our marginality. But such a position also exacts a cost—do we advance our own careers, or do we serve our communities? Many times, we are often caught in the middle of two competing agendas (Tyson, 1998—see also Delgado Bernal, 1998; Villenas, 1996).

Moreover, as Critical Race Theorist suggest, racism is a permanent fixture in our society. Therefore, it does not take long for researchers of color to face the reality that no matter how hard we work, we will probably not see the end of racism in our lifetimes. Such a realization can discourage us from aggressively moving forward.

Nevertheless, many of us hold on to the belief to do all we can do in our lifetime is become agents for social change through our research practices. If we wait for racism to be obliterated before we begin to enact epistemologies of emancipation, then we will be wasting—and waiting—a long time.

Emancipatory research facilitates radical thought, radical thought supports radical action, and radical action can advance a transformative social agenda. In other words, research can provide a working model for resolving the problems of marginalized populations because it incorporates a more organic methodology, because it connects with the "grass roots" and enhances data collection and collaborative analysis, and because the grounded theory that arises from the specificity of the day-to-day experiences of oppressed people can provide links with broader social and political solutions to educational problems. Its hope and promise lies in courageous action for change and the desire for critical understanding.

Historically, an increased desire for liberatory and courageous action has led to a revolution. The time for change

is now, and the time for educational research to lead such a change is at hand. Academia, on the other hand, is not a place for fermenting a revolution. Oppositionally speaking, academia is conservatively maintaining the status quo: a status quo that maintains a context that confuses knowing and understanding. As a researcher who shares the intersections of specificity of institutional and historical oppression, as a researcher whose epistemologies and methodologies can set the stage for change, and as a researcher who wants to teach "liberating arts and sciences," I await, prepare, and will join the educational research revolution.

Notes

[1] Du Bois' concept of "double consciousness," he described as "a peculiar sensation.... One ever feels this twoness—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder."

[2] Gay/Lesbian/Transgender is not a minority based on race, however the historical oppression is analogous, in some ways, to racial oppression.

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (1990). Can there be a feminist ethnography? *Women and Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory*, *5*, 7-27.

Behar, R. (1993). *Translated woman: Crossing the border with Esperanza's story*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Behar, R., and Gordon, D. (Eds.). (1995).*Women writing culture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bell, D. (1995). Racial realism—after we're gone: Prudent speculations on America in a post-racial epoch. In R. Delgado (Ed.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 2-8). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Crenshaw, K., (1995). Race, reform and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimization in anti- discrimination law. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, B. Peller, B., and K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: Key writing that formed the movement*, (pp. 103-122). New York: The New Press.

Davis, A. (1998). Black women in the academy. In J. James, (Ed). *The Angela Y. Davis Reader*, (pp. 222-231). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Delgado, R. (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Delgado, R. (1995). The imperial scholar. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, Peller, B., and Thomas, K. (Eds.), *Critical race theory: Key writing that formed the movement*, (pp. 46-57). New York: The New Press.

Delgado Bernal, D. (1998). Using a Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, *68*(4), 555-582.

Denzin, N., and Lincoln, Y. (1997) *Handbook of qualitative research*. California: Sage Publications.

DuBois (1903). *The souls of black folk*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998). Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy and civic courage. Lanham: Rowan and Littlefield.

Hughes, L. (1990, c 1933) *The ways of white folks*. New York: Vintage Books.

Hurston, Z. (1994). *Folklore, memoirs, and other writings*. C. Wall (Ed.). New York: The Library of American Literary Classics.

Irvine, J. (1997) *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners*. Washington, D.C.: AACTE.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Just what is critical race theory and what is it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G., and Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*, 47-68.

López, G. R. (1997). Reflections on epistemology and standpoint theories: A response to "An indigenous approach to creating knowledge." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(2).

Lorde, A. (1984). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.

Matsuda. M., Lawrence, C., Delgado, R., and Crenshaw, K. (Eds.). (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the first amendment*. Boulder, CO.: Westview.

Narayan, K. (1993). How native is a "native" anthropologist? *American Anthropologist*, *95*(3), 671-686.

Parker. L. (1998). Race is…race ain't: An exploration of the utility of critical race theory in qualitative research in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*, 43-55.

Scheurich, J. J., and Young, M. D. (1997). Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, *26*(4), 4-17.

Trinh, T. M. (1990). Not you/like you: Post-colonial women and the interlocking questions of identity and difference. In G. Anzaldúa (Ed.). *Making face, making soul/Haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by feminists of color*, (pp. 371-375). San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Tyson, C. (1998). Coloring epistemologies: A response. *Educational Researcher*, *27*(9), 21-22.

Villenas, S. (1996). The colonizer/colonized Chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field. *Harvard Educational Review*, *66*(4), 711-731.

Mid-Western Educational Research Association

2003 Annual Meeting Call for Proposals

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: May 1, 2003

October 15-18, 2003   Janet K. Holt, Program Chair
The Westin Great Southern, Columbus, OH   jholt@niu.edu

The 2003 Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (MWERA) will return to Columbus with an exciting program of invited speakers, focused workshops, and peer-reviewed papers presented in a variety of session formats. The 2003 program will center around this year's theme: ***Research and Practice: Building Bridges*** and will feature dynamic speakers of interest to both researchers and practitioners. Teachers, administrators, and other school personnel are especially invited to come and share their school-based research and experiences at the 2003 MWERA conference.

Workshops will be scheduled throughout the four-day meeting, allowing attendees to participate in a wide range of focused, longer-term sessions on a variety of interesting topics. Peer-reviewed papers continue to form the backbone of the 2003 conference, with authors/presenters encouraged to consider a variety of presentation formats that allow for interactive and engaging discussion.

The meeting returns to The Westin Great Southern in Columbus, a historic landmark hotel, featuring charming guest rooms, excellent meeting facilities, a fitness center, and a short walk to the quaint shops of German Village. Columbus is the home to numerous theaters, a symphony, wonderful restaurants, shopping and fun nightlife! There is also entertainment for the whole family with the Center of Science and Industry, the Zoo and Aquarium, and the Blue Jackets NHL team.

If you are looking for a place to sit down and chat with researchers from schools and universities about your ideas and perspectives, the Mid-Western Educational Research Association provides that opportunity with its supportive, collaborative environment. Educational researchers across North America return to MWERA to renew acquaintances, make new contacts, and engage in exciting conversation in a collegial atmosphere. Come and be a part of MWERA in 2003!

General Information

The 2003 MWERA Annual Meeting will be held **Wednesday, October 15 through Saturday, October 18,** at the Westin Great Southern in Columbus Ohio. This year's theme is ***Research and Practice: Building Bridges.***The program will consist primarily of presentations, selected through a peer review process, by divisional program chairpersons. In addition, there will be invited speakers and symposia, panel discussions, special sessions for graduate students and new faculty, a luncheon and other social events open to all attendees.

New for 2003 – **All Web Submission**

Proposals **MUST** be submitted electronically over the internet using the form available on the meeting website. Proposals mailed or e-mailed to the Program Chair or Division Chairs will **NOT** be processed. Specific instructions for electronic submission can be found at the meeting website:

http://etra.cedu.niu.edu/mwera/

Questions about a proposal, the electronic submission process, or the meeting should be directed to the Program Chair:

Dr. Janet K. Holt
MWERA-2003 Program Chair
Department of Educational Technology,
 Research and Assessment
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115-2854
Office: 815-753-8523
Fax: 815-753-9388
e-mail: jholt@niu.edu

Any educational professional may submit a proposal for MWERA-2003, whether or not that person is currently a member of MWERA. *All Annual Meeting presenters must be members in good standing with MWERA (non-members must join MWERA upon notification of proposal acceptance).* To promote broader participation in the program no one person should appear as a presenter on more than three proposals.

All proposals must be posted on the MWERA website no later than midnight CST on May 1, 2003. Submissions will then be forwarded to Division Chairs and each Division Chair will coordinate a number of volunteers in a system of blind (without author identification) review. Appropriate criteria, depending on the format and type of scholarly work being presented, have been developed and are used for the review process. These criteria include: (a) topic (originality, choice of problem, importance of issues); (b) relevance of topic to the Division and MWERA membership; (c) contribution to research and education; (d) framework (theoretical/conceptual/practical, rationale, literature review, grounding); (e) analyses and interpretations (significance, implications, relationship of conclusions to findings, generalizability or usefulness); and (f) overall written proposal quality (clarity of writing, logic, and organization).
Papers presented at MWERA are expected to present original scholarship, conducted by the author(s), which has not been previously presented at any other meeting or published in any journal. Further, it is a violation of MWERA policy to promote commercially available products or services (except as Exhibits) which go beyond the limits of appropriate scholarly/scientific communication. Individuals who wish to display educationally related products or services are encouraged to contact Dr. Sharon McNeely, Historian/Archivist, P. O. Box 34421, Chicago, Illinois 60634-0421, 773-442-5518.

All persons presenting at the 2003 Annual Meeting are expected to register for the full meeting. All sessions listed in the program will be open to any registered meeting participant; however, enrollment may be limited, and a small additional fee required, for some workshop sessions. Tickets for the Friday luncheon and speaker are available to all pre-registrants. *Ticket availability is not guaranteed for late and on-site registrants.* Registration materials for the 2003 Annual Meeting will be published in the *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, on the MWERA website, and can be obtained by contacting the Program Chair.

Presenters whose papers have been accepted to a session with a Session Chair and/or Session Discussant are responsible for submitting a completed version of their conference paper to the Session Chair and Discussant no later than September 19, 2003. *Papers not available to the Session Chair and Session Discussant may be dropped from the program*. Presenters must also provide complete copies of their papers (or detailed handouts) to attendees at their sessions. Overhead projectors and screens will be provided by MWERA in most presentation rooms. Presenters needing additional A/V equipment are responsible for arranging such with the hotel at the presenter's own additional expense.

MWERA reserves the right to reproduce and distribute summaries and abstracts of all accepted proposals, including making such works available in a printed Program Abstract, through the MWERA website, and in press releases promoting the Annual Meeting and the organization. *As a condition of acceptance all authors of papers accepted to the 2003 Annual Meeting explicitly grant MWERA the right to reproduce their work's summary and/or abstract in these ways.* Such limited distribution does not preclude any subsequent publication of the work by the author(s).

Authors of accepted proposals assume the ethical and professional responsibility to appear at the Annual Meeting and to participate in their presentation or assigned session. When circumstances preclude the author(s) from doing so, it is the responsibility of the author to arrange a suitable substitute and to notify the Program Chair in advance.

Divisions

A - Administration and Leadership
This division is concerned with research, theory, development, and the improvement of practice in the organization and administration of education. Chair: Randall L. Turk, 1845 Fairmount Ave., Witchita State University, Wichita, KS 67220-0142, Randy.Turk@wichita.edu

B - Curriculum Studies
This division is concerned with curriculum and instructional practice, theory, and research. Chair: Nancy Saunders, Indiana Wesleyan University, 4301 W. Riverside, Muncie, IN 47304, ngsaunders@comcast.net

C - Learning and Instruction
This division is concerned with theory and research on human abilities, learning styles, individual differences, problem solving, and other cognitive factors. Chair: Gregory P. Montalvo, Department of Educational and Interdisciplinary Studies, 80 Horrabin Hall, 1 University Circle, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455, gp-montalvo@wiu.edu

D - Measurement and Research Methodology
This division is concerned with measurement, statistical methods, and research design applied to educational research. Chair: Beverly J. Dretzke, Department of Psychology, 105 Garfield Ave., PO box 4004, University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire, Eau Claire, WI 54702-4004, dretzkbj@uwec.edu

E - Counseling and Development
This division is concerned with the understanding of human development, special education, and the application and improvement of counseling theories, techniques, and training strategies. Chair: Thomas J. Cody, Department of Educational and Interdisciplinary Studies, RM 80N Horrabin Hall, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455-1390, Tj-cody@wiu.edu

F - History and Philosophy
This division is concerned with the findings and methodologies of historical research in education. Chair: Rebecca P. Butler, Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL 60115, rbutler@niu.edu

G - Social Context of Education
This division is concerned with theory, practice, and research on social, moral, affective, and motivational characteristics and development, especially multicultural perspectives. Aimin Wang, EDP, 118 McGuffey Hall, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056, wanga@muohio.edu

H - School Evaluation and Program Development
This division is concerned with research and evaluation to improve school practice, including program planning and implementation. Chair: Isadore Newman, 2995 Stanley Road, Akron, OH 44333, inewman@uakron.edu

I - Education in the Professions
This division is concerned with educational practice, research, and evaluation in the professions (e.g., medicine, nursing, public health, business, law, and engineering). Chair: Francine Michel, Reassure America, 2220 Canton St. Apt. 108, Dallas, TX, 75201, Michel.27@att.net

J - Postsecondary Education
This division is concerned with a broad range of issues related to two-year, four-year, and graduate education. Chair: Katrina Daytner, Horrabin Hall 80J, 1 University Circle, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455, Km-daytner@wiu.edu

K - Teaching and Teacher Education
This division is concerned with theory, practice, and research related to teaching at all levels and in-service and pre-service teacher education, including field experience supervision and mentoring. Chair: Hema Ramanathan, Middle/Secondary Dept., 4600 Sunset Avenue, Butler University, Indianapolis, IN 46208-3485, hramanat@butler.edu

Important Dates

Proposal Submission Deadline	**May 1, 2003**
Notification of Acceptance	July 15, 2003
Papers to Session Chairs/Discussants	September 19, 2003
Meeting Registration and Hotel Reservations	September 24, 2003
MWERA 2003 Annual Meeting	October 15-18, 2003

Guidelines for Submitting a Proposal

Session Format Descriptions

Paper Presentation

Paper sessions are intended to allow presenters the opportunity to make short, relatively formal presentations in which they overview their papers to an audience. Three to five individual papers dealing with related topics are grouped into a single session running from 1.5 to 2 hours. The presenter(s) of each paper is(are) allowed approximately 15 minutes to present the highlights of the paper. A single Session Discussant is allowed approximately 15 minutes, following all papers, for comments and critical review. A Session Chair moderates the entire session. Presenters are expected to provide complete copies of their papers to all interested audience members.

Roundtable Discussion/Poster

Roundtable Discussion/Poster sessions are intended to provide opportunities for interested individuals to participate in a dialogue with other interested individuals and the presenter(s) of the paper. Presenters are provided a small table around which interested individuals can meet to discuss the paper. Presenters may elect to provide small, table-top poster-type displays, ancillary handouts, or other table-top A/V materials to augment their discussions. Interested individuals are free to move into and out of these discussions/posters as they wish. Presenters are expected to make available complete copies of the paper on which the roundtable discussion/poster was focused.

Symposium

A symposium is intended to provide an opportunity for examination of specific problems or topics from a variety of perspectives. Symposium organizers are expected to identify the topic or issue, identify and ensure the participation of individual speakers who will participate in the session, prepare any necessary materials for the symposium, and Chair the session. It is suggested, though not required, that the speakers or symposium organizer will provide interested individuals with one (or more) papers relevant to, reflective of, or drawn from the symposium.

Workshop

Workshops are intended to provide an extended period of time during which the workshop leader helps participants develop or improve their ability to perform some process (e.g. how to provide clinical supervision, using the latest features of the Internet, or conduct an advanced statistical analysis). Organizers may request from 1.5 to 3 hours, and are responsible for providing all necessary materials for participants. Many workshops are scheduled for Wednesday afternoon, although others may be scheduled throughout the conference. Organizers may, if they wish, receive an honorarium based upon the number of paid participants in their workshop and the fee schedule.

Alternative Session

The form, topics, and format of alternative sessions are limited only by the imagination and creativity of the organizer. These options are intended to afford the most effective method or approach to disseminating scholarly work of a variety of types. Proposals for alternative sessions will be evaluated on their appropriateness to the topic and audience, their suitability to meet the limitations of time, space, and expense for MWERA, and the basic quality or value of the topic. The organizer of alternative sessions is responsible for all major participants or speakers, developing and providing any necessary materials, and conducting or mediating the session. Because a variety of approaches may be proposed within this category, alternative session proposals should include a brief rationale for the alternative being proposed.

Best Practices Forum

The "Best Practices" sessions are intended to provide opportunities for individuals or groups to present "best" or "promising" practices impacting both K-12 and higher education. These sessions highlight unique and innovative programs that have demonstrated promise for improving and enhancing educational practice. Presenters will be grouped by similar topics to facilitate discussion between and among the groups and audience. Presenters are expected to make available complete copies of the paper on which the "Best Practices" session focused.

Submitted Content

Summary

Summaries for **Paper** and **Roundtable Discussion/Poster** proposals should explicitly address as many of the following as appropriate, preferably in this order: (1) Objectives, goals, or purposes; (2) Perspective(s) and/or theoretical framework; (3) Methods and/or techniques (data source, instruments, procedures); (4) Results and conclusions; and (5) Educational and/or scientific importance of the work.

Summaries for **Symposium, Workshop, and Alternative Session and Best Practices Forum** proposals should explicitly address as many of the following as appropriate, preferably in this order: [1] Descriptive title of the session; [2] Objective, goals and purposes of the session; [3] Importance of the topic, issue, or problem; [4] Explanation of the basic format or structure of the session; [5] Listing of the Presenter and Co-Presenter(s), with an explanation of each person's relevant background and role in the session; [6] Anticipated audience and kind of audience involvement.

Abstract

The abstract should be 100 - 150 words. The abstracts of accepted papers will be published in the *MWERA 2003 Annual Meeting Abstracts* book, and will be available on the MWERA website. Use clear, precise language, which can be understood by readers outside your discipline.

Session Descriptors

Ability Grouping	Educational Policy	Performance Assessment
Accountability	Educational Reform	Philosophy
Accreditation	Elementary Schools	Physical Education
Achievement	Equating	Planning
Action Research	Equity	Politics
Adaptive Testing	Ethics	Postsecondary Education
Administration	Ethnicity	Principals
Admissions	Evaluation	Private Education
Adolescence	Experimental Design	Problem Solving
Adult Education/Development	Facilities	Professional Development
Affective Education	Factor Analysis	Program Evaluation
African-American Education	Faculty Development	Psychometrics
Aging	Family/Home Education	Qualitative Research
Anthropology	Finance	Race
Aptitude	Gay/Lesbian Studies	Reading
Artificial Intelligence	Gender Studies	Research Methodology
Arts Education	Generalizability Theory	Research Utilization
Asian Education	Gifted Education	Restructuring
Assessment	Governance	Retention
At-Risk Students	High Schools	Rural Education
Attitude	Hispanic Education	School/Teacher Effectiveness
Attribution	History	Science Education
Bilingual/Bicultural	Indian Education	Self-Concept
Business Education	Indicators/Information Systems	Social Class
Career Development	Individual Differences	Social Context
Case Studies	Information Processing	Social Processes/Development
Certification/Licensure	Instructional Design/Development	Social Studies Education
Child Development	Instructional Practices	Sociology
Classroom Management	Instructional Technology	Special Education
Classroom Research	Intelligence	Staff Development
Clinical Education	International Education/Studies	Standard Setting
Cognition	Item Response Theory (IRT)	Statistics
Cognitive Processes/Develop	Language Comprehension/Devel	Stress/Coping
Collaboration	Language Processes	Structural Modeling
Community Colleges	Law/Legal	Student Behavior/Attitude
Comparative Education	Leadership	Student Cognition
Compensatory Education	Learning Environments	Student Knowledge
Comprehension	Learning Processes/Strategies	Student Teaching
Computer Applications	Life-Span Development	Studying
Computerized Testing	Literacy	Supervision
Computers and Learning	Literature	Survey Research
Conceptual Change	Mainstreaming	Teacher Assessment
Constructivism	Mathematics Education	Teacher Characteristics
Continuing Education	Measurement	Teacher Cognition
Cooperative Learning	Media	Teacher Education/Development
Counseling	Medical Education	Teacher Knowledge
Counselor Training/Supervision	Memory	Teacher Research
Critical Theory	Mentoring	Teaching Context
Critical Thinking	Meta-Analysis	Technology
Cross-Cultural Studies	Metacognition	Testing
Curriculum	Middle Schools	Test Theory/Development
Data Analysis	Military Education	Textbooks
Decision Making	Minorities	Tutoring
Demography	Moral Education/Development	Urban Education
Desegregation	Motivation	Validity/Reliability
Differential Item Functioning	Museum Education	Vocabulary
Dimensionality	NAEP	Vocational Education
Dropouts	Networking	Women's Issues
Early Childhood	Organization Theory/Change	Work
Economics of Education	Peer Interaction/Friendship	Writing

The 2002 Annual Meeting
of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association

A. William Place
Program Chair
University of Dayton

The association broadened and expanded its horizons in one way by moving the meeting to Columbus, Ohio. Even more salient was the expansion of topics that were connected to the rest of our theme—*Still Pursuing Diversity*. From the comments that I received, the membership seemed pleased with the hospitality of the hotel and the city of Columbus. The move saved the association and individual attendees considerable money, allowed us to provide some amenities, such as coffee and Danish or muffins each morning, and improved culinary selections at the receptions which were not affordable in previous years.

The meeting was a success due to the hard work of many people that I wish to thank. First, we thank the division chairs and co-chairs for seeking submissions and reviewers and for all the work needed at that level to prepare the program. Jeff Hecht once again showed his deep caring and commitment for MWERA by generously serving as the webmaster, giving countless hours of work to make the program a success. As always, Jean Pierce ensured that registration went well. Thanks are also due to the graduate students who helped out from the University of Dayton. Carmen Giebelhaus, our president and Bob Barcikowski, president-elect kept us organized. I would like to thank all who helped put the meeting together—the presenters, reviewers, discussants, session chairs, the Association Council and Officers. Perhaps, the most important aspect of the meeting was the great dialogue that went on throughout so many of the sessions and continued in the halls and foyer.

Presidential Address

The "fireside chat" with Dr. Maria Luis Gonzalez started us off with a lively and free flowing discussion. After a group of early morning sessions Dr. Gonzalez helped us expand our thoughts and cross new conceptual borders with a well received keynote address at 9:30 Thursday morning. Division meetings, paper sessions and round tables filled the rest of the time Thursday. On Thursday morning, Keith McNeil from New Mexico State University was the Division H invited speaker and Jay Thompson from Ball State University was the Division B invited speaker. Division D also had an invited speaker, Tracy McDonald of Perseus Development Corporation, on Thursday afternoon.

Friday morning started off early with more Division meetings and paper sessions. Division A had I. Philip Young from the University of California—Davis as their invited speaker. Friday's Luncheon Address featured Dr. Cynthia A. Tyson of the Ohio State University. Dr. Tyson kept us interested and excited even without discussing the soon-to-be national champion football team. Her thought-provoking address, *From Hegemony to Liberation*, and remarks focused on a social justice framework. In addition to paper presentations, this year's meeting featured several workshops throughout the annual meeting. One of eight workshops was on Friday when presenter, Mary Bendixen-Noe, The Ohio State University, gave a brief overview of the Reggio Emilia approach to early childhood education and the group visited C.O.S.I. to view the *100 Languages of Children* exhibit.

On Saturday October 19th, Carmen R. Giebelhaus gave the presidential address which provided a framework and involved the audience in a discussion of *Using Assessment: to Inform Instruction.* The Editorial Board of the Mid-Western Educational Researcher also met on Saturday morning with Mary Bendixen-Noe introducing the new editors—Jim Salzman and Jane Zaharias from Cleveland State University.

The 2003 Program Chair, Janet Holt, and I listened to attendees' comments about the 2002 Annual Meeting at the Conference Planning and Feedback session Saturday morning. Feedback was helpful as the conference planning for 2003 began. If you would like to be involved, contact Janet Holt and look for this year's call for proposals, it is all web based submissions. I'm looking forward to seeing each of you in Columbus again next October!

Presidential Address and Reception

Presidential Reception

Professors Negotiating Borders: The Courage to Lead*

María Luísa González
affiliation

Welcome to the annual conference of Midwest Educational Research Association. Twelve years ago, I felt the same way that many of you are probably feeling, not knowing anyone or just a few people. Little did I know that a while later, I would be addressing you as the keynote speaker for this most distinguished consortium of professors of educational research.

The two main areas I will cover today are (a) a concept of professors of educational research as borderlanders and (b) a description of how we as university professors play a role in leadership. While we teach and conduct our research we oftentimes forget our roles as leaders.

In order to focus on the children in Pk-12 classrooms and our location in higher education settings, I propose the need to negotiate borders, not simply cross them. Because there are numerous kinds of borders, we are all borderlanders living on borders. It is up to us to transform borders to better meet the needs of each side, with one goal in mind, for all of us, it is children.

To best illustrate this concept, I will borrow from the work of a well-known Chicana author Gloria Andzaldúa, and one of the most respected sociologists, an expert on borders, Oscar J. Martínez. Andzaldúa (1987) defines borders as a confluence of two or more cultures or groups or where people of different races or experiences inhabit a common area. On the other hand, Martínez (1998) describes a border as:

> a line that separates one nation from another or, in the case of internal entities, one providence or locality from another. The essential functions of a border are to keep people in their own space and to prevent, control, or regulate interactions among them. A borderland is a region that lies adjacent to a border. (p. 5)

For purposes of this speech, borderland and border will be used interchangeably.

I am a product of the border. I am what we call in Spanish a *fronteriza*. Interestingly, the exact translation of the word border in Spanish is *frontera* or *frontier*. It is this sense of the meaning that we will keep in mind as we discuss the different interactions that take place in the Borderlands Interaction Model (Martínez, 1998) that I will soon present to you. We will be exploring new frontiers or trying to reach these "frontiers" with a different perspective.

I was born in Hollywood, California. Yes, you heard correctly Hollywood, California. My family's was a migration opposite to many. My parents decided that they were called back to the border, to the Mexican side. The children

of revolutionary figures from Mexico, they decided to move to Juárez, Mexico, across from El Paso, Texas. Now this was a major anomaly, given that both had been born and raised on the U.S. side of the border. Thus, I grew up in an urban city, of more than one million people on the Mexican side of the border, crossing the bridge that connected the two cities every day for 21 years of schooling. I always kept one foot in one country and the other, figuratively speaking, on the other side. To the Mexicans I was considered very Americanized. My friends' parents were shocked that I could date at age 16 without a chaperone. Ironically, in the US I was viewed as very Mexican. Instead of taking sandwiches for lunch I took burritos. Mexican food was not as popular then as it is now.

Little did I realize that these early experiences with marginalization and living in a developing country, while at the same time crossing into an industrialized nation on a daily basis, witnessing hunger and oppression on both sides, would imprint the professional mission I feel today: to serve children from marginalized groups. I have always found strength in understanding both sides of an issue. These multiple perspectives have helped me thrive in the public schools and survive in higher education.

When I moved out of the Juárez-El Paso milieu, borders continued to follow me. I feel that life on the border prepared me for the personal and professional life I have led as an adult. Martínez (1998) explained that borderlanders live and function in several different worlds. These worlds include:

> the world of their national culture, the world of the border environment, the world of their ethnic group if they are members of a minority population, and the world of the foreign culture on the other side of the boundary [and that] considerable versatility is required to be an active participant in all of these universes, including the ability to be multilingual and multicultural. By contrast, individuals from interior zones who live in homogeneous environments have no need to develop such multifaceted human proficiencies, or to be knowledgeable and sensitive to the perspectives of other peoples. (p. 20)

Martínez (1998) described a sense of "otherness" that occurs in borderlands. This experience is most real to those of us who have belonged to "other worlds"; that is, we came to higher education with former professional lives. For example, we become borderlanders when we move out of Pk-12 classrooms. This same phenomenon followed us as we moved from roles as school site-leaders to central office

positions, and then into the world of academe. One foot remained in PK-12 schools and the other in postsecondary education, straddling the worlds of administration and leadership. We continue to maintain the sense of "otherness" because we can still feel what it is like to be a principal, a teacher or a doctoral student. More importantly, we try to never lose sight of children and how the adults, who are supposed to work for them in education, impact their very existence.

I invite you to extend the practice of leadership into our higher education settings. It is not enough to simply preach, teach, and research; we must practice leadership. This is the reason for my asking you to take a brief sojourn into how we, as professors of educational administration, are borderlanders negotiating different borders. Let me borrow again from Martínez to explain the issues of living on different borders and the idea of borderland interactions. Through this model, I will offer my perspective as a professor and discuss the directions I see our profession taking.

In his book *Border People: Life and Society in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands* (1998), Martínez categorizes borderlands in order to understand the type of cross-border movements and interactions created by borders. There are features each border creates and four types of borderlands interactions are identified: alienated borderlands, co-existent borderlands, interdependent borderlands, and integrated borderlands (1998).

I will discuss how each type of interaction can apply to certain situations in our own profession and how these interactions can offer direction to some of the changes that have taken place and still need to appear in our organization. Please bear in mind that I have taken liberties in applying the model to our world of the professoriate. However, I must reinforce the fact that there will always be borders and the interactions taking place within them define our progress on issues that continue to challenge us. The first borderland we will visit is the alienated borderland.

Alienated Borderlands in the Professoriate

Friction-ridden interactions reign in alienated borderlands. The border is "functionally closed, and cross-border interaction is totally or almost totally absent. Residents of each country interact as strangers" (Martínez, 1998, p. 7). How does this concept of alienation apply to our profession and within our own departments?

Many of us arrive at the portals of academe wanting to make a difference. We come with different backgrounds. Sometimes within our own departments, we marginalize each other. We may unknowingly develop alienated borders. For instance, those of us with extensive public school experience may look upon "others" as not being in touch with the reality of the schools. In turn, those who have opted to be professors without Pk-12 experience may tend to look at the "others" as too practitioner-oriented or not scholarly enough.

Often it is an issue of intellectual and/or experiential arrogance. Let us dissolve this alienation. Either way, it is the student in the classroom we need to impact.

It is time we think of ourselves as a community. We need to erase borderland interactions that are divisive and fragmentary. Sometimes these interactions are manifested by the manner in which we conduct our inquiry. It does not matter to the principals in probationary schools, who are trying to provide the best education possible in the most at-risk of settings, whether our research is based on empiricism or is conducted qualitatively. They want our support, they need our help, and we can play an integral role through sound research that supports best practices.

How else can we build on the concept of a scholarly community? Let us expand this concept by presenting the issue of diversity in the professoriate. This is an important aspect to include because it is part of the theme for this conference. I am not here to count the numbers. All one has to do is to look around the different sessions or to undergo searches in our own departments to realize there are few professors of color in our field. However, I am here to discuss the quality of life within our departments that is critical to address this shortage. The book, *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success* (Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers, 2000), presented a synthesis of research regarding professors of color. The research clearly points out that faculty of color feel alienated, isolated, and excluded in the chilly climate of the ivory tower where subtle and not so subtle discrimination takes place (Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers, 2000). While the book attends to the issues of faculty of color, the same issues can be raised by faculty who come from other underrepresented groups including women, gays, lesbians, as well as any others who in some way are challenged for being different.

According to Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers (2000) several studies point out that faculty of color experience alienated borderlands because oftentimes different demands are placed on their time and energy than what is expected of other faculty members.

For example, faculty of color are often asked, and feel compelled to serve on more committees and conduct more service activities than white faculty members. Faculty of color feel they are expected to accept committee invitations, particularly when an opportunity to address minority issues is involved. Faculty of color find that research on minority issues is not considered legitimate work, particularly if articles are published in journals that are not mainstream. Research interests of faculty of color are denigrated, either because the research area is not traditional or because the faculty themselves are seen as inferior due to race or ethnicity. Faculty of color report that colleagues expect them to be less qualified or less likely to make significant contributions in research. Some have noted a

pervasive attitude of complacency: the belief that hiring one person of color in a department is sufficient. This contributes further to the isolation of being "the one" in a department. (p. 25-27)

Kulis and Miller's study (as cited in Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers, 2000) declared that tokenism "should be identified and abolished" and the "concomitants of tokenism, such as committee overload, professional isolation, and marginality should be monitored and redressed" (p. 28).

However, it is not enough to talk about diversity. One must also address multicultural issues in our programs. In our course content it is not sufficient to bring in readings and discussions of diversity and multiculturalism. We must ensure that our readings are inclusive of researchers of color. For example, in my field of educational administration I would ask my colleagues, how many of us include works by our esteemed colleagues of color including: Judy Alston, James Bliss, Marmette Benokmn, Paula Cordeiro, Michael Dantley, Ernestine Enomoto, Mark Gooden, Barbara Jackson, Kofi Lomotey, Gerardo López, Rosita Marcano, Larry McNeal, Sylvia Mendez-Morse, Khaula Murtadha, Grayson Noley, Rodney Ogawa, Flora Ida Ortiz, Martha Ovando, Robert Peña, Larry Parker, Pedro Reyes, Tina Reyes, Alan Shoho, Marilyn Tallerico, or Linda Tillman, to name but a few?

Another area to consider in building a scholarly community and trying to eliminate the interactions that promote a borderland of alienation is to study the conduct of hiring processes. Care should be taken not to promote alienated borderlands when we go through faculty searches in our institutions. For example, in a study conducted by Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers (2000), a respondent:

observed interviews for positions in urban education and reported being very mindful of the candidate's knowledge or ignorance of diverse scholars, writers, and practitioners in the field. In "job talks," candidates should display knowledge of work done by diverse scholars in the field. Otherwise, their thorough knowledge of their field as well as their ability to contribute to an inclusive departmental environment should be questioned. (p. 14-15)

As we undergo any hiring process we should be mindful to include guidelines and expectations that demonstrate a candidate's beliefs relative to inclusivity and multiculturalism. Since we are about the learning of all students it is not enough for the complexion of our faculty to change, our ideologies should reflect these changes as well.

Coexistent Borderlands in the Professoriate

The second type of borderland interaction is coexistent borderlands. In coexistent borderlands "stability is an on-and-off proposition. The border remains slightly open, allowing for the development of limited binational interaction.

Residents of each country deal with each other as casual acquaintances, but borderlanders develop closer relationships" (Martínez, 1998, p. 7). I will begin with an exploration of the relationships between practitioners in the field and those in higher education.

Many times in our own departments this type of borderland still exists. Although we meet at the table to address the issues of educational preparation and shortages, organizations representing higher education sit on one side of the table while practitioner-oriented groups sit on the other side. As in coexistent borderlands, practitioner groups have developed closer relationships among each other, and academic groups have done the same. What we need now is a focus on efforts that enable us to face educational issues together. We must not remain mere casual acquaintances. The educational success of all students remains an untenable cause until all at the table realize that they are part of the solution. Scapegoating and finger pointing are wastes of time (Young, Petersen, and Short, 2001). Rather, energy should be concentrated on realizing that we are one educational pipeline, identifying the leaks, and working persistently in unison to ensure that the beginning and the ending of the schooling process are successfully negotiated by all.

While we may experience coexistent borderlands with practitioner groups, the same experiences can exist within our own institutions. In our own hallowed halls we have often kept to our own side of the fence. That is, many times we have isolated ourselves from involvement needed with other programs in our colleges. Where do we include courses in counseling, in bilingual education, in special education, and others to better address the needs of diverse learners in our schools? By the same token, do those in other fields take our courses given that the school reform literature expects that teachers, alongside all educators, should be leaders in their own right?

Our focus on leading and learning directs us to understand that this type of coexistent borderland interaction is not necessarily best for the children. If we want to impact their education then practitioners, hand-in-hand with academicians in the multiple fields of education, must go beyond coexistence. It is partnership that we must seek within a community of leadership. This sense of partnership will be evident as we visit the third type of borderland interaction, the Interdependent Borderlands.

Interdependent Borderlands in the Professoriate

Interdependent borderlands are characterized by a sense that, stability prevails most of the time. Economic and social complementarities prompts increased cross-border interaction, leading to expansion of the borderlands. Borderlanders carry on friendly and cooperative relationships (Martínez, 1998, p. 7). It is within this type of borderland that I would like for us to visit the interactions taking place between our own students and us as professors.

Sadly, our programs continue to lack the diverse populations that we need to have. This shortage links us directly with our public school counterparts. We must recall the image of a pipeline to describe the links between the availability of faculty of color, the training of minority graduate students, the accessibility of undergraduate education for minorities, and the success of minority students at the elementary and secondary school levels. The presence of leaks in this pipeline provides one explanation for under representation at all levels (Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers, 2000, p. 23). It is critical that we combine leadership with learning, so that we have success for all students in order to augment the pool of minority candidates in our own programs. Further, several studies "indicate that the problem of under representation is one of supply and that the solution is to increase the number of doctoral recipients of color" (Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers, p. 23). We all know this to be a critical need, which brings in the next point relative to our negotiating the borderlands involving interactions with students. How we interact with our own students is crucial to the success of our programs.

Rendón (2000), a renowned scholar in the area of minority persistence and retention in higher education and one of the most recent presidents of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, wrote a piece entitled, "Academics of the Heart". In it, she describes relationship-centered teaching that brings meaning and connection to learning to foster a sense of community. Rendón proposes developing "a new model reconceptualizing traditions that have worked against community, the balance of reason and spirit, and the education of the whole person in higher education" (p. 3). She believes we must validate our learning communities by accommodating multiple views and revering varied ways of knowing. She also feels that our role is to help students see themselves as powerful learners early in programs by ensuring that core curriculum is inclusive of diverse groups within higher education. Rendón further explains that having only one way of knowing is limiting in any environment. "We must open our learning community to engage those voices that have been traditionally silenced such as those of women, people of color, gays, lesbians, and bi-sexuals" (p. 4).

Moreover, Rendón reminds us that learning environments allow for "error, imperfection, and reflection" (2000, p. 4). Let me share one simple example that brings this idea to light. When I asked a student from another department what impressed her of all the things her faculty does, she mentioned the kind notes one professor wrote to students who failed an important exam, encouraging them to not give up. How many of us are available to students even beyond our office hours, or do we still see them as interruptions to our research agendas? How do we involve our students as partners in team teaching courses or in undertaking collaborative research projects? Do we grant them the authorship they deserve when it is important for us to be listed first? Do they join us in service activities? For many of us the interpretation of the promotion and tenure process in our own campuses limits our accessibility to students and even from work with professional organizations, particularly at state and regional levels. Little wonder that our absence in the organizations that our students usually belong to creates the sense that we simply do not care for schools and that we are out of touch. These feelings of detachment begin in our own backyards, so to speak, and carry major ramifications at the national level as well.

It is my belief that how we treat all of our students, in general, is a reflection of our commitment to the schools. Many times we replicate the same type of doctoral interactions that we experienced with our doctoral committees and advisors even when our own experiences may not have been the most positive. Yet, it is this model that we follow and expect our students to survive. Students of color may be even more vulnerable in that there may not be enough faculty members to act as their advocates, mentors, and/or role models.

Another benefit of our positive interactions with students is that this builds on social capital. In her study of three Latina superintendents, Ortiz (2001) states that social capital refers to the structure of social relations in communities in which these Latinas were successful in keeping their jobs. One of the major factors that was associated with their success was the extent and type of social networks to which these women were connected. Our success as professors rests on the extent and type of social networks to which we are connected. This aspect is especially important given the criticism that is being leveled against our programs. I firmly believe that social capital begins in our own classrooms in the form of social relations. Our students, after they graduate, are the ones who respond to the surveys that ask whether they believe they were duly prepared for their educational positions. It would be interesting to investigate the correlation between the relationship that they had with their professors, and the ratings given to their preparation programs. I still believe that the criticisms against our programs are not so much a matter of the way we prepare our students but how we have engaged and inspired them. It is not just the mind that must be impacted, but the heart as well. So then how do we go about interacting with *all* our students? It goes beyond just attracting students into academe or into our preparation programs. It is what happens once they are in them. The chilling climate that sometimes alienates professors might be the same climate that alienates students as well. This climate must change.

From the borders that need to be negotiated to bring focus on students, to the artificial ones that we create among our scholarly community, let us now move into the world of negotiating borders in our university classrooms. Please do not get me wrong. I have had to make this argument countless times. I am not talking about supplanting high standards, watering down our course content, or lowering expectations. What I am talking about is added value. Bring in relationships as a central feature of the teaching and learning processes that take place in our courses and our programs. I

have realized that one cannot reach others without building a sense of trust and strong relationships.

Our programs must highlight what is important. For instance, during admission to our educational leadership programs how do we measure potential leadership in educational settings? Should this not include the ability for sound judgment with a belief system that values leading and learning for the success of all students? Should our measure not include a strong human relations component honoring that which we teach and model? These might be better predictors of a student's leadership potential than any standardized instrument available.

In addition to the importance given to human relations in our educational programs, university professors must also accentuate and practice the importance of becoming reflective practitioners and scholars. This concept is equally important for university professors to practice. Rendón reminds us that: "Academics of the heart begin not with what we do with or for others, but with what we do with ourselves. We cannot engage the hearts of our students without knowing how to engage our own hearts" (2000, p. 5). Furthermore, she makes clear that self-reflection and contemplative introspection are a part of our own professorial practice.

Integrated Borderlands in the Professoriate

Finally, there is the integrated borderland where, stability is strong and permanent. The economies of the two countries are functionally merged, and there is unrestricted movement of people and goods across the boundary. Borderlanders perceive themselves as members of one social system (Martínez, 1998, p. 7). This is a somewhat ideal, yet attainable condition.

The integrating of borderlands and subsequent interactions should lead us to see each other as part of the same entity. Seeing ourselves as one entity is critical to our profession and the successful schooling of students.

In summary, each of us is critical in this integration process of others and us. The others are we. Although we all might not be able to be actively involved at the national level, each of us must do our share beginning at our home institution, whether our focus will be to change relationships with our own faculty, with students, or in promoting equitable treatment for people of color throughout our program's climate and content. Collaboration with those in other depart-

ments as well as with practitioners throughout our regions, including policy makers at all levels, is essential. Let us become involved in activities that integrate us with the positive energy that must be in our schools. We must begin to practice that which we preach—leadership. As professors we are leaders. We are not merely teachers, we must model leadership. We need to realize this before we expect anyone else to do so. As professors, we must build on the concept of social capital in whatever form our integrated partnerships come. These may develop with students, our Pk-12 counterparts, or policy makers. Let us capitalize on our relationships and interactions to make these an integral part of what we do.

Thank you very much for allowing me to share a few ideas with you today. I wish you a most exciting MWERA conference and may we all continue in our quest to build a cohesive community of educational borderlanders.

*Adapted from, González, M.L. (2002). Professors of educational administration: Learning and leading for the success of ALL children. *University Council of Educational Administration Review*: Winter 2002, 4-8.

References

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: La frontera-the new mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters-Aunt Lute.

Martínez, O. J. (1998). *Border people: Life and society in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands*. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.

Ortiz, F. I. (2001). Using social capital in interpreting the careers of three Latina superintendents. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *37*(1), 58-85.

Rendón, L. (2000, July-August). Academics of the heart. *About Campus*. OCLC

First Search Electronic Collections Online. Available at http://www2.oclc.org/ocle/fseco/pulish.htm.

Sotello Viernes Turner, C., and Myers, S. L., Jr. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Young, M., Peterson, G. J., and Short, P. M. (2001). *The complexity of substantive reform: A call for interdependence among key stakeholders*. Paper commissioned for the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation. Racine, WI.

From the Editors . . .

 Educational research has changed substantially over the past 25 years. Researchers are freer now than ever before to pursue a wide variety of research questions approached from diverse theoretical perspectives through the use of many different research tools. In our experience, MWERA has been an organization that encourages openness to new ideas, diverse perspectives, and a respect for others who seek answers through different lenses or with different questions. We are very pleased to participate in these efforts through our editorship of the *Mid-Western Educational Researcher* and encourage you to join us in this process. Keep sending your manuscripts, whatever your perspective or research interests and encourage others to do so. Likewise, if you have ideas for strengthening the journal, or if you wish to respond to an article you have read, write or email us. Finally, if you are interested in reviewing manuscripts for *MWER* or have an idea for a special issue on a particular topic that you would like to guest edit, please do not hesitate to contact us.

 As regards the future, we look forward to a continuing conversation that strengthens and encourages diversity in educational research. In addition, we hope to broaden the reach of *MWER* by making it even more accessible in electronic form as an augment to its current availability as a printed publication.

 In conclusion, we would like to thank the outgoing editors, Mary K. Bendixen-Noe and Kim Metcalf, for their support and advice during the editorship transition. Their vision of the journal as vehicle for promoting diversity and dialogue has informed and influenced our own thinking as well as that of the broader field. We applaud them for the tremendous time and thought that they put into bringing this vision alive in the pages of *MWER* and only hope that we can as capably serve the needs of MWERA and its members.

 James A. Salzman and Jane A. Zaharias

 Cleveland State University

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

The Ohio State University
2500 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210