

Editors' Introduction

As scholars of an applied and interdisciplinary field, education researchers regularly define and redefine educational practices and theories. In this dynamic area of scholarship, even novel or critical ideas quickly infiltrate the educational research canon. Dominant frameworks, even those that are themselves challenges to prior conceptions or understandings, are continually criticized, adapted, and extended to incorporate new perspectives that potentially move policy, practice, and theory forward.

In each of the six articles featured in this issue, Volume 4, Issue 1 of the *Berkeley Review of Education*, the authors critique or extend dominant conceptions of educational practice or policy, often developing new theoretical ideas in the process. We begin with three pieces that challenge dominant frameworks about student ability and interests with important implications for reframing teaching and learning. First, Tom Humphries's conceptual piece, "Schooling in American Sign Language: A Paradigm Shift from a Deficit Model to a Bilingual Model in Deaf Education," challenges dominant perspectives of deafness and American Sign Language (ASL). Humphries's piece tracks the theoretical shift from a deficit model of ASL to a bilingual model and the implications of this shift for English literacy. And in "Adolescents as Readers of Social Studies: Examining the Relationship between Youth's Everyday and Social Studies Literacies and Learning," Darin B. Stockdill and Elizabeth B. Moje challenge dominant beliefs about student disengagement with social studies, providing qualitative evidence that students *are* interested in social-studies issues in their everyday lives. Stockdill and Moje suggest that educators explore ways to connect students' interests to social studies course content. In "I Always Knew I was Gifted: Mexican-Origin Ghetto Nerds and the Mestizaje of M.I. Theory," Juan F. Carrillo challenges dominant notions of intelligence, extending Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences to incorporate the political, cultural, social, and aesthetic dimensions embodied by the "ghetto nerd."

We then take a step back from the classroom level to explore teacher education programs. In their article, "When Claiming to Teach for Social Justice is Not Enough: Majoritarian Stories of Race, Difference, and Meritocracy," Kara Mitchell Viesca, Aubrey Scheopner Torres, Joan Barnatt, and Peter Piazza conduct an in-depth case study that examines the impact of dominant conceptions of race and effective pedagogy on a teacher's beliefs and practices. They find that social justice orientated pre-service teacher education programs alone fail to unseat beliefs and practices that reproduce racially unequal schooling.

Finally, we close with two articles that challenge dominant perspectives of education policy. In "New Orleans Education Reform: A Guide for Cities or a Warning for Communities? (Grassroots Lessons Learned, 2005–2012)," Kristen Buras and the Urban South Grassroots Research Collaborative challenge dominant narratives about the post-Katrina New Orleans reform landscape. And in "Governance through Concepts: The OECD and the Construction of 'Competence' in Norwegian Education Policy," Sølvi Mausethagen applies interpretivist approaches to policy analysis to examine how transnational organizations exert influence over national education policy through concepts rather than other more explicit means, challenging dominant perspectives of what governance entails. Next, we examine each of these themes in more detail.

2 *Editors' Introduction*

In “Schooling in American Sign Language: A Paradigm Shift from a Deficit Model to a Bilingual Model in Deaf Education,” Tom Humphries examines how the development and implementation of a bilingual American Sign Language (ASL) and English training program at the University of California, San Diego represents a dramatic shift in deaf education, moving from a historically sedimented deficit orientation of deaf students to a socioculturally nuanced perspective that acknowledges the legitimacy of ASL and the right of the Deaf community to define and contribute to deaf education. The piece contextualizes this shift with rich discussions of current research on bilingual and multimodal learning as well as perspectives from Deaf community members on how best to educate deaf children. After an in-depth discussion of the experimental program’s inception and design, Humphries concludes with recommendations for how this pedagogical shift can be sustained and expanded in order to better serve the historically underserved deaf and hard-of-hearing community.

In “Adolescents as Readers of Social Studies: Examining the Relationship between Youths’ Everyday and Social Studies Literacies and Learning,” Darin B. Stockdill and Elizabeth B. Moje examine the relationship between student engagement and social studies literacy. Using a sociocultural perspective, the authors explore the possible connections between adolescent reading interests and practices, both in and out of school, and social studies learning. This study draws on data from a sample of 802 secondary students from five schools in one urban community. The authors’ analysis of survey and interview data indicates that adolescents often perceive social studies education in school as boring and irrelevant. However, when interviewed, a subsample of students reported an interest in texts related to aspects of their identities, including ethnic/racial, immigrant, urban, youth, and gendered identities, as well as themes of struggle and conflict. The authors argue that while students might not find the subject of social studies interesting, they are drawn to social, historical, cultural, and political concepts, issues, and texts. It should be noted that the authors do not advocate a curriculum of student interest. Instead, they argue that student interests *are already* historical, cultural, social, political, and economic, and that to engage adolescents and extend their social studies literacy practices, we need to help students discover the relevance of social studies to their daily lives.

In “I Always Knew I was Gifted: Mexican-Origin Ghetto Nerds and the Mestizaje of M.I. Theory,” Juan F. Carrillo introduces the concept of Mestiz@ Theory of Intelligences (MTI) to widen and challenge dominant definitions of intelligence. Carrillo begins by examining the limitations of Howard Gardner’s canonical theory of Multiple Intelligences and pushes for new measures of intelligence that highlight the assets possessed by working-class Mexican-origin students. Drawing from interviews with three male scholars of Mexican origin, this qualitative study argues that “successful” working-class Latinos are shaped by their marginalized racial, gendered, class, and migratory experiences. Their abilities to traverse through decades of schooling and remain committed to social justice, while being discriminated against and undervalued, indicate that they embody forms of intelligence that should be recognized and appreciated. The article contributes to current debates regarding the underperformance of working-class Latino male students, urging more complex definitions of intelligence that incorporate and reflect the talents and experiences of these marginalized students.

In “When Claiming to Teach for Social Justice is Not Enough: Majoritarian Stories of Race, Difference, and Meritocracy,” Kara Mitchell Viesca, Aubrey Scheopner Torres, Joan Barnatt, and Peter Piazza use the ideas from Critical Race Theory (CRT), namely *majoritarian stories*, to investigate how dominant Whiteness beliefs held by pre-service teachers remain unchallenged by teacher education programs, even those which intend to promote social justice orientations in their students. They use a case study methodology to rigorously examine the statements and actions of Rebecca Rosenberg throughout her student teaching and first year of teaching, through previously identified stories that CRT research has indicated are used to justify perpetuation of racist actions. This important article re-examines the familiar story of the struggling new urban teacher and uses rich and clear examples to communicate the limitation of social justice education alone to influence teacher belief and practice. The authors conclude with a powerful series of recommendations arguing the necessity of integrating instruction aimed to disrupt hegemonic beliefs of Whiteness into teacher education in order to achieve social justice goals.

Next, in “New Orleans Education Reform: A Guide for Cities or a Warning for Communities? (Grassroots Lessons Learned, 2005-2012),” Kristen Buras and members of the Urban South Grassroots Research Collaborative critique a different type of majoritarian story: the dominant narrative regarding the New Orleans education reforms that have occurred since 2005. Drawing on their years of experience in New Orleans, as well as the scholarly research on the reforms, the authors articulate their critique of the human capital and charter development policies that have been enacted since 2005, examining the implications of these “lessons learned” for the communities within and beyond New Orleans. They situate their work as a response to a New School for New Orleans’s report, *A Guide for Cities*, and other reports on the New Orleans education system that have been written by advocates of the reforms and recently gained national attention. A postscript by Adrienne Dixon, Ashana Bigard, and students of Walter Cohen High School examines the recent slew of decisions made regarding the fate of Cohen High, which were without consultation or input from students, parents, or community members, providing further evidence of the impact of such educational reforms on local communities.

Finally, in “Governance through Concepts: The OECD and the Construction of ‘Competence’ in Norwegian Education Policy,” Sølvi Mausestagen uses an interpretivist approach to policy study to analyze key Norwegian policy texts and documents the influence of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development’s (OECD) conceptions of competence on Norwegian policy and practice. In particular, she highlights a form of *soft governance*, or what she calls “governance through concepts,” whereby ideas from international organizations without formal authority “gain support and are disseminated through, for example, reputation, rearticulation, quotation, and cross-referencing” (p. 167). She argues that the OECD’s influence was evidenced by a greater emphasis on, and mention of, “competence” in Norwegian policy texts, as well as a shift in the meaning of the term. Competence for students and teachers became individualistic, outcome-based, and measurable. She concludes by exploring the implications of these policy shifts for equity and social inclusion in Norway. In this way, Mausestagen contributes to the broader literature on how ideas and knowledge are

4 *Editors' Introduction*

disseminated across and within national contexts, with a particular emphasis on meaning making and the role of ideas, values, and norms as represented in the language of policy texts.

Together, these six pieces help us to critique dominant understandings of student intelligence and motivation, social justice teacher preparation programs, and education reform and policy. From the classroom to transnational policy arenas, these dominant understandings and the authors' critiques have important implications for equity, diversity, and democracy.

We invite pieces that continue and extend the conversations started by the authors in this issue as well as work that starts new conversations on issues related to equity and diversity. We encourage senior and emerging scholars, practitioners, and policymakers to submit articles that address issues of educational diversity and equity from various intra/interdisciplinary perspectives. The editorial board especially welcomes submissions that provide new and diverse perspectives on pressing issues impacting schools, educational systems, and other learning environments. We also welcome a broad range of "critical" scholarship. We define as "critical" work that aims to analyze, evaluate, and examine power and dominant structures as well as work that helps us to imagine something new. As an interdisciplinary journal, we encourage scholarship that reconceptualizes and transcends academic identities, labels, and categories to synthesize knowledge across spheres and to build towards new understandings of educational processes and practices. As an open-access journal, we aim to democratize knowledge and encourage work that originates from and speaks to a wide range of scholars, practitioners, activists, and educators.

We thank the many people who have assisted in getting this issue to press: the authors, current and former board members, volunteers, reviewers, advisers, and the students and faculty members at the Graduate School of Education who have helped us in many other ways. We especially thank Dean Judith Warren Little and our faculty adviser, P. David Pearson, for their ongoing support and guidance as we broaden the scope and readership of the journal. We also thank Sabrina Soracco, Director of Academic Services at the Graduate Division, for training our editorial board to copyedit and proofread manuscripts. We thank the U.C. Berkeley Graduate School of Education, Graduate Assembly, and Associated Students of the University of California for their financial support.

The Editors

In Memory of Randi Engle

Former and current editors and staff of the *Berkeley Review of Education* mourn the passing of Professor Randi A. Engle. Professor Engle passed away on October 26, 2012 after a two-year battle with pancreatic cancer. Her passing is a loss for us and for the Berkeley community.

As a person and scholar, Randi was an exemplar of care, courage, and fairness. Her commitment to student development went beyond the lab and the classroom. Randi was a mentor to us both as students and editors, and she was instrumental in the founding of the BRE. Her dedication to the vision of a student-run academic journal at the GSE spoke to her unwavering belief that the role of educators was to help students at all levels grow and succeed. When we founded this journal, it was without hesitation that we asked Randi to be our faculty advisor, and she served in this capacity during the journal's first two years, until she became ill.

Randi's loss has left our campus, and those of us who have graduated as well, with a sense of grief, but also with a sense of inspiration as we commit to carrying forward her legacy.

Current BRE Editorial Board

Seenae Chong

Leah Faw

Emily Hellmich

Huriya Jabbar

Clare Parker

Dinorah Sanchez Loza

Danfeng Soto-Vigil Koon

Susan W. Woolley

Arturo Cortez

Olivia Flint

Laura Hernández

José Lizárraga

Marialena Rivera

Jaran Shin

Tracie Wallace

Connie Wun

Former BRE Editorial Board Members

Rebecca Anguiano

Audrey Barron

Grace Dong

Nathaniel Dumas

Shlomy Kattan

Elizabeth Matson

Aaminah Norris

Toi Sin Arvidsson

Grace Zamora

Gabino Arredondo

Irenka Dominguez-Pareto

Shayla Duda

Sera Hernandez

Ariana Mangual

Nicola McClung

Jody Sherman

Amy Stornaiuolo