

UC Berkeley

Berkeley Review of Education

Title

Editors' Introduction

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4wz881h5>

Journal

Berkeley Review of Education, 5(2)

Author

Editors, BRE

Publication Date

2015

DOI

10.5070/B85110033

Copyright Information

Copyright 2015 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Editors' Introduction

Educational spaces are defined and animated by social interaction and the contestation of values that necessarily occurs within their spheres. Districts, schools, and classrooms as well as educational policy and advocacy platforms assume unique institutional identities shaped by material and ideational forces. Within their walls, educational spaces derive physical characteristics from their students, families, and personnel and from policies and reforms that dictate the material environments surrounding schools and pedagogical practices. Educational spaces are also defined by their ideational characteristics. Ideas and their often implicit value systems are inextricably embedded within instructional and curricular approaches and are circulated by the interaction of diverse individuals who bring varied life experiences to bear within schools.

Educational scholarship works to expose the material and ideational characteristics of various educational spaces, highlighting how diverse actors engage, exercise power, and advance ideas *within* institutional spaces. In Volume 5, Issue 2 of the Berkeley Review of Education (BRE), three manuscripts and a collection of poems and essays further this scholarly tradition. The authors consider the physical and ideational spaces characterizing schools and educational policy, noting how marginalized groups experience and challenge schooling practices and structures as well as how particular approaches to schooling come to be understood as commonsensical. In particular, the pieces in this issue investigate the experiences of transnational, immigrant groups within the U.S. educational system; the cross-district enrollment processes that impede low-income and minority students from entering the space despite the illusion of more fluid borders; and the public pedagogy that serves to legitimize and normalize charter schools as an ideal policy solution despite numerous, competing educational alternatives that may be of public and policy interest. Finally, the collection of essays highlights the voices of educators, students, and scholars to reveal the power of public events and social movements that impact educational practices and experiences. While highlighting how critical ideas and events permeate and shape educational spaces, the essays also constitute the BRE's own attempt to expand the space inhabited by educational scholarship to be more informed by activism, pressing events, and often marginalized voices. Collectively, the authors provide insight into how ideas and values come to populate and characterize institutional spaces and systems.

In our opening piece, Matthew A. Witenstein and L. Erika Saito call attention to an understudied population—transnational Asian adoptees—whom they argue occupy a “third space,” straddling the culture of their birth country and the culture of their adoptive American families. Witenstein and Saito's theoretical article, *Exploring the Educational Implications of the Third Space Framework for Transnational Asian Adoptees*, highlights the unique challenges and opportunities the third space affords, paying particular attention to how educational spaces can facilitate the processes of identity exploration, understanding, and acceptance among transnational adoptees. The authors suggest that by employing practices from the critical, multicultural, and feminist pedagogical traditions, educators can more effectively support transnational adoptees' socioemotional and

academic needs. Moreover, the authors highlight the important role schools and educators play in creating inclusive spaces for students from all backgrounds and identities.

Our second piece by Helen Ganski explores how families navigate the boundaries that traditionally determine access to U.S. public school districts—and the resources and privileges that lie within or beyond those borders. In her piece, *Inter-District Public School Mobility: Common Misperceptions and a Call for Local Revival*, Ganski explores how inter-district transfer policies can prevent or allow for movement between these educational spaces and the issues of equitable access that accompany transfer policies. In her qualitative study, she examines mobility patterns of students from four districts in one California county. The piece illustrates how districts administer inter-district transfer requests and how policies play out for individuals who choose to pursue opportunities beyond their prescribed boundaries. The author highlights the need for more coordinated action between districts, as current systems are inconsistent in their interpretations and implementation. Furthermore, even well-intentioned policies can prove ineffective because the system tends to benefit knowledgeable and well-resourced parents who possess the social capital necessary to navigate district boundaries, possibly exacerbating patterns of racial and socioeconomic segregation.

Our third article, entitled *Homonormativity, Charternormativity, and Processes of Legitimation: Exploring the Affective-Spatio-Temporal-Fixed Dimensions of Marriage Equality and Charter Schools*, highlights how particular educational remedies gain traction in public and policy spheres and thus come to inhabit the ideational space surrounding educational policy. The author, Mark Stern, considers how the issues of marriage equality and charter schools have become normative and common solutions to the systematic marginalization of disenfranchised groups. Revealing how the ‘public pedagogy’ and rhetoric surrounding these debates taps into the public’s sense of how marginalized groups should act, he suggests that these policies further hegemonic ideas of marginal groups and thus are limited in their advocacy for systemic transformation. In addition to highlighting how these ideas come to populate the educational and public space, his innovative comparison of these current issues enhances the research base, expanding the space of educational research by advancing a nuanced and underexplored theoretical argument.

The issue concludes with an edited selection of the Berkeley Review of Education’s first “Call for Conversations” (CFC)—a collection of short works first published on our website in conversation with the #ferguson and #blacklivesmatter movements. As the #blacklivesmatter movement has grown and changed over time and across various forms of media, scholars and activists have weighed in with a variety of political, historical, and sociological perspectives. However, as a scholarly journal centered on issues of education and committed to supporting open dialogue about current and pressing issues in education, the BRE was interested in creating an open intellectual space that—informed by activism, pressing current events, and the mixing of diverse perspectives—would reaffirm our commitment to building community, strengthen our scholarship, and represent a new approach to tackling questions of broad social importance. These non-traditional pieces represent a broadening of the research space, allowing for more voices to engage in a wider array of expression. Thus the CFC is our attempt to break the

traditional epistemology of scholarly journals and democratize both expertise and knowledge about #blacklivesmatter.

In this effort, we began by asking, “How are you centering Ferguson in your work in educational institutions, in community spaces, with young people? How are we—as students, educators, scholars, community workers—teaching and learning around Ferguson?” Six of the pieces that these questions elicited are presented here, in an attempt to capture the range and depth of thought and feeling that this current moment has evoked from scholars, practitioners, and students. These pieces help us consider how schooling is embedded in the social, political, and cultural life of our country by examining how social movements physically and cognitively cross into educational spaces.

The Berkeley Review of Education invites pieces that continue and expand the conversations underway in this issue as well as pieces that strike up 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 while helping us to imagine something new.

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 Interim Dean Eliot Turiel, outgoing 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 thank the U.C. Berkeley Graduate School of Education, Graduate Assembly, and Associated Students of the University of California for their generous financial support.

The Editors