

le/the Journal

VOLUME 4, No. 1 | SPRING 2015 / PRINTEMPS 2015

A publication of the
Education Graduate Students Association
Association des étudiant.e.s diplômé.e.s en éducation
of the University of Ottawa

Une publication de
l'Education Graduate Students Association
Association des étudiant.e.s diplômé.e.s en éducation
de l'Université d'Ottawa

N.B. : L'emploi du masculin pour désigner des personnes n'a d'autres fins que celle d'alléger le texte.

Chers collègues et lecteurs,

Bienvenue à l'édition printemps 2015 du *le/the Journal : une publication de l'association des étudiants diplômés en éducation de l'Université d'Ottawa (EGSA-AÉDÉ)*. Lorsque j'ai lu les manuscrits soumis pour ce volume du *le/the Journal*, l'entrelacement de thèmes convergents, mais également uniques a émergé des articles de nos collègues. Si les auteurs, étudiants diplômés, partagent un attachement commun pour la poursuite de recherches innovantes en éducation, et ce, avec le plus haut niveau d'engagement, ils développent et mettent en œuvre une démarche d'enquête unique, qui leur est propre. Ainsi, ce numéro met en lumière la nature diverse des recherches menées par les étudiants au sein de la faculté, de la réflexion sur l'ontologie et la méthodologie de la recherche, à l'exploration de l'expérience des enseignants, des parents et des élèves (ou étudiants) de divers horizons

Notre premier auteur, Anton Birioukov, explore la question de l'utilisation de l'étude de cas, particulièrement critiquée pour son manque apparent de pouvoir de généralisation. Il nous offre une perspective objective quant au recours à cette dernière, critiquant ainsi les diverses objections émises dans le milieu de la recherche, fondées sur diverses perspectives épistémologiques et ontologiques. Enfin, de par sa compréhension profonde de l'étude de cas, l'auteur met en exergue ce qu'elle a à offrir ainsi que l'appréciation des contributions uniques qu'elle peut fournir aux chercheurs qualitatifs.

Notre deuxième auteur, Karen (Bouchard) O'Shea, discute du rôle complexe et sous-examiné que peuvent jouer les relations enseignant-enfant dans les relations entre pairs chez l'enfant, en particulier dans les situations de harcèlement et d'intimidation. L'auteur souligne l'importance de la modélisation, par l'enseignant, de relations par les pairs positives, et recommande que les étudiants à la formation à l'enseignement soient formés sur les techniques d'intervention contre le harcèlement et l'intimidation, mais aussi sur les différentes façons d'aborder cette problématique.

Karen Bouchard, Trista Hollweck, et Erin Kraft explorent le potentiel de croissance des approches de justice réparatrice en ce qui a trait à la victimisation par les pairs dans nos écoles. Les auteurs discutent de la manière dont les concepts de la malléabilité et de la nature figée des caractéristiques humaines peuvent avoir une

influence sur le succès des pratiques de justice réparatrice fondées sur les possibilités de changements individuels et collectifs.

Ashley Campbell parle de l'importance de la voix des peuples autochtones, des différentes perspectives et modes de savoir dans la réécriture de l'histoire du Canada à travers une exploration de l'œuvre du spécialiste indigène Thomas King. C'est en parlant d'histoire comme le « re/récit d'une histoire » que l'auteur explore le travail de King comme bouleversement du « grand récit canadien » et la nécessité d'offrir un contre-récit dans le cadre de l'éducation des générations futures.

Marie-Carène Pierre René explore le rôle des partenariats parents-enseignants, en se concentrant en particulier sur les nouveaux arrivants au Canada. À travers l'utilisation de deux études de cas, l'auteur traite des singularités des familles qui viennent au Canada dans le cadre d'une immigration économique, par opposition à ceux qui viennent en tant que réfugiés. Il est suggéré que ces différences entre les groupes auront une influence sur les partenariats parents-enseignants et donc, sur la réussite de l'intégration des élèves.

Enfin, le numéro se termine par un voyage au cœur du non conventionnel avec Eugenia Vasilopoulos qui nous présente la potentielle signification de la réalisation de recherches deleuziennes en éducation. En mettant l'accent sur les différences ontologiques, épistémologiques et méthodologiques de la recherche deleuzienne, l'auteur décrit le processus de « *rhizoanalysis* » tout en nous laissant développer notre propre compréhension.

Merci aux auteurs qui ont contribué à ce numéro et partagé leurs travaux; les communautés universitaires ne peuvent se développer qu'en raison de la volonté comme la vôtre de partager et d'échanger des idées. Nous vous souhaitons beaucoup de succès dans vos projets académiques, et nous espérons que vous allez continuer à participer à notre communauté grandissante de chercheurs. Nous invitons également chacun de nos lecteurs à participer au succès de la prochaine édition du *le/the Journal*, et ce, en répondant à l'appel à contribution qui paraîtra dans un futur numéro du bulletin d'information de l'EGSA-AÉDÉ.

Rédactrice en chef sortante

Joanne M.C. Lalonde

Doctorante

Société, culture et littérature

Rédactrice en chef entrante

Maria Bastien

Doctorante

Société, culture et littérature

Dear Colleagues/Readers

Welcome to the 2015 spring edition of *le/the Journal: A Publication of the University of Ottawa Education Graduate Students' Association (EGSA-AÉDÉ)*. As I read the submissions for this volume of *le/the Journal*, the twinned themes of commonality and uniqueness emerged from our colleagues' articles. The graduate student authors share a common dedication to pursuing educational research at the highest level of engagement and scholarship, while at the same time being informed by their own unique lenses of enquiry. This issue highlights the diverse nature of student research across the faculty, from perspectives on ontology and research methodology, to explorations of the experiences of teachers, parents, and students from a variety of backgrounds.

Our first author, Anton Birioukov, explores the use of case studies, especially critiques of their purported lack of generalizing power, and offers a balanced perspective on their use that discusses objections based on both epistemological and ontological differences. This leads the author to a discussion of the in-depth understanding that case studies offer, as well as an appreciation of the unique contributions that they can provide to qualitative researchers.

Our second author, Karen (Bouchard) O'Shea, discusses the complex, yet under-examined role teacher-child relationships may play in children's peer relationships, particularly in the context of bullying interactions. The author highlights the importance of teacher modeling of positive peer relationships, and recommends that teacher-candidates are educated on both bullying intervention techniques but also on relational approaches to this issue.

Karen Bouchard, Trista Hollweck, & Erin Kraft together explore the potential for growth in restorative approaches to peer victimization in our schools. The authors discuss how concepts of either the malleability, or of the fixed nature of human characteristics

may impact the success of restorative practices which are based on the possibility of individual, and group changes.

Ashley Campbell speaks to the importance of Indigenous voice, perspectives, and ways of knowing in re/writing Canada's history through an exploration of Indigenous scholar Thomas King's work. Speaking of history as 'the re/telling of a story' the author explores King's work as the disruption to the 'Canadian grand narrative' and the necessity of offering a counter narrative as we 'educate future generations'.

Marie-Carène Pierre René explores the role of parent-teacher partnerships, focusing in particular on newcomers to Canada. Using two case studies, the author discusses some of the uniqueness of families who come to Canada as 'economic immigrants' in contrast to those who come as refugees. It is suggested that these differences between the groups will have an impact on the parent-teacher partnerships and thus, to the successful integration of students.

Finally, the issue ends with a journey into the unconventional, as Eugenia Vasilopoulos presents what it might mean to do Deleuzian educational research. Emphasizing the epistemological, ontological and methodological 'differences' in Deleuzian research, the author describes the process of rhizoanalysis, but leaves us to come to our own understanding...

A special thank you to our contributing authors this issue for sharing their work; academic communities only thrive because of willingness like yours to share and exchange ideas. We wish you continued success in your academic ventures, and hope that you will continue to engage in our growing community of scholars. We also invite each of our readers to participate in making *le/the Journal* an ongoing success by responding to the next call for papers in an upcoming edition of the EGSA-AÉDÉ Newsletter.

Outgoing Editor-in-Chief

Joanne M.C. Lalonde

Ph.D. Candidate

Society, Culture and Literacies

Incoming Editor-in-Chief

Maria Bastien

Ph.D. Candidate

Society, Culture and Literacies

Beyond the Quantitative: Generalizing from Case Study Research

Anton Birioukov

Case study research has been used in various contexts by researchers based in multiple disciplines, thereby classifying case studies as a distinct form of research is a difficult endeavour. The definition of what a case study is, and how it should be carried out, is as heterogeneous as the academic orientations of those carrying out this type of research. The methods of evaluating the rigor, effectiveness and trustworthiness of the findings originating out of case studies are likewise stratified along epistemological and ontological groundings of the researchers. However, one continual criticism of case studies is their lack of generalizing power (Hodgetts, & Stolte, 2012). Many authors who employ case study methodology have replied to this critique in numerous ways, ranging from attempts to increase the generalizability of the findings (Cutler, 2004), to an outright rejection of the desirability of generalizations in case studies (Thomas, 2010). Yet, although there is quite a bit of evidence to refute the generalizability flaw, case studies continue to be seen as “a less desirable form of inquiry than either experiments or surveys” (Yin, 2009, p. 14). This paper will focus on the criticisms relating to a lack of generalizability in case studies, the defences against these charges, and an overall framing of the debate that will trace both sides of the argument and evaluate their effectiveness. The main argument presented here is that the calls for generalizations tend to arise from positivist researchers who equate strong social science to the natural sciences, which not only distorts the main goals of qualitative research, but also stunts its growth and development.

With the breadth of literature on the topic at hand it is important to refine the scope to a few particulars. Thus, the main discussion of generalization and case studies will be limited to qualitatively based research, rather than including debates concerning more statistical methods employed in other disciplines. I will begin by briefly outlining what comprises a case study, its characteristics and goals. This will be followed by a documentation of the various criticisms that are placed onto case studies, with a particular focus on

the issue of generalization. Lastly, I will trace the different responses to the critiques, starting with positivistic rebuttals and gradually moving to interpretivist/constructionist arguments. I now turn to a general discussion of what comprises a case study.

Case studies have been used in drastically different contexts and disciplines including, but not limited to “psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology, social work, business, education, nursing, and community planning” (Yin, 2009, p. 4), thus to find a workable and precise definition of case studies is difficult. Yin (2009), who is considered to be one of the leading experts in case study methodology conceptualized case studies in the following way “case studies are the preferred method when (a) “how” or “why” questions are being posed, (b) the investigator has little control over events, and (c) the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context” (p. 2), through this delineation Yin (2009) distinguishes case studies from experimental designs, which, at times, have difficulty answering the “how” or “why” questions. Yin (1981) does acknowledge that “case studies can be done by using either qualitative or quantitative evidence” (p. 58), and much of his writing reflects a positivist leaning. However, context and depth of meaning are recurring themes in Yin’s (1981; 2009) theorizations on case studies. Stake (1995), another expert in the field, takes a more qualitative approach to defining case studies, stating

We study a case when it itself is of very special interest. We look for the detail of interaction with its contexts. Case study is the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances (p. xi)

Both authors point to the contextual nature of case study design (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009), arguing that it is the study of the particular, rather than an investigation of broad and large data sets (Barth & Thomas, 2012). As the focus of this paper is on qualitative uses of case studies, a more thorough exam-

ination of their application in this context is discussed further.

Much of what is written about qualitative case studies often mirrors broad discussions of qualitative methodologies and methods. As Firestone (1993) points out “qualitative methods are useful for understanding the perspectives of students, teachers, parents, and others; for clarifying the processes that take place in classrooms, during program implementation, and in other areas” (p. 16), and this can also be applied to case studies. The focus is on the construction of meaning, rather than an investigation of an objective reality that is advocated for by the more positivist scholars (Tight, 2010). The goal of case study methodology is to become deeply immersed in a field, to become cognizant of its particularities, and to learn the contextual nature of the social practices that occur within a case (Kyburz-Grabner, 2004). The challenge partly lies in what actually comprises a case, as Stake (1995) pointed out “custom has it that not everything is a case...The case is a specific, a complex, functioning thing” going on to argue that “the case is an integrated system. The parts do not have to be working well, the purposes may be irrational, but it is a system. Thus people and programs clearly are prospective cases. Events and processes fit the definition less well” (p.2). Yet, there is disagreement about what comprises a case, and other authors provide a looser definition, while critics charge that case studies have become a catch-all term that academics use due to a lack of a more complex methodology (Dillon & Reid, 2004).

Critically orientated researchers also emphasize the involvement with the participants and creating egalitarian lines of the knowledge exchange process, where the distinction between the ‘researcher’ and the ‘subject’ is diminished in favour of a more reciprocal relationship (Andrade, 2009). Related to closer ties to the participants is the notion of praxis and action, where the researcher strives to assist those with whom she or he works with to implement positive changes that arise out of the research findings. The aim is to contribute something to the location(s) where the research was carried out (Corcoran, Walker,

& Wals, 2004) and lessen the exploitative aspects of academic research practices.

Although one could go on for some length in presenting the varying interpretations of case studies, due to the scope of this paper I will now present some of the commonly found criticisms of case studies, and discuss the issue of generalizability in greater detail.

One of the main criticisms of the case study approach has been its lack of rigor, and the overt focus on descriptive accounts of generally small samples is considered a methodological weakness, as Barth and Thomas (2012) point out “while the learning opportunities offered by case studies have been explicitly appreciated...their ‘story-telling’ approach has often been criticised as too limited and merely descriptive” (p. 753). Kyburz-Grabner (2004) has listed several shortcomings of case study research

the case-study documentation is missing; the case-study report is superficial and is not related to the data; a theoretical basis for the case study does not exist or is not set out; the data collection and/ or interpretation procedure is not triangulated; the chain of evidence is missing or insufficiently stringent; and the theoretical foundation for generalization is not appropriate. (p. 63)

Flyvbjerg (2006) also brings forth issues of confirmation bias that are often cited as being one of the major pitfalls of not only case studies, but qualitative research in general. Since these approaches “allow more room for the researcher’s subjective and arbitrary judgment than other methods” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 234) case studies are considered to be less rigorous than the more quantitative methods. One concern is that a researcher’s intimate involvement with the case can influence/distort their interpretations to such a degree that they will inevitably find themes and patterns that match their expectations (Hodgetts, & Stolte, 2012). However, by far the most cited criticism of case study research in general, and particularly single case studies, is the inability to generalize to a broader context (Eisenhardt, 1989).

As in the above discussion, critiques of case studies are often consolidated into an overall criticism of qualitative research, as Firestone (1993) highlighted, “one of the more frequent criticisms...is that it appears

hard to generalize qualitative findings to settings other than those studied” and that “generalizability is clearly not the strength of qualitative research” (p. 16). Other authors echo this sentiment, arguing that the contextual nature of case studies prohibits wide generalizations, which are available with more numerical approaches (Bergen, & While, 2000). Without a representative or random sample, case study findings cannot be extrapolated to wider contexts. Thus, a feature that its proponents praise, namely the in-depth analysis afforded by the case study design, is also held as a detriment by case study opponents (Dillon, & Reid, 2004). However, upon closer inspection the argument of a lack of generalizability is problematic, as it assumes a particular epistemic and ontological outlook that may not fit particularly well within qualitative research. Numerous researchers have sought to find answers and solutions to the generalizing critique, ranging from positivist to constructivist alignments. In the following section I will trace the rebuttals to the generalization dilemma evident in the literature.

Academics who strive to refute the generalization arguments, but not discount generalizations in general, tend to focus on strategies that attempt to elevate the generalizability of case study findings (Cutler, 2004; Yin, 1981). The methods to enhance the validity of the research are intertwined and interrelated, but can be effectively conceptualized under three concepts: construct validity, internal validity, and external validity.

Construct validity has been defined as “operationalising the data-gathering units of analysis and measures to avoid subjective judgement” (Cutler, 2004, p. 370), and requires a close scrutiny of variables in order to avoid confirmation bias. The thrust is towards a more objective stance, one that allows the researcher to evaluate the strength of the concepts found within a particular case. In order to achieve this Eisenhardt (1981) proposed that the researcher “use multiple sources of evidence to build construct measures, which define the construct and distinguish it from other constructs” (p. 542), and likewise, many other authors have suggested the use of multiple data sources as a way to raise the findings to a more general, and thereby generalizable level (Kyburz-Grabner, 2004; Yin, 2009). Tied into the notion of construct validity is the concept of internal validity.

Internal validity “concerns research where causal links, or inferences of such

links, between two events are made” and “to avoid making invalid links it is important that the researcher has considered alternative explanations in his or her research design, and sought out evidence that might disconfirm the link” (Cutler, 2004, p. 370). Increasing internal validity can be accomplished in numerous ways. The employment of triangulation is again advocated for, with multiple data sources considered to elevate internal validity of the findings (Stake, 1994). Others argue for a ‘chain of evidence’, or rather a thorough documentation of the procedures and definitions of terms, providing the reader with an opportunity to evaluate the relevance and validity of the concepts (Yin, 1981).

Lastly, external validity shares many commonalities with generalization as it consists of

identifying correctly the circumstances under which the results of a study can be generalized to other cases. The inference from the studied case to some new contexts needs to be thus justified by some factors that give us reason to believe that what was found true of the former is most probably true of the latter as well. (Ruzzene, 2012, p. 106)

Increasing external validity, or generalizability, can be accomplished by many of the methods described above. However, there are other steps researchers can take in order to increase the external validity of their findings. One such method is to use multiple cases, where in order for findings to be transferable to other settings they must be consistent across multiple sites (Andrade 2009). An analysis of multiple cases also provides an opportunity to find disconfirming evidence that would disprove a hypothesis, which would not be possible in a single case study (Barth, & Thomas, 2012). Others argue for the use of a large sample size, that aids the representativeness of the study, and thus increases external validity (Ruzzene, 2012). Lastly, Hodgetts, & Stolte (2012) advise that “the strategic selection and construction of a case is important in generating findings of significance beyond the specific example” (p. 381), with careful attention to the selection of the case, the goal is to be able to explicate the findings to other, similar populations.

As the above evidence suggests, many scholars attempt to meet the criteria of validity within case studies. However, the methods developed to approach this task often belie

a positivist approach to research. In the following section, I will discuss the refutation by qualitatively based researchers, many of whom argue that the imposition of generalizability is misplaced in social science, where there are no universal laws that can be transplanted to different contexts (Ruddin, 2006).

Evers and Wu (2006) argued that there are numerous commonalities between contexts, and this allows for the transferability of research findings between cases. They posit that educational institutions bare many similarities that are not context specific, thereby allowing for results of case studies to be used in other settings. Building on the notion of transferability Firestone (1993) proposed an analytic generalization which “does not rely on samples and populations... [rather] to generalize to a theory is to provide evidence that supports (but does not definitively prove) that theory” (p. 17). Analytic generalization forgoes the constraints of representative samples and causal relationships advocated for by experimentalists, instead choosing to focus on broad theories that can be transplanted into different contexts (Ruddin, 2006). Moreover, “cases cannot be considered sample units” (Cutler, 2004, p. 369) due to their specificity and the search for a representative sample is misguided and can never be achieved in the complex world of social science (Thomas, 2010). As Hodgetts, and Stolte (2012) argue

Many colleagues see case studies as a kind of soft option that can be used to raise interesting insights, but which does not constitute a reliable or valid research enterprise. Such critics often draw their methodological inspiration for, and understanding of, research from the physical sciences. Their criticisms stem from the assumption that experiments and large representative samples that support aggregated analyses comprise the gold standard for...research. (pp. 379-380).

Qualitatively based researchers infer a new mode of conceptualizing generalizability and point to the need to “paint a rich picture”, to provide a detailed and holistic account of the case to such a degree as to allow the reader to make their own inferences. Generalization thought in this sense does not arise from the researcher, but is rather created through the reader’s interpretation

(Firestone, 1993; Hodgetts, & Stolte, 2012; Thomas, 2010).

Stake (1978), writing about ‘naturalistic generalizations’, implied that the reader already possesses a wealth of knowledge of other cases, and it is the author’s responsibility to provide a detailed account of the setting, the actors within it, the processes taking place, and the role of the subjective researcher. Through this procedure the reader is able to infer their own generalizations, or more correctly, the transferability of aspects of one case to another. Rather than focusing on inductive, theory testing methods, case study researchers should rather focus on abduction, during which “findings from particular case studies are often compared...to existing theoretical constructs and research findings, and are used to add depth and context to broader deliberations regarding societal issues” (Hodgetts, & Stolte, 2012, p. 383). The findings of a particular case study, even if it is a *single* case, can still be quite valuable in their depth of understanding and provide important insights that can be transferred to different settings. This sentiment was brilliantly articulated by Flyvbjerg (2006) and his discussion will conclude the generalization refutation section of this paper.

Flyvbjerg (2006) takes particular exception to the positivist influence on case study research arguing “there does not and probably cannot exist predictive theory in social science research” (p. 223). Flyvbjerg (2006) posits that social science can never be separated from its context, which is its foremost strength. He goes on to argue that

Formal generalization, whether on the basis of large samples or single cases, is considerably overrated as the main source of scientific progress... formal generalization is only one of many ways by which people gain and accumulate knowledge. That knowledge cannot be formally generalized does not mean that it cannot enter into the collective process of knowledge accumulation in a given field or in a society. A purely descriptive, phenomenological case study without any attempt to generalize can certainly be of value in this process and has often helped cut a path toward scientific innovation. (pp. 226-227)

Thus it can be discerned that perhaps the search for generalizability in the positivis-

tic sense is a misguided affair in qualitative research in general and case studies in particular. The epistemological and ontological groundings that underpin each type of inquiry strive to accomplish different tasks, and to hold them to the same standards does not give qualitative research the justice that it deserves.

This paper has sought to provide a general overview of case study approaches in qualitative research, their criticisms, particularly the issue of generalization, and the rebuttals of the critiques. Initially it may appear that case studies are a ‘soft’ science approach that lacks rigour. However, through a careful analysis one is led to conclude that often the standards of rigor in qualitative and quantitative research are incommensurable. Qualitative and quantitative methods aim to answer different questions and their approaches are quite diverse. The issue appears not to be the lack of rigor in case study research, but that rigor must be understood in a contextual fashion. Case studies provide an extremely detailed and rich account of a particular system, something that is almost impossible to accomplish in a more distanced approach. Their utility lies not in being able to draw broad generalizations, but in contributing a depth of understanding that presents an honest account of a particular case.

References

- Andrade, A.D. (2009). Interpretive Research Aimed at Theory Building: Adopting and Adapting the Case Study Design. *The Qualitative Report*, 14(1), 42-60.
- Barth, M., & Thomas, I. (2012). Synthesising case-study research - ready for the next step? *Environmental Education Research*, 18(6), 751-764.
- Bergen, A., & While, A. (2000). A case for case studies: exploring the use of case study design in community nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 31(4), 926-934.
- Corcoran, PB., Walker, K.E., & Wals, A.E.J. (2004). Case studies, make-your-case studies, and case stories: a critique of case-study methodology in sustainability in higher education. *Environmental Education Research*, 10(1), 7-21.
- Cutler, A. (2004). Methodological failure: the use of case study method by public relations researchers. *Public Relations Review*, 30, 365-375.

- Dillon, J., & Reid, A. (2004). Issues in case-study methodology in investigating environmental and sustainability issues in higher education: towards a problem-based approach? *Environmental Education Research*, 10(1), 23-39.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Evers, C.W., & Wu, E.H. (2006). On Generalising from Single Case Studies: Epistemological Reflections. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 40(4), 511-527.
- Firestone, W.A. (1993). Alternative Arguments for Generalizing from Data as Applied to Qualitative Research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(4), 16-23.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Hodgetts, D.A., & Stolte, O.E.E. (2012). Case-based Research in Community and Social Psychology: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 379-389.
- Kyburz-Garber, R. (2004). Does case-study methodology lack rigour? The need for quality criteria for sound case-study research, as illustrated by a recent case in secondary and higher education. *Environmental Education Research*, 10(1), 53-67.
- Ruddin, L.P. (2006). You Can Generalize Stupid! Social Scientists, Bent Flyvbjerg, and Case Study Methodology. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(4), 797-812.
- Ruzzene, A. (2012). Drawing Lessons from Case Studies by Enhancing Comparability. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 42(1), 99-120.
- Stake, R.E. (1978). The Case Study Method in Social Inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 7(2), 5-8.
- Stake, R.E. (1994). Composition and Performance. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, No. 122, Qualitative Methodologies in Music Education Research Conference, 31-44.
- Stake, R.E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thomas, G. (2010). Ding Case Study: Abduction Not Induction, Phronesis Not Theory. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(7), 575-582.
- Tight, M. (2010). The curious case of case study: a viewpoint. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(4), 329-339.
- Yin, R.K. (1981). The Case Study Crisis: Some Answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 58-67.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beyond intervention: Highlighting the subtle nature of teachers in children's bullying experiences

Karen Bouchard

For decades, scholars have acknowledged the critical role of teachers in shaping children's experiences, both within the school and beyond (e.g. Dewey, 1958; Noddings, 1984/2005; Sabol & Pianta, 2012). Recent bullying literature has certainly recognized the role of the teacher in diminishing children's bullying experiences, but much of this study has focused on the "how-to" of bullying intervention, leaving obscured the more subtle means through which teachers can impact children's bullying interactions with peers. I was witness, and indeed, contributed to this shortcoming in a guest lecture that I presented to bachelor of education students (at a large Canadian university) on the role of teachers in children's bullying experiences. The discussions that followed my presentation were reminiscent of classical bullying discourses. My discussions with the students centred on the identification of characteristics of children who were more likely to bully others or to be victimized; the psycho-social outcomes of bullying and victimization; and the role of teachers in thwarting bullying behaviours in the classrooms through prescribed prevention and intervention efforts. This classical perspective of bullying de-contextualizes children by removing them from the multiple factors that could potentially impact their behaviours. Also from this perspective, teachers' involvement in childhood bullying is limited to their role as intervention agents, thereby concealing their subtle, yet powerful role in shaping children's bullying interactions.

After the first guest lecture, I had the opportunity to speak to another section of the same course. Instead of prompting a discussion on the "how-to" of intervention in this next class, I encouraged students to consider the ways that teachers may subtly impact children's bullying experiences. A small group of students suggested that it was teacher caring that would promote children's pro-social interactions, and another group argued that teachers' positive daily interactions with children might also assist in diminishing bullying behaviours. These observations by

bachelor of education students prompted my interest in the ways that *teacher-child relationships* can impact children's experiences with their peers. In a recent special addition of the *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, Farmer et al., (2011) argued that our understanding of children's aggressive behaviours in school needs to be complemented by a deeper concentration on the ways that teachers act as "invisible hands" in shaping children's multiple contexts. Specifically, the authors writing in this special issue focused on the role of teachers in impacting children's relationships with peers.

The extent to which teachers can impact the peer ecology in the classroom has been under researched. Much of the research that does exist has centred on the direct role of teachers in *managing* peer-level processes, such as through arbitrating student conflicts, and facilitating student interactions in the classroom through grouping practices (Farmer et al., 2011; Luckner & Pianta, 2011). While this work is valuable in highlighting how teacher practices can impact children's peer interactions, it does not consider the more subtle ways that teacher-child relationships can impact peer experiences. In my discussion with bachelor of education students, we agreed that it is the moment-by-moment teacher-child interactions that can profoundly affect children's relationships with peers, and more specifically, children's bullying experiences. We considered that teachers are not just authorities or managers of children's relationships with peers, but also models.

Drawing from Bowlby's attachment theory (1969), there is a building consensus that children's relationships with teachers act as models for the formation of high quality peer relationships (Gest & Rodkin, 2011). Specifically, the communication of the types of relationships that students are expected to establish with each other is implicitly modeled through the teacher-child relationship (Farmer et al., 2011). Drawing from this research, some scholars have argued that teacher-child relationships that are distant and conflictual can contribute to children's lower levels of so-

cio-emotional adjustment and higher levels of involvement in bullying with peers (Murray-Harvey & Slee, 2010). That is, children's negative interactions with peers may be synchronous with, and potentially indicative of the quality of relationships with a teacher. Recent work has also demonstrated that the quality of teacher-student relationships may influence how students are perceived by their classmates, with students' preferences for peers mirroring teacher preferences (Hughes & Chen, 2011). Echoing this, Chang et al. (2007), suggested that the stigma associated with poor teacher-child relationship quality could increase children's victimization experiences. This research emphasizes the subtle ways that children's relationships with teachers can impact experiences with peers, and most seriously, can influence children's experiences with victimization and the development of bullying behaviours.

Recent bullying work has called for an increased recognition of the multiple ecological systems that shape children's bullying experiences, thereby expanding the traditional approach of the de-contextualized nature of bullying to a more comprehensive perspective. In response to this call, many researchers have focused on the pivotal role of teachers in children's bullying, but this has often been limited to analyses of teacher attitudes about bullying and teacher competence of bullying intervention procedures (e.g. Leff et al., 2007; Mishna et al., 2004). Reports from this research often cite the need for ongoing training so that teachers are able to recognize and effectively respond to bullying incidences in the classroom. My first guest lecture centred on this need, explicating the "how-to" of bullying intervention. To be sure, it is important that teacher candidates are educated on the "how-to" of successful bullying intervention, but what is perhaps equally critical is for teachers to understand their complex role in children's peer relationships. This would require further teacher education to include the ways that the teacher-child relationship models positive peer relationships in the classroom. This perspective would shift

the current concentration on the direct practices of teachers in bullying prevention and intervention, to re-establishing bullying as a complex relationship problem that requires relationship solutions (Craig & Pepler, 2007).

References

- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Attachment* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Chang, L., Lin, H., Fung, K. Y., Wang, Y., Wen, Z., & Li, H. (2007). The mediating and moderating effects of teacher preference on the relations between students' social behaviors and peer acceptance. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 53, 603–630.
- Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (2007). Understanding bullying: From research to practice. *Canadian Psychology*, 48(2), 86-93.
- Farmer, T. W., Lines, M. M., Hamm, J. V. (2011). Revealing the invisible hand: The role of teachers in children's peer experiences. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32, 247-256.
- Dewey, J. (1958). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Gest, S. D., & Rodkin, P. C. (2011). Teaching practices and elementary classroom peer ecologies. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32, 257–265.
- Hughes, J., & Chen, Q. (2011). Reciprocal effects and prediction of academic self efficacy. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32, 247–256.
- Leff, S. S. (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at school: Considerations and future directions. *School Psychology Review*, 36, 406–412.
- Luckner, A. E., & Pianta, R. C. (2011). Teacher-student interactions in fifth-grade classrooms: Relations with children's peer behaviour. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32(5), 257-266.
- Mishna, F. (2004). A qualitative study of bullying from multiple perspectives. *Children & Schools*, 26(4), 234-247.
- Murray-Harvey, R., & Slee, P. T. (2010). School and home relationships and their impact on school bullying. *School Psychology International*, 31, 271-295.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sabol, T. J., & Pianta, R. C. (2012). Recent trends in research on teacher-child relationships. *Attachment and Human Development*, 14(3), 213-231.

Room for growth?: Enhancing restorative practices for peer victimization intervention by considering implicit theories of malleability

Karen Bouchard, Trista Hollweck, & Erin Kraft

Peer victimization is a persistent and prevalent issue facing our children. Peer victimization has been defined as a subtype of aggression, whereby victims are exposed to repeated physical, verbal, or relational actions by one or more individuals (Olweus, 1993; Pepler et al., 2006). A critical component to peer victimization, which distinguishes it from peer aggression, is the real or perceived power differentials that exist between the perpetrator(s) and the victimized. Drawing from this definition, researchers have demonstrated that bullying behaviour and being victimized can be predictive of future psycho-social maladjustment, such as aggressive behaviours, drug and alcohol abuse, and withdrawal from school (e.g. Carrera et al., 2011; O'Connell et al., 1999). The negative outcomes of those who victimize and who are victimized have also been acknowledged by practitioners and policy-makers, as is evident by the increase in school-based prevention and intervention programs, and the implementation of government policies, such as Ontario's recently enacted Accepting Schools Act (2012).

In response to the growing need for effective peer victimization intervention, many school-based programs have opted to incorporate a variety of approaches in an effort to ameliorate the negative effects of victimization. These initiatives vary from addressing the micro-psychological processes that contribute to victimizing behaviour or victimization experiences, to considering the wider macro-social processes of the school and community. Whole-school restorative practices in particular, have been utilized at schools to help children manage their relationships and encourage effective problem solving when conflict arises.

Grounded in a relational pedagogy, restorative approaches disrupt traditional disciplinary practices by focussing, instead, on peer relationships and on healing the harm that was caused within a community of support. While these whole-school restorative initiatives may provide some success in resolving and reconciling children's rela-

tionships with aggressive peers, McCluskey (2011) argued that many of these positive changes are inconsistent across and within contexts, and are not sustained over the long term. This inconsistency is especially evident in secondary school settings (Smith et al., 2004). These mixed results can be attributed to its "patchy" implementation (McCluskey et al., 2008) and an inconsistent vision shared by members of the school community. Most notably, Morrison et al. (2005) argued that a core requirement for successful implementation of a restorative program is that it is embedded within a framework that already recognizes the importance of relationships and individuals' needs for social and emotional engagement. While there can be no question that a whole-school culture change is required to successfully integrate restorative practices, recent research (Yeager et al., 2011; 2013) has indicated that children's social-cognitive schemas may also provide further insight about why these programs may or may not be successful at restoring healthy relationships following peer aggression.

An Introduction to Implicit Theories of Malleability

Implicit theories of human malleability are the theories that people hold about the nature of human attributes and interactions. More precisely, these theories concern whether people have the capacity to change or whether human characteristics are relatively static. Researchers have categorized implicit theories into *entity* and *incremental* theories (Carr et al., 2012; Dweck et al., 1993; 1995; Erdley & Dweck, 1993). Entity theorists focus on fixed traits and are more likely to categorize people in terms of these fixed traits (i.e. he is a bad person, she is an aggressive person). Conversely, incremental theorists share a belief in malleable human qualities and tend to focus on other factors that mediate individuals' behaviours (i.e. he is aggressive *because* he feels excluded). Incremental theorists tend to believe that basic human qualities can be changed through ef-

fort and education, whereas entity theorists are often sceptical that these most basic qualities can be changed.

Implicit Theories and Responses to Conflict

Recent literature has sought to examine the relationship between implicit theories and responses to social failure, particularly peer victimization (Dweck, 1995; Rudolph, 2010; Yeager et al., 2011; 2013). Implicit theories of personality, or the belief that personality characteristics are immutable or malleable, create a framework for how individuals interpret and respond to peer victimization. Those who hold an entity theory may believe that people who are "bullies" or "losers" cannot change. This is contrasted with an incremental theory of personality which employs the belief that mediating factors can help to explain aggressive behaviour, and that these characteristics can be changed through negotiation, education, forgiveness, and rehabilitation (Chiu et al., 1997; Yeager, 2011). In 2013, Yeager et al., sought to examine this relationship further by testing the connection between entity and incremental theories and vengeful responses to overt peer victimization. The results demonstrated that entity theorists were more likely to make attributions about the "kind of person" the perpetrator was. When prompted by a hypothetical and recalled scenario of peer victimization, entity theorists were more likely to retaliate aggressively towards the transgressor, especially when accompanied by the belief that one was likely to be further excluded following the conflict. These results were also comparable to earlier studies that found that entity theorists were likely to view social rejection and victimization as resulting from permanent personal deficits and, as a result, were also likely to target the transgressor's character and endorse heavier punishments (Dweck, 1995; Erdley et al., 1997; Giles & Heyman, 2003). From this perspective, entity theorists view other's aggressive behaviours as reflective of enduring immoral characters,

and therefore justifying punishment (Dweck, 1995). In contrast, those individuals who hold a more incremental belief of personality may be less likely to associate the negative behaviour with the transgressor's enduring qualities. While entity and incremental theories are separate constructs, there is also evidence to suggest that incremental theorists are more likely to adopt pro-social strategies and coping mechanisms when victimized by peers (Yeager et al., 2011).

Considering Implicit Theories when Responding to Peer Victimization through a Restorative Approach

School-based restorative approaches are premised on the concept of restorative justice. Rooted within traditional aboriginal practices, restorative justice was initially utilized within the criminal justice system. Originating in the 1970's, restorative justice was largely employed as a framework for working to restore relationships that were harmed from transgressions. The practice was often carried out through mediation between the victims and offenders. Since the early 1990's this approach has broadened to include the communities of care – namely the families and friends participating in the process through peacemaking circles and restorative conferences. This approach has also been widely adopted in schools, signalling a shift from traditional punitive discipline, to a more holistic and engaging process that emphasizes reconciliation (Costello et al., 2010; Morrison & Vaandering, 2012).

The aim of the restorative approach is to reintegrate those affected by a harm/injustice back into the community, through nurturing the “human capacity for restitution, resolution, reconciliation” (Morrison & Vaandering, 2012, p. 140). The restorative approach values: healing, moral learning, community participation, respectful dialogue, forgiveness, responsibility, apology, and making amends. Within the last two decades, there has been an emergence of restorative practices being used in schools to address relational conflict (Costello et al., 2010). In comparison to other proactive and reactive strategies, the restorative approach has been rated by educators as moderately to highly successful in developing a safe and accepting school ethos, and for resolving relational conflict (McClus-

key et al., 2011). However, it has also been noted that these improvements are often not sustained overtime.

Restorative practices are premised on change. Students involved in restorative conferencing are asked to consider the harm that was caused, listen to all members involved, and adopt strategies to work through the problems constructively. This process is followed by a genuine attempt to make amends, and for affected members to reintegrate back into the school community. Students who hold incremental beliefs may be more likely to promote discussion, education, and display an effort to try to cultivate the damaged relationships. Mirroring this, a study conducted by Haselhuhn et al. in 2010, found that incremental theories may lead to more trust recovery efforts, as opposed to entity theories, which promote scepticism and insensitivity to trust-repair efforts. Students with incremental beliefs may also be more likely to consider the mediating factors that led to the transgression, while placing less emphasis on the transgressors permanent qualities. This focus on malleable characteristics may promote a further engagement in adopting pro-social strategies when addressing conflict with peers. While many restorative practices already focus on the process of making amends and recognizing the external factors that may have led to the transgression, these efforts may prove to be less successful if children's fundamental knowledge structures are not first addressed. Evidence from research on implicit theories would suggest that there needs to be an effort to change construals of oneself and others before actions for reconciliation should be adopted. Considering these implicit beliefs about the malleability of personality may be an integral component in order for students and the school community to profit from restorative interventions.

Changing Implicit Theories

Given the emphasis placed on renewal and reconciliation that both incremental theories and restorative practices share, addressing implicit theories within a restorative framework may contribute to more success in restoring healthy relationships following a social conflict. Very few intervention strategies have explicitly addressed socio-cognitive knowledge structures within its framework, but there is evidence to suggest that by doing so, students' implicit beliefs are able to change, which may affect students' response

behaviour. Given the pervasive nature of implicit beliefs, it is surprising that these beliefs can be changed, even with minimal prompting (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007). In 2013, Yeager et al., found that teaching incremental theories to students through various workshops reduced conduct problems in schools, and reduced depressive symptoms, primarily among those students who reported the most victimization by peers. These changes remained 3 months post-intervention. In 2011, the same researchers found that even reading an article about incremental theories reduced students' desires for vengeance and increased pro-social responses. These results suggest that addressing implicit beliefs and teaching about incremental theories can modify students' responses to peer victimization.

Conclusion

A restorative practices framework for peer victimization intervention should include a message of malleability – namely, that we are not divided into good people and bad people and that our relationships require cultivation and effort to develop successfully. While some research may suggest that changing implicit theories requires little probing, reducing aggression is not a simple matter. Mentioning implicit theories in restorative approaches may not be enough to create lasting changes in children's responses. As with any intervention, the practices and values of the intervention need to match the practices and values of the school community. This requires an ongoing commitment in fostering a school ethos that promotes an incremental theory of growth.

References

- Carr, P. B., Rattan, A., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Implicit theories shape intergroup relations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 127-165.
- Carrera, M. V., DePalma, R., & Lameiras, M. (2011). Toward a more comprehensive understanding of bullying in school settings. *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(4), 479-499.
- Chiu, C., Dweck, C. S., Tong, J. Y., & Fu, J. H. (1997). Implicit theories and conceptions of morality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 923-940.

- Costello, B., Wachel, J., & Wachel, T. (2010). *Restorative circles in schools: Building community and enhancing learning*. Bethlehem, Penn: International Institute for Restorative Practices.
- Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality and development*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (2008). Can personality be changed? The role of beliefs in personality and change. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(6), 391-394.
- Dweck, C. S., Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (1995). Implicit theories and their role in judgments and reactions: A world from two perspectives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 6(4), 267-285.
- Erdley, C. A., Cain, K. M., Loomis, C. C., Dumas-Hines, F., & Dweck, C. S. (1997). Relations among children's social goals, implicit personality theories, and responses to social failure. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(2), 262-272.
- Erdley, C. A., & Dweck, C. S. (1993). Children's implicit personality theories as predictors of their social judgments. *Child Development*, 64, 863-878.
- Giles, J. W., & Heyman, G. H. (2003). Preschoolers' beliefs about the stability of anti-social behaviour: Implications for navigating social challenges. *Social Development*, 12(2), 182-197.
- Haselhuhn, M. P., Schweitzer, M. E., & Wood, A. M. (2010). How implicit beliefs influence trust recovery. *Psychological Science*, 21, 645-648.
- Heyman, G., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Children's thinking about traits: Implications for judgments of the self and others. *Child Development*, 64(2), 391-403.
- Kray, L. J., Haselhuhn, M. (2007). Implicit negotiation beliefs and performance: Longitudinal and experimental evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 49-64.
- McCluskey, G., Lloyd, G., Kane, J., Riddell, S., Stead, J., & Weedon, E. (2008). Can restorative practices in schools make a difference? *Educational Review*, 60(4), 405-417.
- McCluskey, G., Kane, J., Lloyd, G., Stead, J., Riddell, S., & Weedon, E. (2011). "Teachers are afraid we are stealing their strength": A risk society and restorative approaches in school. *British Journal of Education Studies*, 59, 105-119.
- Morrison, B. E., & Vaandering, D. (2012). Restorative justice: Pedagogy, praxis and discipline. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(2), 138-155.
- Morrison, B. E., Blood, P., & Thorsborne, M. (2006). Practicing restorative justice in school communities: The challenge of culture change. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal*, 5, 335-357.
- Morrison, B. (2002). Bullying and victimization in schools: A restorative justice approach. *Australian Institute of Criminology: Trends and Issues*, 219, 1-6.
- O'Connell, P., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: Insights and challenges for intervention. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22(4), 437-452.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell
- Rudolph, K. (2010). Implicit theories of peer relationships. *Social Development*, 19(1), 113-129.
- Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 548-561.
- Yeager, D. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2013). An implicit theories of personality intervention reduced adolescent aggression in response to victimization. *Child Development*, 84(3), 970-988.
- Yeager, D. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., Tirri, K., Nokelainen, P., & Dweck, C. S. (2011). Adolescents' implicit theories predict desire for vengeance after peer conflicts: Correlational and experimental evidence. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(4), 1090-1107.

An Indigenous Voice: Re/writing Canada's History

Ashley Campbell

"The truth about stories is that's all we are" (King, 2003, p.2).

History is the re/telling of a story, and like all stories, it can change depending on who is telling it. In Thomas King's (2012), *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America*, he presents his/story as a nonlinear sequence of events that defies political borders. King's narrative account is not a story of national progress and development. His work embodies Ezra Pound's concept of memory:

We do NOT know the past in chronological sequence. It may be convenient to lay it out anesthetized on the table with dates pasted on here and there, but what we know we know by ripples and spirals eddying out from us and from our own time. (p. xi)

King (2012) challenges the role of the 'good historian' in his role as storyteller: "A good historian would have tried to keep biases under control. A good historian would have tried to keep personal anecdotes in check. A good historian would have provided footnotes...I have not" (p. xii).

Canada's colonial history served to silence the voices of Indigenous peoples. As Werner (2002) states, "Voice and power are inseparable," and it is through understanding these power relationships that readers come to recognize a text beyond the voices present (p. 202). The Canadian grand narrative continues to deny the complexities and cultural diversity of Indigenous peoples in favour of a single story that celebrates national heroes and triumphs (Ross, 1995). Ross argues that History by its, "...Normative inclusive character denies its own fictionality and instability and thereby distorts the creative possibilities of the present and future" (p.673). King argues that such grand narratives present a romanticized version of History, which continues to deny Indigenous voices. As he writes, "We trust easy oppositions. We are suspicious of complexities, distrustful of contradictions, fearful of enigmas" (King, 2003, p. 25). King's narrative account challenges simple binaries

and gives voice to Indigenous histories and worldviews.

The Canadian grand narrative freezes the image of 'the Aboriginal' in the past in favour of a story of national progress. "Typically then, the Aborigine, like the Native American, occupies a paradoxical place in the national narrative. They are both set apart, not considered citizens, yet migrants from a primordial time" (LaSpina, 2003, p.678). Canada's colonial history and continued re/telling of this single story fails to relate present challenges to the past in the continued disenfranchisement of Indigenous peoples. Furthermore, these historically constructed images remain fixed within contemporary society, which perpetuates harmful stereotypes. King, a voice of resistance, states, "North America no longer sees Indians" (King, 2012, p. 53). What Canadians do see is the fabricated image of the 'North American Indian' as presented in Canadian textbooks and history curricula.

Stanley (2000) argues that, "overcoming colonialism is a complex project. It requires rejecting simple binaries of heroes and victims"(p.101). Canada's educational institutions play an important role in transforming our understanding of our colonial past. As Létourneau (2006) writes, *Mythhistories* are stories created by groups and/or individuals that are held as historical truths based on a person's personal understanding and experiences. She poses the question: "How does information of different types mix in a person's mind to produce ways of seeing that, over time, will consolidate 'mythhistories' that may undermine his or her capacity to see the world another way" (p. 71)? King challenges the *mythhistories* of Canada's past and its reputation as a fair country, and disrupts this position of power prevalent in nationalist histories.

King (2012) further challenges the assumption that the past is in the past, and that historical conflicts have been resolved. "You see my problem. The history I offered to forget, the past I offered to burn, turns out to be our present. It may well be our future" (p. 192). King speaks of Canadian-Aboriginal relations, from the Canadian government's apology for Indian Residential Schools, to Prime Minister Harper's statement at the

G20 summit in which he declared, "We have no history of colonialism" (p. 124). This contradiction indicates Canada's failure to learn from its history. King also speaks of government policies such as the *two-generation cut-off clause*, which denies some Aboriginal people their status. He highlights the report from the *Royal Commission of Aboriginal Peoples* prepared for the Federal government, which outlined recommendations to improve First Nations living conditions and government relations. "Probably the most embarrassing aspect of the Royal Commission of Aboriginal Peoples affair was the speed with which the report was buried. Alive" (p. 170). King raises awareness of present-day treaty abuses and unresolved land claims. As he states, "The issue has always been land. It will always be land, until there isn't a square foot of land left in North America that is controlled by Native people" (p. 217).

King (2012) argues that there is a history of a 'racist denial' in Canada that is not only perpetuated through government policies, but also through mainstream media (Stanley, 2006). "They [Indians] are the stereotypes and clichés that North America has conjured up out of experience and out of its collective imaginings and fears" (p. 53). Media as a cultural tool influences our understanding of our realities. As Wertch (2002) states, "Remembering is a form of mediated action, which entails the involvement of active agents and cultural tools" (p. 13). King speaks of his experience meeting with a French photographer who was taking his picture with a group of Native authors: "But, with my splendid moustache, I was no longer an authentic Indian. Real Indians, she told me, with no hint of humour or irony, didn't have facial hair"(King, 2012, p. 64). In sharing personal anecdotes, King evokes an emotional response from his readers that encourages a deeper reflection. As Werner (2002) argues, "Narrative and empathetic readings can be used instructionally to counter us/them dichotomies and the process of "othering" that often results from perceived cultural differences and assumed hierarchies" (p. 411).

Stories have the power to educate and transform. King's account of Native history in North America is a counter narrative to the Canadian grand narrative – a series of inter-

connected his/stories. King discusses the historical mistreatment of Indigenous peoples in Canada and continued abuses. As Werner (2002) states, "There is no narrative closure except as authors attempt to impose it, and as readers accept this attempt as legitimate" (p. 207). King (2012) presents a renewed vision of Canadian history that connects the past to present as an on-going story. He is direct in his language and unapologetic for brash

statements. Sharing his own lived experiences, he disrupts traditional academic writing, assigned schemas, and traditions. "Besieged by coyotes in Ottawa and Washington, Native people stopped asking for justice and began demanding it" (King, 2012, p. 157). King asserts his identity as an Indigenous scholar through the historical re/telling of American/Canadian histories that give rise to Indigenous perspectives. King does not ask permis-

sion or avoid controversy in telling this story, but reaffirms his identity as a member of the academic community and storyteller. If history is not to repeat itself, and Canada is to recognize its failures and move forward as a nation that values Indigenous ways of knowing, then more academics like King, need to continue to disrupt tradition in order to tell their stories and educate future generations about the dangers of silence.

References

- King, T. (2012) *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America*. Canada: Doubleday.
- King, T. (2003) *The Truth about Stories: A Native Narrative*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press.
- LaSpina, J. (2003). Designing Diversity: Globalization, Textbooks and the Story of Nations. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35 (6), 667-696.
- Létourneau, J. (2006) *Remembering Our Past: An Examination of the Historical Memory of Young Québécois*. In R.W. Sandwell (Ed.) *To the Past: History Education, Public Memory & Citizenship in Canada* (p. 70-87). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ross, D. (1995). Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing: From Romance to Uncertainty. *The American Historical Review*, 100 (3), 651-677.
- Stanley, T. J. (2006). Whose Public? Whose Memory? Racism, Grand Narratives and Canadian History." In R.W. Sandwell (Ed.) *To the Past: History Education, Public Memory & Citizenship in Canada* (p. 32-49). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Stanley, T. (2000). Why I Killed Canadian History: Towards an Anti-Racist History in Canada. *Histoire sociale/ Social History*, 33(65), 79-103.
- Werner, W. (2000). Reading Authorship into Texts. *Theory and Research in Social Education*. 28(2), 193-219.
- Werner, W. (2002). Reading Visual Texts. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30 (23), 401-428.
- Wertsch, J. (2002). *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, D. (1995). Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing: From Romance to Uncertainty. *The American Historical Review*, 100 (3), 651-677.

Partenariat parents-enseignants

Marie-Carène Pierre René

Introduction

Si l'école est l'une des institutions qui facilitent l'intégration sociale des élèves nouvellement arrivés et des immigrants, elle représente un défi de taille pour leurs parents qui ont de la difficulté à comprendre le système scolaire. Cette situation se vit beaucoup à Ottawa où s'installe la grande majorité des nouveaux arrivants et des réfugiés s'établissant au Canada (CPS, 2004). Plusieurs chercheurs ont étudié la collaboration et le partenariat entre parents immigrants et enseignants, sans tenir compte de la terminologie utilisée dans leurs études (Kanouté et Lafortune, 2011; Kanouté et Llevo, 2008; Kanouté, Vatz Laaroussi, Rachédi et Doffouchi, 2008; Vatz Laaroussi, Kanouté et Rachédi, 2008). Afin de comprendre les phénomènes sociaux tels que la collaboration entre parents et enseignants, le terme « immigrant » est souvent utilisé dans son sens large par ces auteurs pour désigner à la fois les parents immigrants et économiquement autonomes et les parents réfugiés – ceux qui ont fui leurs pays pour éviter la persécution (Kanouté et Lafortune, 2011; Kanouté et Llevo, 2008; Kanouté et coll., 2008; Vatz Laaroussi et coll., 2008). Afin d'inclure les deux groupes ci-haut mentionnés, il faudrait plutôt parler de parents immigrés au lieu de parents immigrants si l'on se réfère au concept dans son sens global. En évitant de différencier entre les parents immigrants économiquement autonomes et les parents réfugiés, les chercheurs ignorent les trajectoires migratoires distinctes de ces individus. Ces trajectoires divergentes pourraient affecter l'intégration de ces parents dans leur nouvel environnement de différentes façons, ce qui pourrait nuire à l'établissement du rapport parents-enseignants. Cet article vise à étudier les différences entre les parents économiquement autonomes et les parents réfugiés afin de mieux comprendre l'importance de la collaboration parents-enseignants dans l'accompagnement et la réussite scolaire.

Au cours de l'examen du partenariat entre parents immigrants, parents réfugiés et enseignants, les questions de recherche qui s'imposent sont les suivantes : comment les différentes trajectoires viennent-elles influencer le partenariat entre parents-ensei-

gnants? Quels défis cette influence vient-elle ajouter à la collaboration?

L'article est divisé comme suit : la problématique et la justification de la recherche, la recension des écrits (partenariat parents-enseignants), la méthodologie, les résultats, la discussion et la conclusion.

Problématique et justification de la recherche

Une grande majorité des nouveaux arrivants et des réfugiés au Canada s'établit à Ottawa. Selon le Conseil de planification sociale d'Ottawa (CPS), la région accueille 29 % des réfugiés, en comparaison avec Vancouver qui en reçoit 9 %, Toronto qui en reçoit 10 % et Montréal qui en reçoit 19 % (CPS, 2004). De plus, 11 % (7 065) des nouveaux arrivants qui s'établissent dans la région d'Ottawa proviennent d'autres villes canadiennes (CPS, 2004). Les écoles représentent l'un des premiers lieux d'interaction des nouveaux arrivants. Il est important d'assurer que les institutions scolaires facilitent leur intégration dans la société.

Une enquête menée par le CPS concernant l'intégration des gens issus de l'immigration fait état d'un écart qui existe entre les parents immigrants, les parents réfugiés et les enseignants. Les parents immigrants sont souvent des résidents permanents qui ont immigré en raison de leur capacité à contribuer à l'économie canadienne et des travailleurs qualifiés acceptés en raison de leurs compétences professionnelles (CIC, 2012). Ces travailleurs qualifiés ont fait leur propre demande pour s'établir au Canada dans le but d'augmenter leur capital et leur statut social (Kanouté et Llevo Calvet, 2008). En revanche, les parents réfugiés qui se trouvent au Canada craignent la persécution s'ils retournent dans leur pays d'origine (CIC, 2012). En majorité, ces familles réfugiées ont dû endurer des conditions migratoires déplorable, entre autres, les camps de réfugiés clandestins et divers tracasseries administratifs (Kanouté et Vatz Laaroussi, 2008). Ils vivent encore des moments difficiles au Canada au point de vue économique et social. Les parents réfugiés, qui ont souvent de la difficulté à communiquer dans l'une des deux langues officielles du Canada, soit par gêne ou par

manque de connaissances, comptent souvent sur leurs enfants pour les aider à interpréter et comprendre les normes institutionnelles et ces limitations sont souvent une source de plusieurs malentendus entre les familles et l'école (Vatz Laaroussi, 2008).

Le malentendu entre parents immigrants-enseignants et parents réfugiés-enseignants

Le malentendu entre parents et enseignants peut être attribué à l'écart sociale et culturelle qui existe entre les parents et les enseignants. Les différences culturelles et les styles parentaux, en autres, sont souvent utilisés pour expliquer les difficultés scolaires des nouveaux arrivants et même leurs échecs (Vatz Laaroussi et al, 2008).

Le projet migratoire est souvent structuré autour du rêve d'une mobilité sociale rapide et significative (Vatz Laaroussi et Rachédi, 2001). Selon Dubet (1997), quoique l'école soit devenue plus démocratique, elle continue à renforcer les inégalités sociales : « l'école s'est donc démocratisée, mais les écarts entre les groupes sociaux se sont maintenus et même creusés » (p. 2). Malgré leurs différents niveaux de classe sociale dans leur pays d'origine, les familles immigrantes et les familles de réfugiés voient leur capital social changer dans le pays d'accueil. D'une part, les familles immigrantes cherchent à surmonter ces obstacles en essayant de s'intégrer. Elles s'efforcent à participer aux partenariats parents-enseignants dans le but d'augmenter leur capital social, tandis que les familles réfugiées vont essayer d'atteindre le même capital social que les familles canadiennes, car elles n'ont pas d'objectif réaliste par rapport à leur situation socio-économique (Dubet, 1997; Vatz Laaroussi et coll., 2008). Ceci peut avoir un impact sur la réussite scolaire et l'accompagnement scolaire.

Les parents ont souvent des attentes envers les enseignants et vice versa. Changkoti et Akkari (2008) postulent que les tâches des enseignants et des parents ne peuvent être clairement définies. Il y aura toujours du chevauchement entre les deux. Les enseignants doivent accepter que la mission assi-

gnée à l'école soit désormais la socialisation et l'instruction selon les contextes.

Méthodologie

Ce qui suit sont deux études de cas, non-généralisables qui ont été effectuées dans le cadre d'un projet pilote. Afin d'examiner comment les différentes trajectoires migratoires viennent-elles influencer le partenariat entre parents-enseignants nous avons utilisé une approche qualitative avec des entretiens semi-structures face à face. Une analyse du contenu des réponses a été effectuée en utilisant les procédures de repérage des thèmes semblables pour comprendre le phénomène. La recherche eut lieu dans un organisme communautaire à but non lucratif qui offre des services d'établissement et d'intégration à la communauté immigrante d'Ottawa.

La collecte de donnée s'est donc faite avec la participation de deux parents. L'un (pseudonyme « Jocelyne ») appartenait à la catégorie de travailleurs qualifiés. L'autre (« Roger ») est un réfugié de la Somalie venu s'établir au Canada avec sa famille. L'origine ethnoculturelle et le sexe n'étaient pas un facteur dans la sélection des parents dans cette étude.

Cas de Jocelyne

Jocelyne est mère monoparentale qui a émigré de l'Égypte avec ses 3 enfants. Elle a une fille âgée de 13 ans en 8^e année, un garçon de 11 ans en 6^e année et une fille de 9 ans en 4^e année. La famille réside dans un appartement subventionné par le gouvernement canadien. Jocelyne, appartenant à la catégorie de travailleurs qualifiés, était hautement scolarisée. Elle était reconnue en tant qu'anesthésiologiste en Égypte, son pays d'origine.

Cas de Roger

Roger a immigré au Canada avec son épouse et leurs 9 enfants (4 garçons et 5 filles). Sa fille aînée est mariée et réside présentement dans leur pays d'origine. Six des neuf enfants sont présentement inscrits dans une institution scolaire : deux en 11^e année, un en 8^e année, une fille en 3^e année, une jeune fille au jardin d'enfants et deux jeunes garçons d'âge préscolaire nés au Canada. Roger, qui était réfugié, n'avait pas complété son secondaire. Jocelyne et Roger ont vécu à Ottawa entre 6 mois et 1 an. L'entrevue avec

Roger nécessitait la présence d'un interprète qui avait été fourni par l'organisme.

Discussions

Perception positive de l'institution scolaire

Les deux parents disent avoir bien été accueillis par le personnel scolaire. Ils ont des personnes ressources à qui faire appel lorsque c'est nécessaire et les enseignants sont prêts à leur fournir de la rétroaction sur le progrès de leurs enfants en tout temps. En général, Jocelyne et Roger semblent avoir une bonne relation avec les enseignants. Ils expliquent tous les deux que les enseignants sont patients et leur fournissent de l'aide au besoin.

Parents économiquement autonomes et partenariat avec l'enseignant

Jocelyne participe le plus souvent possible aux rencontres avec les enseignants. Elle lit souvent les notes envoyées par ceux-ci, surveille les devoirs de ses enfants et elle les accompagne dans leurs scolarités. Elle exerce une collaboration à la fois assignée et partenariale. Son plus gros défi est qu'elle le fait seule dans un pays auquel elle n'est pas encore habituée. C'était son choix de quitter son pays natal pour venir éduquer ses enfants au Canada. Elle accueille ces obstacles à bras ouverts et se dit que c'est le prix à payer pour la décision qu'elle a prise. Elle est optimiste que sa situation s'améliorera aussitôt, qu'elle aura réussi son agrément dans sa profession et qu'elle pourra travailler dans son domaine. Elle accepte les changements culturels avec un esprit léger. Elle a une bonne mine concernant sa nouvelle vie et le cheminement qu'elle a décidé d'entreprendre. Son attitude positive se traduit directement dans la façon qu'elle transige avec les enseignants.

Parents réfugiés et partenariat avec l'enseignant

Roger ne participe pas activement aux rencontres scolaires. Ce n'est pas parce qu'il n'est pas investi dans la réussite scolaire de ces enfants. Au contraire, c'est l'une de ses premières inquiétudes. Roger nous fait comprendre que ses enfants n'ont pas eu accès à des institutions scolaires lorsqu'ils étaient dans les camps de réfugiés et souffrent donc d'un manque dans leur éducation. À leur

arrivée au Canada, ils ont tous été placés dans des classes qui correspondaient à leur âge et non à leur niveau académique. Comme parent, il trouve extrêmement difficile d'exprimer et de faire comprendre ses inquiétudes, surtout pour ses enfants au niveau du secondaire. Il reconnaît que ses enfants aînés ne pourront pas continuer leurs études universitaires, mais il souhaiterait qu'ils apprennent un métier pour pouvoir vivre et avoir une source de revenus. Il aurait préféré inscrire ses enfants dans une école de vocation, mais cette décision était hors de son contrôle.

De plus, il explique qu'il n'a pas les compétences langagières, ni les connaissances académiques nécessaires, pour aider ses enfants avec leurs devoirs. C'est donc sa responsabilité d'aller chercher de l'aide pour qu'il puisse y arriver ou au moins comprendre ce qu'ils sont en train d'apprendre. Il va souvent chercher cette aide en communiquant avec son agent de liaison, un bénévole offert par l'organisation à but non-lucratif, qui le guide et lui fournit les renseignements au sujet de divers clubs de devoirs auxquels pourraient participer ses enfants.

Résultats et Conclusion

L'étude avait pour but d'examiner comment les différentes trajectoires viennent-elles influencer le partenariat entre parents-enseignants? Quels défis cette influence vient-elle ajouter à la collaboration?

Selon notre étude, un partenariat entre parents immigrants autonomes et enseignants est plus facile à établir, car les parents n'ont pas autant de barrières linguistiques. Ils peuvent se débrouiller dans au moins l'une des deux langues officielles, ils accueillent et acceptent les changements culturels et à cause de leur éducation, ont souvent recours au modèle de collaboration assignée et à la collaboration partenariale avec les enseignants, ce qui facilite la tâche d'éducation et la réussite scolaire. Généralement, les enfants des parents immigrants autonomes ont reçu une bonne éducation dans leur pays d'origine, ce qui leur permet de s'intégrer plus facilement dans le pays d'accueil. Les parents réfugiés ont plus de difficulté à établir un partenariat de collaboration. Ces parents éprouvent plus de contraintes linguistiques dans les langues officielles du Canada et doivent avoir recours aux organismes communautaires pour obtenir de l'aide supplémentaire afin de faciliter leur intégration dans la nouvelle communauté et la réussite scolaire de leurs enfants.

Il est important de retenir qu'il existe des différences entre les deux groupes de parents et ces différences doivent être reconnues lorsque les chercheurs effectuent des études.

Cette recherche pourrait aider les professeurs à deux niveaux : en premier lieu, à mieux comprendre le style parental qui peut exister parmi les parents immigrés afin d'établir une meilleure partenariat entre parents et

enseignants pour l'accompagnement scolaire de leurs enfants et étudiants, et deuxièmement, éviter de regrouper dans la même catégorie les parents qui ont subi des trajectoires migratoires différentes.

Références

- Changkakoti, N., et Akkari, A. (2008). Familles et écoles dans un monde de diversité : au-delà des malentendus. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, 34(2), 419–441.
- Conseil de Planification d'Ottawa (2004). *Immigrants in Ottawa: socio-cultural composition and socio-economic conditions*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Dubet, F. (1997). *École, familles : le malentendu*. Paris Textuel
- Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada (2012). Réfugié. (En ligne). Consulté le 26 novembre 2012. (<http://www.cic.gc.ca/francais/refugies/index.asp>)
- Kanouté, F., et Lafortune, G. (2011). La réussite scolaire des élèves d'origine immigrée : réflexions sur quelques enjeux à Montréal. *Éducation et francophonie*, 39(1), 80–92.
- Kanouté, F., et Llevo Calvet, N. (2008). Les relations-école-familles immigrées au Québec et en Catalogne. *Éducation et francophonie*, 36, 161–176.
- Kanouté, F., Vatz Laaroussi, M., Rachédi, L., et T. Doffouchi, M. (2008). Familles et réussite scolaire d'élèves immigrants du secondaire. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, 34(2), 265–289.
- Larivée, S. J. (2011). Regards croisés sur l'implication parentale et les performances scolaires. *Service social*, 57(2), 5–19.
- Vatz Laaroussi, M., Kanouté, F., et Rachédi, L. (2008). Les divers modèles de collaborations familles immigrées-écoles : de l'implication assignée au partenariat. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, 34(2), 291–311.

Experimenting with Deleuzian Research Methodologies

Eugenia Vasilopoulos

This paper attempts to explain what it means to do educational research from a Deleuzian perspective. Deleuzian ontology and associated research methodologies are far from conventional. As one experienced researcher warns, “if one wishes to put Deleuze’s concepts into practice, it demands a radical transformation of what it is to do educational research: epistemologically, conceptually, theoretically, methodologically, and rhetorically” (Waterhouse, 2011, p.506). The natural question that follows is whether this struggle will produce worthwhile results. In this paper, I discuss the many challenges of applying Deleuze (and Deleuze and Guattari) to practical educational. Conversely, I also discuss its potential of making a meaningful contribution to the field of education. I do this by first explaining what Deleuzian research methods entail. I then present how this fits within the Deleuzian assemblage. Finally, in Deleuzian style, I leave it up to the reader to plug-in and take what they may from this discussion.

What are Deleuzian Research Methods?

What are Deleuzian research methods? While it would be convenient to answer this question with a prescriptive list of criteria, it is no accident that such an inventory does not exist. In other words, the descriptive “what is” definition and the instructional “how to” procedures of Deleuzian research methodology remains ill-defined because as Lather rationalizes, it is “an inquiry that might produce different knowledge and produce knowledge differently...This inquiry cannot be tidily described in textbooks or handbooks (2013, p.635). Lather (2013) goes on to define characteristics of Deleuzian research methods as thinking differently and going beyond the reflective turn. It problematizes traditional notions of scientific inquiry emphasizing Marcus’ (2009) notion that there is “no methodological a priori” (p. 5).

With no fixed procedural set of methods to prescriptively guide data collection and analysis, Deleuzian research methods

can be viewed as a “thousand tiny methodologies” that are highly context dependent (Lather, 2013). The prominence of variation and difference in methodology contrasts to consistency and systematicity that has long defined scientific research. Again, this is no coincidence. A central principle of Deleuzian ontology is emphasis on difference, and this is reproduced in opposition to modes of inquiry that do not seek to uncover commonality and sameness (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Martin and Kamberlis (2013) emphasize its deconstructive nature which problematizes positivist arguments, quantitative representations, and structuralist logics. For Peters and Burbules (2004) this means calling attention not only to what is included in the research but also to what is omitted. From a Deleuzian approach to inquiry, the researcher is forced to grapple with the messy transgressive data that doesn’t fit into neat coding and categorization practices (St. Pierre, 2013). Furthermore, notions of essentialist identities, brute data, and fixed categorization of phenomena and processes are rejected giving primacy to differentiation and how continuous difference evolves (Greene, 2013).

As with postmodern/post-structural approaches to qualitative research, Deleuzian research methods also aim for a more “dynamic, historic, contingent, and situated understandings of complex human interactions, events, and institutions” (Martin & Kamberlis, 2013, p. 669). However, there are inherent differences which are expounded in Deleuze and Guattari’s explanation of a rhizome and rhizoanalysis. Methodologically, Deleuzian research draws on the rhizome and the practice of rhizoanalysis which incorporates 6 basic principles (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). For brevity, I will fast forward to the last two principles which relate to methodology and the observation, documentation, and explanation of growth. Principle five is “decalcomania” (tracing) and principle six is “cartography” (mapping). A tracing is a copy and operates according to principles of reproduction with the aim of representing the structure as accurately as possible. Tracing practice is embedded in scientific inquiry which

assumes the phenomenological experience to be essential and stable. This tradition has long guided qualitative inquiry. Tracing involves coding, interpretation, analysis and the presentation of generalized thematic findings representative of the research subjects. As a final product, a tracing is typical of qualitative data analysis and reporting; it would convey with closest accuracy the current state of meanings and experiences for the research participants. Tracing portrays reality as straightforward, linear, cause and effect relations and consequently, ignores other forces, often hidden, that may be at work (Martin & Kamberlis, 2013).

On the other hand, mapping involves tracing, but it moves beyond what is observable by exploring how open systems are contingent, unpredictable, and productive. Maps exceed both individual and collective experiences of what seems “naturally” real uncovering the virtual and potential for lines of flight that are particular to each individual. According to Deleuzian ontology, reality is composed of two kinds of vectors or lines of force. First,

lines of articulation are centripetal, homogenizing, hierarchizing, and normalizing discourses and practices. They perpetuate the status quo. Lines of flight are centrifugal, decentering, dispersing discourses and practices. They are the available means of escape from forces of repression and stratification (Martin & Kamberlis, 2013, p. 671).

To emphasize difference, the fundamental purpose of rhizoanalysis is to identify and map lines of flight. Hence the purpose is not to identify what is common or the same within the research but to emphasize difference, that is, what happens in between essentialized codes and categories. For example, in educational research this may be looking between the pre-given categories of motivated/unmotivated students, participatory/non-participatory learning, or inclusive/non-inclusive curriculum.

What does Rhizoanalysis Look Like?

Now, I will turn to Multiple Literacies Theory (MLT) (Masny, 2013) for a more specific explanation of rhizoanalysis. Keeping with Deleuzian ontology, MLT maintains that there are no codes as codes imply pre-given or constructed categories for which the data should be dissected and neatly packed to fit the category. Likewise, from an MLT perspective, interpretation of the data and generalizations are not the goal. Such an approach would be creating a type of knowledge based on the researcher's judgment and interpretation. Instead, vignettes are offered as raw data, unfiltered and untouched except for its selection based on researcher affect. Data is presented through vignettes as events that happened. At this juncture, the critical question is how vignettes are selected. Masny (2013) suggests

The vignettes foregrounded for analysis is based on its power to affect the assemblage and be affected by the assemblage. Vignettes rupture, deterritorialize, and take off in unpredictable ways. Instead of considering interpretation and what a text means, the questions are what vignettes do and how they function" (p. 343).

From this explanation, we can see that when reading the data, the researcher is affected. There are certain points within the data that strike the researcher's interest. The data has affected the researcher, and reciprocally, the researcher affects the data through selecting that piece as a vignette to be discussed. This multilateral interconnection between researcher, participants, data, instruments, observation site, and work space is the assemblage where the manuscript is produced. This data is offered to the reader to plug into and create their own independent meaning. Another assemblage occurs when a reader picks up the manuscript and begins to engage. The audience creates their own assemblage plugging into the ideas and reading in their own way.

Is This Still Research?

Clearly, what I describe above does not fit the criteria of traditional definitions of

scientific research. For the undiscerning eye, rhizoanalysis may seem to be the antithesis of systematic rigor, the benchmark of scientific inquiry. In other words, it may be perceived as random, not objective, and completely void of logical reasoning (Greene, 2013). Those unfamiliar with Deleuzian research methods might ask: Is this still research? The answer to that question depends on what you call research, and your ontological view of the world¹.

At this point, I should clarify how rhizoanalysis is not random, and instead, how this technique is embedded and coherent with the Deleuzian ontological view of the world that emphasizes difference (discussed above) and interconnection (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). In terms of interconnections, Deleuze and Guattari maintain that people are not isolated from their environment. People are inseparable from the pressures and resources presented by the external and internal milieu which they function in and from which they are produced. In fact, all entities, human and non-human are in flux in the assemblage.

This interconnection extends to the research process whereby the researcher, research topic, research participants, research site, and research methodologies are all intertwined making and unmaking each other. Thus, the researcher cannot separate herself from the research topic, the research site, the field material, and the research participants. Entangled within the research assemblage, it is impossible for the research to ascertain pure positivist objectivity. While post-structuralists are in agreement on this point and have long acknowledged this unrealistic expectation, there still remains a belief that a "real truth" exists. This "real truth" can be only be discovered by reflective researchers well-trained in stepping outside of themselves and bracketing their subjectivity (Barad, 2007). Moreover, Barad (2007) refers to Haraway's observation that "reflexivity has been recommended as a critical practice, but my suspicion is that reflexivity like reflection, only displaces the same elsewhere, setting up worries about...the search for the authentic and really real" (p. 71). In other words, the quest for reflexivity perpetuates the impossible search for a fixed truth.

Similarly, Deleuzian ontology rejects the notion that there is a 'real' truth waiting to be uncovered. For Deleuze and Guattari, multiple truths of reality exist momentarily only to morph into a different truth, and then another

different truth, and so on. Because whatever "truth" we can make of reality is always fleeting, Deleuze and Guattari espouse research that shifts from the participants' experience of the research phenomenon to what is happening in the research assemblage. Hence, the focus is on the research process itself as the researcher attempts to uncover and understand the participants' experiences. As Sandvik (2010) notes:

The radical shift of focus from the subject (here the researcher) as a unit inscribed in and inscribing her/himself discursively, towards a decentered subject immanently related to matter, time and nature, passing into the various elements and objects opens up to an overwhelming complexity (p. 31).

This decentered researcher placed next to a decentered participant reflects what Lather (2013) and Martin and Kamberelis (2013) describe as a different type of inquiry to produce a different type of knowledge.

Conclusion

This paper provides a cursory introduction and explanation of Deleuzian methodologies. I write this paper from the perspective of a novice researcher in the field. Unfortunately, I notice too often academic peers have been quick to reject what does not neatly adhere to established practices, guidelines, and assumptions. The messiness, non-uniformity, abstract, overly philosophical, and not-readily accessible nature of Deleuzian inspired research makes it easy target for gut reactions. Keeping with tradition is much more comfortable than embarking on an unpredictable journey, especially a journey that endorses and embraces the very unpredictability that research has for so long denied. If one accepts that the world, and the world of educational research is not as clear cut as previously believed, and that much goes on in-between the categories that we've used to define, essentialize, and interpret our research participants' experiences, then we must look towards an ontology and corresponding tool-kit of research methodologies that better reflects the phenomenon around us and within us. I leave it up to the reader to make their own assessment.

Endnotes

1. St. Pierre (2000, 2002, 2004) provides an excellent discussion of the epistemological coherence of research method to ontology. Lather (2004a, 2004b, 2006) also puts forward a compelling argument for the expansion of criteria for rigor in scientifically based educational research.
-

References

- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Burbules, N. & Petes, M. (2004). *Post-Structuralism and Educational Research*. Lanham, U.S.A.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Deleuze, G. (1990). *The Logic of Sense*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Continuum.
- Greene, J. (2013). On rhizomes, lines of flight, mangles, and other assemblages. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26, 749-758.
- Lather, P. (2013). Methodology-21: What do we do in the afterward? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26, 634-645.
- Lather, P. & St. Pierre, E.A. (2013). Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26, 629-633.
- Lather, P. (2004a). This is your father's paradigm: Government intrusion and the case of qualitative research in education. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10 (1), 15-34.
- Lather, P. (2004b). Scientific research in education: A critical perspective. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30 (6), 759-771.
- Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19 (1), 35-57.
- Martin, A. D. & Kamberelis, G. (2013). Mapping not tracing: qualitative educational research with political teeth. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26, 668-679.
- Masny, D. (2013). Rhizoanalytical pathways in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19 (5), 339-348.
- Sandvik, N. (2010). The art of/in educational research: assemblages at work. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, 1 (1) 29-40.
- St. Pierre, E. (2013). The posts continue: becoming. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26, 646-657.
- St. Pierre, E. (2004). Deleuzian concepts in education: The subject undone. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36 (3), 283-296.
- St. Pierre, E. (2002). 'Science' rejects postmodernism. *Educational Researcher*, 31 (8), 25-27.
- St. Pierre, E. (2000). *The call for intelligibility in post-modern educational research*. *Educational Researcher*, 29 (5), 25-28.
- Waterhouse, M. (2011). Deluezian experimentations in Canadian immigrant language education: research, practice, and policy. *Policy Future in Education*, 9 (4) 505-517.

Anton Birioukov attended Ryerson University, majoring in History, with a minor in Sociology. Upon completing his Bachelor's degree he earned a Master's of Education degree and a Graduate Diploma in Urban Education at York University where he investigated causes of student absenteeism in an inner city secondary school. He is currently attending the University of Ottawa's Ph.D. program in Education in the concentration of Society, Culture and Literacies. His current research focuses on how inner city schools approach attendance issues when working with an economically disadvantaged demographic.

Karen Bouchard (O'Shea) is a Ph.D. student in the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation stream at the Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa. Her interests focus on children's social-emotional experiences at school, particularly in how students develop and navigate their social groups and friendships. For her dissertation, she will explore how pre-adolescents experience victimization within their friendships. Karen is involved in Canada's PREVNet (Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence Network), as a graduate student executive member and continues to annotate violence prevention programs for the Canadian Best Practices Portal. Karen holds a B.A., B.Ed., and M.Ed. from Queen's University.

Ashley Campbell is a Ph.D. student at the Faculty of Education in the Society, Culture and Literacies stream. Her research focuses on decolonization and the integration of local and Indigenous knowledges in teacher education programs and public schools systems. She previously worked for the Ministère de l'Éducation nationale in France, Aboriginal Education/The Native Language Instructors' Program at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay, Ontario. She has also worked in various alternative education settings, including the Montessori system. She holds a B.A. in French Studies and Sociology, a B.Ed. in French as Second Language (FSL) and Social Science (Individual & Society), and an M.Ed. (thesis) with a focus on children's human rights and arts-based education.

Trista Hollweck is a Ph.D. student at the University of Ottawa in the department of Education, Teaching, Learning and Evaluation. After her experience teaching in Japan through the JET programme, Trista earned her Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) from the University of Edinburgh (Moray House) in 2000 and began her teaching career as a middle school ELA teacher at the Western Quebec School Board. Since then she has been an administrator, teacher leader and school board consultant. Most recently, she has been involved in the development and coordination of board-wide new teacher induction and mentoring and teacher evaluation initiatives, which aim to promote teaching and learning. As a passionate community builder, Trista is actively engaging with and training others in Restorative Practice (IIRP), Tribes TLC and Instructional Intelligence within the school and University setting. Trista also holds a B.A. (McGill) and an M.Ed. from OISE/UT.

Erin Kraft is a M.A.(Ed) student in the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation concentration in the Faculty of Education at the University of Ottawa. Her area of research examines the teaching methods that are utilized by swimming instructors, when teaching children with an Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) diagnosis how to swim. A specific interest in this research focuses on the enhanced peer interactions that emerge from implementing appropriate teaching methods into aquatic based lessons. Erin completed her double major B.A. at York University and B.Ed. at the University of Ottawa.

Marie-Carene Pierre René est doctorante à la Faculté d'éducation de l'Université d'Ottawa. Détenant un baccalauréat en développement international et mondialisation avec concentration en psychologie ainsi qu'une maîtrise en éducation, son champ d'intérêt de recherche comprend l'expérience des étudiants immigrants dans le contexte de l'éducation langue seconde, la race et la racialisation.

Gene Vasilopoulos is a second year Ph.D. student in the Second Language Concentration. Her research interests are in language identity and language socialization, and most recently, language learning from a Deleuzian perspective.

le/the Journal

VOLUME 4, No. 1

SPRING 2015
PRINTEMPS 2015

*A publication of the Education
Graduate Students Association
Association des étudiant.e.s
diplômé.e.s en éducation
(ESGA-AÉDÉ) of the
University of Ottawa*

*Une publication de l'Éducation
Graduate Students Association
Association des étudiant.e.s
diplômé.e.s en éducation
(ESGA-AÉDÉ) de
l'Université d'Ottawa*

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
RÉDACTRICE EN CHEF**
Joanne M.C. Lalonde

**ASSOCIATE EDITORS
RÉDACTEURS ADJOINTS**
Maria Bastien
Shezad Ghani

**PRODUCTION EDITOR
RÉDACTEUR, PRODUCTION**
Jonathan Weber

