

Negotiating Notions of Self, Culture, and Curriculum throughout Graduate School: One Student's Reflexive Explorations

Christina Skorobohacz

Brock University
cskorobohacz@gmail.com

Abstract

Inspired by an autoethnographic mode of inquiry, I attempt to make sense of my experiences during graduate school by exploring critical incidents that have propelled me to reconstruct new visions of myself as a scholar and to adopt flexible understandings of curricula in higher education. I articulate several significant experiences involving my ongoing negotiations of self, culture, and curriculum throughout graduate studies. Utilizing a poststructuralist lens of analysis I take up these moments of tension, by asking myself a series of Deleuzian inspired questions (Williams, 2005), which prompt reflexive thought. These questions may help other graduate students to reconcile contradictions they encounter throughout their graduate education, while striving to identify productive visions for themselves as scholars and to adopt open-mindedness towards different perspectives.

Purpose

According to Doll (2002), “we need to look at curriculum as a transformative personal experience as we— students and teachers— reflect, autobiographically, on our journey” (p. 44). I came to graduate school optimistic and excited about entering a new phase of my development. I spent the first years (a) attempting to make meaning of dense theoretical texts, (b) juggling a heavy workload, and (c) dealing with loss in my personal life (parental divorce, death of a loved one, etc.). For a short time, I buried myself in my studies in order to avoid dealing with family matters. Later, I found that reading, researching, and writing about others' experiences associated with adult identity, change, and personal growth (e.g., Anthis, 2002; Emmons, 2003; Graham, Sorell, & Montgomery, 2004; Kunnen & Klein-Wassink, 2003) helped me to come to terms with my own feelings of grief, confusion, alienation, and fragility, and to appreciate the complexity of my own autobiography as a learner (Brookfield, 2012). The purpose of this paper is to share reflections from my learning journey throughout graduate school as I attempt to make sense of significant critical incidents that have propelled me to reconstruct new visions of myself as a beginning scholar and aspiring academic and to adopt flexible understandings of curricula in higher education. Part of expressing who I am and who I hope to become involves openly acknowledging to myself and to others my priorities, successes, failures, and the lessons that I have learned along the way. Graduate students at various stages of their programs are likely to be interested in this paper, as I offer key questions and tools that they may find useful when reflecting on their own learning journeys and strategizing on how to move forward with their academic programs.

Identifying a Theoretical and Methodological Approach to Inquiry

Influenced by autoethnography (e.g., Duarte, 2007; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Holman Jones, 2005; Holt, 2003), in this paper, I venture into the examination of self, culture, and curriculum through an analysis of critical incidents. Autoethnographers purposefully and daringly utilize their experiences as a tool to engage, invite, and support individuals and communities to recognize the messy, connected, and uncertain nature of their lives and surroundings through ongoing reflections, reactions, and transformations connected to themselves and societies (Holman Jones, 2005). Practically, authors recall the details of significant happenings that occurred in a given time, place, and social

setting for the purposes of reaching novel discoveries through conscious consideration (Duarte, 2007). Burgess (2006) notes that tension-filled experiences can be productive, if listened to, explored and contemplated critically, as they can lead to growth and personal awareness. Critiquing experiences and articulating visions are important practices for emerging scholars as they begin to explore who they are and what they stand for. Reflexive inquiries encourage individuals: to move beyond narrow-minded conceptualizations of research (exploring varied investigative approaches such as autoethnography); to acknowledge that there are many things they do not know; to recognize the need for venturing beyond “the familiar;” and to work at navigating between disciplinary, scholarly, institutional, and other communities (e.g., Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Gardner, Hayes, & Neider, 2007; Pallas, 2001). I analyze multiple self-authored documents that I produced during the first two years of doctoral studies including presentations, course reflections, assignments, and a reflective journal, in order to identify emerging themes, tensions, and contradictions connected to my understandings of self, culture, and curriculum. It is my hope that elements of these stories, feelings, and reflections resonate with other graduate students, and possibly help them navigate some of the complicated moments they encounter throughout their scholarly pursuits (e.g., Ellis & Bochner, 2000).

I use poststructuralist discourse as a springboard to critically examine pivotal moments of learning that have led to transformations in how I understand myself and my experiences in higher education. “In poststructuralism, life is not to be defined solely by science, but by the layers of history and future creations captured in wider senses of language, thought and experience” (Williams, 2005, p. 16). By drawing on two key poststructural theorists (e.g., Deleuze, 1968/1994; Derrida, 1967/1978), I begin to interrogate my understandings of identity, culture, and curriculum, coming to see that these constructs cannot be reduced to simplistic, predictable or singular representations, for they are multifaceted and complex (Williams, 2005). I, like other graduate students, often struggle with conflicting conceptualizations of identity and how to locate myself within an array of epistemological and ontological traditions. Notions of identity, belonging, and community quickly become destabilized as I engage with poststructural analysis. Identities are viewed as fluid, conceptualized in relationship, and in connection to other frames of reference (Schwandt, 2007).

In particular, I take up moments of tension and possibility connected to (a) my attempts to reconcile challenging feedback I received on a course assignment, and (b) my ongoing negotiation of academic work roles. Continued reflection reshapes my thinking about these happenings (Williams, 2005). I offer some of my own counter-stories (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001), against structuralist representations of curricula. I frame them within poststructural inquiry to get at different sorts of experiences, perspectives and readings, which avoid perpetuating one dominant “grand narrative” (Williams, 2005) of graduate school. All the while I ask myself Deleuzian inspired critical questions such as: What is missing or remains unspoken? (Eisner, 1985; Williams, 2005), “ ‘What tensions and paradoxes are at play here?’[,] ‘How am I determined to move the problem on?’ ” (Williams, 2005, p. 64), and “How can we make things different?” (Williams, 2005, p. 3). These questions guide my exploration of the incidents that I share. Through the continuous practices of writing, thinking, analyzing, extending, and imagining, I attempt to show my evolving understandings of curriculum in higher education. I now appreciate the potential that exists for reinterpreting and working with higher education curricula in a creative and flexible manner that aligns closely with graduate students’ needs and aspirations.

Exploring Critical Incidents in Graduate School: A Search For New Learnings

I came to graduate school with a passion for teaching and learning, and a growing repertoire of pedagogical tools I had acquired through my former work as a heritage language instructor, one-to-one lifeskills worker, and private tutor. However, upon entering graduate school, much of what I thought I knew about teaching and learning, including the fixed or structuralist representations of identity, culture, and curriculum that I was holding on to would quickly be disrupted and destabilized as I came up against particular theories, methodologies, and individuals that forced me to confront some of my deeply held assumptions and my partial perspectives.

In the following section, I attempt to analyze two critical incidents throughout graduate studies that have pushed me to think about the multiplicity and complexity of self, culture, and curricula. By viewing these moments from

different vantage points, I am coming to understand them in new, yet limited ways (Williams, 2005). In the context of this paper, I refer to critical incidents as “significant life events” “acting as transformative pathways allowing for self discover[ies]” (Skorobohacz, 2008, p. 132). My continued reflection reshapes my thinking about these happenings (Williams, 2005). At times, I generate more questions about these incidents than I do answers.

Reconciling Challenging Feedback: Critically Examining Myself, My Fears, and My Privileges Through The Lens of My Writing

In this paper, I have drawn on Cherryholmes’ (2002) understanding of curriculum as “that which students have an opportunity to learn (inclusion) and what they do not have an opportunity to learn (exclusion) and the skills and knowledge(s) and disposition(s) required to produce success” (p. 118). The first critical incident I will analyze involves my attempt to reconcile difficult feedback I received about my writing in a doctoral course.

Early in my program, I was required to take an online stream-specific seminar. The world of online learning was completely new to me. I found myself contending with the challenges of navigating this unfamiliar environment, having discussions in asynchronous time, missing face-to-face interaction, agonizing over word choice as I posted my weekly responses, and encountering difficulties with misinterpretation (Kanuka & Kelland, 2008). I struggled to make meaning of most readings that term. Key topics in the course including critical discourse analysis and environmental education seemed quite disconnected from anything I had ever read about or planned to undertake. I desperately tried to find ways to tie concepts, ideas, and perspectives together in order to move my own research and thinking forward; yet my ongoing attempts to do so seemed forced and contrived. I wondered why we were reading these particular articles and not others. What was I “supposed” to be learning from these texts? How could I apply the ideas I was reading about to my own personal or professional life and work? Confronted with the challenges of feeling lost and alienated, I struggled with the discomfort of “getting personal” (Richardson, 2001), wondering how to write about myself in an online learning platform. I grappled with how much of myself and my stories to include and exclude, knowing that the text would be posted indefinitely, for my peers and professors to read.

One of the questions I thought about frequently throughout my online learning experiences was “What constitutes active engagement?” I realized that online courses are demanding in terms of the amount of reading, responding, synthesizing, and connecting that are required in order to be actively engaged in learning. I continued to document my reactions to the readings. When I read authors’ works that demonstrated their careful, deep thinking, and open acknowledgement of their identities and motivations, I felt more trusting of them and more at ease. Yet, I continued to struggle with expressing my voice (and revealing aspects of myself to others) through my own writing. Others have commented that my writing (as well as my style of presenting at conferences) can seem firm, formal, professional, and guarded. I find it extremely difficult to write (and present to an academic audience) in any other way. Kompf (2009) states that: “Writing about self can help overcome writer’s block” (p. 14); yet, I often find the opposite to be true for me. As I write about myself, I am forced to deal with the complexity of emotions, tensions, and uncertainties that I do not necessarily want to bring to the surface and reveal to others (especially my peers and mentors). As colleagues in my courses articulated in their postings, putting oneself out there can be daunting, as feelings of vulnerability and insecurity are bound to surface. It is like airing one’s “dirty laundry” for all to see. I was frequently left questioning: How can I overcome this hurdle and offer my authentic voice? What does “authentic voice” mean? Does such a thing even exist? Is there a middle ground that I can somehow manage to reach, where I can root my claims firmly in both existing literature and intimate personal experience? What do these questions and struggles convey to others regarding my beliefs and assumptions about scholarly writing? Why should writing in the first person and from personal experience be any less valid or credible than writing in the third person and from research?

Interestingly, I have found that when I begin to think of speaking or “writing from the heart,” as a teaching and learning tool (or catalyst for opening up discussion of important issues), I am more willing and able to proceed. Richardson’s (2001) words are finally beginning to resonate with me: “People who write are always writing about their lives” (p. 38). I am reminded of Claire Smith’s (2008) work, which expresses the same sentiment. Through my online courses, I began to see that whether I acknowledged it explicitly or not, my writing and my research were largely grounded in making sense of critical incidents in my personal, professional, and academic life, such as my

parents' divorce, my struggles in balancing academic and employment roles, the pressure I put on myself as an eldest sibling to be a role model and mediator, the difficulties I have experienced as a young woman and a new scholar with saying no and striving to please others, and so on. By acknowledging and verbalizing some of my own challenges on paper, perhaps I can reach out to others who may be experiencing similar tensions, and help them to understand that they are not alone.

In that first online course, my major paper was returned to me with critical feedback that I struggled to embrace. This experience proved to be a pivotal moment in my learning journey that I take up here in an attempt to explore some of the omissions and assumptions that were embedded in my earlier thoughts and writings. In her feedback, the instructor cautioned me to consider that "in the support of a generic construction of 'women' [I was] essentializing and reproducing the notion that 'women' is equated with white women." She encouraged me to consider applying an intersectionalities framework in the future, in order to aid in a deeper and more complex analysis of the issues. At first, I felt hurt by and defensive about her comments. I did not know if or how I could make use of this feedback. I put the paper away and did not return to it for several weeks.

As the course came to an end, I spent some time on my own reading about intersectionalities frameworks that acknowledge individuals' multifaceted identities including but not limited to their race, gender, class, religion, ethnicity, and sexuality and facilitate an understanding of the complex ways in which those identities "intersect," contributing to a person's differential positioning within particular moments and institutional spaces, pointing to instances of privilege, marginality, as well as exclusion (e.g., Berry, Jay, & Lynn, 2010; Brayboy, Castagno, & Maughan, 2007; Collins, 1986; Gopaldas, Prasad, & Woodard, 2009; Schlosser & Foley, 2008; Wall, 2008). Turning back to some of the earlier course literature in light of what I read, I was able to appreciate how my use of language was exclusionary. Brayboy et al. (2007) recognize that "system(s) of dominance allow for the re-creation and continuation of privilege, even by those who are well intentioned" (p. 177). My failure to include an intersectional framework within the paper meant that I was reproducing colour-blind ideologies (Yosso, Parker, Solorzano, & Marvin, 2004). Intentional and unintentional omissions, manipulation of language and discourse (van Dijk, 1993; 2002), and essentializing strategies (Williams, 2005) are some of the "cultural mechanisms" "equivalent" to "'pan and scan' editing" (Gough, 2002, pp. 6-7). I could not remain ignorant or naive to these practices.

Since then, I have begun to ask myself, "How is [my] privilege at someone else's expense?" (Brayboy et al., 2007, p. 181). In privileging white western perspectives, am I not "forc[ing] some students and professors to abandon aspects of their identity that are central to their being, survival, and success" (Brayboy et al., 2007, p. 167)? Listening to the counterstories of others (e.g., Solorzano & Yosso, 2001) continues to broaden my awareness of the barriers that many individuals experience every day. With an open mind, I am better able to welcome feedback as constructive, and realize its potential to be transforming and productive. I have started to appreciate mentorship as both supportive and critical at the same time (e.g., Doll, 2002; Spillett & Moisiwicz, 2004), ultimately pushing me to strive for more.

Through this experience, I realize that I have limitations in my own thoughts and understandings that I must strive to address in conscious ways and on a daily basis. Sometimes my biases and positions of privilege can be identified by scrutinizing my writing, reflecting critically upon my childhood experiences and dissecting the demeaning representations of others found within messages, images, and texts around me and the ways these representations have influenced how I look at, think of, or approach others. Applying intersectionalities frameworks to better appreciate how a person's multiple social locations complicate his or her positioning and daily struggles is an important practice. My learnings throughout the experience of negotiating difficult feedback brought some of these complex issues to my consciousness.

Subsequently, I have started to think critically about possible gaps in my knowledge and understandings; the ways that I am growing and changing; the importance of taking risks in my learning and being open to adopting new theoretical lenses; the need to move beyond theorizing towards an action orientation that allows me to be accountable for my own learning and practice; and my ongoing struggles to embrace change, instability, and chaos within and around me (e.g., Doll, 2002). Making mistakes and opening them up to scrutiny and subsequent

reflection presents an important opportunity for learning and growth. Constructive feedback offers a way to push my thinking in new directions, and the sharing of ideas provides an opportunity to learn about and from others. Now, a few years later, I notice within me a greater willingness to venture outside my comfort zone in search of diverse perspectives and knowledge that enable me to make sense of the world in creative and non-linear ways, recognizing value in reading outside my discipline and experimenting with non-traditional forms of representation (e.g., poetry, media). I am at ease with feeling uneasy, I appreciate that learning never ends, and I am prepared to switch course when new ideas facilitate shifts in my thinking (e.g., Gardner et al., 2007).

Negotiating Academic Work Roles: Tensions of An Aspiring Academic

The second critical incident I take up in this paper involves my ongoing efforts to negotiate academic work roles. Early in my doctoral program, I listened to a guest speaker talk about tips for completing the dissertation and mapping out one's road to success in academe. He talked about the importance of publishing and securing grants, and seemed to refer to these endeavours as if they were a game that he had mastered. His detailed spreadsheets documented the precise trajectory that he would attempt to follow. After his presentation, I remember feeling completely overwhelmed. Seeing his comprehensive 5-year plan for completing his dissertation and moving into an academic position, I wondered was that really what was expected from me? If so, did I desire this kind of professional life?

I quickly realized that I did not want to become the kind of academic who seemed to be more concerned with impact factors and the ways I could ensure primary authorship, than with helping students, making a positive difference within my discipline and university, and carrying out a program of research that I could be passionate about and view as worthwhile. What (if anything) could I take away from his talk? I began to think about who I was and who I hoped to become. I recognized the need to build my research skills; to accept that there would be many things I did not know and it was all right to admit this (and ask for guidance from others when necessary); to write regularly; and to set long-term and short-term goals and monitor my progress.

Throughout my directed study course, I began to hold bi-weekly theme-oriented critical conversations with my supervisor. I facilitated our dialogues based on my emerging reflections, critiques, and insights in response to readings, research, and my own experiences. I valued the one-on-one dialogue with an established academic. Specifically, this dimension of the course was helpful in terms of understanding the ways that one professor negotiates her roles and navigates the field, and aiding me to see the processes involved, to identify the types of questions I should be thinking about at this stage of my career, and to push me towards considering issues from different vantage points.

During this period in my graduate studies, and in response to both the former guest speaker and the higher education literature I had been reading, I decided to conduct a two-week time-study to examine my use of time in and across various academic roles (e.g., coursework, teaching, research, service, professional development, writing, etc.). I was shocked to discover that I was spending nearly 45% of my time engaged in service. I noted my own struggles with balancing academic work. I recognized misalignment and differing values when I compared the time I spent in these roles with standard institutional expectations for tenure-track faculty members in Canada (i.e., 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service). I wondered how to deal with this, and began thinking about the tensions I would face as a novice academic if I did not re-adjust my use of time to more closely mirror the traditional breakdown of academic work for tenure-track faculty members (my desired career goal). I continued to have ongoing conversations with my supervisor around these issues, and our discussions led us to undertake a collaborative research project related to professors' commitments to service and their quality of working life (see McGinn & Skorobohacz, n.d. for details). The opportunity to be a co-investigator (involved in all facets of the project and an equal decision-maker) was important to the development of my researcher identity and skills. It allowed me to recognize myself as becoming a legitimate researcher (rather than merely serving as someone else's assistant) (Harris, Freeman, & Aerni, 2009). Together, we pondered some of the following issues: What constitutes "service?" Who engages in it and why? Has there been an erosion of academic citizenship across universities? And, What implications exist for the future of university governance? I quickly realized that other academics were similarly struggling with these questions and concerns.

Although I have dramatically reduced my service commitments, I am still devoting more than 20% of my time to these activities. Service work continues to be extremely important to me, as I am able to learn about institutional protocols and chains of command, be involved in decision making, offer input on issues that affect graduate students, connect with faculty and students within and beyond my institution, take on leadership roles, and contribute to the various communities to which I belong. Engaging in service has helped to demystify decision-making processes. Knowing how decisions are made is useful in terms of developing my understanding of institutional structures and governance models. This service work allows me to be a part of departmental-, Faculty-, and university-level conversations and to appreciate the differing perspectives, priorities, and matters that make their way into the discussions that take place within these separate, yet interconnected systems that comprise a university. As Hall (2007) explains:

Our individual needs and desires as members of a community must always operate in negotiation with the macrolevel concerns of our departments and colleagues. Furthermore, our understandings of the dynamics of our department must always work in tandem with our explorations of the larger needs and priorities of our colleges and universities. And finally, our colleges and universities must operate responsibly with reference to and some understanding of the perspectives of their surrounding communities. (pp. 10–11).

Engaging in service allows me to traverse across these spaces and encourages me to adopt a holistic understanding of how external movements and mandates influence universities, Faculties, departments, staff, and students. At times, I think that it is necessary to step outside my department to gain new insights, a larger perspective, and sensitivity towards what is happening in other places across campus and how that might influence my own work within a particular program or department. Understanding my work as being part of a whole, enables me to recognize myself as belonging to (and engaged in) various communities, rather than functioning in isolation from them.

My service commitments have enabled me to participate in department meetings, plan colloquia, adjudicate awards, review calendar entries, contribute to policy development, learn about University Senate processes, dialogue about field safety, connect with professional and disciplinary associations, and review proposals and manuscripts. As Morris (2007) argues, “In our...service, we show where our hearts lie—in what we do for whom, where, and why” (p. 248). My service work tells others that I am an engaged, committed, and collegial academic citizen who demonstrates initiative and cares about others. I am willing to take on the roles of leader, advocate, organizer, facilitator, mentor, researcher, writer, thoughtful listener, questioner, adjudicator, reviewer, and so on, in order to support others, nurture a culture of collegiality, and give back to the communities that I serve. However, I still have many unresolved tensions related to service. At times, I feel frustrated by the slow pace of decision making and by peoples’ resistance to change. I often struggle when concerns over finances and resources seem to trump discussions about meeting students’ needs and enhancing their experiences. On occasion, I am bogged by the lack of communication and connections that exists between Faculties and departments. Likewise, I am mindful that students and pre-tenured faculty might face some risks when they take part in service work.

Within universities, certain work roles are esteemed over others (e.g., publishing and researching are acknowledged over service and teaching; Side & Robbins, 2007; Stout, Staiger, & Jennings, 2007), which sometimes contradicts individuals’ interests and commitments (such as giving back to particular communities by serving others and engaging in committee work). Individuals try to dissuade me from engaging in service. In these moments, I feel discouraged, particularly when I notice that there are people in academia who do not genuinely support and value service (e.g., other students, professors, promotion and tenure committee members, etc.). I often wonder why this is the case. What might this tell me about the nature of academic work and the structural constraints of universities? How can members of universities begin to emphasize and recognize the importance of service? Sometimes I seriously question whether I will be able to work within these existing structures and meet institutional expectations without losing sight of who I am and what matters to me.

In thinking about how to move this problem forward (Williams, 2005), I connected with two colleagues who shared their own concerns and tensions associated with navigating the professoriate. Together, we started an informal network (a peer mentoring group) for aspiring academics in our program. We organized a variety of sessions, often

brainstorming topics related to our needs, interests, and current stages within the program. At times, we invited faculty or senior graduate students to share their insights, experiences, tensions, and strategies with us. We held sessions related to mentoring in academe, the challenges and opportunities of transitioning from graduate student to beginning professor, navigating the comprehensive examination process, locating academic positions, constructing a curriculum vitae, and identifying ethical and legal issues relevant to new academics. Our group, although small, provided an inviting and collegial space for candid conversations and exchange of strategies that assisted us with negotiating the complexities of the institution, as well as program requirements.

Concluding Thoughts

Over the course of my learning journey thus far, I have begun to develop the skills, knowledge, and experiences necessary to be an academic. Each day I grow more aware of who I am and what I believe in. Part of my awareness has come from an increased willingness to talk openly about critical incidents in graduate school (involving both successes and failures), and to think carefully about what I have learned as a result of those experiences. I now strive to be self-protective of my time (Hall, 2002, 2007). I attempt to set boundaries and deadlines in order to balance my obligations. I make a concerted effort to articulate my personal positioning including how I connect to the topics I research and teach. The discomfort and vulnerability that I might feel in the process of articulating my positioning oftentimes push me towards important self-realizations. I regularly ask for interim feedback from my students, colleagues, and professors to help me identify where I am at in my own learning, writing, or teaching, and where I need to go. Joining or creating learning communities (e.g., conversation colleagues, peer mentoring groups, instructor networks) has helped me to cultivate spaces for exchanging stories, ideas, resources, and support strategies. I recognize that endeavours outside my formal coursework greatly enrich my student experience and self-explorations. Finally, I take time to reflect on Hall's (2007) important question: "How [do] [y]our actions and interactions contribute positively or negatively to the realization of a more just and intellectually dynamic world, within [y]our department and more globally"? (p. 18). I am committed to going beyond course requirements and beyond formal curricula, to listen to others' stories, and to cultivate opportunities to make meaning of my learning.

The exchange of stories, experiences, and resources helps to nurture connections and brings curriculum to life in ways that textbooks are not capable of doing. Through collaborative efforts, graduate students and professors can engage in deconstructive work in partnership with one another (Deleuze, 1968/1994) and begin to ask challenging questions of themselves and their experiences such as: What is missing or remains unspoken? (Eisner, 1985; Williams, 2005), " 'What tensions and paradoxes are at play here?' [,] 'How [are we] determined to move the problem on?' " (Williams, 2005, p. 64), and "How can we make things different?" (Williams, 2005, p. 3). In this way, scholars can begin to utilize reflexive analysis of critical incidents to support the enmeshing of fruitful possibilities that (a) enable the bridging of ideas, languages, worldviews, and disciplines; and (b) transform their understandings of identity, culture, and curriculum in exciting ways.

Acknowledgements

Parts of this manuscript originated from my unpublished doctoral comprehensive portfolio narrative. I would like to thank my advisor, instructors, committee members, and colleagues for their generous contributions to my intellectual development as a scholar. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education 2012 conference in Waterloo, Ontario. I am indebted to Dr. John Freeman (discussant) and Ana Santos (journal reviewer) for their valuable feedback on my writing.

References

- Anthis, K. S. (2002). On the calamity theory of growth: The relationship between stressful life events and changes in identity over time. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 2, 229–240. doi:10.1207/S1532706XID0203_03
- Berry, T. R., Jay, M. J., & Lynn, M. (2010). Introduction: Thoughts and ideas on the intersectionality of identity. *Educational Foundations*, 24(1–2), 3–9.
- Brayboy, B. M. J., Castagno, A. E., & Maughan, E. (2007). Equity and justice for all? Examining race in education scholarship. *Review of Research in Education*, 31, 159–194. doi:10.3102/0091732X07300046159
- Brookfield, S. (2012, May). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. Keynote address presented at the 25th Annual Teaching and Learning Innovations Conference, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON.
- Burgess, J. (2006). Participatory action research: First-person perspectives of a graduate student. *Action Research*, 4, 419–437. doi:10.1177/1476750306070104
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (2002). Curriculum ghosts and visions— and what to do? In W. E. Doll, Jr., & N. Gough (Eds.), *Curriculum visions* (pp. 116–126). New York: Peter Lang.
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, 33(6), S14–S32.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. (P. Patton, Trans.). London, UK: Athlone Press. (Original work published in 1968).
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. (A. Bass, Trans.). London: Routledge. (Original work published in 1967).
- Doll, W. E., Jr. (2002). Ghosts and the curriculum. In W. E. Doll Jr., & N. Gough (Eds.), *Curriculum visions* (pp. 23–70). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Duarte, F. (2007). Using autoethnography in the scholarship of teaching and learning: Reflective practice from "the other side of the mirror." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(2). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1057&context=ij-sotl>
- Eisner, E. (1985). The three curricula that all schools teach. In *The Educational imagination* (2nd ed., pp. 87–107). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 733–768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Emmons, R. A. (2003). Personal goals, life meaning, and virtue: Wellsprings of a positive life. In C. L. M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 105–128). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gardner, S. K., Hayes, M. T., & Neider, X. N. (2007). The dispositions and skills of a Ph.D. in education: Perspectives of faculty and graduate students in one College of Education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31, 287–299. doi:10.1007/s10755-006-9029-1
- Gopaldas, A., Prasad, A., & Woodard, D. (2009). Intersectionality: Insights for consumer research [Extended Abstract]. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 36, 789–790.
- Graham, C. W., Sorell, G. T., & Montgomery, M. J. (2004). Role-related identity structure in adult women. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 4, 251–271. doi:10.1207/s1532706xid0403_3
- Hall, D. E. (2002). *The academic self: An owner's manual*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Hall, D. E. (2007). *The academic community: A manual for change*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Harris, J. B., Freeman, T. L., & Aerni, P. W. (2009). On becoming educational researchers: The importance of cogenerative mentoring. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 17, 23–39. doi:10.1080/13611260802658546
- Holman Jones, S. (2005). Autoethnography: Making the personal political. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln's (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd Ed., pp. 763–791). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Holt, N. L. (2003). Representation, legitimation, and autoethnography: An autoethnographic writing story. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(1), 1–22. Article 2. Retrieved from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/2_1/html/holt.html

- Kanuka, H., & Kelland, J. (2008). Has e-learning delivered on its promises? Expert opinion on the impact of e-learning in higher education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 38(1), 45–65.
- Kompf, M. (2009). “*There is more to me than my story...*”: Examining what narrative researchers leave behind. Revised from paper presented at International Study Association on Teachers and Teaching Biennial Meeting, St. Patrick’s College, Dublin, July 1999.
- Kunnen, E. S., & Wassink, M. E. (2003). An analysis of identity change in adulthood. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 3, 347–366. doi:10.1207/S1532706XID0304_03
- McGinn, M., & Skorobohacz, C. (n.d.). *Faculty service workload and quality of life*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.brocku.ca/academicsservice/>
- Morris, L. V. (2007). Faculty power and responsibility. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31, 247–249. doi:10.1007/s10755-006-9030-8
- Pallas, A. (2001). Preparing education doctoral students for epistemological diversity. *Educational Researcher*, 30(5), 6–11.
- Richardson, L. (2001). Getting personal: Writing stories. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(1), 33–38. doi:10.1080/09518390010007647
- Schlosser, L. Z., & Foley, P. F. (2008). Ethical issues in multicultural student-faculty mentoring relationships in higher education. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16, 63–75. doi:10.1080/13611260701801015
- Schwandt, T. A. (2007). Poststructuralism. In the *Sage dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed., pp. 237–238). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Side, K., & Robbins, W. (2007). Institutionalizing inequalities in Canadian universities: The Canada Research Chairs program. *NWSA Journal*, 19(3), 163–181.
- Skorobohacz, C. (2008). *Exploring female graduate students’ multifaceted and intersecting roles and identities in a complex educational milieu* (Unpublished master’s thesis). Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario.
- Smith, C. (2008). Performing my recovery: A play of chaos, restitution, and quest after traumatic brain injury. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 9(2), Art. 30. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/410/889>
- Solorzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(4), 471–495.
- Spillett, M. A., & Moisewicz, K. A. (2004). Cheerleader, coach, counselor, critic: Support and challenge roles of the dissertation advisor [Electronic version]. *College Student Journal*, 38, 246–256.
- Stout, P. A., Staiger, J., & Jennings, N. A. (2007). Affective stories: Understanding the lack of progress of women faculty. *NWSA Journal*, 19(3), 124–144.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4, 249–283. doi:10.1177/0957926593004002006
- van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Discourse and racism. In D. Goldberg & J. Solomos (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to racial and ethnic studies* (pp. 145–159). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wall, S. (2008). Of heads and hearts: Women in doctoral education at a Canadian university. *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 31, 219–228. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2008.04.007
- Williams, J. (2005). Understanding poststructuralism. In J. Reynolds (Ed.), *Understanding movements in Modern Thought* (pp. 1–180). Bucks: UK: Acumen Publishing.
- Yosso, T. J., Parker, L., Solorzano, D. G., & Marvin, L. (2004). From Jim Crow to affirmative action and back again: A critical race discussion of racialized rationales and access to higher education. *Review of Research in Education*, 28, 1–26.