SPECIAL ISSUE
Rethinking Education Policy and Methodology in a Post-truth Era

education policy analysis archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,
open access, multilingual journal

epaa aape

Arizona State University

Volume 26 Number 145 November 19, 2018 ISSN 1068-2341

Start Here, Or Here, No Here: Introductions to Rethinking Education Policy and Methodology in a Post-Truth Era

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth
University of South Florida

Mirka Koro-Ljungberg
Arizona State University

Travis M. Marn
Southern Connecticut State University

Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie
Sam Houston State University

&

Shaun M. Dougherty
Vanderbilt University
United States

Citation: Wolgemuth, J. R., Koro-Ljungberg, M., Marn, T. M., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Dougherty, S. M. (2018). Start here, or here, no here: Introductions to rethinking education policy and methodology in a post-truth era. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 26*(145). http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.4357 This article is part of the Special Issue, *Rethinking*

Journal website: http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/
Facebook: /EPAAA
Twitter: @epaa_aape

Manuscript received: 11/8/201
Revisions received: 11/15/2018
Accepted: 11/15/2018

Education Policy and Methodology in a Post-truth Era guest edited by Jennifer R. Wolgemuth, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Travis M. Marn, Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie, and Shaun M. Dougherty.

Abstract: This special issue takes up urgent questions about how we education scholars might think and do policy and methodology in what has come to be known as the post-truth era. The authors in this special issue grapple with questions about the roles and responsibilities of educational researchers in an era in which research and policy have lost their moorings in T/truth. Collectively they reconceptualize educational research and policy in light of post-truths, anti-science sentiment, and the global rise of right-wing populism. At the same time we editors wonder whether post-truth is given a bad rap. Could post-truth have something productive to offer? What does post-truth open up for educational research and policy? Or, is the real issue of this special issue a collective despair of our own insignificance and obsolescence in the wake of post-truth. Whatever we editors and authors aimed to do, this special issue will not be heard by post-truth adherents and partisans. Perhaps its only contribution is encouragement to stay with the troubles of a post-truth era, even as we despair the consequences of our research and policy creations.
Keywords: post-truth; methodology; education policy; fake news

Comience aquí, o aquí, no aquí: Introducciones para repensar la política y metodología educativa en una era posverdad

Resumen: Este número especial plantea preguntas urgentes sobre cómo los académicos de la educación pueden pensar y hacer políticas y metodologías en una era posverdad. Los autores se enfrentan a preguntas sobre los roles y responsabilidades de los investigadores educativos en un momento en que la investigación y la política han perdido sus amarres en V/verdad. En conjunto, reconceptualizan la investigación y la política educativa a la luz de las posverdades, el sentimiento anticientífico y el auge mundial del populismo de derecha. Los editores también se preguntan si a la posverdad se le da una mala reputación. ¿Podría la posverdad tener algo productivo que ofrecer? ¿Qué abre la posverdad a la investigación y la política educativa? O bien, ¿es el problema real de este número especial una desesperación colectiva de nuestra propia insignificancia y obsolescencia después de la posverdad? Independientemente de lo que nosotros (los editores y autores) pretendamos hacer, este número especial no será escuchado por los partidarios y partidarios de la posverdad. Quizás su única contribución sea un estímulo para permanecer con los problemas de una era posverdad, incluso cuando nos desesperamos por las consecuencias de nuestras investigaciones y creaciones de políticas.
Palabras-clave: posverdad; metodología; política educativa; noticias falsas

Comience aquí, o aquí, no aquí: Introduções para repensar a política e a metodologia educativa em uma era pós-verdad

Resumo: Esta dossiê especial levanta questões urgentes sobre como os estudiosos da educação podem pensar e fazer políticas e metodologias em uma era pós-verdade. Os autores se deparam com questões sobre os papéis e responsabilidades dos pesquisadores educacionais em um momento em que a pesquisa e a política perderam seus laços na verdade. Juntos, eles reconceitualizam a pesquisa e a política educacional à luz das verdades posteriores, do sentimento anti-científico e da ascensão mundial do populismo de direita. Os editores também se perguntam se a verdade posterior recebe uma má

reputação. A pós-verdade poderia ter algo produtivo para oferecer? O que abre a verdade depois da pesquisa e da política educacional? Ou o verdadeiro problema desta questão especial é um desespero coletivo de nossa própria insignificância e obsolescência depois da verdade posterior? Independentemente do que nós (editores e autores) pretendemos fazer, esta edição especial não será ouvida pelos apoiadores e apoiadores da verdade posterior. Talvez sua única contribuição seja um incentivo para permanecer com os problemas de uma era pós-verdade, mesmo quando nos desesperamos com as conseqüências de nossa pesquisa e elaboração de políticas.
Palavras-chave: pós-verdad; metodología; política educativa; noticias falsas

Start Here, Or Here, No Here: Introductions to Rethinking Education Policy and Methodology in a Post-Truth Era

Introduction X

This special issue takes up urgent questions about how we education scholars might think and do policy and methodology in what has come to be known as the *post-truth* era. Collectively and individually, the articles in this special issue grapple with pressing, puzzling, and intractable questions about the role(s), responsibilities, and value(s) of educational research(ers) in the ongoing era of what has been formally called post-truth (*Oxford Dictionaries'* word of the year for 2016), which the publisher defined as "relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief."

As editors, we draw the readers' attention to three overarching and intertwined provocations that serve as starting points for rethinking education policy and methodology in a post-truth era. First, in a post-truth era, *many* research epistemologies, ontologies, processes, and policy discourses have lost their moorings in T/truth. This unsettling of T/truth, amidst continuously shifting and unstable intersections between policy and methodology, generates both challenges and opportunities for scholars to rethink the purpose and value of their works.

Second, the Trump administration's election and policy (un)making might mark an unprecedented time in U.S. and global history in which scientists, including educational researchers, must rethink the political ethics of their scholarly works. They might ask: Should I become an activist for science and science policy? How could an activist scientist or politically passionate scholar function and act? What role(s) should scientists and research (now) play in educating a civil society and informing policy? How has the Trump election and current world politics urged educational researchers to rethink methodologies, designs, methods, agendas, and the overarching political ethics of research?

Third, perhaps we are now fully in the ruins of scientifically based research (SBR) in education (Lather, 2013). If the election of Trump was a referendum (Klein, 2016) against centrist liberals and their support for neoliberal policies in education (e.g., SBR, standardized testing, value added modeling), then scholars may (again) question the role SBR can or should play in education policy-making. Do educational researchers unite under a common arch to advocate for (a return to) SBR or something else not possible or thinkable before the era of post-truths? What new political and research dilemmas do educational researchers face and how do they position themselves and their scholarship for an uncertain political future? What (new) spaces have opened up for them and what has closed down? What might educational researchers fight for?

This special issue includes seven authors' reflections on these and other questions of policy and methodology in a post-truth era. We organized the articles in a loose progression of the authors'

positioning of post-truth and T/truth. Specifically, we begin with articles that discuss post-truth in a mostly negative light and call on educational researchers to take up methodologies and approaches that reveal the ills of post-truth and illuminate T/truths. We end with articles that avoid accounts of post-truth as solely bad and value methodological and political approaches that continue to question and undermine our sense of T/truth. Each article offers an insightful analysis and/or (re)conceptualization of educational research and policy in light of post-truths, anti-science sentiment, and the global rise of right-wing populism.

Joshua Childs and Sarah Jessica Johnson begin the special issue with an outright rejection of the activism-research divide. They argue that in a post-truth era that gives equal credence to racist, sexist, homophobic, etc…discourses, it is more vital than ever to conduct critical research that centers the voices of people of color and others at the margins in order to speak truth-to-power.

Chris Bacon similarly argues that critical literacies are essential to combatting post-truth discourses. He notes, however, that critical literacies and post-truth discourses share common features and discusses the "first wave" critical literacy responses to post-truth that risk emboldening post-truth instead of dismantling it. He urges critical literacy scholars to renew the "critical" in critical literacies.

Rubén Arriazu also sees critical literacy/thinking as a way to combat the ills of post-truth. Illustrating a "hermeneutic methodology of suspicion" to critique two opposing Internet accounts of the *Charlie Hebdo* attack in France, he reveals how the Internet is a catalyst for multiple-truths. At the same time, Arriazu notes the potential of Internet accounts when viewed through suspicious eyes to resist mainstream, normative, and privileged "truths" of events.

Rachel E. Friedensen and Ezekiel Kimball, in contrast to the critical approaches advocated in the first three articles, draw on Rortian pragmatism to argue that "utility," instead of objective truth, should be the standard for evaluating expert judgement under attack by conservative anti-intellectualism. Embracing the axiom that expert judgement always conflates facts and values, they argue objective truth is an unrealistic and unobtainable ideal and, therefore, should be abandoned as a frame for discussing research quality in higher education.

Jessica Van Cleave also contextualizes her work in light of anti-intellectualism and assaults on expertise and evidence. Rather than advance a resistance, she illuminates the dangers and risks of an "overzealous scientism" backlash by reminding us of SBR's not-so-distant dominance. She wonders about the "science" that is advocated for in movements like the March for Science and warns us against uniting (again) under a restrictive account of "science." She calls on scholars who seek to counter forces of anti-intellectualism, to continue to undermine the "truths" of science, asking what science and for whom?

James Burns, Colin Green, and Jaime Nolan also take up the questions about the truths of concepts in the post-truth era. They advance Foucauldian genealogy and *parrhēsia*, or truth-telling, to understand post-truth as emerging in public relations and propaganda discourses in the early 20th century. They argue that genealogical and truth-telling methodologies together frame a new ethics of adversarial public scholarship, necessary to understand the academy's role in subverting and perpetuating power in the so-called post-truth era.

Ryan Gildersleeve ends the special issue by bringing together the contexts and concepts of the Anthropocene and post-truth to rethink education policy and methodology in light of critiques of higher education policies on undocumented students. His analysis offers educationalists "plausible postures"—or ethical frames—for thinking education policy and methodology that speak to the need for speculation and radical decentering of the human and what constitutes human truths.

Collectively, these articles offer educational scholars much to reconsider as we struggle with important questions about how, whether, and why educational research can and should speak to policy in the post-truth era.

Introduction X and Y

This special issue takes up (or does it?) urgent questions about how we education scholars (and citizens, immigrants, mothers, fathers, resisters, supporters and more) might think and do (non)policy and anti/post/un-methodology in what has come to be known, felt, sensed, and lived as the post-truth era. Collectively and individually, these articles, thoughts, senses, affects, and matterings grapple with pressing, puzzling, and intractable questions about the role(s), responsibilities, and value(s) of educational research(ers) in the ongoing (past, present, becoming) era of post-truths.

In general, post-truth has been perceived as a negative phenomenon, something that scholars must deny, correct, and work against. However, alternative truth practices and positionings might also have something interesting to offer. What if one considers post-truth to function as a productive movement and constructive space: a space for infinite and acknowledged difference, becoming, and fruitful questioning? It could be argued that current critical societal discourses, alternative forms of social media, and diverse and liminal opinions of the public have finally caught up with postmodernisms and multiplicity of partial and fragmented knowledges (see also Koro-Ljungberg et al., 2018). In many modern societies and in these times of overproduced "realities," citizens and scholars are faced with a need to learn to live with uncertainty of knowledge, situated truths, and multiplicity of information of all kinds. It is possible that news, knowledge structures, and truths can no longer be traced back to signifier-signified linkages or their origins. Instead, this kind of knowledge could produce desirable differences and otherness. However, it might also question, fail, and possibly disappoint. Additionally, in the times of post-truth, knowledge can be both accurate and inaccurate, narratives sincere and falsified, and drawn conclusions factual as well as fictional. Truth can no longer hide behind academic claims and writing, power, or rely on political connections, lobbyists, or any kind of "validated" information delivery. The relationship among truth, science, and academia might also become problematized. Derrida's immanent and endless aporia could as well characterize today's state of knowledge, truths, news, and information regardless of the context and assumed stable truth conditions. Knowledge and information of all kinds might take new and unexpected turns where language is likely to continue to reinvent itself, its discourses, and its practices.

Post-truth in its fragmented, problematizing, fake, and non-signifying forms has inspired scholars from Nietzsche and Derrida to Foucault, Baudrillard, Deleuze, and others to re-conceptualize assumed normativity, causality, absolute truth-value, will to power, knowledge, validity, and more. Fabricated subjects, non-subjects, virtual, becoming, relational, material and discursive subjects (both human and non-human) have generated non-stories, counter narratives, hyperreal theories, overly reproduced relations, knowledges and information linkages independent from stable knower and verifiable object formations. Without stable speaking and knowing subjects, truths are also continuously being transformed, changed, and circulated. Un-knowing and uncertain proxy, almost, "nearly there" subjects are asked to make decisions in the face of aporia and the undecidable (see Derrida, 1993), while knowledges problematize their own practices and structures at their own pace. Critical techniques, alternative technologies, spaces of deconstruction, linguistic and ontological turns, and ontologies of difference can possibly enable post-truth individuals and proxy subjects to process inconsistencies and insufficiencies in their lives, language, concepts, theories, and practices. However, the value of knowledges likely continues to become even more

situational and context dependent and, as such, increasingly contested, invalidated, contradicted, and problematized with each new relational turn and emerging sociocultural situation.

Massumi (2015) referred to societies as open fields of thresholds and gateways where enclosures, walls, and rigid structures no longer suffice. From this perspective, truth and knowledge structures might function as checkpoints, crossing lines, and potentially internally contradictory assemblages. Drawing from Deleuze, Massumi encourages communities (and scholars) to find a way to believe in the world again. We need to "experience our belonging to this world, which is the same thing as our belonging to each other, and live that so intensely together that there is no room to doubt the reality of it" (p. 45). Massumi continues that the political question is not to impose solutions or find resolutions [to the truth question] but to explore how to keep the intensity in that which comes next and continues to differentiate. This position could also imply that complexity of truth and knowledges would not be a problem but an ecological starting point. Goodman (2018) reminds us that speculative affirmation could work as a technique not to confirm normative possibilities for relating and thinking-doing but to linger with experimenting freely. What if truth(s) are defined by what (e)scapes them? What if truth(s) are lived by/through the events of potentiality, ecological differentiation, and relationality?

Introduction ~~X, Y,~~ and Z

What is the purpose of this special issue? This special issue, for whatever it purports to do, for whatever the editors and authors stated they were doing, will not be heard by post-truth adherents and partisans. Fake news! (Trump, 2016). The call for this special issue was germinated in the overwhelming affects of disbelief and anger following the 2016 elections. Disbelief eroded over time, but the anger is renewed daily by the continuing horrors of a world cloaked by "fake news" and post-truth. That anger bled into our research accompanied by nihilism and perhaps something more—perhaps a sense of the oncoming dread of the price of post-truth now and in the future, here in academe and elsewhere. Post-truth drives at the heart of scholarship, research, and the multiplicities of truth we once knew. What remains of truth is uncertain and what to do in response is even less clear. Scholarship did not get "us" into post-truth. How can scholarship get us out?

Maybe our real issue is the revelation of our own seeming insignificance and oncoming obsolescence in the wake of post-truth. That academics are just playing catch-up rather than driving thought. Perhaps this special issue is just a collective delusion—a *folie à deux* (Trump, 2018) between us the writers and you the readers—that we can only look to ourselves for reassurance. What is the place of this special issue then? Of research? Of policy research? Is this academic group therapy?

Are we just sore that Donald Trump, of all people, and his ilk did what decades of scholarship could not do: herald the death of truth—to bring us to the place where "fake news" (Trump, 2016) and "reality" contend for supremacy? Scholars have long argued that the Truth, truth, T/truth, ~~truth~~ was multiple. Is post-truth multiple? What is the cost of making common cause with post-truth when it is attended by racism, nativism, anti-intellectualism, and perhaps more horrors to come? Would the scholar class, assuredly the only ones reading this, pay that cost? How much of it? We sought the death of truth to liberate. Trump uses post-truth to oppress. What is "good" research now? Not simply what makes research good to us, but does research not aimed at stemming the post-truth tide no longer have value? Is this special issue "good" research? What are the ethics of my/your/our research now? Or perhaps we should do nothing and continue, little swayed.

Not all are so concerned about post-truth—that nihilism, anger, and disbelief occludes the possibilities of post-truth. That post-truth, as a force of liberation, transcends or, perhaps, undercuts the vicissitudes of daily life. That the amorphous post-truth is kin (Haraway, 2016) to the post-structuralist/modernist/humanist/qualitativist. No one would claim that the violence, hate, and

vitriol was worth the price of post-truth, but scholars are left with the monumental task of both defending science while also asking what can be mobilized in the aftermath of post-truth. Can this be done? Can what we do next be undone? What assurances can we offer to policy studies, methodologies, and academic research? Can they be preserved in the penumbra of post-truth and our reactions to/with it? Are we even asking the right questions? The Jefferson Kroger shooter, the #MAGAbomber, and Pittsburgh synagogue shooter were all caught the week we composed this introduction. The November 6 election loomed. What remains of truth is uncertain and what to do in response is even less clear.

Perhaps, if it can be said to affect anything at all, this special issue will provide readers with encouragement to "stay with" the troubles of a post-truth era, to continue to live and think—create—even as we despair the consequences of our creations (Haraway, 2016).

References

Oxford Dictionaries. (2018). *Post-truth*. Retrieved from https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/post-truth

Derrida, J. (1993). *Aporias* (T. Dutoit, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Goodman, A. (2018). *Gathering ecologies: Thinking beyond interactivity*. London: Open Humanities Press.

Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University.

Koro-Ljungberg, M., Carlson, D., & Montana, A. (In press). Productive forces of post-truth(s)? *Qualitative Inquiry*.

Massumi, B. (2015). *Politics of affect*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

About the Author/Guest Editors

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth
University of South Florida
jrwolgemuth@usf.edu

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth is an Associate Professor in Measurement and Research at the University of South Florida. Her research focuses on the socio-politics of social science research. Her work illuminates and disrupts categorical accounts of the contexts, ethics, and outcomes of social science research, including their personal and social impacts on researchers, participants, and those who shepherd research evidence into policy and practice.

Mirka Koro-Ljungberg
Arizona State University
Mirka.Koro-Ljungberg@asu.edu

Mirka Koro-Ljungberg (Ph.D., University of Helsinki) is a Professor of qualitative research at the Arizona State University. Her scholarship operates in the intersection of methodology, philosophy, and socio-cultural critique and her work aims to contribute to methodological knowledge, experimentation, and theoretical development across various traditions associated with qualitative research. She has published in various qualitative and educational journals and she is the author of *Reconceptualizing qualitative research: Methodologies without methodology* (2016) published by SAGE and co-editor of *Disrupting data in qualitative inquiry: Entanglements with the Post-Critical and Post-Anthropocentric* (2017) by Peter Lang.

Travis M. Marn
Southern Connecticut State University
Marnt1@southernct.edu
Travis M. Marn (Ph.D., University of South Florida) is a Professor in the Curriculum & Learning Department at Southern Connecticut State University where he teaches child development and educational psychology. His scholarship focuses on philosophically informed empirical accounts of performative identities, employing new materialism and posthumanism in psychological research, and contributing to the development of qualitative and post-qualitative methods and methodologies.

Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie
Sam Houston State University
tonyonwuegbuzie@aol.com
Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie is Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at Sam Houston State University, where he teaches doctoral-level courses in qualitative research, quantitative research, and mixed research. Further, he is a Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Johannesburg and an Honorary Professor at the University of South Africa. His research areas primarily involve social and behavioral science topics, including disadvantaged and under-served populations such as minorities, children living in war zones, students with special needs, and juvenile delinquents. Also, he has conducted numerous research studies on factors that predict educational achievement at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels. Additionally, he writes extensively on qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methodological topics applicable to multiple disciplines within the field of the social and behavioral sciences.

Shaun M. Dougherty
Vanderbilt University
shaun.dougherty@vanderbilt.edu
Shaun M. Dougherty is an Associate Professor of Public Policy and Education, Peabody College of Education & Human Development, Vanderbilt University. His work focuses on applied quantitative analysis of education policies and programs, equity, and career and technical education.

SPECIAL ISSUE
Rethinking Education Policy and Methodology in a Post-truth Era

education policy analysis archives

Volume 26 Number 145 November 19, 2018 ISSN 1068-2341

SOME RIGHTS RESERVED Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives,** it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA**. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), Directory of Open Access Journals, EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), PubMed, Redalyc, SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, SOCOLAR (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at Audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join EPAA's Facebook community at https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAAPE and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)
Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)
Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson**, **Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Scott Marley, Molly Ott, Iveta Silova** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro San Diego State University
Gary Anderson New York University
Michael W. Apple University of Wisconsin, Madison
Jeff Bale OISE, University of Toronto, Canada
Aaron Bevanot SUNY Albany
David C. Berliner Arizona State University
Henry Braun Boston College
Casey Cobb University of Connecticut
Arnold Danzig San Jose State University
Linda Darling-Hammond Stanford University
Elizabeth H. DeBray University of Georgia
Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy
John Diamond University of Wisconsin, Madison
Matthew Di Carlo Albert Shanker Institute
Sherman Dorn Arizona State University
Michael J. Dumas University of California, Berkeley
Kathy Escamilla University of Colorado, Boulder
Yariv Feniger Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
Melissa Lynn Freeman Adams State College
Rachael Gabriel University of Connecticut
Amy Garrett Dikkers University of North Carolina, Wilmington
Gene V Glass Arizona State University
Ronald Glass University of California, Santa Cruz
Jacob P. K. Gross University of Louisville
Eric M. Haas WestEd
Julian Vasquez Heilig California State University, Sacramento
Kimberly Kappler Hewitt University of North Carolina Greensboro
Aimee Howley Ohio University
Steve Klees University of Maryland
Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo
Jessica Nina Lester Indiana University
Amanda E. Lewis University of Illinois, Chicago
Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana University
Christopher Lubienski Indiana University
Sarah Lubienski Indiana University
William J. Mathis University of Colorado, Boulder
Michele S. Moses University of Colorado, Boulder
Julianne Moss Deakin University, Australia
Sharon Nichols University of Texas, San Antonio
Eric Parsons University of Missouri-Columbia
Amanda U. Potterton University of Kentucky
Susan L. Robertson Bristol University
Gloria M. Rodriguez University of California, Davis
R. Anthony Rolle University of Houston
A. G. Rud Washington State University
Patricia Sánchez University of University of Texas, San Antonio
Janelle Scott University of California, Berkeley
Jack Schneider University of Massachusetts Lowell
Noah Sobe Loyola University
Nelly P. Stromquist University of Maryland
Benjamin Superfine University of Illinois, Chicago
Adai Tefera Virginia Commonwealth University
Tina Trujillo University of California, Berkeley
Federico R. Waitoller University of Illinois, Chicago
Larisa Warhol University of Connecticut
John Weathers University of Colorado, Colorado Springs
Kevin Welner University of Colorado, Boulder
Terrence G. Wiley Center for Applied Linguistics
John Willinsky Stanford University
Jennifer R. Wolgemuth University of South Florida
Kyo Yamashiro Claremont Graduate University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas
consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)
Editores Asociados: **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Angelica Buendia**, (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **Ezequiel Gomez Caride**, (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina), **Antonio Luzon**, (Universidad de Granada), **José Luis Ramírez,** Universidad de Sonora), **Paula Razquin** (Universidad de San Andrés)

Claudio Almonacid
Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega
Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México

Xavier Besalú Costa
Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia
Universidad de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner Universidad Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez
Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación, México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes
Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV, México

Pedro Flores Crespo Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ana María García de Fanelli
Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad (CEDES) CONICET, Argentina

Juan Carlos González Faraco
Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa
Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé
Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez
Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM, México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez, Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, México

Miguel Pereyra Universidad de Granada, España

Mónica Pini Universidad Nacional de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves
Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico (IDEP)

José Ignacio Rivas Flores
Universidad de Málaga, España

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas
Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez
Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto
Universidad de Oviedo, España

Jurjo Torres Santomé, Universidad de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya
Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón
Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal
Universidad Diego Portales Santiago, Chile

Antoni Verger Planells
Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Catalina Wainerman
Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina

Juan Carlos Yáñez Velazco
Universidad de Colima, México

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)
Editoras Associadas: **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV, Brazil), **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mende**s (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **Marcia Pletsch, Sandra Regina Sales** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso
Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá
Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Maria Helena Bonilla
Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes
Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Suzana Feldens Schwertner
Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta
Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brasil

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins
Universidade do Vale do Itajaí, Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes
Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes
Universidade Estadual de Ponta Grossa, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes
Universidade Federal Fluminense e Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora, Brasil

Debora Nunes
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brasil

Alda Junqueira Marin
Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco
Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Jane Paiva
Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira
Universidade do Estado de Mato Grosso, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva
Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso do Sul, Brasil

António Teodoro
Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Lílian do Valle
Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil