Editorial

CHARLES SCOTT Simon Fraser University

SAI TZY HORNG Simon Fraser University

MARK WEILER Simon Fraser University

SEANNA TAKACS Simon Fraser University

Dear Readers,

As your editorial team, we are proud to present to you the 2010 edition of the SFU Educational Review.

One purpose of the SFU Educational Journal is to create a scholarly, peer-reviewed journal that can act as a transitional space for graduate studies and academic publishing. As a transitional space it is what Bhabha refers to as a *liminal space* in which cultural identities are negotiated; the graduate student reviews the faculty member's article and recommends resubmission, reviewers offer differing theoretical and practical perspectives to inform author identification and students practice stating opinions, clarifying positions and establishing a voice. It was also a period of change amongst the editorial team as we went from part-time paid employees to volunteers and worked as a team rather than as a hierarchy. We broadened the journal's scope by soliciting and accepting submissions from those presenting at Education With/Out Borders but also from outside the conference. We were richly rewarded for this brave venture.

In the fourth year, we were also in a position to assess our accomplishments. To our delight, the SFU Ed Review has been the object of much attention in its short life! As of Fall 2010, articles from the first issue were downloaded 803 times, the second issued 1290 times, and the third issue 2458 times. This is a total 4451 downloads over 3 issues. This amounts to approximately 195 downloads for each published piece and should give future authors and editorial teams encouragement to weather the challenges of academic publishing.

Finally, with this issue, we felt that we really knew the meaning of collaboration. Any journal needs those willing to serve on an editorial team. It needs students and faculty who think it worthwhile not only to offer submissions but also, and just as importantly, to offer peer reviews. We take this opportunity to express deep appreciation for those who submitted and those who, under heavy workloads and severe time limitations, offered thoughtful and insightful reviews. It is clear that the reviewers took this task very seriously, and those who submitted gained much from these reviews. This issue therefore is an opportunity to enter a phase of reflexivity that is purposely directed towards renewal.

We are proud to present this issue to you.

© Copyright 2010. The authors assign to the SFU Educational Review the right of first publication and educational and nonprofit institutions a non-exclusive license to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the author.

2 SFU Educational Review

In Cathy Shaw's piece we have a new concept of the writer's voice that could prove useful in helping students develop their academic writing skills. Scholars from various disciplines still have differing views on what constitutes the writer's voice (if there are clear conceptions at all), the degree to which the writer's voice is important in academic writing, and how it should manifest there.

In referring to the work of Vygotsky and Bakhtin, Shaw offers a conception of voice that emerges out of subjectivity and the sociocultural and historical forces which shape the individual: a concept that embraces both the subjective and the intersubjective; Shaw's concept helps us understand that utterances are both subjectively and intersubjectively contextualized. Shaw offers us a dialogical ethos, maintaining that, among other things, the presence of voice offers a gateway to dialogue. That it might do so is significant since scholarship is by definition a dialogical process of developing knowledge in a collaborative fashion. Shaw's ideas on voice could help students more fully and meaningfully engage in the academic process. It offers us two benefits: it is a distinct and significant move to a more comprehensive and integral model of the writer's voice. In addition, it offers both students and teachers an approach, through various forms of scholarly writing as they are developed in writing courses, to develop deeper understandings not only of the writing process but also of self, others, and the world. The writer's voice is significant because it represents the means through which students can offer their own, reflective and critical responses to the subjects before them, to others, and to the worlds which surround them and invite their response.

Daniela Elza lives and works in a multiverse of worlds, straddling the modern and postmodern, inviting us, through her play with the words and formatting of her concrete poetry, to reconsider meaning and our relationships to it. Drawing from the works of Robert Bringhurst and Gaston Bachelard, her work explores the complex relationships between language and knowledge. Elza's poems may be said to exist in the well-established Canadian tradition of concrete and visual poetry: the works of Earle Birney, Bill Bissett, bpNichol, Judith Copithorne, and Steve McCaffery, to name but a few. But this is not the only tradition she in.habits. She is also a bud.ding philo.sopher (phila. sophia. her), and her work properly belongs alongside such Canadian luminaries such as Jan Zwicky and Tim Lilburn. Words may not be what they initially seem. We can recast them into wholly different forms and meanings with the simple placement of a period. Our benefit is that we get to think about things in a different way; sometimes we are shocked into a radical epistemic twist. What else can you do with a lines like "I never thought as far as

the s unset"

?

Or how about this: .reality is that ill perceived light that has to look into my eyes for meaning.

Elza's pauses and dashes, her interruptions and periods, jar us out of a calm and certain scholastic comfort. At the same, though, they and the words she plays with are exhilarating and liberating for those used to a beginner's mind, a beginner's eye. Her poems at time strike with a resounding "Thwack!", like a Zen koan. Her work, like Zwicky's and Lilburn's, is both lyrical and narrative, and like theirs, her words invite you along and hold you back to pause. They tease and torment.

Glen reminds us of what it means to be a full participant within learning environments. She revisits the issue of what a learner as a whole person means. Through performative inquiry in

installation art, Glen opens up a space of awareness where learners can question, engage, and conduct a dialogic relationship with their everyday world. According to Glen, performative inquiry in installation art allows one's to become aware of one's physical presence and the interconnectedness with one's context, thus allowing learners to deconstruct the dualisms that have "kept persons reduced to their minds" (p. 18). Glen argues that only through an educative process where learners can situate themselves as whole persons, thus as full participants within their learning and lived contexts, and where learners acknowledge that the spaces they inhabit are not static but are liminal, transitory, robust and full of possibilities, can a reflexive pedagogy emerge.

A reflexive pedagogy refers to a reflective and relational process engaging participants with their everyday lived contexts and experience. Such pedagogy is crucial to education as it acknowledges the relational constitution of learners. Furthermore, Glen contends that adopting a reflexive pedagogy recognizes the continuous and relational nature of dialogue. It is a well-timed reminder to educators in a time where learning is increasingly viewed as merely a means to an ends and where the dispositions of learners are increasingly understood as fixed and biologically constituted that educators cannot turn their backs to the situated, reflexive and dialogical nature of education.

As the SFU Educational Review seeks renewal for future issues we are proud that the SFU Educational Review has its following, that it is a source of collaboration, risk-taking, academic practice and in many ways, that it continues to be a source of transition as graduate work has been and shall continue to be.

Your SFU Educational Review team,

Charles Scott Sai Tzy Horng Mark Weiler Seanna Takacs