

UA Repository

Community Based Research in Postcolonial Communities

Item Type	Book chapter
Authors	Faraclas, Nicholas;Kester, Ellen-Petra;Mijts, Eric
Citation	Faraclas, N., Kester, EP., Mijts, E. (2019). Community Based Research in Postcolonial Communities. In: Community Based Research in Language Policy and Planning. Language Policy, vol 20. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23223-8_2
DOI	10.1007/978-3-030-23223-8_2
Publisher	Springer International Publishing
Download date	2026-06-15 01:44:55
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14473/760

Chapter 2

Community Based Research in Postcolonial Communities



2.1 Background

In this work we focus on postcolonial communities in which the former colonizer's language (still) plays a dominant role in education, governance and law. The possibility of using the students' home language as medium of instruction in these settings is continuously up for discussion and is subject to fierce societal and political debate despite the fact that research overwhelmingly demonstrates the value of L1 teaching for maximizing educational opportunity and impact.

In this volume, the benefits of L1 education are not up for discussion. Language rights have been affirmed in article two of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

and the education of a child shall be directed to the development of and respect for, among others, a child's language, according to article 29 of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child.

1. States Parties agree that the education of the child shall be directed to:
 - (a) The development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential;
 - (b) The development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations;

- (c) The development of respect for the child's parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values, for the national values of the country in which the child is living, the country from which he or she may originate, and for civilizations different from his or her own;
- (d) The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin;
- (e) The development of respect for the natural environment.

The 1953 UNESCO monograph "The use of vernacular languages" proposes that it be taken 'as axiomatic, [...], that the best medium for teaching is the mother tongue of the pupil' (p. 6) and in the 2003 UNESCO Education position paper "Education in a multilingual world", the 'support for mother tongue instruction as a means of improving educational quality by building upon the knowledge and experience of the learners and teachers' is reconfirmed (p. 30). According to this report, based upon Dutcher and Tucker (1997), Mehrotra (1998) and Dutcher (2001), 'studies have shown that, in many cases, instruction in the mother tongue is beneficial to language competencies in the first language, achievement in other subject areas, and second language learning' (p. 15). However, 'the application of the principle of mother tongue instruction nevertheless is far from the rule' (p. 15). Based upon the numbers of pupils being taught in a foreign language in educational systems in Asia, Africa and the Americas it has been estimated that up to half of the world's school population is taught in a weak second language or a completely foreign language (Faraclas 2011). This lack of compliance with the fundamental right to education in the mother tongue is often justified by managerial, political, economic and academic challenges and fails to underscore the educational, political, economic and academic benefits of education in the mother tongue.

The drawbacks and challenges listed by UNESCO are primarily discussed in relation to the protection of mother tongue education for minorities and migrants, but do not pay sufficient attention to the contexts of postcolonial states in which the former colonizer's language is - by far - a minority language, but is used as the language of instruction, and as the language of governance and the judiciary.

The study of LPP has seen big changes over the twentieth and twenty-first century, due to theoretical shifts fueled by globalization, neoliberalism and hybridization in a world of superdiversity (Watson-Gegeo et al. 2018, p. 401) and also by a growing sense of the importance of perspective, state traditions and language regimes (Cardinal and Sonntag 2015). The interdisciplinary character of the field and the methodological shift towards critical studies (Tollefson 2013) and ethnographic approaches (Canagarajah 2006, p. 154) has opened the field to new interpretations that take into account the ideological and multi-layered character of LPP.

The theoretical shifts in LPP pose methodological challenges. Pérez-Milans and Tollefson (2018) emphasize that 'the challenge for future research is [...] to sort through and make explicit the underlying ontological, epistemological and personal/social underpinnings for researchers' claims. This effort may involve engagement

with approaches that no longer privilege discourse in the study of social change, but instead focus more explicitly on the material realities of people understood not merely as disembodied life forms embedded in discursive systems, but rather as concrete human beings with substantial and inescapable material needs' (Pérez-Milans and Tollefson 2018, p. 731). To achieve this goal of minimizing the reification of the population that typified the approach of research in St. Eustatius' past and of maximizing meaningful input from all groups in society in the design, implementation and analysis of the research, a community based approach was adopted. This approach carefully integrates Statian traditions of church meetings and town hall meetings in which everybody's voice can be heard, and is not based on an exclusive set of key informers that the researchers deem to be representative of the voice of the island. As a result of this approach, the research project became an integrated thread in the fabric of Statian society.

The case study of Statia presented in this volume is a remarkable example of this state of affairs: in an island society where a variety of English is the majority language, and where varieties of English are the majority languages of the surrounding islands, the choice for Dutch as a language of instruction is hard to justify on the basis of educational, social or economic arguments. Supporters of the use of Dutch in education policy justify this by the fact that the island is part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and follows the educational traditions of the Netherlands, including the employment of Dutch teachers, the adoption of Dutch school books and educational materials, and preparing the children in schools for further studies in Dutch in the Netherlands.

In many postcolonial island settings, such as those found in Haiti (DeGraff 2016, p. 436), Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu (Faraclas et al. 2016, p. 173) and Cabo Verde (Baptista et al. 2010, p. 276), the medium of instruction in education, especially at post-primary level, is the former colonizer's dominant language. These practices illustrate the way in which the state tradition of the former colonizer is perpetuated in the postcolonial state. This leads to a situation in which L1 teaching is not (or marginally) adopted and the foreign language of the former colonizer is used as the medium of instruction in schools instead. Although not all failure in education can be attributed to this policy and practice, it can be identified as one of the main factors contributing to lack of educational success, as well as a lack of ownership of and a general disenfranchisement from the formal education process.

Teaching in the former colonizer's language, more often than not entails that the majority of children of these societies are taught in a foreign language and that the home languages of the peoples of these decolonizing regions have no place in the school systems. Such practices have a negative effect on the acceptance, recognition and promotion of these home languages. This imposes a triple burden on the children as well: the value of their home language is denied, their proficiency in their home language is neither acknowledged nor valued and access to academic content is blocked or is at best severely limited. Despite their investment of significant amounts of time and effort in the development of proficiency in the foreign language of instruction, many fail. This reflects a stunning denial of the importance of the use of home languages in education. Alarming educational statistics (Migge et al. 2010)

notwithstanding, the misconception lives on that the use of a foreign language as the language of instruction and initial literacy somehow leads to a better understanding of content matter and... proficiency in that language. These ideologies, which promote the use of a foreign language as language of instruction at the expense of the home languages of the students, fail to take into account key insights from research in education and language learning, and are based on misunderstandings and misrepresentations of the differences between first, second and foreign language learning (e.g. Lightbown and Spada 2013), childhood bilingualism (e.g. Orioni 2017), the multilingual classroom (e.g. Stan 2017, Le Pichon-Vorstman and Baauw 2017) and the critical period hypothesis (e.g. Paradis et al. 2011).

Traditional research methods in education, linguistics and sociolinguistics have more often than not yielded forms of evidence and recommendations that are not readily accepted and embraced by the societies in which that research has taken place. As such, this research has failed to contribute to sustainable, equitable and inclusive change in postcolonial societies, especially not in small island states where the allegedly more prestigious former colonizers' languages are the media of instruction as well as the languages of governance and law, and the often less prestigious languages spoken as the home language by a majority of the population are tolerated at best and sometimes even excluded from use in formal and educational settings.

Research is not often well received by the societies that are subject to the investigative gaze, due to the fact that the populations of researched societies are often not informed about the purpose, results and potential consequences of the research, nor are they involved in any significant way in research design, implementation, analysis and interpretation. These negative attitudes toward research are magnified in the case of research done by institutions and individuals identified with the former colonizer in postcolonial societies. Questioning the ethical responsibilities of the researcher in the research process, Smith (1999) remarks: 'from the vantage point of the colonized ... the term 'research' is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, 'research', is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary.'

Tollefson (2006: 44–45) concludes that 'a critical examination of research methodology raises several fundamental questions'. Based upon Blommaert (1996); Pederson (2002) and Ryon (2002), he asks 'how different discourse communities, including language-policy researchers, establish and maintain their preferred forms of knowledge?' Based upon (Gegeo 1998; Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo 1999; Williams and Morris 2000), he also asks 'what "counts" as legitimate research questions, acceptable research methodologies, and persuasive forms of evidence?'. Finally, following Canagarajah (2002) he asks 'how are preferred forms of knowledge created and sustained among groups affected by language policies?' and following Ryon (2002) he questions 'what role [...] others [should] play in the research process, especially in evaluating research.' Based upon these fundamental questions, he concludes, following Williams and Morris (2000) that 'people who experience the consequences of language policy should have a major role in making policy decisions'.

To Tollefson's three questions, we add the following three: (1) What is the relationship between research and social change? (2) Can research be considered separately from the communities studied and their agendas for social change? and (3) To what extent can we achieve instant valorization of the research on the part of the researched community by forging partnerships between them and the researchers for study design and execution?

Community based research (CBR) addresses these questions in such a way as to create a community of co-researchers and co-learners in order to ensure that the expertise and agency of the researched community are maximally acknowledged and mobilized, not just for the traditional academic research tasks of description and analysis of their problems, but also in achieving maximally viable and sustainable solutions to those problems. This heightened community involvement increases the likelihood of community wide valorization of a given research project and the acceptance of its outcomes and recommendations.

The challenges faced by island societies are in some ways different from those faced by non-island societies. This is particularly true in areas such access to resources, technical expertise and backup systems. As a consequence, island peoples have traditionally had to rely on themselves to meet their medical, educational and technological needs. This has fostered the development of a high degree of autonomy, self-reliance and collective responsibility in many island communities. By recognizing and respecting local knowledge and expertise, the community based approach is able to mobilize and build upon such strengths.

2.2 Guiding Principles and Best Practices

The fundamental principle of community based research is critical dialogic praxis. This involves replacing traditional research ethics that are primarily focused on institutional acceptability of the research outcomes with inclusive research ethics that are primarily focused on the acceptability of the research outcomes to the researched community, without violating the basic research principles of validity and falsifiability. In our approach to the research that we carried out in Statia, critical dialogic praxis was operationalized through the following four guiding principles:

1. Acknowledging and valorizing the expertise of the researched community,
2. Applying multiple methods, not only through a traditional process of triangulation, but also through the development of different perspectives to which the researched community can relate,
3. Integrating different research backgrounds to ensure the broadness of the approach and the extent to which the results fit the society as a whole,
4. Combining insights from the literature and from other times and places with those that the researched community has gained from real-life experience.

These guiding principles translate into the following five best practices:

1. Co-creating the research design in context, replacing a more traditional academic research design that is rooted in the research needs, traditions and capacities of the former colonizer's academic and political worldview and agenda with a research design that is formulated, accepted and adopted by the researched community in such a way as to minimize the alienation between researchers and researched community.
2. Using multiple research methods and an interdisciplinary approach that acknowledge the complexity and multi-faceted nature of community problems, while avoiding narrow approaches which may yield more concrete data on a specific aspect of the community's problems, but which are not likely to lead to results that help societies or communities resolve these problems in a balanced way.
3. Mobilizing the population in such a way as to maximize community involvement and research outreach, thus contributing to the acceptance and successful implementation of research outputs.
4. Using multiple modes of communication, not only academic platforms (such as this one) but town hall meetings, radio broadcasts, flyers, newspaper interviews, and newspaper articles, in order to make the purpose, design, implementation, results, analysis, interpretation, and recommendations as accessible as possible to the highest possible number of members of the researched society.
5. Adopting a strong ethical posture as researchers, by acknowledging the researcher's position and influence over the beliefs, the perception of truths and other aspects of the discourse and lived realities of the researched community.

2.3 The Roots of Community Based Research

Once again, there is no such thing as teaching without research and research without teaching. One inhabits the body of the other. As I teach, I continue to search and re-search. I teach because I search, because I question, and because I submit myself to questioning. I research because I notice things, take cognizance of them. And in so doing I intervene. And intervening, I educate and educate myself. (Freire 1998. p.35).

It is difficult to discuss formal academic writing on community based research (also called 'community based participatory research,' 'action research,' 'participatory action research,' or 'praxis research') without discussing critical pedagogy (also called 'popular education' or 'critical literacy'), since key contemporary actors in both areas are often the same. In the work of Paulo Freire, the best known and most influential modern exponent of both community based research and critical pedagogy/literacy, it is by no means easy to make any clear distinction between the two approaches. This is in no small part due to the fact that Freire saw both research and education as processes which emerge from the fundamental human activity of problem solving. Indeed, one aspect of Freire's critique of the dominant paradigms of Western scientific investigation and education revolved around what he

considered to be the artificial separation of these two activities and the emergence of a class of ‘expert’ researchers and teachers whose professionalization has trivialized and/or replaced the investigative and educational work in which all humans have always been engaged, in order to solve the problems of daily life and in order to prepare the younger generations to do the same.

Although the literature on community based research and critical pedagogy is extensive, it can be said that those who study and advocate these frameworks for investigation and education often do so without questioning some key aspects of the dominant patriarchal, ethnocentric and economically accumulative/exploitative discourses that these approaches were in many cases originally formulated to challenge. When one considers the archaeologies of knowledge that are generally done to explain the origins of these critical orientations to research and education, their roots and resonances in the praxes of women, people of non-European descent, members of non-accumulative indigenous societies, and non-propertyed people of European descent are more often than not rendered invisible and silenced.

As mentioned above, most accounts trace community based research and critical pedagogy back to the emancipatory work of Paolo Freire in the second half of the twentieth century. Some go further back in time, identifying Freire’s antecedents in the work of other European descended males of the intellectual and propertyed classes, such as Orlando Fals Borda, Myles Horton, Kurt Lewin, John Dewey, Antonio Gramsci, Karl Marx, N. F. S. Grundtvig, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Few, however, identify a source for critical education in the diverse pedagogical praxes of women of all ethnic and class backgrounds that have ensured our social, cultural and biological survival as a species from time immemorial. As a source for community based research, perhaps even fewer acknowledge the multiplex investigative praxes of indigenous communities worldwide, despite the fact that for most of human history they have provided just, equitable and ecologically sustainable solutions to the myriad problems faced by communities everywhere on the planet, and could play a pivotal role in addressing many of the seemingly intractable problems involving violence, inequality, and environmental degradation that typify contemporary societies (Smith 1999).

The Platonic episteme that underpins Western hegemonic discourse insists on the separation of research, education and social action into distinct areas of human endeavor, each with its own set of experts, such as scientists, teachers and politicians. Although the claim is made that these distinctions are empirically based and universal, they are in fact highly artificial and represent a relatively recent division of tasks which has emerged as a tool for social control by the dominant classes in what started out as a mere handful of hegemonic societies, such as those of the (former) colonizers. In the praxes of most societies for most of human history, all three of these activities have been inseparable and indistinguishable, and have formed part of the epistemic commons that has been the basis of the subsistence powers shared by all of humanity. In order to raise children and manage families and communities, we as human beings traditionally devise and deploy scientific praxes that seamlessly merge pedagogy (education), the identification, description and analysis of problems (research) and the resolution of problems (social action).

The lifeways by which some indigenous peoples have chosen to define themselves as 'indigenous' suggest that in the non-accumulative societies in which all but the most recent of our ancestors lived, everyone was a scientist, a teacher, a learner, a researcher, a politician and an agent for social change (Faraclas 1998b). The rise of patriarchal, ethnocentric and accumulative societies has been made possible through the usurpation of these epistemic powers once shared by everyone and their concentration in the hands of classes of symbolic elites specialized in areas such as research, education and policy formulation/implementation. The 'professionals' or 'experts' who make up these elites have been carefully selected and cultivated to establish and propagate a monolithic 'truth' and a set of norms that correspond with the interests of the privileged minority that constitutes the dominant classes, rather than with the interests of the community as a whole (van Dijk 2002: 148).

Of the many metaphysical traditions of antiquity, it is not surprising that the ideas of Plato and his disciples are the ones that have played the predominant role in defining and shaping 'Western' thinking, science, religion and academic work, including the ways in which we conceptualize research and education. This is largely because Platonic metaphysics have provided politically dominant classes with tools designed to maximize social control. It is this metaphysics that has been used to justify colonialism in the past as well as to justify neo-colonialism in the present.

Plato argued that we can only really know something when we know its essential and pure form, which exists above and beyond our sensory experience in the world. Plato's idealized and universal worldview asserts that there is one true, universal, essential and normal reality and one true, universal, significant, and normal way of knowing the world. In a forced choice, zero-sum game scenario which sets up polarized binaries which are mutually exclusive and conjunctively exhaustive, all other understandings of reality are considered to be false, illusory, trivial, superficial, or abnormal. Platonic epistemology has allowed politically dominant classes and the clerics and academics who serve their interests to seize control and declare a monopoly over our understanding of what is 'true'.

On the basis of this metaphysics, Plato proposed that the ideal form of the 'good' constitutes a norm to which we all should conform. But this norm is not only a goal for human behavior, it is the one and only true, real, universal, normal, way of being in the world. All other ways of being are therefore not only false, illusory, superficial, and abnormal, but also evil. Platonic morality has allowed politically dominant classes and the clerics and academics who serve their interests to seize control over our understanding of what is good. Patriarchal, ethnocentric and economically exploitative norms have been established and enforced on all of Western society as well as on the societies colonized by the 'West' as the only true, universal, significant, normal, and good ways of being.

The internalization of Platonic normative binaries is fundamental to the perfection of systems of hegemonic rule, where coercive force is largely replaced by internalized discursive force to establish and maintain asymmetries of power in society. When we spend our entire lives trying to conform to artificial, idealized patriarchal, ethnocentric, and economically accumulative norms established not in our own

interests, but in the interests of politically dominant classes, we spend our entire lives striving to become who those ruling classes want us to be, instead of who we want ourselves to be; serving their interests instead of our interests; shaping reality in their image instead of our own; and projecting and imposing their norms on ourselves and on all with whom we come into contact, such as our colleagues and students.

Both community based research and critical pedagogy have played an enormous role in challenging hegemony because they attempt to erase the artificial borders that separate education, research and social action which have been created by the dominant classes and policed by the symbolic elites. In critical pedagogy, the hierarchical 'banking model of education' (Freire 1970/1993), where the teacher has the monopoly on truth and knowledge and the students are empty receptacles in which the teacher 'deposits' that truth and that knowledge, is replaced by a community of co-learners, where everyone's truths, knowledges and experience are acknowledged, valorized and mobilized. This community of co-learners is also a community of co-researchers and social actors, whose learning process includes the identification, description, analysis and resolution of community problems.

Most of the academic and political discussion concerning community based research and critical pedagogy view these approaches as both revolutionary and innovative, because they break with hegemonic understandings of investigation and education. While it would be difficult to overestimate the revolutionary potential of community based research and critical pedagogy to subvert the epistemic construction of asymmetrical social relations, the view that these are 'innovative' orientations to investigation and education is more problematic. By viewing them as new and without substantive precedent in human history, not only do we erase rich traditions of pre-hegemonic human epistemic and social agency, but we also unnecessarily limit our sense of our own powers and possibilities for assuming control over how and in whose interests we know and change our world, as well as over how and in whose interests we make up and change our minds (van Dijk 2008).

Freire is rightly credited with a radical re-interpretation of literacy as the ability to 'read and write the world' instead of the more conventional understanding of literacy as the ability to read and write texts, as prescribed by the symbolic elites in the image and interests of the dominant classes. In their efforts to implement critical literacy and popular education programs, however, some indigenous peoples have attempted to radically re-historicize and deepen Freire's understanding of literacy by asserting that before the advent of hegemonic societies and of print literacy, all indigenous peoples had the scientific ability to 'read and write life' as well as the pedagogical praxes that allowed them to pass on this ability from one generation to the next (Faraclas 1998a,b). In this re-formulation of what it means to be literate, indigenous peoples claim in a manner not dissimilar to Roland Barthes (1957), that all of life can be subject to interpretation, *lexis* or reading. They contend that part of the learning process in indigenous societies is to acquire the ability to read the soil to know when it is time to plant, to read the sea to know when it is time to fish, to read the movements of animals to know when it is time to hunt, to read the faces of other humans to discern their thoughts and feelings, to read their utterances in order to discern their intentions, etc.

Indigenous peoples have also used this idea of ‘reading life’ to describe their approach to community based research. In indigenous communities, everyone is involved in the processes of identifying, describing and analyzing community problems, which can be seen not only as a prime example of community based research, but also as another instance of ‘reading life’, that is, the interpretation or *lexis* of their living and lived reality. But in indigenous communities, this research process does not limit itself to the identification, description and analysis of problems. It also includes mobilizing the community to solve these problems, which indigenous peoples have termed ‘writing life’. Thus, community involvement and problem resolution, the key elements that differentiate Freire and others’ conception of ‘living’ community based research from the conventional ‘dead’ academic research paradigm that it challenges, have been an integral part of indigenous research and science (‘reading and writing life’) for millennia.

With all of the caveats expressed above, we turn our attention back to the various intellectual and social movements in Europe and the US that could be considered to have contributed to the emergence of community based research. It is interesting that Socrates is best known at present for an approach to education that incorporates key elements of community based research and critical pedagogy. Based on questions formulated to acknowledge and mobilize the knowledge and problem solving capacity of the learner, the Socratic method transforms teachers and students into a community of co-learners, where all are actively engaged in the processes of identification, description, analysis and resolution of problems. As such, Socrates can be seen as the last exponent of the indigenous ancestral Greek tradition of ‘living’ community based research/critical pedagogy. After Socrates, Plato and Aristotle re-assigned investigation and social action to separate spheres of activity, reconceptualized research as the search for an idealized, universal and unchanging (therefore ‘dead’) ‘reality’ and redefined learners as passive consumers of knowledge provided by an ‘expert’ teacher. Plato and Aristotle were thus responsible for setting the stage for the emergence of the dominant paradigms of Western academic thinking on research and education which community based research and critical pedagogy seek to problematize and challenge. Freire articulated this challenge in various ways, including the following:

The investigator who, in the name of scientific objectivity, transforms the organic into something inorganic, what is becoming into what is, life into death, is a person who fears change. He or she sees in change (which is not denied, but neither is it desired) not as a sign of life, but a sign of death and decay. [...]. However, in seeing change as a sign of death and in making people the passive objects of investigation in order to arrive at rigid models, one betrays their own character as a killer of life. [...]. I cannot think *for others* or *without others*, nor can others think *for me*. Even if the people’s thinking is superstitious or naïve, it is only as they rethink their assumptions in action that they can change. Producing and acting upon their own ideas — not consuming those of others — must constitute that process. People, as beings “in a situation,” find themselves rooted in temporal-spatial conditions which mark them and which they also mark. They will tend to reflect on their own “situationality” to the extent that they are challenged by it to act upon it. Human beings *are* because they *are in* a situation. And they *will be more* the more they not only critically reflect upon their existence but critically act upon it. (Freire 1970/1993 pp. 81–82)

Within the dominant Western paradigm, perhaps the first influential attempt to break with the concept of the learner as passive consumer of knowledge was the publication of the multi-volume novel-treatise *Emile* by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in 1762. In *Emile*, Rousseau argued for new perspectives on the education of children which were centered on their natural curiosity and goodness, in explicit opposition to the corruption of society, the church and its Platonic/Aristotelian educational institutions. From the second half of the eighteenth century onward, and especially after the French revolution, educational theorists and practitioners in Europe and the US, such as J. B. Basedow, C. G. Salzmann, J. H. Pestalozzi, J. F. Herbart, Friedrich Froebel, N. F. S. Grundtvig, J. M. Bosco, Cecil Reddie, Helen Parkhurst, Rudolf Steiner, Maria Montessori and John Dewey became part of what at least in hindsight can be identified as a movement for Progressive Education, which to one degree or another incorporated a number of approaches which can be found in critical pedagogy as well, such as a focus on experiential learning/problem solving, the encouragement of cooperative learning, an insistence on critical thinking, the cultivation of social responsibility, a commitment to democracy, and preparation for lifelong learning. The impact that the Progressive Education movement has had on pedagogy for both children and adults worldwide has been significant.

The Progressive Education movement, however, was generally not focused on radical social change beyond the confines of the school itself. From the mid-nineteenth century onward, especially after the socialist uprisings throughout Europe in the 1840s and 1850s, a more socially engaged Popular Education movement for adults and adolescents emerged. One of the pioneers of this movement was liberal theologian N. F. S. Grundtvig, who in 1844 founded the first of what was to become a national network of folk high schools in Denmark, with the goal of making lifelong education accessible and relevant to the non-propertied classes. The curriculum of these schools was designed to stimulate a community of co-learners, where dialogic interaction between teachers and learners was focused on the realities lived by the people and their everyday problems.

Thereafter, folk schools and other popular education initiatives spread rapidly in Europe and the US. Some of these initiatives were inspired by socialist intellectuals and social activists such as Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin. During the early and mid twentieth century, the critical elaboration of Marx' and Lenin's analyses of systems of domination to include the control exerted by the formulation, propagation and internalization of hegemonic discourse by Antonio Gramsci, Kurt Lewin, Mikhail Bakhtin, Pavel Medvedev, Valentin Voloshinov and Lev Vygotsky proved to be influential on the thinking and practice of social psychologists, sociologists, educators and community activists. A number of these, such as Orlando Fals Borda, and Myles Horton formulated and implemented various models that might be seen as precursors to what is now commonly understood to be community based research, as part of their efforts to bring about social change through popular education.

Paulo Freire's work is a dynamic synthesis of progressive and popular education, radical theology and radical politics, and activist psychology and sociology. Therefore, his work can be said to have been influenced directly or indirectly by the thinking and social engagement of all of the proponents of these tendencies

mentioned above, from Socrates to Karl Marx to Myles Horton. From the later part of the twentieth century until the present, Freire's ideas and activism have inspired countless intellectual reflections and concrete social interventions that incorporate the principles of community based education and critical pedagogy worldwide. Those whose thinking and work have been inspired consciously or unconsciously by Freire number in the millions and can be found promoting social transformation everywhere on the planet. Freire's impact has been particularly significant in neocolonial/postcolonial societies.

Community based research does not prescribe a specific methodology. Instead, it is a general *approach* that problematizes and re-unites the artificially separated fields of education, scientific research, and politics. An indispensable and fundamental principle of all community based research, however, is *critical dialogical praxis*. Dialogue, or the establishment of dynamic communities of lifelong co-learners, can be seen as the aspect of community based research that corresponds to what the dominant Western episteme has conceptualized as education, while praxis, or the dynamic lifelong interaction between reflection and action, can be seen as the aspect of community based research that corresponds to what the dominant Western episteme has conceptualized as scientific research (reflection) and politics (action). The critical dimension of community based research insists on the lifelong questioning, problematizing and challenging of systems of domination, such as patriarchy, ethnocentrism and economic accumulation/exploitation. In our work on the island of Statia, we attempted as much as possible to adopt a community based research approach based on critical dialogic praxis.

Literature

- Baptista, M., Brito, I., & Bangura, S. (2010). Cape Verdean in education: A linguistic and human right. In B. Migge, I. Léglise, & A. Bartens (Eds.), *Creoles in education: An appraisal of current programs and projects* (pp. 273–296). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Barthes, R. (1957). *Mythologies*. Paris: Les Lettres Nouvelles.
- Blommaert, J. (1996). Language planning as a discourse on language and society: The linguistic ideology of a scholarly tradition. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 20, 199–222.
- Canagarajah, S. (2002). Reconstructing local knowledge. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 1, 243–259.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Ethnographic methods in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Language policy: Theory and method*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cardinal, Linda Selma Sonntag. 2015. Introduction: State traditions and language regimes: Conceptualizing language policy choices. State traditions and language regimes eds. Linda Cardinal Selma Sonntag, 3–26. Montreal/Kinston: McGill – Queen's University Press.
- DeGraff, M. (2016). Mother tongue books in Haiti: the power of Kreyòl in learning to read and reading to learn. *Prospects*, 46, 435–464.
- Dutcher, N. (2001). *Expanding educational opportunity in linguistically diverse society*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Dutcher, N., & Tucker, G. R. (1997). *The use of first and second languages in education: A review of international experience*. Washington, DC: World Bank, East Asia and the Pacific Region, Country Department III.

- Faraclas, N. (1998a). Critical literacy and control. In P. Freebody, S. Muspratt, & A. Luke (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practices* (pp. 141–184). London: Allen and Unwin.
- Faraclas, N. (1998b). El desafío de la educación indígena en el contexto del desarrollo, el poder y la identidad. In L. King (Ed.), *Nuevas Perspectivas en la Educación de Adultos para Pueblos Indígenas* (pp. 203–223). UNESCO Institute for Education. Mexico: Plaza y Valdés. Also appears in English as: Faraclas, N. (1998b). Development, power, and identity: The challenge of indigenous education. In L. King (Ed.), *Reflecting visions: New perspectives on adult education for indigenous peoples* (pp. 137–148). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Adult Education.
- Faraclas, N. (2011). How the ABC island have become world leaders in language policy and education. Powerpoint of seminar presentation delivered on 15 June 2011 at the University of Curaçao.
- Faraclas, N., Kester, E.-P., Mijts, E., Ruiz, S., & Simo, J. (2016). Mother tongue literacy in the Caribbean, Latin America and the South Pacific: Community based approaches that promote the survival of endangered languages. In N. Ostler & P. Mohanty (Eds.), *Language colonization and endangerment: Long-term effects, echoes and reactions* (pp. 170–175). Hyderabad: University of Hyderabad and Centre for Endangered Languages and Mother Tongue Studies.
- Freire, P. (1970/1993). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum/Penguin.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy and civil courage*. Lanham/Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gegeo, D. W. (1998). Indigenous knowledge and empowerment: Rural development examined from within. *Contemporary Pacific*, 10, 289–315.
- Le Pichon-Vorstman, E., & Baauw, S. (2017). Meertaligheid als sleutel tot inclusief onderwijs voor nieuwkomers. In O. Agirdag & E.-R. Kambel (Eds.), *Meertaligheid en onderwijs* (pp. 79–89). Amsterdam: Boom Uitgevers.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mehrotra, S. (1998). Education for all: Policy lessons from high-achieving countries. *International Review of Education*, 44(5–6), 461–484.
- Migge, B., Léglise, I., & Bartens, A. (2010). Creoles in education: A discussion of pertinent issues. In B. Migge, I. Léglise, & A. Bartens (Eds.), *Creoles in education: An appraisal of current programs and projects* (pp. 1–30). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Orioni, M. (2017). *Het meertalige kind: een eerste kennismaking*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij van Genneep.
- Paradis, J., Genesee, F., & Crago, M. B. (2011). *Dual language development and disorders. A handbook on bilingualism and second language learning* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Brookes Publishing Company.
- Pederson, R. W. (2002). *Language, culture, and power: Epistemology and agency in applied linguistics*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.
- Pérez-Milans, M., & Tollefson, J. (2018). Language policy and planning: Directions for future research. In J. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language policy and planning* (pp. 727–741). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ryon, D. (2002). Cajun French, sociolinguistic knowledge, and language loss in Louisiana. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 1, 279–293.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Stan, A.-M. (2017). Taalonderwijs en leren van talen in meertalige klassen: een introductie bij het rapport van de Europese Commissie. In O. Agirdag & E.-R. Kambel (Eds.), *Meertaligheid en onderwijs* (pp. 53–65). Amsterdam: Boom Uitgevers.
- Tollefson, J. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 42–59). Malden: Blackwell.
- Tollefson, J. (2013). Critical issues in language policy in education. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 3–10). New York/London: Routledge.
- UNESCO. (1953). *The use of vernacular languages in education*. Paris: UNESCO.

- UNESCO. (2003). *Education in a multilingual world*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Discourse and racism. In D. T. Goldberg & J. Solomons (Eds.), *A companion to racial and ethnic studies* (pp. 145–159). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. New York: Pallgrave Macmillan.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. W. (1999). Culture, discourse and indigenous epistemology: Transcending the current models in language policy and planning. In T. Huebner & K. A. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA* (pp. 99–116). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen, A., Gegeo, D. W., & Fito'o, B. (2018). Critical community language policies in education: Solomon Islands case. In J. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language policy and planning* (pp. 398–419). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, G., & Morris, D. (2000). *Language planning and language use: Welsh in a global age*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.