

Tugging on Threads: A Loving Self-Critique of our (White) Comforts

Kairi Black
Duke University

Johan Benedict Cristobal
Loyola Marymount University

Jessica Ellis Hagman
Colorado State University

Kaylee Fantin-Hardesty
Colorado State University

Wendy M. Smith
University of Nebraska

Rachel Tremaine
Loyola Marymount University

Authors are listed alphabetically; we all contributed substantially to this research.

The ACT UP Math project was a multi-institutional research practice partnership (RPP) formed to engage students, faculty, and administrators in collective equity-oriented work for critical change in undergraduate mathematics programs. Through careful critique of our own decisions and results, we identify opportunities with which we could have embraced greater criticality, especially in relation to disrupting our own white comfort. In doing so, we aim to provide guidance on better practices to enact when engaging in critical work. We orient ourselves to this critique with (critical) love, engaging with love for ourselves with the goal of growth as researchers, love for the research we do with the goal of growth for our field, and love for the research participants with whom we partnered with the goal of learning from one another.

Keywords: critical research methods, reflexivity, self-critique, narrative inquiry, research practice partnerships

A growing number of research studies investigate the inadvertent impact of introductory mathematics programs that were *initially* designed to support a predominantly white, masculine, and higher socioeconomic population (i.e. the population of people who initially had access to higher education, especially technically-oriented higher education). As more women, more people of color, more low-income students, and more first-generation students seek higher education, STEM degrees in particular, the mathematics education community increasingly grapples with how introductory mathematics programs are not structurally designed to support this increasingly diverse population of students (Ong et al., 2018). Improvements to existing programs have included tutoring programs, bridge programs, incorporation of active learning, and the creation of co-requisite courses, among other efforts (see Voigt et al. (2023) for many examples).

Some change efforts work to improve the experience and achievement of a more diverse group of students within the current structures of introductory mathematics programs. Other change efforts work to rethink the structure of programs altogether; these efforts often question aspects of programs historically taken as given and work to develop creative alternate ways to provide and conceptualize mathematics education for diverse populations of students. The latter efforts take a *critical* approach to improving equity - they work to change the system - whereas improvement efforts that work within the system take a *dominant* approach (Gutiérrez, 2009). Equity scholars have long argued the value of both approaches, to improve the existing system and simultaneously work to change the system as a whole (Martin et al., 2024). This report discusses the ACT UP Math grant, which engaged in research practice partnerships (RPPs) with three mathematics departments. Each department created a Networked Improvement Community (NIC) of faculty members, students, and/or administrators with the intention of using local data to make transformative changes to their introductory mathematics programs. As a research team,

we worked to support them in making *critical* changes, with the recognition that critical changes are much harder to conceptualize when one works within and has succeeded within the existing systems.

With each department partner, we supported a team of students, faculty, and administrators to develop critical perspectives and apply those perspectives to their introductory mathematics programs. We encouraged the use of data to inform critical perspectives, which included both quantitative and qualitative data on student experiences in the programs. As we supported the three mathematics departments, we also strove to engage in critical scholarship- by which we mean the interrogation of norms and hierarchies in dominant research. For instance, dominant research traditions attempt to adopt “objective” perspectives of observers and value the expertise of faculty over students; a critical approach embraces that all human experiences are subjective, and recognizes the value in hearing from diverse voices and students’ lived experiences.

Our research team consists of mathematics education researchers with varied experiences in critical scholarship, and many previous experiences with dominantly-oriented research teams. To support our research team in enacting criticality, we asked (and paid) a *critical friend* with expertise in critical scholarship to attend meetings, view recorded meetings, read meetings notes, and respond to specific reflective prompts related to how we were and were not engaging with our work critically. One transformative part of the feedback that our critical friend gave was that we had centered *white comfort* within our researcher meetings and whole team meetings (which included the research team and the leaders of the department change teams). This specific feedback led to deep reflection from the team related to the ways in which whiteness and white supremacy culture impacted our orientation to our work, and inspires this report of a self-critique of how we engaged in critical scholarship. We orient this self-critique through, taking inspiration from Basile and Azevedo (2022), who used this approach to recognize where they could have done more in working to make transformative progress in STEM education. We also draw upon Foste (2020) who identifies “three reflexive considerations for white scholars beginning to take up the critical study of whiteness: creating contexts for racial comfort, validating racist beliefs, and missing educational opportunities to disrupt whiteness” (p. 132). Therefore, we guide our loving self-critique with the following research question: *How did our research team enact (white) comfort, and what opportunities did we (not) take to disrupt the tensions and contradictions therein?*

Literature Review

Our work follows a growing body of research that is grounded in love throughout theory and methodology. Paris and Alim (2014) critiqued the then-current operationalizations of asset pedagogies with an eye toward moving away from a dominant white gaze. They deliberately centered their critique in love: “we use loving critique to denote the position of deep respect from which we problematize and extend... scholarship and practice” (Paris & Alim, 2014, pp. 1-2). Basile and Azevedo later took up the idea of loving critique and oriented it to the self, in critique of their own “failures” as STEM educators: “Our loving (self) critique entails a willingness and courage to deeply interrogate our own complicity in the perpetuation of some of those same inequities we purport to stand firmly against” (Basile & Azevedo, 2022, p. 1087). We follow this tradition of loving (self) criticality.

Indeed, Clingan (2015) invites us to “consider what might be possible if love were intentionally and specifically identified as a methodology, pedagogical practice, and value in... education” (p. 1). However, as Johnson et al. (2018) remind us, we must use “love” with mindfulness and care. We do not refer to the romantic and often hierarchical love common in

Western culture, but rather we refer to “the type of deep-seated love that is cloaked in pain and that is bounded in action which disrupts... white supremacist patriarchy through the practice of humanizing love” (Johnson et al., 2018, p. 48). The latter kind of love demands self-transformation as we collectively labor for improved education systems. We offer in the next section a perspective for how queer theory supports us in this transformation through self-critical love; also see a theoretical development of *critical love* by Author 1 (under review).

Theoretical and Analytic Framework

After joining for two research team meetings, our “critical friend” – in an act of love for us and the project – shared critiques, the most provoking of which was that our meetings “gave off white comfort.” To facilitate our deconstruction of our white comforts, we chose a theoretical lens of critical whiteness studies to “recognize, analyze, and critique the power and privileges associated with Whiteness” (Haviland, 2008, p. 41). Within this lens, we center power to challenge the power-evasive tendencies of whiteness (Haviland, 2008) and to attempt to avoid the confessional, rather than transformational, critique stemming from an overemphasis of privilege (Lensmire et al., 2013).

Within our centering of power, we maintain awareness of the interwoven nature of power and privilege (and the stronger form in supremacy). Therefore, we introduce a weaving metaphor whose structural backbone consists of Okun’s elements of white supremacy culture (Okun, 2021). From Okun’s work, we highlight white supremacy’s *right to comfort, only one right way thinking, paternalism, and fear of open conflict*, as these components of white supremacy resonated with the team during reflections (for a more comprehensive discussion of white supremacy culture, we encourage the reader to visit Okun’s website). We appeal to weaving as a metaphor, and consider as vertical threads the structures of dominant cultural traditions (including white supremacy culture), and as horizontal threads the ways we enact institutional and interpersonal norms, policies, and practices as a research team. We therefore consider how we inadvertently wove our project’s “horizontal” interpersonal norms of care around the “vertical threads” of white supremacy culture, creating a space of white comfort. We now engage in the ongoing work of “tugging” on the horizontal threads to unweave them, seeking to reweave them elsewhere in critically transformative ways.

Foste (2020) encourages teams of predominantly white researchers, such as ours, to attentively engage in continual reflection and recognize that this work is ongoing. In this work, we both identify comforts and work to deconstruct them, and identify ways in which we are changing behavior and ways in which we still need to change behavior. We root our work additionally in queer theory which holds together the tension of product (this contributed report) and process (our continual engagement in reflection, even after this manuscript is “complete”).

Our choice of queer theory also returns us to our namesake ACT UP, a queer grassroots coalition of activists. This coalition “exemplified the pragmatic ability of queer activists of the 1980s and 1990s to join ‘deconstructive reading practices and grassroots activism together, laying the groundwork for... queer theory’” (Freeman, 2010; cf. Brim & Ghaziani, 2016, p. 15). We also work to deconstruct – or “*unweave*” – our “white comforts,” which we view as inherently indiscrete. Likewise, “Whiteness is not monolithic” (Haviland, 2008, p. 41) and “white racial identities are multifarious messes of thought and feeling... we must remain open and attentive to the pedagogical possibilities of complexity and conflict” (Lensmire, 2010, p. 170). In recognition of this messiness, and the potential for transformation when embracing complexity and conflict, we see queer theory as a natural foundation for our critique--for its ability to deconstruct binaries, critique hierarchy, and engage with uncertainty (see Chapters 2

and 3 of Hall (2003) for what these entail). As such, queer theory offers a supportive frame for our (self-)critical love through the tugging and unweaving of our enacted white comforts.

Data and Method

Our loving self-critique is rooted in our critical friend's feedback and entries from ACT UP Math RPP members' journals reflecting on feedback and tensions felt in the RPP. These journals prompted members to think about their RPP experiences, areas of tension, and progress toward critical transformations. Amorphously, we also bring personal reflections of our time in the RPP -- in part to contextualize written journal entries and in part to dive into how tensions and comforts were addressed.

Our first stage of analysis consisted of identifying the comforts within the reflective journals, asking ourselves "if this space gave off white comfort, what is it that we found comfort in?" We looked broadly for areas of comfort in the data, whether tied to white comfort or not. We employed a reflexive thematic analysis (Braun et al., 2023). Initially, a PI and author of this paper created a preliminary grouping of entries which touch on similar ideas (e.g., white supremacy culture, identity, metaphors for tension, etc.). Then, we used these initial groupings to begin giving names to comforts identified. Next, we individually consolidated comforts under broader categories to allow for each member's unique interpretation of these comforts and how they relate. After comparison and discussion, we collectively reconciled the higher level categories that form the comforts we identified which formed the basis of our critique. The analysis did result in all of the comforts being rooted in white supremacy culture; we used (white) – with parentheses – in our research question to indicate that we were looking for all types of comforts that may have limited our criticality, including those not necessarily attributable to white supremacy culture.

Our second stage of analysis focused on how these comforts were (and are still) both influencing our work and being actively interrogated through our work as the ACT UP Math project team. We found it appropriate to use narrative inquiry (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) for its ability to *queer* the context of these comforts – that is, queer theory and hence this critique are "perpetually becoming" (Browne & Nash, 2010, p. 1). Moreover, telling stories, especially about mathematics, allow people to unpack held beliefs (Gutiérrez et al., 2023) and heal traumas (Scott & Zuniga-Ruiz, 2024). We utilize the three-dimensional inquiry space (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) to structure our restory process of comforts as follows: continuity (e.g., time before/after critical friend's feedback), situation/place (e.g., research meetings), and interactions (e.g., members of the RPP). Through these dimensions, we built a narrative that contextualized the things we found comfort in, and thereby giving form to our comforts which could be unraveled. By unraveling each thread, we begin to unravel *our* tapestry of (white) comfort. We share a piece of this narrative below.

Results and Discussion

Structuring our loving self-critique through narrative inquiry required investigation into the overall narrative of the ACT UP Math project. In the prologue to the ACT UP Math narrative, the PIs were involved in multiple past large grant-funded projects, all of which we experienced as rooted in patriarchal models. Thus, as the ACT UP Math narrative began, the PI team came together to create an equity-focused project both in process and in focus. We endeavoured to create a non-patriarchal space with a distributed leadership structure that honored the knowledge and experiences of everyone rather than assigning status based on age, gender, or role. We also intentionally scheduled community building activities to begin every meeting, not just the first

few meetings. We set up project norms (later recast as community agreements) that were dynamic, and evolved to align with our growth as individuals and as a community, and as our community membership changed over time. These structures and norms, bundled together with the broader institutional ways of being we have been enculturated in, were woven horizontally, across the vertical threads of white supremacy culture as enacted more broadly in academia. For us, maintaining relational threads in every meeting helped to strengthen our overall weaving, and illuminate the community we were weaving together.

Our narrative then comes to our “critical friend” who, after joining two research team meetings, shared the critique that our meetings “gave off white comfort.” Following this critique, we began and still continue the work of unravelling comforts rooted in white supremacy and those rooted in other systems of oppression. We first identified four threads through which comfort manifested in, and sometimes limited, the critical nature of our team’s work: *Comfort in (Dominant) Tradition*, *Comfort in Easing Discomfort*, *Comfort in Hierarchy*, and *Comfort in Whiteness*. These threads were by no means distinct, but allow us to consider some of the ways in which white comfort worked to limit more critical progress.

In this paper, we share only a piece of the narrative so that the reader has the opportunity to consider one of our unravellings more deeply, rather than more surface-level unravellings of all four threads. We focus on unravelling the *Comfort in (Dominant) Tradition* thread. This thread consisted of ways in which we chose to (or defaulted to) not question research practices and research methodologies that are rooted in white, Western notions of academia. The vast majority of our research team was formally trained in traditional education research methodologies, and carry with us knowledge and comfort in those environments and methods. Both in the structure of our interactions with participants and in the methods we chose, we frequently fell back on what we knew from previous research experiences, rarely challenging taken-for-granted norms in how research is conducted.

Through this loving self-critique, we now recognize missed opportunities for greater power-sharing within our research-practice partnership that we did not take up. In conjunction with the *Comfort in Hierarchy* thread, we did little to dismantle the pedestal upon which research (and therefore, researchers) are often placed in professional development contexts. While we did explicitly encourage NIC members at our participating institutions to see themselves as experts in their own experiences, and to leverage their institutional expertise to inform critical changes, we missed opportunities to invite them to collaborate in research spaces throughout the project. Often, they were left in the dark with regards to *why* we were collecting the data we collected, and they were not asked to influence the types of data we collected.

In a particularly poignant example that stands out to our research team, during a final project interview, one participant explicitly shared some frustration with the fact that we repeatedly asked participants to illuminate “what data felt impactful” during the course of the project. When the researchers conducting the interview shared that we were curious about how participants’ perspectives around data changed throughout the course of the project, the interviewee expressed curiosity around why we didn’t share that with the local NIC leaders and participants, as it would have mitigated some of the confusion and frustration participants felt around being repeatedly asked the same question. Notably, the participant only felt comfortable sharing this frustration with us after three years of intentional relationship development; as is the case in traditional research and participant interaction, our research team did not make space for critique of our project from the participants, which undoubtedly would have served to enhance the project itself. This is but one reflection of the missed opportunities we had to share the purpose of our research

with the participating NIC members (or, more critically, allow our practitioner partners to shape the directions of our research).

As a result, the research side of our work, especially in the early years of the project, existed in a “black box” which was not visible to our participants, which diminished the *partnership* value of the RPP. As we unravelled this particular thread of comfort during the later months of the project (after our critical friend’s critique), some intentional ways in which we reweave this thread included greater intentionality in extending invitations to NIC leaders and members to be a part of research propagation efforts. These invitations were made asynchronously via email and during meetings with NIC leaders at the three institutions, and contained summaries of *all* projects presently being worked on alongside opportunities to indicate interest in other research directions created by them. As more NIC leaders and participants have opted into engaging in the research side of our work, new challenges came to light; in particular, we needed to learn how to share data with participants while protecting the anonymity of other participants in the project, which we have handled on a case-by-case basis. We have found the challenge minimal compared to the immense value of having NIC leaders and participants in conversations that shape (and constitute) our research propagation efforts. While we are still working on many of these efforts, we have seen for ourselves the value that having NIC members and leaders actively involved in shaping propagation efforts has. Indeed, the ACT UP Math grant originally chose the term propagation—rather than dissemination—for its suggestion of growth rather than spreading. The involvement of NIC members has substantially contributed, and continues to contribute, to the growth of our research.

Even so, our propagation efforts continue to reflect traditional education research methods. The PIs of this project intentionally leveraged a grassroots activist organization’s acronym with the intention of responding powerfully to the injustices that can be perpetuated by contemporary U.S. mathematics education policies and practices. Our desire was to partake in activism through a research lens—to be activist-scholars as we conducted and propagated this work on how to make change. However, we fell short of this desire, and rarely in the moment considered how the comfort we found in traditional academic and mathematics education research methods continued to feed into some of the systems we had so intentionally set out to disrupt.

For example, the vast majority of our propagation efforts have been filtered through traditional propagation channels: established journals and conference proceedings, which themselves are inaccessible to a broad audience and subject to forms of gatekeeping that maintain traditional academic practices. By choosing to submit our work (and in many cases, be accepted) to such avenues, we have already “played the game” – or at least, a component of the game – of academic prestige associated with publishing in traditional, dominant spaces: a game which a more radical stance might reject entirely. For example, a stance of refusal (Tuck & Yang, 2014) more radically questions and disrupts research as the highest form of knowing, noting that even more inclusive definitions of what research *is* continues to uphold *research* as the eclipsing way to make meaning of human experiences. Even when we use more critical or arts-based methodologies (such as poetic transcription or visual analysis), we continue to call them *research* and seek to publish them in normative mathematics education research spaces. This is done with genuine care and awareness for our colleagues (particularly those in their early career, where citations matter a great deal in terms of career trajectory) and for the research community, who we hope will learn from and build on our work. We continue to submit and publish work in traditional academic avenues of propagation (such as RUME). This care and continuation of practice exists alongside our more recent unravelling of how *Comfort in*

Tradition kept us feeling safe in these propagation practices.

Recently, we have explored other non-academic avenues through which we might share our findings, curiosities, and wonderings, as potential re-weavings of this thread. Drawing from creative spaces of subversion, we distributed a Zine at MAA MathFest 2025 focused on how we came to understand dimensions of creating authentic student partnerships in change-making groups (Bolick, 2025). The Zine featured artwork and poetry from a collaborative team of researchers and NIC participants, many of whom were students. When our project was funded, we also maintained a public blog *Get Lit: Mathematics Education* that discussed literature of interest to our team. Both of these avenues of propagation were not subject to any form of review and highlighted more critical ideas and presentation forms than may have been published in more mainstream journal or conference spaces, and thus allowed us to reflect more of the activist stances we had set out to take with this project, and distribute those thoughts more widely. Ultimately, these remain but two pieces of work, with the vast majority of our work published (even now) in mainstream academic spaces. This does not mean that such traditionally published work does not or cannot have value, but necessitates an acknowledgement that, in filtering through traditional channels, we are not necessarily disrupting research norms in a way aligned with our initial activist intentions. Our unravelling of the *Comfort in (Dominant) Tradition* thread leads us to critique the ways in which our work maintained traditional hierarchies between researchers and practitioners of mathematics education, alongside this recognition that we are continuing to perpetuate traditionally reviewed and published *research* as the highest form of knowing. Within a stance of care for colleagues and awareness of the need to “play the game”, we continue to seek ways to reweave this thread.

Implications

We share our loving self-critique with the RUME community for multiple reasons, which bring with them implications for future practice. For many of us, the RUME community is our research home, so the practices we fell back on are exactly those practices shared, cultivated, and valued by this community. Thus, as we lovingly critique our own use of these practices (or comforts), we extend this loving critique to the RUME communities’ continued use and comfort in these practices. We encourage our colleagues to consider ways that they default to research practices that uphold dominant tradition (especially in research methodologies and propagation efforts) and hierarchies (based on social and professional identities) – two tenets of white supremacy that have infiltrated our academic culture so much so that we may not notice them.

We also share this loving self critique as an example of the type of vulnerable and reflective work that can lead to growth, which we (and therefore our field) can all always benefit from. We envision a loving self critique of research projects available to all RUME colleagues, asking (and importantly sharing) not only what we believe we got “right”, but also how our work could be improved. We do not want this room for improvement to be misconstrued as a robust “limitations” section of a traditional paper. Instead, we remind ourselves and others that courage, humility, curiosity, and a critical interest in *growing* one’s own propensity to do meaningful work are all woven into the work of a loving self critique (Black, this volume). We see these values in our RUME colleagues, and recognize many may be doing their own internal loving self critiques. Here, we call for that work to become publicly valuable so that we may all learn from purposeful introspection, and to place those introspections into dialogue with broader societal discourses, such as white supremacy culture. Our hope is that the “deep-seated” and “humanizing love” (Johnson et al., 2018, p. 48) with which we engaged in this work is felt and can propagate within this community.

Acknowledgments

Thank you so much to everyone who contributed to the ACT UP Math project, particularly through vulnerable self-reflections. The ACT UP Math project was originally funded by the National Science Foundation (#2201486) until funding was terminated by DOGE April 19, 2025. All findings are those of the authors and not necessarily of the former funding agency.

References

- Basile, V., & Azevedo, F. S. (2022). Ideology in the mirror: A loving (self) critique of our equity and social justice efforts in STEM education. *Sci Educ*, 106, 1084-1096.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21731>.
- Black, K. (this volume). If (critical) love is an answer, what is the (research) question? *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Conference on RUME*. (11 pages). SIGMAA on RUME.
- Bolick, M. A. (Ed.). (2025). *The ACT UP Math Guide to Uplifting Student Voices* [Zine].
[https://scimath.unl.edu/sites/unl.edu.cas.csmce/files/media/file/2025 SaP Zine-2.pdf](https://scimath.unl.edu/sites/unl.edu.cas.csmce/files/media/file/2025%20SaP%20Zine-2.pdf)
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., Hayfield, N., Davey, L., & Jenkinson, E. (2023). Doing reflexive thematic analysis. In S. Bager-Charleson & A. McBeath (Eds.), *Supporting research in counselling and psychotherapy: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods research* (pp. 19-38). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Brim, M., & Ghaziani, A. (2016). Introduction: Queer Methods. *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly*, 44(3), 14-27. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/ws.2016.0033>.
- Browne, K., & Nash, C. J. (2010). Queer methods and methodologies: an introduction. In K. Browne & C. J. Nash (Eds.), *Queer methods and methodologies intersecting queer theories and social science research* (pp. 1-23). Routledge.
- Clandinin, J. & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Clingan, J. (2015). A pedagogy of love. *Journal of Sustainability Education*, 9.
- Foste, Z. (2020). Remaining vigilant: reflexive considerations for white researchers studying whiteness. *Whiteness and Education*, 5(2), 131-146.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23793406.2020.1738264>.
- Freeman, E. (2010). *Time binds: queer temporalities, queer histories*. Duke University Press.
- Gutiérrez, R. (2009). Framing equity: helping students "play the game" and "change the game". *Teaching for Excellence and Equity in Mathematics*, 1(1), 4-8.
<https://journals.charlotte.edu/teem/article/view/1704>.
- Gutiérrez, R., Myers, M., & Kokka, K. (2023). The stories we tell: Why unpacking narratives of mathematics is important for teacher conocimiento. *The Journal of Mathematics Behavior*, 70, 101025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmathb.2022.101025>.
- Hall, D. E. (2003). *Queer theories*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Haviland, V. S. (2008). "Things get glossed over": Rearticulating the silencing power of whiteness in education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(1), 40-54.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107310751>.
- Johnson, L. L., Bryan, N., & Boutte, G. (2018). Show us the love: Revolutionary teaching in (un)critical times. *The Urban Review*, 51, 46-64. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-018-0488-3>.
- Lensmire, T. J. (2010). Ambivalent white racial identities: fear and an elusive innocence. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(2), 159-172.
- Lensmire, T. J., McManinon, S. K., Tierney, J. D., Lee-Nichols, M. E., Casey, Z. A., Lensmire, A., & Davis, B. M. (2013). McIntosh as synecdoche: How teacher education's focus on white privilege undermines antiracism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(3), 410-431.

- Martin, D. B., Valoyes-Chávez, L., & Valero, P. (2024). Race, racism, and racialization in mathematics education: global perspectives. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 116(3), 313-331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-024-10346-0>
- Okun, T. (2021). *(Divorcing) White supremacy culture: coming home to who we really are*. White supremacy culture. <https://www.whitesupremacyculture.info>
- Ong, M., Smith, J. M., & Ko, L. T. (2018). Counterspaces for women of color in STEM higher education: Marginal and central spaces for persistence and success. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 55(2), 206-245.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85-100.
- Scott, M., & Zuniga-Ruiz, S. (2024). The practice of mathematics reasoning to foster healing for prospective elementary teachers. In Lindgren, R., Asino, T. I., Kyza, E. A., Looi, C. K., Keifert, D. T., & Suárez, E. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference of the Learning Sciences - ICLS 2024* (pp. 1554-1557). Buffalo, USA: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). R-Words: Refusing Research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Communities* (pp. 223-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Voigt, M., Hagman, J. E., Gehrtz, J., Ratliff, B., Alexander, N., & Levy, R. (Eds.) (2023). *Justice through the Lens of Calculus*. Mathematical Association of America. <https://maa.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/NTE96.pdf>