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ABSTRACT

COMMUNAL STORYWORK: DEAF EDUCATION AND THE LATINE COMMUNITY

by noralee jasso

In order to challenge the dominant and deficit perspectives in deaf education, this study utilized a Critical Race Theory framework to examine Latine families with Deaf children as they are portrayed in literature across areas of policy, research, and practice. Through qualitative semi-structured interviews, this research project invited nine adult Latine family members with Deaf children to share their lived experiences with having a Deaf child as part of the family and within a California school. To center the experiences of Latine families with Deaf children as visible, legitimate and necessary constituents of their children’s educational journeys, this research required a decolonial approach which incorporated Indigenous Research Methodologies and frameworks such as that of Storywork and Relational Accountability. Given the opportunity to learn about and from Latine families with Deaf children can inform deaf education practitioners, researchers, and policy makers toward a more equitable and socially just approach in the overall praxis of deaf education.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Deaf education policy, research, and practice in this country is explicitly predicated upon European-American culture and its perspectives and has historically excluded Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC), as is recurrently evidenced throughout this study (Anderson & Bowe, 1972; Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990; Gannon et al., 1981; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Wolbers, 2002). Since legal establishment of racial integration, deaf education scholars and educators have reported significant shifts in the demographics of families with Deaf children and concerns about how to work with these families (Cohen, 1997; G.L. Delgado, 1984, Gerner de Garcia, 1993, Kluwin, 1994; Sass-Lehrer et al., 1997; Walker-Vann, 1998). However, decades later, there remains a lack of relationship and accountability to families with Deaf children who are not European-American. In California, policymakers, researchers, and educators have minimally demonstrated any standardized commitment to its largest population of families with Deaf children in deaf education—the Latine community. It is this lack of relationship and accountability to the Latine community and their Deaf children that prompted the application of Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Brayboy, 2013; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Wilson, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019) and Critical Race Theory (CRT) (K. Brown & Jackson, 2013; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Zamudio et al., 2011) frameworks to guide this interdisciplinary investigation, analysis, and overall research process. These frameworks provided the necessary, relevant, ethical, and culturally competent frameworks and methods for receiving entrance into the Latine community for research in general and engaging Latine families with Deaf children for this study in
particular, as will be detailed across several chapters. The centering of Latine families with Deaf children required highly intentional confrontations of colonial impact at every step of this entire doctoral experience and research process, as will be described in sections pertaining to applying an antiracist and decolonial approach. Continual reflection and analysis about and with the research contributors, the literature, the writing process, and real-time applications of emerging findings, highlighted and centered a core IRM concept of being relationally accountable to self and community (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Penn State College of Education, 2020; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Valenzuela, 1999; Wilson, 2008).

In alignment with this unprecedented decolonial research approach to deaf education, excerpts placed in every chapter titled, “A Word…” provide insight to the noting, assessing, and addressing of colonial impact from the personal to the systemic, historical to the contemporary, from the Latine community to deaf education, and various other intersecting aspects of this work. While these excerpts may appear to begin or end abruptly to the Eurocentric-minded reader, the placement and context are deliberate engagements of learning, unlearning, reclaiming, re-membering, and storying process (Archibald, 2008; Brayboy, 2013; Penn State College of Education, 2020; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021) toward a decolonial path of racial and social justice for and with Latine families with Deaf children, the Latine community at large, and all who are striving to be accountable to self and community.
A Word on the Dominance

A word on the dominance, discrimination, racialization and survival of the Latine people indigenous to the Americas and colonized by the Europeans of Spain. People inhabiting the Americas prior to European colonization are indigenous to the Americas, regardless of the arbitrary borders, legislation, racialization, language differences, and demonization that European settlers have imposed upon us for hundreds of years. We are home.

I include myself in this “we” as I am a descendent of these indigenous people whose histories I have traced to the areas of México, that are currently known as the states of Texas and Nuevo León, located on both sides of the political and arbitrary border of the current United States of America (USA) and present-day México. While much indigenous history has been deliberately erased physically and psychologically in some form or another, oral histories of my maternal grandparents, mother, local community members of the small town my mother is from and some direct investigation of my own, indicate that we are Alazapas, a group that research claims to have been nomadic and now extinct. My mother, the oldest child in her family, recalls her maternal grandfather speaking an indigenous language but was too young to identify it. We continue to search for our roots. From the oral histories of my paternal grandmother and a few family members including my older sister, I learned we are from indigenous groups in the south of present-day México and from the Pacific Southwest in present-day USA. Diné, a group that research claims to be mostly in the areas of the current Pacific Southwest and under the colonial marker of “Navajo”, is one particular group my paternal family members have been able to trace through their own oral histories and investigations. From my paternal side of the family, there does not appear to be biological
mixing of European ancestry other than culturally through language, some religious practices and the Hispanicizing of our names. From my maternal side of the family, there are stories of my grandfather having possible Spanish and Arab ancestry (and the glorification of it) but it has been difficult to trace even the origins of the family surname which has changed its spelling over time. My family story of having been stripped, colonized, and re-racialized by European settlers over time is not unique.

As we struggle to reclaim our identities, figure out how we should identify with the given European settler system of racialization or describe ourselves in new terms that move us more toward decolonization and healing as a collective, the range of identity labels is wide and at times utilized to further divide our people. Some examples of these given or self-ascribed identifications are Hispanic, Latina, Latino, Latinx, Latine, Mexican, Salvadoran, Guatemalan, Indigena, Mexican American, Mexicano, Hispano, Hispana, Chicana, Chicano, Chicanx, and many other hyphenated American labels to name a few. However, what we cannot be separated from indefinitely and collectively is the land.

Thousands of years of our ancestors’ blood and bones rest beneath us. Our relationship to the land on these Americas is a unique and indescribable relationship that no other settler or immigrant can ever fully know on this land. In our DNA, we carry thousands of years of ancestral knowledge, memory, intuition, and understanding that has ensured our survival to date. We are still here. We have endured hundreds of years of attempted extermination by European settlers through outright genocide, land theft, continual re-racialization (my own birth certificate states that my indigenous parents are Caucasian), depletion of our land’s natural resources, displacement (deportation) of entire communities, imprisonment, and
deliberate erasure of our languages, community ties, and identities through systematic
colonization, indoctrination, direct violence and institutionalized racism. We have survived
and we are still here. We have learned to navigate European settler institutions. We have
learned the European settlers’ languages of English, Spanish, French, and Portuguese and
then have been further ridiculed, ostracized, and discriminated against for not mastering
English above all other European languages. We have been portrayed as foreigners on our
own land. When we have extended our hands in communal effort to teach others about
ourselves, the land, and our ways of learning and knowing the world, there has been no
authentic relationship. We have been met with attitudes of superiority and simultaneous
exploitation of our cultures and customs for profit across markets, media, and literature.
Libraries and databases across the country hold historical accounts and present-day
depictions of how European writers, settlers, and consequently internally colonized peoples
have ranked us as inferior and incapable. Perhaps it is the literature that has been the most
damning to our people since it is the most lauded form of knowledge for European settler
institutions in what is now called the USA. It is within the literature where deficit and
dehumanizing descriptions of who we are have been perpetuated for centuries and solidified
as truths by those who hold dominance and authority to decide legitimacy; a legitimacy that
roots itself in Eurocentrism, upholds White [European-American] supremacy, favors
European settler perspectives and preserves colonial mentality, but we are still here. It must
be enraging. Centuries later, we are still here, guided by our ancestral memory, intuition,
strong will for justice of all living creations despite the endless attempts to erase us from
ourselves and each other, and striving to reclaim and recenter our communal knowledge of deep-rooted ontological and epistemological foundations.

This is how I must situate this study for those of us who willfully choose to Other the indigenous people of the Americas. While contemporary times has racialized the indigenous people who were colonized by Europe’s Spaniards as “White” with subcategories of Hispanic, Latina, Latino, Latinx, Latine or other hyphenated American labels, I center this study from a perspective that this particular group, at its core, continues to be indigenous to these Americas and their relationship to the land and community continues to endure, inform their existence, and thrive. Context matters. At its core, this indigenous group functions as a collective for the greater good, for balance, and for justice but is continually offset by the oppressive power dynamics that can only survive as long as it keeps us struggling. Words matter and while historical context matters in any study, it is not within the scope of this research to explain nor educate others on such topics of colonization of the Americas, racism, and related topics that have been available for decades with as little effort as a simple Google search.

Statement of the Problem

Latine and Deaf Education

As aforementioned, identity labels for this group of indigenous people colonized by Europe’s Spaniards, range from systemically invented labels to smaller community identifiers or individualized identities. For the purpose of this study and to link previous research dedicated to this particular group identified as Latina/Latino/Latinx/Latine or “Hispanic”, I will use the umbrella term of Latine. Latine is a gender-neutral term derivative
of the gendered terms Latina, Latino, and Latinx, which appears to be the most common or understood term in referencing this particular population (Collins Dictionary, n.d.; El Centro, n.d.; Martinez & Kemunto, 2021). I will utilize this term going forward to refer to the collective indigenous people of the Americas colonized by Europe’s Spaniards (and Portuguese as appropriate) via language, traditions, and/or religions, and who are not distinctly labeled as “Native Americans” colonized by Europe’s England or France. For the purpose of this study, I will also include the specific identity of any research contributor as they disclose it along with the umbrella term of Latine for consistency and uniformity. For the reader unfamiliar with common deaf education and Deaf community identifiers, the term “deaf” references educational or clinical descriptions often expressed as “little d deaf”, and the term “Deaf” refers to identity or cultural affiliation often expressed as “big D Deaf” (Bahan et al., 2008 Bauman, 2004; Eckert, 2010; E.N. Gertz, 2003; Lane et al., 1996; Padden & Humphries, 2005; Pendergrass et al., 2019; Stapleton, 2014, 2016; Wilcox, 1989). Each term will be utilized accordingly and intentionally when referring to clinical or cultural aspects of this study.

*Deaf Education in California Schools*

Latine communities have had to learn to navigate within and around dominant European centered institutions in general and within public education in particular since it has been touted as the primary means for surviving all other Eurocentric and European-American established institutions and systems here in the USA. What family would not want an opportunity for their children to be considered a success in a society that endorses this type of systemic education in such an esteemed and necessary manner? We are still here navigating
oppressive institutions as a means of survival and perhaps even with a deep desire for an eventual acceptance of who we are as we are. There is a need to know us genuinely for systems to shift, society to change, and balance to return. Centering Latine communities and their experiences within education and specifically examining deaf education where over 200 years of pristine European centered ideology and dominance has continued undisturbed, is a start.

While there may be ample research on education and Latine families, information on this population within California deaf education programs is essentially non-existent. Any available research on Latine families within deaf education in general has focused primarily on deficits in language or communication rather than on understanding their actual lived experiences and potential contributions. In other words, Latine family experiences, perspectives, and strengths have not been centered and families have not been regarded as legitimate stakeholders within deaf education in California schools. Only recently have organizations such as California Council de Manos and Deaf Latinos y Familias been more widely recognized within the broader Deaf community but those organizations are still at the margins when it comes to deaf education programs and schools. The time to review and analyze deaf education from a decolonial approach and appropriately center Latine families with Deaf children is long overdue.

**Education Law and Families**

Federal law (Education of the Handicapped Act [PL 94-142], 1975; Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act [IDEIA], 2004), state mandates (California Education Code [Cal. EC] § 56000 et seq.) and research (Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990;
G.L. Delgado, 1984; Harry, 2008; Honda, 1998; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Lopez, 2014; Wathum-Ocama & Rose, 2002; Wesley, 2011) state that families are integral to the function of public education and necessary stakeholders in deaf education. In California, Latine families with Deaf children comprise at least 55% of families involved in deaf education and documented data indicates that percentage can fluctuate to over 70% (California Department of Education [CDE], 2013; Honda, 1998; Lopez, 2014; Wesley; 2011). However, representations of Latine families with Deaf children within the literature are limited and often portrayed in a deficit manner by the predominantly monocultural hearing European-American dominated field of practitioners and researchers (Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990; Dávila, 2015; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Leonardo & Boas, 2013; Salas, 2004; Sleeter, 2017; Valencia & Black, 2002; Walker-Vann, 1998; Wolbers, 2002; Wu & Grant, 1997). Most literature on deaf education has continually focused on student performance, achievement or communication modalities, aligning family experiences with the dominant European-American cultural perspectives and assumptions, thus, excluding the narratives of historically omitted groups such as those of Latine families with Deaf children (T. Allen, 1992; Cohen, 1997; G.L. Delgado, 1984; Gerner de Garcia, 1993, 1995a, 1995b, 2000a, 2000b; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Lopez, 2014; Ramsey, 1997; Steinberg et al., 1997; Wathum-Ocama & Rose, 2002; Wesley, 2011).

Even though policy requires equal partnership, engagement and inclusion of families with Deaf children in all aspects of the educational process, it is too often absent for Latine families with Deaf children. Research has historically interpreted policy along dominant European-American monocultural and monolingual perspectives for educators of the Deaf,
who also subscribe to that same orientation (Cohen 1997; Wathum-Ocama & Rose, 2002). As rights, needs, support, and access have been established for Deaf students and their families over time, I posit that Latine families with Deaf children, the largest population in deaf education in California schools since the late 1970s (CDE, 2013; G.L. Delgado, 1984), have been largely discounted as vital and legitimate constituents of deaf education. I assert that while Latine families with Deaf children have been mentioned in the literature, information has been limited or deficit and not centered on awareness or knowledge of their actual experiences, knowledge, or contributions outside of comparisons to European-American perspectives. Whereas legislation continues to demand for families to be integral constituents of the deaf education process; whereas as educators of the Deaf continue to be predominantly hearing European-American women with little to no knowledge of Latine family experiences or community; whereas research has not centered or equally acknowledged the experiences of Latine families compared to their European-American counterparts; and whereas Latine families continue to be the majority with Deaf children in California schools, it is necessary to learn more about the experiences of Latine families as visible and legitimate members of deaf education. It is necessary to highlight and center the community of Latine families whose knowledge and experiences have remained at the margins.

**Purpose of the Study**

*Latine Family Experiential Knowledge*

This study centers Latine families with Deaf children as legitimate bearers of culture and knowledge and attempts to underscore their experiences as necessary for us to learn from and
include as significant contributions to deaf education policy, research and practice. In California, over half of the deaf education student population are from Latine families (CDE, 2013; Honda, 1998; Lopez, 2014; Wesley; 2011) with some concentrated areas or programs personally reporting up to 80% to 90% (N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016, qualifications presented in a later section; my own worksite program has fluctuated from 60% to 88% Latine Deaf students) yet representations of Latine families with Deaf children within the literature continue to be at most, a group whose culture and community is misunderstood or largely neglected, and at worst whose culture and community is to blame for language deficits, lack of involvement, lack of education, and in need of rescue by the predominantly White (European-American) researchers, professors, and educators (Bennett, 1988; Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990; Dávila, 2015; Harry, 2008; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Mitchell, 2013; Salas, 2004; Sleeter, 2017; Valencia & Black, 2002; Valenzuela, 1999; Walker-Vann, 1998; Wathum-Ocama & Rose, 2002; Wolbers, 2002; Wu & Grant, 1997;). Most narratives about Latine families with Deaf children have not been centered as rightful contributions for positive impact on research or practice and instead have framed Latine families with Deaf children as incompetent, uneducated, low socioeconomic status, uninterested, and/or lacking in some way to justify low or slow rates of achievement for Deaf Latine students (Bennet, 1988; Cohen, 1997; Dávila, 2015; G.L. Delgado, 1984; Harry, 2008; Horsford & Grosland, 2013; Ramsey, 1997; Schirmer, 2000; Valencia & Black, 2002). Additionally, the limited and largely deficit literature available related to Latine families with Deaf children has essentially been conducted within frameworks or ideologies to serve the dominant culture of those working within deaf education which is European-American.
The primary interest of this qualitative study was to personally learn more about the experiences of Latine families with Deaf children as an educator of the Deaf to inform my own practice and that of my colleagues and peers in deaf education. As I searched for more information in the areas of policy, research, and practice regarding Latine families it became clear that this study was necessary to address historical misrepresentations or limitations in the literature, learn more about why Latine families have not been at the forefront of research being that they are the largest population served in California schools, and finally, to disrupt the status quo by centering this population and community as visible and legitimate constituents of California programs and schools that serve Deaf students.

**Research Questions**

The data collection process incorporated in-depth semi-structured interviews and the snowball sampling method for recruitment. Initially nine research contributors were recruited from the northern, central, and southern areas of California. As the research process unfolded and a more decolonial approach was incorporated, additional research contributors, events, and encounters began to inform this study and shift my original plan and framework as will be presented throughout the following chapters. Principal research questions for this study were:

1. What are the experiences of Latine families who have Deaf children?
2. How do the experiences of Latine families shape their roles in deaf education schools or programs?
3. What are the implications of centering the experiences of Latine families with Deaf children?
These questions served as a guide to authentically understand the experiences and perspectives of Latine families with Deaf children with intent on centering this population as one of strengths, abilities, skills, talents, and legitimate bearers of knowledge. Additionally, the study aimed to challenge dominant and deficit perspectives to inform research and practice on how to relate, learn, and understand Latine families with Deaf children through an antiracist approach and decolonial perspective.

**Theoretical Framework**

To examine the available literature the framework of Critical Race Theory in education (Crenshaw, 2011, 2019; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Malagon et al., 2009; Zamudio et al., 2011) was utilized to highlight the experiences (or lack) of Latine families with Deaf children in deaf education in general and deaf education across California in particular. The Critical Race Theory (CRT) perspective in education is comprised of five general categories or tenets that aim to disrupt the status quo of deficit policy, research, and practice and center the narratives of historically excluded groups with a commitment toward social justice (Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Malagon et al., 2009; Zamudio et al., 2011).

The first tenet of a CRT perspective states that race and racism are endemic and central, and acknowledges the intersections of class, gender, sexuality, immigration status and other identities [and abilities] as complex layers of this racialized position (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Malagon et al., 2009; Zamudio et al., 2011).
Tenet two uses CRT to challenge dominant ideology as it pertains to assertions of objectivity, color neutrality, White [European-American] privilege, meritocracy, and race neutrality (Crenshaw et al., 2019; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Gillborn, 2006; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Malagon et al., 2009; Villenas & Dehyle, 1999). It also aims to expose standards or research that are utilized to maintain power and privilege for dominant communities and describes how historically excluded communities are framed in a deficit manner (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Villenas & Dehyle, 1999; Zamudio et al., 2011).

The third tenet states that social justice is a primary goal of critical race methodology and it is committed to the empowerment of People of Color while striving to expose structures of and eliminate racism, sexism, poverty and other oppressive systems (Dávila, 2015; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Malagon et al., 2009; Zamudio et al., 2011).

Tenet four draws upon the lived experiences of marginalized people through counterstories, testimonios, and other narratives recognizing their knowledge as critical and legitimate in understanding and deconstructing racial subordination within education (Archibald, 2008; Blackmer Reyes & Curry Rodríguez, 2012; Pérez Huber, 2009, 2010; Rangel, 2019; Urrieta & Villenas, 2013; Villenas, 2005; Zamudio et al., 2011). CRT highlights the lives of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) as bearers of knowledge, valuable and necessary to the broader context of the collective mainstream narrative.
The final tenet challenges traditional perspectives and draws upon interdisciplinary scholarship such as psychology, history, law, and ethnic studies while analyzing race and racism within the contexts of historical and contemporary times (Crenshaw et al., 2019; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Zamudio et al., 2011). This is especially critical to the social justice tenet and reinforces the idea that there are many influences in research and systems that should be considered and analyzed from many perspectives rather than claiming a narrow and falsely objective view (Crenshaw et al., 2019; Milner, 2007; Romano, 1973).

Given the narrow understanding of Latine families with Deaf children, these CRT tenets were deemed the most appropriate guides for the evaluation and the centering of this population. Additional perspectives and principles became necessary as this study progressed toward a more ontological approach rather than one which felt like artificial praxis. These additional frameworks, perspectives, and principles are addressed in detail across several chapters.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

For this study, contributors met the criteria to participate by residing within the state of California with at least one Deaf family member who had attended a California PreK-Transition school within the past five years. All contributors were consenting adults ranging from the ages of early 20’s to late 70’s. All contributors willingly participated and presumably answered questions or shared experiences that were honest and true. Contributors demonstrated genuine interest in sharing their experiences and were invited to counter any observations or disagreements with the researcher at any time during the process.
The limitations of this study included difficulty accessing a research site which required changes to the initial proposal and in turn affected sample size. Additionally, due to time constraints, some willing research contributors were not available at the time of scheduling or data collection and therefore, opportunities were missed in gaining a larger sample size. Another notable limitation in this study was narrowing the focus to CRT to center race and address racism rather than on DeafCrit (G. Gertz, 2016) which centers deafness and addresses audism. While I recognize audism—discrimination against individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing (Humphries, 1977; Wilcox, 1989)—is a key factor in deaf education, the Deaf community, and with Deaf students, since this study was geared toward learning the experiences of Latine families as a whole, race is the central focus of analysis, while also acknowledging and inserting discussion of intersectionalities as appropriate.

Summary of Chapter 1

Educational policy mandates schools and programs to provide access to learning opportunities, support, exchanges, and equal partnerships for families. Literature centering the experiences of Latine families with Deaf children is limited and has historically portrayed this population in a fractured, out of context, and deficit manner. Educators for the Deaf, intentionally or not, continue to rely on and therefore perpetuate any deficit perspectives in practice. Hearing European-American women are the majority of educators for the Deaf across the country including California.

Latine families with Deaf children are the majority in deaf education throughout California deaf education schools and programs. Given the large proportion of these families and their children in deaf education schools and programs, increased investigation and
research are needed to learn more, and accurately, about Latine family experiences with Deaf children. It is also necessary to examine existing research with a less deficit and less limited lens to update the literature to include firsthand representations of Latine family experiences that disrupt the status quo and center this population as visible and legitimate.

If we as educators do not understand or know the population we are serving, we cannot with certainty agree that we are inclusive or providing the most appropriate services for any type of student population, much less that of Latine families with Deaf children who have been historically excluded. Additionally, if we are to consider Latine families with Deaf children as equal partners in deaf education it is critical that their narratives be as familiar as the narratives of European-American Deaf students, their families, and those of the predominantly European-American educators who direct the field.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This literature inquiry about Latine families with Deaf children in education was conducted through online database searches and other campus library collections. From the inception of this research study to date, literature on the key term “Deaf” grew from 115,683 sources in 73 databases to 252,649 sources from over 400 online databases. Of this literature, to date only 161,755 sources have been classified as scholarly or peer-reviewed. As technology has improved and data has become more accessible, recent reviews indicate that scholarly works on the key term, “Deaf”, were first published in 1863 with the general use of the word “deaf” appearing as early as 1707. Of the scholarly and peer reviewed literature available, various key terms were utilized to locate any written work relating to Latine families with Deaf children (Appendix N). For example, a search on “education”, “family” and varying words for “deafness” produced 271 results. Another search on varying words for “deafness” and varying words for “Latine” produced 226 results. Each of the 226 sources was independently reviewed and searched for references to education. Additional searches over the course of this study, using varying terms referring to deafness, families, education, and Latine (e.g., Chicana/o/x, Latina/o/x, Hispanic, etc.) were conducted to ensure any available literature was located. Literature was reviewed for duplicate results and relevance to Latine families with Deaf children related to education. After multiple searches throughout the course of this study, reviewing hundreds of articles in deaf education and reaching out to known scholars and prominent Deaf community members for references on any works that may have been overlooked, less than twenty sources were available that laterally or parenthetically referenced Latine families with Deaf children in studies that focused on topics
of language, communication, academic achievement, assessment, overall schooling of Deaf children, multiculturalism, and other comparative studies based on racial assumptions or suppositions. Fewer than ten sources were found to center Latine families with Deaf children as the literature’s primary focus. The majority of those sources measured or sought methods of guiding Latine families with Deaf children toward subscribing to the predominantly European-American standards of deaf education (Bennett, 1987, 1988; Cannon & Luckner, 2016; Cohen, 1997). In other words, most literature on Latine families with Deaf children is aligned with deficit perspectives portraying students or their families as lacking in some manner and needing to conform to European-American standards in order to be deemed successful within the structure of policy, research, or practice in the field of deaf education similar to Latine families and their students in general (Cohen, 1997; Harry, 2008; Dávila, 2015; G.L. Delgado, 1984, 2001; Valencia & Black, 2002; Valenzuela, 1999). Most literature therefore, directly or indirectly mentioning, evaluating, or classifying Latine Deaf students is devoid of knowing their Latine families, much less centering them as legitimate stakeholders in deaf education.

Due to the dearth in literature explicitly dedicated to the knowledge, expertise, and lived experiences of Latine families with Deaf children, this research borrowed upon the available studies of non-Latine families and non-European-American families in deaf education and what little is shared as incidental reference to Latine families when addressing Latine Deaf students in education. This inquiry also examined any significant works in policy, research, and practice specifically impacting Latine families with Deaf children and deaf education but did not center or couch the study within any particular longstanding academic framework or
field, such as within Special Education, Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies, LatCrit, DisCrit, and/or DeafCrit, in consideration of the complexity and uniqueness that the Latine community and the Deaf community experience at its intersections, given that both Latine and Deaf people identify with language, community and culture and the Deaf community does not define itself from a dis/abilities perspective (Eckert, 2010; Gannon et al., 1981; Lane et al., 1996; Padden & Humphries, 2005; Wilcox, 1989). Instead, various lenses, frameworks, and interdisciplinary perspectives were utilized throughout the study to center Latine families with Deaf children under a more decolonial approach.

To review this literature, the lens of Critical Race Theory in education (Bell, 1980; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Malagon et al., 2009; Tate, 1997; Urrieta & Villenas, 2013; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999; Zamudio et al., 2011) and perspectives from Community Cultural Wealth (Yosso, 2005) were originally applied as markers of analysis to examine how Latine families with Deaf children have been portrayed in the field of deaf education. As the study progressed, it became clear that analyzing the literature using Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) perspectives was not the best lens for reviewing the literature or conducting research with Latine families with Deaf children. This shift in framework is discussed in further detail later in this study throughout several chapters.

Continual reflecting and researching for best research practices on conducting literature reviews, data collection, and critical analysis in a manner that centers the research contributors of this study as legitimate knowledge-bearers requires theoretical, conceptual and analytical frameworks that are antiracist and decolonial as elaborated further throughout
this work. Utilizing CRT as a foundational lens for reviewing the literature became the primary framework while incorporating Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) frameworks and perspectives (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Brayboy, 2013; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). These frameworks were critical to maintaining a decolonial critique of the literature, data collection, critical analysis, and accountability to the community whose knowledge was openly shared for the purpose of this study.

Further review and analysis of the literature sought to determine whether and how this population has been positioned in any significant manner that confidently and legitimately impacts policy, research or practice. As the largest group involved in deaf education schools and programs across California for the past several decades, Latine families with Deaf children should be at a minimum, the most researched population in the field and at best, should be central to the shaping of policy, research and practice in California within all areas of deaf education from Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate.

**Framework Descriptions for Deaf Education Literature**

Critical Race Theory (CRT) principles (R. Delgado & Stefancic, Lynn & Dixson, 2013: 2017; Zamudio et al., 2011) and Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) concepts (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Brayboy, 2013; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019) were the foundational frameworks utilized to review the available literature in the areas of policy, research, and practice. The principles of CRT were necessary to assess how Latine families with Deaf children have been and continue to be racially interpreted and positioned within
deaf education. The subsequent application of IRM concepts, ensuring that the research is carried out in a respectful, ethical, and beneficial manner, also became necessary for the overarching analysis of relationships with Latine families with Deaf children in policy, research, and practice. Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) frameworks were critical to the study and analysis of conscientization, relational accountability, and the legitimacy of Latine families with Deaf children as described in chapter three. The Storywork (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Iseke, 2013; Davidson, 2019; Weber-Pillwax, 2004; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019) of Latine families with Deaf children, as described in chapters three and four, became central as a critical expression of Latine culture, identity and a reclaiming of research pathways for current and future works in deaf education.

The following are general descriptions of each framework and how each could be applied across the areas of policy, research, and practice within the field of deaf education in California. In areas where literature has yet to be produced regarding contributions, experiences, and the legitimate centering of Latine families with Deaf children, application and proposed analyses were still offered to support future research. Included was also a review of critiques on any notable limitations of these frameworks, their concepts, and/or combined application within the field of deaf education across the areas of policy, research, and practice.

**Critical Race Theory in Education**

There are many thematic concepts to Critical Race Theory in reference to the law as developed by Critical Legal Studies (CLS) scholars (Bell, 1980; Crenshaw, 2011; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Zamudio et al., 2011). Within education, CRT
continues to evolve in its organization of these concepts and the manner in which each can be applied across academic disciplines and in the areas of policy, research, and practice. The defining elements of CRT as it has been applied within the general field of education, predominantly in higher education and research, include the following: acknowledging that racism is endemic to all institutions and daily life; understanding the intersectionality of race and racism; critiquing concepts of liberalism and civil rights laws; challenging ahistoricism; recognizing experiential knowledge from People of Color or Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) and their communities; applying interdisciplinary knowledge; and working towards the elimination of racism and all forms of oppression (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Malagon et al., 2009; Tate, 1997; Zamudio et al., 2011). The framework of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in education centers race with intersections of class, gender and other marginalized identities; challenges the status quo of European-American perspectives; seeks to position lived experiences or oral histories as legitimate forms of knowledge; supports the fight for racial and social justice; and engages both historical and contemporary works across disciplines (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Tate, 1997; Malagon et al., 2009; Urrieta & Villenas; 2013; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999; Zamudio et al., 2011). Particular to Chicana/o/x (Latine) students and faculty, CRT in education has been applied to this group through the framework of five general tenets in an attempt to encompass all thematic concepts of CRT as originally developed by critical legal scholars and theorists (A. Brown & Urrieta, 2010; Malagon et al., 2009; Urrieta & Villenas; 2013; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999; Zamudio et al., 2011). While the
five general tenets are explained in the following manner with examples of how application and analysis can engage the field of deaf education, it is important to maintain an understanding that the field of Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies—a longstanding and accredited discipline—has not centered the Deaf, Latine Deaf, and/or Latine families with Deaf children across any areas of study within the field, including education. It is equally important to maintain an understanding that Deaf Studies, deaf education, and/or the Deaf community at large have not centered Latine Deaf and/or Latine families with Deaf children in any substantive manner—outside of language or communication deficits—that has shifted deaf education away from its over 200 years of European-American—and very hearing—impositions of monological and monocultural standards, practice, and overall ideology. This is not to dismiss the grassroots movements at local levels within Latine and Latine Deaf groups who have challenged specific California counties, districts, schools, programs, and/or services within their immediate communities and carved spaces for changes on improved deaf education leadership, approach, and services. This is also not to discount the countless bodies of work or prominent scholars in Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies who have paved the way for Latine communities to access, engage, challenge, and improve educational participation or outcomes in regular, special, bilingual, and higher education. In fact, it is Chicana/o/x (Latine) scholars and activists, who have produced and shaped much of the policy, research, and practice for the Latine community at large, from local to state to federal levels of education. Latine families with Deaf children have certainly benefited from Chicana/o/x (Latine) scholars and activists in gaining entry to deaf education and receiving legal protections against race and disability discrimination in all areas of education.
Therefore, while it is not within the scope of this research to delve into the extensive works of Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies in education, this study borrows upon and references the works and frameworks that have direct impact to deaf education for Latine families with Deaf children, such as perspectives of CRT within Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies in education or epistemological foundations in communal practices that reconnect to IRM frameworks. From this perspective, CRT was expanded to examine and include deaf education from the perspective that while race is central, it cannot be centered at the expense of audism or ableism. Therefore, this process required a careful and relationally accountable critique along the lines of Latine and Deaf, keeping in mind that both are communities with their own languages, cultures, and ontological and epistemological foundations. For the purpose of this study, while noting the limitations from a Deaf perspective, CRT in Chicana/o/x Studies and higher education was the best available framework captured in the following overarching categories or tenets and how each applies or can apply to the field of deaf education.

Tenet one of CRT in education states that race is central and racism is endemic across all institutions. Intersectional areas of race, class, gender, sexuality, and other marginalized identities are acknowledged within this premise (Ladson-Billings, 1999; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Tate, 1997; Malagon et al., 2009; Urrieta & Villenas, 2013; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999; Zamudio et al., 2011). Within deaf education, applying a CRT lens should readily acknowledge that Latine families with Deaf children are the majority of families within deaf education programs and schools across the state. A CRT analysis of policy, research, and/or practice should examine how race and racism is positioned within these areas across the field and how this impacts Latine families with Deaf
children. This tenet should also acknowledge and consider the intersectionalities of deafness, race, ethnicity, gender, immigration status, language, and other intersecting layers of identities that uniquely and directly impact Latine families with Deaf children.

Tenet two of CRT in education challenges dominant (European-American) ideology and standards in its assertions of objectivity, “colorblindness” (an ableist term in this context that will be replaced with color neutrality going forward), meritocracy, white (European-American) privilege, and race neutrality (A. Brown & Urrieta, 2010; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Donnor, 2013; Jay, 2003; Ledesma & Calderon, 2014; Lipsitz, 2019; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Malagon et al., 2009; Matías et al., 2014; Picower, 2009; Milner, 2007; Rangel, 2019; Tate, 1997; Zamudio et al., 2011). This tenet examines power, self-interest, and privilege with the intent of exposing and dismantling deficit frameworks utilized to maintain the status quo, that of European-American supremacy and white (European-American) privilege (Bell, 1980; A. Brown & Urrieta, 2010; Donnor, 2013; Jay, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Ledesma & Calderon, 2014; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Urrieta & Villenas, 2013; Zamudio et al., 2011). Within the field of deaf education, this should include examining policy for bias or unintended consequences that impact Latine families with Deaf children in unique ways than how policy impacts or benefits European-American families with Deaf children. An example of this is California Senate Bill 210 (2015), legislation that impacts Latine families with Deaf children much differently than European-American families with Deaf children, as described later in the area of policy. Applying this tenet should examine the lenses utilized for conducting, analyzing and producing deaf education literature. This area of CRT should assist in
determining whether the literature is implicitly or explicitly portraying deficit perspectives of Latine families with Deaf children. It should help highlight how race is considered across deaf education programs when the neutralizing factor for educators is deafness, the majority of students are Latine, and the programs and classrooms are run by predominantly hearing European-American women.

Tenet three of CRT in education asserts a commitment to social justice through transformative, emancipatory, and liberatory responses to oppression that leads toward the empowerment of BIPOC and the elimination of racism and its intersectional systems of oppression (Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Rangel, 2019; Zamudio et al., 2011). This requires a fundamental understanding about how race and racism functions within European-American dominated society and its institutions, including deaf education. It should examine how race and racism impacts Latine families with Deaf children and how policy and research inform deaf education practice in classrooms across the state. To commit to social justice, this tenet must assume there is a standardized knowledge and competence of practitioners in deaf education regarding dismantling systems of oppression that these practitioners agree to and strive to be accountable to Latine families with Deaf children in their daily commitment. Currently, there is no standardized knowledge of antiracist—or anti-audist—understanding, and therefore no available competence to address, or much less, remedy systems of oppression within deaf education.

Tenet four of CRT in education challenges dominant (European-American) ideology with counternarratives or counterstories that are deemed critical to understanding, analyzing and teaching about racial subordination (Calzada et al., 2010; Fernández, 2002; Zamudio et al.,
This tenet centers around storytelling, *testimonios* (Blackmer Reyes & Curry Rodriguez, 2012), parables, poetry, Storywork (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Iseke, 2013; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019), biographies, oral histories, chronicles, and other experiential knowledge of historically excluded communities as appropriate and legitimate methods of disrupting the status quo in education (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Pérez Huber, 2009, 2010; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Rangel, 2019; Zamudio et al., 2011). In deaf education this means practitioners recognize and center the knowledge and experiences of Latine families with Deaf children in such a manner as to be able to implement critical elements of the other tenets in the work toward dismantling harmful European-American ideologies such as color neutrality or objectivity. Since there is no standardized knowledge or culturally relevant pedagogical training, curriculum, or implementation process for antiracist and anti-audist practices in deaf education from university teacher credentialing systems to daily classroom teacher interactions, this tenet of recognizing and centering Latine families with Deaf children is difficult to achieve. Deaf education in California has never been interrupted from its 200 years of European-American governance, save a random incidental hiring of an educator for the Deaf here or there, who already understands and subscribes to antiracist and anti-audist standards across their daily lives which may include in-class practices if it is safe to do so (Franklin et al., 2014; Higginbotham, 1992; Jay, 2003).

Tenet five, the final tenet, of CRT in education grounds its scholarship in interdisciplinary perspectives and aims to be accountable to both historical and contemporary contexts of race and racism as it is represented, interpreted, and projected within the various
levels of European-American dominated educational institutions (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Zamudio et al., 2011). Drawing upon interdisciplinary perspectives ensures CRT research and analysis has a broad perspective when challenging color neutrality, privilege, meritocracy or any other false notions of objectivity in the work toward social justice (Archibald et al., 2019; Crenshaw, 1989; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Donnor, 2013; Gillborn, 2006; Romano, 1973; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019; Zamudio et al., 2011). In deaf education, this should take into account research or practice in other fields such as special education, the arts, regular education, ethnic studies, law, Indigenous studies, science, and other disciplines that help understand race and dismantle racism across all factors that encompass deaf education in California.

While each CRT tenet is critical to the whole of examining and dismantling white (European-American) supremacy in European-American dominated institutions, CRT in education, especially in special education and deaf education, is still in its evolving stages and there are limitations to consider. For example, some BIPOC scholars position frameworks with CRT tenets and principles in a manner which continues to cater to these oppressive institutions, whether intentionally or subconsciously. Because BIPOC scholars also come from a colonial experience, treading carefully in how CRT is addressed or implemented in education is essential to avoid incidentally perpetuating or catering to oppressive systems in nuanced and more dangerous forms. It is important to understand that racism and white [European-American] supremacy exist because it does not care about racial or social justice nor the BIPOC who are impacted by it in micro or macro circumstances (Bell, 1980, R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Jay, 2003; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; Lipsitz, 2019;
Omi & Winant; 1994; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Williams, 1987). European-American institutions and systems function in a manner as to co-opt, destroy, and capitalize on any development BIPOC scholars or community members propose (Jay, 2003; Ladson Billings, 1999, 2005). For example, the framework of Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) in education (Yosso, 2005) is established upon the foundational tenets of CRT with the premise of shifting the research lens that “allows critical race scholars to ‘see’ multiple forms of cultural wealth” (p. 82) across historically excluded communities including that of Latine (Chicana/o/x) families with school age children. While Yosso (2005) briefly mentions these forms of capital should not be co-opted or exploited, the very use of the word capital draws the attention of European-American scholars in any field toward their cultural and foundational mindsets of meritocracy and capitalism seeking profit in the form of labor, services, and trending markets. Another concept considered for this study was the trending emancipatory perspective which in its inception could also be considered valuable in supporting subjugated people in attaining democratic and social equity. However, that too has been commodified to cater to the “feel good” respectability politics of European-American academic institutions in which hierarchies are still at play and power must be negotiated within a framework of what feels acceptable or not (Delpit, 1988; Higginbotham, 1992; Jay, 2003; Lipsitz, 2019; Matías, 2013; Picower, 2009; Rodríguez, 2021; Sleeter, 2017). This does not support the centering of Latine families with Deaf children as self-determined and legitimate within their own right. It was this realization that pushed this study toward a more antiracist and decolonial path which is described at length in later sections of this study.
Perspectives on Literature Analysis

While there are multiple frameworks from which to analyze data and literature, this study sought references, research, and data that centered a racialized and historically excluded group as legitimate and purposeful constituents within the field of deaf education. To align with the analytical, conceptual, and theoretical research frameworks utilized and proposed throughout this study, relationally accountable methods of research included reaching out to real-time scholars in the field of deaf education and to real-time professionals who are highly involved within Deaf and/or Latine Deaf communities. Attending relevant Latine, Deaf, and Deaf Latine activities and reaching out to Deaf community advocates, scholars, activists, and educators to incorporate their historical knowledge and expertise in evaluating the literature on policy, research, and practice was an intentional act and integral process of following a decolonial approach. The real-time engagements served as continual reminders to confront colonial impact and served as a decolonial member-checking process for all elements of the study not just for the analysis of data collection. Dr. Julie Rems-Smario, Irma Sánchez (hearing), Socorro Garcia, Gilberto Partida (hearing), Joel Garcia, Melissa Elmira Yingst, Dr. Sean Virnig, Dr. Nancy Sager (hearing), and Dr. Paul Ogden were among some of the prominent Deaf community, Latine Deaf community, and deaf education professionals whose expertise at conference presentations, Deaf events, direct communications, and public forums, offered much insight to various topics and themes addressed throughout this study. Direct statements offering policy insights, literature analysis, statistical data and/or other relevant evaluations and expertise across policy, research, and practice pertaining to
California deaf education were cited accordingly with the appropriate references pertaining to each professional, their credentials, positions held, and overall expertise.

The framework of Critical Race Theory (CRT) as it is applied within education (Zamudio et al., 2011) was utilized to review previous literature on deaf education in the areas of policy, research, and practice where Latine families with Deaf children are centered as a critical mass being they are the largest attending population in California deaf education programs across the state (CDE; 2013, 2019). Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Brayboy, 2013; Tuhuiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019) became the necessary framework as the awareness set in that the capital-based model of CCW (Yosso, 2005), emancipatory guidelines, and other limited or capitalistic trends employing CRT aspects heavily catered toward European-American dominant society by requesting or sometimes demanding space in which to negotiate with and partake in dominant (and oppressive) educational institutions, at all levels from kindergarten to the professorate. While systemic racism permeates every type of institution and there are many ways of organizing, resisting, and demanding racial equity and social justice, it became clear that many analytical frameworks are still subservient to the master structure of European-American systems and can be best described as what is widely known as interest convergence (Aleman & Aleman, 2010; Bell, 1980; A. Brown & Urrieta, 2010; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Jay, 2003; Sleeter, 2017; Zamudio et al., 2011). In other words, European-Americans in absolute control of their institutions, including educational spaces, will temporarily and intermittently entertain notions of racial and social justice when it is self-serving or palatable, such as in
superficially appeasing public outcry through tokenism, giving restricted and limited access to one person, a small group, or entity so as to redirect deeper systemic disclosure, or quell any other reactionary behaviors to suppress real change to maintain the status quo (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Freire, 1970; Jay, 2003; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Williams, 1987; Zamudio et al., 2011). In contrast, while acknowledging that participation in European-American controlled and oppressive institutions require a type of currency or capital for survival within those inequitable and harmful systems, IRM turns inward to its community. Applying IRM, positions researcher and community member alike, to rely profoundly on relational accountability to recover, recenter, or emphasize communal knowledge and practices to maintain its own legitimate existence as equally valid outside of, next to, or in socially just reciprocal interaction with European-American society and its institutions (Archibald et al., 2019; Brayboy, 2013; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Wilson, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). Whereas European-American supremacy relies on its culture to perpetuate competition, meritocracy, individualism, linear learning, and constant accumulation of resources and knowledge as a means to success, Indigenous scholars and research maintain that knowledge is constructed and shared communally, reciprocally, and never for the advantage of one or to harm another but instead for the benefit of the community (Archibald et al., 2019; Brayboy, 2013; McKay, 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). Therefore, using CRT and IRM frameworks to analyze the literature in a more antiracist, anti-audist, socially just, and decolonial manner was the most appropriate approach. By centering Latine families with Deaf children across policy, research, and practice through CRT and IRM frameworks, a
more antiracist and decolonial approach furthered discussion for more ethically appropriate analysis and representation.

**Pedagogy of the Oppressor.** It is not surprising knowledge that European and European-American ideology banks on its centuries of institutionalized systems of oppression to preserve its power over historically excluded communities across the globe (DuBois, 1903; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Omi & Winant, 1994; Pratt, 1992; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021). Within the deaf education system in California, it is no different with over 200 years of European-American educators establishing and maintaining a system that only until the late 1900s began allowing Deaf children of BIPOC communities to participate (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954; G.L. Delgado, 1984; Gannon et al., 1981; PL94-142). Many scholars across disciplines have examined and critiqued European-American ideologies of power and oppression across various institutions within the current United States of America (Bell, 1980; Crenshaw, 1989, 2011; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Milner, 2007; Omi & Winant, 1994; Pratt, 1992; Romano, 1973; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Williams, 1987; Wilson, 2008), and in particular the manner in which these ideologies are practiced within the institution of education to preserve and perpetuate oppression (Freire, 1970; Jay, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Matias, 2013; Matías et al., 2014; Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Milner, 2007; Picower, 2009; Rangel, 2019; Sleeter, 2017; Zamudio et al., 2011). Critical Legal Studies scholars and Critical Race Theory scholars alike, have underscored the power dynamics of European-American (white) supremacy in efforts to dismantle it and move toward more liberatory practices. Some salient traits of European-American culture and maintenance of power that permeate the education system,
especially deaf education, are those of race neutrality, objectivity, meritocracy, and interest convergence (Bell, 1980; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Donnor, 2013; Freire, 1970; Jay, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Lipsitz, 2019; Omi & Winant; 1994; Pratt, 1992; Romano, 1973; Sleeter, 2017; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Zamudio et al., 2011).

European-American institutions within the United States of America rely heavily on the maintenance of ideas that continuously suppress and erase historically excluded communities while centering its European-American population as normative for every conceivable standard, action, and/or benefit to maintain power and control (Bell, 1980; Jay, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Lipsitz, 2019; Matías, 2013; Omi & Winant; 1994; Picower, 2009; Pratt, 1992; Sleeter, 2017; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Williams, 1987). It is the primary reason public education was invented in the first place—to indoctrinate indigenous children on the “common sense” of the “American” (European-American) way as a method to subjugate those that Europeans, European settlers, European immigrants, and later European-Americans were not able to fully exterminate (MacMath & Hall, 2018; Omi & Winant, 1994; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021). While the idea of public education has shifted toward a more inclusive system creating legislation to support that shift (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954; Kirst & Wirt, 2009; PL94-142; Yinger, 2004), deeply engrained practices of erasure and privileging of knowledge continue to exist (Jay, 2003; Picower, 2009; Zamudio et al., 2011). Race neutrality and objectivity are two such practices that are systemically perpetuated, especially within special education and deaf education. The amount of assessment that is utilized to determine eligibility for special education services is a great example of these practices by which standardized testing (meaning European-American
invented criteria based on their monolingual, monocultural, and monological perceptions of what is legitimate or not) is proctored by predominantly European-American educators under the guise of not seeing race and holding an objective perspective (Bell, 1992; Delpit, 1988; Harry, 2008; Horsford & Grosland, 2013). Should factors of race, family background, or other intersections be considered, it will be utilized to justify the deficit outcomes of the “neutral” evaluations with the primary need being that of “assimilating” and/or conforming to the Eurocentric standards of European-American institutions (Dávila, 2015; G.L. Delgado, 1984, 2001; Figueroa et al., 1984; Horsford & Grosland, 2013; Lerman, 1984; Luetke, 1976; Valenzuela, 1999; Zamudio et al., 2011). As a result, deaf education assessments and most literature that acknowledges Latine families with Deaf children or Latine Deaf children without context of family or community, is often from analytical frameworks of comparison to European-American families with Deaf children and the goal of measuring up to a supposed “neutral” and “normal” standard (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992; Horsford & Grosland, 2013; Jay 2003; Lipsitz, 2019). Where many deaf education scholars have pointed to the need of better understanding Latine families with Deaf children and the Latine community in general, policy action and research applications have not reflected these needs, outside of language and communication assessments or practices that push Latine families to align with European-American cultural assimilation at the expense of discrediting, oppressing and subtracting from Latine identities (Cohen, 1997; G.L. Delgado, 1984; Harry, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999; Zamudio et al., 2011). In the most comprehensive dedicated Hispanic (Latine) Deaf research during the 1980’s—less than 30 years after legal demands for desegregation of schools by race and just a few years after the first special education rights
and inclusion law—scholars in deaf education convened in acknowledging that the Hispanic (Latine) population in the field was markedly increasing and needed critical attention (G.L. Delgado, 1984). At the Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf (CEASD) on June, 21, 1981, the following resolutions were proposed to address the Hispanic (Latine) population as they were finally allowed access to deaf education across the country:

1. Recruitment efforts also concentrate on hiring Hispanic (Latine) professionally trained individuals;

2. Public and information programs be directed to colleges and universities in order to encourage young Hispanics (Latine), and other minorities, to consider careers in deafness;

3. Curriculum emphasize a bicultural approach as a means of developing appreciation and understanding of the contributions of Hispanics (Latine) to the American way of life;

4. Instructional materials be carefully selected for their authenticity and presentation of Hispanic (Latine) cultural contributions; and

5. Parents and family members from limited or non-English-speaking homes be provided appropriate interpreter services in order to make the home and the school accessible to each other. (G.L. Delgado, 1984, p. v)

While these recommendations or proposals were well-intentioned and considerably realistic and attainable measures to support Latine families with Deaf children who had previously been denied access to deaf education, the literature (and consequently teacher credentialing and classroom practice) to support these resolutions portrayed a dysconscious understanding (E.N. Gertz, 2003; J.E. King, 1991). For example, scholars expressed concerns
for language differences and how educators might communicate with Latine families who spoke Spanish, while in the same breath using archaic and deficit information to relay concerns as to why Latine families with Deaf children should not use Spanish in the home because English, ASL, and Spanish would confuse the Deaf child (Dean, 1984; Lerman, 1984). Inquiry on whether Latine brains could handle contradictory language codes and syntax for English and Spanish, and assumptions that Spanish-speaking homes did not use sign language (Lerman, 1984) demonstrate the refined power dynamics of centering European-American ideology as neutral that harm Latine families and their Deaf children within the system (Leonardo & Boas, 2013; Mitchell, 2013). If on the one hand, the argument that being exposed to or learning multiple languages simultaneously can harm or confuse a child (a now present-day debunked stereotype) when referring to English and Spanish languages, families in English-speaking homes learning American Sign Language should also be evaluated along the same factors but there is no documented evidence of this scrutiny toward European-American families with Deaf children. On the other hand, positing that delays, deficits, and low achievement for Latine Deaf children may be impacted by Spanish-speaking homes not utilizing sign language (another assumption often made by deaf educators in general) is contradictory to the assumption that the issue is due to multiple languages in the home. What is often overlooked is the fact that race and racism are the factors that have influenced scholars and classroom educators to posit these contradicting arguments from the perspective that European-American monolingual and monological standards are the required goals and norms at the expense of maligning Latine identities, which are perceived as neutral or unracialized practices (Lipsitz, 2019; Matías, 2013; Matías...
et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Mitchell, 2013; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017). With European-American deaf education scholars and educators maintaining common monological, monolingual, and monocultural foundations and understanding (Cohen, 1997, Sass-Lehrer et al., 1997), the contradictions and oppressive impacts are difficult to challenge and dismantle (J.E. King, 1991).

It cannot be both that Latine families with Deaf children are at fault for low academic achievement because they have multiple languages but then have low academic achievement because they do not have more than Spanish in the home. Latine Deaf children do not all come from only Spanish-speaking homes and Latine Deaf children do not all come from only multi and bilingual speaking homes. Latine families with Deaf children also do not all come from homes that do not have sign language. Therefore, data indicating that Latine Deaf children in general continuously achieve lower than their European-American Deaf counterparts (Bennett, 1987, 1988; G.L. Delgado 1984; Ramsey, 1997; Schirmer, 2000; Walker Vann, 1998) cannot use contradictory arguments such as these, to justify such dismal statistical academic outcomes and believe that these justifications are not couched in racism and the European-American ideologies of race neutrality and objectivity that power it (Mitchell, 2013). Nearly four decades later, the list of accountabilities to Latine families with Deaf children by CEASD never came to fruition and subsequent literature became focused on perpetuating harmful narratives mostly in the areas of language and communication deficits (G.L. Delgado, 1984, 2001; Bennett, 1987, 1988; Fischgrund et al., 1987).

Other expressions of European-American pedagogical oppression are to invalidate the historical inequities, disparities, and trauma inflicted upon historically excluded communities
using face value observations or racist assumptions devoid of root causes to shift the blame away from the oppressor and trap their target into producing the outcome the oppressor commands, to maintain the status quo (Jay, 2003; Higginbotham, 1992; Picower, 2009; Rodríguez, 2021). In today’s terms, it is called “gaslighting” (Merriam-Webster, 2021), a systemic psychological manipulation in which a victim is perpetually harmed and undermined by the perpetrator but coerced by the perpetrator that this is not true or that it is the victim’s fault (Jay, 2003; Leonardo & Boas, 2013). In other words, European-Americans willfully and actively participate and uphold white (European-American) supremacy with well-documented patterns of behavior to assert, protect, legitimize, and maintain their privilege, sense of entitlement, and power—real or perceived—without regard to (or at times consciously) the harmful impact to others (Bell, 1980, 1992; Delpit, 1988; Dillard, 2020; Donnor, 2013; Higginbotham, 1992; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; Jay, 2003; Matías, 2013; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; McKay, 2019; Mitchell, 2013; Picower, 2009; Rodríguez, 2021; Williams, 1987). These “tools of Whiteness” (Picower, 2009, pp. 206-207) and “politics of respectability” (Higginbotham, 1992, p. 271-272; Rodríguez, 2021, pp. 89-111) as weapons of whiteness and superiority, are attested patterns of behaviors and actions employed to the extent that European-Americans—including the concentrated cluster within the California deaf education system—will readily depict themselves as the victim of their own racism to ensure their privilege, their power to oppress, their power to (de)legitimize, and their overall status of superiority remain intact at all costs (Crenshaw, 1989, 2019; Delpit, 1988; Dillard, 2020; Donnor, 2013; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; hook, 1991; Jay, 2003; Lorde, 2007; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Matías, 2013; Picower, 2009; Rodríguez, 2021; Sleeter, 2017; The Young
The deaf education system is adept at implementing this skill as part of its toolkit in power relations as it has maintained the status quo for over 200 years from Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate.

An example of this could be defensive responses by deaf education scholars and educators regarding the exposure of the deficit and racist literature perspectives; This could include seeking justifications for using detrimental terminology or discrediting the source doing the exposing; It could be seeking out BIPOC who will agree with the oppressor or pointing to unrelated situations or incidents to punish the target; It could be accusing the target of “withholding” antiracist/social justice knowledge; It could be gatekeeping opportunities, access, or requirements -short term or long term; It could be isolating the target through damaging and deceitful narratives; It could be implicit double standards or implementing letter of the law policy for Latine families but spirit of the law interpretations for others; It could be becoming highly emotional as an act of self-flagellation with the expectation of being absolved of any accountability; It could be wielding anger or accusing the target of being ungrateful or unappreciative for requesting accountability or many other gaslighting absurdities to maintain the status quo (A. Allen et al., 2013; Dávila, 2015; Jay, 2003; Leonardo & Boas, 2013; Matias, 2013; McKay, 2019; Sleeter, 2017; Williams, 1987).

There may be infinite expressions yet it is the response to one factor— the perpetual weaponizing of what it means to have white skin (physically, socially, or otherwise) or be in close proximity of it in a systemically highly racialized society that holds it as superior (Dillard, 2020; Donnor, 2013; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; Jay, 2003; Picower, 2009; Thurston,
The behaviors shift to various tools, patterns, and tactics to meet the moment, assert dominance, discredit/delegitimize their targets, wield violence, justify harmful actions, and perpetually legitimize superiority across subtle daily interactions or systemic operations, and are distinctively self-evident to BIPOC communities and BIPOC individuals alike who are victimized by this unrelenting oppression of European-American (white) supremacy (A. Allen et al., 2013; Anderson & Bowe, 1972; Bell, 1976, 1980, 1992, 2008; Call-Cummings & Martinez, 2017; Crenshaw et al, 2019; Dávila, 2015; Dillard, 2020; Donnor, 2013; Franklin et al., 2014; Gorski, 2019; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Jay, 2003; McKay, 2019; Matías, 2013, Matías et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Picower; 2009; Sleeter, 2017; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Williams, 1987). A visual representation of these European-American supremacy patterns of behavior is outlined in the condensed but explicitly displayed video capture of the 2021 Central Park incident (The Young Turks, 2021) in which a European-American woman flawlessly executes these tools of whiteness, expectations of respectability, privilege, and sense of entitlement to the extent of situating herself as the victim of her own racism (Delpit, 1988; Jay, 2003; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; Leonardo & Boas, 2013; Matías, 2013, Matías et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Mitchell, 2013; Picower; 2009; Sleeter, 2017; The Young Turks, 2021, Williams, 1987). This is the pedagogy of the oppressor that established itself supreme and continues to permeate all European-American systems and institutions at micro and macro levels, including that of California deaf education from Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate.
Another concrete example within deaf education literature, is the statement, “[Latine] Parents from more traditional backgrounds tend to be less involved with the educational needs of the child and more concerned with basic child care,” (Lerman, 1984, p. 51). Statements such as these are clear examples of how scholars analyze BIPOC communities such as Latine families with Deaf children from perspectives and frameworks that center and maintain European-American ideology as standard, neutral, normal, and unimpacted by race or racism and then blame families when their expectations of Eurocentric outcomes are not met (Jay, 2003; Lipsitz, 2019; Matías, 2013; Mitchell, 2013; Picower, 2009). Should this racist statement be taken as truth, it simultaneously Others an entire group of people as less—insert any deficit term here—than the self-ascribed superior group and negates the root causes that European-American supremacy created and readily perpetuates for Latine families with Deaf children who still need to participate under this dominance to survive. Those imposed circumstances might potentially force Latine families with Deaf children to prioritize childcare to address the disparities that European-American culture created and has perpetuated, rather than prioritizing European-American education systems that have historically been unwelcoming. However, deconstructing these statements in this manner still places the onus on Latine families and should be examined further from a decolonial lens. The analysis should be on whether the deaf education system has established and provided services in a culturally competent and accountable manner rather than expecting the Latine community to seek or plead for support to a system that has rejected their identities and their entire essence since its inception. Perhaps it is not that Latine families with Deaf children from “more traditional backgrounds” are busy with basic childcare needs but that the deaf
education system is culturally, linguistically, and racially incompetent and therefore is not able to relate to or engage this population appropriately or beneficially. The fact is that the historical function and current operation of European-American dominated education systems for any person deemed an outsider (as with any other Eurocentric institution) requires oppressive-system-survival skills and has little to do with unwilling or willing participation in a system that actively explicitly or implicitly harms or rejects them (Bell, 1976, 1980, 1992; MacMath & Hall, 2018; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021).

Take any literature regarding Latine families with Deaf children and more often than not, this community is approached and evaluated from this European-American ideology of Other, outsider, different, uneducated, non-conforming, uncaring, deficit and relegated to the margins (A. Allen et al., 2013; Bennett, 1987, 1988; G.L. Delgado, 1984, 2001; Kohli & Solórzano, 2012; Matías, 2013; Matías et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017; Valencia & Black, 2002; Valenzuela, 1999). Glancing solely at scholarship titles that are presumed to support Latine families with Deaf children, immediately prepare the reader to assume that Latine families, their identities, culture, language, citizenship status, income and so on, are subtractive and inferior attributes to their participation or achievements within European-American dominated schooling. For example, title terminology used to introduce literature about Latine Deaf students and their families such as, “bilingual and special education ‘challenge’” (Erickson, 1984), “‘non-native-language’ homes” (G.L. Delgado, 1984), “bilingual ‘problems’” (Green Kopp, 1984), “’non-English-speaking’ homes” (Secada, 1984; Blackwell & Fischgrund, 1984), “considering ‘alternatives’” (Secada, 1984), “language ‘intervention’” (Fischgrund, 1984), “schooling the
'different’” (Bennett, 1987), “gateways to ‘powerlessness’” (Bennett, 1988), “’formal’ schooling” (Bennett, 1987, 1988), “subgroup differences” (T. Allen, 1992), and “’profiling’ Hispanic” (Walker Vann, 1998), reveals how scholars readily, (intentionally or unexamined) uphold the hegemonic order of European-American ideology as superior while situating this community as inferior (Delpit, 1988; Donnor, 2013, Jay, 2003; Lipsitz, 2019; McKay, 2019; Mitchell, 2013). These are typical descriptions conferred upon Latine families with Deaf children within the literary canon of deaf education. While not dissimilar to the rhetoric in broader academia about Latine or any BIPOC community and education in general (A. Allen et al., 2013; Call-Cummings & Martinez, 2017; Matías, 2013; Matías et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Mitchell, 2013; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017; Valenzuela, 1999; Villenas & Dehyle, 1999), these harmful narratives against Latine families with Deaf children have served as uninterrupted literary foundations about this community for ongoing scholarship to build upon and perpetuate, and for practitioners to affirm and apply their unchecked bias.

It is these types of repetitive disparaging statements throughout much of the literature written about Latine Deaf students and parenthetically about their families, that simultaneously harm and destroy Latine communal knowledge, culture, and practices while placing European-American scholars at the top of their self-constructed hierarchy to determine what educational needs are, and how those needs can only be met by participating in their self-constructed schooling standards where systems of oppression are practiced and preserved (Dávila, 2015; Crenshaw et al., 2019; Lynn & Dixson, 2013). These stereotypes trap the Latine community under a false monocultural stereotype of “traditional”, a seemingly racist code for “does not belong”, “unamerican”, or possibly even “primitive”
when some Latine families with Deaf children must make tough decisions in response to the conditions in which they have been forced into by longstanding impacts of European-American supremacy (McKay, 2019; Mitchell, 2013). Further analysis from CRT and IRM perspectives should examine the positionalities of the scholars and educators and their intentions behind situating Latine families with Deaf children in this manner. There should be a review of accountability on whether historical contexts were researched and an examination of how those contexts have impacted past and contemporary circumstances for the Latine community apart from who they are as a community or how they identify as a culture (Lipsitz, 2019; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017).

Responses and reactions by Latine families with Deaf children to the systemically oppressive conditions European-American culture and institutions have created for them is not a cultural aspect of the Latine community, yet deaf education scholars and educators have built their scholarship and practice upon racist interpretations of the very circumstances they and their ancestors helped produce under the guise of culture, identity, and difference (A. Allen et al., 2013; Cohen, 1997; Bennett, 1987, 1988; Leonardo & Boas, 2013; Mitchell, 2013; Valenzuela, 1999). What is a cultural attribute of the Latine community (and the indigenous peoples of these Americas in general) that is highly devalued and consistently criticized are the communal ontological and epistemological foundations and practices (Archibald, 2008; Archibald & Parent, 2019; Anzaldúa, 2002; Blackmer Reyes & Curry Rodríguez 2012; Flores, 2020; Rodríguez, 2021; Cannon & Luckner, 2016; Davidson, 2019; Delgado-Gaitan, 1993, 1994; Dominguez Barajas, 2002; Fernández, 2002; Lopez, 2014; Rangel, 2019; Soto et al., 2009; Villenas, 2005; Villenas & Dehyle, 1999; Wilson, 2008).
This idea that European-American educators and their education systems are the sole manner in which anyone can be educated or gain knowledge is antithetical to IRM perspectives of communal and relational practices of learning, teaching, and reciprocating knowledge for the benefit of the community that are foundational to all of the Indigenous people of these Americas, including the Latine population (Archibald et al., 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999). Learning and sharing knowledge for Latine communities is reciprocal, communal, and legitimate in all spaces regardless of whether it happens to take place at home, in class, outdoors, or at any gathering as all interactions are relational influences (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Brayboy, 2013; Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Lopez, 2014; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Villenas, 2005; Weber Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). The devaluing of this education style is further emphasized as scholars perpetuate and broaden racist statements to ensure that any Latine family decisions or choices that do not align with European-American perspectives implies that Latine families and their Deaf children are deficient, uncaring, uneducated, defiant and many other denigrations (Cohen, 1997; Kohli & Solórzano, 2012; Matías, 2013; Matías et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017; Valencia & Black, 2002; Valenzuela, 1999).

For example, expanding upon the imposed narrative that Latine families are more concerned with childcare than attending European-American deaf education programs, Wolbers (2002), adds, “Young deaf children who spend a considerable amount of time in daycare have less of an opportunity to develop stable communication and language patterns,” (p.44,) referring to Hispanic (Latine) and Black families with Deaf children. Therefore, from
these deaf education critically unexamined platforms, not only are Latine brains confused with multiple languages, lack language, have a terrible preoccupation with childcare rather than caring about “formal” schooling, but additionally, their choices in daycare are also impeding development of their Deaf children. It demonstrates the lack of understanding regarding communal ontological and epistemological foundations of Latine communities and how knowledge and teaching/learning exchanges occur within the community. Perhaps in European-American families, childcare means a child is left isolated or without much interaction in a location that does not engage children. When communities are communal, everyone is involved in sharing knowledge, teaching/learning, and communicating (Calzada et al., 2010; Delgado-Gaitan, 1991, 1992, 1994; Fernández, 2002; Flores, 2020; Lopez, 2014; Valenzuela, 1999), which would include a place of childcare, a dynamic language rich environment. Perhaps, European-American families have similar experiences but Latine families are described in this manner to perpetuate the narrative of difference, not belonging, and Other. What is a fact, is that descriptions such as these are neither objective nor helpful in dismantling systems of oppression that plague deaf education. It is harmful to Latine families with Deaf children and it compounds over time (A. Allen et al., 2013; Dávila, 2015; Franklin et al., 2014; Gorski, 2019). This is the power and damage of European-American supremacy that permeates deaf education and harms Latine families with Deaf children from feeling safe and accepted to participate or being seen at all (Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Crenshaw et al., 2019). In these statements it is painfully obvious from a CRT and IRM perspective that Latine families are considered inferior and that deaf education is either deliberately perpetuating racist perspectives or is grotesquely incompetent at recognizing systems of
oppression and understanding culturally relevant pedagogy, both inflict lifelong harm (Call-
Cummings & Martinez, 2017; Davila, 2015; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017).

Statements continue as Lerman (1984) characterizes Hispanic (Latine) culture as
collectively immigrant, poor, and fatalistic, with intent on measuring fatalist attitudes of
Puerto Rican (Latine) families with Deaf children. Again, this demonstrates how racism is so
deply entrenched in deaf education that scholars and educators can establish their research,
findings, and practice upon these racist assumptions and then blame Latine families with
Deaf children for outcomes that do not cater to, align with, and/or assimilate to European-
American educational expectations and standards (Jay, 2003; Sleeter, 2017). Never mind that
these Latine families have an ancestral legacy of having lived and thrived on these Americas
for thousands of years prior to European-American colonization and are still present today.
Again, from CRT and IRM perspectives the contradiction is blatant. According to deaf
education scholars, on the one hand, Latine families with Deaf children are more involved
with caring and raising their children, which no doubt indicates that they value basic needs
and staying alive, but on the other hand they have fatalistic attitudes, which promotes the
idea that Latine families with Deaf children do not care about life or their futures. Latine
families with Deaf children cannot be both, having a strong will to live and trying to ensure
the survival and future of their children by prioritizing their care and having a fatalistic view
about living and their future survival. Again, the manner in which scholars engage the
literature about Latine families with Deaf children legitimizes racist assumptions as truths,
establishing the literary foundations for perpetuating harm with ongoing and future
scholarship that depends and builds upon these historical underpinnings without question
(Donnor, 2013; Jay, 2003; Lipsitz, 2013; McKay; 2019). This gaslighting of Latine families with Deaf children, only serves to assuage the oppressor—in this case European-American scholars and practitioners in deaf education—of the responsibility and accountability that has not been addressed systemically or within programs and individual classrooms since its establishment (Jay, 2003; Matías, 2013; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017).

These European-American patterns, tools, and behaviors are the pedagogy of the oppressor which systematically function to maintain its power and continually offset historically excluded communities from experiencing justice and reestablishing self-determination (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Delpit, 1988; Jay, 2003; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Matías, 2013; Matías et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; McKay, 2019; Picower, 2009; Thurston, 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Zamudio et al., 2011). European-American hegemonic forces maintain their power across all of their institutions, including deaf education, by consistently asserting and reshaping European-American superiority, privilege, and power as objective, raceless, apolitical, and ordinary (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Donnor, 2013; Freire, 1970; Jay, 2003; Matías et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Omi & Winant, 1994; Pratt, 1992; Romano, 1973; Thurston, 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Zamudio et al., 2011). This portrays the false notion of objectivity, which absolves scholars and educators alike of owning and addressing their participation in perpetuating harm with biased assumptions, deficit evaluations, and demeaning assertions posited as facts (Donnor, 2013; Lipsitz, 2019; Matías, 2013; Pérez Huber, 2009; Romano, 1973) upon the Latine community, families, and their Deaf children.
For example, the aforementioned literature titles and statements position researchers and educators as merely neutral reporters of their unexamined assumptions and harmful interpretations about Latine families with Deaf children, which leads to a false belief that those assessments and interpretations are objective (Crenshaw et al., 2019; Milner, 2007; Romano, 1973). This foundational European-American ideology of objectivity or not seeing color, leads to fertile grounds for meritocracy to flourish, forcing any participating Latine families with Deaf children to reject their own identities and communities in order to be accepted into services, schools, and programs in a system governed by experts in maintaining European-American supremacy—the predominantly hearing European-American woman educator of the Deaf (Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Sleeter, 2017; Wolbers, 2002). In cyclical manner, the literature impacts educational policy to develop around Eurocentric assimilation and European-American acculturation, which in turn impacts university teacher credentialing programs that has continued to churn out over 200 years of these European-American and European-American subscribing educators (Jay, 2003; Matías, 2013; Matías et al., 2014; Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017). These educators then proceed to maintain these oppressive power relations against Latine families and their Deaf children within the classroom that significantly impact overall schooling experiences long term, with damages going beyond the classroom and well into adulthood (A. Allen et al., 2013; Cohen, 1997).

Attempts to systemically dismantle this European-American supremacy, including racism and audism, has only occurred publicly and nationally a few memorable times to confront audism in deaf education (Gallaudet University, 2021). Confronting audism within deaf
education surely benefits Latine families with Deaf children but they are left behind at the intersections of race, trapped between the standards and expectations of assimilating toward the European-American hearing society and measuring up to the European-American Deaf community who are privileged by dominant hearing society over Deaf BIPOC and the Latine community (A. Allen et al., 2013; Crenshaw, 1989; Crenshaw et al., 2019; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Stapleton, 2014, 2016). Since California deaf education schools and programs are run by predominantly European-American women (Bennett, 1988; Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990; Dávila, 2015; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Salas, 2004; Walker-Vann, 1998; Wolbers, 2002; Wu & Grant, 1997), attempts to acknowledge racism is rare, attempts to dismantle it even more so, with costly consequences of being harassed, ostracized, and eventually pushed out (Bell, 1976, 1980; Higginbotham, 1992; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; Jay, 2003; Picower, 2009; Rodríguez, 2021; Sleeter, 2017; Williams, 1987). In the rare cases that deaf education schools and programs consider changes for equitable services or address deficit or oppressive actions toward Latine families and their Deaf children, it has only been within the context of interest convergence. In other words, requests, challenges, and/or drawing attention to that which impacts Latine families with Deaf children systemically, will often be addressed on an individual basis so as to maintain the status quo—a deaf education system run by and for European-American hearing culture and standards (Aleman & Aleman, 2010; K. Brown & Jackson, 2013; A. Brown & Urrieta, 2010; Jay, 2003; Lynn & Dixson, 2013). If broader equity-coated, antiracist, or anti-audist changes are considered, attempted, and/or implemented, it will only occur with the convergence of interests and benefit of the educator, administrator, program, school, district, or county whose oppressive actions have come under
temporary scrutiny (Aleman & Aleman, 2010; Bell, 1980; Delpit, 1988; Jay, 2003; Sleeter, 2017). It is critical to understand that intermittent antiracist or anti-audist actions within the California deaf education system—from infant and toddler programs to the professorate—are not due to the moral or ethical accountability to those being discriminated or oppressed such as Latine families with Deaf children (Bell, 1976, 1980; Jay, 2003). Rather, these changes or “improvements” are utilized for self-promotions, derailing deeper investigations of systemic racism, and/or quelling any significant disruption to the 200+ years of European-American dominated and oppressive deaf education system (Bell, 1976, 1980, 2008; Donnor, 2013; Jay, 2003; Lipsitz, 2019). Were it not, these research inquiries would be unnecessary.

While much research on the concepts of race neutrality, privilege, meritocracy and interest convergence has been published and discussed, the methods these oppressive European-American constructs envelop in its implementation process can be difficult to capture within frameworks or descriptive language as it is not static (Crenshaw et al., 2019; Denzin, 1994; Kincheloe, 2001, 2005). What is certain, as many prominent scholars have cautioned, European-American supremacy and oppressive ideology is adept at maintaining its oppression by converging for self-interest, co-opting from marginalized communities to profit from or serve back as their own, keeping false narratives of racism and meritocracy alive to promote intragroup and intergroup conflict, and continuously shifting its rules in insidious ways to reassert itself in nuanced forms and spaces (Bell, 1976, 1980; Crenshaw, 2011; Crenshaw et al., 2019; R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; Jay, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1999, 2005; Lipsitz, 2019; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Mitchell, 2013; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Williams, 1987; Zamudio et al., 2011).
With this acknowledgement and caution at the forefront of this research process, Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) is introduced to deaf education against over 200 years of uninterrupted European-American (and very hearing) dominance, with intent on disrupting the status quo and invite all who participate, support, and/or work within the California deaf education system to pause, reflect, acknowledge, and center people and perspectives that have been kept at the margins for far too long—the Latine community, Latine families, and their Latine Deaf children.

**Indigenous Research Methodology in Education.** Frameworks from indigenous perspectives emphasize communal and collective research, knowledge production, and social justice commitments toward researched groups rather than European-American ideologies of individualism, meritocracy, capitalism, resource accumulation, objectivity, self-serving competition, and race neutrality (Archibald et al., 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2001, 2004; Wilson, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). Specifically, the concepts of relationships and relational accountability are foundational concepts of IRM frameworks (Archibald, 2008; Archibald & Parent, 2019; Archibald et al., 2019; Davidson, 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Wilson, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). Indigenous scholars and IRM frameworks center and define relationality as an ontological and epistemological grounding that all knowledge is relational and all relations must be reciprocally accountable (Archibald, 2008; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2008).

In other words, people, objects, words, the environment, the cosmos, concepts of past, present, and future time, and lived experiences require relationships with each other in order to inform our realities and entire systems of thinking (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al.,
Thus, “we could not be without being in relationship with everything that surrounds us and is within us. Our reality, our ontology is the relationships” (Wilson, 2008, p. 76, emphasis in original). Scholars have addressed this relationality concept with European-American education systems for decades as these systems tout objectivity and neutrality as standardized practices across policy, research, and practice which is antithetical to human and life interactions (Delgado-Gaitan, 1991, 2012; Freire, 1970; Romano, 1973; Valenzuela, 1999; Wilson, 2008). Communal ontological and epistemological foundations from indigenous communities, research or any other engagement cannot exist objectively or independently of being (emphasis added) as being necessitates relationship to and with all surroundings (Freire, 1970; Romano, 1973; Wilson, 2008). It is the same observation Freire (1970), noted upon his evaluation of Eurocentric schooling practices devoid of basic human interaction between educator and student in what he described as suffering from “narration sickness” (p. 71). Likewise, Valenzuela (1999) outlined, in her study of Latine high school students with varying intersectionalities and circumstances, the overwhelming student expectation of relationships—caring relationships that provided safe or trusted spaces to learn and share. The emphasis in relationships and being accountable to them is relayed again in the scholarship of Delgado-Gaitan (1991, 1993, 2012) with the Latine community, families, students, and the co-creation of knowledge, advocacy, and change in their educational experiences. To relate or engage in relationship, requires a reciprocity of vested interest or care in meaning making and an accountability to that shared knowledge to self and community (Archibald, 2008, Wilson, 2008).
Therefore, in IRM frameworks, the ontological and epistemological foundation of relationality informs the axiological and methodological concept of Relational Accountability (RA) (Wilson, 2008). In other words, when conducting research within any community, a researcher must be accountable to all of their relations in a manner that is responsible, reciprocal and with respect or reverence (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). Indigenous scholars expand upon RA to include that a researcher entering a community should know and understand entrance protocol, rules of engagement with members of the community, and how to engage (and protect) the knowledge that has been shared or co-created (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Davidson, 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). There should be a relationship of vested interest in the integrity of not only the research contributors, but with the community as a whole, which is extended for this study to include the writing process, reflexivity, and all of the interactions or relationships engaged with people, time, places, and the self (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). This process aids with meaning making as relationships are established, repositioned, and/or continued. To maintain vested interest is to care authentically and wholly which encourages relational accountability that benefits all relations. For this study from the lens of RA, there is reciprocity and respect between the researcher and the community giving entry to the researcher, with the understanding that information shared will be for the benefit of the community and should establish sustainable
commitment to remain relationally accountable (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). This is a decolonial act as it does not subscribe to the Eurocentric notions of linear, extracting, objective research for personal gain (Archibald et al., 2019; Milner, 2007; Romano, 1973; Weber-Pillwax, 2004; Wilson, 2008) In short, studies conducted on members of a community, especially within indigenous and historically excluded communities, should be guided by the researcher’s accountability to build ethical relationships that seek to uplift and not denigrate, that seek to recenter, reclaim, and reconnect toward a decolonial and healing space. Likewise, the same approach and conscientization should take place with Deaf children in the classroom and with their families to create and sustain a relationally accountable community. It is the combination of relational accountability from IRM and centering the historically excluded community of Latine families with Deaf children from CRT that provide the critical lenses to examine the literature of policy, research and practice within deaf education through a decolonial and antiracist process.

**Dominant Ideology in Deaf Education.** Critical Race Theory (CRT) addresses European-American ideologies of self-interest and objectivity that are maintained by dominant society to uphold the status quo of European-American supremacy and privilege across institutions including that of education (Aleman & Aleman, 2010, A. Brown & Urrieta, 2010). Specific to deaf education, as previously mentioned, for over two centuries deaf education schools and programs have been under the management of European-American educators who have predominantly been hearing and female (Cohen, 1997; Cohen
et al., 1990; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Redding, 1997; Salas, 2004; Sleeter, 2017; Walker-Vann, 1998; Wathum-Ocama & Rose; Wolbers, 2002; Wu & Grant, 1997). This indicates that while other education systems or all institutions in general, have diversified its leaders, students, and employees whether by force or choice, deaf education programs and schools across California remain largely unchanged from credentialing university professors to the administrators to the teachers in the classrooms. Therefore, it can be safely assumed that if no significant changes in the demographics of educators from the professorate to the classrooms of deaf education schools and programs have occurred, it is likely that systemic practices of oppression have not shifted much either and that the power enforcing the deaf education system is quite established after two hundred years of the status quo. Policy would be the initiating factor of establishing and upholding the deaf education system in California.

**Literature on Special Education Policy and Latine Families**

The European-American education system, from Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate, has come a long way from its foundational ideology of allowing access only to the privileged in power—European-American males. Activists, scholars, and advocates alike have tried to shift this ideology over the decades through policy at federal, state, and local levels. This research study departs from the premise that community and academic knowledge both hold legitimate sets of rules for engagement, research should be a reciprocal process not an extraction nor for personal gain, and with the relational accountability and commitment to racial and social justice toward self-determination (Archibald, 2008; Brayboy, 2013; Davidson, 2019; Delgado-Gaitan, 1993; Wilson, 2008; Zamudio et al., 2001). However, in the 21st century, the European-American education
system remains a contentious space across policy, research and practice in its struggle to
equitably investigate, produce, and portray a system that is accessible, safe, and equitable for
all (Bell, 1980; Crenshaw et al., 2019; Donnor, 2013; Gorski, 2019; Jay, 2003; J.E. King,
education policy is produced from the ideals of individual opportunity, access, and upward
social mobility, which has created and perpetuated disparities for historically excluded
students, and by extension impacted their communities and broader society in a cyclical
manner (Kirst & Wirt, 2009; Yinger, 2004). Additionally due to globalization, attempts to
remedy disparities through policy or direct practice is complicated by shifting demographics
due to migration and immigration across states, including California (Kirst & Wirt 2009;
Wathum-Ocama & Rose, 2002; Wu & Grant 1997). This is the context in which special
education policy is examined at the intersections of deaf education and Latine families with
Deaf children.

Special education, including deaf education, stipulates equal partnership among families
and professionals across federal, state, and local mandates (Cal. EC, § 56000 et seq.; PL94-
142). The “Education Act for All Handicapped Children of 1975” by the federal government,
stipulates parent participation and consultation in a manner that ensures and protects rights to
accessing free and appropriate education for all special needs children (IDEIA, 2004; PL94-
142). Revisions to this policy since its inception have only further emphasized the
importance and necessity of family perspectives. For example, with the reauthorization of the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA 2004) the
legislation specifically addresses how critical families of special needs students are, and how
educational experiences are more effective by, “strengthening the role and responsibility of parents and ensuring that families of such children have meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children at school and at home” (IDEIA, 2004, p. 118 STAT. 2649). Specific to California, guidelines have aligned its communication access and educational standards to federal and state mandates (California Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Education Advisory Task Force, 1999; State Special Schools Division, California Department of Education [SSSD-CDE], 2000) reemphasizing how essential families are to the process of deaf education.

The most significant and in-depth guidelines that outline requirements for deaf education programs in California and encourage needed contributions from and support for families with deaf children, is the Programs for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students: Guidelines for Quality Standards (SSSD-CDE, 2000). This evaluation and protocol details all of the components of services, stakeholders, standards, and employees a California deaf education program should have and incorporate to reasonably meet the needs of families with Deaf children. This guidebook was developed as a collaborative effort with over 40 stakeholders that included teachers, parents, superintendents, professors, audiologists, and speech therapists. Of those 40+ authors, only one can be presumably identified as a Latine mother if relying on surname assumptions. While in print, families are described as being critical to the process of deaf education, in practice, California Department of Education excluded its largest consumers from contributing to their policy guidelines and only referenced diversity and demographics as something to be something familiar with regarding employment (SSSD-CDE, 2000). Examining the authors more closely if relying on surname assumptions
of origin, the majority of contributors were hearing European-American women which is consistent with other literature on research and practice in deaf education (Cohen et al., 1990; Wolbers 2002). Outside of this detailed guidebook of over 200 pages on what a deaf education program should include and implement that was written in 2000, there has not been much movement in policy for California deaf education with the exception of two directly impacting policies, California Senate Bill 210 (2015) and California Senate Bill 692 (2021).

California Senate Bill 210 legislation pushed for more teacher accountability in tracking American Sign Language (ASL) or English language proficiency in Deaf children birth to 5 years of age to ensure they are as language proficient as their hearing peers once they enter the K-12 public education system in California. This policy was led by a majority of European-American Deaf advocates, European-American Deaf educators, and European-American Deaf community members in collaboration with mostly hearing European-American deaf education professionals, who recognize a longstanding gap of school districts dropping deaf education services once county Early Start Programs, that serve birth to 3 year-olds, transfer Deaf children back to their district schools and Deaf children are left without services until they return to the K-12 public school system at age 5 for kindergarten (J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018, qualifications presented in a later section). California Senate Bill 210 (2015) at minimum allows for language baselines to be established early in deaf education and preliminary data has already shown gaps along levels of hearing and racial lines (J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018 & August 7, 2021). However, SB210 did not consider that proficiency in ASL in non-English
language homes, such as that of Spanish, which can be a common language used in Latine families with Deaf children, is just as legitimate but would be difficult to evaluate by the predominantly European-American and monolingual-speaking educators. Instead of centering, this policy further complicates, the lives of Latine families with Deaf children as they enter K-12 public education and are consigned to English Learner (EL) status and protocol, a lifetime of assessments that decreases classroom instruction opportunities, and adds unnecessary paperwork to comply with state requirements on EL standards. Essentially, one could argue that all Deaf students are EL since they cannot hear spoken English and therefore are assigned to ASL as their primary language. However, policy has been established in such a manner as to burden Latine families and other non-English speaking families with fulfilling this evaluative yearly requirement while European-American families with Deaf children are exempt. This EL designation becomes a legal argument of blatant discrimination when Latine Deaf students surpass their European-American Deaf peers in English language acquisition and achievement but remain ensnared in the EL system of listening and speaking testing segments that no Deaf child will ever pass without access to hearing. Additionally, with predominately hearing European-American women educators evaluating and determining proficiency, given what is known about implicit bias and racism in European-American institutions (Matias, 2013; Sleeter, 2017), it would not be surprising to find more Latine families with Deaf children classified as EL homes regardless of whether the Deaf child knows any spoken Spanish or whether there is Spanish in the home at all.

California Senate Bill 692 (2021) introduced by the Bay Area politician, Dave Cortese, struck fear in deaf education programs and schools across the state at all intersections of race,
class, gender, and other areas. This bill proposed to increase inclusion into regular education
classrooms and decrease specialized academic instruction for special education students.
While this is a noble effort at desegregation and diversity for special needs students, the
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) (which is not within the scope of this study to address
or analyze at this time) functions in the opposite direction for Deaf students (Alexander,
1992). The more that Deaf students are integrated, the more they lose out on language
development, social interactions, and other important factors in their education, while the
more they are in a critical mass, language barriers diminish, curriculum is accessed directly,
social interactions are unrestricted, and other important factors increase (Aldersley, 2002;
Alexander, 1992). When knowledge of SB692 (2021) reached deaf education schools,
programs, and advocates, swift action was taken by prominent scholars and advocates to
ensure that description of the law included protections for Deaf students to access state
schools and programs in deaf education across the state (J. Rems-Smario, personal
communication, August 7, 2021). As California continues to ebb and flow on educational
policies that promote or further disregard historically excluded groups, policy specifically
related to deaf education presents itself only in the form of guidelines and cannot necessarily
impose its suggestion or recommendations on any program or organization in practice
(California Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Education Advisory Task Force, 1999; SSSD-CDE,
2000). Thus, the majority of deaf educators, who are hearing, European-American, and
female, continue to maintain archaic practices saturated in racism (and audism) while
perpetuating their own implicit, and at times explicit, bias from their own monocultural and
monolinguistic ideologies (Matías & Zembylas, 2014; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017).
Further discussion with Dr. Julie Rems-Smario (personal communication, August 7, 2021), a Deaf and European-American scholar and longstanding advocate for all Deaf children, indicates any shifts in policy to promote the centering of Latine families with Deaf children as the largest population involved in deaf education across California schools, has been challenging to gain support and sustainability for any real impact. Opposition has continued along historically racist and audist ideologies but Dr. Rems-Smario (personal communication, August 7, 2021) has recently assisted in establishing a coalition of Latine mothers with Deaf children that might be the first group of its kind as these leading Latine women have knowledge and access to the Latine communities, direct lived experiences with raising Deaf children, and understand how to navigate and/or challenge deaf education programs that subscribe to dominant hearing European-American philosophies and standards. This is the type of inclusion and participation that has been lacking in deaf education policy for over 200 years and will no doubt continue to be a struggle as the coalition begins to connect and mentor Latine families with Deaf children in a systematic manner across the state. It is the aspiration of the few antiracist and anti-audist scholars and advocates in deaf education that these Latine women with Deaf children will press to investigate, question, and/or recommend local and statewide changes that hold educational policy and deaf education programs accountable to Latine families with Deaf children, the largest population in California deaf education programs (J. Garcia, S. Garcia, I. Sanchez, M. Yingst, personal communication, September 16, 2017; J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, August 7, 2021).
The letter of the law is clear that families are essential, have legally protected rights, and should be central to the process of deaf education for their Deaf children. As of today, Latine families remain at the margins as research and practice continue to interpret legal requirements along monolingual (European-American English) and monocultural (European-American culture) perspectives (SSSD-CDE, 2000; Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990; Kluwin, 1994; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Wolbers, 2002). There is renewed hope in deaf education policy along the lines of equity with the establishment of this coalition of Latine mothers, a refreshing and much welcomed necessity that is centuries overdue. It remains to be known to what extent this coalition will gain entrance to, attention from, and influence on the California Department of Education and its policy guidelines, services, and supports in deaf education or whether the coalition and Latine families in general will experience continued marginalization. From the Latine community perspective, this coalition is certain to gain attention and have direct impact for Latine families with Deaf children in mentorship, advocacy, and overall support with engaging California policy, research, and practice in deaf education.

**Literature on Deaf Education Research and Latine Families**

Deaf education in the United States dates back to 1817 (Gannon et al., 1981; Lane et al., 1996) with recent nationwide events celebrating its 200-year anniversary. However, most historical accounts pertaining to Deaf students and their families center around predominantly European-American narratives with no indication that Latine families with Deaf children existed in deaf education until as recent as the 1970s (G.L. Delgado, 1984; Gannon et al., 1981; Lane et al., 1996). Additionally, the pattern in which Latine families
with Deaf children or Latine Deaf children emerge in the literature appears to coincide with the political climate of the times. In other words, articles and books addressing the Latine population in deaf education indicate huge markers of interest convergence (Bell, 1980; A. Brown & Urrieta, 2010; Lynn & Dixson, 2013). Where the political climate or policy has endorsed multiculturalism, diversity, or even nationalism along federal or state laws, there are productions of academic literature seeking to align themselves in deaf education with those same perspectives or highlighting previous contention and recommending change (California Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Education Advisory Task Force, 1999; SSSD-CDE, 2000: G.L. Delgado, 1984; IDEIA, 2004). It is within this European-American power dynamic that scholars in deaf education might be able to enter from a non-dominant perspective and be allowed a small platform within the literature. For example, while this study is not centered on language, communication, and classroom learning, the most extensive works on addressing these concerns with BIPOC students, and specifically Hispanic (Latine) students, has been the longstanding dedicated scholarship of Barbara Gerner de Garcia (1993, 1995a, 1995b, 2000a, 2000b). Aligning much of her work within bilingual education policy with intentions of improving access, language, and overall education for Deaf Latine students across all of the Americas, Gerner de Garcia is not viewed as a threat to the status quo and is in fact lauded by the European-American deaf education system for tending to historically excluded students and their rights to bilingual education along converging interests (Aleman & Aleman, 2010; Bell, 1980). The gradual focus from national to international work in deaf education, leads to curiosity on whether power
dynamics of the European-American deaf education system influenced that shift given the historical background and current state of deaf education politics (Jay, 2003).

Regardless of the political climate and established policy that influences when deaf education literature is produced and accepted, much of the available research on Latine families with Deaf children has historically focused on topics of low academic achievement, communication barriers of the home, and/or factors contributing to lack of student performance or lack of parental support or involvement (Cohen et al., 1990; G.L. Delgado, 1984, 2001). The most comprehensive examination of the Latine population and deafness in the United States acknowledges the immediate need to know and learn about the experiences of these families but predominantly centers around communication, assessment, and language deficits, with assumptions that Latine families are presumably Spanish-speaking, not utilizing sign language in the home, fatalistic, are of low socioeconomic status, unable to cope, predominantly immigrant, and have little to no education (Bennett, 1987, 1988; Dean, 1984; G.L. Delgado, 1984, Lerman, 1984; Figueroa et al., 1984; Meadow-Orlans et al., 1997). Nearly four decades later, this collection of research dedicated to the Hispanic (Latine) Deaf, remains relatively comparable to the current state of affairs in California deaf education in the 21st century. No current largescale research on even basic statistical or demographic data has been conducted in California deaf education to establish baselines on working competently with Latine families and their Deaf children (N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016), save the recent language data collection for SB210 (2015) that happens to inquire about demographics (Rems-Smario et al., 2018; J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, August 7, 2021). Preliminary results from SB210 (2015)
indicate what scholars and practitioners have been reporting since the 1980s, that Latine families with Deaf children have become the majority population in the California deaf education system (Ayantoye & Luckner, 2016; Cannon & Luckner, 2016; CDE, n.d., 2013, 2016a, 2019; G.L. Delgado 1984; Lopez, 2014; Rems-Smario et al., 2018; N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016) with the SB210 demographic data revealing that over 40% of the Deaf children in California Early Start infant and toddler programs alone are from Latine families (Rems-Smario et al., 2018; J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018).

To locate demographics for the Deaf student population in California or any other deaf related data, one must rely primarily on local educators, scholars, and professionals in the Deaf community who can verify information across schools or programs and with each other to obtain up-to-date statistics (J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018 & August 7, 2021; N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016). There is no state level database or department designated to deaf education in California to date. Dr. Nancy Sager, a hearing European-American scholar and Dr. Julie Rems-Smario, a Deaf European-American scholar are two such professionals and Deaf community members who have worked directly at national, state, county, and district levels in various roles and capacities in serving, monitoring, consulting, advocating for, and advising deaf education schools, programs, and educators across the state. Dr. Sager and Dr. Rems-Smario hold invaluable knowledge, experience, and expertise about California deaf education, demographics, and its current affairs that informed this study, verified literature on policy and research, and supported analyses on past and current practice.
The CDE also collects some demographics but one must disaggregate data from the reporting database that organizes special education across several categories including academic performance, race, grade level, or legal eligibility codes (CDE, n.d.). Data under legal eligibility codes such as “deafness”, “hard of hearing”, and “deafblind” must be calculated to determine the total amount of all Deaf students. This does not take into account students with autism, intellectual disability, and/or other legal eligibility codes where students are also deaf but deafness may not be listed as the primary eligibility. Therefore, the disaggregated data on the Deaf student population for California may be higher than what the CDE actually reports. In fact, local scholars, educators, and related professionals have reported higher numbers from in-person observation and school or program data collection (Rems-Smario et al., 2018; J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018 & August 7, 2021; N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016). Currently, conducting grassroots investigation by contacting known programs or networking across deaf education spaces in person or online, and searching the CDE database, are the only avenues for finding the most accurate demographic data on California Deaf students. With this dilemma, reviewing California data reports provide at minimum, a general baseline that concurs with past research that Latine families with Deaf children continue to be the majority in deaf education in the state of California and continue to increase as noted within the timeframe of this research study (CDE, 2013/2019; Honda, 1998; Lopez, 2014; Wesley; 2011).

From the inception of this research study to date, the disaggregated California demographics data report indicates the Deaf student population shifted by a few percentage
points with a decrease in European-American Deaf students and an increase in BIPOC Deaf students. Figure 1 displays a total of 13,766 Deaf students in California schools for the 2015-2016 data report of which 78% are BIPOC students (CDE, n.d., 2016a). Further disaggregation of the total Deaf student population, indicates that the majority of these California Deaf students are from Latine families. Figure 2 displays the totals and percentages of Deaf students who are from Latine families in comparison to Deaf students who do not identify as Latine for 2015-2016. Within a two-to-four-year span, accounting for trending migration between states or relocations due to the COVID-19 pandemic impact on the local economy, the deaf education student population increased by a little over two hundred students in the data report for 2018-2019 (CDE, 2016a, 2019). The statistics in demographics also increased for BIPOC students including those from Latine families.

Figure 3 shows BIPOC Deaf students gaining a 2% increase in population enrollment in 2018-2019, decreasing the percentage for European-American Deaf students. While factors such as graduating or homeschooling can reduce the number of students accounted for in these data reports, the increase in population within the timeframe of this study suggests the decrease in European-American Deaf student percentage is not due to less enrollment but rather an increased enrollment of BIPOC Deaf students and who are predominantly from Latine families. Further data disaggregation to examine the Latine Deaf student population for the 2018-2019 data report, indicates that Latine families with Deaf children increased their representation by 1% for a total of 60% or approximately 8,328 students of the 13,894 total state deaf education population (CDE, 2019). Figure 4 demonstrates the ratio of Latine Deaf students compared to Deaf students who do not identify as Latine according to the CDE
2018-2019 disaggregated data report (CDE, 2019). While the current demographics indicate that Latine families with Deaf children comprise over 55% of California’s deaf education population, checking in with local scholars and deaf education professionals, they assert that across deaf education programs, this statistic appears to be greatly underestimated. Especially within individual programs, sites, or classrooms, local scholars and educators alike report that Latine Deaf students could represent over 90% of the deaf education population in those local spaces (J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, August 7, 2021; I. Sanchez, personal communication, September 16, 2017; N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016; personal observation). With such a large representation of Latine families, it would be expected that the educators who work with this population would also be representative of the Latine community or at minimum be predominantly BIPOC educators and Deaf.

Figure 1

*Population of Deaf Students in California 2015-2016*

DEAF STUDENT POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA
2015/2016
TOTAL: 13,766

- Total Deaf BIPOC Student Population (10,743)
- Total Deaf European-American Student Population (3,023)

Note: 2015-2016 CDE disaggregated Data Report of Black Indigenous People of Color (BIPOC) Deaf student to European-American Deaf student ratio.
Figure 2

Population of Deaf Latine Students in California 2015-2016

DEAF STUDENT POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA 2015/2016
TOTAL: 13,766

- Total Deaf Latine Student Population (8052)
- Total Non-Latine Deaf Student Population (5,714)

Note: 2015-2016 CDE disaggregated Data Report of Latine Deaf student to non-Latine Deaf student ratio.

Figure 3

Population of Deaf Students in California 2018-2019

DEAF STUDENT POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA 2018/2019
TOTAL: 13,984

- Total Deaf BIPOC Student Population (11,218)
- Total Deaf European-American Student Population (2,766)

Note: 2018-2019 CDE disaggregated Data Report of BIPOC Deaf student to European-American Deaf student ratio.
However as noted throughout this study, the deaf education system is run by predominantly European-American hearing women who subscribe to their own monolingual and monocultural standards in sharp contrast to the Latine community student population they serve (Ayantoye & Luckner, 2016; Cannon & Luckner, 2016; CDE, 2019; Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990; Lopez, 2014; J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018 & August 7, 2021; N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016; Wolbers, 2002;). Statistics on the demographics for deaf education teachers and staff do not exist in any currently available database. To estimate the totals and statistical data of deaf education teachers, California data reporting of overall teacher demographics, and asking local scholars or professionals to self-report across networks, are the only sources for locating this information. Using the statewide demographics from the California 2018-2019 data
reporting, estimates can be made for deaf education teachers with the understanding that numbers are likely higher than the state average due to the disproportionate concentration of European-American hearing women within the field of deaf education from Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate (Cohen, 1997; Cohen et al., 1990; Salas, 2004; Walker-Vann, 1998; Wolbers, 2002).

Figure 5 indicates the statewide demographics of certificated teachers in California during the 2018-2019 reporting period in which at least 60% of the population are European-American certificated teachers (CDE, 2019). Regarding Latine certificated teachers, Figure 6 indicates that this population makes up 21% of the total certificated teacher population for the 2018-2019 California data reporting (CDE, 2019). The numbers for Latine certificated teachers are likely extremely low within deaf education. From scholars, professionals, and decades of experiential observations, it is rare to have more than one BIPOC teacher working at a program or school site among the predominantly European-American teachers in deaf education. There is potentially more teacher diversity within the two California Schools for the Deaf in Fremont and Riverside than there is across the entire state, given that their programs are larger and therefore have more probability of having more and diverse staff. Latine teachers for the Deaf are even more rare than other BIPOC educators who work in deaf education. Likewise, any studies conducted on the diversity of deaf education, whether about staff or students, have reported similar patterns in demographics (Cohen et al., 1990; Salas, 2004; Wolbers, 2002). While Latine families with Deaf children have been increasing participation in deaf education for the past four decades, European-American educators have remained the steady workforce, preserving much of the archaic and deficit literary
foundations and practices that are steeped in racism, audism, and other systems of oppression without any disruption for over two hundred (200) years (Cohen, 1997; G.L. Delgado, 1984).

Having such an extreme disproportionate representation between European-American teachers and the Deaf BIPOC student population, speaks to how the deaf education system has remained stagnant when it comes to engaging 21st century antiracist and anti-audist practices, understanding social justice approaches, and implementing culturally relevant pedagogy (Cohen, 1997; Jay, 2003). From a statewide data analysis perspective, deaf education remains relatively unfamiliar and overlooked in California. There is no designated deaf education department to meet the unique needs of Deaf students and no central database to account for deaf education programs or services across the state.

Figure 5

*Population of Certificated Teachers in California*

CERTIFICATED TEACHER POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA 2018/2019
TOTAL: 364,759

- Total BIPOC Certificated Teachers in California (127,456)
- European-American Certificated Teachers in California (220,539)
- No Response Certificated Teachers in California (16,764)

Figure 6

Population of Certificated Latine Teachers in California


In a shared list of contacts that Dr. Sager drafted as she physically visited sites for data collection during her consulting tenure for the California Department of Education, Dr. Sager personally documented well over 150 names of educators and/ or site locations that served Deaf students (personal communication, September 2, 2016). Her most concerning frustration was the shuttering of programs and classrooms across districts when unqualified administrators were placed to oversee deaf education services who did not understand the unique needs of this population. Programs and classrooms disappeared and reappeared year to year, with no established protocol or protections for families in the area (N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016). Attempts to verify these contacts yielded 63 responses from deaf education staff across the state sharing that their programs or services were still in place. Conducting real-time research on this matter, mirrored similar results. At
a Deaf event in southern California, scholars, families, advocates, and community members shared concerns about program and staffing needs for the area’s deaf education services and how administration did not understand the unique needs of the Deaf (J. Garcia, S. Garcia, I. Sanchez, M. Yingst, personal communication, September 16, 2017). Joel Garcia, Socorro Garcia, and Melissa Yingst identified as Latine Deaf and having personally experienced the deaf education system, were well-known community members and strong advocates for Latine families with Deaf children in the local area, who all expressed similar concerns about local districts and counties dismissing the requests for deaf education leadership and accountability to the Latine community (J. Garcia, S. Garcia, M. Yingst, personal communication, September 16, 2017). Likewise, Irma Sanchez, identified as Latine hearing and indicating her knowledge of the deaf education system as a parent, educator, and advocate, founded the Deaf Latinos y Familia Organization to create the support network she did not find with the education system (I. Sanchez, personal communication, September 16, 2017). These individuals verified the lack of state and local research Dr. Sager noted and that Dr. Rems-Smario continues to request and attempt to conduct to date. Since Dr. Sager’s retirement, Dr. Rems-Smario also supported CDE to establish better monitoring of deaf education and has also verified that there is no central department or database to account for deaf education programs or services across the state (J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018 & August 7, 2021). The task of surveying the state, designing a deaf education department and creating a database is an impossible task for one individual. Currently, Dr. Rems-Smario is leading the progress on data collection and accountability for SB210 (2015) as well as supporting the Latine mother coalition that is in
its beginning stages of establishment (Rems-Smario et al., 2018; J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018 & August 7, 2021). However, current research and evidence-based policies or protocol addressing the unique needs of the Latine population in deaf education in California for the past 40 years does not exist, nor does it appear to have garnered much support when local scholars, advocates, families, and former Latine Deaf students have demanded it at the local and state levels.

Given the historical contexts of discriminatory actions by the public education system in general (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954; IDEIA, 2004; PL94-142) and the fact that the Latine community is the majority participating in deaf education, piques alarming interest into the roles and responsibilities of CDE and university research and credentialing departments as to the priority of and accountability to Latine families with Deaf children. Given the demographics of deaf education in California, this continues to impact Latine families with Deaf students the most as they struggle to make life-impacting decisions to move away, accept piecemeal supports, or receive no support at all. These scholars, professionals, advocates, and community members continue to express the need for broader support from the state, residential schools, stable deaf education programs, and families to develop a deaf education department, network, and/or database to review data and statistics for analysis and development of appropriate programs and services (J. Garcia, S. Garcia, I. Sanchez, M. Yingst, personal communication, September 16, 2017; J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, August 7, 2021; N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016). For now, deaf education is clustered within special education under regulations, teaching philosophies, and audist protocols that tend to be severely limiting for Deaf students.
in general and harmful for Latine Deaf students who are already on unequal footing from the start. Depending on the local level and whether administration is knowledgeable about deaf education, Latine families with Deaf children can expect a range of experiences previously discussed in the section of oppressor pedagogy and how dominant ideology impacts their daily interactions. The following reviews the research on practice and what information from real-time investigations yielded about practice at local levels across the state of California.

**Literature on Deaf Education Practice and Latine Families**

While there is some research about Latine Deaf children with some references to their families in the areas of policy and research, there is far less when addressing Latine families with Deaf children and practice. Literature in deaf education practice remains largely focused on English only acquisition and assessment tools or practices on achieving acceptable English learning goals and overall school-specific literacy (G.L. Delgado 1984, Gerner de Garcia, 1993/2013; Schirmer, 2000). Urgency regarding nationwide demographic shifts and the need to align Latine Deaf students with European-American hearing and Deaf counterparts continue to be the dominant narratives for deaf education literature in the area of practice (Ayantoye & Luckner, 2016; Blackwell & Fischgrund, 1984; Erickson, 1984; Fischgrund, 1984; Green Kopp, 1984; Livingston, 1997; Ramsey, 1997; Schirmer, 2000; Secada, 1984).

For example, national demographic surveys between 1980 and 1990 revealed that BIPOC deaf education staff shifted from 11% to 7% in one report (Cohen et al., 1990) but was 14% in a study by Wolbers (2002) and the same in a separate study by Salas (2004). Demographics on BIPOC student population within those same studies revealed a 40%
national average and European-American teachers holding up to 80% of the deaf education workforce (Cohen et al., Salas, 2004; Wolbers, 2002). California reflects starker polarizing demographics as data has shown Latine families with Deaf children are the majority while educator demographics has remained European-American since deaf education was established. In other studies conducted on Deaf BIPOC students or their families, including Latine families, scholars conducted quantitative surveys with hundreds of participants exploring topics of parent involvement, language use and proficiency, responsiveness to the education system, and similar topics that tended to be exploratory and fashioned toward seeking justifications to explain noted differences in academic achievement levels between European-American families with Deaf children and everyone else (T. Allen, 1992; Bennett, 1987, 1988; Call, 2006; Cohen et al., 1990; Dean, 1984; G.L. Delgado, 1984, 2001; Erickson, 1984; Figueroa et al., 1984; Fischgrund, 1984; Fischgrund et al., 1987; Green Kopp, 1984; Kluwin, 1994; Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Lerman, 1984; Luetke, 1976; Mapp & Hudson, 1997; Walker-Vann, 1998; Wolbers, 2002). From these studies, discussion and analyses range from Latine families language deficits, to measuring the manner in which they cope with having Deaf children as a measure of Deaf Latine student achievement, to highlighting BIPOC students as successful for aligning to meritocratic expectations, to direct racist and harmful descriptions of Latine families all under the pretext of wanting to help, justify, and/or perpetuate the status quo in deaf education for Latine families with Deaf children (Ayantoye & Luckner, 2016; Cohen, 1997; G.L. Delgado, 1984, 2001; Parasnis, 1997; Redding, 1997).
Study after study disclosed similar statistics regarding the disproportionate representation of European-American educators and BIPOC or Latine students in deaf education with varying explanations on why Latine students are not meeting European-American educator expectations (Kluwin & Corbett, 1998; Mapp & Hudson, 1997; Walker-Vann, 1992; Wolbers, 2002). From a CRT and IRM perspective, what is noticed by research conducted on demographics is the sense of fear or panic that European-American scholars and practitioners appear to imply in the urgency to point out the increase in Latine families with Deaf children participating in the system and the myriad explanations as to why it is a problem, challenge, intervention, or concern to be fixed, forced, or rejected (Bennett, 1987, 1988; Cohen, 1997; Kluwin, 1994). As previously noted in the area of power and oppression, these types of approaches or perspectives position Latine families and their Deaf children as outsiders as if they are encroaching into spaces implicitly owned and therefore regulated as to who is legitimate enough to enter and how and at what costs (Dávila, 2015; Donnor, 2013). From a CRT and IRM perspective, the pressing concern would be to interrogate how forty years have passed with scholarship on Latine Deaf students or their families that have yielded the same deficit perspectives and continued dismal outcomes of achievement and how neither state or local levels have prioritized changing or improving upon the narratives and outcomes that are harmful to Latine families and their Deaf children.

While some scholars have engaged race and discrimination discussions within deaf education, only one author (Cohen, 1990) has spoken truth to power, naming racism within the European-American dominated field of deaf education, and calling for changes. In the brief but direct article, Cohen (1990) does not mince words, noting historical oppression and
using terminology such as “antiracist” (p. 80-83) which was very uncommon terminology in
education literature during the 1990s. Since this sole article on antiracism, deaf education
literature resumed its complicity and preoccupation with studying language and
communication. As other scholars have discussed BIPOC families and Deaf students, most
have approached topics of race and racism through the lens of advocating for diversity,
perpetuating race neutrality, aligning historically excluded communities with European-
American interests at a cost, and/ or providing multicultural strategies. All of these
perspectives seek quick remedies of complex realities and readily dismiss any analysis of
historical contexts impacting contemporary schooling, and therefore does very little to
dismantle European-American supremacy to hold deaf education accountable to Latine
families (Brill et al., 1986; California Teachers Association [CTA], 2022; Cohen et al.,
1990; National Education Association [NEA], 2022; Redding, 1997; Sass-Lehrer et al., 1997;
Stapleton, 2014, 2016; Wesley, 2011). Further investigation in search of Latine families with
Deaf children as the central focus that did not cater to European-American expectations of
meritocracy or objectivity, yielded to two sources (Flores, 2020; Lopez, 2014). Presumably
BIPOC scholars, both sources centered Latine families with Deaf children from the
perspective of legitimate communal practices that benefitted the participants and their
communities (Flores, 2020; Lopez, 2014).

In the study by Lopez (2014) two Latine families are centered with inquiry on whether or
not families can relay their values, language, and culture to their Deaf children and how.
Through extensive interviewing, Lopez (2014) gains entry into the personal lives of the
Latine families to observe and engage how transmission of communal knowledge takes place
between Latine hearing family members and their Deaf children. Though the review of the literature references similar stereotypes and assumptions that have been discussed throughout this study, Lopez (2014) is inconsistent with the manner in which they are addressed which leaves the reader confused as to whether the information is being reinforced, rejected, or ridiculed such as the reference to “mamacita” (p. 33). Much of the stereotypes and over exaggerations in describing Latine family or community behavior are simply listed and referenced from the sources but are not deconstructed or further analyzed. Perhaps as Latine, the researcher has assumed or has taken for granted known conventions that were omitted in providing more context or perspective to the list of stereotypes and descriptions of Latine people in general. Nonetheless, the impact is still harmful and can be perpetuated by others as acceptable information coming from within the Latine community. The framework of research however, positions Latine families as legitimate knowledge and culture bearers who have been successful in transferring their knowledge and culture regardless of whether their child is Deaf. While struggles with communication between family members were noted, Lopez (2014) demonstrates the agency Latine families have to ensure their Deaf children are equally valued members of the family and their community and not the helpless uneducated families that most deaf education literature espouses (Bennett, 1987, 1988; Fischgrund et al., 1987; Flores, 2020; Lopez, 2014; Wesley, 2011).

In the study by Flores (2020), Latine families were sought out by local professionals working with the Deaf to share knowledge on raising a Deaf child. While the community-based participation project was originally established to proceed as a banking method of sharing information from professionals to families, it was Latine communal culture that
shaped the manner in which the research unfolded (Flores, 2020). The professionals set up meetings presumably understanding historical contexts, the manner in which Latine families are impacted by European-American systems of oppression, and with consideration of scheduling that would be optimal for attendance. By offering transportation, meals, childcare, Spanish-language access, and scheduling meetings that respected family schedules, Latine families responded in reciprocal manner, some commuting long distances, to engage in knowledge sharing (Flores, 2020). While some aspects of the research require careful consideration in deconstructing audist perspectives, the practice of culturally relevant responses around the planning and implementation of this study, highlights the relationships of care and accountability that Latine families with Deaf children expect and reciprocate when it is genuine and authentic (Wilson, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999). Through the community-based action participation, Latine families and deaf education professionals as well as medical professionals were able to build community reciprocally and share knowledge that assisted them in understanding more about each other. Unfortunately, long term relational accountability was lost due to the funding support needed to address historical and marginalizing impacts against Latine families. What this brief action-based study demonstrates is the value in communal learning, the importance of relationship and the accountability to the communities that researchers enter and engage (Archibald, 2008; Davidson, 2019; Delgado-Gaitan 1991, 1993, 2012, Valenzuela, 1999; Wilson, 2008). In practice, deaf education has the power to establish similar communal spaces to develop connections with the Latine community and begin the decolonial and healing process toward
creating sustainable and accountable relationships with Latine families and our Deaf students.

**A Word on the Narratives**

A word on the narratives of the European-American (Western) canon and its perpetual self-aggrandizing propensity of Othering and erasing non-European-American knowledge. All communities have knowledge, wisdom, and sophisticated systems of self-governance and education. All indigenous peoples throughout the entire world have histories of intricate communities, civilizations, and foundational knowledge about the sciences, arts, social sciences, philosophy, education, mathematics, politics, technology, governance, sustainability, agriculture, and so on. In fact, many of these disciplines derived from indigenous peoples of the Americas and Africa and are well-known within those communities of people. For thousands of years prior to European and European-American invasions of The Americas and other geographical locations, indigenous peoples lived and thrived in strong relationship to the land, with each other, and without the need to deny that others existed around them. While conflict appears to be part of human behavior in all of its time of existence, there was no need to travel around usurping knowledge from others to tout it as their own or present it as inferior to theirs. Quite the opposite in fact, there is plenty of documented evidence that indigenous peoples of the Americas were and are communal. Indigenous peoples traveled up and down the Americas (and still do), including the surrounding islands, to trade and share a diversity of resources, knowledge, and culture (Anawalt, 1992; Benitez, 2013). In fact, it is precisely that sharing of resources and knowledge with European colonizers that European-American settlers exploited, to capture,
exterminate, and subjugate indigenous peoples across the land. The dominant (false and harmful) narrative is that the land was there for the taking, free of people, open and wild (Pratt, 1992). The insatiable greed for power and resources is relentless, astounding, and predictable, all at once. Should it have ended there with exploitation of resources or knowledge and a return to Europe, would be a great relief. However, since the 1400’s, Europeans began documenting atrocious attacks on indigenous peoples around the world, including the areas of Africa and the Americas with depictions and descriptions so outrageously racist and inhumane, that many European-Americans go through great lengths to ensure these truths are not openly shared (Pratt, 1992; Reynolds & Kendi, 2020).

Likewise, the European-American legacies of slavery, Jim Crow, and segregation that have been slow to end, are still traumatically vivid to many firsthand survivors, yet their lived experiences and realities are denied, hidden, and threatened into silence. It is difficult to understand the logic in hiding truths from the very people who experienced those truths and is a very classic example of the gaslighting that is wielded at BIPOC to maintain European-American (white) supremacy at all costs. The laws may have changed but behavior patterns are slow to follow and harm has not only gone unaddressed but compounded over time. In a society that is becoming more and more diverse, it is time for European-Americans to repair and heal the harm they have caused to others and themselves. We cannot separate ourselves from our ancestors. We carry blood memory, ancestral knowledge, culture, and the burden of our past and future legacies. We carry our narratives and we must take care of them, learn from them, do right by them, and pass them forward to the future. What kind of legacies are
we producing right now and how do we want to be remembered seven generations from now?

It is time to listen and learn other ways of knowing, not to take away but to add and uplift. Negating the truths about the harm done and continued to be done to BIPOC communities within these Americas only perpetuates the harm in nuanced and insidious forms. Who are we hiding the truth from when all of us know it exists? What purpose does this serve other than to protect, preserve, and perpetuate European-American supremacy and the intersecting systems of oppression? There is no middle ground in the work toward social and racial justice. We commit to dismantling harm or we commit to more harm. Narratives are the most lauded forms of valuing everything in this country. Our history books and government tell stories that center European-Americans as the master race, given rights by a Christian god to take and to command and to always win, to be proud of that God-given right of power and control- Manifest Destiny. Everyone who speaks against it is wrong, will be harmed in some way. Those stories are in our history books, churches, government, even printed on the money we use. It is a constant reminder that European-American culture, standards, religion, schooling, and ways of living, eating, speaking, sleeping, dressing, learning, and behaving are superior to the rest of the world whether current European-Americans subscribe to this or not, whether BIPOC attempt to align to it or not- It. Exists. It is harmful, costly, and can only be stopped actively and together. In the 21st Century, we see a rise in the expression of European-American supremacy with the same force and violence that committed genocide against the indigenous people of the Americas and Africa. We see European-Americans who have denied this history and reality, paralyzed at witnessing past
truths repeating in real-time. Under this history and current reality, we want Latine families with Deaf children and BIPOC children to believe we have their best interests at heart while denying their histories, denigrating their identities, and gazing at them through lenses of inferiority. If we are not actively dismantling racist historical narratives, actively addressing racism and other systems of oppression, actively speaking truth to power, actively creating safe spaces, actively caring and fostering care in the education system, actively promoting students to do the same and work toward racial and social justice collaboratively for all people; if we are not doing this work, we are upholding European-American supremacy, systems of oppression, and approving of the force and violence that is uprising daily. While many European-Americans do not subscribe to those false and archaic narratives of superiority, most continue to remain silent and benefit from its historical actions and legacy. Rather than acknowledging the harm done and the benefits reaped, European-Americans cling to dysconscious narratives of not seeing color, seeking to invalidate, not having ever used racist name-calling, or never having owned a slave, as tools to absolve, invalidate, shutdown conversations, and maintain privilege and power (Jay, 2003; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017). Our schools reflect society.

In fact, within the school system, Latine families with Deaf children and BIPOC in general, witness these patterns of maintaining the dominant narrative quite regularly. Families outside of this study, students former and current, BIPOC staff who have left the profession or work as support staff and are privy to office talk, and some European-American allies are astute at observing European-American educators go through great lengths to uphold the status quo. Becoming so irate as to seek out harm in the form of disciplinary
actions, depriving resources, withholding access, and/or creating a harmful and inaccurate narrative are some of the patterns of behaviors Latine families with Deaf children, BIPOC families, students, staff, and allies have experienced or witnessed for the audacity to name injustices, violence, and/or other concerns—for just naming it. Again, Latine communities, families with Deaf children have been harmed for daring to speak truth to power. The harm is compounded in this manner, perpetually, and it sends the narrative to others as a warning to be silent or experience wrath. While Latine families with Deaf children learn to tolerate and navigate most of the harmful acts against them, it is the power of the narrative that will eventually break them. “Laura is not a happy mom, she complains too much”, “Susie isn’t being bullied, she has behavior problems”, “Tommy is deviant with those baggy pants”, “Carlos doesn’t care to learn how to communicate with his kid”, and the narratives carry on from the 1400s to date, Latine families with Deaf children are still working toward dismantling false narratives that have compounded and refined themselves into stories we call racial microaggressions- a compact narrative that causes faster, deeper, damage with great subtlety. Narratives have the power to harm or to uphold and when historically excluded communities are inaccurately storied, the harm is more profound than when an inaccurate story is told about dominant groups. While European-Americans can engage in violence such as mass murder in schools, European-Americans have the privilege of not being attached to such a narrative. When an unarmed Black male is unlawfully killed by European-American police officers, the first reaction is to create a narrative about him, his family, all of his descendants, and the entire Black community that dehumanizes him to the point of convincing European-Americans that the killing was justified (See the video by the
Young Turks in the references for behavior patterns) and place themselves in the narrative as the victim of this type of racism. Narratives are powerful, narratives are dangerous, narratives move people to harm and to love or care. We must take care of our narratives but also not perpetuate historical deficit, harmful, racist, audist, and other oppressive narratives about others because it destroys lives in an instant, and long term. Our narratives have consequences. We only protect, support, and perpetuate one narrative of power in this country, the story of European-American (white) supremacy. Naming that reality is an affront to it and even the “nice white lady” (Matias, 2013, pp. 68, 78) or good liberal or “moderate white woman” (M.L. King, 2021, VI) will ensure she is the victim of her own racism for the audacity to have to know she’s been exposed, asked for accountability, or asked to stop future harm. When will we stop the harm, value other ways of life, value all life, and be accountable to all of our relations? We can dismantle oppression and balance power within the education system and among communities, if we really collectively wanted to, we could. If we were vested in the communities we serve because we value life and care about each other authentically through action and actively dismantling systems of oppression, we would experience social and racial justice. If within the education system, we want to tout that systems have shifted and it is the place to dismantle systems of oppression and restore the humanity of oppressed peoples, transform European-Americans into antiracist leaders, and dismantle the system of European-American (white) supremacy, what spaces have we created for that to happen? What does that look like inside of a classroom? At a school? Within a program? At the district? In the county? Across the state? How are we listening to the true lived experiences of others and correcting historical damage of false narratives,
harmful narratives, and unbefneficial narratives to uplift communities, to understand other
legitimate paths of learning, to value each other for existing as people of a community? How
are we working toward social and racial justice as educators who claim to be wide open and
ready but hide behind privilege and power the moment it feels uncomfortable? Are we saying
our discomfort of unpacking our identities, our internalized bias, and our normalized racism
in our daily actions is more important and more valuable in protecting feelings than the lives
and humanity of the people who have suffered because of those unpacked dangers? That is
white supremacy at its finest, most refined, systemically permeating, glory.

**Summary of Chapter 2**

Literature in the areas of policy, research and practice demonstrate a disproportionate
representation of monocultural European-American educators who dominate the field of deaf
education along Eurocentric ideologies and deficit perspectives (CDE, 2016b, 2019; Cohen,
and subsequently any literature in deaf education excludes the Latine population until the late
1900s (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954; Gannon et al., 1981; IDEIA, 2004; Lane et al.,
1996; PL94-142). Today, Latine families with deaf children are the largest population
participating in California deaf education schools, programs, and services, yet they have been
excluded from leading or having any significant roles in the areas of policy, research or
practice (CDE, 2016a, 2019; Brill et al., 1986; Cannon & Luckner, 2016; J. Rems-Smario,
personal communication, August 7, 2021; N. Sager, personal communication, September 2,
2016). Few studies have centered Latine families with Deaf children to learn about their
knowledge, culture, communities, and overall expertise. In response to the dearth in literature
centering Latine families with Deaf children, this study draws from CRT and IRM frameworks to explore the ontological and epistemological foundations of a community long ignored. To center Latine families with Deaf children, linear European-American theories and methods did not suffice. Therefore, multiperspective frameworks, concepts, and perspectives converged to address the proposed research questions. Using a qualitative approach of quasi open-ended interviews and observations as a primary source of data collection, followed by secondary community and classroom member checking and comparative analysis, nine research contributors shared knowledge through interdisciplinary and multiperspective lenses drawing from Critical Race Theory and Indigenous Research Methodology. Establishing reciprocal relationships can support the California deaf education system in dismantling its 200 years of Eurocentric practices that are deficit and harmful to Latine families and BIPOC families in general. It can become the reality of the racial and social justice that is so adamantly promoted on the NEA (2022), CTA (2022), and every county/ district website across the state.
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

Latine families with Deaf children are the largest group that California deaf education programs and schools serve across the state (CDE, 2013, 2019; N. Sager, personal communication, September 2, 2016; J. Rems-Smario, personal communication, March 20, 2018 & August 7, 2021). However, across the literature, Latine families with Deaf children in education have been largely excluded by scholars in academia, special education, deaf education, and even within educational research in Chicana/o/x Studies. In addition, the trivial amount of literature available on policy, research, and practice referencing Latine families with Deaf children has been rooted in deficit, if not overtly racist, perspectives (Bennett, 1987, 1988; G.L. Delgado, 1984, Matias, 2013; Matias et al., 2014; Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Picower 2009; Sleeter, 2017). While it is not within the scope of this research to investigate every factor that has excluded Latine families with Deaf children from the literature in policy, research, or practice, racism and audism are historic and significant reasons (Bahan et al., 2008; Cohen, 1997; Jay, 2003; Matias, 2013; Mitchell, 2013; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2017). Aside from the literature, one can conduct a simple online search on deaf education credentialing departments at any participating university or search public deaf education programs to find that the field—from Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate—is dominated by European-Americans who are commonly hearing and female. Since my own involvement in deaf education and with the Deaf community beginning in the early 1990’s, I have yet to work alongside a Latine teacher of the Deaf. Of the many professors and teachers, I have met over the years in professional deaf education settings, only two have been Latine teachers, who did not remain in the field for longer than five
years. As mentioned throughout this study, for over two hundred years the field of deaf education has been dominated by European-American educators—mostly hearing European-American women—with little to no knowledge about any other group outside of their own monocultural and monolingual identities and no systemically required nor desired expectations to change that (Cohen, 1997; Jay, 2003). For nearly 40 years, Latine families with Deaf children have been the primary population receiving services from these European-American educators with dismal outcomes of achievement or college and career preparation, with no representation at any level of deaf education, experiencing harm from deficit narratives in deaf education literature and the lack of culturally relevant pedagogy in practice. Being part of deaf education at any given level or position in California and not being part of the dominant group, generates a palpable awareness of hegemony and subjugation for BIPOC educators, students, and families alike (Jay, 2003). Latine families with Deaf children are keenly aware of this European-American hierarchy in deaf education which influences their decisions, participation, and overall interactions, a concept I further engage throughout the chapter of findings.

In this chapter, I share a review of the purpose and specific inquiries of this study, the procedures that took place in recruitment, setting, collection of data, and the structure of my research design and approach. Research contributors are described at length from a relatable and relationally accountable perspective, rather than from European-American ideology of research ownership, dominance, and supposed objectivity. I also include considerations and reflections on my positionality, ontological and epistemological transitions that occurred during this study, and overall ethical considerations. I close the chapter with an invitation to
the examination of findings through my proposed woven interdisciplinary lens that center Latine families with Deaf children as substantiated bearers of knowledge and legitimate contributors to deaf education policy, research, and practice through a communal sharing of Storywork (Archibald, 2008; Archibald & Parent, 2019; Archibald et al., 2019; Davidson, 2019; Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Iseke, 2013; Wilson, 2008).

**Research Purpose and Inquiry**

Latine families with Deaf children in California deaf education programs and schools are the largest participating group yet review of the literature reveals a dearth of information in all areas from policy, to research, to practice, which indicates a demand for current and accurately reflective scholarship to inform these areas of deaf education (CDE, 2016b, 2019; Cohen, 1997; G.L. Delgado, 1984). Without accurate knowledge and antiracist perspectives regarding the experiences and knowledge of Latine families with Deaf children, the predominantly European-American educators, who dominate the field—from Early Start infant and toddler programs through postsecondary education and the professorate at university teacher credentialing programs—cannot be sure current practices are best practices. We as current scholars and educators in deaf education cannot rely on the available deficit (and mostly archaic) literature referencing Latine families with Deaf children to inform practice without perpetuating harm. In other words, deaf education needs to keep up with the times and the evolution of antiracist pedagogy and practice (NEA, 2022; CTA 2022).

While education in general has gone through many reforms continuously seeking to modernize its approach to address its historical harm, center its growing diversity and keep
up with social changes and antiracist pedagogy, deaf education has remained stagnate. Scholars and practitioners alike have spent the past two hundred plus years maintaining a hegemonic system of European-American standards and expectations in deaf education thus keeping Latine families with Deaf children—the largest population participating in California deaf education programs, schools, and services—at the margins. While there has been literature and discussion about audism since the 1970s (Eckert & Rowley, 2013; Bauman, 2004; Humphries, 1977) and momentum toward directly addressing audism in current research (Bahan et al., 2008; Eckert, 2010; E.N. Gertz, 2003; G. Gertz, 2016; Stapleton, 2014, 2016) that has pushed Deaf awareness beyond educational programs and into mainstream visibility, antiracist research and even basic multicultural exploration are topics that remain largely silenced within the deaf education field. In fact, only one source has dared to utilize the term, “anti-racist” in deaf education research to date (Cohen, 1997) as mentioned in the review of literature.

With deaf education student populations in California being from predominantly BIPOC families and Latine families holding that majority, we are past due on knowing, understanding, and centering Latine families in this field across all areas of policy, research, and practice. Therefore, this study aimed at disrupting the status quo of deaf education policy, research, and practice by utilizing antiracist and decolonial frameworks to center the perspectives and experiences of Latine families with Deaf children in California. The purpose was to learn about, pursue, develop and/or implement approaches for Latine families with Deaf children that are anti-oppressive and toward a decolonial reclamation, grounding, and healing.
Hence, I proposed the following research questions to guide this study:

1. What are the experiences of Latine families who have Deaf children?
2. How do the experiences of Latine families shape their roles in deaf education schools or programs?
3. What are the implications of centering the experiences of Latine families with Deaf children?

Exploring Research Designs

As I have shared throughout the chapters of this study, my perspectives and intent for researching the Latine community was much aligned with European-American ideology and research methodologies that I had received as my training throughout my undergraduate and graduate studies experiences. I had over time—due to my own colonized experiences of K-12 schooling and expectations as both a student and an educator—adapted a view that my own community was inferior, needed to be saved, and that Latine families with Deaf children needed to engage a meritocratic path to achieve any type of success. My first research design for engaging Latine families with Deaf children during my graduate programs with Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies and Special Education concentrated on the deficit premise that parents did not want to be involved in supporting their Deaf children. I wonder to date, how much harm I engaged in and perpetuated against my own community and myself. The deficit literature and most significantly, my observations of the school culture climates of deaf education programs in which I volunteered and/or worked in from 2004 to date, were the sources that informed this deficit perspective. The literature available then, is still relatively the only literature that is available today regarding Latine families with Deaf children.
Therefore, I relied more heavily on the experiential knowledge of European-American educators that in turn influenced my own observations accordingly. As Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies offered me a safe space to realize the impact that colonization, white (European-American) supremacy, and other systems of oppression (details I elaborate on later in this chapter) had on my life, my family, and my own communities, I began to seek knowledge and information to reclaim my lost—or suppressed—identities. This shift in consciousness began to inform my approach to research and reevaluate my overall education as a student, as an educator, and as a member of my own community. I realized my research designs thereafter, needed frameworks that were less deficit, more asset-based, antiracist and eventually decolonial. For an extended time, I clung to the works of Tara Yosso’s Community Cultural Wealth (2005) feeling that I had finally found a less deficit and more asset-based model by which to interpret Latine families with Deaf children to the predominantly European-American colleagues and coworkers in deaf education who did not see them as they saw their European-American (and sometimes Asian) students. Something was still lacking or unsettling. After several papers and projects of centering Latine families with Deaf children using Community Cultural Wealth (CCW), something was still not making sense or fitting in for me. It was during this doctoral program that my cohort mate, Dra. Adriana Rangel and I began searching for a more decolonial path. While asset-based research was a great move away from deficit research, I realized that CCW still catered to dominant European-American ideology, standards, and in turn perpetuated social inequities. On the research end, CCW was nicely commodified for European-American scholars to digest enough to consider Latine communities as potential contributors to capitalism instead
of the usual negative assumption that it is a community that is depleting resources or needing saving of some sort. On the practitioner end, while I am not sure CCW is widely utilized in classrooms or schools, CCW provided social and racial justice educators a model by which to inspire historically excluded students to see their own value, while antithetically encouraging those students to progress through and try to survive an oppressive education system that only seeks to capitalize on that said value. Was this also for the sake of capitalism and learning how best to be subservient and absorbed into dominant European-American society? At best, CCW might be considered emancipatory, a current trending approach, that at its core, still begs permission from dominant society, institutions, policy, research, and practice for freedoms and rights. While I understand we are all a part of these systems and in order to engage or even survive day-to-day (i.e., earning money to pay for food and shelter) we must participate on the terms European-American dominance expects, such emancipatory methods, research, and policy only promotes further colonization and harm to our communities. Seeking emancipation only perpetuates and gives validation to the hegemonic structure that one community is inferior to another and therefore any type of access, rights, and/or freedoms must be begged for or negotiated upon (Bell, 1976, 1980, 1992; Aleman & Aleman, 2010). No thank you! What we want and need is self-determination, restoring and recentering of our communities as worthy, independent of European-American institutions and standards. If we stand within those institutions, we want to be visible for who we are and not for what you can take from us for your own benefit. It was later that I connected to research that spoke to those off-center intuitions that I felt and the struggle of trying to place into words what Ladson-Billings (2005) explained so clearly. In a review of how CRT in
education had developed since she had first proposed its use in the education field, Ladson-Billings (2005) warned us of this very dangerous predicament in building too hastily upon CRT in education without thoroughly holding center Critical Legal Scholars (CLS) foundational principles of challenging power, dismantling white (European-American) supremacy, and ensuring substantive critique of liberalism. Specifically, to the Chicana/o/x (Latine) community of scholars, Ladson-Billings (2005) advised:

I…encourage them [Latine scholars] not [to] be naïve about the way capital can be deployed as a way to create hierarchy and inequity, i.e., the institutions of a capitalist and White [European-American] supremacist society will happily allow you to have your new forms of capital as long as they do not infringe on their old established ones. More insidious, they will appropriate your forms of capital and repackage them to produce their forms. (pp. 116-117).

In other words, as I have noted throughout the entire study in areas that mention power dynamics and the manner in which European-American systems of oppression function to keep BIPOC at the margins in general and Latine families with Deaf children in particular, European-American supremacist society does not stop to consider our humanity when it will not even acknowledge we are visible (Bell, 1976; Dillard, 2020; DuBois, 1903; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; Lipsitz, 2019; Matias & Zembylas, 2014). We have tried to appease dominant society and we have tried to convince it to see our humanity. We have weaponized our pain to elicit a response of humanity. We have exploited our skills and strengths to elicit a response of humanity. We have tried many ways to fit in, appease, and be accepted by a system that does not see our humanity in the hundreds of years we have been colonized and subjugated. How are we to believe European-American systems of education have our best interests at heart and care about a community that remains invisible until it is unapologetically present and that is when new trends emerge in cyclical manner to maintain
the status quo. Hundreds of years of the same cycle, only 40 of which we have been allowed to enter but remain on the sides. We do not need emancipatory educational strategies nor innovative forms of capital to understand that our realities are unjust or that we need to give something deemed valuable to an oppressive society in order for us to survive or be accepted. We tried that already. It has not worked. We want a decolonial path of self-determination that promotes healing and reconnecting to ourselves and our community. Latine families with Deaf children already tried 200 plus years of Eurocentric ideology and European-American supremacist standards of education, of which nearly 3/4 of that time they were exclusively and deliberately excluded. It has not worked. Unpacking and deconstructing systems of oppression is necessary. Establishing relationships based on authentic care and relational accountability is necessary for the lip service of racial and social justice touted in counties and districts across California to become a reality. The return to systems rooted in indigenous knowledge and research is necessary.

This colonial and decolonial awareness and dynamics of power made navigation of this research study extremely complex, as I straddled both worlds using only the colonial words of English and Spanish that were forced upon me just three generations ago. It was this conflict of power dynamics and the limited oppressive frameworks to choose from, that Dra. Rangel and I discussed at length while searching for substantive answers and frameworks that led us both to the works of indigenous scholars. We theorized at length about our own ontological and epistemological foundations against the impact of colonization which we attempted to explain in holistic terms. A visual representation developed, Figure 7, as we straddled the Eurocentric experiences of academia and our communal identities, two
contradictory existences that demanded one existence. It was this intuition toward ancestral knowledge that kept us searching the literature for past scholars who surely must have written about this process of conscientization and captured it in a manner that would resonate (Anzaldua, 2002; Archibald et al., 2019; Bell, 1976; DuBois, 1903; Freire 1970; Wilson, 2008). Each time research brought forth the scholars of the past who spoke to this theorizing of the self within contradicting systems and pointed toward ancestral knowledge, a more informed cycle of conscientization occurred and shifted my understanding.

Figure 7

First Draft of Decolonial Ontology, Axiology, Epistemology Framework

Note: Preliminary image of conscientization process during 2016 doctoral classes.

Our theorizing about our own ontological and epistemological foundations led us toward ancestral knowledge. We researched Dra. Rangel’s ancestral community to learn how indigenous people of Perú secured their ancestral knowledge in plain sight using quipus that European-American historians have trivialized into accounting tools. We looked into the indigenous languages that make meaning for communal knowledge that is difficult to
translate into English and Spanish without losing its context. We connected to the concept of relationality and the accountability it must have with each relation (Wilson, 2008). I searched my parents’ histories to understand my blood memory. I traveled to a tiny community of 400 members or less in the rural lands of Nuevo León near the México/US border. I walked the small town with my mother and brother and visited the exact spot on the earth where my mother had been born, which was now just a small concrete patch on the ground taken over by plants and nature. I listened to my mother’s Storywork of the community, ways of life, and how it was disrupted by European-American religious missionaries- the one’s responsible for my harsh Protestant upbringing. I watched my younger brother take my mother by the arm and walk with her to the river that held the balance of life for that community, now dry and taken over by surviving brush and cactus. I listened and watched and the learning was visceral, as I witnessed my mother share her ancestral knowledge, pointing to exact locations on earth, ancestral roots entwined with the land, in which lived experiences transpired that shaped her ontological and epistemological foundations. I shared this space with my mother as she reconnected to herself and as a result impacted me as we engaged in meaning making that could only happen within the context of our shared relationship to the knowledge, land, time, and each other. It was where Storywork left academia and presented itself in action, Figure 8, a moment of transformation. I suddenly realized: “I have been here before, several times in fact, yet for the first time I understand, I have not been here”. In this space I understood my mother in all of her essence for the very first time in my life, outside of European-American supremacy and society yet very much
impacted by it in all the ways possible. It was profound. I reemerged through another cycle of conscientization.

**Figure 8**

*Storywork of Ancestral Knowledge*

Note: Conscientization moment of the importance in Storywork for the sustaining of ancestral knowledge with relational accountability to contemporary communal participation.

As I traveled back home, bringing this knowledge and heightened awareness back to my current reality of chaotic overlapping systems and demands, I theorized about what and how to apply this understanding. I continuously re-evaluated dynamics of power, positionality, privilege in some spaces, marginalized in others, and tried to figure out how to engage the self and community in a better more accountable manner. The doctoral process and my profession overlapped and contradicted much of what I was beginning to deconstruct and much of what I needed to shift in my practice. I needed to know Latine families and their Deaf children from their perspectives and not how I or the system needed them to respond,
even in the instances that I cared deeply for the Latine families, I could not care authentically because I was expecting them to subscribe to contradicting systems. I was contradictory, claiming to value the Latine community and following European-American supremacy ideologies of stripping away identities through invisibility in the education system that I was participating in daily. I returned to the visual representation to apply Latine perspectives. It was here that Dra. Rangel and I began connecting our communal knowledge to this conscientization. Within this IRM framework of relationality, we realized the beauty and complexity of knowledge sharing within our communities. We quickly listed the themes we were discussing at that moment in an attempt to capture our process in Figure 9. Through language, rules of engagement, cultural awareness, ancestral intuition and blood memory, we made meaning from these thematic lists that no outsider would be able to understand without relational knowledge and accountability. Relationality was the center to our research, to us.

During many of our sessions of theorizing that took place during classes, after class, in parking lots, over meals, we continually experienced the contradictions of European-American supremacy and colonization. For example, while deeply engaged in theorizing one afternoon, two cohort mates witnessed our process. Without relational knowledge or accountability, one cohort mate, with her complete sense of entitlement, interrupted the conversation to point at Figure 7 with a circulating finger motion and in a condescending tone said, “coooool draawing”, chuckled and walked off. The chuckle of the first cohort mate piqued the interest of the second one who watched for a moment then asked if she could take a photograph of our work for her own benefit. This is the type of Eurocentric violence that takes place in classrooms that whispers to Latine families and the community at large
that our identities and knowledge are simultaneously not legitimate but useful to co-opt. This is the education system from Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate. This is the system that needs disruption from the harms of systemic oppression that we have all legitimized by accepting these patterns of behaviors, silencing others from speaking truth to power, pretending we did not witness or experience harm, invalidating and minimizing attacks, or engaging in more violent acts of punishment and physical exclusion. Centering Latine families with Deaf children is an unapologetic stance while using IRM frameworks for this study is a decolonial act of transgression against European-American supremacy and its systems.

**Figure 9**

*First Iteration of Decolonial Ontology, Axiology, Epistemology Framework*

Note: Image of conscientization process from Latine values and ethics.

**Defining A Decolonial Design**

While I do not claim to understand the extensive or full capacity in which Indigenous Research Methodologies (IRM) can be applied to any given research, I do know that
European-American imposed research frameworks and methodologies do not depict the complete essence of the Latine community in this study. Therefore, as I am concurrently working on my own decolonial journey and understanding that people under the umbrella term of Latine are indigenous people of these so-called Americas, I was compelled to lean toward IRM frameworks, principles, and concepts that can better represent the Latine community whose families have Deaf children throughout California schools and programs. Through these indigenous research lenses, I learned more about how to engage others as a researcher, community member, learner, and educator. I was reminded and reconnected to the knowledge and practice of relationships. With IRM, I saw myself and the research contributors in this study reflected back to me as I realized the mundane intuitive actions in my classroom or with community members and the understanding of when and what to engage with the research contributors were not so insignificant. Frameworks, principles and concepts from indigenous research perspectives highlighted the ancestral and community knowledge along with the rules of engagement that an outsider would never be able to capture or perceive, and relational accountability—a foundational IRM concept—was key for admittance into these spaces (Archibald et al., 2019; Kincheloe, 2001, 2005; Wilson, 2008).

With these perspectives and understandings in mind, the congruence of my research intent, ethical considerations, strong discernment of power dynamics, understanding of relational accountability, and push toward a decolonial, racially, and socially just path for my decolonizing process and that of re-membering, reclaiming, and co-constructing knowledge with the Latine community in deaf education began to align with the blended works listed below to create a bricolage framework (Denzin, 1994; Kincheloe, 2001, 2005):

-Concepts of “Authentic Care” and “Educación” (Valenzuela, 1999)


-Concept of Storywork (Archibald, 2008; Archibald & Parent, 2019; Archibald et al., 2019; Davidson, 2019; Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Iseke, 2013; Penn State College of Education, 2020; Wilson, 2008)

- Critical Race Theory (CRT) tenets and concepts in education (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Crenshaw et al., 2019; Tate, 1997; Zamudio et al., 2011)

-Concept of “Interdisciplinary Synergy” (Denzin, 1994; Kincheloe, 2001, 2005)

My search for a neatly formatted framework to fit my research in and attach it to any well-established scholar was a decolonizing and re-educating journey for me as I began my research study in data collection and analysis. People do not fit nicely into simple-minded categories or binaries of any sort. People are not static and therefore it can be challenging to capture a moment in time on paper that portrays all of the historical contexts and intersectional identities. As my research continued, from the challenges and barriers of the university, meeting and interacting with research contributors, to the written draft of this
study and the relational accountability I have to the community who invited me into their lives for this study, specific awareness of themes, concepts, and principles repeatedly emerged. Within the literature and while interacting with others for the purpose of this study, in addition to my own epistemological influences, the dynamics of power presented itself consistently. Whether it was information from the literature, discussing the deaf education system, listening to Latine families share their experiences, analyzing methodologies, and/or addressing university requirements, power negotiations were consistently present. I wondered, if justice were at the center of all of these interactions, if I or others would be so aware of the power dynamics. I wondered, if I were not part of any marginalized communities, if I would notice or be able to relate to the research contributors regarding their awareness of and interaction with such power dynamics. While those are long term philosophical ponderings that I may never find answers to, it was clear that I had to address and examine power relations within this study and share the perspectives that the research contributors of this study shared with me. This has since evolved into what I term, Nepantla Consciousness, a liminal and sacred space away from European-American demands, where keen awareness of European-American oppression and power expectations is examined and reviewed prior to engaging with it. In this space, it is lined with a tension I term, El Aguante, the moment in which the decision has been made to step out and engage the power dynamics of European-American institutions and all of its systems of oppression. These terms are explored and described further in the chapter as an element of this bricolage framework.
A Word on Justice

Justice. The word alone evokes such a mixture of thoughts and emotions. It is a difficult word to describe in plain colonial English words without the juxtaposition of injustice and the many lived experiences or witnessing of that injustice. Justice could mean laws or rights or access or lack of harm to anyone. The quote by Dr. Cornel West hangs on my classroom wall, “Justice is what love looks like in public” (West, n.d.). I agree and I add that love is an unconditional acceptance of ourselves and the life around us; a visceral, spiritual, interconnected and interactive grounded knowing. Justice is the right of existing to experience joy, wonder, love, authentic care, community; es convivencia, perhaps- a complex and Latine (and most likely indigenous) culturally-affiliated concept of communalism (Villenas, 2005). For me, justice is genuinely caring about each other, feeling empathy when others are hurting, and feeling joy in witnessing their joy. Justice in this society is sharing resources, not harming each other, or coming together to solve a societal challenge. Justice in this society should be the deconstructing of colonial systems of oppression to notice pathways of self-determination and healing for historically excluded communities such as Latine families with Deaf children. It is this core understanding and desire for justice that moves me to do anything in this life. It is this justice that my parents and their parents and our community have helped me understand and fight for regardless of which community, institution, and/or topic it involves. It is this justice that connected me to the concepts of Authentic Care and Educación, ideas described by Valenzuela (1999) in her study of students identified within the umbrella of Latine identities and their school experiences.
In her description of student experiences with educators, Valenzuela (1999) noted a distinct difference of caring between Latine students and their community than that of the predominantly European-American educators at school which she described as an “authentic caring” that included the concept of “educación” (p. 61). While the word educación looks very similar to the English word education, educación carries with it a more profound and complex connection to knowledge and community as will be described in detail in the section dedicated to this element of the framework. Inseparable to these concepts is the idea (and responsibility) of relational accountability (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019) the next element of the framework and an IRM principle.

While I understand academia in European-American institutions require quotas on research projects and publishing to survive and/or establish professional standing, each of us ultimately decides the manner in which we will enter communities and take or give back. In my understanding of justice and my intent for everyone to experience justice, it stands that research conducted in any community should be for the benefit of that community and not solely for personal and individualistic gain. How am I connecting and what am I giving back when Latine families with Deaf children are sharing with me? This is the relational accountability described by Valenzuela (1999) when she explains that students want to be engaged as whole people and experience relationships of reciprocity. It is the relational accountability that Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) is founded upon (Archibald et al., 2019, Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Wilson, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). Indigenous scholars explain that everything is relational. Our knowledge is tied to the land and people
and our relationship to both. To share and pass along this knowledge requires not only a connection but a profound understanding of the historical contexts from which it came, the significance with which it is meant to be passed along to others, and the intention of how that knowledge will be used or circulated (Tuhiwai Smith 2021; Wilson 2008). This connects the next element of the framework to the method of Storywork (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019). Historically, humans have always passed along information through stories whether it was carving or painting images on rocks, sitting around fires to verbally explain, performing interpretive dances, reporting on the television, disseminating curriculum books to children, giving a sermon at the pulpit, posting on social media, or drafting a linear account of events and thoughts on paper for a dissertation. The IRM concept of Storywork offers a path to reconnect or become a member of a community through connections of sharing stories. While European-American institutions may scoff or mock the idea of story as fable, myth, and/or fantasy, I counter this idea with two responses. My first response is what I previously mentioned, that historically humans have been storytellers as long as humans have existed and though the methods have varied, stories continue. Secondly, considering that European-American systems of oppression seek to maintain power and consistently shift to invalidate other forms of knowledge, power, and/or even basic visibility of others, any degrading ideas about Storywork is obvious gaslighting and an obvious oppressive attempt to continue disregarding BIPOC scholars and indigenous practices in research, knowledge, and community. Given that European and European-American stories are what makes up most of the literary canon, for which the rest of us are required to accept as single defining truths and then forced to emulate them for perceived validation, all scholars could benefit from
conducting research with IRM frameworks and principles. Crossing paths with IRM frameworks, I related to the concept of Storywork with my previous understandings of counterstories, testimonios, oral histories, dichos, consejos, corridos, narrative research and other forms of storytelling (Blackmer Reyes & Curry Rodríguez 2012; Calzada et al., 2010; Flores, 2020; Davidson, 2019; Delgado-Gaitan, 1993, 1994; Dominguez Barajas, 2002; Fernández, 2002; Lopez, 2014; Rangel, 2019; Soto et al., 2009; Villenas, 2005; Wilson, 2008). Storywork encompasses all of these perspectives but emphasizes the importance of relational accountability and communal engagement or reciprocity (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019), that I expand upon at length in its own dedicated section.

The overarching lens I utilized in working with all of the concepts and elements of this framework continued to be the critical perspective of centering race and intersecting marginalized identities with Critical Race Theory (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Tate, 1997; Zamudio et al., 2011). While I analyzed the literature through Critical Race Theory (CRT) perspectives for the purpose of searching for moments of racial and social justice outcomes of Latine families with Deaf children that did not surface, for this section of the study, CRT played a more interactive role as will be detailed later in the chapter. In short, CRT complimented and supported each element when addressing issues of power, centering marginalized identities and engaging historically excluded communities, all with intentions of centering Latine families with Deaf children as bearers of culture, expertise, and knowledge.

As the elements of this framework blended together, it was difficult to separate them into individual components. Thus, the framework of bricolage, an interdisciplinary and
multiperspective methodological approach, served to create the structure and space in which these elements could overlap and interact. This interaction and overlapping created what Kincheloe (2001) described as synergy which I expand to call Interdisciplinary Synergy. This concept as I attempt to capture in words later in the chapter, is the interacting and communicating energy that brings forth knowledge production and knowledge awareness. While each element of the framework can be explained independently with its own definitions, it does not capture the thorough essence of their meanings in action, when each of the elements interact with each other. It is this convergence that creates a dynamic framework that is relational to the researcher and research contributors in a synergistic display of more awareness, profound meaning, and a connection or relational accountability to the Storywork or knowledge production taking place. The following sections are attempts at separating each element of the framework to share foundational contexts of this dynamic framework that functions as a whole.

*Interdisciplinary Synergy*

The conceptual, theoretical, and analytical frameworks of bricolage methodology offer the best multiperspective approach for this study. Bricolage (Denzin, 1994; Kincheloe, 2001, 2005) compliments the tenets of Critical Race Theory (CRT) (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Tate, 1997; Zamudio et al., 2011) in a manner that both lenses challenge monological knowledge and notions of objectivity. Whereas standardized and archaic monological frameworks insist on objectivity and compartmentalizing objects or subjects of study, bricolage pushes the researcher to consider and critique past these constraints to include the complexity of people and environments as never static and with
critical historical underpinnings. Within this complexity, the intellectual power of a bricoleur demands an engaging of interdisciplinary processes informed by various methodological, hermeneutical, historiological, etymological, and ethnographical processes creating a synergistic approach to research (Kincheloe, 2001). In other words, applying one framework of methodology or using just one perspective, can result in perpetuating or reinforcing monological (i.e., colonial and Eurocentric) standards of thinking and knowledge production which is the precise contradiction to the purpose of this study—examining and centering historically excluded communities such as Latine families with Deaf children in California deaf education in a decolonial manner.

While there is no specific name or label for the process and production of a bricolage framework, for this study I call it Interdisciplinary Synergy. I use the term interdisciplinary because I am utilizing concepts, methods, and frameworks that extend beyond the field of deaf education to include works from the fields of general education and Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies, such as works by Angela Valenzuela (1999), lenses from legal and law studies such as Critical Race Theory (CRT) (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Zamudio et al., 2011), social science frameworks such as principles from Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) (Archibald et al., 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019), and other works such as that of Gloria Anzaldúa (2002), Jo-Ann Q’um Q’um Archibald (2008, 2019), and research from the arts, and sciences. Using a multilayered approach to gather and analyze data ensures that I am conscious and sensitive to the complexity of people and environments as I enter community spaces for a brief moment in time (another concept I unpack later in this chapter) to observe
and collect information. Bricolage methodology provides the necessary framework to formulate this interdisciplinary approach:

As researchers draw together divergent forms of research, they gain the unique insight of multiple perspectives. Thus, a complex understanding of research and knowledge production prepares bricoleurs to address the complexities of the social, cultural, psychological, and educational domains. Sensitive to complexity, bricoleurs use multiple methods to uncover new insights, expand and modify old principles, and reexamine accepted interpretations in unanticipated contexts. Using any methods necessary to gain new perspectives on objects of inquiry, bricoleurs employ the principle of difference not only in research methods but in cross-cultural analysis as well. (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 687).

In short, bricolage methodology provides the opportunity to conduct the necessary counter-hegemonic research that is so urgently needed in the field of deaf education. By incorporating lenses from across academic disciplines and learning from historically excluded communities, such as Latine families with Deaf children, the deaf education system—which has been subjugated by European-American ideology for over 200 years—can finally break free of its monological knowledge and monocultural standards of practice, that are oppressive and archaic. Bricolage methodology researchers recognize that conducting research or producing knowledge with and about Latine families with Deaf children in California schools is a complex process requiring interdisciplinary methods and lenses from multiple angles to observe, address, and/or create insights that will disrupt centuries of monological, monocultural, and monolingual research, policy, and practices in deaf education.

I use the term synergy to address the process of combining interdisciplinary perspectives to produce a multiperspective approach that enables me to see past the literalness or monological information for a deeper inquiry and understanding of my research. I understand
that multiple lenses, people, environments, and moments in time are complex and not static. I understand that I must be sensitive to all of the moving parts of research and be open to the multiplicity of research avenues and knowledge sharing or production as these entities interact. This interaction is what I label synergy, a merging and emerging phenomenon taking place with or without me but with the understanding that I am influenced and have influence in these interactions as Denzin (1994) describes:

The bricoleur understands that research is an interactive process shaped by his or her personal history, biography, gender, social class, and ethnicity, and that of the people in the setting. The **bricoleur** knows that science is power, because all research findings have political implications. There is no value-free science. (pp. 17-18, emphasis in original)

Therefore, as a researcher understanding the complexities of this Interdisciplinary Synergy, I continually reflected and revisited all of the elements, data, and the manner in which Latine families with Deaf children are impacted or will be impacted in dynamic or dangerous ways to ensure I was being relationally accountable to the community. A constant iterative analysis of all elements involved in this study—including that of my own possible ignorance as a hearing researcher without a Deaf child—was necessary for discerning interactions from the intended perspectives in which they were taking place. The interdisciplinary perspectives along with the awareness and attention to the synergy of interactions, provided the best opportunities for ensuring research contributors were interpreted and represented in this study accurately and without intentional or unintentional harm at any level or capacity of this research. The added lens of CRT, kept me as a researcher from deviating toward European-American deficit frameworks—a tendency due
Critical Race Theory

At the time that this study began, the political and racial climate of the United States was bubbling under the surface of a Black president. While it is not within the scope of this research to detail the historical timeline of this study—not in this section at least—context is always important. During the course of this study, the political climate can be summarized by the following statements. Racism is not a surprise, especially to those who are impacted by it daily. The education system, while endemically as racist as any other European-American institution, was mostly left alone for insiders to conduct research as they pleased. With the change of presidents, a backlash to having a Black president—unlike any I have ever witnessed in my own lifetime—brought strong attention to the education system and antiracist approaches. Since these historical moments, the term Critical Race Theory (CRT) has been thrown about in all areas of this society with descriptions as ridiculous as an established curriculum for indoctrinating children for the purpose of subjugating white people. Again, I highlight the extremes that European-Americans will go to in order to protect and uphold the power and privilege of European-American supremacy, including establishing themselves as the victims of their own racism (Dillard, 2020; Donnor, 2013; Hines & Wilmot, 2018; hook, 1991; Jay, 2003; Lorde, 2007; Matias, 2013; Picower, 2009; Rodríguez, 2021; Sleeter, 2017; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Williams, 1987). It is within this tension that I chose to continue with the application of CRT as a theoretical, conceptual, and analytical foundational framework for this study. While some scholars in education have
attempted to commodify CRT into marketable aspects and easy to use checklists, I assert that CRT in this type of application is too synergetic to materialize in that manner. Power is a constant conversation when engaging CRT. Additionally, what most educational scholars tend to skip over is the in-depth critique of liberalism CRT engages (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). It was this critique that led me away from Community Cultural Wealth and on a mission to find frameworks that did not cater to liberalism ideals of emancipation, capitalism, or other convergence of interests agendas (Aleman & Aleman, 2010). There must be more to being human than labor in exchange for survival. In this critique of liberalism, CRT engages the power paradigms of objectivity and interest convergence (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Lynn & Dixson, 2013; Zamudio et al., 2011). As with other scholars across various disciplines, people are not static and therefore the concept that objectivity exists in any type of research is absurd. Particularly to the European-American institutions who hold power over every plausible aspect of interaction with such a linear view of who is deemed legitimate or not, who can be accepted or not, and who will be promoted to positions of power or not, I find it almost comical that those in power of these institutions cannot see the irony of claiming objectivity while imposing their unexamined subjective (and racist) perspectives upon everyone else. In education, nothing is value-free. In deaf education, not only is it not value-free but indeed costly due to the limited options of schools and programs across the state and under the control of predominantly hearing European-American women. This directly connects to the concept of interest convergence in that any change within deaf education systems will occur only when the predominantly European-American educators observe a structural or personal benefit for themselves or a perceived liability too great to
quell without negotiating a quick exchange (Aleman & Aleman, 2010; Lynn & Dixson 2013). Examples include token BIPOC and/or Deaf hires, targeted reprimands to suppress any disruptions of structural changes, targeted funding or sudden specific drastic change in protocol that was previously vehemently denied, and many other overt and covert power dynamic shifts to maintain the status quo (Jay, 2003; Hines & Wilmot, 2018, Picower, 2009; Zamudio et al., 2011). Were we for social and racial justice or educational equity of any type, it would not be 200 years later with the exact same system, save for a few changes in communication modalities and philosophies—that of forcing Deaf children to speak, then “allowing” them to use their own native sign language (E.N. Gertz, 2003; Humphries, 1977). If deafness were the equalizing factor in deaf education, all Latine families with Deaf children would experience similar or better outcomes than that of European-American families with Deaf children. However, two hundred years later and with only less than 50 years of access to deaf education, Latine families with Deaf children, as the largest participating population in California deaf education remain at the margins. Utilizing the CRT framework, kept Latine families with Deaf children centered within this study as visible and legitimate. For the deaf educators who struggle with centering this population, a consistent—and no doubt, incessant to some—reminder of historical contexts, power dynamics, and examples of such has been necessary throughout this study to serve as reminders and hold us accountable to the Latine families with Deaf children we engage with daily. Intentional frequent discussions of historical and contemporary evidence of Eurocentric domination and impact throughout this entire study served to keep myself and the reader actively confronting European-American supremacy, colonialism, and other
systems of oppression. European-American supremacy does not rest nor let rest, and requires active confrontation. As a process of being relationally accountable during the writing process and to demonstrate its power and pervasiveness in the daily lives of Latine families with Deaf children, I named (and continue to name) European-American (white) supremacy every time, as it continued to materialize in the classroom, in the research process, in the doctoral classrooms, in the process for data collection, among colleagues, within the literature, in the knowledge and stories shared, it persists. To confront and challenge this oppression requires dynamic frameworks and lenses. Critical Race Theory assists us as deaf educators to continually reflect on our daily actions and answer to how we are being relationally accountable to the Deaf community who are predominantly from Latine communities across California.

**Relational Accountability**

All interactions require relationship. In order to interact with another person, nature, or object, it is within the context of relationship to that person, nature, or object (Wilson, 2008). European-American ideology has commodified this idea quite well in its business sector—build a relationship to get buy-in and make a sale! Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) reminds us of the humanity in relating. To be in “relationship with” signals reciprocity, a giving and taking or an ebb and flow. When we are accountable to our relations, we share trust, we care, we revere, we love, we strive for equitable reciprocity, and we are vested in each other’s humanity, not for what we can produce and for what we can take away or capitalize (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999; Villenas, 2005; Windchief & San...
Pedro, 2019). While European-American ideology is to habitually quantify accountability through measures of production, punishment and reward, indigenous ideology is asking and reminding us to legitimize accountability through our actions and engagement of relating, of caring for the relationship, or of caring for the humanity of others outside of personal benefit or individual gain because we see each other as valuable in our own right (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Brayboy, 2013; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Weber-Pillwax, 1999, 2004; Wilson, 2001, 2003, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). Relational Accountability (RA) is synergetic and dynamic because it requires us to learn who we are, how we relate to others, and how others relate to us at levels that are not easily captured in writing or words but in energies, in blood memory, and in intuitive knowledge such as that of the Monarch butterfly that knows exactly how to relate to its kaleidoscope and engage in communal migration (Archibald, 2008; Sosa Provencio, 2019; Wilson, 2008). Relational Accountability requires deep levels of understanding and engagement to know what actions and reactions to take within those relationships. As a researcher or educator, it is ensuring positions of power are taken care of as a responsibility not to further subjugate or cause harm. It is acknowledging that as a researcher and educator, regardless of my own marginalized experiences, I hold specific relationships to power and privilege between the space of deaf education and the Latine and Deaf communities. Utilizing the framework of RA, maintains a present and continuous reminder that I must be reflective at every step of the research process to ensure that I am being accountable to Latine families with deaf children but also to the Latine and Deaf communities in the various capacities of membership that I hold within those spaces. I do not get to be researcher to take data, use it for my own personal gain, and then return to
my communities within a different capacity and not be accountable for influences or harm I might have caused. While that can occur unintentionally, this is why RA is critical to research and engaging any community in general so that we are not just aware of how communities engage at a distance but rather, understand the complexities of ontological underpinnings that shape expressions we observe and feel. In order to implement Relational Accountability, we must care enough to want to know and understand the lived experiences of Latine families with Deaf children and learn about their knowledge and expertise.

**Authentic Care and Educación**

The small word of “care” carries huge complex and relational meanings depending on how, with what, and with whom it is applied. In fact, there is much literature on the politics of care, its meanings, applications, and variations across disciplines and contexts (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Sosa-Provencio, 2019; Valenzuela, 1999). For this concept, I chose to stay close to the works of care in education from the perspectives of Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies and the associated meanings of care in education by Angela Valenzuela (1999) because this study is about the Latine community and because these works have already grounded their frameworks within the necessary racial and historical underpinnings, influential and valuable to this specific study (Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Sosa-Provencio, 2019; Valenzuela, 1999).

While the author uses the language of social capital in defining Authentic Care and Educación (Valenzuela, 1999), I expand and push toward a decolonial perspective to define these concepts as more of a communal accountability to and within the Latine community. Under European-American ideology, we all express an idea of care that students are learning
and we want them to be successful enough to contribute as functioning members of broader society. Keeping CRT and RA central, this caring shifts to a deeper understanding of what it means to care about the students, their families and the communities from which they come. In deaf education practice, these European-American educators will gaslight authentic care as “getting too involved” or “wasting academic time” as they make known their boundaries of humanity and who is worthy of it in the workplace. Within the Latine community, authentic care is embodied in all that we do within the actions or interactions between relationships, verbal or non-verbal, physically; it is an energy, an intuition, synergistic, an acknowledgement that is seen and felt that is noticed on the faces of children when they recognize it (Archibald, 2008; Sosa-Provencio, 2019; Valenzuela, 1999). A child who recognizes this authentic care is able to bring their whole self to school and that is also recognizable. While education systems speak of caring for our students, it is not in the deep-rooted familial and community sense of caring that BIPOC scholars analyze between educators and their students (Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Valenzuela, 1999). When European-American supremacy is present, no amount of telling Latine families and their Deaf children we care will convince them. We cannot both subscribe to oppressive ideologies and tout authentic care to the victims of this oppression. Within the deaf education systems, it is palpable and recognizable to Latine families with Deaf children and all BIPOC children if they are authentically care for, legitimately wanted, and unconditionally loved and accepted. Masked feelings of disgust or disdain under the guise of caring (Matias & Zembylas, 2014) for student achievement and academic outcomes will not suffice to create and sustain relationships that are accountable to Latine families and their children. It creates a hostile
environment where families and students understand they can never present their full essence and share their complete identities.

Analysis of this authentic care and masked disgust or disapproval through a CRT lens exposes the power dynamics that European-American educators exercise, (intentionally or unexamined) to maintain a separation, an “us (educators)/them (families)” mentality (Matias, 2013; Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Donnor, 2013), and therefore a perpetual Othering of Latine families and their Deaf children. This functions to distance, and therefore excuse, deaf education professionals from ever learning about, understanding, and being relationally accountable to Latine families with Deaf children and their community. Analysis from the RA perspective, exposes the deficits European-American educators have in cultural competence, social and racial justice pedagogy, and ability to care or relate authentically and accordingly. If foundational components of the relationship are lacking, then Authentic Care, and therefore RA, cannot occur with Latine families and their Deaf children. I assert we can only care as profoundly as we are willing to invest in understanding ourselves and the relationships we hold with others and even systems, objects, and our environments, such as nature. We cannot care about something or someone if we do not know about it, and if we do not care to know about it in the first place, we cannot change, improve, and/ or address systemic issues to be relationally accountable to the communities we serve such as the Latine community in deaf education.

This is a fragile subject for deaf education because for the European-American hearing women who dominate the field, it can be perceived as an insult to their years of practice. From their perspective, they have dedicated their lives obtaining years of formal education,
professional development, developing curriculum (there is no dedicated or formal deaf education curriculum— a story for another day), and supporting students in navigating and achieving as closely to hearing student counterparts as possible working within race neutral, meritocratic ideals (Matias, 2013; Matias & Zembylas, 2014: Picower, 2009). All of these factors take place within the Eurocentric and colonial European-American dominated deaf education system, where the rules of engagement cater to these educators and their monological, monocultural, and monolingual perspectives (Cohen, 1997; Mitchell, 2013; Picower, 2009: Sleeter, 2017). Any disruption to the centering of themselves or to the system that upholds their ideologies produces strong backlash and reactive responses to protect that system and avoid accountability, as has been discussed various times throughout this study (Higginbotham, 1992; Lipsitz, 2019; Rodriguez, 2021; Williams, 1987). Again, these are known tools of European-American supremacy to maintain power, deflect accountability, and perpetuate subjugation (See Chapter 2 Pedagogy of the Oppressor). As I have mentioned previously, in deaf education these actions and reactions are palpable because European-American educators have not been required to unpack their own identities, implicit and explicit bias, and examine their roles in maintaining harmful systems of oppression systemically and within their daily practice with Latine families and their Deaf children. Until we have unpacked ourselves and are equipped with tools of promoting racial and social justice rather than tools of whiteness (Picower, 2009), we will continue to cause harm to the Latine community and their Deaf children. Since this study is not about centering the predominantly hearing and female European-American educators in deaf education, I only offer these statements to demonstrate the challenge Latine families with Deaf children face
when the Authentic Care and Relational Accountability are lacking and families are left to challenge the power dynamics of what many scholars have described as the white moderate, white fragility, respectability politics and other longstanding research analyses about how European-Americans (often women) engage in and uphold racism, audism, and other systems of oppression (R. Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Jay, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2005; M.L. King, 2021; Matias, 2013; Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Matias et al., 2014; Picower, 2009; Rodríguez 2021; Thurston, 2019; Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Williams, 1987). This behavior and the expectations in school are conflicting to the concept of Educación. While rigid expectations of learning and engaging education are standards within European-American ideology of schooling, Educación is the knowledge of understanding communal standards for that learning process. It is the process of learning to engage and be within one’s community, understanding the complexities of relating to others, and being relationally accountable by reciprocating the authentic care, responsibility, reverence, and interrelatedness that expresses you are educado. It is a representation that demonstrates you understand communal knowledge as it is intended and know how to relate to it accordingly always with care and respect. Educación is the act of older generations teaching younger generations about authentic care and relational accountability to one’s relations and overall community. While European-Americans begin to accept accountability to do the work of unpacking their own identities and understand how they play a role in upholding or dismantling European-American supremacy and other harmful systems of oppression such as audism and classism within their daily lives, I turn toward Latine families with Deaf children to center their lived experiences in spite of, next to, inside of, and otherwise unapologetically present in deaf
education. In a system and society where narratives carry power to harm, to legitimize, to inspire, to educate, to live, and to know joy and love, Storywork is the appropriate method for sharing knowledge from within the Latine community and their Deaf children attending California schools.

**Storywork**

The Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) concept of Storywork engages people in real time but captures the metacommunicative aspects of knowledge sharing, that linear and printed stories cannot always describe. By metacommunicative, I mean the behaviors, inferences, contextual cues, and awareness of familial and historical references that relate to the shared knowledge at hand. For a particular story or knowledge to be shared there must be a relationship and awareness to understand and capture the metacommunicative aspects.

The bricoleur also knows that researchers all tell stories about the worlds they have studied. Thus, the narratives or stories scientists tell are accounts couched and framed within specific storytelling traditions, often defined as paradigms (e.g., positivism, postpositivism, constructivism, etc.) (Denzin, 1994, p.18).

To engage in research using Storywork, the researcher must be story ready and understand the principles of respect, responsibility, reverence, reciprocity, holism, interrelatedness, and synergy (Archibald, 2008; Archibald & Parent, 2019; Archibald et al., 2019; Penn State College of Education, 2020; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). I expand these concepts to connect to works that Latine scholars also utilize and that Latine communities apply under communal practices of authentic care, respeto (respect), educación, and various codes of participation (Delgado-Gaitan, 1993, 1994; Dominguez Barajas, 2002; Sosa-Provencio, 2019; Soto et al., 2009; Valenzuela, 1999). These Storywork principles align well with similar Latine practices and communal knowledge of relationships. For example,
addressing an elder requires metacommunicative understanding of the historical context, current moment, and insider knowledge about the rules of engagement that communicates respect and reverence. Within the Latine community, having Educación (Valenzuela, 1999), is equivalent to the combination of Storywork principles with the synergy that highlights the authentic care or vested interest in the relationship (Archibald, 2008; Penn State College of Education, 2020; Valenzuela, 1999). In Storywork, knowledge shared can be stories that carry ancestral history, offer advice, present an issue, solve a problem, inspire others, or make meaning in many other forms that are relevant to the members within that community (Archibald, 2008, Penn State College of Education, 2020). Likewise, within Latine communities, meaning making is relational and members must be familiar with the rules of engagement that have been shared as ancestral knowledge and history to know the references and methods used in sharing knowledge. For example, dichos, consejos, testimonios, or even adivinanzas are Storywork that make meaning in different ways for different situations and circumstances that community members can distinguish and relate or reciprocate accordingly. To test the validity of communal knowledge and shared understanding of experiences, I use Storywork in analyzing research contributor knowledge. By situating the shared knowledge from each contributor as a Storywork gathering, I follow the method of analysis that Wilson (2008) uses to engage the data he has gathered from individual interviews and situated together as a conversation. To center the research contributors as equal Storywork members and balance power dynamics, I engage the shared knowledge in reciprocating fashion in search of salient themes that appear communally. During my meetings with research contributors and during the process of revisiting and centering their
work for this study, I continually reflected on the process of honoring the Storywork of each research contributor while struggling to ensure that I would not perpetuate any harmful Eurocentric ideologies. It was a battle of consciousness in the space of Nepantla as I cycled through iterations of conscientization, emerging each time with deeper understanding of myself and this research process.

**Nepantla Consciousness and El Aguante**

When confronted with competing or overlapping environments, ideas, and/or identities, there is an awareness that develops to understand the structures, rules of engagement, and navigation of these realms. When the expectations for engaging are oppressive or threatening, navigation becomes an act of survival rather than just living. Many scholars have written about these competing or overlapping areas at the intersections of it as a sense of duality, a transition of change or transformation, or a liminal space of being a part of or not being a part of these competing or overlapping environments or identities. In an attempt to describe this complexity as many other scholars have also addressed (See Anzaldúa, 2002; Archibald et al., 2019; hooks, 1991; DuBois, 1903, Tuhiwai Smith, 2021; Wilson, 2008; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019), both Denzin (1994) and Kincheloe (2005) refer to working within a liminal space of being and knowing.

...paradigms as overarching philosophical systems denoting particular ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies cannot easily be moved between. They represent belief systems which attach the user to a particular world view. Perspectives, in contrast, are less well-developed systems and can be moved between more easily. The researcher-as-**bricoleur**-theorist works between and within competing and overlapping perspectives and paradigms. (Denzin, 1994, p. 17-18).

This liminal space that scholars have attempted to describe is what I term Nepantla Consciousness. Nepantla is a precolonial indigenous word in Nahuatl defined as “estar en
medio” (to be in the middle of), an “inbetweeness” (Anzaldúa, 2002; UNAM, 2012). I add to the term consciousness because while many can be in and out of this liminal space just trying to survive, there may not be a critical awareness of it, the manner in which it functions, or how it impacts individuals or communities. Nepantla Consciousness therefore, is defined as this absolute keen awareness that you are inside of this middle space and you are aware of the physical, spiritual, and/or conceptual tensions competing, overlapping and/or interacting. It is Nepantla Consciousness that DuBois (1903) and Anzaldúa (2002) also describe in the following written works.

In his work, The Souls of Black Folks, W.E.B. DuBois (1903) wrestles with his identity as a Black man and as an American citizen in society during an overtly and dangerously racist time. He terms this grappling as a type of double-consciousness in which he cannot fully be part of both experiences simultaneously (DuBois 1903). In this state of double-consciousness, DuBois (1903) contends and negotiates with himself in a gap he designates as the Veil, noting that an uneven duality in his thoughts, ideals, and duties cause him incredible turmoil. In the Veil, DuBois (1903) finds the space to realize and deliberate his sense of twoness, struggle with irreconcilable demands from either side, and admit to the warring, doubt, and bewilderment of his soul as a result. The Veil becomes the zone of intersections, contradictions, and a sacred region in which to find transformative ways of living in and outside of its borders.

Likewise, in her work titled, “now let us shift…the path of conocimiento…inner work, public acts”, Gloria Anzaldúa (2002) wrestles with her identity as a Queer Chicana feminist within European-American society. She describes a process of stark upending filled with
chaos and crisis with moments of self-contempt and self-realization. Through cycles of conflict, awareness, and transformation which she assigns to stages or pathways toward transformed consciousness or ways of knowing called the “seven stages of conocimiento”, the author continuously develops a clearer understanding of herself and how she identifies within various contexts outside of this struggle (Anzaldúa, 2002, p. 543). Similar to the double-consciousness of DuBois (1903), Anzaldúa (2002) describes sensing a split awareness or double knowing in which she struggles to deconstruct and transform herself outside of the social structures that attempt to convince and define her. Within these stages, her Veil, or space of engaging this split awareness, is identified as Nepantla, an indigenous word meaning an in-between space (Anzaldúa, 2002). The author expounds upon this term to describe the concept of liminality within cultures of race, class, sexuality and other social structures that cause great conflict and contradiction to embody as one existence (Anzaldúa, 2002). Within Nepantla, Anzaldúa (2002) experiences that same turmoil with profound awareness that she is entrenched in oppositional ideals and identities that demand and reject different aspects of her being. As with DuBois (1903) and the chaotic yet sacred area of the Veil, Nepantla, this lugar entremedio (roughly defined and “in between space”), is also a safe haven for revolutionary transformation to occur amidst the extreme chaos of these contradictions with which she must reckon (Anzaldúa, 2002).

It is within this space, that I term Nepantla Consciousness, that I too experienced much of what DuBois (1903) and Anzaldúa (2002) describe with a keen awareness of the ontological and epistemological divides. Indigenous to the Americas yet perpetual foreigner, communal and collective yet individualistic or competitive, teaching for justice or teaching for
capitalism and the contradictions are endless with no satisfactory response to the systems
demanding one existence. It is within this space that I wrestled with deciding how to present
my authentic self, whether to speak truth to power, continuously negotiating which part of
my identity was safe outside of my community and which part of me influenced by
European-American supremacy was unacceptable or harmful within my community. These
are the struggles and straddling that I analyzed within the space of Nepantla Consciousness,
keenly aware of what waited for me beyond this safe space where I could just be and pause in
transition. Lining this sacred space, is El Aguante, the visceral knowing of the “ooof!” and
shaking of the hand up and down quickly. El Aguante is the whole-body experience of
having to live in a colonial society, entering into European-American society, armed with the
decisions you have made for the moment or the day, knowing exactly what awaits and still
coming out on the other side having survived. In the Latine community when someone has
endured such a horrific experience that seems unbearable and feels like it takes super human
strength to survive it, we say- que aguante! It is more than endurance, more than grit, more
than pressure, more than suffering, more than just the literal sense of the word and it can be
tied to the wounds of unfathomable injustice. Just as educación is more than a translated
word of education that carries various concepts, feelings, and behaviors, El Aguante also
carries a heavy heart, an almost unavoidable harm, despair, and extreme visceral knowing of
injustice. It holds many of our dichos and consejos close such as that of sacrifice, doing the
just thing regardless of the suffering, supporting others without qualifying, and enduring
emotional, physical, psychological costs, but never spiritual. It is, for the European-American
reference: being put through the wringer expecting death and harm but turning up on the
other side realizing it could not kill the spirit. It is a concept too synergistic to capture in English or Spanish words as it is the relationship to the Latine community who have the experiential knowledge of immediately understanding what El Aguante infers and how. It is not something Latine readily use to describe anything else other than for the response of witnessing or learning about someone who has experienced great aguante that appeared impossible yet has emerged from it. It is profoundly relational to the community and to each relationship that engages the concept of that shared experience. El Aguante is what the Latine community experiences each time it is in contact with European-American supremacy and survives it. Latine families with Deaf children decide each day to send their children to school keenly aware of the dangers but also expecting we will see their humanity.

It is this Bricolage framework of overlapping synergistic elements that converged for a process that assisted my analysis of this study. Because everything is relational, this process also became the overarching framework for analyzing ontological, epistemological and axiological foundations beyond this written work and into my daily life and life’s work with others. In my attempt to visualize the process and with the co-constructing knowledge of Dra. Rangel, Figure 10 emerged as the final image of that tentatively represents the theoretical, analytical, and conceptual methodology that took place during this doctoral process which will no doubt continue shifting as I continue unpacking myself, working toward decolonial practices for myself, within my communities, and within any work I commit to that is working toward racial and social justice. These processes kept me accountable to the relationship of this writing and to the relationship of the Latine families with Deaf children as I immediately began putting theory into practice during this journey. As a method of member
checking and testing generalizability, building communities with relational accountability and authentic care in the spaces I inhabit, continue to show promise. The process of these methods, details of the challenges I encountered with trying to access resources for this study, and the application of decolonial approaches are described throughout the remainder of chapter three. Latine families with Deaf children are introduced as equivalent researchers for this study as a decolonial act of legitimate acknowledgement that these communities have valid, important, and necessary research knowledge, research methodologies, and overall research practices from any perspective one wishes to gaze.

Figure 10

Second Iteration of Decolonial Ontology, Epistemology, Axiology Framework

Note: Image of final conscientization process incorporating Latine and IRM values.

Research Study Preparation Protocol

The following sections outline the protocol preparation to analyzing the data. This research study began with drafting an IRB proposal for research through my affiliated
university. The initial proposal requested permission to conduct research with 12 Latine families who spoke Spanish in the home and had Deaf children who communicated through American Sign Language (ASL) at school and at home. These families were to have their Deaf children currently enrolled at the “California Deaf Education School”. That deaf education program was composed of multiple sites that served Deaf students from ages 3 to 22 from preschool through an adult transition program. The “California Deaf Education School” was designated to be the only institution for participation recruitment with permission from the County/District Superintendent of Schools (Appendix M), the County/District Special Education Director (Appendix L), and the deaf education principal of the “California Deaf Education School” (Appendix K). Consent forms from the superintendent and deaf education program principal were to be submitted following IRB approval. Consent was denied by the principal which will be described further in the chapter.

The proposed study criteria for research contributor recruitment sought 12 adults who identified as Latine family members between the ages of 18 and 80. These Latine family members were required to be using Spanish as their primary language and be living in the home of a Deaf child who utilized ASL at home and at school. The Deaf children of these research contributors were required to be a part of the proposed research site. Protocol letters, surveys, and other required IRB documentation was prepared and included for IRB research approval. This included describing my research study design which was slated to be qualitative semi-structured interviews after sending out recruitment surveys at the proposed deaf education program sites. A short survey (Appendix A and Appendix B) was created for recruitment purposes. A letter of consent to participate (Appendix E and Appendix F) with a
description of the study was created for research participation. A protocol of interview questioning (Appendix C and Appendix D) was designed with emphasis on research contributor navigation of deaf education programs. The general intent and purpose of the study was to gather and provide information on how Spanish speaking Latine families with signing Deaf children navigate the deaf education system.

As the principal investigator, I also shared that I had been part of this proposed research site in various capacities five years prior to this research study and for a period of several years which provided me with some familiarity of the program and educators but I did not have any current affiliation with the proposed deaf education research site. Therefore, there were no real or perceived conflicts of interest by being involved in this research study. Fortunately, due to the denial of consent to access the research site by the program’s principal, I returned to the IRB proposal process to reconsider my options which led me to a more widespread recruitment and a necessary self-reflection that shifted my entire perspective, approach, and relationships to both the act of conducting research and the manner in which I engage my community overall.

**Recruitment Process**

This study recruitment process began with intentions of recruiting 12 Latine families with Deaf children through personally known California Bay Area regionalized, state, and/or independent deaf programs and schools via recruitment surveys (Appendix A and Appendix B). Recruitment introduction letters in English (Appendix G) and Spanish (Appendix H) were drafted. I prepared recruitment surveys in English (Appendix A) and Spanish (Appendix B). Letters to deaf education programs and schools (Appendix K) for site access,
and letters to Latine families for consent were prepared in English (Appendix E) and Spanish (Appendix F). The proposed protocol for data collection in English (Appendix C) and Spanish (Appendix D) was also drafted to submit for IRB approval to the university. While I awaited IRB approval, I reached out to the proposed research site to confirm access. Because I am not the norm in this field (i.e., a hearing European-American woman), the challenges of recruiting families in this manner required reassessment and expansion of recruitment beyond the spaces of educational programs and schools within the field of deaf education. It became evident very quickly that the predominantly European-American educators within the field of deaf education, as the literature has delineated across policy, research, and practice were intent on upholding the status quo—that of monolingual and monocultural European-American educators and standards. I was forced to reconsider my options for research sites.

A fairly easy process for recruitment could have been conducted through my place of employment. At that time, my employment required access to a database of deaf education students across a California county and in some cases across the state depending on the type of database utilized by other California counties. This database contained over 500 families with children who received various services and supports for deaf education within that specific county. With the click of a few buttons, I could have certainly printed out addresses and easily sent out recruitment letters for this research study to the entire county of deaf education related families. The supervisor would have probably given consent as many researchers conduct research from their own workplaces, labs, and institutions for ease of access and convenience. It did not feel ethical and at the time I did not know the words to
describe how this type of recruitment lacked relational accountability. I would be taking from strangers for my own academic benefit with no real direct impact to those from whom I took.

I proceeded with the ethical standard of first reaching out to deaf education schools and programs where I had previously worked and where I had professional relationships. In preparation as stated previously, I drafted an introduction and research study explanation letter (Appendix G and Appendix H), initial recruitment survey (Appendix A and Appendix B), and stuffed in an envelope with an enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. The original consent request letters (Appendix E and Appendix F) for access to recruit at the deaf education programs and schools described the study and procedure on disseminating the research contributor surveys for recruitment. For the original planned research site, I asked if these survey envelopes could be given out to all deaf education students at the multiple sites. I also offered to disseminate the envelopes of surveys myself by standing outside of the school at the pick-up and bus zone and hand out these packets to all students boarding a bus and/or families who came by to pick up their children.

It became apparent fairly quickly that I would not be able to access these educational spaces to recruit research contributors for my study. I first noticed this dynamic when I was in graduate school for my master’s programs. I came to understand that in order to have research access, I would need a deaf education credential to be able to elicit cooperation to conduct further research that relied on those important relationships and credibility. Yet, even after I obtained that—deaf education credential, master’s degree in Chicana/o/x (Latine) Studies, and master’s degree in Special Education, complimented by several years of professional experience—colleagues in the field who knew me and knew my work, I was still
considered an outsider in deaf education when it came to requesting access or equal standing as that of my European-American colleagues. For example, in one program, an educator stated, “You know you can’t make any more money with a doctorate in deaf education.”, while another stated, “We don’t need any more experts in deaf education! What we need is someone who knows the law.” After reaching out and explaining twice to an educator in charge of one deaf education program, because I had not heard back after sending letters of my research, requests, and protocol, I received a response of, “No. That is my final answer.” I had never received a first answer. Simultaneously, I received a response from this educator’s supervisor, a Latine supervisor who was not familiar with deaf education but temporarily overseeing that particular program. This Latine supervisor, approved my access to recruit only for the purpose of self-interest in the study and gave me permission to overstep the educator in charge. Because of the vulnerability of being the only Latine educator of the Deaf in the area and being further ostracized by the predominantly European-American dominated field (power dynamics I have explained at length in previous sections), I opted not to recruit from this program as I perceived it as a danger to my career and access to later professional access or opportunities. That Latine supervisor did not remain in the field long as has been the standard in special and deaf education. These experiences are similar to what has been explained at length in chapter two and what also emerged with Latine families with Deaf children who had similar experiences and witnessed similar practices.

My next option after reaching out to deaf education programs directly and not obtaining access, was to reach out to audiology departments. Again, I carried these prepared packets,
some in English and some in Spanish. My cohort mate Dra. Adriana Rangel, assisted me with this preparation including the designing and building manila-folder made boxes with signage and decoration for attention. Dra. Rangel accompanied me to audiology offices across the Bay Area where I requested permission to leave these recruitment packet boxes in lobbies, waiting areas, front office counters, and hallways. These locations also reacted in similar form as had educators in deaf education programs. All locations denied access except for one. In one particular location, I was referred to another department for consideration. After explaining my research and requests, I was told I would receive a call to confirm or deny. A few days later I received a call with two names of audiologists who would allow me to leave these packets in their offices with some conditions. I needed to submit a new IRB with their own research institution and add their names to my research. I would be the second author. At the time I did not understand academia and its author sequencing protocol but my intuition advised me to decline.

The next option was to begin reaching out to individual scholars and colleagues who might be willing to refer Latine families with Deaf children to me, assist in recruiting by giving out my prepared packets, and/or personally introduce me to any of their scholarly or Latine family connections. My survey recruitment slowly became a snowball recruitment with one scholar recruitment and a chance encounter with a former Latine parent with a Deaf child whom I had met a decade prior to this research. Both these individuals referred me to Latine families with Deaf children who in turn shared my recruitment surveys with their connections. As these connections shared the next possible recruitment it emphasized the IRM frameworks with how to enter communities, how to be relationally accountable and
how to take care of the knowledge shared with me. Each individual I met who shared a possible recruit or accepted to be recruited impacted my way of conducting research and I began to map the process (Appendix I) which later informed the study in the areas of power dynamics and related strongly to some of the emerging themes from several research contributors. My original plan to conduct research in the Bay Area near my work and home soon became a research project that expanded the state to include the northern, central, and southern locations of California. Additionally, as I traveled throughout the state to meet Latine families with Deaf children, I was invited, in relationally accountable and reciprocal manner, to conferences, events, meetings, parties, and other gatherings that assisted in recruiting interested contributors. It was the communal understanding and recognition that provided the tools for me to navigate and enter this community without having previously met. It was the communal vetting and analysis by Latine families who acknowledged my relationship and welcomed me into their homes and celebrations. While some Latine families respectfully recognized me as an educator from the deaf education system and therefore unsafe to contribute to this research, they supportively referred me to others who were ready to engage this type of interaction. As I met Latine families, attended social gatherings, and continually cycled through this process of conscientization, I shifted my research plan to center Latine families with Deaf children for who they are and how they thrive, rather than a Eurocentric framework of meeting a checklist that would fit nicely into oppressive deaf education beliefs or expectations. Nine Latine family members from northern, central, and southern California agreed to share their time with me for the purpose of this study.
Setting

All meetings for each research contributor took place in a location they preferred. Many contributors preferred to meet in the comfort of their own homes. One contributor asked to meet at the school where their Deaf child was enrolled. Two other contributors met in the home of a close friend and mentor due to time constraints. With the exception of the contributor who met me at school, all other contributors utilized the living room or kitchen areas of the homes for meeting. Most research contributors set up the area for the entire family which at times included spouses, hearing children, Deaf children, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and sometimes close family friends or neighbors. While other family members or friends were openly invited to sit and witness the process, people came and left. Sitting arrangements for each meeting was always in the form of a circle or sitting together rather than across from each other. For example, in the living room of one family, the family set up kitchen chairs around a couch to create a circle. The family invited me to sit on the couch while they sat in the chairs. Water and cake were offered to me and I accepted. In another home, the family used the kitchen table where I was served pan dulce (Mexican sweet bread), and hot tea. The parent sat to the left of me at a square table rather than across. The parent placed their copy of the interview questions aside and scooted in to share my copy.

Characteristic of the Latine community, families invited me into their homes and offered me something to eat or drink. The contributor who met with me at school, searched their bag and brought out a cough drop and candies to offer. The two research contributors who met with me in someone else’s home also searched for something to give. One research contributor, with nothing to give, asked if I wanted water and went to ask the home owner for
water to give me even though I had my own bottle of tea on the table. The other contributor at the home of a friend, having just arrived from work via two bus transfers to meet with me, searched their belongings and pulled out a fruit I had never seen in real life— a passionfruit. The research contributor offered it to me and asked if I was familiar with it when she saw my reaction. She educated me quickly on the fruit and I later recognized it at a grocery store where prices averaged three dollars for one. With each research contributor, I recognized Latine communal knowledge of food and drink offerings as a gesture of welcoming and reciprocal understanding of community norms. As time progressed, research contributors recognized my own understanding of Latine community knowledge and practices as they vetted me with each of their own questions or actions, such as getting up to wash dishes and me joining them while we continued to engage in conversation. These were contributors I was meeting for the first time in my life but I understood exactly what I needed to do and how I needed to engage to collect their expertise and knowledge about living with Deaf children. Of the nine research contributors, seven contributors engaged in some type of, what I will call “moving conversations”, in which I moved from my chair or the couch, to join the research contributor in physically tending to a task. During my time with research contributors, I engaged in dish washing, drawing with a child, problem-solving an argument between children, carrying in the groceries, watching a child explain a situation to me or sharing their school experiences, clearing up the table, pulling out a splinter from a child’s hand, setting up an area for a later event, eating pan dulce (Mexican sweet bread), eating a full meal of chorizo, eggs, beans, with nopales (cactus), eating passionfruit, eating tres leches cake (cake made with three different types of milk), and eating or drinking other snacks and
drinks that were offered to me, and joining the research contributor tending to small tasks here and there, as intuitively appropriate for Latine families. For example, in one home a young neighbor came to the door to inform the research contributor of a situation outside. Instinctively, I stood to join the family outside to tend to the situation which resulted in my aiding in removing a splinter from a child’s finger. It was only in hindsight that I began to note the communal understanding of tending to real-time interactions while maintaining the conversation with the research contributors that did not distract or deter from the knowledge sharing process. Instead, the interactions continued while we engaged in other activities.

A European-American researcher would have likely been confused or felt that Latine families were uninterested with the research or that the interview was over. Perhaps damaging assumptions and deficit analyses would have resulted due to the lack of communal knowledge and relational accountability. I wonder if this is what previous scholars witnessed without communal knowledge, who then produced deficit and harmful descriptions of Latine families devoid of relational accountability for the purpose of personal and professional advancements in academia. It is a betrayal for the Latine families with Deaf children to have researchers impose their presence, collect data, and harm the entire community with findings that are misunderstood, misinterpreted and perceived from a lens of superiority. On the other hand, the dearth in literature on Latine families with Deaf children may also speak to the communities awareness of potential harm. Having an understanding and respect for ontological and epistemological groundings, being familiar with expressions of communal practices, and knowing the difference between culture and imposed circumstances are necessary for conducting ethical and relationally accountable research. With these “moving
conversations” that always returned to the original setting, a researcher would need to have relational knowledge by the information shared if the conversation was genuine, a cue to end, or a vetting procedure by the community member. These shared experiences with each research contributor allowed me to reflect and analyze what types of knowledge, behaviors, or patterns were communal and which were circumstantial as I witnessed similarities emerge across nine individuals who lived apart from each other and with different experiences or perspectives. I also noticed how I was continually vetted as each contributor situated me within their frameworks of knowledge and understanding as well, a welcomed reciprocal process of the research process.

**Research Contributors**

The Latine families with Deaf children who contributed to this study by sharing their knowledge and lived experiences with me, included eight households, one of which included two family members, for a total of nine Latine family members. Each family member met the requirements for participation which included the following criteria:

1) You are an adult of at least 18 years of age.

2) You identify within the umbrella term of “Latine” which includes indigenous peoples within the political borders of present-day North and South America and surrounding islands with the exception of present-day Canada. For example, research contributors could identify as Latina, Latino, Latinx, Latine, Hispanic, Mexican, Honduran, Salvadoran, Guatemalan, Puerto Rican, Chicana, Chicano, Chicanx, any “Latinoamerican” indigenous identifiers such as Maya, and/or any hyphenated American identifiers within this demographic such as “Mexican-American”. 
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3) You reside in the state of California at the time of the study.

4) You live with at least one Deaf child in the home who is currently enrolled or has attended a California school within the past five years.

5) You are willing to share 90 minutes of your time to share your experiences.

The nine Latine family members with Deaf children, Table 1, all fell within the age range of 25 to 80 years old. Two of the nine research contributors stated to have been born within the political borders of the USA, specifically California. The other seven members stated to have been born outside of current-day California in areas within current-day México and El Salvador prior to living in California. All contributors stated to have been living in California for at least the past five years. Contributors resided in the northern, central, and southern areas of California at the time of the study. Access to institutional education was afforded to all nine contributors with varying opportunities. The highest level of education, as understood by USA educational standards, was undergraduate level education with one contributor earning a Bachelor’s degree from a California university. Other contributors accessed community college, high school, middle school, and elementary level educational opportunities across the three present-day countries of USA, México, and El Salvador. Six contributors resided with one Deaf child in the home, while the other three contributors resided with at least two Deaf children in the home. Within the home, languages used to communicate with family members including the Deaf children, included English, Spanish, American Sign Language (ASL), and other sign languages and gestures. Only one contributor did not use American Sign Language in the home as they had just recently identified the Deaf child with having hearing loss and were in the process of connecting to
sign language classes in the community. Assistive Listening Devices (ALD) of the Deaf children also ranged from using no devices of amplification at home, school, or within the community, to devices utilized at home, school, and/or within the community that included Behind-The-Ear (BTE) hearing aids, Cochlear Implants (CI), and/or Bone Anchored Hearing Aids (BAHA). Contributors had a wide range of occupations from working within institutions such as universities or schools to working in agricultural industries of factories and fieldwork. The Deaf children also came from a diverse range of deaf education experiences which included residential regular education schools, county or district deaf education programs with deaf education classrooms, residential Deaf schools, and regional deaf education programs. While the Deaf children were not included as direct research contributors, families encouraged their presence and sharing during our meetings which informed this work and my own understanding of each research contributor as part of the family. For the protection and confidentiality of the research contributors and their children’s rights to privacy, no specific demographic information regarding education levels, location, ALD details, employment, or other identifying markers were attached to individuals. Because the Deaf community is considered small and close knit, members are easily identified within the community regardless of location. For example, Deaf community members from Napa may know Deaf community members from Florida or even Thailand. To respect the privacy and honor the openness and trust with which research contributors shared, demographics were grouped together, pseudonyms were used for all individuals presented. Additionally, I masked gender for some portions of this study.
Table 1

Research Contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Contributors</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanarani</td>
<td>Aymara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapik</td>
<td>Nayarak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti y Taiyari</td>
<td>Asiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakúh</td>
<td>Suyana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: List of Latine research contributors with designated pseudonyms.

Procedure of Analysis and Presentation

Analysis for this study involved multiple processes and from various perspectives. To prepare myself for the analysis of each section of this study, I engaged in self-reflection and member-checking with peers, colleagues, and former Deaf students. Each interaction and discussion about this study encouraged deeper self-reflexivity and ontological shifting (See Figure 10). The Decolonial Ontology, Epistemology, Axiology Framework in Figure 10 became the visual representation of the constant comparative analysis (Charmaz, 2014; Creswell, 2013) that I engaged in throughout the entire dissertation process. Cycling through this framework for each section allowed me to theorize and apply ideas or findings in real-time with current Latine families and their Deaf children. As a form of member-checking and analysis, I frequently engaged Latine and Latine Deaf friends, colleagues, and community members with general topics, themes, or possible findings. Additionally, as a practitioner, I engaged Deaf students in real-time discussions about their concepts of authentic care, relational accountability, and what they need from me as an educator to be able to show up to
school in their complete essence and whole identity. These real-time comparative analysis and member-checking practices assisted with deepening my understanding of Latine families with Deaf children and assisted in identifying communal themes within the shared knowledge as a whole story of one community. The Bricolage framework of the six conceptual elements assisted with defining the boundaries and protocol of meeting research contributors and maintaining the appropriate lenses for listening and engaging. As a multiperspective and interdisciplinary approach, it allowed for dynamic interactions such as that of “moving conversations” and knowing when to help an elder, while maintaining a protocol of authentic, ethical, and accountable relationships that simultaneously and reciprocally impacted my ontological and epistemological understandings (Archibald, 2008; Denzin, 1994; Kincheloe, 2001, 2005; Wilson, 2008). Both the analytical framework and conceptual framework held me accountable to the research contributors and the research process as it perspective outlines served as protocol to counter bias and any internalized colonial propensity of defaulting into European-American supremacist ideology or harmful deficit analysis. To present the collective knowledge of the research contributors, Storywork in a communal format was designed to incorporate shared analysis (Wilson, 2008). In his Storywork example with colleagues and elders, Wilson (2008) positioned himself within a literary circle of discussion with data from interviews and meeting he had conducted separately. As a form of Storywork analysis, Wilson situated the data as reciprocal conversation that produced a dynamic experience of knowledge engagement. As a dynamic form of analysis, I engaged communal responses to preliminary observations by conducting community check-ins at conferences, events, and social gatherings and discussing topics of
relational accountability with Deaf students and colleagues. Rather than imposing my individualistic analysis in compartmentalized lists of findings, Storywork is presented communally as conversational exchanges to allow communal knowledge to emerge and keep Latine families with Deaf children at the center of their own research and expertise.

**Positionality**

My most pressing concern during this entire research process was the possibility of any harm I might do in my own ignorance of something I may have overlooked or have not yet learned or understood about the Latine community in general and specifically about Latine families with Deaf children. As a hearing Latine who identifies as Indigenous Chicana without a Deaf child, I treaded carefully between my hearing privilege and identity perspectives, also aware of power and privilege dynamics as an educator and part of a system that has caused harm. To balance power dynamics during meetings and the analysis of research contributor knowledge, I practiced relational accountability. This was demonstrated in the way I communicated with research contributors, their children, and any family or friends who were present during our meetings. This included engaging in select word choices and language that informed others of how I situated myself within the dynamics of power of their presence regardless the status outside of that context, which relayed my understanding of communal norms in showing respect and reverence to those around me. Additionally, I frequently checked any assumptions or preliminary findings with Latine and Latine Deaf community members in open discussion, as practice, and direct inquiries to help me confront any overreaching I might be doing or veering toward oppressive ideologies and deficit analyses. Being part of some of the communities I engaged with provided insider knowledge
in some aspects of the research but as an outsider in other areas, I am sure I will learn of limitations or missed opportunities that I missed as I continue to self-reflect and do better.

**Summary of Chapter 3**

Nine research contributors accepted the invitation to share their knowledge about having a Deaf child and participating in deaf education within the California education system. Conducting research within the Latine community requires an ethical, caring, and respectful approach that does not denigrate its members or their communal knowledge. To center Latine families as legitimate holders of knowledge, European-American research methodologies did not suffice. This study applied Indigenous Research Methodology with Critical Race Theory to engage Latine families with Deaf children in a collaborative, sharing, and co-construction of knowledge around their lived experiences. A Bricolage framework of six conceptual elements was comprised as a decolonial conceptual framework for conducting research while a decolonial analytical framework was designed to assist with constant comparative analysis of shared knowledge. Additionally, Latine and Latine Deaf community members served as member-checking partners for general ideas and themes that surfaced to refine analysis in a communal process. Attending conferences, events, and other social gatherings to verify ideas and concepts assisted with reinforcing or debunking preliminary findings. As analysis yielded several themes, research contributors were positioned through Storywork to share their knowledge in communal presentation.
Chapter 4: Research Storywork Sharing

The general objective of this qualitative research study was to learn about Latine families with Deaf children in California schools. Specifically, I sought to learn and understand the lived experiences of Latine families with Deaf children and how their experiences shape their roles in deaf education schools or programs. Lastly, I explored and reported on the implications of centering the lived experiences of these Latine families with Deaf children in California schools. As stated in the previous chapter, proposed data collection included a recruitment survey (Appendix A; Appendix B) and a request for a one time 90-minute in-depth interview. Nine Latine family members (one household which was a couple) who lived with at least one Deaf child in the home opted into the study to share their lived experiences for a total of eight separate families from the areas of Northern, Central, and Southern California. As a result of member-checking my protocol with a community member, the in-depth interview protocol shifted to what can be described in European-American standards of research as, semi-structured narratives and a quasi-ethnographic approach. From an Indigenous Research Methodology (IRM) perspective, Relational Accountability was foundational when meeting families which resulted in a synergistic connection where families invited me to stay longer than the 90-minute request and subsequently invited me back to later events, celebrations, other significant meetings and introduced me to other Latine community members including those of the Deaf community. The opportunity to stay with the families for longer periods of time, not only provided more data but enriched the data by adding profound context to their shared stories and allowed more opportunity to verify information to understand emerging themes with more confidence. While one moment
in time or a few quotes in conversation can have meaningful context, it cannot compare to the meaning-making that can be drawn from various conversations around similar topics or concepts over a longer period of time and within the environmental happenings in which they are taking place. The time spent with the research contributors allowed for a multiperspective view of exchanges between multiple languages (Spanish, English, and/or American Sign Language), body language and gestures that conveyed emphasis on meaning beyond literal words on a page or voice recordings, and overall communication or engagement at levels an unfamiliar outsider would not be able to detect, as part of Latine, knowledge, community, practices, and the interrelating with Deaf knowledge, practices, and community.

While all of these synergistic interactions took place simultaneously or in synchrony with other practices or conversations, capturing them in linear descriptive format is not an easy feat. Therefore, I use the dynamic IRM framework of Storywork to present these shared lived experiences. Through Storywork, I situate research contributors within a literary gathering, such as would be a typical communal Latine gathering of members to share experiences of insight, knowledge, strengths, and other experiences as if we were in conversation together. As each research contributor shares their experiences around a specific theme, I introduce other research contributors who share similar experiences as a way of performing constant comparative analysis. Additionally, I respond in communal conversation with personal witness accounts I too have experienced, within my profession or within a related theme that reinforces the thread of conversation.
Introduction to the Research Contributors

The following table, Table 2, describes the demographics of the research contributors who opted into the study. Each name utilized is a pseudonym and a name from various indigenous groups and languages across the Americas. I chose to use indigenous names to honor the ancestral history and knowledge of these Latine families with Deaf children. While I do not speak or know these indigenous languages personally, I conducted extensive research on names and significance to ensure each of the research contributors were given a pseudonym that was a relational reflection of my experience with each research contributor and how they impacted me, as we spent several hours or half a day together.

Table 2

Research Contributor Language and Location Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Contributor</th>
<th>Deaf Children in the home</th>
<th>Languages used in the home</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanarani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English, Spanish, American Sign Language</td>
<td>Home of research contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanish, American Sign Language</td>
<td>Home of research contributor’s friend during Deaf event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se' ti Talyari</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English, Spanish, American Sign Language</td>
<td>Home of research contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakú h</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English, Spanish, American Sign Language</td>
<td>Home of research contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aymara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English, Spanish</td>
<td>School of Deaf student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanish, American Sign Language, Mexican Sign Language</td>
<td>Home of research contributor’s friend during Deaf event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English, Spanish, American Sign Language</td>
<td>Home of research contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suyana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English, Spanish, American Sign Language</td>
<td>Home of research contributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Selected identifying information regarding Research Contributors.

Additional information shared is the number of Deaf children within the Latine family, the languages I observed being used throughout my time with each research contributor, and the location in which I conducted the meeting. While there are other statistical and
demographic details that could have been collected and shared, the Deaf community is small and close-knit where any given Deaf student, adult, or member of the community can be readily identifiable across the globe by significant markers that are shared. To maintain confidentiality and ensure research contributors and their Deaf children are not easily recognized or treated differently as a result of this study, I chose to share only these four directly attributed demographic details of the families. Other demographic details throughout chapter three and within chapter four are shared as group description only and not directly attributed to the research contributor who shared that specific attribute or statistic. Additionally, for each Deaf child mentioned by name, a gender-neutral pseudonym will be utilized along with the pronouns “they” and “their” to ensure confidentiality for the Deaf children who might continue to be in deaf education programs and schools at the time of publication.

As research contributors shared their identities and understanding of the complicated and problematic terms used to identify our Latine community, researcher contributors agreed with the idea of using an umbrella term for this study. The term initially designated was Latina/o which evolved to Latinx and which finally resulted in removing gender markers altogether for the term of Latine, terms described in earlier chapters. Some contributors also decided to share the geopolitical regions of The Americas from which they were born, lived in, and/or moved to, throughout their lived experiences. As a result, the information shared indicates that all research contributors have rooted experiences within current-day El Salvador, México, and the United States of America. All contributors live within the political borders of current-day California and have Deaf children attending deaf education schools or
programs within the state and/or have had Deaf children attending within the past five years at the time of meeting together.

Name selection for each research contributor and Deaf child was a process I decided to conduct in relationship to how I came to know each person, how they expressed their roles in the family and within the deaf education system, and the manner in which I came to know them personally. In addition, to honor indigenous peoples of the Americas and first languages, I dedicated several hours seeking names that reflected the meanings of how I came to know each Latine family member. Following, I briefly describe the intentional pseudonyms chosen for each research contributor, identify the first peoples’ language each name comes from and my reason for choosing the name.

In the P’urépecha language, Shanarani takes on the translation of “caminante” in Spanish or “walker” in English. However, Shanarani carries with it a relational understanding within the community and language that the concept is a collaborative or balanced union between femininity and masculinity, a leader of energies. I observed to understand that Shanarani is the caminante, the leader, walking with, and not ahead of, Latine families with Deaf children. Shanarani’s strength in showing, not telling, was critical to the profound relationships she held with her Deaf child, the Latine community, Latine families with Deaf children and her active involvement in deaf education at state and local levels.

In the Mazateco language, Seti takes on the translation of “brillante” in Spanish or “shiny” in English. I understood Seti to be a lively and proud parent to her Deaf children. I observed to understand that Seti is the light that shines upon the joy of having Deaf Latine children. Seti’s strength in shining the light upon the joys of parenting Deaf children was
critical to the profound relationships she held with her Deaf children and her desire to show them how to be proud of being Latine and Deaf.

In the Huichol language, Taiyari takes on the translation of “nuestro corazón” in Spanish or “our heart” in English. I observed to understand that Taiyari was all heart, “de todo corazón” (roughly translated to “goodhearted people”). Taiyari wanted everyone to succeed whether he knew them or not, demonstrating a strong Latine community characteristic of relational accountability. Taiyari’s strength in describing and seeking ways to uplift his spouse, his Deaf children, and his Latine community was critical to the profound relationships he held with his spouse in raising Deaf children, his Deaf children, the Latine community and his strong desire to learn more about how to support Latine families with Deaf children, not only his own.

In the Quechua language, Aymara (not to be confused with the names of languages or locations: Aymará) takes on the translation of “protectora y misericordiosa” in Spanish and “protector and merciful” in English. In Spanish, and most likely in Quechua, the words indicating protection and mercy have relational understandings within the communities who use these words. From this experiential understanding of the Latine community, I observed to understand that Aymara was an elder to me and others in the community. By this term elder, I mean a longtime holder of community knowledge, wisdom, and the care for those community foundations while also understanding the systems of oppression that attempt to erase those foundations. Aymara’s strength was in helping community to extend grace to each other in the midst of European-American oppressive structures but also to protect or defend those who were vulnerable or not ready to survive within those structures. This again
was reflective of the relational accountability of the Latine community at large and within the concentrated Latine community of Deaf individuals.

In the Totonaca language, as with Taiyari in Huichol, Nakúh takes on the translation of “corazón” in Spanish and “heart” in English. While Taiyari means “our heart” and I described what that was for me within the context of this study, the Latine community in general and with Latine families with Deaf children in particular, Nakúh, “heart”, “corazón”, in this context was central and lifeline. I observed to understand that Nakúh was the heart or central connection to an extensive Latine community of Deaf Latine members, adults and children alike. Nakúh’s strength was in helping the community remember who they were and where they come from as a Latine community of ancestral knowledge, values, practices, traditions, mutual and authentic care, and other defining markers of the community that distinguishes a Latine Deaf community from the Deaf community. This was reflective of the ongoing relational accountability that defines core values and interactions of the Latine community.

In the Ténec language, Chapik takes on the translation of “fuerte” in Spanish or “strong” in English. Chapik was foundational for me in helping me remember my indigenous roots. For me, the word “fuerte” feels stronger in Spanish than it does in English. It connotes a fierce strength, one that speaks to the resistance against European-American systems of oppression and one that stands solid on the foundational knowledge or wisdom regardless of how it may be interpreted by outsiders. I observed to understand that Chapik was the core of the indigenous heart that threads all Latine people together as a constant reminder that we are still here, very much alive, and we have also endured much harm and hurt. Chapik’s strength
was in her vulnerability of sharing the atrocities she had experienced as an indigenous Latine woman—mother—at the hands of European-American and Eurocentric institutions who could not see her humanity, only in moments of false accusations or to further dehumanize her. Chapik’s continual tenacity to remain the Latine community member—woman and mother—she was and is, within the Latine and Deaf communities or while interacting with the European-American systems, was a foundational representation of the Latine community’s continued capacity to withstand the centuries of attempted extermination and displacement. Chapik was the confidence and fierceness that outsiders cannot detect by seeing her physical presence.

In the Quechua language, Nayarak takes on the translation of “la que tiene muchos deseos” in Spanish or “one who has many dreams, wishes, hopes and desires” in English. Nayarak was the energy of the Latine community realizing the dualities of living between spaces and systems and coming to terms with what really mattered—relational accountability—to her immediate family and the Latine and Deaf communities. I observed to understand that Narayak engages the awareness of what is possible, the energy to do the work within the community, the understanding of risks involved outside of the community and the responsibility of being on the cusp of what feels like make-or-break decisions. Nayarak reflected the Latine community’s understanding of seeing both opportunities and obstacles simultaneously and having to make decisions that have short term and long-lasting impacts with deep desire to see beneficial outcomes for self and others.

In the Quechua language, Asiri takes on the translation of “sonriente” in Spanish or “smiling” in English. While “smiling” in English can have various interpretations of why
someone might smile, “sonriente” in Spanish for me takes on a Latine community relational understanding that a person who is “sonriente” is personable in their actions, easy to communicate with, and/or welcoming. I observed to understand that Asiri was the stirring up of “convivencia” in the Latine community of families with Deaf children and within the Latine community at large. Without digressing too much from “sonriente”, “convivencia” (literally meaning coexistence in English) within the Latine community is roughly a mutual understanding of reasons to be connected with each other and joyous- communal celebration. It is a synergy understood by Latine community members that bring about the surface communal understanding (or characteristics of a community) that everyone with the relational understanding of the Latine community is a “tía y tío” (literally meaning an aunt or uncle in English), again another relational understanding that outsiders cannot easily detect or comprehend without direct instruction.

In the Quechua language, Suyana takes on the translation of “esperanza” in Spanish or “hope” in English. Again, for me the Spanish word “esperanza” carries a relational understanding tied to the Latine community unlike that of the English word “hope”. Con esperanza (with hope) we not only carry out our daily practices within community and against European-American systems of oppression, we continue to push for social and racial justice toward self-determination. I observed to understand that Suyana engages heart, care, strength, leadership, compassion, joy, and sharing which reminds the Latine community there is hope, despite the perpetual European-American systems of oppression and power that plague the community at every level. At its core, the relational understanding of the Latine community reminds us to hope we remain in community and hope that we continue to work.
toward uplifting all of its members, including Latine families with Deaf children and the Latine Deaf community within. These are the nine dynamic research contributors with Deaf children who welcomed me into their lives to share their knowledge and expertise.

**Storywork Implementation and Analysis**

To center Latine families with Deaf children in this research, Storywork was applied to report out research contributor experiences. In this manner, families are portrayed as having a conversation with each other, where I support the storytelling process with description and transition details. I also add any professional experiences I have witnessed personally if appropriate to the theme at hand. In this manner, I offer what Wilson (2008) describes as a cumulative analysis where I apply the method of Storywork in sharing insights and developing themes from research contributors in a manner that ensures I am retaining relational accountability practices. As I elaborate on emerging themes, research contributor experiences and expertise are composed as collaborative discussion. In reciprocating the trust and understanding of what is shared, I add context, professional experience perspectives as an insider within deaf education and an insider as a member of the Latine community. As a decolonial approach, rather than explaining from a dominant and linear way of thinking, the IRM of Storywork guides the data in story form with my participation as a process of decoding, verifying, constantly comparing, and analyzing shared information, taking note of the relationships as research contributors center their lived experiences as experts of knowledge production and knowledge bearers.
Emerging Themes

Themes that began to emerge across all Latine family experiences within the framework of Relational Accountability included the following topics: 1) Flow of information, 2) Keen awareness of power relations, 3) Continuous Vetting of Proximity to Membership and Whiteness 4) Agency and 5) Expectations of deaf education schools and programs.

As the experiences of the research contributors began to take shape within the Relational Accountability framework, various themes began to emerge repeatedly within the experiences of each research contributor as well as across all of the experiences from all research contributors as common threads. While I initially began coding and organizing themes under separate categories, it became clear that many themes were overlapping and continuously connecting to Relational Accountability (RA). After an extensive iterative process of defining themes and how each might relate or interact with other themes, all areas relayed back to Relational Accountability (RA). It is at this time that I decided to reorganize, in Figure 11, the themes in a manner that each became an important component of how Latine families with Deaf children come to determine the level of RA that others have in relation to their interactions.

Relational Accountability

Latine community, as indigenous people who have been forced to navigate systems of oppression for survival, while continuing to maintain core community foundations of knowledge, participate in practices that in-group members are able to intuitively identify. These practices include vetting all Latine community members or non-members who engage within any aspect of the Latine community. Latine families with Deaf children, as part of this
community, participate in these same practices of vetting within at least two levels; where one stands as a Latine person in relationship to the culture and its people and where one stands as a Latine person in relationship to the educational system, including deaf education. This requires a keen awareness of the dynamics of power, how power relationships interact between the Latine community in general and how those interactions impact Latine families and their Deaf children. While Latine families may not be fully aware of or have access to the flow of information for understanding or interacting with all of the components of deaf education, they are aware of the education system in general and that services or supports should be provided. In this regard, Latine families with Deaf children are continuously vetting others to understand where others stand within Latine cultures or communities, their proximity to whiteness—European-American systems of oppression and power—and how those others choose to use their stance or position. Latine families with Deaf children also hold various complex expectations of Latine community members who are part of European-American institutions or systems such as with a Latine educator in deaf education like me. In the process of vetting, Latine families with Deaf children are seeking to understand whether the member or non-member is trustworthy, how knowledgeable one is about the community, how accountable one is to the community, whether one understands the power relationships and intersections in which power dynamics occur, and how vested one is in uplifting the community.

For example, throughout the interviews, research contributors continuously posed questions to me in general as an important topic of discussion but also as a question of my own accountability as a Latine community member and as an educator in deaf education.
Because I am familiar with the Latine questioning in vetting and verifying trustworthiness, I recognized repeated and rephrased questions as part of this process whereas this line of questioning from European-American community members would be interpreted in the opposite manner- an interrogation of not being believed. Likewise, the manner in which I inquired about information, needed to be framed within the formal cultural expectations of what is deemed respectful questioning. In Spanish, that required using the formal “you” (usted) rather than the informal “you” (tú) to indicate the level of respect as a person requesting for knowledge and expertise to be shared with me. There are also in-group practices and understandings that indicate more complex layers within the Latine community of relational accountability that will identify Latine members as outsiders or distant from the core community that unfamiliar researchers may not notice. For example, while in several homes of Latine families with Deaf children, daily living events continued throughout the interviews. These included, family members, neighbors, and/or friends coming by the home, carrying out chores, and/or other communal dynamics. In one instance, a grandmother arrived to the front door with a rolling cart full of groceries. Without comment or explanation, both myself and the research contributor stood up and walked hurriedly to the front door to assist the grandmother. The research contributor assisted her mother-in-law with stepping into the home while I unloaded the cart and carried groceries to the kitchen counter. As a Latine community member, this was not an unusual situation nor was it unexpected. It is only in hindsight after sharing and processing data with my committee that I realized it was a practice of relational accountability tied to the Latine community. A European-American researcher, without context to the Latine community, would have
described this as disruptive to their research project or that research contributors did not value education as has been historically and systemically reported in similar research circumstances. As I reflected on such moments, I was impacted by the awareness of the immense power and responsibility of that power that researchers have toward the communities we engage in for research purposes. While I have engaged in moments of rage and disgust at the blatant dehumanizing descriptions of BIPOC communities across research disciplines, the psychosomatic cognizance that I was now in that same capacity of drafting words for these same communities was a process that caused me great moments of terror, profound responsibility, and joy all at once. I continued to listen to the experiences of the research contributors on my drive to work and back, during chores, and while engaging the printed and digitally written data to ensure I did not misinterpret or misrepresent any information. Each time, I surprised myself by recognizing more and more moments—such as this grandmother arriving with her groceries—of Latine community expressions that I have taken for granted as common sense and common knowledge but have also suppressed in the face of European-American scrutiny. The Latine families with Deaf children whose knowledge was so openly shared with me encouraged me along my own decolonizing journey. The vetting I observed and experienced was a constant visceral reminder of the keen awareness Latine families must have, to ensure they are safe and to inform them of how to engage accordingly.

While Latine families with Deaf children demonstrated continuous vetting of me as a Latine community member and educator for the Deaf, I also practiced in the vetting process of understanding the position and proximity of researcher contributors. For example, I noted
that vetting was stronger and more consistent from a research contributor I would consider to be more indigenous-practicing. This contributor’s Spanish language was consistent with Spanish-speakers whose primary language is indigenous, with hard glottal stops in Spanish that are common with indigenous languages of México and interchanging of gender pronouns which is also common of many global indigenous languages including those of Việt Nam and the Philippines where identifying someone’s gender in conversation is not a common practice. In this example, the research contributor often intertwined their responses with vetting questions of who I was as a Latine member or my proximity to whiteness—European-American systems of oppression and power—and proceeded according to their satisfaction of my responses.

**Figure 11**

*Relational Accountability and Latine Emerging Themes*

Notes: Research contributor themes emerging around the core concept of Relational Accountability.
While there are many assumptions within the literature and many assumptions I have heard in person from my years of service within deaf education, I actively paid attention for my own curiosity to note whether any of these “common” assumptions of Latine families with Deaf children had any history or relevance. Some of the assumptions I have had myself were that hearing families did not communicate with their Deaf children. It is a common narrative within deaf education programs to state that Deaf children are isolated at home with no communication. In fact, it is customary to incorporate time into classroom schedules for Deaf children to socialize and share their experiences after long school breaks such as winter or summer vacations. While I am now realizing that this practice in deaf education is most likely an extension of the Deaf community practices known as Deaf Clubs, European-American educators have translated this Deaf communal practice into an audist and racist interpretation that BIPOC families and some hearing families in general do not engage their Deaf children.

Every research contributor I witnessed communicated with their Deaf children engaged their Deaf children through English, Spanish, and/or American Sign Language (ASL) with gesturing, visual cues, and any other communication method they needed to use to ensure their Deaf children understood the message. Every research contributor had expectations for their Deaf children to engage and be part of the family as would any hearing child. During my visit, I observed eight of the nine research contributors use ASL, at times with spoken Spanish or spoken English and strong visual cues to interact with their Deaf children and other Deaf community members who may have been present. In the situation where one research contributor had just been informed on communication options that included signing,
this contributor gestured and used technology with photographs or printed words to ensure the Deaf child understood the communication. While it may not be the preferred dominant language of American Sign Language that European-American educators require from Deaf children in classrooms to communicate with, assess, and/or instruct them with, communication and interactions are happening with Latine families and their Deaf children. Research on the communication of Chicanx (Latine) Deaf community members through the use of Barrio Sign Language was one example of Latine Deaf community knowledge and practices, including languages and communications, that has been historically disregarded as legitimate (J. Garcia, personal communication, September 16, 2017). According to Garcia, (personal communication, September 16, 2017) his research led him to coin the term “Barrio Sign Language” which was the communication used within the Latine community he observed. In my extended conversation with him, I related to his findings and how American Sign Language has Eurocentric roots of oppression that has invalidated indigenous sign languages established well before colonization. Additionally, Black Sign Language has also been marginalized but more recently recognized as a legitimate language. Garcia, shared how Chicanx (Latine) community members use hand movements and gestures that are culturally identifiable and have influenced Latine Deaf in their communication knowledge. I have engaged this topic with Deaf Latine students over the years who concur with Garcia (personal communication, September 16, 2017) that there are known signs within the Latine community that are not part of ASL but instead belong to Latine Deaf culture. My biggest indicator for knowing Latine families with Deaf children have a working form of communication has been that every Deaf child knows and understands their family’s religion.
and the “chisme” (gossip) of what is happening within the immediate and extended family. This type of communication is abstract and would require well established concepts and information between Deaf children and their family members, a strong indicator that Latine families do communicate, and communicate great complexities, with their Deaf children.

Other assumptions I have encountered within the literature and in practice are those of educational expectations and agency. The narrative that Latine families in general have low expectations and are passive in their quest for public education access and instruction is a familiar and deficit narrative that has been utilized to oppress and subjugate the Latine community for decades. Latine families with Deaf children have not been excluded in these forms of attacks. In fact, it is more commonly perpetuated within deaf education given that there is rarely anyone informed enough or willing enough to counter the hegemony of European-American hearing women educators within the field of deaf education from Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate. I, too, in my early years of working within the Deaf community and in deaf education accepted that narrative when I witnessed European-American hearing women discussing this as fact and with the evidence that Latine families with Deaf children were not showing up. I was lost in my own colonized pain of needing to conform to be accepted as valid and legitimate. I wondered why Latine families with Deaf children did not care. Today, I reflect on how much harm I caused to my Latine community in believing European-American ideologies that only kept me and Latine families with Deaf children in a constant state of harm and trying to appease those who only offered systemic racism and other oppressive experiences. I was naïve. It was only through Relational Accountability re-membering, that I began to reconnect with Latine families and
reclaim myself, practicing the intuitive knowledge and practices of reciprocity, respect, responsibility, authentic care, and other grounding Latine communal ways of being in-community. The expectations and agency of the Latine community in general and that of Latine families with Deaf children in particular, are profound and complex. Latine families have knowledge and expertise, with and without Deaf children or other children with special needs. The Deaf children in Latine communities are our children, and the expectations of the Latine community are that of equal access and opportunities, similar to that of hearing Latine children and as equitable as the hearing and Deaf children of European-American families. Given the appropriate flow of information, the data of constant vetting, the keen awareness of power dynamics and the manner in which European-American educators of the Deaf utilize their positions of power, it is not lack of expectations nor lack of agency that keeps Latine families with Deaf children away from deaf education systems. It is the knowledge and expertise of having survived hundreds of years of European and European-American attempted extermination and the perpetuating systems of oppression that are strongly preserved within the deaf education system from cradle to the professorate. This leaves Latine families with Deaf children at the margins and seeking coincidental opportunities of Relational Accountability with a random educator or advocate, here or there throughout their approximately two decades of deaf education. Latine families with Deaf children want to know, not what or when, but how we as educators in deaf education are engaging and uplifting the community as a vested member, advocate, or ally. How are we as educators being relationally accountable to the Latine community in deaf education? The following Storywork explores the research questions in a conversational manner around Relational
Accountability to note what Latine families have, want, expect, and engage in regarding their experiences with Deaf children.

noralee: As an educator in the field, I have come to learn that relationships with students and families must move beyond the need for solely academic achievement or being successful in contributing to capitalism. It must include a genuine and authentic caring that extends to the communities from which students and families come. How am I impacting the movement for social and racial justice and self-determination? How can we as educators and/or researchers be accountable to the Latine community beyond conducting research?

Shanarani: [Well] having a program that continues the support in the earlier years of elementary, that the teachers will see that, that was worth it to create more successful – a successful student, a successful program, so successful teachers—and staff—because it's not just the teachers. It's the staff that they [Latine families] get the support from…There's a lot more to do, a lot more to do. And I hope to see that in the future. I don't think I will disconnect completely from special education and I hope to see a change to create that stronger foundation for all the students. Thank you for doing this too—you yourself—and I hope you will come and work for one of these programs [laughs] and start the change…what are they doing to put more people into doing special ed? Or deaf education? Because Deaf people or Deaf babies are not going to go away!

Suyana: Well first of all, you know how you set up all these services or meetings, well start- I’ve always said that you cannot get the Latine families together overnight, we are not going to gather from one night to the next morning but let’s say- we could get together if you set it up like not right now but for example if you set it up ahead of time, like a month before. And you say, “Ok parents, we are going to have a Latine family reunion with your Deaf children. And well it will be a celebration and fun gathering, each of you bring some Mexican food and we will set up a potluck list. But you have to bring ALL of your children.” I think if you did it that way, that’s when you will see us get involved more and say “oh a party well then yes”. And so if you got to an event and you enjoy it then you will go back. But when you see events that are like “really boring!” The truth is that, well we should just be honest- we are not going to go. We are not going to take time off from work to go to some event that we aren’t even interested in.

noralee: Yes, I see that one of the biggest issues for supports and resources is that they tend to drop off once families leave the baby programs. You are left to be more independent I guess and we haven’t prepared you to do that so we need to work on that. Perhaps the elementary schools can continue at least some of the supports and event that Early Start does to help bridge that connection into the K-12 system. I also like the idea of having gatherings for fun to build the relationships with the whole family. In the past I have seen this be very successful. A program in the North Bay held family events at least once a year. It was a big deal, very fun for the whole family and we did share some of
that “boring” stuff but it didn’t take up the space of communal time. We shared it in games like trivia. I have also witnessed ASL classes set up for families in the North Bay and the South Bay that had huge turnouts. Both instructors created community with families and so they came just like you say- they will come if it’s fun and interesting because there is a connection, a relationship.

Asiri: They [deaf school program] gave sign language classes and I would go sometimes but right now I am in college and looking to take classes there. I was studying English because I needed to learn a little more so I could get into those sign classes. So I think by this fall when they offer sign language classes, I will be able to take them but if it’s like school, I can’t really go because if I miss the teacher doesn’t really like us to miss class.

Seti: Well you know how in the baby program people came to the house to teach us about Deaf culture and sign language and I also went to sign classes. I am not proficient or anything but I do know how to defend myself a bit. So now that it’s this other school and they have sign language classes- We went, we really tried- but you know, we don’t know a lot of English, so like the sign are given with the English word and they’re giving- obviously it’s a class for English speakers so it’s too fast. We were like- yeah we don’t know.

Shanarani: The language, and well, since most of the teachers are white or from another culture and, yeah, having most of the students or the families being a big percentage [of Latine] there, I think a lot of times it lacks the connection of where culturally that understanding or learning how each individual family is unique… I see the disconnect from our education group, perhaps not giving more time to learn about each family or I have often say, "Why don't we do something to get the families to know more about us at the same time learn more about them?" But obviously that will take a lot of work to put together and it hasn't happened.

noralee: I must agree with Shanarani that we have a lot of work to do, so much work to do. I think even if we have resources for families we are not providing access to those resources as you have mentioned that we need interpreters, we need to provide more information in the later years like we do with the baby programs, and first of all we need to build those relationships with all families. As Suyana says, you will come and you will commit if it is something beneficial and you do not have to lose work. That makes me think of what other wrap-around services we need to provide to have those meetings and sign language classes. In the North Bay program, the county paid for food, childcare, and provided transportation when we wanted families to meet with us. I think it is a matter of priority at the district and county levels as well, what they are willing to fund. This is important, these opportunities to build relationships. It would help with flow of information as well.
Flow of Information. The theme of information being shared, withheld, and/or not provided in a timely or efficient manner was present throughout all of the research contributor’s shared experiences. It was the flow of information that was not up to the expectations, satisfaction, and standards of the Latine families. As an important element for ensuring Relational Accountability (RA), Latine families shared their experiences and reflections with flow of information when engaging European-American systems to seek supports and services for their Deaf children. Some research contributors noted the differences in Early Start infant and toddler programs that utilize whole family approaches and philosophies as compared to later years where families are only contacted by deaf education staff when it is time for the yearly Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Flow of information is not only communicating to relay dates, resources, or meetings to the Latine families, but checking in to see what these families think about the information shared, what clarifications are needed, and/or what specific information is for, and in what capacity it serves. Flow of information is showing the reciprocity of RA within the relationship between Latine families and the deaf education system in what is being given and received and how it is impacting, depriving, and/or uplifting the Latine community. Latine families shared experiences of encounters with gaslighting and gatekeeping from the early years of diagnosis with medical professionals that impacted education access and relationships with those working with their Deaf children. The following are examples in Storywork form on the complexities of the flow of information between the deaf education system—and by extension the medical fields of audiology and related services—and Latine families with Deaf children.

noralee: During my work with Early Start infant and toddler programs, I was witness to every type (i.e., race, class, gender, immigration status, etc.) of family learning that their child had some type of hearing loss. While there is extensive research and resources on how families grieve their loss of what they had imagined for themselves with a hearing newborn and how they come to terms with re-imagining a revised reality with their Deaf newborn, families relied heavily on Early Start infant and toddler programs to guide them
with resources and decisions that were new to them. It was during this time that I realized the potential of what deaf education systems in PreK-transition could become for Latine families who would continue into the system after their Deaf children aged out of these infant and toddler programs. Early Start infant and toddler programs provided the space and flexibility of co-creating with entire families (immediate and extended) around the supports and services for the Deaf child. Unfortunately, it is also plagued with similar systemic audism and racism that harms Latine families with Deaf children. In general, Early Start infant and toddler programs are resource-rich and in turn, by default impact Latine families with Deaf children more positively than within PreK-transition schools and programs. It is this familial approach, however, that is most related to the communal practices that Latine families expect in reference to creating and maintaining Relational Accountability between Latine communities and deaf education systems. While every family is different in their journey and pace, a commitment to that journey and pace from deaf education staff is necessary to the RA expected by Latine families with Deaf children throughout their entire educational experiences from infant toddler programs to high school graduation or adult transition programs.

Shanarani: [Yes], every family, is different. Every individual process information different. So even I think that what I want researchers to know and what I want teachers educating our students with hearing disabilities or any disability to know, is that in the early years they say, from birth to three years old program, is when we give the parents all this information. I think they [educators of the Deaf] know, but if they don't, I want them to know that each family process information different and that they are going through a grieving process and it might take longer for some to reach the process than others. And as all this information is coming to us, like community resources or whatever it is, seminars they need to go to, little classes to help cope with the process, or to learn about the disability the student has, or meetings that they have as to how your student is going to be learning, because obviously is not going to be learning the same way that any other hearing students going to a public school or private school. There are going to be needs. This information, it's overwhelming for us as parents, and a lot of times even if we go to one seminar or two seminars about the same thing, we are going to miss stuff. And handouts are given to us. A lot of times I think we – and, again, everybody will take care of it in a different way- but I think most of the time this information, we just put it in a stack of papers. We probably would say like, “for when we need it”, because we are not ready to look at it, again, because of the process and the stage that we are at. And so, from birth to three years old, it might not be – I would say I know for a fact it's not enough time for each family to be ready to move forward for the following years of education.

noralee: In addition to the amount of information given to Latine families with Deaf children at the start of the educational process which I am sure is overwhelming, there are also concerns of communication with the deaf education system that is tied to the medical field of audiology and referring pediatricians, who often ignore Latine families with concerns that their children may be Deaf. While California law now has newborn hearing
screening requirements to detect deafness at birth, there are still school age children from the era of prescreening within the deaf education system who were diagnosed in later years, even as late as middle school. Additionally, we cannot be certain of how accountable or reliable private or non-profit hospitals are for screening all California newborns. Another reason for late-diagnosis is that hospital screenings may not detect newborns who have fluctuating hearing or progressive deafness at the time of testing leaving Latine families scrambling in later years trying to receive an appropriate diagnosis. This causes major delays in accessing appropriate educational resources and some families might miss out on the Early Start program.

Seti: So with Andy- we thought well perhaps they can’t hear us after we learned that Alahi was deaf. And yes it was true, it was a long process dealing with Andy. Honestly the clinic was not really helping us out when we would go to get the audiograms- Andy always had fluid in their ears. They’d [the medical professionals] “We can’t do the tests, it didn’t come out right, you’re going to have to wait until the next appointment” But they would never give us answers and with that fluid in Andy’s ears. That fluid damaged Andy’s ears, their hearing, because what they [medical professionals] should have done is put tubes in Andy’s ears- but they didn’t- not until Andy was about 3 years old. So that entire time, Andy had fluid in their ears, aside from catching colds and all that- it just made things worse. But that is why Andy has more hearing loss than Alahi, because with Alahi we already knew at birth.

Aymara: Well, when we took [Belén], even after [Belén] got tested with the audiologist over here, Dr. [Bob] – I forget – [Smith], I think it was the last name. And he [Dr. Smith] says, "No [Belén] got 50 percent hearing loss in both ears. So [Belén] gotta have hearing aids." But God they determined that so quick! Why didn't they determine that a long time ago? And I used to tell my [adult relative], "Take [Belén], take [Belén]!" and [adult relative] would! But they'd [medical professionals] do the same thing again, just assume that [Belén] was hearing okay but Belén has learning disability. And they [medical professionals] just went that way. Like I tell you, they even thought that [Belén] was autistic. I don't know where my – I asked [adult relative], but [adult relative] doesn't tell me, "Who told you [Belén] was autistic? Or did you just assume that so you just didn't never try to teach [Belén] anything, because you thought [Belén] wasn't gonna be able to learn it?"

noralee: I am sorry you had to experience neglect and being dismissed by medical professionals who are supposed to support you. These are similar experiences that my students’ families have shared with me before and in one situation a parent begged me to join them to the hospital because their child had been bleeding from the ears for several weeks and the medical professionals had not resolved the issue. Instead, the parent shared with me that the doctor said, “this is what happens when you let your baby drink milk while they go to sleep and it goes into the Eustachian tube and causes problems”. That parent wanted me to inform the doctor they had never done such a thing and that their child was in severe pain. I joined the parent to the hospital where the doctor was
summoned from the clinic in the neighboring offices. The doctor was rude and condescending saying there was nothing wrong with the child. I spoke up and requested a referral for the parent and it shocked the doctor. They thought I was a family member who did not speak English. A group of people came into the room trying to figure out what was going on with the child and who I was. Turns out, the child had a ruptured eardrum on one side and an ear infection on the other and needed surgery. The surgery date was postponed twice but the parent continued to hold them accountable.

Taiyari: …honestly in my experience with our children it got to the point where I almost just took off to México so they- well a doctor from here told me that it wasn’t a bad idea because according to him and his experience, he said in México there are doctors that are better than the ones here in the United States- that was what that doctor told me because he had worked in México and so that’s why he knew but- I just wanted to know, are you going to help me or not because this was really stressful to see my child in distress because it had been 3 days in the hospital, and this was happening twice a month so it was too much…

noralee: Other parents have expressed the same frustrations from all over the state and I am curious about what I can do to connect medical professionals to the deaf education system more consistently. I know during my time with the baby program, we brought in audiologists and Ear Nose Throat (ENT) specialists to meet families and build networks. Just as I joined a parent to the hospital, perhaps we could get medical professionals to come visit classrooms to understand what supports or challenges are happening to provide better services to families during doctor appointments. Within the classroom or with the deaf education program, are there any concerns with flow of information in those areas?

Shanarani regarding communication from program teachers in general: Yeah, that was frustrating. And so that happened in the early years and I made sure I kept in good communication with the – it was more like communicate – we have to keep in communication with the teacher, the mainstream teacher. And the mainstream teacher had the responsibility to communicate [to] the [deaf education] teacher that was overlooking the mainstream students. But if I was not a parent that kept in communication with the teacher directly then may times that information would not come to me until months later…What we were finding out, we – it was like at the IEP, they had this list of stuff that Dani was struggling on, and I'm like, "When did you find out [they were] struggling in that area?" "Well, like six months ago." "How come I wasn't told six months ago?" And the thing is that [they know me well] and they just held this information back and waited to have something to say at the IEP that Dani needs help in certain areas more than others. I mean, that's what IEPs are for, but if they're struggling now then tell me they're struggling in certain areas right now and not in six months when I have the IEP.
Aymara regarding getting deaf education access and services as the appointed guardian:
…I didn't know that Belén wasn't totally hearing everything. They did tell the parent in the school, from the third grade, the fourth grade, and the parent took [Belén to check their hearing]. See that school in that district wouldn't allow me to go to the conferences. I could pick Belén up and drop them off, but they would not share with me any of the information in the conference [as the guardian].

Taiyari: Well for us when we have IEPs we need a Spanish translator and sometimes they scheduled both children together and there is only one interpreter- so like Seti says sometimes there is a bit of- well we won't say discrimination but no language access-so in those instances we are at a disadvantage…sadly it is our understanding that there is only one Spanish interpreter for the entire program- that’s what we’ve always known but that’s an important concern. After every meeting Seti would send a list of clarifications and points and the interpreter would send us answers but sometimes the answers were, “that was discussed at the meeting, sorry I did not attend” and that was our response. So those types of things are difficult with the school.

Shanarani: So somehow that material never crossed our hands that there is a list of things that a deaf student can ask in the mainstream classroom. And that was a big issue for us, that we didn't have those options. We didn't know we – somehow in many trainings- we went we missed it. But the program knew that they could do this and they didn't do it, that was not okay. Yeah. So, yeah, having – I don't know why they would do that, that they know they could do something but they don't offer it if we don't ask. And I would say we don't ask – I didn't ask because I didn't know I could. But they didn't volunteer it. So it's that. Why'd they do it, I don't know. I don't know if there's a reason why they don't offer it. Why don't they say, "We could do this and that if you think your student could benefit from it." And I wish they did. They didn't do it for me but I wish they'd do it for other families coming along.

Chapik: Well for help, but sometimes you have to go show up so they have to help you. It didn’t matter to me back then how I did it, walking, crawling, but I would get there. I struggled so much during that time [locating services for Deaf child] and then with no money? I didn’t eat and I really struggled with Angel so much. And they [social services] gave help and I didn’t know about it. They said they gave SSI, now I have it, but before? I didn’t know about all of these resources. And then there was another agency that helped out too- they gave food and basics- I didn’t know. It’s not until other parents find out and get services, then they informed me. That’s how you do it for example- you show up to a sign class or something like that and you start talking to other parents and you learn from that. Like they just say, “Look it’s this easy, here’s the phone number, here’s the address” you know things like that and there you go, a path opens up- and then you feel things get easier. But when you don’t know any of that? Everything is difficult.
**Keen Awareness of Power Relations.** Latine families with Deaf children, as with Latine community members in general, have a keen and multiperspective awareness of the most subtle expressions of power, especially its abuse. European-American supremacy has been successful for over 500 years due to its insidious and ever shifting dynamics of power. The premise of maintaining the status quo is to ensure the rules of engagement will always favor European-American supremacy and its institutions. European-American institutions or systems have never engaged in a power relation for the sake of social or racial justice. It is only within moments of perceived threat, that European-American supremacy and its institutions will engage in superficial actions of benefiting historically excluded communities in acts of interest convergence and ensuring that it maintains the status quo. Having survived extermination, Latine families with Deaf children engage and interact to and within the deaf education system with this keen awareness and understanding of risks. Because deaf education schools and programs are few and limited compared to the options of regular public education schools and programs, Latine families are at high risk of enduring an exceptionally traumatic journey should they encounter gatekeeping administrators, educators, or any staff who are in positions of impacting their access, services, and/or overall experiences. Whereas hearing families can move programs, schools, districts, counties, and/or states for a vast variety of educational options, Latine families with Deaf children are typically bound to one classroom, school, program, and/or itinerant educator for deaf education services. Unless Latine families live in major metropolitan areas with more than one option for deaf education services, Latine families must send their Deaf children to whatever local services are available. This is a relationship that will be held from infant to adult transition or high school graduation. Given this predicament, Latine families with Deaf children have critical decisions to make in terms of power relations and access.
Nakūh regarding power relations of K-12 transition support: They help the students that live in "their" (emphasis on enunciation of the word) area but not the ones that are over here in [predominantly Latine city]. My kid didn’t – they offered [them] the transition program to stay for one more year. [My kid] said, “no, I’m ready to go to college.” We went to the – the first time we met with VR, two of the representatives from [K-12 deaf education program] came. We were all there. After that, never heard from [K-12 deaf education program] again. [Signing there/ left there] Okay, you’re set. They haven’t even, you know emailed or followed up. Like, “how’s it going? Are you good? Do you need anything?” Because we’re in [predominantly Latine city]. But if were in [predominantly European American city], trust me, they would be constantly like, “What do you need? What do you need?” IIIff (strong emphasis and drawn-out expression of the word) we were also white but because we’re Latinos… “Oh, scratch your own back!” And, yeah, and so, again… as parents, we worry about that, you know. And we lose trust in these professionals. We lose hope in contacting all these agencies that are supposedly supposed to help us. And so, we end up with kids at home doing nothing (signed in ASL). And so, once again, you know my husband and I are like, okay, we need to work on this.

Shanarani: …as a parent I would like to get to meet you more often than once a year when you have my child's IEP. And as a parent, I think a lot of – or Hispanic parent I think thinks a lot of times we are judged that we don't do enough for our kids. And some might do more than others but we don't know the background as to why it's not being done. And that's where getting together, opening I guess the gate to communication where we are going to learn why this family is doing more than these other families and finding the reasons would allow the program to provide resources and refer them to where they can learn or maybe perhaps we can have volunteers from our community put events or small seminars together to help them learn what they can do better to help their student.

Asiri: Yeah it’s difficult you know we aren’t lazy! Like that’s why I can’t stand Trump, because we aren’t lazy people. There are lazy Mexicans of course I can accept that, but there are also lazy Chinese, lazy white people, like everyone can be the same way. There are super intelligent Mexicans with great jobs, everything! And so are white people, Chinese the same, Black people the same, everyone can be the same. But it’s always us, the Latinos all the time, all of the time, they drag us- the Mexicans are lazy! the Mexicans are thieves! But these [white people] here, they live in an apartment [I live in a house] and my husband works construction so these white guys were trying to steal my husband’s truck! And I pointed out, “Those aren’t Mexicans!, they were white!” and the police said they were Mexican. And I said “No they weren’t Mexicans! They were whites!” Because our neighbor across the street saw them and she told us who it was, but that’s how they always do us, try to make us inferior, but just for that, so they can see that no- I’m giving it all I got [with college].
Chapik being accused of child abuse for a scrape the doctor accidentally made on the child’s head that became infected: Yeah so they wanted to know, did I throw my baby or had my husband beat me or what happened? And I was still recovering from giving birth so our home was a mess. Who was going to clean it up? My husband at work and me in bed? And I didn’t own a crib. I was recovering from being operated on, I was hurting and I didn’t need a crib. I told them the baby slept by my side but I would never hurt or throw them, but who is going to believe you? You against them? And one shut me in a room demanding for me to tell the truth, to just tell the truth. Did my husband beat me, did I abuse the baby, did I drop the baby. They wanted to take away my baby, my first born child. I told them, I’m telling you, they didn’t understand. There is no domestic violence here, nothing. My only error was that I had no crib. My baby was so tiny, who needs a crib? But they also locked up my husband and interrogated him, “Where do you work? How much do you earn? How long have you lived together?” And honestly we had been together forever and waited to have children…But that was my very traumatic experience.

noralee: I want to say that I hear and see you and understand the layers of power, discrimination, and oppression you have explained. Que Aguante de verdad! I share your understanding when you share these painful stories of injustice, of being gaslighted, not believed, wrongfully accused, and deprived of access to basics and resources. I also admire your willingness to be vulnerable to share the harm we have caused you. I say we because I continue to be a part of these systems that continue to commit these acts of violence. I hope that we can stop perpetuating these types of behaviors against you and I commit to actively calling it out and actively trying to stop it when it happens in my presence. I hope that we can figure out a way as a community to repair the harm and build better relationships with you so that I / we can do better and do right by you and your children.

**Continuous Vetting.** Because of the power relations involved and the keen awareness of engaging carefully, Latine families with Deaf children are continuously vetting members of various communities. There is vetting that happens in-group amongst Latine community members, vetting that takes place with educators in deaf education, and especially vetting of Latine community members engaged in deaf education as consumers or providers. Latine families are conducting constant analysis of others in relation to Latine community membership, deaf education, the Deaf community, and one’s proximity to power, its use, and proximity to whiteness (European-American power and privilege). For example, because Latine families live within this Eurocentric society, families have firsthand knowledge and
lived experiences of the various ways European-American ideologies, supremacy, and subjugation function. While Latine families may not know the legal, scientific, or philosophical terminology of power relations or European-American labels of oppressive systems, the knowledge of its functions and impact are profoundly known and viscerally understood. In this section I pull away from Storywork to insert myself as the point of reference for this concept that I observed research contributors do while we interacted. Because it is very contextual and nuanced to the moments in time that these exchanges took place, it is likely readers will not capture meaning. Therefore, I pause to share context about vetting and the manner in which I experienced it. Within communities there are different norms and expectations of getting to know someone. Within the Latine community, I recognized that I was being analyzed to see how safe I was to each research contributor and how much communal knowledge I had and to what was it owed. For example, at the start of each meeting there was casual conversation as research contributors watched my behaviors, listened to my speaking and made decisions based on information gathered on how to proceed. Asiri for example was very friendly and share much about her life and goals at the start of the conversation but avoided engaging about the deaf education program. As we progressed she asked where I was currently living, measuring distance as safety, she began sharing more about the program and her Deaf child. In another example, Chapik was very forthcoming about the deaf education program and any challenges she had with services or communication and I realized very quickly her expectations were to discuss solutions for the concerns she shared. She essentially “sized me up” to understand where I might be able to support her and other families. While this is also intertwined with relational accountability and expectations, it was also an analysis of proximity to power, privilege, resources, and safety. Chapik also fired rapid questions in between sharing her experiences that if I were not listening intently, I would have missed. In the middle of a story, she might
ask me where I was from, as in where are my parents and my ancestors from. Moments later she might ask me if I was a teacher having already informed her that I was a teacher. She asked in a verifying manner as in, “so you said you are a teacher, no?” Other contributors invited me to later events, again part of this was tied to the expectations and being relationally accountable to the community but also a vetting of whether I would and how I would commit. In those later events that I accepted to attend, I recognized the same patterns of behavior from Latine families in a workshop with fathers, at a presentation with educators, a Latine social, and many other observation opportunities. I do believe that when research contributors noticed that I was aware of their vetting, humor would chime in which I would like to explore further. For example, in a question about my family, I smiled knowing it was a vetting question and was quickly thrown off by a joke of a mother having a giant baby and a tiny baby. These metacommunicative experiences, informed me that the meaning making the research contributors and I were engaged in was reciprocal, intuitive, and holistic, we understood each other beyond the words.

**Agency.** As previously mentioned, Latine families with Deaf children understand systems of oppression, power relations, and in turn engage deaf education accordingly. While European-American institutions may perceive and assume that Latine families with Deaf children are passive, deficit, unresponsive, and therefore kept at the margins or considered undeserving of access to services and supports, Latine families understand and have agency. Should European-Americans and institutions believe that Latine communities in general are unable to know what they need, how they need it, and how to make their own choices to have real communal and collective impact, it is only a coping mechanism by which to ignore the fact that after many attempts of extermination, erasure, and dispossession, the indigenous people of the Americas have outlived all genocidal attacks. The fact that
centuries later, Latine people continue to exist and thrive should inform everyone, that Latine families are making important and impactful decisions within their communities and against the systems which oppress them. With deaf education systems, Latine families with Deaf children will seek out and obtain information and resources or services necessary for their children.

Nakúh regarding addressing Latine Deaf students finishing high school and providing support into adulthood: … So we’re thinking of – and so he (spouse) told me, “I want for you to work on this.” I’m like, okay. So yeah so now I have to figure out how to write a grant because that’s the only way we’re gonna get money. And if we are lucky to get that grant specifically (strong emphasis and drawn-out expression of the word) for the Latino (Latine) community, we are gonna make such a big impact, such a big difference. Oh, God, I can only see it, yeah! That’s my next project.

And, again, we have to collaborate with the Deaf community because only they will know how to help us to work with these Deaf students. I’m not Deaf. I’m not specialized in deaf education but they are and so I’ve already planted the seed on two of them that I trust. Because that’s another thing. You have to be careful who you tell your ideas to because there’s a lot of people that take them from you. At least I’ve learned the hard way and so I’ve entrusted two male Latino Deaf that I’ve meet. And what I like about both of them is that they’re very humble. Both of them grew up in a household where there was a lack of either dad support or – no actually both of them lacked the father support- so they understand the need for role models. They understand that, you know, not everyone is gonna go to college. And so, they told me, “Yeah, we’re willing to work with you.”

And they’ve already warned me, there’s gonna be a lot of people who are gonna get mad at you. We’re just letting you know and I’m like, “I don’t care. I honestly doon’t (strong emphasis and drawn-out expression of the word) care! Because all I care about is for these kids, not only mine ‘cause I’m - I’m not thinking about only my kids. I’m thinking about the rest of these children that are not gonna have the opportunity to go to college. I want to be able to have something implemented by the time that they get there. “Okay, so you’re not gonna go to college, but guess what, we have this here. There’s this support here.” We’re gonna have, so this is my plan.

Have those two Deaf people work with these kids, provide some type of life skills or work training. Something for them to succeed. Because we don’t want them being suck in McDonalds or Burger King even maybe help them set up their own businesses. Something! And then I want to have workshops for parents. How do we help these parents help their kids tambien (also) because we all have to work together. And so, if we can make that happen, oh my god, we’re gonna change the world!
Aymara regarding repeated attempts to seek support for student and trying to address issues alone: …And the little babies come around, and she says- my Tia would tell me, "Look at this little girl; she's only two years old and tell her to sing you all those." And she could sing them all the way through, and my [Belén] couldn't. The ABC's, we learned them, we finally learned the ABCs. I used to have a card – stack of heavy cards that we could flip over and they would be A, B, C, D, E, F, G, all of them and they had pictures on them. And A for the apple, and different characters were on them. And Belén loved to play that one. We'd lay it all out, and then, "Okay A, B, C," and then pick A, B, C, "Which one's a D? Which one’s “A”– you know? And Belén could do that one; Belén finally learned ABCs finally. But I guess that's a little – I guess it's a little more simpler than reading the word, than hearing the word. 'Cause Belén couldn't hear the word; that's why Belén – and that's why Belén wouldn't talk for so long. Because when Belén said something, nobody understood what Belén was saying.

noralee: Aymara, it was a good thing Belén had you because after being neglected by doctors for more than 10 years, you definitely did not let that stop you from teaching Belén. In the baby program, I saw this a lot, innovation parents finding ways to teach their children while the system is stalling in diagnosis or services or whatever is going on. Before the California newborn hearing screening, these situations were more common where children were not diagnosed, medical professionals dismissed parent concerns, especially that of Latine families. I am glad you just kept going and working with Belén. It definitely helped considering the years it took to get a diagnosis.

Nakúh: I work with families and a lot of them tell me the same thing. “How come I didn’t know about this?” You know a lot of them question, “where can I get help to fill out the FAFSA form for financial aid?” A lot of them don’t know how to fill it out and what happens? They give up! They let the kid handle it. The kid somehow fills it out wrong. And they end up either not getting any financial aid because something was not filled out correctly. And so, we have all these college dropouts because there’s no way to pay for it and so what happens to those students?...(pause and look indicated answer was expected from researcher) …They fall through the cracks. And so, again, we question…“What are …we… doing for those students?” And that’s why my husband and I are, we’ve been talking about that and he says, we need to do something about it. If no one else is, we do. And he’s like, “so pick your brain and think something up. You were able to help families. Now you have to help these [Deaf students becoming adults]” he’s like, “because what are our [children] doing?”

Seti regarding late diagnosis and her knowledge and understanding about her child being different and needing services: Andy didn’t get the opportunities to attend Early Start services before age 3 but they did get some speech services. It wasn’t much because shortly after, Andy was returned to the district and since they didn’t see any hearing aids on Andy they didn’t send Andy to any special school such as the deaf program. So I had to tell the district. I had to write letters and tell them to enroll Andy at the deaf education program. I had some help from other families with Deaf children…A Latine family
liaison was with me. She supported me a lot, helped me appeal the district’s decision because Andy was not in the right placement and they weren’t helping Andy enough. And when Andy finally got their hearing aids at 3yrs old, like 3yrs and 3 months, they were still sending Andy to that same school and the school kept calling me every little while- the hearing aids are making noise! The hearing aids fell off! How do we put the hearing aids on? Oh the battery! They were not provided appropriate services for my child and then they started saying Andy was using signs in class but they were invented signs by the teacher. So the made up signs were useless because I couldn’t use them and they were wrong. So the Latine family liaison helped me and we went to the district. We wrote a letter, had an IEP, and some principal from the deaf program went, and a speech therapist and they helped me tell the district because Andy’s hearing loss is progressive so Andy was losing more hearing and hopefully it wont but Andy can go completely deaf. Either way, Andy needed sign language.

Seti and Taiyari regarding advocating for access to meetings and resources
Taiyari: So I will speak the truth, I don’t understand the language or rather how they talk. I can understand and have some nice little conversations and that’s it- but with the school, I really don’t understand and a lot of people at the school- like if they want to have an IEP and the know I speak some English but when I go, I go to take care of the kids or just to be there. And they’ll ask, are you ready to start and Seti tells them, “Where’s the interpreter?: “No, your husband knows English” and she says “No, we want the meeting in Spanish”

Seti: I had to cancel!
Taiyari: We had to cancel one time
Seti: Because they told me “but your husband speaks English”- :Yes but he isn’t going to understand what you say,” I told them so, no no no we can’t do it! And we had to cancel. And the teacher is like “I forgot you didn’t speak English” -I always put Spanish done. Taiyari: Always! Always! We have always done that but that time they were really upset with us. I told Seti not to worry, “You put it on the IEP that you needed Spanish and that everything needs to come in Spanish, all the time.” Any paper Seti asks for she asks for Spanish.

Expectations of deaf education schools and programs. Given that Latine families with Deaf children have extensive knowledge and expertise about their own Latine community, European-American systems of oppression, and a keen awareness of the power dynamics that play out between these systems and the community, Latine families may not readily be forthcoming with their expectations of deaf education schools and programs. Because of the limited options of access to choose from in general regarding deaf education services, schools and programs, and the limited options of
educators to choose from, Latine families must consider many factors when engaging the deaf education system. This can lead to Latine families with Deaf children having many expectations of the deaf education system that go unheard, unrecognized, and unfulfilled.

Shanarani regarding student services and outcomes after high school: Many of these students are in their community school. They sitting in front of the class, is not enough. They need to have an advocate. Who in their school is the advocate for this student to teach them that they need to be their own advocate in the coming years? And we don't have – I don't think we have someone doing this for these students. …And it's not the students that are failing. It's the educators that are failing the students.

Nakůh:… again, and I’m gonna say it again, you know there’s a lot of successful white Deaf people. And if there are any [Deaf] Latinos who are successful I want to meet them. Where are they? I’ve yet to meet. Yes, I mean I’ve met just this past Saturday I had good role models here, but I feel they’re – somehow I feel that there’s still a disconnect between us and them. And it shouldn’t be that way. But I felt it. I felt it. And I don’t know…Because I – when I heard – well, when she [Deaf white passing Latina] told me what she was, I became so excited and I’m like, oh, my god, this is what I’ve been looking for. The way she came at me, it’s like – is your coffee deaf or hearing? Really? And yeah. But yeah, it’s totally, and I mean just being Latino it’s like the educational system here, it's awful, you know. We as parents have to always constantly have to fight for the rights of our kids.

Nakůh regarding her knowledge, understanding, expectations of relational accountability within the Latine community: And so, here’s a desk and there’s like, I guess this is doorway the staff go into behind the desk. My [child] is standing right here [physically describing using ASL]. Ariel’s not even in the way but because [they’re] standing very near that little door, obviously [they’re] in the way of someone. And I’m standing here [using ASL] talking to the girl. And so, I see a Latino man walking behind me. And he says to my [child], “okay, you guys need to move this way. You cannot be blocking the doorway. Blah, blah, blah.” And so, I’m like, I’m talking to her and so I turn around. And then he says, “didn’t I just tell you to move?” And I’m like, “Excuse me, sir, [they’re] Deaf. [They] can’t hear you!” He didn’t even apologize. He just went in, closed the door and he acted like I didn’t say a word to him. So, the girl that was helping me says to him, “You’re rude. She just told you that [they’re] Deaf!” He pretended like whatever, he went back in. And this is a Latino!
Relational Accountability and the Storywork of Nakúh

While the presentation of themes helps explain the practices of Latine families in linear format, indigenous communities occur dynamically and non-linear. In Storywork, multiple levels and layers of the senses, physical, spiritual, emotional, and intellectual interactions are engaging in a synergistic manner that connects people to each other with intuitive understanding and a profound knowing (Archibald, 2008; Archibald et al., 2019; Weber-Pillwax, 2004; Wilson, 2008). While each research contributor shared their expertise and experiences with me directly, the communal aspects of their lived experiences as Latine families and as families to Deaf children in California schools presented undeniable commonalities. Furthermore, the fact that these families live across the state in diverse towns and cities with different programs and resources, speaks to the Latine experience and how deaf education impacts them in similar ways. Because I am an educator at heart and because I would like to be relationally accountable to the readers, I leave this last Storywork without piecing it and without cues as to what themes are within the story. Storywork is dynamic in the sense that everyone can learn different thing and take away different lessons or perspectives. If you have communal knowledge and relational accountability for the Latine community and their Deaf children, I would love to know your own analysis of this final and complete Storywork: The Storywork of Nakúh demonstrates the interlayered synergy that recontextualizes the thematic references in whole form.

Nakúh: When they [Ariel and Guadalupe] started the school there they had about, I think if I recall correctly she [school official] said either 50 or 60 Deaf students. The counselor that was trilingual. Wonderful! I mean I’ve known her for years. And my [children] were very happy. My [Child, Ariel] loved the class. The mechanic class [Ariel] was in. One of the things that I taught my [children, Ariel, Guadalupe, and Alex] is to be part of their identity. I mean I gave them their Deaf identity. And so, with time and with the years and
with the involvement that we’ve had throughout everything, they’ve acquired their [Latine] identity as well. So, if you ask them, how do you identify yourselves, they will straight out tell you Mexican American. Not like a lot of people where, that I’ve met they’re like, oh, I’m Deaf, but I’m also this. They will tell you I’m Mexican American and that’s it. I’m just – I was just born deaf. Doesn’t make me who I am. I’m Guadalupe or I’m Ariel. That’s one of the things about my [children, Ariel, Guadalupe, and Alexi] that they [Deaf and Latine communities] will say [about them].

And so, Guadalupe, I remember them coming home and telling me, “Oh, my god, mom, my teacher, he’s Mexican and we get along so well because,” Guadalupe says, “you know” and then I’m like, “how do you understand him?” He’s like, “we understand each other with gestures but the interpreter’s there. And when she sees that I don’t understand something that he’s telling me, then she’ll come and help...but he’s really cool.”

Sadly, Guadalupe didn’t last long with that teacher, that class. So that class was about a month so after that Guadalupe had to move to the next level. And that teacher was a little Asian man. And the Asian man was not too happy with having Deaf students in his class and so the problems started. My [child] had class – Guadalupe had class from 8:00 AM to 1:00 PM. So, Guadalupe would get home like two or three in the afternoon because [they were] commuting [by public transportation]. And sometimes Guadalupe would stop by and [they’d] have lunch with [their] friends.

And I remember that day clearly. Guadalupe arrived home early and I’m like, “did class finish early?” Guadalupe was boiling mad. And I said, “why are you mad?” Guadalupe threw [their] backpack in the room and [they] was just boiling mad. So, I let [Guadalupe] steam for a bit and then I’m like, okay, well, [they’ll] come and tell me eventually. Guadalupe comes into my room and [they say], “do you have time?” And I’m like, “yeah.” And I work from home so I put away, you know, put aside my work and I said, “what’s up?”

I want to add that not a lot of parents have that privilege of being able to chat with their kids the way I do. I get that lot. And so, I’m like, “yeah, sure, what’s up?” And [Guadalupe] was like, “I hate my teacher. Do you know what he did to us today?” And I’m like, “what did he do?” Guadalupe’s like, “he showed us a video and this video was very important because it’s part of our project. And so, the video was no captions on. It had no captions on.” So, Guadalupe asked the interpreter to sign. Guadalupe’s like, “but come on, the interpreter’s not gonna be – you know, it's difficult enough.” And I’m like, “so did you [students] request for the captions to be on?” Guadalupe’s like, “the interpreter did. But the teacher blew [them] off.” So, the interpreter said to us, “you guys need to ask him to put the captions on because I told him but he didn’t pay attention to me” So Guadalupe was like, “excuse me, the caption? I need captions.” So, the teacher says to [them], “oh, um, next time. Right now, you have the interpreter. Next time I promise. Tomorrow.”
So, Guadalupe says, “you know I took it patiently” but Guadalupe was like, “I was really mad and so I just took off and came home and we’ll see what happens tomorrow. But I just wanted to let you know that I think my rights have been violated.” And I said, “You know what, and you are right. So tomorrow when you go in, you make sure you request the captions again, and if he refuses, you need to go see the counselor or someone higher than him because that’s not right.” Guadalupe’s like, “okay.”

The next day Guadalupe goes, you know, takes off. [They say] to me, “let’s see what happens today.” And I’m like “hopefully it’ll be cleared up.” Guadalupe comes home boiling mad again. And I’m like, “so how did it go? Obviously, something worse happened because you’re madder than yesterday.” Guadalupe says, “you know what that man did? We told him that we needed the captions on and he says to us, ‘no because it bothers the other students.’ How does it bother the other students? Mom, when you watch TV,” —’cause all my TV’s have captions’—"do they bother you?” And I’m like, “no, actually I enjoy it because I’m reading. And I’ve gotten really good at it so it doesn’t bother me.” [Guadalupe]: “So can you explain to me how it does that bother the other students?” And I’m like, “you know what, it shouldn’t.” And then I go, “so what happened?”

Guadalupe’s like, “we all got out of class and we were outside protesting.” And Guadalupe says, “and tomorrow we have an appointment with—” I think it was, they said, a [an administrator]. “—because she wants to know what’s going on.”

“Oh, perfect, well you let her know.” And Guadalupe’s like, “yeah, I am.” And then Guadalupe’s like, “but you know what? That man, he’s very rude. He said to us that we’re disrupting, we’re very disruptive. He [the teacher] says” – this is what the man said to the interpreter —"you tell them that they are the most disruptive group of students I’ve ever had. Deaf people are very disruptive. I’ve never had any issues with anybody except for those Deaf students.”

Because of those comments, I think it was seven [Deaf] students in that classroom, they all went outside and protested. But after that, four of them dropped the class. Only three continued to stay. Then the following day they had their meeting with the vice president. The vice president, turns out that [their spouse] is Deaf. So [they] know sign language. And [vice president] retired the man. He ended up being retired. We weren’t happy about that. We wanted for him to get fired, but obviously he has seniority and [vice president] says that [they] wished [they] could have done more but, so he was retired early.”

So, they have a new replacement. And it turns out the replacement didn’t really care. He just turned the captions back on and really didn’t do much of explaining. But then – and then so three students dropped the class and only – no, four students dropped it, three continued, then they went on to the next section and [the replacement teacher] ended up failing the three students that were in that classroom. My kid went and argued with him. I think [Guadalupe] ended up getting no higher than a C. and I know my kid deserved
better because I saw how hard [they] worked. [Guadalupe] got a C and so [they] went to talk to the counselor and the counselor was like, I’m gonna try everything that I can, but eventually nothing was really able to be made because the teacher said, “well, you’re not the one teaching the class. You don’t know.” Blah, blah, blah so it was an ongoing thing.

Again, you know [the vice president] saw that was going on, all the discriminating things that were happening. And [they] noticed how much there – much is still to be needed. So [they] decided to go back to school to get [their] Ph.D. so that [they] can come back and help more because [they] said [they] felt that with [their] experience, as much as [they have] experienced, [they] still cannot get through to these people. So [they] went back to school. And [they were] replaced with a person who has no knowledge whatsoever about the Deaf and so I have two dropouts.

Just recently they [Guadalupe and Ariel] both decided to go back because I’m like, you know what, you are at that age where you need to think about what you’re gonna do. Because mom and dad are not gonna always be here for you. It’s not how I raised you. You have to show the world that you can. Don’t let this hold you back. And so, my oldest is gonna start [CCC, California Community College], in the fall. And [Ariel’s] gonna be taking math I think. Well, we have the appointment with the counselor, but that’s [their] plan. And then the middle one is going to the [C]– what is it? [California Community Institute], which is focusing on cars as well. And I think [Ariel] wants to do – what did [they] tell me? [Auto related work], I think. And so [they’re] going back in the fall as well, but it seems like it’s a never-ending process.

It’s a never-ending story for our Deaf kids, you know. It’s like when we think that it’s finally like, oh, it’s going well for them, there’s always someone who’s gonna do something discriminatory to set it back to 200 years back!

**Summary of Chapter 4**

In this chapter the Bricolage and Decolonial frameworks were placed guides for the application of Storywork of these Latine families with Deaf children throughout California. Emerging themes from the collective stories was an overarching expectation of Relational Accountability. Within this concept, the themes or elements that supported the development of Relational Accountability included the Flow of Information, Vetting, Power, Expectations and Agency. Research contributors continually demonstrated a shared experience across these themes despite the fact that they were from different regions of the state, had a diverse
range of demographic identities, and their children attended a variety of placement programs from residential Deaf schools to local deaf programs, and regular education classes at their home schools. What Latine families demonstrate as a collective, is that they have expertise in various areas of deaf education, the Latine community, the Deaf community, and when brought together, readily network and support each other with information and resources. As I close this section, an update from some of the Southern California contributors, advocates, and community members are making progress in their nearly five year fight for better deaf education leadership, representation, and advocacy, a great model and inspiration for other areas across the state to follow suit.
Chapter 5: Conclusion, Implications and Final Remarks

XXthe impact and influence of the research process, the learning and co-constructing knowledge with the research contributors, and my time with the Latine families and their Deaf children was in fact as Shawn Wilson (2008) defines it, “ceremony” (p. 8). Additionally, Wilson (2008) goes on to express that if “research doesn’t change you as a person, then you are not doing it right” (p. 83). I agree and share that it was not until I stopped looking through colonial and Eurocentric lenses, that the essence and synergy of this work became congruent with each step of the process. Once I aligned internally with what was meant to engage me, I was able to relate to the Latine families in a manner that produced friendships out of strangers and be relationally accountable to the families who share their children with me every day in the classroom.

While the Storywork of these loving and self-determined Latine families with Deaf children illuminate the expectations they have for relational accountability in deaf education, building a larger platform and sustaining the centering of Latine families is critical. Without intentional pushing to expand upon this work, given the European-American systems of supremacy and oppression, the probability of relegating these IRM concepts and ideals to a dusty library shelf is highly likely. In being relationally accountable to the research contributors who gave so much of themselves and who continue to advocate for their Deaf children daily, it is my intent to keep this work present and continue to propose changes to the deaf education system to dismantle racism, audism, and other forms of oppression and discrimination. With these intentions I offer current insight, provide suggestions, and provoke discussion about the current state of affairs and future possibilities.
While I engage in this study in part for the fulfilment of a terminal degree within a typical European-American established institution and have thoroughly encountered its intended systemic design for BIPOC, I depart, entering my next cycle of conscientization.

**A Word on the Current State**

A word on the current state of deaf education from Early Start infant/toddler programs to the professorate at credentialing universities across the state of California. The European-American hearing women, who have dominated the field of deaf education for over two hundred years, are retiring in droves as the Baby Boomer generation enters retirement. Deaf education schools, programs, and services across the state are in dire need of new teachers, interpreters, support staff, program specialists, and adept antiracist and anti-audist leadership. This has also impacted deaf education credentialing departments at the university level. University credentialing programs for deaf education in California have disappeared over the past decade with few significant departments left, such as those at the University of California, San Diego and the California State Universities of Fresno and Northridge. There is opportunity and danger with this current state of deaf education in California. The danger lies across all areas of policy, research, and practice wherein politicians, scholars, and practitioners, upon notice of (or usually under impending threat of lawsuits or legal fines) the current crisis in deaf education will put forth remedies for the sake of meeting minimum compliance regulations to avoid or reduce legal liabilities. These measures often include hasty insertions of policies, university programs, professors, and local administrators that perpetuate and uphold racist and audist perspectives with little regard to understanding the population it actually serves. One has only to search online universities purporting to offer
deaf education credentials in comparison to the deaf education teacher preparation programs at the aforementioned universities to notice the differences in Deaf-centered faculty and course content. In fact, currently enrolled or previously enrolled educators for the Deaf have, themselves, mentioned the lack of core foundations and content centered on deafness, American Sign Language, and overall deaf education. These preservice and new educators are often told to find outside resources and piecemeal certifications to comply with these online university credentialing requirements, proving that these types of remedies are not aligned with equitable and relationally accountable services to the population in deaf education across California- the predominantly Latine community.

For infant and toddler programs to adult transition services, this impact has already been noted in some areas where deaf education programs have been placed under European-American hearing administration who have no substantive pedagogical or experiential knowledge about deaf education, the Deaf community, or the Latine community. They arrive with expectations to forcefully align deaf education under that of special education deficit standards and continued Eurocentric ideology, a completely incongruent approach for the Deaf regardless of race but especially harmful for BIPOC Deaf—a topic for another day. The turnover rate for administrators is excessive in programs with well-experienced and long-term deaf education staff who demand at least fundamental knowledge in deafness and Deaf culture. In smaller programs or deaf education services and single classrooms the administrative harm can extend for decades. As California counties and school districts struggle to replace deaf education staff with underqualified or non-qualified deaf education professionals, some counties and districts have opted to shutter programs, pushing Latine
families with Deaf children to make even more difficult decisions. This leads to Latine families with Deaf children having to decide between regular education classes with no supports, minimum supports of speech therapy and assistive listening devices, resigning to send their Deaf children to long-distance residential schools in Fremont and Riverside, and/or considering to uproot the entire family to move to a location where deaf education programs are more stable and comprehensive.

All the while, Latine families with Deaf children making these difficult decisions (within their already impacted European-American produced and perpetuated circumstances of injustices) for access to services are still confronted with systemic European-American (white) oppression regardless of their choices. Should we choose to plug in the gaps of deaf education professionals from infant and toddler programs to the professorate with new European-American hearing women who are not proficient in deaf education and Deaf culture basics, we will have taken over two hundred years’ worth of steps back where at minimum Deaf European-Americans benefited from basic education, long and hard fought resources or accommodations have been legally secured, and occasional Deaf Latine students make it to college (interest convergence?). In other words, we will be taking steps back to further inequities instead of confronting and improving upon them. European-American supremacy harms everyone and causes long term and compounded damage for historically excluded communities.

In this crisis, an opportunity to recruit diverse and culturally competent professionals into the field of deaf education is wide open. Within many deaf education programs and schools across the state, there are support staff who are BIPOC, many who are former Deaf graduates
of those programs and schools. With Governor Gavin Newsom addressing COVID-19 teacher shortages in a recent January 2022 executive order, there is opportunity for current support staff to move into teaching and any BIPOC Deaf, BIPOC hearing, and/or Deaf educators to move into leadership roles from infant and toddler programs to the professorate should university deaf education departments and county superintendents collaborate to make these demands and establish specialized deaf education focused pathways.

There is opportunity for deaf education programs to grow their own educators and shift to a decolonial perspective of equitable, anti-audist, antiracist, and social justice standards of schooling should program specialists/principals collaborate with educators, families, and neighboring deaf education programs to make these demands. Rather than waiting to be held accountable to address the gaps, needs, or current crisis across the field of deaf education under legal obligation and to meet minimum compliance regulations, the California Department of Education and longstanding deaf education credentialing programs in San Diego, Fresno, and Northridge have the opportunity to proactively choose groundbreaking and transformative measures. These systems can start by collaborating with each other on addressing racial and social injustices and inequitable practices or protocol among their staff and within their institutions. Secondly, as a cohesive and supportive network they can reach out to the Latine and Deaf communities to learn how to center these communities’ knowledge, expertise, and approaches to learning that establish relationally accountable access, support, and leadership from within the community that is sustainable.

Creating a Task Force and on-site deaf education coalitions to collect better data on deaf education programs, schools, credentialing programs, and demographics will assist with
designing and implementing much needed changes and supports to the field across all areas of policy, research, and practice. Inviting Latine families with Deaf children and Deaf Latine adults to review and revise the California deaf education guidelines to eliminate harmful information and to include standardized antiracist and anti-audist approaches can improve policy toward a more racially and socially just orientation.

Establishing this policy level protocol that follows up on the implementation and sustainability of those standards in Early Start infant and toddler programs to the professorate are feasible measures California Department of Education can undertake in collaboration with the Latine and Deaf communities and deaf education credentialing programs statewide. All Deaf infants and toddlers should have continuous access to deaf education programs from birth until transferring to the K-12 public school system. The California Department of Education can close this gap between Early Start infant and toddler programs and K-12 education by ensuring that there are no breaks in deaf education program services birth to age five, regardless of speech and language assessments that individual school districts currently rely on to provide piecemeal supports or deny services altogether. This one policy change alone would impact Latine families with Deaf children immediately and drastically, ensuring families have 2-3 more years with infant and toddler programs to prepare for the K-12 public school system.

Additionally, the CEASD proposed list from 1981 of measures to hold itself accountable to the Latine community is a preliminary draft that California can readily accept as a starting point to meet with Latine families with Deaf children throughout California to review, update, or adjust these commitments to meet current educational matters. In the meantime at
the local levels, deaf education programs, schools, districts, and counties can align themselves with general education frameworks of social and racial justice through the National Education Association and California Teacher Association to begin its journey of dismantling 200 years of European-American supremacy in deaf education across the state. Deaf education programs in northern, central, and southern California can seek each other out to form a state alliance of communal knowledge sharing with Latine families with Deaf children and the Deaf community at large.

Deaf Latinos y Familias Organization from southern California can support northern and central California to expand chapters for stronger relationships among the Latine and Deaf communities and the Deaf Latine children throughout the state. I have witnessed this occur within the country of Việt Nam in a short 10-year period where the north, central, and southern Deaf developed networks and alliances to advocate for their rights and education. Deaf education schools, programs, services, and classrooms can reach out to organizations such as Deaf Latinos y Families Organization and Council de Manos to support with Latine family outreach to begin repairing and bridging a relationally accountable networks, coalitions, and alliances for the equitable advancement of all families with Deaf children in deaf education.

At the classroom level, deaf education staff must unpack their own racialized identities toward a reconciliation or healing that allows staff to engage systems of oppression in an ongoing dismantling manner. It means repairing and restoring relationships regardless of explicit participation because we are all complicit if we are not actively working toward racially and socially just relationships with coworkers, students, families and communities
alike. Again, we are complicit in maintaining and perpetuating systems of oppression in our
daily lives when we are not actively working to dismantle them. One more time: We are
complicit in upholding European-American supremacy and systems of oppression when we
do not actively work to stop, dismantle, and work toward social and racial justice. In an
atmosphere where naming Eurocentric systems of oppression such as white (European-
American) supremacy and speaking truth to power is seen as an affront, rather than a
revelation of the work we need to do, we have a long way to go. It takes everyone. To my
colleagues, coworkers, worksites, it takes all of us. It is exhausting work, especially when
working on two fronts- on the receiving end while still working toward dismantling
systemically oppressive patterns and behaviors against students. It is a labor that cannot take
breaks. It takes all of us across intersecting communities, organizations, and schools, inside
and outside of the classroom. Are we going to continue being complicit and willfully harmful
or are we going to do the work and be relationally accountable to ourselves and the families
we committed to as public service workers? I continue this work because I hope for the latter
but it is not sustainable alone. We must unpack ourselves and reach out to the Latine
community with intentions of holding relational accountability at the heart of our service.

With Latine families being the majority in deaf education, we are past due in listening,
waiting, and stepping aside waiting for qualified, culturally relevant, and culturally
competent leaders whose knowledge and expertise are critical to the educational experiences
and outcomes of all Deaf children. We already tried over 200 years of European-American
and predominantly hearing leadership in deaf education with low educational outcomes for
most Deaf children and dismal outcomes for Latine Deaf children. It is time to share the roles
and space in deaf education to welcome racial and social justice perspectives that are rooted in self-determination, healing, and communal uplifting. The future of deaf education over the next few years will see drastic changes due to the current state of affairs. It can flourish with Deaf, Latine, and other diverse leadership toward an equitable and decolonial prospect or it can crumble under the hasty decisions of last-minute liability coverages of less than currently qualified and inexperienced European-American hearing women. I choose the former. A vested interest in uplifting communities, authentic caring about the wellbeing of all our relations, and overall Relational Accountability are what influence change and produce transformation toward social and racial justice. There is no magic checklist, only our love, commitment, and actions to, with, and for self and community. Without intentional, deliberate, willful commitment and vested relational accountability to ensuring social and racial justice and uplifting our communities because we see and value their overall humanity, we are complicit in the oppression of subjugating Latine families with Deaf children and their right to self-determination. Let us be accountable to all of our relations, *siempre haz bien sin mirar a quien!* [rough translation in isolation but with reference of what it means within the Latine community: Always do what is just without controlling who you think is worthy or deserving of your deeds or needing to know who is going to receive it- just do what is good and just because you care and are vested in all of us together, always].
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Appendix A: English Survey Recruitment Questions

Appendix A
Survey Recruitment Questions

Study Identification # _______________________

1. Do you have a child who is deaf or hard of hearing? __ YES __ NO

2. What is the primary language used in the home? ____________________________

3. Does your deaf/hard of hearing child use sign language at school? __ YES __ NO

4. Does your deaf/hard of hearing child use sign language at home? __ YES __ NO

5. How old is your deaf/hard of hearing child? ____________________________

6. Does your deaf/hard of hearing child have other special needs? __ YES __ NO
   If YES, please explain: ___________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

7. Do you identify as Latina/o? __ YES __ NO
   If NO, how do you identify? ____________________________

8. Would you be willing to participate in an interview to share your experiences about having a deaf/hard of hearing child and participating in deaf education? __ YES __ NO
   If NO, what are your concerns? __________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

If YES, please continue with the survey.

9. Please provide your contact information (Name, phone number, email): ____________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

10. What city do you live in? ____________________________

11. When is the best time to contact you? (Check and circle all that apply)
   ___Mondays AM or PM  ___Tuesdays AM or PM  ___Wednesdays AM or PM
   ___Thursdays AM or PM  ___Fridays AM or PM  ___Saturdays AM or PM
   ___Sundays AM or PM

12. Where is the best place for you to meet? (Check and circle all that apply)
   ___at my home  ___at a local library  ___anywhere in my city
   ___at my deaf/hard of hearing child’s school  ___at the researcher’s school in San Jose
   ___anywhere  ___Other: ____________________________
Appendix B: Spanish Survey Recruitment Questions

Estudio número # ____________________

Preguntas de reclutamiento

1. ¿Tiene un niño sordo o con pérdida de audición? __________________________ SI ____  NO ____

2. ¿Cuál es el idioma principal que se utiliza en el hogar? __________________________

3. ¿Usa su hija(o) lenguaje de señas en la escuela? __________________________ SI ____  NO ____

4. ¿Usa su hija(o) lenguaje de señas en la casa? __________________________ SI ____  NO ____

5. ¿Qué edad tiene su hija(o) sorda(o)? __________________________

6. ¿Tiene su hija(o) sorda(o) otras necesidades especiales? __________________________ SI ____  NO ____

Si contestó que SI, por favor explique __________________________

7. Se identifica como Latina(o)? __________________________ SI ____  NO ____

Si contestó que NO, ¿cómo se identifica? __________________________

8. Le interesa participar en una entrevista para compartir sus experiencias como familiar de un(a) niño(a) sordo(a) que participa en un programa de educación para sordos parciales o totales? __________________________ SI ____  NO ____

Si contestó que NO, ¿cual es la preocupación que tiene de participar? __________________________

Si contestó que SI, por favor continúe con el cuestionario.

9. Por favor suministre sus datos personales (Nombre, número de teléfono, correo electrónico): __________________________

10. ¿En qué ciudad vive? __________________________

11. ¿Cuál es la mejor hora para contactarlo? (Marque todas las opciones posibles)

   ____Lunes AM o PM  ____Martes AM o PM  ____Miércoles AM o PM

   ____Jueves AM o PM  ____Viernes AM o PM  ____Sábado AM o PM

   ____Domingo AM o PM

12. ¿Cuál es el mejor lugar para entrevistarlo/a? (Marque todas las opciones posibles)

   ____en mi casa  ____en la biblioteca  ____cualquier sitio en mi ciudad

   ____en la escuela de mi niña/o sorda/o  ____en la universidad del entrevistador

   ____en cualquier parte  ____en otro lugar: __________________________
Appendix C: English Inquiry Guide

Appendix C

English Interview Protocol

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Introduction. Thank the family member for their time with me. Check in on current wellbeing/status. Gauge timing to review consent forms again. Gauge timing to review the research study, agenda for interview session, check for understanding, and proceed with inquiry. Gauge timing, cultural references/intuition/knowledge/expectations throughout conversation such as reciprocating with participant inquiries, accepting food/gifts, participating in culturally known practices, etc.

Rapport Building, Background, General Perspectives:
1. Can you tell me a little about you and your family? Probe: background upbringing, family members, education, community ties.
2. Can you tell me about when you first learned your child had hearing loss?
3. What has been your experience having a child in the family who is Deaf? Probe: What are your experiences with extended family? Community? Deaf education? Probe: placement options, age, hearing loss, academic progress

Educational Experiences and Ideologies as Latine:
4. As a Latine family, do you think your experiences are similar/unique/different than with other families when interacting with the deaf education program? Explain. How, why/why not? Expectations?
5. As a Latine family, what do you think are the most difficult or challenging issues when interacting with the deaf education program? Probe: Differences in communication? Cultural sensitivity? Time schedules? Approach?
7. Looking back, is there anything you would want the deaf program to change, improve or do differently for you and/or your Deaf child? Probe: If so, what would that look like? How about now? Any changes?

Closing Questions
8. Knowing your Deaf child, what are your personal goals him/her?
   Probe: Expectations of progress, achievement, transition, adulthood.
9. What can the deaf education program, administrators, educators, and researchers like me do for you and your family to support those goals and support you and your family?
10. What do you want people working in deaf education programs and researchers to know and value most about you and your child as a Latine family member with a Deaf child?
11. Based on our conversation, is there anything else you would like to share, explain or talk about that I did not ask about?
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Spanish Interview Protocol

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Introduction. Thank the family member for their time with me. Check in on current wellbeing/status. Gauge timing to review consent forms again. Gauge timing to review the research study, agenda for interview session, check for understanding, and proceed with inquiry. Gauge timing, cultural references/intuition/knowledge/expectations throughout conversation such as reciprocating with participant inquiries, accepting food/gifts, participating in culturally known practices, etc.

Rapport Building, Background, General Perspectives:
1. ¿Puede hablar acerca de usted y su familia? RE: crianza, familiares, educación, comunidad.
2. ¿Puede compartir conmigo acerca de cuándo se enteró que su hija/o no podía oír?
3. ¿Cómo ha sido su experiencia en tener un hija/o en la familia que es sordo o con problemas de audición? ¿Cuáles son sus experiencias con familiares? ¿Comunidad? ¿Programa de educación para sordos? RE: opciones de programas, edad, la sordera, el logro académico

Educational Experiences and Ideologies as Latinas/os:
4. Como familia Latina/o, ¿Cree que sus experiencias son similares / únicas/ diferentes en comparación a otras familias cuando interactúan con el programa de educación de sordos? Explique. ¿Cómo, por qué o por qué no? ¿Esperan algo diferente de usted? Experiencias buenas o malas.
5. Como familia Latina/o, ¿Qué opina al interactuar con el programa de educación de sordos cuales son los temas más difíciles o desafiantes? RE: ¿Diferencias en la comunicación? ¿Sensibilidad, consideración de la cultura? ¿Horarios? ¿La manera como se dirigen a usted?
6. Como familia Latina/o, ¿Al interactuar con el programa de educación de sordos que le ayuda más o funciona mejor para usted? RE: ¿Esfuerzo en la comunicación? ¿Sensibilidad, consideración de la cultura? ¿Horarios? ¿La manera como se dirigen a usted?
7. En retrospectiva, ¿Hay algo que desearía que cambiara, mejorara, o que fuera diferente para usted y su hija/o en el programa de educación de sordos? ¿Qué sería? ¿Ahorita, que piensa? ¿Cambiaría algo?

Closing Questions
8. Ya que conoce bien a su hija/o ¿Cuáles son sus metas personales para él/ella? Esperanzas de progreso en la escuela, transición de niña/o a adulto.
9. ¿Qué podemos como programa de educación de sordos, administradores, educadores, e investigadores como yo, hacer por usted y su familia para apoyarlos en sus objetivos?
10. Para los investigadores y las personas que trabajan en programas de educación de sordos, ¿Qué le gustaría que supieran y valoraran más de usted y su hija/o como familia Latina con un niño/o sordo?
11. ¿Hay algo más que le gustaría compartir, explicar o discutir que no le he preguntado en nuestra conversación?
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Appendix E

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

TITLE OF STUDY: Latine Families with Deaf Children in California Schools

NAME OF RESEARCHERS: Noralee Ortiz-Jasso, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Educational Leadership, San José State University. Committee Chair: Jason Laker, Ph.D., Department of Educational Leadership, San José State University.

Hello my name is noralee and I am a student at San José State University studying Latina/o families with Deaf and Hard of Hearing children. I would like to learn more about your experiences with deaf education. You must be a family member of a Deaf or Hard of Hearing child of the PreK-12 deaf education system in California to participate in this study within the past five years.

PURPOSE The purpose of this research is to investigate how Latina/o families experience and navigate the deaf education system. The results of this study may provide insight about families from communities that have been historically under-researched or under-acknowledged.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES
In the first part of the study, you will fill out a survey that will be sent home with your Deaf/ Hard of Hearing child. You will answer questions as best you can. You will return your survey within one week of receipt to school with your Deaf/ Hard of Hearing child for me to collect or mail it back in the envelope provided.
In the second part of the study, you will be contacted to participate in an interview to answer more questions. This interview will take place at a time and place that is convenient for you. Video and audio recording will be used to help me take notes and remember what was said. I am the only one who will listen to and watch these recordings. You will be contacted when your interview is transcribed to check the information and let me know if you approve or want to edit any part.
In the third part of the study, you may be asked for permission to allow me to stay with you for a specific amount of time to listen and observe you and your family.

RISKS
There are no known risks to participating in this study beyond those risks you would encounter in everyday encounters.

BENEFITS
By completing this study you may help improve deaf education programs for yourself, other families and/or educators.

COMPENSATION
In appreciation for your participation, you may receive a $25.00 gift certificate to a restaurant or store of your choosing.
PARTICIPANT RIGHTS
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to participate. If you
agree to participate, you have the right to stop at any time with no consequence. You also have
the right to skip any survey or interview question that you do not wish to answer.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The results of the study will not be associated with you in any way. We are required to keep a
copy of this informed consent document, but it will be kept separate from the study results. No
records are kept that allow your name to be associated with your responses in the study or on the
survey. Your responses will be anonymous. Before reporting any parts of your information, you
are allowed to view it and check for accuracy.

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS
You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study.
• For further information about the study, please contact Noralee Ortiz-Jasso at (xxx) xxx-xxxx
  and noralee.jasso@sjus.edu or Jason Laker, Ph.D., committee chair at (xxx) xxx-xxxx and
  jason.laker@sjus.edu
• Complaints about the research may be presented to Arnold Danzig, Ph.D., Director of the
  Department of Educational Leadership Doctoral Program at (xxx) xxx-xxxx and
  Arnold.danzig@sjus.edu
• For questions about your rights or to report research-related injuries, please contact Pamela
  Stacks, Ph.D., Associate Vice President of The Office of Research: (408) 924-2479.

PARTICIPANT SIGNATURE
Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study, that the details of
the study have been explained to you, that you have been given ample time to read this
document, and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. A copy of this consent
form will be provided to you for your records.

________________________________________
Participant’s Name (printed)

________________________________________
Participant’s Signature Date

INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT
I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and
all of his/her questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the
purpose, risks, benefits, and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily
agreed to participate.

________________________________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent Date
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CONSENTIMIENTO DE PARTICIPACIÓN EN LA INVESTIGACIÓN

TITULO DEL ESTUDIO: Familias Latine con hijas/os sordos en escuelas de California

NOMBRE DE LOS INVESTIGADORES: Noralee Jaso, candidata a doctorado, departamento de Liderazgo Educacional, Universidad de San José, presidente del comité: Dr. Jason Laker, departamento de Liderazgo Educacional, Universidad de San José.

Hola, mi nombre es noralee y soy una estudiante de la universidad de San José que está conduciendo un estudio sobre familias latinas que tienen hijas/os sordos o con dificultades auditivas. Usted lleno un cuestionario de reclutamiento donde expresó su interés en ser parte de este estudio. Me gustaría saber más sobre su experiencia con el sistema educativo para sordos y el tener un hijo sordo o con deficiencias auditivas en su casa. Para ser parte de este estudio usted debe ser un adulto latino y miembro de la una familia con un hijo sordo o con dificultades auditivas que esté cursando educación para sordos en algún grado entre pre Kindergarten al grado 12.

PROPÓSITO
El propósito de esta investigación en entender las experiencias de los familiares de un hijo sordo o con dificultades auditivas en el sistema de educación para sordos. Los resultados de este estudio nos ayudarán a aprender sobre familias en comunidades que no han sido reconocidas históricamente y que no han sido incluidas en suficientes investigaciones.

DESCRIPCIÓN DEL PROCEDIMIENTO DE INVESTIGACIÓN
Esta investigación se conducirá a través de entrevistas de 90 minutos. Las entrevistas se llevarán a cabo en el lugar y a la hora que usted expresó como la más conveniente para usted en el cuestionario de reclutamiento. La entrevista incluye una lista de preguntas a las que usted puede contestar ampliamente o de forma limitada. La entrevista será grabada y/o filmada de manera que pueda tomar notas y recordar la conversación. Yo seré la única persona que escuchará y verá las grabaciones. Usted será contactada/o cuando su entrevista esté transcrita para verificar la información y darle oportunidad de hacer cambios o aprobar la transcripción. Existe la posibilidad que le solicite una segunda entrevista para asegurarme de haber comprendido la información que usted compartió o para darle la oportunidad de agregar o explicar partes de la primera entrevista.

RIESGOS
No hay ningún riesgo evidente en la participación en este estudio más allá de los riesgos regulares de la vida diaria.

BENEFICIOS
Su participación en este estudio puede contribuir al mejoramiento de los programas disponibles para la educación de estudiantes sordos tanto para usted como para otras familias y/o educadores.

COMPENSACIÓN
Este estudio es voluntario pero podrá recibir compensación de tarjeta de regalo de $ 25.00 para una tienda o restaurante de su elección.
DERECHOS DE LOS PARTICIPANTES
Su participación en este estudio es completamente voluntaria y usted puede rehusar su participación. Si usted accede a participar, usted tiene el derecho de detener la entrevista en cualquier momento y por cualquier motivo sin ninguna consecuencia. Usted también tiene el derecho de saltar cualquier pregunta que no desee contestar.

CONFIDENCIALIDAD
Los resultados de este estudio no estarán asociados con su identidad de ninguna manera. Se nos requiere mantener una copia de este consentimiento, pero se mantendrá separada de los resultados del estudio. Ningún registro permitirá que su nombre se asocie con sus respuestas en el estudio. Antes de incluir cualquier parte de sus respuestas en el estudio, se le permitirá ver las respuestas y aprobarlas. Sus respuestas serán incluidas de manera anónima.

PREGUNTAS O PROBLEMAS
Lo invitamos a hacer preguntas en cualquier momento durante el estudio. Para cualquier información sobre el estudio, favor de contactar a Noralee Jasso al (xxx)xxx-xxxx o por el correo electrónico noralee.jasso@sjis.edu o a la Dr. Jason Laker, presidenta del comité al (xxx)xxx-xxx o por el correo electrónico jason.laker@sjis.edu. Cualquier queja sobre esta investigación debe presentarse al Dr. Arnold Danzig, director del departamento de liderazgo educacional al (408)924-3719 o al correo electrónico arnold.danzig@sjis.edu. Para preguntas sobre sus derechos o para reportar daños o perjuicios ocasionados por esta investigación, por favor contacte a la Dra. Pamela Stacks, vicepresidenta asociada de la oficina de investigación al (408)924-2488.

FIRMA DEL PARTICIPANTE
Su firma indica que usted accede voluntariamente a participar en este estudio, que los detalles del estudio le han sido explicados, que ha tenido suficiente tiempo para leer este documento y que sus preguntas han sido contestadas de manera satisfactoria. Se le proveerá una copia de este consentimiento para sus registros.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre del participante (en letra de molde)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firma del participante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DECLARACION DEL INVESTIGADOR
Certifico que se le dio suficiente tiempo al participante para leer y entender el estudio y que todas sus preguntas fueron respondidas. Es mi opinión que el participante entiende el propósito, los riesgos, beneficios, y los procedimientos que se llevarán a cabo en este estudio y que el participante ha accedido a participar voluntariamente.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firma de la persona que obtendrá el consentimiento</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fecha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose CA 95192

PO BOX XXXX
XXXXXXX CA XXXXX

February 5, 2017

Dear Family Members and Guardians of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children,

My name is Noralee Jasso. I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership Program at San Jose State University studying special education. My research and interest is specifically about deaf education and the Latina/o population with deaf and hard of hearing children. I am currently doing a study that will include interviews with Latina/o families who have or have had deaf and hard of hearing children and would like to invite you to participate. I am looking for volunteers to participate in an interview with me that would be 1 or 2 meetings for a total of approximately 90 minutes. We can set up the meeting at a time and place that is convenient for you from the list of options on the survey. You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.

You can be an adult family member of a deaf or hard of hearing child including a parent, guardian, grandparent, older sibling, aunt, uncle, or any adult member living in the home or who has lived in the home with a deaf or hard of hearing child who can share about the experiences of this child and deaf education programs. You must be able to communicate and understand one of the following languages for the interview: English, Spanish, or American Sign Language (ASL).

If you are interested in participating in the study, please fill out the survey and return it by mail in the envelope provided.

Your participation in this study may help inform deaf education programs and improve the experiences for Latina/o families with deaf and hard of hearing children. You may contact me at (xxx) xxx-xxxx and or ********@gmail.com for more information. I am working under guidance of Dr. Jason Laker, whom you may also contact at (xxx) xxx-xxxx for further information. I look forward to receiving your response and getting to learn more about your experiences of having or having had deaf and hard of hearing children.

Sincerely,

Noralee Jasso
Noralee Jasso
Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidate; Deaf Education Specialist
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San José State University  PO BOX XXXX
One Washington Square  XXXXXXX CA XXXXX
San José CA 95192

Febrero 3, 2017

Estimados guardianes y familiares,

Mi nombre es Noralee Jasso. Soy un estudiante en el programa de liderazgo educativo en la universidad de San José. Estudio educación especial. Mi interés en el área de educación especial y mi investigación académica se centra sobre la población Latina con niñas o niños sordos.

La investigación que estoy haciendo por lo pronto incluirá entrevistas con familias Latinas quien tenga o han criado niñas o niños sordos y me gustaría invitarles a participar. Busco miembros de este grupo para participar en una entrevista consenso. La entrevista sería aproximadamente 50 minutos total en una o dos sesiones. Podemos establecer la entrevista en un lugar y a la hora que sea conveniente para usted de la lista de opciones en la encuesta. Para participar en este estudio, debe tener por lo menos 18 años de edad.

Puede participar cualquier miembro adulto de la familia como un padre, guardián, abuela/o, hermano/a mayor, hijo/a, o cualquier miembro adulto viviendo en el hogar o quien ha vivido con un niño/a con sordera y que pueda compartir sus experiencias. Para participar, deber ser capaz de comunicarse y entender a uno de los siguientes idiomas para la entrevista: Inglés, español o lenguaje de señas Americano (ASL).

Si está interesado/a en participar en el estudio, por favor llene la encuesta y devuélvala por correo en el sobre que se adjunta.

Su participación en este estudio podrá ayudar programas educativos para niñas y niños con sordera y mejorar las experiencias de las familias Latinas/os con niñas y niños sordos. Para cualquier información sobre este estudio, favor de comunicarse con Noralee Jasso al (xxx) xxx-xxxx o por el correo electrónico XXXXXXXX@gmail.com Estoy trabajando bajo la dirección de la Dr. Jason Laker a quien puede contactar al (xxx) xxx-xxxx para más información. Quedo a la espera de su respuesta y de compartir y aprender de sus experiencias.

Atentamente,

Noralee Jasso
Noralee Jasso
Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidate; Deaf Education Specialist
Recruitment Process Diagram Quadrant 4
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Letter of Consent California Deaf Education Program

San José State University
One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192

PO BOX XXXX
XXXXXX CA XXXXX

October 6, 2016

“Deaf Education Program”
XXXX XXXXX XXXXX, CA XXXXX

Dear “Deaf Education Program Principal”,

My name is Noralee Jasso and I am a doctoral student at San José State University in the Educational Leadership Program. My field of study includes Educational Leadership and Special Education. In particular, I am interested in learning more about Deaf Education and the Latine population given that this group is currently the majority attending California deaf education programs.

Currently, I am in the process of beginning a research project in which I would like the Latine families who have children in the deaf and hard of hearing program in your Deaf/Hard of Hearing Program to participate. The process and objectives for this research entail interviewing the families of this student population to examine and learn about the experiences Latine families have whose deaf and hard of hearing children attend your program with the “California Deaf Education Program”. Your permission would allow me to distribute recruitment surveys to Latine deaf and hard of hearing students in your program to find interested participants.

Participation from families is voluntary and can be terminated by participants at any time. Explanation and/or any pertinent details about the research will be provided to each participant. Any information and/or data collected from any participants will remain confidential and anonymous with only myself and my committee chair, Dr. XXXX XXXXX, having access to that information. My time with any participant will be scheduled at his/her convenience and at an agreed upon location with no disruption to classrooms, teaching, or schedules.

This project may contribute and/or provide insight to the manner in which we work with Latine families who have deaf and hard of hearing children. I would like for your county to be a part that contribution.

You may contact me at (xxx) xxx-xxxx and/or xxxxx@xxxxxxx for more information. I am working under guidance of Dr. XXXX XXXXXXX, whom you may also contact at (408) 924-xxxx. I look forward to working with you and your program.

Sincerely,

Noralee Jasso
Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidate; Deaf Education Specialist
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October 6, 2016

“County/District Special Education Office”
XXXX XXXXXX XXXXX, CA XXXXX

Dear “County/District Special Education Director”,

My name is Noralee Jasso and I am a doctoral student at San José State University in the Educational Leadership Program. My field of study includes Educational Leadership and Special Education. In particular, I am interested in learning more about Deaf Education and the Latine population, given that this group is currently the majority attending California deaf education programs.

Currently, I am in the process of beginning a research project in which I would like the Latine families who have children in the deaf and hard of hearing program in your county/district to participate. The process and objectives for this research entail recruitment surveys and interviews to learn about the experiences of Latine families with deaf and hard of hearing children in your deaf education programs. Your permission would allow me to distribute recruitment surveys to Latine deaf and hard of hearing students in your deaf education county/district program within the “California Deaf Education Program” to find willing family participants.

Participation from families is voluntary and can be terminated by participants at any time. Explanation and/or any pertinent details about the research will be provided to each participant. Any information and/or data collected from participants will remain confidential and anonymous with only me and my committee chair, Dr. XXXX XXXX, having access to that information. My time with any participant will be scheduled at his/her convenience outside of the “California Deaf Education Program” hours and site at an agreed upon location with no disruption of school schedules and/or instruction.

This project may contribute and/or provide insight to the manner in which we work with Latine families who have deaf and hard of hearing children. I would like for your county/district to be a part of that contribution. Approval to distribute surveys at your county/district deaf and hearing of hearing program may be sent as a written notice by email or sent to the PO BOX listed above.

You may contact me at (xxx) xxx-xxxx and/or xxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx for more information. I am working under guidance of Dr. XXXX XXXXX, whom you may also contact at (408) 924-xxxx for further information. I look forward to having your support and working with you and your county/district program.

Sincerely,

Noralee Jasso
Noralee Jasso, M.A.
Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidate; Deaf Education Specialist
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San José State University
One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192

PO BOX XXXX
XXXXXX CA XXXXX

October 6, 2016

“County/District Superintendent of Schools”
XXXX XXXXX XXXXX, CA XXXXX

Dear “County/District Superintendent of Schools”,

My name is Noralee Jasso and I am a doctoral student at San José State University in the Educational Leadership Program. My field of study includes Educational Leadership and Special Education. In particular, I am interested in learning more about Deaf Education and the Latinx population given that this group is currently the majority attending California deaf education programs.

Currently, I am in the process of beginning a research project in which I would like the Latinx families who have children in the deaf and hard of hearing program in your county/district to participate. The process and objectives for this research entail interviewing the families of this student population to examine and learn about the experiences Latinx families have whose deaf and hard of hearing children attend your county program with the “California Deaf Education Program”. Your permission would allow me to distribute recruitment surveys to Latinx deaf and hard of hearing students in your deaf education county/district program within the “California Deaf Education Program” to find willing participants.

Participation from families is voluntary and can be terminated by participants at any time. Explanation and/or any pertinent details about the research will be provided to each participant. Any information and/or data collected from any participants will remain confidential and anonymous with only myself and my committee chair, Dr. XXXX XXXXX, having access to that information. My time with any participant will be scheduled at his/her convenience and at an agreed upon location with no disruption of school schedules and/or teaching.

This project may contribute and/or provide insight to the manner in which we work with Latinx families who have deaf and hard of hearing children. I would like for your county/district to be a part of that contribution. Written notice of approval may be sent by email or sent to the PO BOX listed above.

You may contact me at (xxx) xxx-xxxx and/or XXXX@XXXX.XXX for more information. I am working under guidance of Dr. XXXX XXXXX, whom you may also contact at (408) 924-xxxx. I look forward to working with you and your county/district program.

Sincerely,

Noralee Jasso
Noralee Jasso
Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidate; Deaf Education Specialist
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#### Literature Matrix 2014 to 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms Searched</th>
<th>Research Tool</th>
<th>Total Sources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Duplicate Listings</th>
<th>Used Listings</th>
<th>New Listings</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Duplication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>115,683</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>68,923</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Hispanic</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Hispanic, Bilingual, Multilingual, Education</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Hispanic, Education (excluding Bilingual)</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Latin*</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Latino, Education</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Latino, Education (excluding Bilingual)</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6 duplicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>60,498</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>43,289</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Education</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>18,776</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13,290</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Education, Hispanic</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4 new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Education, Hispanic (excluding Bilingual)</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6 duplicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Latino</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Latino, Education</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Latino or Hispanic or Chano or Latina or Mexican</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Ethnic*, Education</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Rac*, Education</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing, Impair*, Fam*, Education</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Fam*, Education</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Fam*, Education, Latin*, Hispanic</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Education, and Latino or Chicano or Latina or Mexican</td>
<td>Scholarly timeline</td>
<td>73 databases</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61 duplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, Latina</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1982-1999</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms Searched</th>
<th>Research Tool</th>
<th>Total Sources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Duplicate Listings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Latino&quot;/deafness</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2017-yes</td>
<td>161,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/&quot;Latino&quot; students/deaf education</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2017-yes</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Latino&quot; families/deaf education</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2017-yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf476 databases</td>
<td>Deaf, Hispanic</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1947-yes</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Hispanic, Bilingual, Multilingual, Education</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1983-2020</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Hispanic, Education (excluding Bilingual)</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1978-2020</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Latin*</td>
<td>Deaf, Latino, Education</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1982-2020</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Latino, Education (excluding Bilingual)</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1988-2017</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*</td>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Education</td>
<td>60,498</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>43,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Education, Hispanic</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1975-yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Education, Hispanic (excluding Bilingual)</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Latino</td>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Latino, Education</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1983-yes</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Latino, Education (excluding Bilingual)</td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Latino or Hispanic or Chicano or Latina or Mexican</td>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Ethnic*, Education</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Latino or Hispanic or Chicano or Latina or Mexican and Education</td>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Rac*, Education</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Fam*, Education</td>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Fam*, Education, Latin*, Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Education, and Latino or Chicano or Latina or Mexican</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Ethnic*, Education</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Rac*, Education</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impair*, Fam*, Education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Fam*, Education</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Fam*, Education, Latin*, Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf, Education, and Latino or Chicano or Latina or Mexican</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>unlisted</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix N: Verification of Translation Accuracy

San Jose State University Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board
VERIFICATION OF TRANSLATION ACCURACY FORM

Please either attach this form to your IRB application if the protocol includes translated documents or include this form when revisions of translated documents are submitted to the IRB. Investigator(s) may translate documents, but may not verify the accuracy of the translation. The IRB does not require that a certified translator perform the document translation. The verification may, for example, be provided by a member of the Department of World Languages and Literatures or an individual who has a bachelor's degree in that language. The form must be completely filled out and signed by the individual providing the verification. Duplicate fields are included if documents are submitted in multiple languages that require verification from different individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Investigator(s):</th>
<th>Noralee Orto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Proposed Project:</td>
<td>Understanding the Experiences of Latino Families with Signing Deaf/Hard of Hearing Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Tracking Number (if already assigned by IRB):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Verifying Individual:</td>
<td>Adriana Rangel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language:</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I, the undersigned, verify that all translated materials related to the above named study reflect the intent and spirit of the English text.

[Signature]

Date: 10/6/16