UC Berkeley
UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Research-Practice Partnerships, Urban Education Reform and Teacher Positionality: An Examination of Community Change and Youth Empowerment

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2rd0b64q

Author

Gamez-Djokic, Blanca

Publication Date

2021

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Research-Practice Partnerships, Urban Education Reform and Teacher Positionality: An Examination of Community Change and Youth Empowerment

By

Blanca Gamez-Djokic

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Education

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Zeus Leonardo, Chair
Professor Kris Gutierrez
Professor Michael Omi

Fall 2021

Abstract

Research-Practice Partnerships, Urban Education Reform and Teacher Positionality: An
Examination of Community Change and Youth Empowerment

by

Blanca Gamez-Djokic

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Zeus Leonardo, Chair

Partnerships between schools, universities, community organizations and private
businesses have become an increasingly popular response to the privatization of
resources accompanying market-based education reforms (Rodriguez, 2020; Warren,
2005). Through these partnerships, stakeholders mobilize resources across sectors and
scales in an effort to support students, families, communities and schools. Some of these
partnerships, such as public-private partnerships between schools and corporate
organizations, have been critically examined as emblematic of the neoliberalization of
public schooling (Giroux, 2013; Lipman, 2013). Research-practice partnerships (RPPs),
"long-term, mutualistic collaborations between practitioners and researchers that are
intentionally organized to investigate problems of practice and solutions for improving
district outcomes" (Coburn, Penuel, Geil, 2013, p.2), have recently cropped up as a
"promising" (Datnow, 2020), "hope-based" (Schneider, 2018) equity-oriented alternative
to top-down reforms (Coburn et al., 2013). While these types of partnerships stand to
generate important research and knowledge on schools and teaching and learning by
involving multiple stakeholders and practitioners as well as youth in the research process,
thereby expanding conventional modes of school-community-university collaboration,
there is still a paucity of empirical research that supports the construction of RPPs as
contributing to equity. Specifically, there is little to no empirical knowledge about how
and the extent to which RPPs are intervening in and changing the structural issues they
are positioned as redressing. Depending on the scholar and RPP, they are variously
constructed as race-conscious or race-neutral. Furthermore, while scholarship has focused
on the role of researchers in RPPs, and on the relationships between researchers and
practitioners, few studies have focused specifically on what the experiences of teachers
reveals about the impact of RRPs.

Research-Practice Partnerships, Urban Education Reform and Teacher Positionality: An
Examination of Community Change and Youth Empowerment (CCYE), takes up these
issues. I examine CCYE, a RPP between a research center housed in a university in

California, local civic agencies and business partners, and local urban high schools, that is focused on cultivating civic inclusivity of racially and economically minoritized youth. This dissertation asks:

(1) How and to what extent do RPPs intervene in and/or reproduce the systems and structures they seek to redress?
   a. What do RPP actors' communicative and discursive practices, such as their use of figurative language and speech interactions, reveal about RPPs' functions and impacts?
(2) What are teachers' roles in RPPs and how do they make sense of their roles, experiences, and work in RPPs?

To answer these questions, I conducted an ethnographic case study of CCYE. My findings show that teachers' professional and personal pasts influenced the way teachers made sense of working within a multi-organizational partnership as well as the way that they took up their roles. Teachers made sense of their roles dialogically and drew on social and cultural resources from their past careers and experiences to identify organizational boundaries in the partnership and delineate their organizational position and tasks.

My findings also suggest that increasing concerns with the civic empowerment and career and technical education of young people in state (Linked Learning), and federal-level (Career and Technical Education) reforms engendered slippages in the way that teachers made sense of their roles and CCYE's goals of civic inclusion, referring to themselves as "employers" and "bosses" and their students as "employees" and "workers". I show that working within these slippages impacted teachers' sense of agency and role in ways that differed across racial lines. White teachers' role negotiation in CCYE involved shifting practices and language to take on employer-like qualities, while the discomforts of role negotiation for Black teachers revealed a fraught relationship to the civil sphere. I trace teachers' differential experiences of discomfort to the underlying logic in current education reform that civic inclusion through school can be achieved through participation in the labor market.

Finally, through conversation and discourse analysis, I illuminate the prevailing communicative practices and racializing discourses that CCYE actors drew on to construe and position themselves as social justice actors. By the same token, I also illuminate the ways in which actors disciplined and censored one another through talk and emotional interaction in the interest of maintaining an essential idea of CCYE as a social justice organization.

This project makes an important contribution to literature interested in the impact and function of school-community-university partnerships and teachers' roles and experiences in "alternative" reforms. By drawing on critical theories of race and organizations, in particular racial formation theory and racial organizations, my project responds to urgent calls to critically examine the technologies and relationships that shape RPPs' impacts. My findings demonstrate that RPPs are embedded in contextual

reform histories as well as the histories of the actors that populate them. These histories shape how RPPs respond to structural inequities as well as their capacity to intervene in them.

Table of contents

Acknowledgments

I am deeply indebted to the many mentors, colleagues, friends and family that have supported me in my doctoral journey. Working with an amazing dissertation committee has been a truly fulfilling experience. My wonderful chair and advisor, Zeus Leonardo, has offered sincere, critical and affirming guidance and mentorship that were crucial in shaping my growth and evolution as a scholar. I am not the same thinker or person as I was when I started my doctoral journey, and I owe much of this to the influence of Zeus's scholarship and mentorship. I am grateful for the many ways in which Zeus made himself available to his students, from inviting us into his home, to making sure to organize advisee get-togethers every semester. When the COVID-19 pandemic required us to shelter in place, we continued this practice through Zoom. I appreciated seeing the faces and hearing the voices of my colleagues during a time when it was important to be supported, encouraged, heard, seen, and simply to talk. I am also indebted to the support of Kris Gutierrez, whose intellectual, pedagogical and methodological prowess are an inspiration. I learned so much from participating in Kris's writing groups, a space of warm and rigorous critique and scholarly growth. Finally, I am indebted to Michael Omi's careful and thoughtful attention to my work, beginning in 2014 when I took my first class with Professor Omi, Comparative Racialization and Relations Between Communities of Color. His feedback on my work has been formative to the epistemic and political commitments of my research agenda and I hope to one day emulate his pedagogical and mentoring ethic.

I am also grateful for the camaraderie, support and mentorship of the "Leonardians" advisee group, many of whom continue to offer help and resources after graduation: Jocyl Sacramento, Michael Singh, Gema Cardona, Ellen Lin, Patrick Johnson, Hoang Tran, Nicole Rangel, Joy Esboldt. I am forever grateful for my good friend, Krista Cortes, whose friendship impacted my doctoral journey in ways that still become apparent to me every day. I feel fortunate to feel a part of her loving little family. The support and friendship of Bryce Becker, Renee Kissell, Karen Villegas, Michael Singh, Eddie Rivero, Hector Beltran, Angelica Guevara, Vianney Gavilanes has guided me through the completion of qualifying papers, oral examinations and the dissertation. I am also grateful for the accountability that the "Pandemic Writing Group" offered and continues to offer me: Rachel Williams, Nicole Cotton, Rene Kissell, and Miy'a – I appreciate you all!

The Institute for the Study of Social Issues (ISSI) was a gamechanger for my doctoral experience. At ISSI, I found a "room of one's own," so to speak. A quiet, cozy office to think and work in, a community of scholars, and an officemate that I continue to work with remotely after the shelter in place ordinance. I am indebted to the loving and critical guidance of Deborah Lustig and David Minkus, whose support and feedback on my

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The discursive life of research-practice partnerships

At the center of the Spencer Foundation's page for research-practice partnerships (RPPs) is an image of two young boys, one White and one Black, looking at a small toy or tool that the White boy is holding. The boys' eyes and heads are cast downwards towards this object, and the little Black boy is reaching out his hand in a gesture suggesting it is his turn to hold the object. Half of the White boy's body is covered with a caption that reads: "Research-Practice Partnerships: Collaborative research for educational change". A thick, metal pole passes horizontally behind the heads of the two boys, and the shadowy reflection of large, industrial windows crisscrosses against the splash of sun on the wall behind the boys. To the top right of the image is a metal box – perhaps a circuit breaker box – mounted onto the wall from which loose, unattached wires hang. Beneath the electrical box, another pipe stretches up and then bends to the left, connecting to an ambiguous object, perhaps a socket. It is not clear from the image where the children are, why they are there, when this interaction took place, and whether or not it was staged or natural.

(https://www.spencer.org/grant_types/research-practice-partnerships)

The story behind the drama that unfolds in this opening image – an interaction between two children of different races – is perhaps irrelevant to the ostensive purpose of the page, which makes a call for applications to the Spencer Foundation's RPP Grants Program that supports "education research projects that engage in collaborative participatory partnerships" (spencer.org). However, the image sets the discursive stage for what this drama signifies, research-practice partnerships as a source of educational

change, which is indexed by the caption juxtaposed onto the image. The inter-racial interaction between the two children and the mysterious industrial setting in which the interaction takes place is suggestive of the kind of change RPPs are supposed to be a harbinger of. The words "collaborative research for educational change" inscribed in bold, white lettering over a light blue and floating above the children's hands suggest that the nature of the change RPPs bring about is grounded in questions of racial equity and situated within a history of reforms concerned with the country's industry and capacity to progress and compete globally. More specifically, however, the large industrial windows, the meandering pipes, electrical sockets and boxes, and the toy/tool the children are captivated by, suggest a political and cultural concern with STEM, or science, technology, engineering and mathematics. RPPs, then, are discursively constructed as vehicles of "educational change" in the historical drama of the image and imbued not just with hope, but are positioned also as sites of political and cultural contention.

Additionally, the two child protagonists of the image invoke an innocence and morality to RPP work that is tethered to a utopic imaginary of the future (Nasir et al., 2021), the "what could be" of "educational change". Indeed, RPPs are concerned with promoting "the production and use of rigorous research about problems of practice" that "hold promise for improving the relevance of the research produced, the use of research by organizations, and outcomes for youth" (rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org). Consequently, the idea communicated by the photo is that RPPs are invested in the production of a public good and a better educational future, since children, as the cliché goes, are the future. Not pictured in the image, but implicated in organizations, are the various actors from various sectors that circulate through and populate RPPs. Interactions between these actors have been at the center of recent scholarship examining power dynamics in role negotiation and cross-organizational collaborative work (Farrell et al., 2019). Scholars have captured the frustrations and difficulties that emerge when actors take on new roles and duties, or when organizational cultures collide, clashes that are often complicated by race, ethnicity, gender and class power differentials (Diamond, 2021; Vakil, de Royston, Nasir, Kirshner, 2016). Although invested in the same hopeful project invoked in the Spencer Foundation image pictured above, this scholarship reveals the complex nuances that mark RPPs' relative newness as an intervention and the volatility of organizational design. While the image above captures the grand practical and conceptual gestures RPPs make toward reform intervention, on a granular, (micro)interactional level, the impact and character of RPPs are shaped by the actors that move through them.

It may seem gratuitous to unpack with such a level of scrutiny a single photo (among many others sprinkled throughout the Spencer Foundation website) intended to promote a call for applications to fund projects. However, as "a leading funder of education research since 1971" and "the only national foundation focused exclusively on supporting education research," the Spencer Foundation occupies a privileged cultural and social position to shape dominant trends in and modes of knowledge production and educational priorities. Images help to tell the story of why, how and when these knowledges and priorities become salient and, as can be seen in a perusal of the Spencer Foundation

website, coalesce into a sort of aesthetic of practice, interaction and "educational change" more broadly. It is not just in this image, however, that the story of RPPs unfolds.

The William T. Grant Foundation has also recently invested much attention to the potential of RPPs and significant funds towards studying them (rpp.wtgrandfoundation.org). An entire part of the foundation's website is devoted to defining and describing RPPs, offering literature on RPPs, and providing interactive resources for practitioners and funders interested in forging a partnership (rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org). In the "About RPPs" section, RPPs are described as "a promising strategy for better aligning the research and practice communities" (rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org, para 4). In a slightly more apprehensive approach towards RPPs, and resisting how RPPs appear "on paper," director of the Institute of Educational Sciences, Mark Schneider, discussed RPPs as "mostly hope-based" endeavors, siting a lack of empirical evidence that identifies "the functions, structures, or processes that work best for increasing the *impact* of RPPs" (Schneider, 2018, ies.ed.gov/blogs). As I explain in the following chapter, as RPPs continue to grow as popular "alternatives" to top-down education reforms, practitioners and scholars increasingly call for a critical appreciation of the "expansive possibilities" and "imagination" of RPPs (Suad Nasir, 2021, https://sites.google.com/view/powerpossibilityequityinrpps/home) as well as the "institutional histories" and "power dynamics" (Diamond, 2021) in which RPPs are situated.

Discussing what is not pictured in the aesthetic representation of RPPs, or left out of the frame, suggests areas in RPP research that are still developing and under-researched. Among the actors unpictured are teachers. RPPs vary in scale and take on many different forms and designs (Farrell et al., 2021). This means that while many RPPs are concerned with educational issues and problems of practice, some, but not all RPPs work with classrooms or teachers. The variation in kinds of RPPs that exist has not only made it difficult to make broad claims about the impact of RPPs (Farrell et al., 2021; Penuel & Hill, 2019) but has also likely been a part of the reason for the dearth of empirical research on teachers' roles and experiences in RPPs. Given that RPPs are discussed as an "alternative" to traditional reforms, and given what we know about teachers' overwhelmingly negative interactions with top-down reforms, this constitutes a significant void in the literature that is important and needs investigating.

Purpose of the study

Farrell et al (2021) define a research-practice partnership as: "A long-term collaboration aimed at educational improvement or equitable transformation through engagement with research. These partnerships are intentionally organized to connect diverse forms of expertise and shift power relations in the research endeavor to ensure that all partners have a say in the joint work" (p. iv).While these types of partnerships may generate important research and knowledge on schools and teaching and learning by

involving multiple stakeholders and practitioners as well as youth in the research process, thereby expanding conventional modes of school-community-university collaboration, there is still a paucity of empirical research that supports the construction of RPPs as contributing to equity. Specifically, there is little empirical knowledge about how and the extent to which RPPs intervene in and change the structural issues they are positioned to redress. Depending on the scholar and RPP, they are variously constructed as race-conscious (Barton & Bevan, 2016) or race-neutral (Vakil, de Royston, Nasir, Kirshner, 2016), a key confusion that I will address in this paper. Furthermore, while scholarship has focused on the role of researchers in RPPs, and on the relationships between researchers and practitioners, few studies have focused specifically on what the experiences of teachers reveal about the impact of RRPs.

This dissertation, *Research-Practice Partnerships, Urban Education Reform and Teachers' Roles: An Examination of Community Change and Youth Empowerment (CCYE),* takes up these issues. I examine CCYE, an RPP between a research center housed in a university in Northern California, local civic agencies and business partners, and local urban high schools focused on cultivating civic inclusivity of racially and economically minoritized youth. Through an ethnographic case study of a research-practice partnership, Community Change and Youth Empowerment (CCYE), I show that teachers' professional and personal pasts influenced the way teachers made sense of working within a multi-organizational partnership as well as the way that they took up their roles. Teachers made sense of their roles and drew on social and cultural resources from their past careers and experiences to identify organizational boundaries in the partnership and delineate their organizational position and tasks. My findings also show that increasing concerns with the civic empowerment and career and technical education of young people in state (Linked Learning), and federal-level (Career and Technical Education) reforms engendered slippages in the way that teachers made sense of their roles and CCYE's goals of civic inclusion, referring to themselves as "employers" and "bosses" and their students as "employees" and "workers". I refer to this conflation between civic and economic role and purpose as the "civic-economic slippage," and show that working within these slippages impacted teachers' sense of agency and role in racialized ways. While it seemed to have an enabling function for white teachers, teachers' role negotiation in CCYE involved shifting practices and language to take on employer-like qualities, whereby black teachers were comparatively constrained by these shifts. I trace teachers' differential experiences of discomfort to the underlying logic in current education reform that civic inclusion through school can be achieved through participation in the labor market. Finally, through conversation and discourse analysis, I illuminate the prevailing communicative practices and racializing discourses that CCYE actors drew on to construe and position themselves as social justice actors. By the same token, I also illuminate the ways in which actors disciplined and censored one another through talk and emotional interaction in the interest of maintaining an essential idea of CCYE as a social justice organization.

This project makes an important contribution to literature interested in the impact and function of school-community-university partnerships and teachers' roles and experiences in "alternative" reforms. By integrating critical theories of race and organizations into my analysis, my research responds to recent, urgent calls to examine critically the technologies and relationships that shape RPPs' impact. My findings demonstrate that RPPs are embedded in contextual reform histories as well as the histories of the actors that populate them. These histories shape how RPPs respond to structural inequities as well as their capacity to intervene in them.

Conceptual Framework

Research-practice partnerships, racial projects and racialized organizations

The construction of RPPs as a socially-just alternative to federally and state-mandated reforms as well as the anti-oppressive associations that come with the romanticized construct "community" (as in school-university-community partnership) (Joseph, 2002) may have something to do with the apparent structural neutrality of RPPs. As "alternatives" to neoliberal reforms, RPPs enjoy a perceived exteriority from socializing structures and systems. This does not to suggest that all reforms are universally driven by a logic of competitive individualism, commodification, or accumulation, but rather to question the possible material consequences of discursively placing something outside of or beyond these forces by the way we talk about and name it.

While few scholars have explicitly examined how RPPs, or partnerships between schools, community and civic organizations and universities function as sites of social reproduction and/or contestation, some take up the ways that these partnerships' stated social justice goals and outcomes are unrealistically lofty to the point of being "fantastical" (Baum, 2000). Although partnerships may overstate their goals and impacts for a variety of reasons – e.g., pressures from funders, community activists, or university administrators – Baum (2000) explains that this kind of uncritical approach perpetuates lack of accountability and tension between organizational entities involved in partnerships and harmfully impacts actualizing more realistic interventions to social and structural problems. Although Baum does not explicitly discuss the racial implications of the fantastical realm discursively produced by and in which partnerships exist, implicit in his discussion is the reality that for the racially and economically minoritized people most impacted by structural inequities a gap exists between the production of hope for redress and the materialization of intervention.

These fraught reforms can be thought of as examples of racial projects. Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1994) defined racial projects as "simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial identities and meanings, and an effort to organize and distribute resources (economic, political, cultural) along particular racial lines" (p.125). Racial projects serve as the building blocks of racial formations,

"the sociohistorical process by which racial identities are created, lived out, transformed and destroyed" (p.109) and occur at micro (individual, interactional), meso (organizational), and macro (institutional) levels and thus take on many forms. Omi and Winant explain that there are two kinds of racial projects: *racist* projects and *anti-racist* projects. While a *racist* project reproduces structures of domination based on racial significations and identities, an anti-racist project undoes or resists structures of domination based on racial significations and identities.

Victor Ray's (2019) concept of "racialized organizations" is instructive for understanding how many organizations fall into a slippery space between racist and antiracist projects. Ray defines a racialized organization as "meso-level social structures that limit the personal agency and collective efficacy of subordinate racial groups while magnifying the agency of the dominant racial group. The ability to act upon the world, to create, to learn, to express emotion—indeed, one's full humanity—is constrained (or enabled) by racialized organizations" (p.36). Ray identifies three key mechanisms through which racialized organizations limit the individual and collective capacities of minoritized groups: 1.) limiting access to resources and the abilities of racially subordinate groups to form organizations, 2.) bestowing an assumed legitimacy and unfair access to resources on White organizations (e.g. a "credentialing of whiteness"; p.41), and 3.) by decoupling progressive organizational commitments from the core functions of organizational actions. Racialized organizations are governed by what Ray refers to as "schema-resource couplings," or the coupling of dominant ideologies and scripts ("situationally-applicable templates for social action" (p.31) with the distribution and application of material and symbolic resources. Although Ray (2019) does not explicitly define organizations as single, bounded entities, the examples he provides (AirBnb; churches; schools) suggest as much.

In this study, I extend racialized organization framework to examine the relationships that bring organizations together in collaborative efforts. Miron (2003) explains that an increase in school-community partnerships – or what he calls "joint ventures" – leads to new institutional[1] configurations between cities and schools. Miron draws on Howell Baum's (1999) notion of "interorganizational domains" to discuss how these new institutional configurations call attention to the importance of the relational dynamics that exist between organizations such that no organization is autonomous or exists in vacuum, but rather all organizations are interdependent. "Interorganizational domains" refers to the environmental contexts in which organizations are engulfed and is instructive for understanding how and why racialized organizations are an appropriate framework for the proposed study. Whether or not meso-level organizations like schools,

---

[1] Victor Ray (2019) argues that scholars often conflate the distinction between macro-level institutions and meso-level organizations. Ray positions the "racial state" and "institutionalized racism" at the macro level of analysis, and "individual workplaces; schools; and church" at the meso level. Within the literature reviewed here, scholars sometimes indistinguishably switch between institutions and organizations.

universities, or civic agencies consciously and intentionally formulate partnerships, their existence and fates are linked.

Furthermore, Ray explains that racialized organizations are sites of "racial contestation" as much as they "magnify the power and depth of racial projects" and "reinforce, challenge, or alter racial meanings" (p.30). Thus, a racialized, organizational framework does not assume organizations are racially over-determined, but rather calls attention to the fact that organizations, as meso-level entities, engage in racializing work in multiple, unique ways that are not taken up by micro or macro-level analytics. Ray explains that many organizations make performative claims to engage in antiracist practices and efforts while the material impact of their actions largely reproduce existing structures and systems. This kind of decoupling between performative claims to antiracist equity and actual practice is one of the operative mechanisms of racialized organizations. Racialized organizations are not necessarily squarely racist or antiracist (although they can be) but act as tenuous sites where meanings around race and racism are negotiated, contested, reified and consolidated through discursive and ideological practices.

To the extent that racialized organizations also operate as racial projects, Ray's theory animates and extends racial projects because it affords an understanding of how organizations, particularly those that claim to be doing social justice work, emerge as what Sofia Rodriguez (2020) refers to as a "tenuous racial project." Rodriguez studied a partnership between a school district and a local public library developed with the goal of cultivating a sense of social belonging in migrant youth and showed that the partnership's focus on English language instruction alongside fostering grit and career readiness reinforced assimilationist logics and racialized scripts of migrant otherness that contingently structured belonging, inclusion and opportunity for the migrant youth. Rodriguez argues that school-community partnerships, like the one she examines, can operate as "tenuous racial projects" due to the "tenuous dynamic of simultaneously promoting belonging, and thus educational opportunities, while structuring inequality" (p.6).

I build on the existing research surveyed here to investigate explicitly teachers' experiences (as opposed to grouping a study of teachers' experiences with other actors, such as district administrators and researchers) as situated within broader contexts and histories of reform and experience. The conceptual framing of my project directs my research to examine the interplay between RPPs' organizational responsiveness to existing reforms as well as the impact of teachers' social and organizational positionality on their experiences in the RPP. Drawing on a racial projects and racialized organizations approach, my study interrogates the ways that the mutually implicated nature of RPPs and state and federal reforms can shape teachers' experiences in RPPs in ways that reinforce neoliberal ideologies about the economic purpose of schooling and teachers.

Chapter Overview

In Chapter 2, I review the relevant literature on RPPs, teachers' roles in RPPs, and analyses of RPPs' reproductive and racializing functions. My review of the literature demonstrates that critiques of RPPs are a relatively new but growing area of the literature, as are studies that focus particularly on teachers' roles in and experiences of RPPs. To date, no study of RPPs explicitly has used a racial projects or racialized organization lens to study RPPs, although I discuss similar studies, such as Sofia Rodriguez's (2019) study of a partnership between a school district and a public library as a racialized organization. I situate this missing approach within emerging calls in the literature to examine RPPs from critical race perspectives (Barton & Bevan, 2016; Diamond, 2021).

In Chapter 3, I discuss my relationship to CCYE, researcher positionality, and the ethnographic case study approach I employed to collect and analyze data. I state my research questions and explain how my work with and relationship to CCYE led me to this particular set of questions about RPPs. I also explain my methodological choice to analyze data using a joint hermeneutics of empathy and suspicion (Leonardo, 2013). While a hermeneutics of empathy appreciates the utopic project invoked by RPPs, a hermeneutics of suspicion casts a critical eye towards and seeks to deconstruct the imagined moral consensus of such a project.

In Chapter 4, *Teachers as "Facilitators" and the Dialogism of Boundary-Crossing in CCYE*, I discuss how teachers' past careers and personal biographies are important factors to consider in how teachers understand, take up, and experience their roles in RPPs. I do this by examining the metaphors teachers used to describe their roles, such as teachers' overwhelming use of the metaphor "facilitator". I examine how teachers' metaphors emerged as a discursive tool that allowed teachers to make sense of their new charge in CCYE in relation to past experiences and identities and to draw on past schemas as sources of social-cultural information and knowledge that would assist in the recognition and navigation of boundaries. I also examine how this dialogical process enabled and/or constrained teachers' efforts to articulate and execute a sense of role within CCYE. How actors dialogically enter into and construct their roles in RPPs influences the manner in which they apprehend boundaries and act from within their liminal bounds. Unpacking teachers' metaphors illuminates the complexities of teaching and boundary-crossing, and makes the case for an examination not just of teachers' boundary-crossing practices, but perhaps more importantly, their boundary-*recognizing* practices and resources.

Building on findings discussed in Chapter 4, Chapter 5, *Civic-Economic Slippage: RPPs and the Politics of Vocational Education Reform*, demonstrates that RPPs like CCYE can perpetuate the practice of understanding civic inclusion as occurring through participation in the workforce and thereby through one's economic viability. In particular, I present data that suggests that interactions between federal (CTE) and state reforms (Linked Learning) with local, "alternative" civic-oriented reforms, such as CCYE, can reproduce while attempting to intervene in the structural exclusion of racially and economically minoritized groups. I refer to this interaction as a "civic-economic slippage," where teachers in CCYE interpreted their role, work and relationship to their

students through an economic lens. I discuss how some teachers referred to themselves and civic and business partners alike as "employers," and referred to students as "employees," and made sense of students' civic experiences in terms of preparation for the workforce. I examine the ways that this slippage was reflected in the practical choices teachers made while guiding their students through the PAR projects, such as the careful formation of student groups according to ability. I conclude the chapter by discussing instances where CCYE's organizational practices reflect the operative tenets of racialized organizations as delineated by Victor Ray (2019).

While Chapters 4 and 5 drew largely on interview data as well as field observations to understand how teachers made sense of, enact and experience their roles, Chapter 6, *Resistance and Discipline through the Micro-interactional Politics of RPP "Shop Talk" in a Focus Group Discussion*, employs a different methodology. Using critical discourse and conversational analysis, I conduct a micro-interactional examination of patterns of conversation and dynamics of interaction that emerged during a focus group discussion intended to allow reflection on practice between teachers. By looking closely at *what* was said and *how* it was said, I examine what actors' communicative and discursive practices reveal about CCYE's capacity to intervene in and/or reproduce the structural inequities it seeks to redress. I build on findings from the previous two chapters by focusing specifically on the variously constraining and enabling, as well as racialized and racializing, contours of actors' "shop talk." Findings show that the prevailing communicative practices that transpired between focus group participants disciplined the talk and emotion of teachers and the stories they shared. In particular, the talk, emotion and stories of the only Black teacher present, Mr. Franklin, were disciplined by Alyssa, the white associate director, in the interest of maintaining narratives of CCYE as invested in and facilitating civic inclusion. This dynamic of interaction resulted in the reproduction of racialized narratives of Black dysfunction, the positioning of CCYE as an organizational savior, and the reification of structural antagonisms.

Finally, in Chapter 7, I conclude this dissertation by considering a set of three practical implications for RPPs and RPP actors. These implications include: (1) recognize tension & have "courageous conversations" around contested issues, (2) boundary-recognizing vs. boundary-crossing: Understand how teachers and other actors recognize boundaries, (3) understanding teachers and other actors as situated, "historical actors", and (4) avoid fantasy and articulate possibility. I also discuss implications for future research on RPPs. I suggest that in order to build a robust and comprehensive understanding of how RPPs respond to local issues and what tools might be leveraged across contexts to address questions of equity, it is necessary to mobilize a large-scale, comparative study of RPPs across state regional contexts. Such a comparative examination of RPPs might generate the necessary data to better understand how local and regional context influence design choices, and how these choices in turn impact teachers' sense-making of their roles and position in RPPs. This might also help to

identify what design choices can be leveraged across contexts to enable rather than constrain teacher agency.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

Partnerships between schools, universities, community organizations and private businesses have become an increasingly popular response to the privatization of resources accompanying market-based education reforms (Rodriguez, 2020; Warren, 2005). Through these partnerships, stakeholders mobilize resources across sectors and scales in an effort to support students, families, communities and schools. Some of these partnerships, such as public-private partnerships between schools and corporate organizations, have been critically examined as emblematic of the neoliberalization of public schooling (Giroux, 2013; Lipman, 2013). Research-practice partnerships (RPPs), or "long-term, mutualistic collaborations between practitioners and researchers that are intentionally organized to investigate problems of practice and solutions for improving district outcomes" (Coburn, Penuel, Geil, 2013, p.2), have recently cropped up as a "promising" (Datnow, 2020), "hope-based" (Schneider, 2018) equity-oriented alternative to top-down reforms (Coburn et al., 2013). While these types of partnerships stand to generate important research and knowledge on schools and teaching and learning by involving multiple stakeholders, practitioners, and youth in the research process, thereby expanding conventional modes of school-community-university collaboration, there is still a shortage of empirical research that supports the construction of RPPs as contributing to equity. Specifically, there is little to no empirical knowledge about how and the extent to which RPPs intervene in and change the structural issues they are positioned to redress. Depending on the scholar and RPP, they are variously constructed as race-conscious (Barton & Bevan, 2016) or race-neutral (Vakil, de Royston, Nasir, Kirshner, 2016), an issue that I will address in this review of the literature.

The purpose and uncertain future of research-practice partnerships

Literature on research practice partnerships (RPPs) is a quickly growing body of scholarship. Definitions of RPPs vary from scholar to scholar, and are frequently adapted to reflect developments in the field. Similar, but also distinct from Coburn et al.'s definitions of RPPs above, Farrell et al.'s (2021) most recent definition of RPPs explains that they are "long-term collaboration aimed at educational improvement or equitable transformation through engagement with research. These partnerships are intentionally organized to connect diverse forms of expertise and shift power relations in the research endeavor to ensure that all partners have a say in the joint work" (p. iv). Scholars emphasize the longevity of relationship, practice, and equity of power in relationships across partners and organizational bodies as features that distinguish RPPs from other school-community-university partnerships (Farrell, Harrison & Coburn, 2019; Coburn, Penuel & Geil, 2013). Partnerships "vary in purpose and form […] reflect[ing] the traditions that animate researchers' commitments and methods" (Penuel & Hill, 2019; p.2), causing some ambiguity around what "counts" as an RPP (Farrell et al, 2021;

Trigatti, Chukhray & Turley, 2018; Penuel & Hill, 2019). For this reason, RPP scholars have identified a set of five criteria that characterizes RPPs. Building off of Coburn & Penuel's above definition, Barton & Bevan (2016) identify the following five tenets of RPPs: "[…] they are long-term, organized around problems of practice, mutualistic, data-driven, and involve explicit mechanisms for fostering partnerships" (p.1). While these 5 principles are common to most RPPs, scholars recognize that RPPs vary in form and function. Some scholars categorize RPPs according to these variations – such as research alliances, design partnerships, and networked improvement communities (Coburn et al, 2013). In a recent report for the William T. Grant Foundation, however, RPP scholars move away from this practice of categorization, and instead identify four dimensions along which RPPs vary: (1) goals pursued, (2) composition, (3) research approaches, and (4) funding sources (Farrell et al, 2021, p.iv).

RPPs like CCYE have become an increasingly popular fixture in urban school districts (Barton & Bevan, 2016; Diamond, 2021) with histories of episodic school reforms and where more recent waves of neoliberal reform have decimated public school resources through competitive school choice policies, charter proliferation and state and standardized testing. Whereas neoliberal education reforms emphasize standardization and approach schools and teachers with a punitive and deficit framework (Giroux, 2013), RPPs seek to leverage knowledge and power at a grassroots level, mobilizing connection and collaboration across sectors and between community organizations, civic agencies, university researchers, and school districts and teachers (Datnow, 2020; Barton & Bevan, 2016; Coburn & Penuel, 2016; Denner et al, 2019) towards equity-driven changes in problems of practice. For instance, Denner et al. (2019) draw on empirical data to attest to the "great promise [of RPPs] for producing research that has direct implications for society and schools" (p.2) while Penuel et al. (2015) discuss the "transformative" potential of RPPs to change not only schools and districts, but the way practitioners conventionally conceive of and enact their work towards more hybrid forms that leverage cultural and organizational differences. Likewise, in her review of teachers' roles in education reform movements over the last 20 years, Datnow (2020) points to RPPs as a "particularly promising" (p.8) reform alternative that "bolster[s]" teacher agency, which has gradually eroded over the last two decades of teacher-averse reform.

Despite the significant amount of literature championing the promise of RPPs, RPP scholars also point towards the challenges that emerge from a lack of knowledge around how RPP roles are cross-organizationally negotiated and constructed. Farrell, Harrison and Coburn (2019) discuss how role ambiguity causes tensions around equity of collaboration leading to conflict between actors and organizations: "misconceptions regarding roles and responsibilities within RPPs may have consequences for the ability of partnerships to maintain momentum on their ongoing work, an intermediate outcome necessary for the more ambitious goals of influencing policy, practice, and ultimately student outcomes" (p. 2). For instance, Coburn et al. (2013) list eight challenges RPP actors can encounter:

(1) bridging the different cultural worlds of researchers and practitioners

(2) developing and maintaining trust across actors and organizational contexts

(3) maintaining mutualism, or equitable power dynamics across actor and organizational interactions

(4) balancing local relevance with scalability, or being "deeply responsive to local contexts" (p.17) while seeking to scale up to other sites

(5) meeting district timelines while maintaining depth and quality of research,

(6) meeting timelines while maintaining depth and quality,

(7) challenging school and district contexts, or lacking the "infrastructure and expertise to interpret findings and implement solutions consistent with evidence" (p.18), and

(8) aligning partnership work academic norms and incentives.

RPPs provide fertile ground for understanding how partnerships are initiated, enacted, and assessed as professional learning. Although reports such as this one written for the William T. Grant Foundation identify challenges posed to organizational efficiency and equity of practice, no empirical study of an RPP has yet examined how these challenges are impacted by tensions around race and power or how these tensions influence the overall capacity of RPPs to intervene in systemic school and community issues.

Denner et al. (2019) call for a greater sensibility to the role that power and race play not just in individual actors' experiences of and capacity to thrive within RPPs but also in the broader capacity of RPPs to enact change. The authors explain that discussions around role negotiation are limited to investigations of how actors navigate and adjust to technical issues "such as staff turnover that disrupts the process of collaboration, difficulty creating data-sharing agreements, challenges with synching schedules, and differences in the pace expected by practitioners and researchers" (p.2). The authors (2019) find that in their own experiences participating in an RPP, as well as in their examination of others, questions of power and race were never explicitly named or taken up, but rather indexed through proxy concerns such as "organizational and cultural differences" or defining "mutuality," a colorblind approach to examining collaboration and conflict in RPPs (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). The authors further caution against the tendency in RPPs to allow ideals around RPP language, such as "partnership" and "collaboration" to exceed actual equitable practice. They paint a picture of fraught border crossing: "the set of skills, expertise, and time required to make RPPs successfully cross lines of color and power are not part of most researchers' training, leaving them ill equipped to avoid perpetuating existing systems of injustice" (p.2). Although the authors' study is specific to university researchers, this paper echoes their claim that "the field is lacking honest accounts of how […] researchers and practitioners experience […]

challenges, their reflections on the underlying causes of those challenges, and how they address them" (p.2).

Barton and Bevan (2016) address RPP's silence around "the underlying causes of [RPP] challenges," and argue that in addition to the five tenets of RPPs delineated in the research, a sixth tenet, "mechanisms for recognizing systemic racism" (p.1), should be made explicit. The authors argue that the particular utility RPPs have for urban school districts with majority poor students of color, makes issues of racial and class equity core to RPPs' agenda and work, despite the glaring lack of critical race issues in the conceptual framing of RPPs. They write, "Although RPPs may be an important strategy for addressing inequities, explicit direct attention to race, class, and equity is less fully articulated in the framing RPP literature" (p.2). This absence not only complicates the normative position RPPs currently hold as socially just alternatives to top-down reforms but also reinforces Denner et al.'s point that the work of RPP practitioners needs to be examined critically from a racial lens.

More recently, in a critical reflection written for the William T. Grant Foundation, John Diamond echoes Barton & Bevan's (2016) call to directly address issues of race, class and equity in RPPs. In his reflection, Diamond calls for RPPs to be examined as racialized organizations, explaining that "RPPs are an organizational approach, not an equity strategy" and that "collaborations among school districts and universities can produce just as much harm as good" (p.1). Diamond urges RPP scholars to "confront the *institutional histories, power asymmetries*, and *racialized organizational processes* that shape them. By taking this approach, the field will increase the likelihood that RPPs challenge oppressive systems rather than reproduce them" (p.1; italics original). Diamond also acknowledges that "RPP practitioners present RPPs as democratizing organizational forms. However, the institutional field in which RPPs are embedded are riddled with power asymmetries" (p.1). As I explained in Chapter 1, this research builds on and contributes to this critique of RPPs by extending a racial projects (Omi & Winant, 2015) and racialized organizations (Ray, 2019) analysis of CCYE.

The politics of boundary-crossing in RPPs

As explained above, issues of power and equity in RPPs manifest in the dynamics that evolve from organizational relationships. Thus far, power dynamics in RPP relations have been examined largely through a research–practice and researcher–practitioner binary. This literature takes issue with the common trope of "translating research into practice" that dominates the discussions of collaboration between researchers and practitioners, universities and schools. Rather than conceiving of partnerships as a unilateral "translation" of research into practice from one context to another, scholars emphasize the interactional and collaborative nature of RPPs as "joint work at the boundaries" of organizational bodies (Penuel et al., 2015, p.184). RPP actors, then, become "boundary crossers" where they "navigate multiple cultural, professional, and

organizational differences […] When people from different cultural and institutional domains collaborate, these differences become salient, and they can become obstacles that close down collaboration, or boundaries to be understood and navigated" (p. 188).

Research on boundary crossing in RPPs has been instrumental in helping to understand how RPP actors can leverage difference across organizational bounds in productive, rather than constraining ways (Wegemer & Renick, 2019). It has also offered RPP actors and researchers conceptual tools to consider how their own sense of organizational belonging and role identity as well as others' expectations of their organizational role influence the way they collaborate and do "joint work at the boundaries" of RPP organizational intersections (Farrell, Harris & Coburn, 2019; Penuel et al, 2015). Drawing on Akkerman and Bakker's (2011) large-scale review of studies of boundary crossing (see Akkerman & Bakker, 2011 for their comprehensive discussion on boundaries and boundary crossing), Penuel et al (2015) define boundary-crossing as "an individual's transitions and interactions across different sites of practice […] Boundary crossing entails encountering difference, entering onto territory in which we are unfamiliar and, to some significant extent therefore, unqualified" (p.188). Drawing on this concept to discuss organizational interactions in RPPs, Penuel and colleagues were primarily concerned with reframing the framework of "translation" that dominates in collaborative school-community-university work. The authors take issue with the way "the translation metaphor suggests that translators [i.e., researchers] should render meanings from one language of research into the language of practice so that meanings are not incorrectly transformed or abandoned. The directionality of learning is one-way, and the goal is for knowledge to travel unchanged" (2015, p.185). Boundary crossers engage in "boundary practices," which are "the more stabilized routines, established and sustained over time, that bring together participants from different domains for ongoing engagement" and that "bridge the practices of researchers and those of practitioners as they engage in joint work" (Penuel et al, 2015, p. 190). Boundary-crossing is a metaphorical intervention for researcher-practitioner relations because it "offers a view of diversity and difference not as obstacles to be overcome, but as value inherent to social and professional activity" (p. 186 – 187). While Penuel et al. (2015) call for boundary crossing as a recharacterization and restructuring of researcher-practitioner relations, other scholars have used boundary crossing to examine other kinds of relations and dimensions in RPPs[2].

For instance, Wegemer & Renick (2021) use boundary spanning to examine the ways that power operates in and through RPPs. The authors do so by investigating their own roles as graduate student researchers in equity-oriented RPPs. Acknowledging that

---

[2] The authors' use of boundary-crossing is distinct from other uses of boundary and border-crossing in education literature such as Giroux's (2013) use of border-crossing inspired by Anzaldua's (1987) discussion of B/border-crossing. While RPP engages the idea of "boundaries", which is distinct from "borders," it would be generative for RPP scholarship to take up the idea of boundaries as borders as discussed by Giroux and Anzaldua. See footnote 1 in Chapter 4 for a discussion of instructive intersections between "boundary" and "border" crossing.

"equity work happens at the boundaries," the authors "position boundary spanners as liberational agents of equity" (p.3). They see their role as graduate students as inhabiting a generative liminality, or "amorphous […] middle place," where they navigate complex boundaries not only between organizational contexts, but also intra-organizationally within the university context. Additionally, graduate students occupy a unique social location that sheds light on the complicated interactions that occur at boundaries. The authors discuss how "graduate students may be relatable to students and teachers due to age proximity or cultural familiarity and could have substantial experience working in school or community settings," and are also "more likely to be Black, Latinx, or female than are tenured faculty […] and as a result, graduate students may reflect the students and staff at partnership sites" (p.4). The authors' study of the boundary spanning role of graduate students in RPPs serves as a call not only for a study of relations other than what traditionally constitutes "researcher-practitioner", but also for a focus on the experiences of marginalized RPP actors, such as graduate students, or in this case, teachers. The authors show that power was negotiated and exercised along five spectrums through which their roles changed throughout the partnership: institutional focus (partner or university), task orientation (technical or socioemotional), expertise (experienced expert vs. inexperienced novice), disposition (advocate or critic) and agency (decision-making authority or passive recipient). Depending on the kind of work that was expected of them as well as the contexts in which those needs evolved, the authors found that they held varying degrees of power in the RPPs they were involved in.

Akkerman & Bruining (2016) introduce what they call a "multilevel boundary crossing approach," examining how boundary crossing is brokered simultaneously at the institutional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal levels. The authors take a special interest in brokering processes that occur at the *intra*personal level and the kinds of "transformations" that ensue from the challenges of negotiating relations horizontally, across organizations, and vertically, within organizations. They define intrapersonal boundary crossing as occurring when individuals "simultaneously participate in intersecting practices and literally come to embody the boundary" (248). They provide the example of student teachers who move between their teachers' college and school site in a professional development school (PDS)[3]. The authors examine the kinds of learning mechanisms individuals draw on as they cross intrapersonal boundary, focusing specifically on the four learning mechanisms identified in Akkerman and Bakker's review of boundary crossing literature in education: (1) identification, (2) coordination, (3) reflection, (4) transformation. The authors find that while institutional, interpersonal and intrapersonal boundary crossing possibly occurs at the same time, transformation – or when change becomes visible either in terms of changes in the actor's existing practices

---

[3] The authors define a PDS as collaborative partnership between one or more colleges and a school and/or district designed to renew school and teacher education programs.

or in terms of new in-between practices that are created – was much more likely to occur only at the intrapersonal level after sustained engagement in a PDS.

Studies like Wegemer and Renick's (2021) and Akkerman and Bruining's (2016) are important because they extend boundary crossing and RPP literature to examine the intersections and interactions of actors beyond the researcher-practitioner dyad towards more marginal actors (such as graduate students and teachers) and shed light on the complex ways in which power is differently negotiated at different moments and levels by a variety of actors in RPPs, influencing the extent that "transformation" or hybridity can manifest in the midst of negotiating sociocultural differences towards continuity of action across organizational boundaries (Wegemer & Renick, 2021; Akkerman & Bruining, 2016; Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). However, boundary crossing is a conceptual framework offered from a researcher perspective, which reifies a dynamic RPP collaborations have sought to equilibrate. How do RPP actors *themselves* think about, name, explain and describe their roles, work and experiences at the "joint boundaries" (Penuel et al, 2015) of organizations? Furthermore, there is little discussion of how actors enter into boundary crossing in the first place. RPP actors are not explicitly asked to take on the role of boundary crosser, but rather stumble onto boundary work when discontinuity of practice occurs. Additionally, Akkerman and Bakker (2011) describe boundaries as "ambiguous," "an in-between or middle ground, the boundary belongs to both one world and another. It is precisely this feature that seems to explain how the boundary divides as well as connects sides [Kerosuo, 2011]. However, the boundary also reflects a nobody's land, belonging to neither one nor the other world" (p. 141). However, how do these discontinuities and boundaries become recognizable or legible to actors? There is little attention in the literature to how actors recognize boundaries in the first place. What social-cultural resources do actors draw on to identify and make meaning of boundaries?

How, for instance, might certain spaces, resources, or practices be foreclosed, made available, or conditionally accessible to teachers depending on their positionality? How might the experience of negotiating teachers' roles or organizational status as a border crossers enable or constrain their agency? If border crossing and border practices are indeed promising developments in inter-organizational and cross-sectoral RPP work, it is important to examine how teachers might differentially and emotionally experience the act of border crossing.

Teachers and their roles in RPPs

While the research around boundary-crossing opens up possibilities for expanding normatively circumscribed notions of "teacher," "researcher," "school," "university," and so on, research in this area has focused investigations of boundary crossing on university educators and researchers, neglecting the importance and possibility of K-12 classroom teachers as hybrid actors and boundary crossers. This is a crucial oversight since in many ways, teachers are at the frontlines of educational change (Giroux, 2013; Datnow, 2020). As Ball (2004) and Datnow (2020) point out, teachers are the ones who receive, implement, and/or resist reforms, and cross ideological and organizational borders as hybrid actors in reform capacities including RPPs. Teachers mediate between local-level

community and district interests, and the school as an ideological state apparatus (Althusser, 2014/1976; Apple, 1978), variously negotiating and serving as the disciplining arms of the state (Shange, 2019; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990), and as "organic intellectuals" (Gramsci, 2011; Giroux, 1999, 2004). These roles are inflected by teachers' race and gender, which continuously shape how teachers respond to reforms, including RPPs. Education scholars have documented fairly thoroughly teachers' overwhelmingly negative experience of and emotional reactions to reforms (Zembylas & Barker, 2007; Little, 1996; Kelchtermans, 2005; Hargreaves, 2005; Fisher-Ari, Kavangh, Martin, 2017), Despite this, the extant research has not examined teachers' experiences of RPPs.

Research on teachers' interactions with education reforms has found that the pressure to conform to and apply top-down reform initiatives often makes teachers feel belittled and stressed as they cope with the pressure of producing standardized outcomes and the shame and disappointment of the increasing mechanization and de-professionalization of teaching. In this body of scholarship, discomfort has a foreclosing effect on teachers, causing them to shut down emotionally, search for greener pastures at different schools, or leave the profession entirely (Little, 1996; Zembylas & Barker, 2007; van Vleen, Sleegers & van de Van, 2005). RPPs offer an "alternative" to top-down reforms because their design and implementation is intended to include teachers' experiences and expertise in the research process of developing interventions to educational issues and problems of practice. Thus, as discussed earlier, RPP scholars advocate not so much for a "translation" of research into practice, where teachers are situated in deprofessionalized, mechanistic roles as "implementers" of exteriorly produced research (Apple, 1986; Apple & Jungck, 1990; Hernandez & Fernandez-Ugalde, 2020; Severance, Leary, Johnson, 2014), but rather are positioned as "boundary-crossers" or "boundary-spanners," implicated in the development of new knowledge and practices at the intersections of organizations. Severance et al (2014) investigate how practitioners at different "tiers" of design – namely, teachers, researchers and district administrators – navigate design tensions in an RPP in order to "bridge" the research-practice gap. The authors argue "for the value of a common vision and design methodology to enable design tensions at multiple levels to become generative influences on design" (p.1171). The authors highlight the importance of understanding the needs, expectations and experiences of actors at multiple "tiers" of RPPs, including that of teachers, in negotiating design tensions as a productive source of knowledge for how to structure and maximize RPP inter-organizational interactions towards equitable arrangements.

The small body of scholarship focusing on the role and experience of teachers in RPPs is also concerned with teachers' participation in *research*-oriented tasks and practices. For instance, Hernandez and Fernandez-Ugalde (2020) investigated teachers' roles in an RPP between a university in Chile and its partner schools. The authors investigated how the partnership fostered "teachers' role as researchers" and found that participating teachers appreciated the "pedagogical reflection towards the improvement

of their practices" and the "relationships between practical and theoretical knowledge" (p.423). The authors' findings contribute to a broader inquiry in RPP research related to dissolving the theory-practice gap and power asymmetries between teachers and practitioners and researchers. Thus, much scholarship investigating teachers in RPPs has focused on understanding practice as inquiry and teachers as researchers.

This concern is reflected in a study of RPPs conducted by Computer Science for All (2017, csforall.org) called "RPPsforCS". The study explored the perspective of principal investigators regarding the roles played by teachers and teacher-leaders in the RPPsforCS projects and how those roles are shaped by the contributions that teachers add to the partnerships as well as the constraints their full-time positions as teachers impose on their participation. The study pivots off the premise that "increased participation and leadership role of teachers in research projects creates new challenges, and new opportunities for researchers" (2017, para 2). Specifically, the study was interested in understanding how best to involve teachers in "crucial and integral ways" in RPPs as "leaders" without "exploit[ing] the work of teachers or ask[ing] for too much" (para 2). The study highlighted three key themes that emerged from the data that point to benefits and challenges of engaging teachers in RPPs: (1) Teachers' expertise in subject matter (in this case, computer science) is critical to the iterative development of interventions that can address the specific needs of the student populations teachers serve; (2) teachers' busy schedules and the lack of pay for participation in RPPs disincentivize teachers from becoming involved in RPPs, particularly in the early stages when RPPs are still building capacity (3) RPPs with the most "robust and sustained" teacher involvement found ways to make research activities such as participation in conferences and data collection meaningful to teachers by drawing on and fostering teachers' voice and expertise.

Conclusion

These studies have set the groundwork for explicit and focused studies of teachers' experiences and roles in RPPs as well as of how specific actor experiences in RPPs correspond to the RPP's overall impact and capacity to intervene in issues of practice and equity. However, the scholarship on teachers in RPPs surveyed here has not investigated how teachers themselves make sense of what their roles in RPPs are and of how their experiences shape their sense of purpose and identity as teachers. While scholarship has recognized that top-down reforms diminish and often degrade teachers' sense of expertise and professionalism, there is a lack of understanding of how teachers continue to navigate these existing reforms with RPPs as an "alternative" reform. Moreover, the overrepresentation of RPPs in racially and economically minoritized communities reflects their investment in equity-oriented educational and urban reform (Diamond, 2021; Barton & Bevan, 2016). However, there is still a lack of understanding of how shifts in teachers' practice and sense of purpose as teachers while participating in RPPs registers or is a response to operating at the "joint boundaries" of the RPP and extant educational and urban reforms. An investigation of the relations between teacher

practice, sense of teacher purpose and the dialectic between RPPs and histories of urban and educational reform necessitates a lens critical to how RPPs are structurally and discursively situated (Diamond, 2021). This dissertation responds to this need by applying a racialized organization and racial project lens to an examination of an equity-oriented RPP, Community Change and Youth Empowerment.

CHAPTER THREE

Methods

Research Site: Community Change and Youth Empowerment

CCYE[4] is a school-community-university partnership that is facilitated by the Planning and Learning Institute (PLI), a research center focused on the intersections of urban and city planning, schools, and education, that operates out of Pacific University (PU), a large, public university in northern California. The CCYE partnership is named after the educational strategy it implements in schools. The strategy uses participatory civic action research to support relationships between cities and schools that bring together civic and community partners[5] with schools, teachers and students. PLI staff train teachers to guide students through a five-phase research process where students: (1) are introduced to a civic and community problem in the form of a research question, (2) collect and analyze data (such as interviews, surveys, site-mapping) relevant to the research question, (3) consolidate and leverage findings in the form of a proposal addressing the research question, (4) present proposals to civic and community leaders in a public presentation, and (5) reflect on the research process and apply what they learned towards college and career preparation.

Key to CCYE's mission is to center racially and economically minoritized youth in research initiatives, planning, and policy changes, and to help cultivate students' sense of civic inclusion and civic identity-building in the collaborative research process. CCYE also aims to shift civic leaders' perceptions of and relationships with youth, positioning youth as "experts" on urban and city planning issues and valuable research partners that have a stake in decision-making. CCYE brokers partnerships by taking a question or problem on the part of the civic or community partner to schools in the form of a research question. Teachers then lead students through the CCYE research process, usually throughout the course of an academic semester, where they investigate the issue using different research strategies, such as interviews, surveys, site mapping, and data analysis, ultimately assembling proposals and recommendations addressing the research question that are presented to the civic or community partner. These partners, then, operate as the students' "clients," which is how PLI formally refers to them. Partners vary from city housing authorities, departments of transportation, regional transit agencies, local real estate developers, and nonprofit organizations focused on community issues such as housing and transit equity.

PLI identifies teachers as key actors in shaping young peoples' academic and life outcomes, as well as their relationships to the cities they live in. As such, the CCYE

---

[4] See Table 3 at the end of the chapter for a table of abbreviations. Names of all individuals, organizations and places are pseudonyms.

[5] "Partners" vary across public-private spheres and local, regional, state levels.

strategy is developed not only as a participatory civic action research project, but also as a professional development tool used to foster teachers' social justice praxis primarily through project and work-based learning strategies. Support in implementing the CCYE curriculum is offered to teachers in two primary forms: (a) in-class support, and (b) a professional development workshop offered before implementation of projects. The director of PLI teaches a course at PU on participatory city planning; a key part of the course is training graduate and undergraduate students to act as co-researchers and assist in the implementation of the CCYE curriculum and the development of student proposals as "mentors". These university students, or mentors, are assigned to different classrooms in partner high schools and make once-weekly visits to the classes documenting their interactions and emerging outcomes around evidence of 21st century skills and learning of urban planning concepts in required field note entries. Other CCYE staff members also offer periodic in-class support as well as oversee larger logistical and organizational issues, such as organizing field trips, class visits from clients, and reporting on project progress to CCYE leadership. As I explain below, I assisted with CCYE project implementation and research between the 2017 and 2020 academic years. Although PLI works with school districts throughout California, this study focuses on CCYE projects implemented in northern California in four different cities and seven different high schools. All of the schools serve majority Black, Latinx and Asian/Pacific Islander student bodies and the majority (over 60%) of the student populations qualify for free and reduced lunch.

Ethnographic case study analysis of Community Change and Youth Empowerment

In their report, *Research-Practice Partnerships in Education: The State of the Field*, written for the William T. Grant Foundation, Farrell et al. (2021) explain that one of the "pressing issues" facing the future of RPPs is "questions of RPPs' progress toward their goals," or "understanding how well they meet their goals and the conditions that support or hinder their progress" (p. 29); this "pressing issue" is of central concern to this dissertation. The authors explain that a part of being able to address and investigate this pressing issue is advancing an "understanding of when, under which conditions, for whom, and with what tradeoffs RPPs make progress toward their goals" as well as of the "wider ecologies of RPPs and the underlying conditions they require to succeed" (p.30). As such, thoughtful and critical consideration of the "local conditions" and "educational ecosystem" in which RPPs are embedded is essential for continuing robust research on RPPs.

A second "pressing concern" for the future of RPPs is "cultivating the next generation of RPP leaders" (p.31). The authors explain that "the field has begun to coalesce around the range of skills, knowledge, dispositions, and orientations needed to engage in partnership efforts" (p.31). As explained in the review of the literature, in a reflection written in response to Farrell et al.'s (2021) report on the "state of the field," John Diamond (2021) suggested that RPPs' implication in racial projects is another, though unstated, "pressing issue" facing RPPs that needs examination. Diamond urges

RPP scholars to "confront the *institutional histories, power asymmetries,* and *racialized organizational processes* that shape them" (p. 1; italics original). Diamond explains that these power asymmetries and institutional histories, in part, live on and through the actors – or future "RPP leaders" – that populate and circulate between partner organizations: "Universities often wield more power than K-12 school districts, researchers usually have more institutional power than school-based educators, and university faculty and educators often have power over residents in local working-class and minoritized communities. While those working in RPPs often seek to challenge such hierarchies, this aspiration and the unfolding reality are often at odds" (p. 2). To extend Farrell et al.'s (2021) report and Diamond's (2021) addendum to it, another "pressing issue" facing RPPs are the ideologies and political proclivities, shaped by one's social position, that actors bring into their RPP work and interactions.

Qualitative research methods, such as interviews, focus groups, field observations and analysis of RPP materials such as email exchanges, and planning and annual reports have been important sources of data for studying the pressing issues facing RPPs like the ones summarized above (Denner et al., 2019; Farrell et al., 2019; Farrell et al., 2021). However, long-term, ethnographic studies of RPPs are a less common, although a necessary approach to investigating RPPs' pressing issues (Penuel & Hill, 2019), particularly the "*institutional histories, power asymmetries,* and *racialized organizational processes* that shape them" (Diamond, 2021, p.1; italics original). Wolcott (1999) explains that "the underlying purpose of ethnographic research […] is to describe what the people in some particular place or status ordinarily do, and the meanings they ascribe to what they do, under ordinary or particular circumstances, presenting that description in a manner that draws attention to regularities that implicate cultural processes" (p.68). Ethnographic methods such as extended participation observation and thick description, seek to "[build] theories of cultures—or explanations of how people think, believe, and behave—that are situated in local time and space" (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 8). As such, ethnography offers the methodological tools to unveil the mechanics of power at work in the development and assumption of "skills, knowledge, dispositions, and orientations needed to engage in partnership efforts" (Farrell et al., 2021) that become normative, and as Diamond points out, implicated in and reproductive of racial projects.

In this study, I sought to critically examine how as a part of articulating and making progress towards "shared goals," CCYE teachers articulated a sense of belonging to a broader, organizational whole. I did this by being attentive to the relations and inter-implicated nature of human and social behavior, the ways in which people construct and make sense of their lives, and the lived contexts that shape individuals' frames of reference though observation, interpretation and inquiry (Schram, 2006). I examined how teachers drew on professional and personal social-cultural resources to make sense of their role, identified boundaries between organizational contexts, articulated a sense of role, carried out tasks and, participated in and resisted organizational discourses on a micro-interactional level. Additionally, ethnography is attentive to "contextualization," or the "dialectic process of making connections between parts and between parts and the

whole […] instances of observed behavior make sense as part of a larger picture; in turn, that larger picture is continually brought into view through examination of its parts" (Schram, 2006, p. 96). By focusing not only on the "parts" of CCYE – from intrapersonal processes to micro-interactional exchanges between teachers – but also on the "whole," or contextual, my analytic lens was attentive to the "wider ecologies" such as the "local conditions" and the "educational ecosystem" in which RPPs exist. This attention to context illuminated the state and national reform contexts as a part of the CCYE "whole" and as important variables of analysis in examining how and the extent to which RPPs function as an "alternative" reform.

An ethnographic case study approach to the study of CCYE was an appropriate one as it afforded close examination of a particular phenomenon on an intimate level without sacrificing empirical and conceptual representativeness (Maxwell, 2012). This approach was well-suited to the scope of the project as case studies allow the researcher to examine a particular phenomenon "within its real-life context" (Yin, 1984, p.23). Because RPPs tend to have a place-based design that responds to prescient educational issues and problems of practice (Coburn et al., 2013), case studies are not unusual in RPP research (Penuel & Hill, 2019; Farrell et al., 2019; Kirshner et al., 2018). Schram (2006) explains that case study "involves the exploration of a 'bounded system,' something identifiably set within time and circumstance" (p.107). Indeed, RPPs operate much like a "bounded system," in that organizations and their actors enact roles and tasks towards mutually-shared interests and goals; these interests and goals are salient as they are naturally occurring issues in time and place. Schram further explains that the "strategic value" of a case study "lies in its ability to draw attention to what can be learned from the single case" (p.107). This appreciates the considerable variation that exists in purpose and form between RPPs (Farrell et al., 2021; Penuel & Hill, 2019) but as well, the insights about design, practice and impact that can be gleaned from the particularities of a specific RPP such as CCYE.

Researcher Positionality

David Kirkland (2014) explains, "ethnography brings you closer to a situation (a fish in water); it also allows you to, importantly, stand away from it (a curious observer peering into the fish bowl)" (p.187). Holding these seemingly contradictory investigatory positions (simultaneously the observed fish and the one observing, standing outside of the bowl) at once requires awareness of how one is implicated in that which they are examining as well as the multiple lenses they bring into making this intimacy "strange". The extent to which one is able to do this is influenced by their researcher positionality, or the way that one's location in and interpellation into racial, gendered, sexual, class and ethnic registers shapes their epistemic commitments and interpretive frames. In this section, I explain how my social location shaped not only my interactions with CCYE actors, but as well, influenced the epistemic frames I drew on to make sense of these interactions and informed my relationship to the research site, and the research questions and investigative approaches at the core of this study.

I first became involved with PLI in 2017. As a doctoral student studying pedagogy, the emotions and affect of schooling, the social and cultural contexts of education, race and racialization, and teachers, I welcomed the opportunity to work alongside teachers and students through participatory civic action research intended to foster students' civic engagement while investigating school-city and community-university relations. The job description called for a "project coordinator," which involved liaising between PLI, teachers and civic partners in the implementation of the participatory civic action research projects[6]. The day-to-day work of a coordinator involved tasks such as: mapping CCYE curriculum with teachers, assisting with scheduling introductions to and visits from civic and community partners to the school, scheduling and organizing project-relevant field trips to community sites, guiding teachers and students through the five-phase CCYE research process, helping to organize students' final presentations, administering pre and post-project completion surveys to teachers and students, conducting debrief interviews with teachers and debrief focus groups with students, writing regular field notes after each school site visit, and analyzing data and presenting outcomes and emerging insights at a CCYE summer workshop. I also worked closely with teachers, PLI staff and teachers. Teachers with whom I coordinated CCYE projects became habituated to seeing me in their classrooms on a weekly basis, often multiple times a week. I engaged less with civic partners as they typically visited classrooms on only a handful of occasions throughout the semester, such as to introduce themselves and the research question, during a field trip, and at the final student presentations. I attended regular meetings with PLI leadership and staff to discuss progress on projects we were coordinating.

I continued to work with PLI in the role of "coordinator" and later as a researcher intermittently until the Spring of 2020, during which time I coordinated three total CCYE projects across four high schools all in the same district. I was paid during two academic semesters of my three-year involvement: in Spring 2019 and in Spring 2018. I stayed involved with CCYE even in semesters when I was not paid, occasionally assisting with various PLI research endeavors and with preparation of action research projects. Reasons for breaks in my involvement had to do with shifting my capacity and energies towards graduate milestones, such as finishing my qualifying papers and preparing for oral examinations, and accepting teaching assistant positions which paid more and were necessary in building a competitive CV for the academic job market.

The work of project coordinator called to me for several reasons. As a relative newcomer to northern California and four years into my doctoral studies, I was searching for ways to become involved with the local educational scene in a manner that was not self-serving or crude. I appreciated that working as a project coordinator for CCYE would put me in touch with schools, teachers, students, local businesses and civic agencies while involving me in participatory action research collaborations intended to

---

[6] For the purposes of brevity, I will hereafter refer to the CCYE participatory civic action research projects as "the projects".

center the voices of economically and racially minoritized people in civic issues. The nature of the work was aligned with my own politics and desire to better understand and become involved with the area's educational landscape. I also welcomed the opportunity to begin forging relationships with school administrators, teachers and students that might prove generative for the dissertation study I planned on pursuing at the time, a comparative ethnographic study of the emotional geographies (Hargreaves, 2001) in two schools located in different parts of the city and with different racio-ethnic student populations. I was interested in examining how the schools' locations and histories of demographic change influenced students' sense of belonging to their school and how these insights might complicate or extend the hegemonic framing of poor students of color as "traumatized" or "resilient" in local educational contexts. As a first-generation immigrant from Mexico, my own experiences with the complexities of belonging, exclusion and malaise in school settings profoundly shaped this research agenda (as well as my interest in schools and education, more generally). However, my extended involvement with CCYE persuaded my questions and interests in different, though related, directions.

The work and daily practices of the civic action research project increased my sense of belonging in Sun Valley, the gentrifying, ocean-coastal region where I lived and studied, in many ways, but it also made apparent the complex ways in which my cultural capital simultaneously facilitated this and marked my outsiderness in particular contexts. Because CCYE addresses issues of civic inclusion, project questions took on problems around transit, housing, public space and school equity. Working on the projects offered me access not just to what local business owners, civic stakeholders and school actors understood as pressing issues (that also especially impact poor people of color), but also animated my own racialized movement and relation to space. As a coordinator, I had to travel to schools around Sun Valley on a weekly, and often, daily basis. Because I did not drive, I used different modes of public transportation and interacted with the built environment through a variety of perspectives: from the rolling heights and depths of a metro train car, the staccato starting and stopping of a bus, the deliberate stepping of my own two feet, and when I was running late, not sure where I was going, or traveling far, I watched Sun Valley pass quickly outside the window of an Uber or Lyft. Through these increasingly routine and ritualized movements and practices, I began to feel less like an outsider and more like a "local," at the same time that I was aware that these practices of civic belonging were part and parcel of the gentrifying landscape that compounded the problems of under-enrollment, decimated funding, climate change vulnerability, transit (in)access, and school closures that students investigated through CCYE. I began to question what it means to seek to intervene in problems that I myself was implicated in, and more broadly, what it means to leverage organizational power as an RPP towards interventions to social problems in which those organizations are implicated.

Teachers, civic stakeholders and administrators were open to interacting with me. Teachers welcomed my presence in their classrooms and did not question my ability to guide or coordinate projects. Although I had shadowed PLI leadership during their

coordinating activities and checked in regularly with them during project implementation, and although I drew on my two-years of experience as a high school teacher in a private school to guide my school interactions, I sometimes questioned my capacity to facilitate projects that emphasized the importance of native civic knowledge and critiqued outsider influence while I myself occupied a tenuous liminality as an outsider and insider. This liminal position was compounded by the stark differences in wealth that racially and economically divide parts of Sun Valley and further subdivide parts of cities; thus, while I felt increasingly "local" this did not necessarily make me an insider to the school communities I worked with. While tensions grew all around Sun Valley around gentrification and the rising cost of living, the cultural capital I carried and benefited from as a middle-class doctoral student made me complicit in these issues, although did not inure me from the financial costs of living and studying in the area. My cultural capital also afforded me a relative degree of comfort in school contexts as teachers and students regarded me as carrying a level of expertise that gave me "permission" to be in their classrooms as both a coordinator and researcher. However, this was not always the case.

For instance, facilitating "site-mapping," which involves surveying the planning and design characteristics of a particular place or space, as an outsider, was sometimes uncomfortable for students, teachers and me. On one occasion, I accompanied students on a walk around their predominantly Latinx and Black, Title I school. The students were given handbooks that instructed them to take notes about their surroundings, which involved making observations about the built environment, such as the condition of sidewalks, buildings, and natural elements (green space, parks, plants and trees) as well as using their senses to make note of what they smell, hear, touch, taste and see. Students had been introduced to the premise of the project and to the question the civic partner wanted them to investigate. Thus, aware that the project involved improving their school and community on some level, students were attentive to what they saw as needing "improvement" and made note of homes, streets and sidewalks in disrepair; garbage and illegal dumping; liquor stores; abandoned furniture and cars; the sound of traffic and the smell of urine and pollution. The teacher and his aide left the experience feeling troubled by the students' observations and expressed that the site-mapping activity felt like a "poverty tour." I also documented my discomfort with the activity in my field note following my visit to the school and wondered what I could have done differently, which led me to questions about the purpose and function of my role. I wondered if I could have framed the activity differently, if the questions in the students' workbook – prompting them to make observations about their built environment – encouraged a deficit orientation to one's lived environment. I lamented not having had the foresight to coordinate with the teacher before the activity to discuss how to facilitate it. I also wondered if, regardless of the different ways I could have framed the activity, I should have been the one to facilitate it as an outsider to the school's community. I asked myself if other teachers in other schools in different parts of the city had felt similarly. I had

engaged in the same site-mapping activity with other classes, and this was the first time a teacher had expressed a problem with it to me[7].

I had heard students express on different occasions that projects made them "feel bad" about where they lived and went to school, although this was sometimes tied to articulations of a heightened sense of civic awareness and agency. My personal and political convictions shaped by my own experiences as a minoritized person in the American K-12 system and sharpened by my studies in education attuned me to the importance of cultivating a critical, civic sensibility in young people. Thus, like teachers, civic stakeholders and PLI leadership, I found these attestations from young people to be a testament to the importance of and impact of CCYE's work, and of my own work as an actor within this partnership. However, I also grappled to reconcile contradictions that I recognized as deeply seated in CCYE's form, purpose and design.

Attracted initially by the promise of language like "civic engagement," "action research," "youth-driven," and "equity" peppering CCYE's website and in the call for the position of coordinator, I eventually struggled to make sense of what I felt was a dissonance between the way CCYE came to life through talk and language (on their website, public events, promotional materials and videos, meetings) and the everyday interactions and practices through which CCYE materialized on the ground. I began to question how CCYE partners on an individual actor level and on a collective, organizational level articulated understandings of what civic inclusion and social justice work meant to them. I grappled to reconcile statements of civic distrust and skepticism on the students' parts ("They don't really care about us," "Why are they *really* here?," "Are we gonna get paid for this?"), with teachers' ambivalent attempts to rally student buy-in ("You have a chance to make a difference by doing something different"), with civic partners' exclamations of good will ("We wouldn't be here if we didn't care") and students' visions for civic equity (what one teacher temporally interpreted as "teen time versus civic planning time"), with the excess of moral certainty and liberal optimism that seemed to govern the frames of intelligibility within which CCYE actors interacted and collectively made sense of their experiences. Sitting with these tensions led to the research questions that are at the heart of this study.

Research Questions:

(1) How and to what extent do RPPs intervene in and/or reproduce the systems and structures they seek to redress?
   a. What do RPP actors' communicative and discursive practices, such as their use of figurative language and speech interactions, reveal about RPPs' functions and impacts?

---

[7] As I explain in Chapter 4, another teacher, Mr. Morrison, later explained to me during an interview that he, too, had to stop a project after a site-mapping tour for similar reasons.

(2) What are teachers' roles in RPPs and how do they make sense of their roles, experiences,
and work in RPPs?

A joint hermeneutics of empathy and suspicion

In my data collection and analysis I endeavored to employ what Leonardo (2013) refers to as a joint hermeneutics of empathy and suspicion. To look at RPPs both as an organizational strategy (Diamond, 2021) and an equity-oriented alternative to tone-deaf and out-of-touch reforms (Datnow, 2019) requires a methodological lens that is aware not only of one's own epistemic standpoint (Collins, 1990), but as well, the kind of projects RPPs are implicated in, reproduce and/or complicate. Although Leonardo (2013) discusses the application of a joint hermeneutics to race theories and frameworks, it is instructive to use this explanatory framework in an examination of RPPs as it helps to illuminate and objectify the ideologies that RPPs are wrapped up in. Leonardo explains that whereas a hermeneutics of suspicion "expose[s] the 'true nature' of reality *behind* the veil, a hermeneutics of empathy unfolds the project *in front* of it" (p.2; italics original). A critical race hermeneutics sees through both suspicious and empathic eyes "to maintain the intimate dance between social commentary marred by the effects of ideology (in its classical sense as distortion) and utopia, without which a society – or an intellectual framework – lacks direction as it flails about in search of a better condition or explanation" (p.2). Employing a critical race hermeneutics, I attempted to decipher the ways in which CCYE and RPPs are located in ideological projects and embedded in social structures and systems. In so doing, I sought to resist a "sort of moral supremacy" (Fassin, 2011 in Lashaw, 2012, p.18) overly-reliant on a hermeneutics of suspicion that would lead to facile critiques of CCYE's shortfalls as an equity-oriented intervention.

I tried to also recognize the project "in front of" CCYE and RPPs, one in which individuals across sectors and organizations attempt to collectively articulate "a better condition" and a programmatic vision for it. This required attempting to understand how RPP actors and practices advanced and were implicated in particular interpretations of social structures and systems and racial formations. Bianca Baldridge (2020) has explained how community youth-based organizations can be ideologically complex and contradictory spaces. Baldridge refers to this as the "youthwork paradox," or the "competing logics [that] often exist simultaneously within community-based educational spaces" that create "the potential to both disrupt and reify racism and deficit narratives in education" (p.619). I am not suggesting here that a hermeneutics of empathy and suspicion in this study only recognizes the existence of contradictory logics in organizations, although this is important. Rather, Baldridge's work is instructive for thinking about how paradoxes become a space for advancing particular ideas and frameworks for what "better conditions" should look like. In this case, a hermeneutics of empathy encouraged a sensibility to where, when and how these paradoxes emerged and how actors navigated them to mobilize their ideological commitments. Additionally, I

stayed attuned to how CCYE's modes and ethos of intervention sought to explain social inequity and theorize an "otherwise".

A hermeneutics of suspicion normalized a critical skepticism of CCYE's impact claims when situated against a long history of equity-driven, but ultimately socially reproductive reforms and interventions, from the non-profit industrial complex, to federal and state reforms, to community-based educational spaces. A hermeneutics of suspicion seeks to address the structurally-located nature of things, and as such, helps to denaturalize the structural neutrality RPPs seem to enjoy, or the "inscribed […] virtue that hides their particularity" (Lashaw, 2012, p.16). In this sense, while a hermeneutics of empathy appreciates the utopic project invoked by RPPs, a hermeneutics of suspicion casts a critical eye towards and seeks to deconstruct the imagined moral consensus of such a project. This is the interpretive lens I worked hard to apply to data collection and analysis.

Data Collection: Semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and a focus group

Data informing this study consist of participant observation, field notes, one focus group and semi-structured interviews. Data were collected between 2019 and 2021. I conducted a total of 40 semi-structured interviews with 15 teachers and 5 civic partners, and facilitated one focus group discussion between three teachers. Tables 1 and 2 below detail teacher and partner participant information. Teachers were interviewed between two and four times and interviews lasted between one to two hours. Civic partners were formally interviewed once and interviews lasted between 45 minutes to one hour long. Interview questions asked teachers to discuss their professional and personal backgrounds as well as dimensions of their participation in CCYE such as: their pathways to teaching, how and why they became involved in CCYE, what they understood their role in CCYE to be and entail, shifts in their practice since their involvement, challenges and rewards of the PAR projects. Similarly, interview questions with civic partners asked them to discuss their professional and personal backgrounds as well as dimensions of their participation in CCYE such as how and why they became involved in CCYE, what they understood their role in the partnership to be and entail, to describe their interactions with teachers, students and university partners, their impressions of the project implementation and student recommendations, and to describe the process behind project question construction. Interviews with teachers typically occurred in their classrooms, although I also met with teachers at my campus office and in local coffee shops. Interviews with civic partners typically occurred in their offices, although I also met with some partners in local coffee shops. During the COVID-19 pandemic, I met with both teachers and civic partners over Zoom.

The 15 teachers I interviewed and whose classrooms I observed include teachers with whom I coordinated CCYE projects and teachers for whom I did not coordinate projects, although the bulk of my observations happened in classrooms in which I

coordinated projects. Classroom observations of teacher participants occurred between 2019 and 2020. All of the participating teachers, except for four, were observed for the length of an entire participatory civic action research project, or roughly 5 months. The remaining four were observed a minimum of two times or more, although not for the length of an entire project (an academic semester). In some cases, these observations included students' final presentations of their project recommendations with civic partners and other guests. Observations typically involved spending an entire class period in classrooms and assisting teachers and students with the projects. Frequency of observations varied from classroom to classroom depending on how often teachers decided to work on the projects. Some teachers found ways to integrate the projects with the curriculum they were expected to cover by state and district standards, and so worked on the projects as often as 3 – 5 times a week. Other teachers worked on the projects only once or twice a week. In many cases, as students' final presentations approached, teachers devoted more class time to preparing students' posters, slides and scripts. Thus, observations occurred multiple times a week across multiple high schools. I also participated in and observed meetings between PLI staff, teachers and civic partners, as well as weekly internal meetings with PLI staff to discuss CCYE project progress and plan other PLI organizational activities. Observations were documented and detailed in regular field note entries.

Although civic partners did not end up being the focus of this study, I found interviews with them necessary in order to develop a robust understanding of how boundary-work (Penuel et al., 2015) was brokered in CCYE. As explained above, this involved asking civic partners about their own understanding of what CCYE's organizational mission is, what their own role in that effort is, their motivations for participating in the project, and their ideas around what civic inclusion and equity looks like. I examined how civic partners' articulations around particular indicators, such as "role," "motivations for joining," and "ideas around civic inclusion" differed from and/or intersected with partners', and in particular, teachers' articulations. This also helped me to develop an understanding of how actors understood the work of CCYE to be shaping the purpose of teachers and education in particular ways. Finally, I also interviewed the director of the EBB program for one of the Sun Valley school districts. Because three of the teachers in Sun Valley (although one of these teachers left his position a few weeks into the project, so the project was discontinued) were EBB teachers, I felt it was important to interview the director of the program to better understand how and why he saw organizational alignment between EBB and CCYE. My hope was that this would also shed light on the local cultural politics that bring organizations like EBB and CCYE together.

During the Fall semesters, I participated in PLI meetings where we prepared for and planned the projects. This involved reviewing outcomes and data collected during the previous project year, updating the civic action research curriculum, outreaching to civic partners, schools and teachers, and preparing for and hosting an annual professional development (PD) workshop with teachers and civic agents. It is at this PD workshop

where teachers new to CCYE are introduced to and trained in the CCYE curriculum and meet with PLI staff to do "curriculum mapping," or reviewing where their class curriculum overlaps with the project question and CCYE curriculum, and marking specific weeks and dates during which different steps of the projects can be covered and implemented. "Experienced" teachers, or teachers who have implemented more than one CCYE project, are also invited to the PD workshop and are often asked to share wisdoms and stories from their experiences with new teachers to illustrate the impacts and programmatic dimensions of the projects.

I also accompanied teachers and students on trips outside of the classroom that were a part of their projects. These trips usually involved the "site-mapping" portion of the CCYE research trajectory and required a field trip to the site at the core of the project question. For instance, as I discuss in Chapter 3, students in a Law and Social Justice class investigating affordable housing, visited an empty charter school that the business partner, a real estate developer, was planning to turn into mixed-income apartments. On another trip, I accompanied an EBB class to the public university campus where I was completing my doctoral studies and where I had organized a tour of the campus and student organizations for the EBB students; this trip was a part of the students' research for improving their school's college and career programming. On these occasions, I sometimes met the teachers and students at their school campus and rode the bus with them to the destination. On other occasions, I traveled to the site myself and met the teachers and students there.

Table 1. Teacher Participants

Teacher	Age	Race & Gender Identification	# of YRP Projects	Years Teaching
Mr. Franklin	48	Black Man	4	7
Mr. Morrison	28	Black Man	3	3
Dr. Angello	67	Black Man	6	25
Ms. Jensen	30	White Woman	2	5

Ms. Vern	54	White Woman	2	3
Mr. Castellano	25	White Man	3	4
Ms. Holloway*	50	White Woman	6	12
Ms. Jacobs	60	Black Woman	1	10
Ms. Mulvaney*	N/A	White Woman	2	30+
Mr. Bridges	48	Black Man	1	4
Ms. Saetang*	37	Southeast Asian ethnic group, Woman	2	1
Ms. Prewitt	26	White Woman	2	1
Ms. Hunt*	28	Black Woman	3	1
Ms. Long	35	White Woman	7	2
Ms. Vincent	23	White Woman	2	1

*Teachers observed at least two or more times, but not a full academic semester

Table 2. Partners & Partner Organizations

Partner	Partner Organization	Racial/Ethnic & Gender Identification
Developer	Private real estate organization	Male[8]
Chief Operating Officer	Housing Authority in Sun Valley	Hispanic Male
Senior Planner	Planning Department in South Sun Valley	Mexican Male
Program Director of committee for public health	State Public Health Agency	White Woman
Director	Empowering Black Boys, city in Sun Valley	Black Man

PD Focus Group

I facilitated one focus group discussion during a PD workshop in October, 2019, which I explain in further depth in Chapter 4. I facilitated the focus group at the suggestion of Alyssa, the Associate Director of PLI, who thought it would be a nice opportunity to hear from experienced CCYE teachers while teachers new to the partnership were introduced to CCYE. Seventeen teachers were present at the PD, of which only three were "experienced"[9] and participated in the focus group. Before the PD workshop, I drafted a set of questions that I shared with Alyssa. We decided on the following three questions: (1) What motivates you to participate in CCYE? Why did you decide to return? (2) Are there aspects of the projects that are particularly rewarding and/or challenging for you? (3) How – if at all – has engaging in these projects impacted your practice? However, because the focus group was organized as semi-structured discussion, I posed the additional question: What does 'real-world' mean to you? The focus group was 45 minutes long.

In Chapter 4, I discuss why the focus group emerged as a particularly generative context for understanding how the interactional dynamics and talk between CCYE actors can function to enhance and diminish agency, structure opportunity and reify hegemonic racial schemas (Ray, 2019). To examine and illuminate the interactional norms, logic and

---

[8] When I interviewed this partner and asked how he identified gender, racially and ethnically, he only responded "Male," although he presented as phenotypically white.

[9] "Experienced" CCYE teachers were those teachers that had completed one or more projects before.

discourses at work in the teachers' discussion, I employ a blended critical discourse and conversation analysis approach and excerpt particular moments in the discussion to focus on.

Data Analysis

I transcribed and imported fieldnotes, interviews, and memos into the qualitative data analysis software, ATLAS.ti, to organize and code data. Alongside coding, I wrote additional memos on emerging patterns and the meaning of codes that situated nascent findings with the existing literature. Thus, the initial cycle of open coding generated more specific codes that drew on the literature and theoretical framework, racialized organizations. For instance, first-cycle open coding of interviews and field notes was important for identifying "recurring images, words, phrases and metaphors" (Luttrell, 2010, p.262) such as "real-world," "facilitator," and "boss". During second-cycle coding, I searched for commonalities and patterns across data. For instance, it was during this phase of coding that I began to identify coherence and discontinuities across teachers' articulations of their sense of role in and experiences of CCYE. In memos, I reflected on continuities and tensions between these patterns and the literature, which assisted with the last cycle of coding. During this phase, I introduced codes from the literature and the theoretical framework (racialized organizations) that triangulated with emergent patterns from field note observations and interviews, such as "boundary-crossing," "emotional labor," "racialized decoupling". In this ongoing, recursive process, I identified crucial patterns and themes that responded to my research questions.

The boundary-crossing tensions of a doctoral student researcher attempting to critique the "overexposed"

I did not interview PLI leadership for this project. The reasons for this decision are complex. I shared and discussed the study proposal with the executive and associate directors of PLI. They were supportive of my research interests, offering feedback on two study proposals I had submitted to them, which contributed to the final form of my study, and which I presented in my proposal defense. We agreed that my research questions fell well within the purview of PLI's research agenda, which investigated how the CCYE process and curriculum affects teachers and professionals, supports teaching for 21st century skills, impacts educational practice in the classroom, and shifts teachers' and professionals' beliefs and attitudes around citizenship, civic inclusion and education. I was listed as a "student investigator" on PLI's IRB application, which I assisted in writing, and for which the executive director was the principal investigator. I had planned to interview PLI leadership as one of the last sets of interviews I conducted. However, as patterns emerged during data analysis, I began to notice the dissonances explained above.

Navigating the difficult terrain of being a researcher intimate with the research site and participants and whose epistemic and ethical position around the object of study – in this case CCYE and RPPs – has shifted, is complicated and uncomfortable work, and situated me somewhere between the fish in water, and the one outside the fishbowl, looking in. In a reflection on the ethnographic tactics and ethical considerations of studying a non-profit organization, the Center for Educational Equity (CEE, a pseudonym), committed to equitable education reform and that was at the forefront of California's small-schools movement in the early 2000s, Amanda Lashaw (2012) describes the "uncomfortable, possibly duplicitous" (p.18) position she occupied as a researcher in CEE critically examining the "sacred ground" and "sacred objects" of CEE's "relentless fight to give every poor black and Latino student an open future" (p.17). CEE actors, much like PLI leadership, "represent[ed] themselves and their work as progressive, in terms both of instrumental effectiveness and righteousness" (p.17). As a former education reformer turned doctoral researcher whose relationship to and position towards education reform had shifted, Lashaw grappled to "find a way to be in the air of school reform and be myself" (p.19). This made conducting the tasks of reciprocity such as assisting with interviews, writing meeting notes and "sundry logistical tasks" (p.15) feel "dicey" as they "conferred a moral value on [her] presence, if only because they gave [her] fieldwork an appearance of working for the cause" (p.15). Making her political and methodological stance towards CEE's reform work apparent might have risked confrontations that could have ended the study, for questioning "the virtue of actual actors struggling to relieve actually-suffering city kids could only be perceived as the cynical indulgence of a white middle-class intellectual […] As the moral code goes: critique equals pessimism which equals paralysis. You are either for reform or you are for the racist status quo" (p.17). Thus, Lashaw never made her shift in politics apparent to her participants.

And yet, as Wegemer and Renick (2021) point out, graduate students often occupy a unique position as boundary spanners[10] in RPPs that is "especially well-suited for exploring power and equity in partnerships" (p.3) and "well-positioned to hold critical perspectives of both university and practitioner institutions that support the recognition of cultural wealth and the development of equitable practices" (p.4). Graduate students negotiate multiple power-laden boundaries between contexts and interpersonal relationships. Like Wegemer and Renick (2021), university leadership variously positioned me as a novice and expert. For example, the associate director read the field note in which I explained how the teacher described the site-mapping activity detailed above as a "poverty tour". When we met soon after, she rationalized the critique as an issue with the way I had framed the activity, which I accepted as my responsibility. While the framing of the activity indeed was a part of the problem resulting from my relative novice status as a coordinator, it also emerged as a moment where CCYE resisted critique and leveraged boundary-spanning tensions – my novice status as graduate

---

[10] Wegemer & Renick (2021) use the language of "boundary-spanning," which describes the same phenomena as "boundary-crossing" (Penuel et al., 2015).

student coordinator – as a mechanism of resistance. However, it was presumably my knowledge and skills that qualified me as "expert" enough to do the work of a coordinator in the first place, and later on, collaborate with leadership to write white papers and present at conferences. In these moments, the "amorphous nature of being in a 'middle space'" (p.3), or graduate student boundary spanner, demonstrated the strategic versatility of boundary-crossing for RPPs, but as well, the ways in which it can be used to resist critique. On the one hand, I experienced first-hand how the "middle space" of boundary-crossers affords a critical perspective on relationships in RPPs. On the other hand, I also experienced how the amorphous position of boundary-crosser can be leveraged to lose the specificity of critique in confusion around role-taking and (in)experience.

Lashaw's study and my own are different in important and numerous ways. However, I draw on her methodological reflections here because they capture well the practical tensions of conducting research in and on an organizational reform movement that, in many ways, is "overexposed" (Lashaw, 2012) and thus resists critique. Lashaw explains this condition of overexposure: "Without a built-in difference between subjects under study and the social scientific readers of a study, one has no ready 'outside' perspective from which to produce fresh insight" (p.15). The overexposed nature of RPPs as a promising "alternative" to top-down reforms makes it difficult – indeed, perhaps even cynically indulgent – to examine them as "strange". As Lashaw explains, "the problem is amplified when the phenomena under study resist interpretation precisely because they seem to be already analyzed and already evaluated" (p.16). I worried that an invitation for an interview would invite requests to share my emerging findings, and I shied away from the risk that sharing my findings mid-data analysis would impede or foreclose a study I felt and hoped would advance the field in important ways. Although PLI leadership are not the focus of this study, I relied on my observations during meetings as well as testimony of teachers and civic partners that worked closely with PLI leadership to inform my study of CCYE. Upon completion of data collection and analysis, I wondered if it would have been generative to interview the executive and associate directors and felt, regrettably, that their lack of testimony narrowed the impact and scope of my study.

Table 3. Abbreviations

ABBREVIATION	NAME
PLI	Planning and Learning Institute
PU	Pacific University
EBB	Empowering Black Boys
CCYE	Community Change and Youth Empowerment
PD	Professional Development (workshop)
RPP	Research-Practice Partnership

CHAPTER FOUR

Teachers as "Facilitators" and the Dialogism of Boundary-Crossing in CCYE

Introduction

As a quickly growing field of research and scholarly inquiry as well as an increasingly popularized "grass-roots" and "community-oriented" form of reform, the call to learn more about RPPs is a loud one. As established in the Introduction and Literature Review, primary areas of investigation have been concerned with how RPPs define and operationalize equity between RPP actors and organizations and in collaboratively articulated processes, practices and outcomes. This has led researchers to be concerned with how boundaries between organizational partners are negotiated. Specifically, scholars in this area have been concerned with the politics of university-practitioner relations, with how task assignation is decided, negotiated and assumed, and with learning more about the role that difference plays in the negotiation of these boundaries (Denner et al, 2019; Vakil et al, 2016; Farrell et al, 2019; Diamond, 2021). Formative to the scholarship interested in the way that power is brokered in RPPs has been Penuel et al's (2015) reframing of university-school and researcher-practitioner relationships from a process of "translating" research into practice to one of "boundary-crossing." The authors prefer boundary crossing as a metaphorical heuristic for researcher-practitioner relations because it "offers a view of diversity and difference not as obstacles to be overcome, but as value inherent to social and professional activity" (p. 186 – 187). Acknowledging the complexities and possibilities of "joint work at the boundaries" (Penuel et al, 2015) of organizations has opened and widened avenues of inquiry around the mechanics, impacts and outcomes of RPPs[11].

---

[11] The idea of boundary and border-crossing has been formative to Third World, feminist and decolonial scholarship (Anzaldua, 1987; Anzaldua & Moraga, 1981; Villenas, 2010; Lugones, 1987; Mohanty; 2003). Education scholars have taken up boundaries/borders as a heuristic to investigate the impact of coloniality on the formation of cultural registers such as sex, gender, race, class and ethnicity, and how they intersect with teaching and learning as well as researching education (Giroux, 2007; McLaren & Giroux, 2018; Singh, 2018; Coloma, 2008). RPP scholarship has not conceptualized boundary-crossing from a feminist Third World or decolonial perspective. While it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to bring these literatures together, the findings presented in this dissertation point to the importance of identifying, complicating and expanding the epistemological frameworks from which RPP researchers and practitioners think about and do RPP work, such as boundary-crossing. A part of this expansion is conceptualizing RPP work from varying conceptual and epistemological standpoints, such as Third World feminism and/or decolonial and critical race scholarship (as I do in this study). Indeed, as I point out in Chapter 5, teachers and students in CCYE often verbalized a curiosity and urge to rearticulate and reframe their relationships to space and place that CCYE did not have the design, language or tools to support. Critically investigating the boundaries that exist between the way civic inclusion materializes and is operationalized, and racialized/gendered/classed/settler relationships to space and place necessitates a feminist, Third World and decolonial lens that boundary-crossing RPP scholarship has yet to take up. However, scholars in closely-related design-based research have drawn on feminist Third World frameworks to investigate equity in teaching and learning interactions (Gutierrez, 2008; Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez & Tejada, 1999; see also, for instance, Lizarraga & Gutierrez, 2018, who draw on Gloria Anzaldua to theorize the development of "nepantla literacies," or "literacies that thrive in the boundary" and "in expansive learning situations termed *third spaces*" [p.39; italics original], in dual language learning environments).

Concerned with choosing an accurate metaphorical characterization of what RPP actors are doing when engaging in RPP work, scholars delve into the figurative language and metaphorical frameworks RPP actors engage to make sense of the work of RPPs, such as "working at the joint boundaries of organizations". It points to the undetermined and complex nature of partnership and collaborative work across organizations, as well as the need to name, place, and make sense of it by relating it to past experiences and existing repertoires of knowledge, practice and meaning. Indeed, this became apparent in this study when observing and interviewing teacher participants. The constantly changing landscape of public education means that teaching and teacher identity are contested and in flux (Datnow, 2020; Little & Bartlett, 2010; Day, 2008; Hargreaves, 2008, 2009). As teachers encounter reforms throughout their careers, they adjust their ideological, pedagogical and affective frameworks in an effort to maintain a sense of coherent self in the face of volatility (Hargreaves, 2008, 2009; Kelchtermans, 2005; Little, 1996; Datnow, 2020), to maintain continuity in the face of discontinuity (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). Teaching, then, is a historicized and socially situated act (Leonardo & Boas, 2013; Leonardo & Gamez, 2019), and teachers make sense of their work dialogically. It follows that teachers' boundary crossing is not just a mental vacillation between the present (existing practices in one organization) and immediate future (new practices at the boundaries of organizations) as the metaphor suggests, but presumably necessitates an engagement with personal and social pasts as well – what teachers have done in their lives, how they came to do those things – to inform their particular roles and work in RPPs.

But, how are boundaries determined in the first place? RPP actors are not explicitly asked to take on the role of boundary crosser, but rather stumble onto boundary work when the context of discontinuity in practice occurs, which suggests a certain level of subjectivity in the process of sensing, locating and negotiating boundaries (Vakil et al, 2016). Boundary crossing is a conceptual framework offered from a researcher perspective, which reifies a "top-down" (or "translational") dynamic RPP collaborators have sought to equilibrate. How do actors *themselves* think about, name, explain and describe their roles, work and experiences in RPPs? In their discussion of "multi-level boundary crossing" Akkerman and Bakker (2011) describe boundaries as "ambiguous," "an in-between or middle ground, the boundary belongs to both one world and another. It is precisely this feature that seems to explain how the boundary divides as well as connects sides [Kerosuo, 2011]. However, the boundary also reflects a nobody's land, belonging to neither one nor the other world" (p. 141). Given the ambiguous and ambivalent nature of boundaries, how do boundaries become recognizable or legible to actors? There has been insufficient attention to what mobilizes or renders meaningful or salient the negotiation and accommodation of old practices with new, dissonant organizational-cultural frameworks.

In this chapter, I address these questions and issues in relation to one of the overarching research questions guiding this study: How do teachers make sense of their roles, experiences, and work in RPPs and what symbolic social-cultural-historical resources do they draw on in these sense-making processes? My findings show that how teachers negotiated boundaries in CCYE was related to how they understood the broader partnership; this sense of organizational whole was in turn rooted in how teachers understood their organizational role and the practical

and cognitive work they engaged in to implement it. Teachers drew on personal and professional frames to render meaningful and legible the work of "facilitating"; as the data shows, these frames are not discrete, but implicated. In my elaboration of the data, I first examine how teachers' roles were formally delineated in a letter of agreement (LOA) compiled by the university partner. Then, drawing on interview data, I examine how teachers operationalized the tasks laid out in the LOA. I then turn my attention to the language teachers used to describe their role, focusing on teachers' frequent use of the metaphor "facilitator" (and the gerund, "facilitating"). Although boundary-crossing scholarship has investigated the importance of boundary *objects*[12] as instrumental resources around which practices and perspectives can converge (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011; Penuel et al, 2015), less attention has been given to the figurative language and metaphors teachers draw on to dialogically make sense of their role in RPPs and to situate themselves as a particular kind of actor engaging in a particular kind of work. Throughout my discussion, I draw on interview data to show that while "facilitator" and "facilitating" bare a resemblance to boundary-crosser and boundary-crossing, they are different in important ways. Boundary-crossing as it is currently conceptualized in the literature (Penuel et al., 2015) assumes actors' undifferentiated recognition of and access to boundaries. The *crossing* in boundary-crossing exists a priori to boundary-recognition. As I show in this chapter, teachers' use of "facilitator" (and other similar and dissimilar metaphors) is demonstrative of the process of attempting to recognize where boundaries exist and are drawn in the first place, and how teachers situated themselves in relation to these boundaries in order to navigate them.

A note on "dialogism"

My understanding of teachers' dialogical boundary-crossing work is informed by Akkerman and Meijer's (2011) application of Dialogical Self Theory to a study of teacher identity. The authors argue that Dialogical Self Theory allows for an appreciation of both modern and postmodern views of identity. As such, the authors understand teacher identity to be "multiple, discontinuous, and social" while simultaneously "unitary, continuous and individual" (p.310). The authors explain, for instance, that Bakhtin's postmodern reasoning that individuals speak with multiple voices or what they refer to as 'multiple, possibly conflicting I-positions," is an important perspective from which to examine teacher identity, "especially when teachers face dilemmas or tensions throughout their work" (p.310). The authors also offer tools for thinking about continuity in the face of discontinuity, or in the face of conflicting I-positions. In addition to "narrating" their identities, teachers also eventually develop a "group voice, expressing a viewpoint and using words by which others can recognize the group" (p.314). Akkerman and Meijer (2011) explain that developing a group voice "shows how the way we (come to) see the world is to a large extent informed by significant others, including individuals and groups" (p.314) . This is important for understanding that while teachers' sense and approach to teaching

---

[12] Akkerman and Bakker (2011) define boundary objects as "artifacts doing the crossing by fulfilling a bridging function" (p.133). An example of a boundary object that facilitates boundary crossing is "a teacher portfolio as a means by which both the mentor and the school supervisor are able to track the development of the student teacher in teacher education" (p.133).

may shift through time and is subjective, there are also dominant conceptions of (the purpose of) teaching that endure and that are formative to the way teachers find a sense of stability in their work and identity.

An appreciation of teacher identity as dialogical helps to explain how teachers' metaphorical sense-making of their roles is informed by inter and intra-personal interactions (Akkerman & Bruining, 2016). As I explain in the rest of this chapter and dissertation, teachers are in dialogue with themselves and their pasts (intrapersonal processes) and with others (interpersonal). These inter and intra-personal processes do not happen separately, but are implicated with each other. Thus, the metaphors teachers "live by" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), or relied on to guide their role negotiation, are indicative of a dialogical process because teachers drew on intra-personal resources such as past lives, selves or "voices" (Akkerman & Meijer, 2016) that are not separate from their interpersonal resources, such as interactions and relationships with colleagues, students, and objects, such as the LOA. As the data I present shows, teachers' metaphors, including the use of the metaphor "facilitator," are a product of dialogical sense-making processes because these metaphors were formulated by teachers' access to existing and new cultural, social and symbolic resources, which are both "multi-voiced" as well as individual (Bakhtin, 2010; Akkerman & Meijer, 2011).

From "Teacher Partners" to "Facilitators"

Before the launch of CCYE projects, university partners met with teachers to discuss specific tasks and duties they were expected to complete as "teacher partners". The use of "partner" to refer to individuals or organizations working collaboratively in RPPs is not uncommon and appears in much of the RPP literature. It is implicit that those who work together in a partnership are "partners," and the term is reflective of the equity in practice and sharing of power to which RPPs aspire (Farrell et al, 2019; Denner et al, 2019). However, the organizational complexities that RPPs face (Farrell et al, 2019) as well as the fraught work of teaching in our current moment (Giroux, 2013) complicate the work of being a "teacher partner". How, then, do teachers understand, assume and experience their roles in RPPs?

The LOA listed a set of four broad areas, each with a set of tasks that "teaching partners" are asked to agree to by providing a signature at the bottom of the form. The four broad areas and sub-tasks as they appear on the LOA are listed below[13]:

Classroom

---

[13] Not all RPPs may use LOAs and the way RPPs articulate and come to an agreement about expectations and how tasks are distributed and assigned varies from partnership to partnership (Penuel & Hill, 2019; Tseng et al, 2017). The William T. Grant foundation, a major funder of RPPs across the United States, suggests establishing specific agreements or "memoranda of understanding, charters, operating principles – that provide structure and clarity as to how each side of the partnership will work with the other" (no date, https://rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org/topic/structuring-a-partnership/) CCYE used LOAs that were assembled by PLI to establish expectations and duties.

- Coordinate and administer CCYE 5-step methodology within the regular school day.
- Create a unit plan to integrate CCYE project into curriculum and identify dates to implement CCYE lesson plans within the classroom, with support of PLI.
- Facilitate filed trips, including managing and confirm all school-based logistics, media release forms, field trip permission slips, buses, chaperones, lunches, etc. for field trips.

Civic Client Partner Partnership

- Facilitate/host client introduction of project with students on [tentative date].
- Provide client with final products and deliverables (poster, slides, etc.) by [date].

Research

- Partner with PLI to document CCYE student outcomes and instructional process and ensure PLI receives final data.
- Engage in 30-minute post-survey/interview with PLI research team.

Communication

- Ensure all public reference to CCYE curriculum and materials cites Pacific University and PLI and follows Pacific University/PLI copyright agreement.
  (CCYE Teaching Partner Letter of Agreement, 2018 – 2019)

Consistent with the tasks laid out in the LOA, teachers described engaging in tasks such as planning field trips, coordinating with clients to schedule visits, lesson planning, accommodating CCYE PAR curriculum with state-mandated curriculum expectations, and guiding students through the CCYE research process. However, it is important to note that the LOA organizes tasks discretely by RPP domain (such as "Classroom") and partner (such as "Research" and "Civic Client Partner Partnership"). That said, teachers did not interpret or discuss the tasks they undertook in CCYE as discrete. Teachers' descriptions of their roles converged around the same two categories of tasks: (1) organizing interactions between the different partnership organizations and actors: the university (researchers and PLI staff), the school (administrators, students, other staff), and the civic/community or business partner (the "clients") and (2) guiding students through and ensuring their successful completion of participatory action research projects. Teachers describe and explain their work as implicated and as a part of a broader, coherent effort, which was reflected in some of the teachers' metaphorical references to CCYE as a "hub," a "cell" and metonymically as "the support".

For instance, Ms. Jensen, a white woman and Sustainable Systems[14] teacher, explained:

I'm the facilitator if that makes sense. I wish I was more of-- my job is to bring students and professionals together and to kind of facilitate them to figure out how to work together, right? Obviously, the kids need to learn how to interact with professionals, but those professionals, like the partners and the grad students and the people from Pacific University who come to classrooms, need a little bit of structure to figure out how to work with high schoolers, and so I'm the person in between. I also create structure. You

---

[14] Sustainable Systems is a class focused on the learning of sustainable energy options and environmental resilience.

get the curriculum from CCYE but I have to make that fit in my classroom. So, I'm taking that and developing the structure of the project […] kind of like I'm the nucleus in this bigger cell making everything work together.

Ms. Jensen lists "professionals" such as "grad students," "people from PU", and the "civic partners" as groups of people it is her "job" to "bring together". She suggests that while an "obvious" aim of the RPP is to help students "learn how to interact with professionals," a less obvious task that befalls her is to help the adult partners, or "professionals" "figure out how to work with high schoolers". She describes herself as "the person in between" who "create[s]" the "structure of the project". While the LOA lists these organizational bodies and the attendant tasks and duties owing to each one as discrete, Ms. Jensen's testimony demonstrates the ways that she makes sense of how these tasks are connected, which is also reflected in her description of CCYE as "this bigger cell". Additionally, her sense of location within the partnership and indispensability to its operations is reflected in her reference to herself as "the nucleus" of CCYE. Ms. Jensen's work as a "facilitator" exceeds the parameters of what is listed in the LOA as she brings her own sense of responsibility to the work, such as helping professionals learn how to work with high schoolers or serving as the person in the different organizational bodies, who "develop[s] the structure of the project" (tasks not explicitly indicated on the LOA).

Similarly, Mr. Franklin, a Black man and Entrepreneurship teacher in the Empowering Black Boys program explained his role as follows:

I think, uh, for me I think my role, uh, lends itself more to facilitating, or kind of like organizing the support, 'cause it was a lot of support – Pacific University students, yourself, Alyssa, the folks from Regional Transit Agency. I mean we had a lot of support, and without that support there's no way I could have had the capacity to do it [the CCYE PAR project]. So I look at my role as helping organize the support, the day, stuff like that, and facilitating as much as possible, and facilitating and helping the [students] meet those deadlines. But even that was a lot of support, so for me it was more like organizing and facilitating. The curriculum was already developed for us, which it was very flexible, like it wasn't so rigid where you had to do, you know [chopping one hand with the other to indicate inflexibility], but there were guideposts, so that was developed so we didn't have to develop the curriculum. So, for me I saw it more like organizing support, and the logistics and facilitating completion of tasks, for like, project tasks. I don't think I was teaching more, like, that's why I say facilitating and helping push the process home.

Like Ms. Jensen, Mr. Franklin mentions the different organizational LOA groups who are his "partner" in CCYE. Referring metonymically to CCYE actors as "the support", Mr. Franklin explains that he understood his role as "facilitating" or "organizing" support received from different CCYE actors, such as facilitating their entry into his classrooms and monitoring their

interactions within it, which is implied in his extension of "the support" as "the day." Or as he puts it, "I look at my role as helping organize the support, the day, stuff like that." As a facilitator, Mr. Franklin understands his role as organizing and mobilizing the *delivery* of that support, making its reception possible in the first place. Interestingly, towards the end of his response, Mr. Franklin specifies a sense of shift in his professional identity, indicating that he did not see himself as "teaching more" but rather "facilitating and helping push the process home". For Mr. Franklin, facilitating constitutes a change in practice and sense of teacher identity to accommodate to his position within the partnership. Like Ms. Jensen, Mr. Franklin articulates tasks and duties around organizing adult interactions and supporting students' project completion as implicated.

Ms. Jacobs, a Black woman and Engineering teacher, explained her role in the partnership by first elucidating how she understands CCYE operates. She explains her role as a "facilitator" in relation to how she understands the network of organizations in CCYE to work:

> That's a good question. CCYE to me is like a resource hub that's connecting partners who have issues in our communities that impacts the community. And the partners are interested in hearing from the community, especially the youth, on how to address certain issues. And I see CCYE as being the resource center that connects those hubs. Here they have the partners, the community, or the industry corporations that have a problem that want to solicit input from the youth. And I see the CCYE holding the hub of reaching out to the student community and I'm the connecting piece of that, the tripod of that, being the connector to the resources […] I would say that my role as a teacher is to facilitate the student experience in the learning. Preparing themselves to interact with the corporations and the community partners. Facilitator and a coach, and also making sure that they have access or learn the skills they'll need to get a job, have access to the materials that they need to be effective in presenting ideas and solutions and resolutions to whatever they want to do.

Like the other teachers, Ms. Jacobs explains that facilitating converges around organizing interactions between organizational partners and helping students complete their PAR projects.

While discrete, formal tasks were outlined and identified in the LOA as a way to ensure RPP efficacy (WT Grant Foundation). Facilitating seemed to emerge as a way for teachers to attend not only to the tasks and duties that were formally delineated and requested in the LOA but also to make sense of their location and function carrying out these tasks within a larger, connected totality – the CCYE partnership. For instance, Ms. Jensen situated herself as "the person in between" the different organizational bodies, who "creates structure" through her knowledge of high school students and curriculum. As "the person in between," she represents, somewhat literally, the "joint" in the "joint work at the boundaries of partnerships" (Penuel et al, 2015). Similarly, Mr. Franklin makes sense of the interactions between RPP organizations, such as the university partner and civic partners by metonymizing them as "the support" and situates himself and his class simultaneously as receiver(s) and mobilizer of this support. In their roles as

"partners", teachers interpreted tasks as implicated, and in so doing, made sense of the partnership as a coherent whole, such as a "hub," "the support," and a "cell". A fundamental part of figuratively articulating the different organizational parts of CCYE as a unified effort or entity was to extend the prescribed role of "partner" into "facilitator".

It may not seem unusual for teachers to refer to themselves as "facilitators". This is a term common to educational practice and even frequently used interchangeably with "teacher" in educational literature, popular discourse, and reform language (Farrell, 2016; Udesky, 2015). However, research around teachers' use of figurative language shows that metaphors have been instrumental in understanding teacher practice and teacher identity (Zhao et al., 2010; Thomas & Beauchamp, 2007, 2011; Martinez, Sauleda, and Guenter, 2001). For instance, Thomas and Beauchamp (2007, 2011) examined metaphors teachers use to describe their professional identities immediately after graduating preparation programs and then a year into their careers, and found that their perception of their work shifted from being "ready for a challenge" to "adopting a survival mode". Ungar (2016) found that metaphors helped teachers cope with and make sense of the contradictions of investing hope and expectations into a new educational reform and ultimately living out its disappointments and failures. Konopasky and Reybold (2014) examined the metaphors that adult literacy educators used to describe their professional identities and work and found that educators engaged in what they call "metaphorical improvisation" to negotiate between their own transformative approaches to teaching and the pressure to engage instrumentalist ones, focused on data-driven practice and results. Tobin's work (Tobin & LaMaster, 1995; Tobin, 1990) provides evidence that supports novice teachers in uncovering their metaphors and that evaluating and altering these metaphors could lead to radical change in practice. Indeed, metaphors "act as a bridge for dissonance because they allow people to view one concept through the window of another concept, bringing together reason and imagination" (Konopasky & Reybold, 2014, p. 262).

Moreover, as Leonardo (2016) points out, an examination of the "tropics" that evolve in patterns and trends of metaphor use make apparent the "cultural battles" behind their genesis. For instance, Leonardo examines the "tropics of whiteness" or the "metaphor regimes" (tropics of "singularity," "multitude," and "journey" in whiteness studies) that structure and represent disciplinary and popular approaches to making sense of whiteness. Leonardo suggests that "sensitivity to the power of tropes" as well as the development of new tropes is formative to the way we understand race in education and can have "emancipatory possibilities" (p.12). Heeding this sensibility to the power of tropes, I show that teachers' metaphors were reflective of their social location, which shaped their sense of role and oriented their relationship to boundaries. In other words, a study of the "tropics" of teacher role surfaced the role of social-cultural capital in making boundaries more or less apparent and negotiable.

"Facilitating" as professionally and personally situated work

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explained that metaphors have a crucial role in governing the way we think and the way we interact with our social world. The authors explain that our

"ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details" (p.3). When individuals engage metaphors to make sense of experience, they do so analogically, using information from one experience (pre-existing schemas) and applying it towards another. Lakoff and Johnson explain that this analogical process is implicated in individuals' cognitive processes. Thus, they define "metaphor" as the systematic application of "inference patterns from one conceptual domain to reason about another conceptual domain" (p.246). Metaphors thus organize our thinking and interactions with our physical and social world and as such, shape the way we make sense of and encounter new phenomena. Teachers' overwhelming use of "facilitator" to name and describe their roles demonstrates "that the choice of language is not accidental and represents more than the surface meaning of the concepts" (Ungar, 2016, p.119) and is therefore important to examine for what it might unveil about teachers' sense of meaning in their work in RPPs and RPPs' impact overall.

In the previous section I drew on data that demonstrates how teachers made sense of a set of disaggregated tasks as implicated and as part of a coherent, collaborative organizational totality, rather than discrete to particular organizations. This evidence also showed how in this process, teachers identified themselves as "facilitators" and their work as "facilitating", a shift from "teacher partner" which allowed teachers discursively to situate themselves as part of an inter-organizational totality. Whereas "partner" suggests dyadic participation in organizational pairs (moving back and forth between contexts), "facilitating" suggests dialogical participation across an organizational plurality. In the following section, I more deeply examine the significance of this figurative move. I show how teachers' use of the metaphor "facilitator" constituted a cognitive process whereby teachers made sense of their work in relation to their professional pathways to teaching and personal histories. "Facilitator" was not just an articulation of their sense of organizational location or of executing accordant tasks, but also a type of figurative framework teachers drew on dialogically to make sense of their organizational, social position within the partnership and engagement with new tasks and practices.

The personal and professional dialogism of "facilitating"

Teachers applied schemas from their personal histories and past professional lives to make sense of their unique positions as teachers within CCYE. This dialogical framing equipped teachers with cultural and social tools to recognize and navigate boundaries and make sense of themselves as situated actors in the process. For instance, in the example shared above, Ms. Jacob's use of the metaphor "tripod" to refer to her role and organizational position in CCYE is situated in her discussion of the personal and professional pathways that led to her career as a teacher.

Before becoming a teacher, Ms. Jacobs attended an elite public university in California where she studied Mathematics and then worked "in corporate America […] making pretty good money" for 20 years. She sites her "humble upbringing", her father's hard work and "survivor's guilt" as reasons contributing to her decision to become a teacher. Ms. Jacobs's father was the

youngest of 17 children and dropped out of school in the sixth grade to help put his older sisters through college. He always reminded Ms. Jacobs and her siblings about the importance of education, repeating "go to school, get your degrees, get your education". She explained that "education is the battleground" fraught by "intergenerational poverty." She felt strongly that teaching "is the most important job in the world […] because it is an opportunity to level the playing field". On the recommendation of her friends and family who admired her Sunday School teaching skills that she carefully cultivated over 20 years, she "felt the nudge that I could be a role model and that I could help others acquire this [her success] if they wanted to" and decided to leave her corporate job and pursue a second career as a teacher. Twelve years into her career as a high school Engineering and Career and Technical Education teacher, Ms. Jacobs actively searches for opportunities to continue her professional development, such as applying for and completing a competitive summer externship for teachers at Google, where she researched how tech industries outreach to youth of color before college to "increase the likelihood of them majoring in those lucrative areas once they go off to college". Ms. Jacobs explained that "the Sun Valley is rich with companies and a lot of them want to be good corporate citizens," so she is "always searching for opportunities to partner". Partnering with CCYE, Ms. Jacobs explained, was a "natural next step" in her professional and personal aspirations to "break the cycle of poverty" and "level the playing field" for young people.

Ms. Jacobs drew on her personal background and past professional experience to explain what she wanted to learn from the CCYE partnership:

> **BG**: What are you hoping to get out of the project[15]?
>
> **Ms. Jacobs**: Real-world experience for our students. You know, we can't be isolated. One of the things I've learned – 'cause I did an externship at Google, every summer I'm working with companies. I go in and out of companies all the time. Our curriculum can become stagnant, but it should be relevant to what's going on in the real world. So, we get current real-world enhancement in terms of what we're doing in the schools, so when they graduate, they have some real-world skills. That's so important to breaking the cycle of poverty, making sure everyone has the same opportunities. That's not something we had, or my father had. So, learning how to navigate that, how to communicate. Since they're Seniors, my biggest thing is I believe in preparing our Seniors for the next stage of life. In a few months they will have to learn how to communicate, get work, do projects – either in college or in jobs, or both – so I want to empower them with 20th century skills, collaboration, team work, communication, networking, you know, all those skills are real-world skills, and so through this project, I want to hone them for their sakes.

Ms. Jacobs drew on her father's sacrifices for his sisters and children's education, her Sunday School convictions to act as a "role model", and her corporate know-how both to recognize and

---

[15] Ms. Jacob's CCYE PAR project involved a partnership with the city's department of transportation to investigate how students' commute to campus could be improved (i.e., considerations students were encouraged to focus on were: safety, cleanliness of public transportation, access to public transportation).

mobilize the boundaries she straddled as a facilitator. Her use of additional metaphors, such as "tripod" and "connector to the resources," animates Ms. Jacobs' sense of operating at the nexus of these boundaries. Her desire to "fulfill my father's dream for us" was present at the boundary between "enhancing . . . stale curriculum" through "real-world" exposure to "20th century skills" by interacting with business partners or civic agents in the CCYE project. Additionally, Ms. Jacob's corporate background affords her the cultural resources to "go in and out of companies all the time." Alongside her humble upbringing and past teaching experience as a Sunday School teacher, her corporate career serves as the third leg that situates her as a "tripod" and "connector to the resources" within the larger totality of CCYE, or the "hub" as she referred to it. Thus, Ms. Jacobs' boundary-crossing was enabled by the schemas she drew from her personal and professional experiences and that she applied to her role as a "facilitator". However, facilitating is different from boundary-crossing in that it recognizes that actors engage in a dialogical meaning-making process to understand where boundaries lie in the first place and how one is situated in relation to them. That is, the personal, social and cultural resources (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003) to which one has access influence how one navigates or "crosses" organizational boundaries.

Like Ms. Jacobs, Ms. Holloway also came to teaching as a second career. Before teaching, Ms. Holloway, a white woman and English and Social Science teacher who taught at a health professions-themed high school, completed her bachelor's degree in theater arts before moving to Los Angeles to pursue a career in film and television and special effects. However, after developing an allergy to an ingredient used frequently in special effects makeup and then realizing she could not afford the long hours and unpaid apprenticeships in the entertainment industry, Ms. Holloway found work through a temporary work agency and worked as an office administrator and then in business management for seven years before the company downsized and she was laid off. Ms. Holloway decided to pursue a teaching credential in English after a visit home during which she realized working in education was a "family business." She recalls, "I'm looking around and there's 35 of my aunts and uncles and cousins and everybody and I'm like, 'Wow, everybody in this room is in education except for 5 of us.' And I was like, 'Didn't I at some point think I wanted to be a teacher? Maybe I'll join the company. I'll join the family business.'" One of the other members in her family who did not work in Education is Ms. Holloway's brother, who, instead of going to college, decided to work and eventually became a "marketing guru and makes tons of money". Although Ms. Holloway explains that she loves school and intends to get a PhD in Education, she feels strongly that

> education in general, we have really done a disservice to a lot of our kids by insisting that everybody has to go to or prepare for a four-year college. And don't get me wrong. I love school. I am all about – if I could go – I mean, clearly, I love school because I became a teacher and I'm intending to go and get my doctorate in education. I'm all about it. However, that's my choice that I want to do […] we have to stop selling it that somehow if you went to college you're better than somebody who didn't. It's just different. And so a lot of that is just kind of – it's elitist thinking […] Because that is a class thing. It's not because it's a utilitarian kind of thing. It's not about 'what's the purpose of it?' What's the purpose of it? To show that you're part of this class and that you can enter into those hallways. So, I am very much against that message, which has really kind of pervaded education for years now. I am violently opposed to the standardized testing, these high

stakes tests, because they are not – I've spent enough time as a database administrator to realize that it's bad data.

Ms. Holloway believed firmly that it was important to "prepare [her] students for opportunity, to have choice," rather than "insisting that everybody has to go to college". Like Ms. Jacobs, Ms. Holloway felt that CCYE allowed her to "ground" her practice in "real-world issues" and exposed her students to "different career options and skill-sets" that "empower students to go into the real world prepared". Ms. Holloway felt that participating in the "scientific methods" of the PAR projects taught students to exercise agency in making choices about their post-secondary lives rather than allowing choices to be made for them:

> So, it's a scientific method. It's like 'Okay, go out, and what do you notice? Okay. Well, what do you think about it? What are you going to do about it? Well, test it out. What do you want to change or what do you think you could change? Does it work? Does it not work? All that kind of stuff gives our kids agency. It's not sitting back and being told, 'Well, go do this. Here's how you do such and such. Well, here, do this, blah, blah blah.' The kids have to go figure out what they want to do, what they care about, and that's what's going to keep them from just being told what's good for them, what they're supposed to do, and what they can do and want to do, and to make choices based off that. That's what they're going to need to succeed in the real world after high school.

Exposure to an "authentic audience," or the civic partner, enabled students to interact with "real world" issues and skills. However, Ms. Holloway did not feel that this arm of the partnership was essential for full engagement with the PAR projects. In fact, Ms. Holloway felt that civic or business partners could interfere with students' full engagement in the PAR projects because "they do not know how to work with kids," a problem Ms. Holloway "[does] not have time for". Thus, when she "felt like the client was not stepping up or we couldn't get what we needed from them," she simply continued the project without the client, a shift in the CCYE partnership she felt not all teachers would be able to manage.

> There are still questions that exist constantly for development and city planning, and you can always pose those to the kids whether or not you have a client […] So, it can go forward [without a client], but it depends on the teacher a little – well, quite a bit. It'll depend on the teacher. So, I mean, CCYE is not a boxed curriculum that you can just hand any teacher the binder and say, 'Okay, here's your client. Let's go.' There's got to be teacher understanding of it. I mean, a teacher can be bought in and be, 'Oh, it's a great idea.' But if they don't understand the concepts underneath or if they're not used to running projects like this, a hands-on, project-based, work-based learning is really what it is, then they're going to have some trouble if they're looking for like, 'Well, where are the study questions and where's the worksheet?' […] it doesn't run that way. That's not what it is, so. I have enough experience under my belt that I can bring to the table and know how to guide the students to the finish line.

Like Ms. Jacobs, Ms. Holloway drew on schemas from her personal and professional life to animate "facilitating" with meaning, a dialogical process that allowed her also to recognize where boundaries lie and what personal, cultural and social resources she needed to navigate

them. Ms. Holloway's own pathway to teaching involved changing career paths from the entertainment industry, to business management, and then to teaching. The final decision to pursue teaching was framed as a choice to join a family "business" or "company," a common career path in her family. Similarly, Ms. Holloway framed her brother's path to becoming a "marketing guru" as his personal choice when he opted to join the workforce after high school instead of pursuing college, a choice she emphasizes was well remunerated[16]. Thus, ensuring that her students have the same access to choice was important to Ms. Holloway's pedagogy and formative to the way she facilitated. Exposing her students to "real-world" audiences (the client), skills and problems was important to ensuring that they learn how to exercise agency in order to obtain choice. CCYE's "scientific method" appealed to Ms. Holloway because it engaged students in practices that prepared them to exercise agency to make choices, rather than passively absorb demands: *"Well, go do this. Here's how you do such and such. Well, here, do this, blah, blah, blah."*

Ms. Holloway applied the schema of choice in navigating the boundaries between her own personal convictions about the purposes of education, teaching, and CCYE's PAR curriculum. In the same way that she made choices among career pathways, Ms. Holloway felt comfortable making the choice to break with CCYE design and protocol to work with civic clients. When she felt that clients were not "stepping up" or she was not "getting what [she] needed from them," she made the choice to continue the project without them. Ms. Holloway felt that her past career experience endowed her with enough "experience under [her] belt" to replace the client role, blurring the boundary between the role of the client and the teacher in CCYE. Likewise, her experience as a database manager affirmed her belief that standardized testing is a "bad idea" invented to sustain the exclusory and "elitist" nature of higher education. The ability to bring a variety of skills "to the table" and "run" a project are resources that Ms. Holloway suggests she was able to draw on from her past to move between teacher and client, indeed to cross, or hybridize, the boundary between these two roles. Ms. Holloway explains that not just "any teacher" is able to do this but "there's got to be teacher understanding of it". While a teacher can be "bought in," or convinced of the value of the project and think "it's a great idea," Ms. Holloway claims that the teacher must "understand the concepts underneath," suggesting that there are skills, know-how, or certain knowledges and forms of capital necessary to "run" the project. Ms. Holloway uses the metaphor "run" not just to refer to what she perceives herself as doing in the partnership, but also to her authoritative location within the partnership. If she is "running" the project, like Ms. Jensen who perceived herself acting as the "nucleus" of CCYE, Ms. Holloway embodies the multiple operations necessary for CCYE to "run that way". According to Ms. Holloway, the understanding of "concepts underneath" CCYE operations, then, not only exceed a set of basic tasks laid out in a worksheet or binder (or LOA) but seem to require both symbolic (for instance, a disposition towards and comfort with choice and authority) and material resources (for instance, a range of professional skills) to be able to interpret the CCYE curriculum and operationalize it. Thus, Ms. Holloway drew on schemas and resources from her personal history and past professional life to recognize and navigate boundaries – or "facilitate" – in CCYE. Said another way, the boundaries that emerged as salient for Ms. Holloway between "facilitator," "partner," and "teacher" were made legible and navigable

---

[16] Ms. Holloway did not discuss how her brother's race, gender and family class status were likely factors that contributed to this choice being a successful one for him.

through schemas that Ms. Holloway carried over from her professional and personal pathways to teaching.

Additionally, the identification and negotiation of these boundaries was in part guided by Ms. Holloway's subscription to neoliberal values, such as meritocratic individualism and consumerist logic (Lipman, 2011). For instance, the importance of agency and choice to Ms. Holloway's pedagogy is organized around three assumptions: (1) students have access to the same currency of social and cultural capital that she does, (2) exercising choice is the same as exercising agency, and (3) choice is the key to social mobility and educational and economic success. Bourdieu (1987; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) explained that it is not access to capital alone that affords one social and economic mobility, but rather an accumulation of capital that carries social and cultural currency, or distinction. While participation in CCYE and an education in a health professions-themed high school might expose students to various forms of capital - relationships with and an audience with civic stakeholders, experience that leads to medical certifications - this does not necessarily mark this capital as "distinct" (or "distinguished") which raises questions around what is classified as a "resource" and what constitutes (social-cultural) "capital". Resources do not necessarily accumulate in value the way that capital does. Moreover, access to these resources does not mean that students will be able to exercise choice as agency in the same way that Ms. Holloway did. While Ms. Holloway and her brother pursued careers in unconventional ways that allowed them to "shop" for the right career (i.e., teaching as a family "business" and "company") and made them feel in control of their future, it is well documented in the literature that pursuing "choice" in this way is fraught for poor people of color (Camardelle, 2021). Additionally, as Tara Yosso (2005) and Gonzalez, Moll and Amanti (2005) have empirically documented, not all forms of capital are legible or carry the same social-cultural currency. By blurring the distinctions between access to resources and to social-cultural capital, and between exercising choice and agency, Ms. Holloway approached her role as "facilitator" in a way that reproduced neoliberal notions of educational success and civic inclusion. Ray (2019) points out that this is a part of the constraining of agency that racialized organizations, such as workplaces, schools, or RPPs, can impose on people of color.

Drawing on schemas from personal and professional history made facilitating challenging for some teachers. Ms. Saetang, a Southeast Asian woman who taught in a Law and Social Justice pathway as a Career and Technical Education (CTE) teacher for two years, expressed doubt and hesitation about participating in CCYE after completing her first project. Ms. Saetang decided to teach after practicing family law and then as a legal aid for nine years. Searching for a way to continue to support economically marginalized people while also spending more time with her family, Ms. Saetang decided to leave her career in law to become a teacher, a career whose time commitment would likely differ. Although in the nascent stages of her teaching career, Ms. Saetang was intentional about applying frameworks from her legal practice to her teaching:

> For me, I teach like I practice law. I like to think I teach with an eye to what I think that students really need to know as adults, which is kind of like the basics for making sure that they can navigate the world. I also teach just with my own experiences in mind, about diversity and inclusion and what I saw and didn't see when I was going through

school. And particularly since I teach a large population of African-American students, I teach a lot of criminal law, and I teach race in criminal law, so I teach implicit bias. I teach the history of policing, I teach about jury selection and racism that comes through there. I teach about judicial independence and the power of certain roles like judges and prosecutors in particular. Yeah, but mainly, I just want to make it useful. The population that I teach now is essentially the children of the population that I served as a lawyer. And so, making sure that they have that information that's going to be helpful to themselves and their families is the most important thing.

When the College and Career Readiness director at her school told teachers about CCYE and suggested partnerships, Ms. Saetang felt that their organizational focus on city planning fit well with her course content on the impacts of local government, and she liked the idea of using CCYE's curriculum, rather than having to make her own. Ms. Saetang also felt that CCYE's goals to cultivate civic inclusivity and a sense of civic identity in marginalized youth reflected the teachings she brought into her classroom from her career in family law and legal aid, a set of skills and information she felt it was crucial for her demographic of students to have. It is through this lens that Ms. Saetang interpreted and articulated the purpose of CCYE. When asked what she understands CCYE to be and do, Ms. Saetang replied:

Well, I mean, first and foremost, I think it is encouraging youth to engage - right? - in their immediate environment. And then, secondly, I think what I understand CCYE to be about is essentially advocacy. Actually, almost like – almost like practicing law, right? How to kind of start the beginning stages of advocacy and how to-- who would you do that to. Right? If you wanted to change something in your city, who would you do it to? So, understanding kind of how local rules and local governments affect your life.

Despite the alignment Ms. Saetang identified between her classroom content, teaching skills and CCYE's curriculum, she felt that completing the projects was very stressful. Although she recognized the merit of completing the PAR projects for her students, she saw little incentive for teachers to engage with the partnership:

BG: Has engaging in the project made you feel any differently about teaching or about yourself as a teacher?

Ms. Saetang: […] about being a teacher I think it has [laughter]. And again, because I'm still struggling with this. You hear a lot of things about teachers and we've all had good and bad teachers. And what I would say about doing this CCYE project is that-- or doing any big project, but this is really the only big project I've done aside from a student small trial which we've done, is that there is not a lot of incentive for teachers to do something hard like this with their students. Practicing law, your impact is pretty clear. But you really don't get anything [laughter] from doing this. If I did this or if I didn't do this, nobody would necessarily say anything as long as classes are going fine [laughter] and there are no huge issues or complaints. But I guess that was my realizing – I was like, "Oh man, I don't know, but this was a lot of work." And mostly it was a lot of stress, not necessarily even that much work [laughter], but in addition to what I would normally do, but it was a lot of stress to make sure that I could connect with all the students and that they could be ready.

And that there isn't a lot of incentive or payoff for me the entire time until I actually see my students' work [laughter] and see what they could do or see if they got something out of it. So, I guess that was my main realization. It's like, "Okay, well now it's done and my students enjoyed it, but selfishly, how much work do I – if this is so much work and it's been so stressful, how much do I want to do it again if there's nothing really in the end to say, 'Oh no support, right? No kudos and no feedback, positive or negative, from either colleagues or administration or anything like that. I mean, that was my main realization. It's easy to be-- it's easy as a teacher to [laughter] do little if you really want to, and it's hard to be ambitious, I guess […] I really didn't know what the payoff for me would be until the very end, right? And so, at the very end when my students gave me feedback and they said they enjoyed it, but then it could have gone either way. It could have been like, "Oh my God, that was so stressful, and I never want to do that again," or, "I didn't get anything out of it".

Ms. Saetang felt that the lack of extrinsic affirmation, recognition and incentive from colleagues or administration made it difficult for teachers to be ambitious and find motivation to take on cross-organizational collaborations such as CCYE on top of regular teaching duties[17]. Moreover, the uncertainty around the outcomes of the project, such as whether or not her students would find it gratifying and what exactly she or they would get out of the project, made it difficult for Ms. Saetang to see a clear "pay-off". She compared these challenges to practicing law, where the work's impact tends to be "pretty clear"; however, without affirmation from colleagues and administration or feedback on the projects, the pay-off and incentive to participate in CCYE were not clear. Rather, it became apparent to Ms. Saetang that it is easier for teachers "to do little" than to be "ambitious".

While it is impossible to know if Ms. Saetang would feel the same way about participating in CCYE if she had not previously worked as a lawyer, the comparison she makes between the "clear" outcomes of practicing law and the uncertain outcomes for teachers in CCYE suggests that she made sense of her role in CCYE, in part, through the lens of her former lawyer self. As Ms. Saetang pointed out, her previous career as a lawyer aligned well with her role as a CTE teacher in a Law and Social Justice Pathway and with the organizational goals of CCYE, but applying scripts (i.e. "pretty clear outcomes") from her career as a lawyer to her role in CCYE heightened and complicated rather than softened the boundaries between "teacher" and "facilitator". Ms. Saetang may have also been reacting to the pervasive influence of ideas of teacher selflessness upheld in the structure of CCYE where teachers often assume partnership duties, such as coordinating with clients, on top of their regular teaching duties, sometimes with no recognition (aside from what is detailed in the LOA). Indeed, "facilitator" is defined as "someone who helps to bring about an outcome (such as learning, productivity, or communication) by providing indirect or unobtrusive assistance, guidance, or supervision" (merriem-webster.com). The implicit expectation to take on the extra stress in an "unobtrusive"

---

[17] It is important to note that Ms. Saetang and her students completed their CCYE projects remotely as schools closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic just as they were reaching the final stages of their PAR projects. Although Ms. Saetang did not explicitly name the pandemic or remote teaching as reasons for why she found the project "stressful" or lacking clear incentive for teachers, it likely contributed to the difficulties she encountered.

and "indirect" manner clashed with the ambition that Ms. Saetang wanted to bring to her practice.

Additionally, the marginality suggested in this kind of "unobtrusive" and "indirect" facilitating diverged from the social-cultural ethics Ms. Saetang sought to teach her students and emulate in her practice. This is perhaps why Ms. Saetang explains that the project made her think differently about herself as a teacher who acts "selfishly" by debating what merit the project had for *her*. The act of drawing dialogically on schemas from her past career as a lawyer to inform her work and sense of role in CCYE surfaced and intensified intrapersonal and interpersonal boundaries (Wegemer & Renick, 2021; Williams, 2009) between Ms. Saetang's sense of teacher identity and her school colleagues and administrators. Akkerman and Bruining (2016) identify four possible intrapersonal learning outcomes when an individual participates in two or more institutionalized practices. They are:

> (1) A person comes to define his or her own simultaneous but distinctive participatory positions,

> (2) A person seeks means or procedures to distribute or align his or her own participatory positions in multiple practices,

> (3) A person comes to look differently at his or her own participatory position because of the other participatory position,

> (4) A person develops a hybridized position in which previously distinctive ways of thinking, doing, communicating, and feeling are integrated. (p.246)

These outcomes are neither mutually exclusive nor do they occur simultaneously. Past career and personal schemas helped Ms. Holloway and Ms. Jacobs identify and cross boundaries. When Ms. Saetang applied past professional schemas to her work, it cast a light on the ways in which teacher roles in RPPs are complicated by institutional problems such as lacking administrative support and school or departmental structure, and pervasive and entrenched notions of teacher selflessness. Encountering intrapersonal boundaries along the four indicators listed above spurred *inter*personal boundaries between Ms. Saetang and her school and administrators.

Other novice teachers also encountered heightened boundaries when drawing on schemas from their past to facilitate their current role. Ms. Vincent, a white woman and English teacher who taught with Ms. Jacobs in the same Engineering academy, was in her second year of teaching when she implemented her first CCYE project[18]. Ms. Vincent had just completed a year in Teach for America (TFA) and received a subject area credential. As such, the schemas she applied to "facilitating" were largely drawn from her college experiences. Ms. Vincent double-majored in English Literature and Political and Social Thought. Through her undergraduate studies, Ms. Vincent developed an interest in incarceration, a topic she explored in depth in her

---

[18] Ms. Vincent and Ms. Jacobs worked on the same CCYE PAR project as they all taught in the same academy and shared the same set of students.

undergraduate thesis that examined literature written by incarcerated women. During her studies, Ms. Vincent took a class through which she taught Russian Literature at a juvenile facility. This experience made an impression on her, sparking her interest in pursuing a teaching career. Feeling "burned out" by the history of incarceration in the United States as "disturbing and broken", Ms. Vincent asked herself, "'Okay, well then, how do you divert people from continuing through that system or continuing into that system?' And I landed on education". Known to be "the kind of person who could come home and just rant to my roommates for 17 hours about whatever new little bit of information I learned about incarceration or education or whatever," her friends put her in touch with a TFA recruiter who worked on her college campus. After considering her post-graduate options and long-term plans, Ms. Vincent decided she wanted to "be in the classroom" but was not ready to commit to graduate programs or a long-term teaching career and so decided the time-commitment and reduced financial costs of completing the TFA program was the best route for her.

Unlike the other teachers discussed thus far, Ms. Vincent did not use the word "facilitator" to describe her role in the CCYE partnership. Instead, she explained that the role of the teacher in the CCYE partnership is as a "vault of information," a role she did not feel she was able to fulfill:

> The role of the teacher, then, is to be that sort of – and this is how I've kind of envisioned my role in a lot of ways – it's like to be that vault of information. And if students have a question, you should be able to answer it. If a student has a question of like, "Is this doable? What is this about? Why is this, this way?" As they're coming up with their own ideas, we should be able to tell them the answer […] the role of the teacher is to be the subject matter expert and help guide students away from like, "Okay, that actually is completely not doable, and I know that because of this. So, what else might you be able to do then? If this is not possible, what is?" Yeah, it's still, I don't like not feeling like I know enough about the subject matter to even suggest something to kids […] And I also had a hard time completely relinquishing control over the outcome of the project. Because I am more used to being the person who is an expert and having that super strong grasp on content and guiding the class in a way that probably is overbearing.

Ms. Vincent used additional metaphors similar to "facilitator" such as "funnel" and "connector" to describe her role, as well as the metaphor "sieve", which simultaneously contradicted the fluidity and hybridity of "connector" and "funnel." She relates,

> So being more of that guide towards something that's actually like a proposal that's actually sensible. I can see that kind of like being the teacher role. So, you end up being that connector piece or the funnel between all of the amazing, crazy, creative ideating that students do and the client, who are obviously looking for something that they can implement. You become sort of like the sieve of what actually reaches them. And it's still the students' ideas, right? I just don't know how well I was able to do that.

Having studied humanities in college, Ms. Vincent felt insecure about her ability to guide students through their PAR projects, which partnered with the city's Department of Transportation to investigate how to improve students' commute to their high school campus.

She also felt uncomfortable teaching an English class in an engineering-themed academy. But, because she had implicit administrative permission to curate her own curriculum, she felt better able to decide what was within her capacity to teach. Other factors that contributed to the difficulties in her inaugural teaching years included her young age and the common perception that teachers are not "professionals" and rather seen as "just kid people like we're not actually professionals ourselves. We're like mini professionals or something for children," issues that many first-time and veteran teachers face (Thomas & Beauchamp, 2010; Williams, 2009). To mitigate her sense of insecurity Ms. Vincent relied on her area expertise as a source of "authority":

> I think what's saved me in a lot of ways, is that I know my subject matter really well, which is probably not the most important thing, but what I'm still figuring out, the whole-- the classroom management and I don't naturally have a ton of authority because they know how old I am. When I started last year, it was like days after my 22nd birthday. And so, my kids came in 18 years old and they know. And so, I think I don't have a ton of very natural authority. I'm not going to be like a mother figure or anything like that. So, I think what has saved me is that I know a lot about English literature. I've just done it for a long time. Like I know, and when I tell them, you need to be able to do this in college and this is how you do it, they believe me, which has helped them see me as a professional.

However, Ms. Vincent was neither able to exert the same influence over the CCYE curriculum as she did in her regular classroom nor was she able draw on her English literature knowledge to assist students through their projects, which made her feel incompetent and question, "What did I go to college for?" Because she was not an expert in transportation, city planning or engineering, Ms. Vincent experienced insecurity as well as incoherence between the roles she expected herself to be able to fulfill and what she was actually able to do. Thus, Ms. Vincent experienced a contradiction in her roles (between "vault" and "sieve", and "funnel" and "connector"), which heightened the boundaries between her capacities as a novice teacher and sense of self as an "expert," her job as a teacher in an engineering-themed academy, and her role in the CCYE partnership.

The difficulties that many first-year teachers face, such as insecurity about young age, constructing a new identity, navigating new institutional contexts and relationships, and establishing a pedagogical style and authority (Thomas & Beauchamp, 2011; Flores & Day, 2006) were compounded by Ms. Vincent's sense of role insecurity in CCYE. To mitigate some of these insecurities, Ms. Vincent relied on her confidence in her knowledge of English literature, such as appearing as an authority in front of her students. This confidence and ability to "rant for 17 hours" about "whatever new little bit of information" she read is a schema that worked well for her in college and which allowed her to frame herself as an expert. This schema is also reflected in the framing of her role in CCYE as a "vault of information" and "sieve" of students' ideas. However, the dissonances Ms. Vincent experienced surfaced boundaries in ways that reified problematic approaches to teacher practice and hierarchical notions about working in the public versus private sector. For instance, Ms. Vincent explained that teachers in CCYE should "end up being that connector piece or the funnel between all of the amazing, crazy, creative ideating that students do and the client". However, because she felt she was not able to fulfill this role, she instead conceived of herself as a "sieve" that allowed students

contingent access to a "vault of information". In this way, Ms. Vincent selectively decided which students' proposals would ultimately reach the client. A "vault" is a "large room or chamber used for storage, especially an underground one"; it is also a "secure room in a bank in which valuables are held" (merriem-webster.com). Ms. Vincent's use of this metaphor reflects her sense that knowledge and information are privileged resources and symbolic capital to which only some should be granted access, thus requiring the need for teachers to act as "sieves". Although Ms. Vincent expressed a desire for her students to be "empowered" and "have a voice" as well as "equal access to opportunities and resources", her ideas about pedagogy and the role of teachers in CCYE reflect problematic gatekeeping ideologies and practices that are well known in education.

Finally, although Ms. Vincent appreciated that interactions with other "adult professionals" validated her own sense of professionalism and the skillset she brought to her role, it also reified a sense of hierarchy between teachers as unprofessional public actors and "professionals" in the private sector:

> And it's so deeply apparent to me how the work that I do and the skills that I have as a teacher kind of mold into the rest of the private sector ecosystem of jobs. But to other people, to other professionals, we are very siloed. We have this super-specific role. And we do these super-specific kid things. And we are just kid people like we're not actually professionals ourselves. We're like mini professionals or something for children. That's how people view teachers. And I think interfacing with other adults outside of the school system and having other adults be excited about the work that I'm doing and recognize the value of the work that I'm doing with kids and the value of the contributions that 17-year-olds can actually make was validating in a weird way, personally, yeah. And it is nice to just-- in the same way that kids feel stuck, I think, in the day-to-day of the classroom, feels a little bit disconnected, teachers feel that, too. So, working on, I think, a real project, I think it also re-centers me on what is the mission of my work, what am I actually preparing kids to do. But how do you maintain that once the project is done?

Like Ms. Saetang, Ms. Vincent and Ms. Jacobs's project transitioned to remote learning when schools closed at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. When I interviewed Ms. Vincent for the second time after her students' final Zoom presentation, she indicated that she had been looking for jobs in the education technology industry, where there was a clear need for teachers' perspectives and experiences, which she found were underappreciated in the industry:

> "Eventually, I think, I want to end up in product. And it's hard to get a role just going – it's hard to get just straight into product, especially in tech, right? People here are very exclusionary. And teaching, to the entire rest of the business community, is a joke, basically. It's, 'I took two years off from finding a real career,' that's what people think. And I've heard that like, 'Oh, so is that just a gap year for you?' Nope, not a gap year, but okay. So, whatever. Obviously, it's been frustrating trying to penetrate into the private sector, but it's the global pandemic, so I figured it was good timing.

Although this line of work does not fit squarely with Ms. Vincent's English literature background, she felt her teaching experience would be an important contribution to the field and

that it would "be a good area to create impact on a broader scale without the burnout of being a classroom teacher". Although Ms. Vincent is critical of the perception that teaching is not a real profession and "a joke", she seemed to seek external legitimization and a sense of belonging to an "actually professional . . .ecosystem of jobs" – whether through short-lived collaborations with other professionals through CCYE, or by joining the private, education technology industry.

As a novice teacher just two years into her teaching career and out of college, Ms. Vincent's misgivings about the low prestige and "professionalization" of teaching and teaching outside of her subject area, emphasized particular intra-personal and interorganizational boundaries for her (Wegemer & Renick, 2021). While working with other professionals "validated" Ms. Vincent's sense of professionalization and "re-centered" her on the "mission" of her work, it also heightened Ms. Vincent's sense of hierarchy between the public and private sectors, and between teaching and other "real" professions. Likewise, drawing on schemas from her college experiences of "being an expert" who seeks "real professions" educed intrapersonal boundaries between her sense of self as a teacher and idealizations of herself as an expert professional (i.e., vault of information; sieve; education technology professional) (Konopasky & Reybold, 2015; Thomas & Beauchamp, 2010).

Conclusion: Understanding RPP teachers as situated actors

Ms. Jacobs, Ms. Holloway, Ms. Saetang and Ms. Vincent's experiences as teachers in the research-practice partnership suggest that teachers' past careers and personal biographies are important factors to consider in how teachers understand, take up, and experience their roles in RPPs. These factors intersect and manifest differently for teachers and shape the dialogical processes through which they make sense of their roles within the broader inter-organizational gestalt of research-practice partnerships. The way these factors intersect influenced how boundaries became legible to teachers, which boundaries were more or less salient, and how teachers daily navigated those boundaries. Teachers expressed their sense of role metaphorically, identifying themselves as "facilitators," or through similar terms such as "connector," "funnel," or "tripod". These frames emerged as a discursive tool that allowed teachers to make sense of their new charge in CCYE in relation to past experiences and identities and to draw on past schemas as sources of social-cultural information and knowledge that would assist in the recognition and navigation of boundaries. This dialogical process enabled and/or constrained teachers' efforts to articulate and execute a sense of role within CCYE.

For instance, Ms. Holloway dialogically made sense of her role by drawing on schemas about "choice" that emerged from her own pathway through different jobs and her family's sense that higher education should be a choice available to all and not an expectation or "elitist" privilege. These schemas enabled Ms. Holloway to articulate a clear role for herself in the partnership that in some cases, replaced the role of the client as well. Ms. Holloway's personal sense that students should be equally prepared for the workforce as they are for college, as well her position as a teacher in a career-themed high school made the boundaries between client and teacher permeable. There was a mutually intrapersonal and interpersonal enabling effect in the reinforcement between Ms. Holloway's role in CCYE, her position as teacher, and personal ideologies. Similarly, the schemas Ms. Jacobs applied from her corporate experience, father's history of sacrifice and repetition to "go to school, get your degrees, get your education," her "survivor's guilt" and wish to serve as a "role model" at the forefront of the educational

"battleground" had intrapersonally and interpersonally mutually reinforcing effects that enabled her to situate herself as a "tripod" holding up the broader CCYE "hub". Pursuing partnerships with both private corporations, such as Google, and civic/community organizations, such as through CCYE, and navigating the boundaries therein, was "facilitated" by the schematic frameworks Ms. Jacobs applied to her work and role.

By contrast, Ms. Vincent and Ms. Saetang's personal and past professional schemas caused intra- and interpersonal incoherence (Wegemer & Renick, 2021). The schematic frameworks that Ms. Vincent applied to her teaching and role in CCYE about being an "expert" engendered an intrapersonal boundary between idealized notions of what she felt she should be able to do and the first-year teacher difficulties she encountered, including a dissonance between her subject matter expertise and the engineering-themed academy she taught in. An interpersonal boundary also emerged between herself and other "real professionals" where she felt both professionally validated and invalidated by her interactions with them, reinforcing her insecurity that teachers are not "real professionals". So, while Ms. Vincent was enabled by her participation in CCYE – feeling professionally legitimized, pushed to question her perhaps "overbearing" pedagogy – she also felt constrained by the boundaries that emerged and began to search for employment in the private, educational technology sector. Facing the same intra- and interpersonal incoherence, Ms. Saetang also questioned her relationship and fit to teaching. Drawing on frameworks from her past professional life as a lawyer, where the time and energy one invests in their work has a "pretty clear impact," Ms. Saetang struggled to see the merit or "payoff" in the added time and effort that CCYE required of her as a teacher. Intrapersonal boundaries between her sense of ethics and sense of self as a teacher emerged, as did interpersonal boundaries between herself and her colleagues, from whom she received little recognition or feedback on her work. This affirmed for Ms. Saetang that it is easy to have no ambition as a teacher, a pervasive idea echoed in Ms. Vincent's insecurities that teachers are seen as a "joke" or "mini professionals".

The metaphors that teachers draw on are instructive for understanding how actors in RPPs make sense of their roles and what kinds of situated symbolic and material resources from their personal and professional lives they bring into their cross-organizational interactions and work. This bears on the ways in which RPP actors cross boundaries. It also sheds light on how actors come to recognize boundaries in the first place. As of now, boundary-crossing discussion in RPP literature discusses boundaries as if they exist a-priori, but the data presented here suggests that actors recognize boundaries in different ways and at different points based on their past experiences. How actors dialogically enter into and construct their roles in RPPs influences the manner in which they apprehend boundaries and act from within their liminal bounds. Specifically, unpacking teachers' common use of the metaphor "facilitator" illuminates the complexities of teaching and boundary-crossing, and makes the case for an examination not just of teachers' boundary-crossing practices, but perhaps more importantly, their boundary-*recognizing* practices and resources.

Finally, as situated actors, teachers are not only situated by meso-level, organizational contexts, such as their past places of work and current school contexts, as I have shown above. They are also socially and structurally situated, which means they are situated in racial formations, implicated in racial projects and marked by vectors of difference, such as race and gender (Omi & Winant, 1994). For instance, the survivor's guilt that was an impetus in Ms. Jacob's career transition to teaching is a racialized feeling (Bonilla-Silva, 2019) indicating that race is a formative factor in teachers' uptake and experience of their roles. Similarly, Ms.

59

Vincent's exclamation that her youth and sense of lack of authority preclude her from being "a mother figure or anything like that" demonstrates a gendered, but also historically racialized notion of the purpose of schools and teachers (Leonardo & Boas, 2013; Lucas, 2013). Teachers' metaphors also help us to understand that teachers are situated actors that are both shaped by and have a stake in shaping structures and systems (Giroux, 2013). The intersection between teachers' sense of organizational position and social-structural location will be examined in the following chapter, in which I examine another category of metaphors teachers used to describe their roles – that of teachers as "employers" and students as "employees". I examine how the "employer-employee" relational metaphor captured a continuity between college and career reforms (CTE programming and career academies) in California, teachers' personal-professional frames, and CCYE's civic inclusion goals that structured particular relations between teachers, their work and their students. I consider the possibility that this engendered a slippage in teachers' perceptions of what civic inclusion is and looks like with ensuring their students' human capital and economic viability.

CHAPTER FIVE

Civic-Economic Slippage: RPPs and the politics of vocational education reform

Introduction

All of the teachers in this study either held a Career and Technical Education (CTE) certification and/or taught in an industry-themed academy, pathway or small school[19]. Thus, teachers operated as situated actors in the sense that they were also part of a long and evolving history of vocational education reform movements. In this chapter, I examine the interaction between the CTE and Linked Learning (LL) vocational education reforms, CCYE's civic inclusion and work-based alignment with these reforms, and the figurative language teachers

---

[19] While the measurable impacts of CTE and LL on learning outcomes and post-secondary trajectories is not the focus of this dissertation, it is important to note research discussing these impacts, particularly since this study deals with teachers' experiences working within these reform contexts. While many attempts have been made to empirically document the impacts of CTE and Linked Learning, because of varying school data tracking, documentation, reporting and analytical practices, it has been difficult for researchers to make conclusive statements about correlations between participation in the programs and outcomes in student learning, and thus about the benefits or disadvantages of both reforms (Reed et al, 2018; Fitzgerald et al, 2016). Moreover, as Johnson (2020) points out, many studies of the impacts and outcomes of Linked Learning and CTE have been sponsored and/or commissioned by the funders and founders of Linked Learning.

CTE impacts on academic and career outcomes at the high school are inconclusive due to "the fact that much of the data no longer reflects prevailing policy contexts, outcomes are often only short-term, and relatively few studies can support interpretation of causal effects" (Reed et al, 2018, p. 6). Although some studies document promising patterns of increased academic outcomes within particular districts (Rutherford-Quach & Rice, 2013) and across districts (Warner et al, 2015; this is a study financed by the James Irvine Foundation, a major funder of Linked Learning), other comprehensive studies on the impacts of Linked Learning have rendered largely inconclusive findings (Fitzgerald et al, 2016). A study conducted by the US Department of Education, *The Effect of Linked Learning Certified Pathways on Selected Student Outcomes,* analyzed data reported by school districts and states in California from the 2010 – 11 and 2011 – 2012 and 2012 – 13 academic years and found that the impact of CTE courses and pathways on student outcomes such as GPA, graduation rates and post-secondary enrollment were not statistically significant (Fitzgerald et al, 2016).

Studies specific to California show that ELL and poor, male students of color are more likely to take CTE classes (Kim et al, 2021; Reed et al, 2018). For instance, Reed et al (2018) explain: "students in California are more likely to be male and from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds than students who do not participate in CTE. Amongst students in CTE pathways, there are also slightly higher proportions of English language learners than amongst non-CTE students. There are also observable differences by racial/ethnic background; students participating in and completing CTE pathways were more likely to be Latino and less likely to be Asian, African American, or White than non-CTE students. When considering academic performance, there is little difference between CTE students and non-CTE students in the average scores on the Smarter Balanced Assessments" (p.5).

Finally, studies that have examined the impacts of Linked Learning and CTE have focused on measuring shifts along particular indicators such as graduation rates, test scores, post-secondary enrollment, employability, and earnings. While a focus on these indicators is an important measure of the impacts and effects of CTE and LL, it overlooks how these programs impact students and teachers' relationship to schools and education as well as their ideas around what the purpose of schooling is.

drew on to explain their experiences and sense of role within this intersection. I present data that shows that interactions between federal (CTE) and state reforms (Linked Learning) with local, "alternative" civic-oriented reforms, such as CCYE, can reproduce while attempting to intervene in the structural exclusion of racially and economically minoritized groups. I refer to this interaction as a "civic-economic slippage," where teachers in CCYE interpreted their role, work and relationship to their students through an economic lens. I discuss how some teachers metaphorically referred to themselves and civic and business partners alike as "employers," and referred to students as "employees," and made sense of students' civic experiences in terms of preparation for the workforce.

Linked Learning & Career and Technical Education

In order to have utility for teachers and schools, CCYE has to be aligned with CTE and LL, which have been implemented in the schools that CCYE partners with. CTE and LL are two recent developments in the US's checkered history with vocational education and tracking (Kliebard, 2004; Oakes, 2005). Linked Learning is an approach to high school reform originating in California and intended to prepare students for college *and* career. The Linked Learning (LL) website explains that it is a "proven, systemic approach to education that helps students prepare for college and career, grow through real work experiences, and prepare to participate in civic life […] Research and experience show that real educational solutions exist in the 'and'. When we combine college and career preparation, we put every student in a position to pursue the full range of postsecondary options, whether trade school, college, or other credentialing programs" (linkedlearning.org). Linked Learning is a part of a broader federal reform development called Career and Technical Education (CTE).

CTE has its roots in vocational education reforms introduced during industrialization at the beginning of the twentieth century. During this time, concerns with social efficiency, or the creation of a "coolly efficient, smoothly running society" that sought to apply "standardized techniques of industry to the business of schooling" (Kliebard, 2004, p.24), persuaded stakeholders and educators to "vocationalize" school curriculum so that youth would be prepared to meet the demands of a quickly industrializing society. Vocational education reforms have since evolved to address the racialized, gendered and classed practice of placing students into particular vocational or educational "tracks," more popularly known as "tracking" (Lanford & Tierney, 2015; Oakes, 2005). According to the Congressional Research Service, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 "supports the development of academic and career and technical skills among secondary education students and postsecondary education students who elect to enroll in career and technical education programs, sometimes referred to as vocational education programs" (Dortch, 2012). A key change in this recent iteration of vocational education federal policy is the integration of academics with vocational training, reflected in the Linked Learning (LL) emphasis on "the 'and'" (linkedlearning.org) in college *and* career preparation. The impacts of CTE and LL are felt across California school districts in the form of industry-themed high schools (for instance, around the health and medical sciences), industry-themed "academies" or "pathways" within high schools (i.e., law and social justice, education, agricultural science, carpentry), and the

62

increasing hire of former career teachers, often through federal funds made available through the Career and Technical Education Act (Lanford & Tierney, 2015; Stern & Stearns, 2006; Johnston, Castellano & Darche, 2019). Reed et al (2018) explain that "states look to CTE as a way to fill gaps in 'middle skill' jobs (i.e., jobs requiring some postsecondary education, but not necessarily a four-year degree)" (p.5).

California's public schools have dealt with a series of reforms differently impacting schools across and within districts throughout the state, many of which were complicated by the passing of Proposition 13[20], the effects of which were compounded by an enduring history of racial and economic inequity that segregated schools and neighborhoods along class and racial-ethnic lines. As the local, available funds for public schools were drastically slashed, some Californians showed their support for market-driven reforms by advocating for school choice and sending their children to charter and private schools. Meanwhile, districts and public-school advocates continue to struggle to patchwork federal, state and local funding sources with new practices and school designs as a way to improve disparate student outcomes with ever-diminishing teaching and learning resources. This panoply of reforms included the small school movement, the closure and merger of schools, and industry-themed "small learning communities." Of concern to this chapter is how CTE and LL, and CCYE resonate with local, "alternative" reform (Rodriguez, 2019; Datnow, 2020) around what the purposes of education and teaching are, and how this was reflected in teachers' sense-making processes about their role in CCYE. How CCYE actors situate themselves in relation to cultures of reform tell us something about its organizational capacity to achieve its social justice aims, and to reproduce and/or resist the existing inequities in which it seeks to intervene. It is important to recall that CCYE has an explicit social justice agenda insofar as it seeks to cultivate civic inclusion of racially and economically minoritized youth and their communities by building connectivity between cities and schools through participatory action research projects that bring together civic stakeholders (e.g., city planners, community organizations, and business owners) and young people. As such, civic belonging and inclusion of economically and racially minoritized youth and their communities in local decision-making and policy are core tenets of CCYE's equity focus and the "public good" it seeks to provide.

In the following discussion, I unpack teachers' use of workforce metaphors wherein they classify themselves and their students within an employer – employee relationship. Drawing on the dialogical nature of metaphors, I provide evidence that traces teachers' use of workforce metaphors (e.g., "employers" and "employees") as situated in teachers' status as former career professionals, placement in an industry-themed pathway or academy, and position as "facilitators" within a work-based, civic-inclusion-oriented RPP. The data documents the process whereby the framing of teachers' roles as "employers" engendered a slippage between modeling work-place and employer-like expectations to ensure students' economic viability, and working

---

[20] In brief, Proposition 13 is a referendum that was passed in California in 1978 that cut and capped property taxes for residences and businesses, drastically impacting how much money schools received in funding from property taxes, which had previously been the main source of K-12 funding. Prop 13 limits property taxes to 1% of the property's assessed value, and restricts increases in property values to 2% annually.

towards the civic inclusion of students and their communities; I refer to this slippage as a civic-economic slippage. This is important because it shows that the reform context within which CCYE is located had a formative role in teachers' dialogical sense-making processes of their partnership role and work that conflated CCYE's goals of civic inclusion with constructing teachers as "employers" and their students as "employees." One third (n = 5) of the teachers that participated in this study drew on workforce metaphors to explain and/or describe their role, work and relationship to their students within the CCYE context. While this is not a large enough sample to generalize claims about the impacts of work-based, civic-oriented RPPs operating in the US today, my findings raise important questions and considerations about RPPs' capacity to bring about educational change and equity (Diamond, 2021) as well as their relations and responsiveness to the broader reform contexts in which they are embedded.

The (racial) politics of "facilitating" in a neoliberal reform era: Teachers as "employers", students as "employees"

Ms. Saetang

When asked to describe her role in CCYE, Ms. Saetang responded with the following: "The way I think about it, it's almost like a project manager. So, it's almost as if I was the employer and the students are the employees, and we have this product, right? This pitch. And if you want to think about it in terms of advertising, right? And it's my job to make sure the students are ready for that proposal, to deliver the pitch."

My interview with Ms. Saetang occurred four days after she and a group of five of her students[21][22] presented the recommendations they developed as a part of their PAR projects at a final digital roundtable presentation to which school and district administrators, civic clients, university partners, and civic stakeholders and guests were invited (a total of 19 guests). Ms. Saetang's class partnered with the city's Planning Department to investigate how to build affordable housing for families and residents through new zoning policies. In their presentations, students explained their research process, which involved "site mapping," or surveying spaces and locations in their city where affordable housing exists or could be built, surveying community members about their housing experiences and desires, and researching housing policies and zoning laws in their city. Students also presented recommendations for the Planning Department, which they developed based on their research and personal experiences living in and attending school in that city. Their recommendations included improving the quality of sidewalks, creating more public and green space, and developing mixed-use and mixed-income housing. Towards the end of the presentation, students thanked their school administrators, the

---

[21] Student attendance rates in Ms. Saetang's school district – and in many districts in California (Harrington, 2020) – fell considerably during the COVID-19 pandemic, which likely contributed to the low student turnout at the final project presentations.

[22] The student population at Ms. Saetang's high school in the Central Valley is 40.8% Hispanic, 26.7% Asian, 21.8% African American, 3.3% Pacific Islander and 3.1% White. 87.6% of the student population is socioeconomically disadvantaged (caschooldashboard.org).

Planning Department partner, and university partners for the opportunity to engage in the project. Importantly, the students expressed their gratitude in relation to being able to "speak up" as youth not just in the face of economic disenfranchisement and housing vulnerability – which their PAR project investigated – but in the face of antiblack state violence.

Students' presentations were held just days after the murder of George Floyd, and it was apparent to students how issues around youth marginalization, housing insecurity and gentrification are imbricated with and compounded by antiblack racism (Mahadeo, 2019). The students – except for one who commented in the Zoom chat that his microphone and audio had stopped working and he could not hear anything – often took "the floor" on their own volition to reflect on the racialized politics of their PAR project, their own positionality, and the particular moment in which the roundtable took place. One student shared that "not a lot of people listen to young people today" which made "living in an era of racism worse" for her. They shared, "I've been told not to speak so many times. For us to speak our minds, our thoughts, we're probably not allowed to speak back to our parents, or any kinds of adults. It lets you know what we're thinking, even if we say no 24/7, it lets me know like, they actually care, they wanna hear our ideas, even if they're bad […] So this makes me like, 'Ok, I can speak, there are adults that actually care about what I have to say and this makes me want to speak a lot.'" Another student expressed similar thoughts:

> It's not often that people are cordial and listen to young people, and you all have been cordial. Redlining […] is the cause of inequity and everything that is happening is because of redlining because we don't know how to interact with each other when we intertwine. We wouldn't have so much violence if we knew how to interact as people of different colors without bleeding through the paper. Because of you and your color, this is your expiration date and you get no say in this. People have really said, "Hey, we want to listen to what you have to say, and you matter," and that's what's really important to young people today. Young people are constantly told "you can't say this because of the consequences," and you all told me "It's OK to speak out because you matter". And I think that's what matters.

Impressed by the students' recommendations and investment in the project, the district's Director of College and Career Readiness expressed that she would follow up with the civic partners to ensure that all of the students who were present at the digital roundtable would be offered paid summer internships. The students' testimonies during the roundtable reflected the importance of creating space and opportunities for young people to interrogate the implicated nature of issues they encounter daily, such as housing insecurity, antiblack state violence, and the sense that their experiences and views do not matter.

The confidence students demonstrated presenting on housing law and zoning, as well as on their own views about how this intersects with antiblack racism, is in part a product of Ms. Saetang's work with the students throughout the semester, which was discussed in the preceding chapter. It is significant, then, that Ms. Saetang described her role in CCYE as an "employer" preparing her students, "employees," to deliver a "pitch" for a "product". One might expect Ms. Saetang to frame her role in terms more reflective of or aligned with the civic issues her students interrogated or spoke to. Alternatively, she could frame her role as a "civic agent," what Mirra

and Morrell (2011) describe as a teacher "engaged in learning that is collective, productive, and active" and who is involved "in a collective endeavor with their students to read the word and the world by engaging in shared inquiry that is embedded in the concerns of local communities" (p.412). Indeed, the frame of "civic agent" would also be more consistent with her "teach[ing] like I practice law" as well as with the language CCYE used discursively to frame its mission. However, Ms. Saetang's chooses to describe herself as an employer and her students as employees, therefore framing her students' and her participation in the partnership within a market-oriented logic of competition.

If the students' recommendations are delivered as a "pitch," this suggests that Ms. Saetang interpreted the presentation within a competitive structure, wherein only the most convincing, best-researched proposals will "make it" or "win." Within the work-based framework of CCYE, only the best would be rewarded with a paid internship. Given this, it is not unusual or outlandish that Ms. Saetang and other teachers drew on the employer-employee metaphor to characterize their roles. Indeed, students' PAR projects are adapted to fit district project- and work-based expectations. Thus, the idea is that subject-area curriculum – or in this case, a Foundations of Law class – is integrated with "real-world," or practical, work-based experience. Students are exposed to local businesses and practices where they can see how their class content has practical application, an experience that ideally has college *and* career application for students (linkedlearning.org). Here, the work of civic inclusion, or centering students' voices and experiences in housing planning and zoning policy, is conflated with a concern for students' economic viability and capacity to compete in the labor market, a neoliberal orientation to civic education and inclusion (Rodriguez, 2019; Mirra & Morrell, 2011). Neoliberal discourses and practices in education produce "'highly individualized, responsibilized subjects' who are highly entrepreneurial in all dimensions of their lives" (Neoh, p.30, 2017), and "although the skills of innovation, criticality or problem solving may be evident in neoliberal curriculums, these skills are couched within rationalizations such as preparation for work or addressing demands in the global economy" (p.30). Ms. Saetang's understanding of CCYE and her role in it reflects the "couched" nature of neoliberal discourse as she expressed that her students' roles and her own fulfilled an economic end before a civic end, or that they are one in the same.

The slippage that occurred between vocational and civic education reflected the imperatives of the marketplace. More specifically, CCYE's work-based and civic education curriculum situated students as "flexible" (Ong, 1999) civic individuals whereby their civic identity and inclusion is mediated through and contingent on their participation in competitive, market-driven practices and cultural repertoires (delivering a "pitch") (Neoh, 2017; Rodriguez, 2019). Through this slippage, teachers' mental frameworks (and practices, as I will show) reflected the imperatives of the marketplace. Additionally, the neoliberal approach to participatory civic inclusion perhaps created an opening for Ms. Saetang to reclaim some of sense of agency and ambition she felt she lost as a teacher in other aspects of the CCYE project discussed in the preceding chapter. As a teacher whose ambition is neither incentivized nor recognized, Ms. Saetang shared Ms. Vincent's skepticism about the prestige of teaching. However, as a figurative "employer", Ms. Saetang has an agentic function, "managing" a project, "preparing" students to "deliver a pitch" and is in charge of the development of a "product," something that has social-cultural capital and value. In this case, the product includes viable modes of civic belonging that her students are at once proposing and into which they are being

initiated[23]. Although it is not disadvantageous or harmful to prepare students to be workforce-ready, the slippage that results between civic inclusion and economic viability, and between teacher as a civic agent and teacher as "employer," is suggestive of the kind of neoliberal creep that Bowles and Gintis (1975) cautioned about when they discussed teachers' roles in reproducing the "long shadow of work".

Ms. Long

---

[23] The meaning, purpose and design of civic education and what it means to be civically competent or involved, is contentious and undecided (Sanchez Loza, 2020; Neoh, 2017; Rodriguez, 2019).   While CCYE sought to normalize and cultivate connectivity between typically disconnected groups such as schools and cities, youth and adults, civic and business stakeholders and racially-economically minoritized communities, it often did so in ways that maintained rather than disrupted normative social and organizational relations, despite students' and teachers' curiosities and gestures towards playfully imaginative and more radical approaches. For instance, one business partner, a private housing developer who had partnered with CCYE and Ms. Long's classes twice as of 2020, lamented what he saw as the students' "naive" and "idealistic" recommendations for the building of sustainable and affordable housing, such as students' popular recommendation to institute community and rooftop gardens in order to locally source fresh produce (an intervention to food desserts). Although the premise of centering students' voices, as teachers put it, is to "dream big" because "no idea is off the table," teachers often pushed their students to make "realistic" and "serious" recommendations about changes they wanted to see in their communities.

For instance, during a visit to an elementary charter school that had closed and that the private developer was intending to turn into a mixed income housing development (set at 80% area median income, which is still unaffordable for the majority of residents in that community), students walked through the abandoned, desolate building, tasked with taking notes and making observations about how to best repurpose and rebuild the space into housing. Making their way through the cold and empty rooms, students remarked on the "eeriness" and "ghostliness" of touring a school that had been vacant for five years. Alongside questions about why the school closed in the first place (which acknowledged the ongoing tensions between charter and public schools in the city) one student commented, "This is creepy as hell. Why are they trying to turn this into apartments? Why can't they just let it be?" This student echoed other students' skepticism and ambivalence towards property and space, particularly during protests in the wake of antiblack police violence, where the desire to "fuck shit up" was exclaimed by students across schools. Although the private real estate developer is not wrong in observing that young people can be idealistic, their verbalized urge to question and redefine a property and work-based approach to having a "voice" in civic equity matters such as housing and city planning, is one that also demands a re-evaluated approach to normative organizational relations and boundaries in RPPs. Perhaps the questions we ask about boundary-crossing should be interrogating not just how RPP actors can engage in boundary-crossing without compromising efficiency and equity (Coburn et al, 2021; Denner et al, 2019; Penuel et al, 2015; Farrell et al, 2019), but also how this can be done while challenging RPPs' conceptualizations of being and belonging in space and place, especially since many RPPs are explicitly and implicitly place-based endeavors (Coburn et al, 2013).

There are deep-seated, social-cultural boundaries that RPPs like CCYE have yet to contend with, such as the settler-colonial logic that permeates the inter-organizational structure and design of CCYE. The case-specific implications of the examples discussed in this footnote are worthy of further investigation in RPP scholarship. The young students' desire to articulate different relations to property and space was not reconcilable with the planning department or private developer's relations to space and place, nor with teachers' expectations to "deliver" a "serious" "product," nor with the university partner's intention to bring these entities together to include students in normative civic processes as well as meet district college and career learning outcomes. The organizational relations of CCYE as well as the local and national reform contexts in which it is embedded are mediated by broader settler-colonial scripts about the utility of people and things (such as space and place) (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Ahmed, 2019) that are worthy of further examination.

When asked to discuss how she understood her role in CCYE, Ms. Long, a white teacher in a Law and Social Justice pathway, also described herself as a "boss":

> I mean, I think my role is to take what y'all are giving me, that information and the client and the project question and kind of making it easy for my students to understand and give them the context, and kind of get them ready almost like as a boss would to get your workers ready to do their job, and to present, and then come up with these ideas. But just thinking about the jobs – possible jobs, and urban planning, and all the things that we kind of talk about, it's like trying to do those things and do a good job at it. Because I also just don't like disappointing people. So, just making sure that things are going well and the kids are going to do a good job. And I think it gives a little bit more pressure to me. But it's good pressure. It's not negative. And then also to the kids. So, they kind of feel it. And when they're done, they're so excited and they're so happy.

Ms. Long moved from New York City to California to begin her teaching career after completing her Master's degree in History and Social Studies Education. As of 2020, she had been teaching for seven years and had completed two CCYE projects. Although Ms. Long did not have a previous career like Ms. Saetang, she articulates her role using the same employer-employee frame, describing herself as a "boss" and her students as "workers" whom she prepares to "do their job". Explaining her pedagogical approach, Ms. Long explained that she does not "like disappointing people," a quality that can be stressful and constraining. While disappointing people, either as a student or a teacher, is often a mundane and sometimes instructive part of school life, within the context of CCYE where students are figuratively positioned as "workers" and teachers as "bosses," disappointment sometimes carries higher-stake consequences. Working to avoid this disappointment, Ms. Long explained, was ultimately a beneficial and rewarding learning experience that she described as "good pressure" for her students and herself. As my data shows, however, this was not the case for all of Ms. Long's students. It is important for students to be able to understand how their skills and learning translate into contexts outside of school. However, the kind of figurative role-taking and role-placing that teachers like Ms. Long and Ms. Saetang engaged in conflated the work of civic inclusion with ensuring their students' workforce readiness, which reinforced the civic exclusion for some groups of students.

Following a class trip to a charter school that had closed and whose building was slotted for redevelopment into a mixed-income housing community (see footnote 15), Ms. Long led her class through an analytical exercise wherein students had to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the site (abbreviated as "SWOT" analysis). This analytical exercise is intended to mimic the process that city planners and designers follow when troubleshooting a planning issue or launching a development project. This process is also intended to animate the idea that students are stakeholders and "experts," like civic and business partners, one step in the CCYE curriculum that culminates in the final roundtable presentations discussed above. In fact, just a little over a week before I observed this particular class, Ms. Long reviewed important vocabulary and concepts pertaining to the project, such as "built environment," "gentrification," "distribution based on need," and "equity." Ms. Long asked students questions like "What should we do to understand a community?" "What is an expert?" "Who are the experts on your community?", guiding students towards an understanding that *they* are the experts on their communities, and they are the ones who should decide what changes happen in their community.

During this particular class, Ms. Long put students into groups to complete the SWOT analysis. However, not all students had attended the trip, including three Latinx English language learners. Ms. Long had verbally explained instructions for the assignment with accompanying bullet point instructions projected on a slide in the front of the classroom. One of the English language learner (ELL) students spoke some English, whom Ms. Long instructed to "convert it [the lesson] all into Spanish" for his less proficient classmates. She passed out large pieces of chart paper that students divided into quadrants, one for each category of the "SWOT" analysis into which they had to sort various qualities and dimensions of the site (the abandoned school) and discuss how they posed challenges to or lent themselves to rebuilding into a mixed-income housing development. Ms. Long instructed students to look up the address of the building on their phones for images through Google Maps and Google Earth. This process refreshed the memories of the students who attended the field trip as well as helped students who had not attended.

Having difficulty understanding the instructions, the student tasked with translating instructions asked Ms. Long what they were supposed to do. She repeated the instruction to look up the address of the building on their phones and then attended to other groups. The student wondered aloud to himself and the other two ELL students, "que lugar?"[24] Hearing the students' confusion, I turned around from the group I was sitting with and explained the instructions to him. Still, he was confused about how to assess the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of a site by looking at a street view of a building that he had not visited. The three students remained frustrated and confused for most of the period, sitting in a cluster apart from the rest of their group who filled out the chart. One of the non-ELL group members asked the student if he could present their SWOT analysis to the class, an invitation he refused. The other two ELL classmates encouraged him to facilitate, but he still refused. Once the group was finished, another group member turned to the ELL students and said "Yay, thank you group, thank you guys". They responded by smiling, but the student later mumbled to his ELL classmates that their groupmates thought that they were "pendejos", or useless[25].

I neither share this vignette as a criticism of Ms. Long, nor of her school or district, who all grapple to support the needs of an increasing ELL student presence with limited resources and funds[26]. Rather, I share it as a point from which to examine how a long history of work-based reforms limits access to different scripts, cognitive frameworks and figurative roles through which teachers can (re)structure their relationship with their students through "alternative" reform mediums, such as CCYE. The ELL students' exclusion from the SWOT analysis (and likely other aspects of the PAR project) reinforced boundaries between students, further reifying civic exclusion along racio-ethnic and linguistic lines (Kim, 1999; Omi & Winant, 2014). In the scenario described above, the group of ELL students were not able to participate in a series of exercises (e.g., the field trip, SWOT analysis, presentation of analysis) intended to elucidate their civic belonging and encourage recognition of their civic "expertise"[27]. Thus, they were situated

---

[24] In English, "que lugar?" translates into "which place?"

[25] It was not my impression that the groupmate who thanked the ELL students was being sarcastic in making this remark. The group seemed sincere in trying to include their ELL classmates.

[26] See Laura Hill's (2012) report for the Public Policy Institute of California for a discussion of funding and accountability in supporting ELL students in California schools (https://www.ppic.org/wp-content/uploads/rs_archive/pubs/report/R_912LHR.pdf).

[27] One teacher referred to this notion of students as experts on their communities' needs as harboring "innate knowledge". Indeed, many students were natives of the cities their PAR projects were located in and embraced the

outside of this realm of civic identification as well as outside of a socioeconomic class (city planners and private real estate developers, the professions they were mimicking). The ELL students left the experience feeling "useless" compared to their English-speaking classmates who participated in the activity[28]. Although all students were positioned as "workers", the ELL students' access to this mode of civic belonging was contingent on their access to particular forms of cultural capital, such as English proficiency. Ms. Long's classroom practices alongside her sense of being a "boss preparing workers to do their job" contributed to a slippage between cultivating students' civic inclusion and ensuring their economic viability.

Even though Ms. Long did not have a former career like Ms. Saetang, she still saw herself as a "boss" and her students as "workers," as having economic before civic purpose and worth. This metaphorical framing may seem at odds with Ms. Long's equity-oriented lessons. The Law and Social Justice pathway she taught in as well as the CCYE PAR curriculum sought to engage students in critical conversations about power, the reproduction of poverty, and the role of schools as agents of civic change. Ms. Long encouraged students to recognize the hidden curriculum that normalizes civic exclusion and narratives of civic disfunction and apathy of economically and racially minoritized communities. Students are encouraged to see themselves as experts, to engage in the same analytical practices as city planners and designers and to interface confidently with stakeholders about crucial changes for their communities. However, in practice, the same hidden curriculum remains intact as teachers more readily tap into economic and market logic frameworks to frame their work and classroom dynamics. So, as figurative "workers" the ELL students ultimately did not harbor the requisite skills and capital to fully participate in the civic action research projects. Thus, they were cast as uncompetitive candidates for high-skill work environments like urban and city planning[29].

---

idea of being experts, appreciating the recognition of their knowledge about their lived environments. However, the pervasive idea among CCYE actors that students harbored an "innate" knowledge about the issues afflicting their communities, as Shange (2019) points out, ontologizes systematized civic disinvestment so that students "are somehow *of* the landscape" (p.11). In referring to the way some of the teachers at Robeson Academy (the school that is the subject of her ethnography) identified Black students by the housing project where they lived ("these Sunnydale girls"), Shange writes: "Blackness is recast as indigeneity in the second-order settler-colonial landscape that has already been […] exhausted of Native bodies" (p.110). Although the students that participated in CCYE in school districts across California and that are examined in this study belonged to various minoritized racio-ethnic groups, Shange's critique is instructive for thinking about how ontologizing civic disinvestment facilitated the civic-economic slippage. In the same way that in the American settler-colonial imaginary, land, space and place must have (economic) utility, so too, should people. As I discuss further in the following chapter, implicit in CCYE's PAR curriculum is that when students undertake the task of "transforming" spaces and places for "better" – such as an abandoned charter school into a mixed-income housing development – students also "transformed" themselves. As this chapter demonstrates, some teachers conflated the civic aims of such a transformation as economic ones, whereby civic inclusion constituted economic utility.

[28] The student population at Ms. Long's high school in the Bay Area is 35.7% Hispanic, 32.1% Asian, and 24.4% African American; 27% of the student population are English Language Learners. 86.7% of the student population is socioeconomically disadvantaged (caschooldashboard.org).

[29] A week before this particular class visit, students submitted signed permission slips to Ms. Long to attend a field trip to San Quentin prison through a district program. The purpose of the field trip was for students to speak candidly with prisoners about the mistakes they had made that landed them in prison and for the students to learn from these stories. The difficulty to cultivate civic inclusion when reminders of the systemic civic exclusion that non-white students of color face – especially in the state of California, which has one of the highest populations of incarcerated people in the country, of which Black and Latinx men are overrepresented (Bayley & Hayes, 2006) – is substantial. To cultivate civic inclusion, RPPs like CCYE must contend with systematized and racialized civic

Ms. Vern

While Ms. Vern, a white CTE teacher in a Green Energy pathway, did not explicitly refer to herself as a boss or employer, she shifted her classroom practices while implementing the CCYE curriculum in her classroom to mimic workplace interactions that she felt would reflect for her students what the "real world" is like. Before joining the Green Energy pathway at her school as a CTE teacher, Ms. Vern worked for 26 years as a chemical engineer doing "environment work" at an oil company. Although she initially enjoyed her work, she became "less excited about the direction the company was headed," because of what she saw as a lack of diversity in the industry. As part of her job, Ms. Vern was tasked with visiting college campuses where she would recruit and interview students. She quickly realized

> I was interviewing the same kids over and over. They were all upper-middle class. 'Cause I was looking for engineers – all upper-middle class, and all very, um, unaware of what the world was really like for a lot of people. And I figured out from working with teams at work that if you don't have a lot of diverse opinions on a team, you're not gonna get to as a good of a solution. And I was just so disheartened about the fact that I couldn't find any diversity in hiring that I decided, 'OK, I need to do something about it,' and the clearest path to doing something about it seemed to be becoming a teacher.

Thus, Ms. Vern sought out a CTE credential certificate. By 2020, her third year of teaching, Ms. Vern worked on her second CCYE PAR project and thought about what she would do differently this time around. Of particular concern to Ms. Vern was how she would facilitate groupwork. She reflected that during her first project she had allowed students to choose their own groups, but did not like the way that students self-segregated along racio-ethnic lines, stating "It's amazing, they self-segregate. They totally self-segregate. Which I hate, but I was just like, this is a long project, I want them to actually like who they're working with". For her second CCYE project, Ms. Vern decided that she would use a different system to form groups to avoid self-segregation and to ensure mutual student accountability[30]. Ms. Vern also wanted to adapt the group formations to the project, a partnership with a state agency whereby students were asked to investigate how schools can be more resilient and designed to protect vulnerable populations from the effects of climate change. Each group would investigate this issue in relation to the middle or elementary school they attended. So, Ms. Vern intended to group students in accordance to the school they indicated they wanted to research as well as according to student ability and developed a complex spread sheet to form these student groups.

This sort of intentional group formation was the product of much reflection on Ms. Vern's part. In our first interview in October, 2019, five months after the completion of her first CCYE PAR project and three months before implementing her second project in 2020, Ms. Vern reflected on her practice and how to facilitate student interactions differently:

---

exclusion in the era of the prison-industrial complex (Gilmore, 2007; Massey & Denton, 1993; Omi & Winant, 2014).

[30] The student population at Ms. Vern's high school in the Bay Area is 36% Hispanic, 30.8% African American, 11.7% Asian, and 10.8% White. 69.9% of the student population is socioeconomically disadvantaged (caschooldashboard.org).

For this project [the 2020 PAR project], I will set them in groups kind of by their willingness to work and a little by skill level, because the main complaint that my kids always told me about group projects is that there's nothing worse than being on a project and there's like one kid who you know isn't gonna do anything, and they're just kind of dead weights. And you're gonna end up doing all of their work, and so they were like, 'whatever you do, don't let kids do that.' So, group them by how hard they're willing to work, put all the hard workers in a group and let them enjoy working with a group where everybody's pitching in, and put the kids that you know work when they have to together and you'll be amazed, 'cause they'll get things done. And the kids that don't work, let them sink or swim on their own. So, that I think I will do, 'cause I do think I did get more effort out of the second two groups than I would have if they had been in a group where they could coast. Once you're out in the real world and working, it doesn't change. In general, the group that doesn't do anything, they don't get hired, but you definitely have the group where you're like, 'Oh my god, I'm so glad she's on my team because she will kill it!' But, there's also the person who will just sit back and let everyone do all the work. I think it changes with organizations. Like, I think with a lot of IT organizations it's not like that because if you're not producing, they'll put you off the team, and I didn't give students the chance to boot people off the teams. I kind of played with that idea but I was kind of like, 'eeeek…maybe I need to be more experienced before I do something like that.'

Ms. Vern followed her plan to group students according to "skill level" while also trying to accommodate which school students wished to research[31] as well as which of their classmates

---

[31] This choice also risked excluding some students from fully engaging with and enjoying this project. Some students' schools had closed due to declining enrollment and had merged with other schools. This caused much friction between students, families and communities and the school district and led the district superintendent to distinguish between "closures" due to mergers of schools and "closures" that were not a part of a merger. The latter type of "closure" resulted in the loss of jobs of staff and administrators, the placement of students into other schools and the physical closure of the school building and facilities. Many community members expressed frustration at the city's market-friendly and racist policies at the root of declining student enrollment and school closures. Ms. Vern recognized that this was a "hot-button" issue and debated how to facilitate the project without upsetting students, school administrators, or the partner – a state agency, though she emphatically disagreed that the issue had anything to do with race. In a discussion about board meetings and school finances during a lunch period, Ms. Vern explained to me that "people get mad about the school closures and turn it into a whole racial thing without understanding how the district's finances work". I documented the discussion in my field notes: "Ms. Vern explained that the district did 'actual studies' that show that they have limited finances and can't operate all the schools that they have open, and so it makes sense to close schools. She said that she would rather send her kid to a school farther away that is well-staffed and resourced than one that is close that is not, and that she doesn't understand why all the people that get mad do not see that. She said, 'you can't get mad and stomp your feet if you don't understand or have a viable solution.'" Although Ms. Vern understood that a part of the problem was that charter school openings correlate to declining public school enrollment, she nevertheless felt that some community members' distrust towards the city and district was misguided, a sentiment reflected in our last interview. Ms. Vern explained, "I tend to be pretty optimistic and pretty forgiving of those making big decisions. I know some people tend to get really critical of them. When there's some of them like Trump that are just idiots. But most of the folks in California that are making big decisions for us, I generally think they're trying to look at science and to look at economics and make smart decisions". Ultimately, matching students by school interest was not a formative factor in the group-making not just because some students' schools had closed, but because there was not much commonality in the middle and elementary schools that students attended. In the examples provided here, Ms. Vern's pedagogical practices (having students designate a school to focus their PAR projects on) and her colorblind trust towards policy and lawmakers

they indicated they would "work well with," which they listed in a google survey and Ms. Vern factored into the excel sheet. Although Ms. Vern expressed concern about the students self-segregating, she ultimately co-signs this practice by rationalizing that she wanted the students to enjoy the project. Additionally, she resolves her dilemma about whether or not to group the students by ability level and allowed them to "boot" one another off teams by grouping students according to who they indicated they worked well with. The logic behind Ms. Vern's grouping practices mimics the "real world," which Ms. Vern conflates with the workforce, where one's employability determines their value. This is made evident in the slippage Ms. Vern engages when comparing her classroom to "IT organizations". Students who do not put in effort, or who do not "step up" are compared to individuals who do not get hired. Although Ms. Vern acknowledges and expresses concern that students' patterns of self-segregation are also formed around "ability" level, she also characterizes the students' unwillingness or lack of motivation to do their classwork as a lack of work ethic and skill, reminders of a veiled culture of poverty frame that overlooks the effects of the very same structural disinvestments that the project question and client asked students to investigate.

In our last interview following the completion of the project Ms. Vern reflected that because students had to work in groups, she was compelled to "circulate more" and "talk to students more" instead of stand at the front of the classroom "talking at them", which she saw as pedagogical growth. She indicated that she now felt capable of guiding students through long-term projects and that she felt her students had learned to be accountable to each other. She also indicated – echoing other teachers' sentiments – that the project "empowered" her students and showed them "that they do have good ideas and how you package and present yourself and your ideas is important". She explained that many students do not "realize the impact of first impressions and the impact of how they present themselves, how that impacts what opportunities are going to be available to them. And telling them that, they don't like to hear it because they're like, 'That's wrong! The world shouldn't be that way.' But the world is that way." It is likely that students learned how to be accountable to one another as a result of working in groups and found value in the opportunity to work with powerful state stakeholders. However, patterns in the data demonstrate that the modes and practices of empowerment – or civic inclusion – were conflated with cultivating fit for, belonging and survival in the workforce.

By grouping students according to perceived skills, which Ms. Vern admitted reproduced students' self-segregated groups, she implicitly recognizes that the workforce is racio-ethnically segregated, where one's phenotypical, cultural, and symbolic proximity to whiteness corresponds with their income level and professional class (Leonardo, 2018; Wingfield & Chavez, 2020). Students' "civic empowerment" is bundled up with lessons about where in the socioeconomic ladder they fit and the kinds of skills and cultural and symbolic capital they need to move up in it. A lesson in civic inclusion, then, is also a lesson in civic exclusion as those students who "sink" instead of "swim" likely do not participate in the final roundtable presentations, are excluded from internships (like some of Ms. Saetang's students), and are aware – like Ms. Long's ELL students – that they are being cast as "useless". As a CTE teacher, Ms. Vern perhaps endeavored to expose her students to the "knowledge and training necessary to succeed in future

---

are characteristic and reproductive of the broader inequality regime (Wooten & Couloute, 2015) in which CCYE operated. These forces contributed to the development of organizational routines at the microlevel (Ms. Vern's classroom practices and beliefs) as well at the meso-level (partnerships between state agencies, schools, universities) that ultimately reproduced experiences of exclusion for particular groups of students, as the rest of this chapter demonstrates.

careers and to become a lifelong learner" (careertech.org). However, teaching at the confluence of the CTE, Linked Learning pathways and CCYE's work-based civic education curriculum amplified cognitive slippages between teacher and employer, student and worker, and civic inclusion and economic viability.

Dr. Angello

Like Ms. Vern, Dr. Angello, a Black, 68-year-old Computer Applications teacher in an Information Technology Academy[32][33], also did not directly compare himself to an employer but drew on metaphors that reflected a contradictory sense of teacher role in CCYE, one that was both agentic and diminished. Dr. Angello's contradictory metaphors and discussion of his role show a sense of shift in teacher purpose within evolving and intersecting federal, state and local reforms (Career and Technical Education, Linked Learning, and civic-oriented RPPs like CCYE).

A veteran teacher, Dr. Angello regarded himself as his students' "grandpa," a loving sense of kinship reflected in his frequent exclamations that he would "fight tooth and nail" for his students, to whom he frequently referred as his "family". Having served as a teacher for twenty years following past careers as a musician and corporate trainer, Dr. Angello developed a sense of confidence and panache as he interacted with administrators and school partners, including business and civic partners such as Hewlett Packard and the city's Youth Development Office. For instance, when explaining how he understood his role in the CCYE partnership, Dr. Angello explained that he was "training" (or "raising" as he articulated it in other interactions) principals, administrators and business partners "to know what to do," which involved approving classroom visits from various organizations and individuals, approving costs for learning softwares and materials, as well as hosting of events on school grounds:

> I'm a facilitator. I'm a facilitator to help – to make – back to the facilities. To open the facilities up, make sure the facilities are available to be used. We used to take our kids to the mayor's office, up to city hall. Then I said, 'eh, why don't you bring city hall down to us? Let's put it in the library, let's have all of those dignitaries and stuff come here to our school so that they can show off […] so, that's the way we do it now. We do it here […] which is good 'cause our school has an image problem with different fights and stuff going on, we have an image problem. But the kids feel appreciated, so. One thing is to open facilities up, to provide access for the CCYE to do what it does. Actually, pretty much all the clients, everybody in the office is well trained. When somebody says they're coming to see Dr. Angello, it's like, "here's the badge, just go" [laughing, extending his arm to mimic robotically handing over a badge]. There's no "why?" or "where to?" Just, "go." And training administrators, it's a job to train them to know what to do […] my job

---

[32] According to the district's website, the Information Technology Academy (ITA) is "a small learning community that integrates core academic classes with the technology field". The mission of ITA is to "motivate and prepare students to a post-secondary education and careers in network and web design". The ITA operated much like a small school within a larger, comprehensive high school. A team of teachers, including Dr. Angello, taught the same group of students within this academy.
[33] Dr. Angello's high school in the East Bay is 66.5% Hispanic, 24.6% African American, 4.8% Asian, 1.5% White and 1.5% Pacific Islander. 43.3% of the student population are English Learners and 80.7% are socioeconomically disadvantaged (caschooldashboard.org).

is to make sure that the administration stays out of CCYE's way [laughing]. Let the business partners come in and help us. There's always some rule or something if the administrators are not trained well. If you have an administrator who says what should not happen, then you have to retrain them into what should happen. Stop looking at what shouldn't happen and start looking at what should happen. Principals and all of them, they have to be trained. They have to be well trained on how to support a teacher like me, or else I'm doing things that most teachers can't do.

The relationships Dr. Angello had cultivated over the years by "raising" and "training" administrators and other partners to understand his expectations and desires as a teacher, allowed him to exercise and enjoy a sense of pedagogical agency. He "trained" university, civic and business partners to "come here to our school" instead of hosting final presentations at city hall, and trained administrators and office staff not to question his classroom activities and to know how to "support a teacher like [him]". In this way, Dr. Angello challenges any idea that these individuals or organizations have influence or power over him.

Dr. Angello's confidence and tenure were an asset for the partnership with CCYE, as he explains, since he was able to keep administrators "out of CCYE's way". He was aware that he was an asset and at times his testimony reflected a weariness and sense of being used. Still, he approached his relationships with community and business partners in a transactional way and in exchange for resources that would benefit his students. In these instances, Dr. Angello discursively framed public-private partnerships, like the one between ITA and Hewlett Packard, in the same way as civic research-practice partnerships, like CCYE. Additionally, the various metaphors Dr. Angello drew on to explain and describe his role and work in CCYE reflect a sense of waning teacher agency in the place of an encroaching business partner presence, with which Dr. Angello conflated CCYE.

In one particularly strong metaphorical comparison, Dr. Angello described being "pimped" by Hewlett Packard (HP). In "exchange" for discounted prices on computers and other classroom resources, partners at HP asked Dr. Angello's students to film themselves making statements about HP's benevolence. The statements appeared in a short film that HP promotionally showed at the Cannes Film Festival:

> **Dr. Angello**: HP (Hewlett Packard) stepped up. They gave us a discounted price in exchange for a rollout – a ribbon cutting ceremony. And also, we made a film that they could show at Cannes Film Festival. So, they got theirs, they pimped us […] So, we took care of each other [laughs].
>
> **BG**: And, was that part of a marketing – (Dr. Angello interrupts)
>
> **Dr. Angello**: – So what happened was they originally said they wanted a ribbon cutting ceremony. So, the Vice President (VP) of that division, he came in to do the ribbon cutting ceremony. He gave his speech and this, that and the other. And another thing I demanded is that I needed mentors. So, for two years he mentored kids here[34]. Last year he had a 15-year-old sitting right here in the corner, a little African American kid talking to the VP of HP for four sessions. He had to learn to navigate getting and sending emails

---

[34] These meetings between HP members and students happened virtually, not in person.

backwards and forwards and setting the time and all the rest. So, that's the quality of the business relationship that I like to have. So, when the bosses saw what they had done, they said, "Well, we're going to Cannes. Can we get some stuff? Can we get some films?" And they asked for statements from the kids. I'm all like, "Shoot, that's simple. I'll just pull off the stuff we did for the CCYE. I got statements all over the place!" Then they called back and said "No, we want something a little more personal." So, the kids wrote something and that's what they voiced over and made the things and took their pictures. They pimped us. I'm good. And they gave us a discounted price on the computers which brought them in line with what the other computers in the district were. So, it was a win-win for me.

In the same way that Dr. Angello explains "training" administrators and business partners, he explains making "demands" of HP to meet the "quality" of the type of business relationship he expects. However, his choice of metaphor makes it clear that these relationships are contingent on exploitative exchanges that test his agency as a teacher. Dr. Angello's use of the expression "they pimped us" locates his students and him in an exploited position of being used for corporate gain. The partnership between HP, a multinational corporation owned and operated by predominantly white men and women, and ITA is emblematic of many public-private partnerships in the neoliberal age (Baldridge, 2019) that "include" poor, black, indigenous and people of color into the civil sector contingently[35]. The partnership is also a part of racialized educational inclusion reforms, where STEM is constructed as a panacea for structural and racialized injustice (Vakil & Ayers, 2019). STEM-themed academies such as ITA dangle the promise of the "good life" without intervening in entrenched structures that funnel poor students of color into middle to low-wage and low-skill jobs that meet the needs of the "new economy" (Sengupta-Irving & Vossoughi, 2019; Vakil & Ayers, 2019; Davila & Rios, 2021).

Although CCYE constitutes a different kind of partnership than the pervasive public-private partnership that characterizes political and financial relationships in public education today (Lipman, 2011), Dr. Angello discursively conflates it with ITA's partnership with HP on multiple occasions. In the passage quoted above, Dr. Angello makes it evident that partnerships, whether public-private or a civic-oriented RPP, often demand the same promotional material from teachers and students that generate the same, interchangeable and reproducible remarks about the saviorism of external partners, an exploitative demand wryly captured in Dr. Angello's claim to have "statements all over the place." Indeed, an anonymous students' voice-over in the video sent to HP could easily replace the name of any partner in their statement: "This great partnership with [partner] has the ability to change the lives of students". When asked how many CCYE projects he had participated in, Dr. Angello joked, "Apparently, I've been in five or six, or seven – quite a few! [laughs] You know, I don't even remember. You know, CCYE has used me like HP and everybody else so that I'm kind of on board…all the time! […] I got the message that they want me at this conference, 'we got this person you can see, go see this person, and this, that and the other. Let's bring him on board!' And I'm like…No. I keep saying no until the time I wind up there." Dr. Angello's humorous expressions of passivity ("I keep saying no until the time I wind up there") and resignation to being "used [by] everybody" was a part of his

---

[35] Sengupta-Irving and Vossoughi (2019) discuss the STEM movement's implicit privileging of the "right" kind of racial and gender minority student and the "unspoken *overrepresentation"* of multiply minoritized individuals in STEM industries, such as the poor women of color that make up 70% of the workforce in maquiladoras, or border factories, in Juarez, Mexico.

rationalizing that this exploitation is an inevitable part of the process of minoritized students' civic inclusion. It is possible that after two decades of teaching Dr. Angello is cynical as much as he is resigned. Indeed, Dr. Angello reminded me frequently that he was greatly looking forward to his retirement, two years away. It is important to consider, however, that emotions are racialized and that race is "felt" (Bonilla-Silva, 2019; Berg & Ramos-Zayas, 2015). If Dr. Angello is cynical, this is not an undifferentiated sense of distrust, but likely an expression of exhaustion (Wingfield & Alston, 2013) and malaise (Dumas, 2014).

After completing the CCYE project in early 2020, which involved partnering with the city's newly formed Department of Children and Youth to investigate how it could best serve the city's young people, Dr. Angello noted that the head of the department wanted his students to present a second time at their headquarters in front of her supervisor and other city officials. Conceding that he would probably indulge this request, Dr. Angello reflected, "It's political because she has an agency. She wants us to talk to her bosses, so it's getting kudos for showing she's been successful in what she's trying to do. And I say, 'use us, just don't misuse us.' So, that's all I care about. You can use our children, use their work, just don't misuse them." While the aims of the CCYE project sought to incorporate young people's voices into the new office's planning and programming, Dr. Angello's sense that they were being used by the head of the youth department to ingratiate herself with her superiors reflects a distrust towards the utilitarian and racialized transactionalism that Baldridge (2019) suggests governs many youth work organizations in the neoliberal age. Baldridge discusses how out-of-school organizations, such as community youth-based organizations, must often accommodate their organizational frameworks and ethos to compute with dominant narratives of Black disfunction in order to compete for and receive funds (Baldridge, 2019, 2014). Although it is neither a private-public partnership nor a community youth-based organization, Dr. Angello's testimony shows that CCYE actors engaged some of the same organizational legibility practices, including the tokenization of urban youth of color and circulation of narratives of the need for their "transformation".

This sense of inevitable exploitation corresponded with a sense of disappearing teacher agency and presence, which was reflected in the metaphors Dr. Angello drew on to describe his role and experiences in CCYE. For instance, when describing how he felt used by the university partner and was constantly invited to speak and present at CCYE-related events, Dr. Angello drew on consumerist metaphors to animate the contradictory experience of being an experienced teacher fulfilled with his career while simultaneously experiencing a sense of disappearing teacher agency:

> I have dined to sufficiency. I don't need anything on my plate. I don't need to eat anymore. I don't need any pain. I'm sorry. I will feel – I have to be fearful with this. No, I'm even reluctant to say I've trained other people [in CCYE PAR curriculum] because there is a leader among the CCYE clan, people who want to – we're talking about making this a lighthouse, the lighthouse academy where they would train other people. They would come to us to learn our Bible. I'm like, 'Okay, be careful what you say.' So, I hardly have anything to say. I don't know. I don't want to show any interest […] you know, it's like, CCYE has a tendency to keep taking another bite out of the apple over and over again […] I appreciate their value, but it's time to do something else now.

In the scene described by Dr. Angello above, he begins by portraying himself as satiated, indicating that he has "dined to sufficiency". In the first part of this figurative landscape, Dr.

Angello is the consumer. He has absorbed the vicissitudes of teaching, the emotions, pain and many jobs that fill one's "plate" as a public-school teacher ("I don't need to eat anymore"). In the second part of the passage where Dr. Angello discusses the possibility of being roped into making his school a "lighthouse academy" for training teachers in the CCYE curriculum, his position shifts and he becomes the consumed, objectified as the apple that CCYE bites over and over again, until presumably, there is nothing left. This shift reinforces Dr. Angello's sense of tokenization and objectification, and is indicative of a sense of waning teacher agency at the hands of extended school partnerships with private and university-community partnerships alike. It is perhaps for this reason that Dr. Angello is "reluctant" to admit that he has trained other teachers at his school in implementing the CCYE curriculum because he is "fearful" of the outcome. As explained earlier, Dr. Angello balanced this sense of fear by articulating it as necessary and inevitable, later explaining, "But that's alright. But I'm good. Use me until there's no more [laughs]. I'm good with that". While Dr. Angello articulated his sense of exploitation as inevitable, his figurative language reflects a sense of waning agency and disappearance.

The metaphors Dr. Angello chose to describe his role and experiences reflect an embodied sense of shifting teacher function and purpose in the broader reform landscape. The agentic stance Dr. Angello claims as a facilitator who "trains" and "raises" administrators and partners to accommodate his expectations is mitigated by accompanying characterizations of himself as a "bystander" to clients' interactions with students, "their employees":

> Okay, I try to-- I'm not a throughway, I'm a bystander. So, from that viewpoint, I was taking pictures and such while the client was interacting with the students, speaking to them, asking questions and such. That's between her and the students, her employees. So, I didn't want to get much in the way. And so, after that, when I did see her on the field trip, the only thing I asked her, they had a question, "What is already out there?" And I said, "Well, we don't want to start from zero, do you guys have a database of stuff you've already got?" And she said, "Yeah, we'll get that over to you." And in the next couple of days, they sent us a list with hundreds of people they already got. I was like, "Okay. Great. We won't even try to match that database."

While Dr. Angello framed his teacher position as marginal and his agency as diminished, this does not mean that his responsibilities or work as a teacher decreased. Of importance in the passage above is that Dr. Angello uses the passive metaphor of a "bystander" taking pictures to describe his role, but in the rest of the explanation of his interaction with the client, he details involved and active work, such as asking for and examining the department's existing database of youth resources in the city, and planning a research agenda for his students that would avoid producing redundant data. Dr. Angello's perception of the roles and functions he fulfilled in the broader partnership rendered a position at the margins of his classroom as a "bystander" that was not reflective of the actual labor he produced for the partnership. Furthermore, Dr. Angello defines his role as a bystander in relation to what he is *not,* a "throughway".

The interaction between the client and the students, then, is presumably unfiltered or unmediated by his role as a teacher and the school context. In this interaction, despite the client being a city department, the students are rendered not as constituents or civic stakeholders, but as "employees". Ultimately, Dr. Angello felt this kind of unfettered interaction maximized the preparation students received through their CTE academy to enter into the "real world," or the workforce:

It's their world. It's them and the client. They are satisfying the client's needs, and if they don't satisfy them well, the client tells and that's the real world. All I do is put some grades in there, okay. So, then the idea is that by the time students are ready to step foot in college, they have a sense of what career they're looking for. And they have the skills to change their mind. So, even if that's not going to work for me, okay, but I have the skills to say, "Okay, let's go see what related things, what skills am I bringing forward to – what can I use them for?" And if we can get them critically thinking outside of the box, then they're very valuable for the new economy, extremely valuable. The new economy is not asking for people who can just do a certain thing. They're like, "We can train you to do something. We need you to come in and talk about what we don't know how to do. Do better what we're doing. Come make us the money." That's what we're looking at […] They have a reason to get an education. There's a job waiting for them at the end. They can become productive citizens, somehow. And that's through the CTE what the pathway movement wants to foster.

As the students continue to be framed as employees-in-the-making, the client presence continues to be conflated with that of an "employer." In this formulation, the function of the teacher is to take pictures and "put some grades in there," and the students' "value" and ability to "think outside the box" is measured in relation to their utility for the new economy. It is this interaction that makes them "productive citizens." Thus, the aims of civic inclusion and empowerment of the PAR project are conflated with the students' singular preparation for the workforce. Within the context of an RPP like CCYE, this constitutes another level of the civic-economic slippage, since both teachers and civic partners are reframed as employers, and students and civic experiences (e.g., investigating fair housing policies, retention of youth in impoverished communities, schools' climate resiliency) are reframed as potential employees. As Dr. Angello pointed out, the purest or ideal educational interaction is that between the employer and the employee. Dr. Angello's testimony also shows that this slippage happens alongside a racialized marginalization and diminishment of Black teacher role and agency. As Baldridge (2014) has pointed out, the increasing blending of educational spaces with the market's capital interests requires tokens who stand to be "saved" by this marriage. Dr. Angello offers himself up as this "token" (reflected in his many statements about being "used") and absorbs a figurative sense of teacher marginalization ("bystander" not a "throughway"), disappearance ("use me up until there's no more"), and diminishment of agency ("I keep saying no until the time I wind up there").

Mr. Morrison

Mr. Morrison, a Black man who teaches Computer Science, directs the Entrepreneurship Pathway at his high school[36] and facilitates the Empowering Black Boys (EBB) program, echoed Dr. Angello's sense of racialized utilitarianism and transactionalism as a "facilitator" in CCYE. Using language similar to Dr. Angello's narrative to detail his role, Mr. Morrison explained that he saw his "role as a facilitator. Hanging back, getting out of each other's way. Letting the

---

[36] Mr. Morrison's high school in the Bay Area is 80.5% African American, 7.8% Hispanic, 3.6% Asian, and 2.8% White. 90.5% of the student population are socioeconomically disadvantaged (caschooldashboard.org).

mentors and the client do their work. Letting the students show their brilliance." He also explained what he saw as the challenges of facilitating:

> The thing is that it is a challenge, because you have these community partners, you have these different agendas that have to be made, so it could sometimes be disruptive because it has to fit into the class or the course, because it's not its own course […] What are the expectations from – 'cause now you have the expectations from the district, the school, the department, and now this partner - which you have to meet as well, so there's a lot of that. But it's just a lot of planning and trying to figure out how do you appease everybody, and what are the common things, or is it something that's totally separate, and make sure that the project gets done.

Consistent with findings in the literature that document the difficulties of working across boundaries, or boundary-crossing (Penuel et al, 2015), Mr. Morrison explained that part of his role was managing the "expectations from the district, the school, the department, and partner" as well as the emotional labor that is expected of him to "appease everybody." Despite his characterization of his role as "hanging back," Mr. Morrison explained that implementation of the YRP curriculum "could be stressful" because of the need he felt to "teach everybody:"

> There's a lot of negligence in these so-called underserved communities, and these [partners] have no idea. They have no clue. And so, they were never ready for what came out of the project. And so, every client, every partner, every mentor even, learned from this project. Every year I've done it I have not only taught my students, I was teaching the mentors, the clients, the partners, and I was teaching the volunteers.

Like Dr. Angello, then, Mr. Morrison figuratively and descriptively frames his role as passively facilitating from the margins of his classroom, by "hanging back," "getting out of each other's way," and "letting" partners and the students do their work, despite the additional work and emotional labor of having to teach others how to work with poor, predominantly Black students[37] in "so-called underserved communities". Indeed, Mr. Morrison described having to intervene in the project to do racial work (Wingfield & Alston, 2014) on multiple occasions. On one occasion the students were doing a "site-mapping" tour of the neighborhood around their school, a task that requires making observations about one's built environment. The client and mentors prompted students to observe the condition of homes, sidewalks, parking lots, at which point Mr. Morrison decided to cancel the entire project because of the way the experience made his students feel. On another occasion, unhappy with the way mentors engaged with his students, Mr. Morrison decided he had to "stop everything" and talk to the mentors assigned to his classroom privately about "what it means to work with this population of students." On another occasion, at the end of a long school day and hours before presenting their PAR projects at a

---

[37] As an EBB facilitator, Mr. Morrison taught all Black boys. Additionally, the school where Mr. Morrison taught has a student population that is 80.2% African American, 6.5% Hispanic, 4.2% Asian, and 4.7% White. 90.5% of the student population is socioeconomically disadvantaged (californiaschooldashboard.org).

80

public presentation at City Hall, Mr. Morrison quickly brought a group of his students to a local department store where he purchased professional attire for them, such as collared shirts and dress pants as a part of teaching his students that "communication is so much more than verbal." After their presentations, Mr. Morrison debriefed with his students in order that they "understand what it meant for somebody in the meeting to say that they appreciated the way that they were dressed and how they came and how serious they took it because they see that the way I am dressed is communicating something".

When I asked Mr. Morrison if he thought it was fair for him to assume the extra responsibility and emotional weight of having to "teach everyone" about working with Black, male students, including making sure that they have adequate professional attire to present at City Hall, he explained that he did not see it as an ethical issue, but rather a necessity. He stated,

> Well, fair is a, uh…a different concept, you know, in thinking about what's fair. For me, I found it necessary, because like I said before, you have an untapped resource, and it was time for the experts [his students] to start speaking. So, I would go that deep because I believed in the students in that classroom, and I believed that they needed that chance and opportunity to let their light shine and their brilliance show, and be the experts and talk about what they needed in their cities. You have a lot of people coming in to point out what cities have, what cities don't have, and adding things to it that appeal to other people, but maybe not for the community that's there, and miss what they're actually looking for. And, so, because of that, it causes miscommunications and a lot of waste of resources.

Like Dr. Angello, Mr. Morrison approached his role and the accompanying responsibilities as a racialized exchange of resources. It was "necessary" for Mr. Morrison to assume responsibilities exceeding those of his regular teaching duties in order for his students to have the "chance and opportunity" to speak to stakeholders "about what they needed in their cities" and for their "expertise" to be recognized as an "untapped resource". Mr. Morrison referred to this understanding of his role as the instructor's "buy-in"

> because I had the buy-in as an instructor, so I encouraged my students to have the buy-in and I believed in the project […] And so I definitely think they [the students] got a lot out of it in the end. It always takes a while to get the buy-in, and when you do, it's a whole other project once you see the buy-in kick in. I'm a supporter of the CCYE myself, and like I said, it really depends on the instructor because if the instructor doesn't believe in it, and is not willing to do that work to make sure that the students have the buy-in, then it's hard to get a project out of it. I know one year we did our project and we presented, there was another school there that asked if they could redo theirs after they seen the passion that we had and how much energy we put into it. That's amazing to me to see that. And my students who didn't have as many resources coming in as some of the other schools did and for them to be able to come out like that and gather everybody's attention without the resources the other schools had was definitely a proud moment for me. But it

really showed that "I can do this, we can make change, and there's a lot of support for us once we show what we can do."

Like the other teachers discussed in this chapter, Mr. Morrison framed his students' work with the same logic of competition, albeit using different terms. However, unlike the other teachers who either explicitly used the words "employee," or "boss," or "employer" to refer to themselves in a more overt reflection of the market logics in their classroom and pedagogy, Mr. Morrison does not draw on explicit workforce metaphors. Rather, Mr. Morrison uses CCYE's language of young people as an "untapped resource" of unrecognized "experts." A part of the teacher "buy-in," then, was recognizing students as human capital (Goldin, 2016). To substantiate his point, Mr. Morrison alludes to a presentation where students from an Advanced Placement (AP) Environmental Science class from a better-resourced and better-funded public high school in the same district presented at the same City Hall presentation as his EBB students. It was Mr. Morrison's impression that his students' presentations were more "passionate" and "energetic" than the AP students' presentations, which he described as "amazing" because of the difference in resources and wealth that exists between the two schools. Mr. Morrison's students' brilliance is read in terms of their resilience and grit, their capacity to complete the PAR projects and perform "energetically" and "passionately" despite the systematic disinvestment in their school and communities. The students' demonstration of their "brilliance" despite this civic disinvestment is the resource that is offered in exchange for civic *in*vestment. This exchange is made possible by the tax placed on Mr. Morrison's time, resources and affect (Ray, 2019; Wingfield & Alston, 2014; Wingfield, 2010). Recognition of human capital is contingent on the teacher and students' demonstration of "what we can do," and is rewarded with "support" from the civic sphere and stakeholders, such as paid summer internships for a select few students. Rewarding students' "grit" and "perseverance" (Tough, 2012) obscured their structural exclusion while maintaining the appearance of a racially progressive organizational commitment (Ray, 2019).

Additionally, while the other class presenting was not a part of a CTE or Linked Learning Pathway, Mr. Morrison's Entrepreneurship class was. Thus, students were not only in different school tracks (otherwise referred to as "among-school tracking"; Leonardo, 2018) but were on different college and career tracks as well. The triumph felt by Mr. Morrison that the EBB students' presentations outshined the AP students' presentations invokes an implicit correspondence between the EBB students' school and community poverty, their educational underachievement and their civic exclusion, and the AP students' relative school and community wealth, educational achievement and civic inclusion. In other words, the EBB students' performance is measured as triumphant in relation to the AP students' relative social position. The AP students' "smartness as property" (Leonardo & Broderick, 2011) begets their civic belonging as itself a form of property, while the EBB students in the Entrepreneurship Pathway must competitively vie for civic inclusion by demonstrating their resilience, perseverance and grit in the face of an under-resourced school and community, feats rewarded by their school and city's recognition of the students' economic viability as an "untapped resource". While the AP students might have been outshined by the EBB students, their racialized and discursive position

as AP students on a college track situates them as always-already civically belonging. In other words, racially and economically, AP students carry civic capital, whereas the EBB students in a CTE pathway and as Black boys, are always-already situated outside the realms of racial and civic belonging, unless they prove their human capital as an "untapped resource".

Like, Dr. Angello, Mr. Morrison's role in CCYE is constrained as he takes on additional work (driving students to purchase professional attire) and emotional labor (teaching partners how to engage with predominantly poor, Black boys). Acting as "everyone's teacher," Mr. Morrison was conscripted into doing racial brokering (Wingfield & Alston, 2014) for CCYE by managing and "appeasing" the different organizational actors' "expectations," "needs," and "agendas" while protecting his students against racialized objectification and ensuring they have "buy-in" to the project. This is also a part of the civic-economic slippage as structural and civic inequities are obscured by an overemphasis on the EBB students' soft skills, such as perseverance and grit (Tough, 2012) as an untapped "resource" and form of human capital. But, Mr. Morrison saw his work as a necessary part of the civic inclusion of his students, despite the fact that civic inclusion is articulated within the competitive terms of proving one's economic viability.

Thinking about RPPs as racialized organizations

In a post for the William T. Grant Foundation, John Diamond (2021) has called for RPPs to be examined as racialized organizations. Diamond explains that "RPPs are an organizational approach, not an equity strategy. Collaborations among school districts and universities can produce just as much harm as good." Diamond thus urges RPP scholars to "confront the *institutional histories, power asymmetries*, and *racialized organizational processes* that shape them. By taking this approach, the field will increase the likelihood that RPPs challenge oppressive systems rather than reproduce them" (wtgrantfoundation.org; italics original). Diamond also calls for acknowledgement that "RPP practitioners present RPPs as democratizing organizational forms. However, the institutional field in which RPPs are embedded are riddled with power asymmetries" (wtgrantfoundation.org). The data presented in this chapter presents a compelling case responding to Diamond's call to examine RPPs as racialized organizations.

Victor Ray (2019) defines racialized organizations as "meso-level social structures that limit the personal agency and collective efficacy of subordinate racial groups while magnifying the agency of the dominant racial group. The ability to act upon the world, to create, to learn, to express emotion—indeed, one's full humanity—is constrained (or enabled) by racialized organizations" (p. 36). Ray identifies three key mechanisms through which racialized organizations limit the individual and collective agency of minoritized groups: 1.) limiting access to resources and the abilities of racially subordinate groups to form organizations, 2.) bestowing an assumed legitimacy and unfair access to resources on White organizations (e.g. a "credentialing of whiteness"; p.41), and 3.) by decoupling progressive organizational commitments from the core functions of organizational actions. Ray further explains that racialized organizations shape group-based agency by racializing time, through racial deference

rituals, and by privileging whites' emotions. The findings that I have presented in this chapter demonstrate some of the ways in which CCYE functioned as a racialized organization.

Limiting access to resources and the abilities of racially subordinate groups to form organizations

First, the civic-economic slippage that resulted from the intersection of federal (CTE), state (Linked Learning) and a local, civic-oriented and work-based RPP (CCYE) served as an institutional field "riddled with power asymmetries" (Diamond, 2021). Although efforts continue to be made at multiple levels to operationalize a "multiple pathways" (Oakes & Saunders, 2008) approach that equitably prepares all students for both college and career, the country's history of class, gender, and racio-ethnic-based exclusion through vocational education programs has complicated the conceptualization and implementation of college and career programming. The pervasive insinuation of industry-themed schools, academies, pathways, and curriculum (such as "work-based" learning) also shaped the way that teachers made sense of their role in a partnership intended to strengthen relationships between cities and schools, cultivate racially and economically minoritized students' civic inclusion, and "democratize" relationships between youth and civic stakeholders/adults. However, teachers' use of workforce metaphors show that they saw themselves as having a gatekeeping power over their students and that they understood one's civic worth and inclusion relative to their economic viability. In this sense, teachers limited access to resources and the abilities of racially and economically minoritized students to form organizations by reproducing socially hierarchized workplace formations in the classroom while espousing the idea that the potential of diversifying particular business sectors (largely STEM) is what makes the students and their experiences valuable (Leong, 2013; Melamed, 2011). This was evidenced, for instance, by Ms. Long and Ms. Vern's classroom practices where factors such as student "ability" and English proficiency became salient markers of how included students would be in the PAR projects and by extension, the civic and economic spheres. It was also evidenced in the broader presumption among teachers that the purpose of the project was to prepare students for the "real world," which involved teaching soft skills, such as awareness of the "impression" they make on others and how their dress and appearance communicates "professionalism." Lisa Delpit's (2006) work has emphasized the importance of this kind of knowledge for Black and non-Black minority students. Delpit argued that in addition to learning academic competencies, student must learn to understand the "culture of power" in order academically and socially to thrive. Indeed, Mr. Morrison and Dr. Angello's awareness of an undergirding transactionalism in CCYE reflects an urgency to teach their students the "culture of power". However, it is necessary to interrogate where RPPs fit between perpetuating assimilation to the culture of power and unveiling and disrupting the culture of power.

Bestowing an assumed legitimacy and unfair access to resources on White organizations

CCYE's alignment with districts' implementation of CTE and LL reforms facilitated partnerships with schools and civic and business partners that maintained rather than created the space and opportunity to interrogate the "inequality regimes" – or "the loosely interrelated practices, processes, actions and meanings responsible for the systematic disparities between participants in power and those lacking power" (Wooten & Couloute, 2017, p.3) – that govern each organizational context and that therein shape the broader practices and culture of CCYE into which actors (including teachers and students) are inculcated. For instance, teachers of color and students often expressed distrust of civic and business partners as well as a skepticism that these partners were sincerely invested in the project of allying with students, teachers and their communities to facilitate organizational-level and structural change. Thus, achieving teacher and student "buy-in" to the partnership – as evidenced in the case of Mr. Morrison – was key in the early stages of the projects. Achieving "buy-in" often took precedence over mining the causes of distrust. Thus, teachers like Ms. Vern, who verbalized their trust in "folks in California that are making big decisions for us," entered into CCYE with a set of racialized privileges that nulled any doubt in the organization and ethos of the partnership.

By contrast, Dr. Angello and Mr. Morrison verbalized their doubts and skepticism about their role and function in the partnership and had to manage their own discomforts on top of meeting or "appeasing" others' needs. This necessitated emotional labor and in the case of Mr. Morrison, a theft of time and resources (buying students' professional attire in preparation for their final presentations after school) (Ray, 2019). This reflects the lack of extrinsic and intrinsic pressure White teachers felt to concern themselves with other partners' needs and desires, what DuBois (1935/2017) referred to as the "psychological wages of Whiteness" (see also Roediger, 1999). Race scholars have variously referred to Black individuals' acute sense of the Other's gaze, needs and expectations as an "emotional tax" (Harris, 2007) and "racial battle fatigue" (Smith, 2011). Additionally, because of the work and civic-education based model of the partnership, civic and business partners such as the real estate developer, the state agency, or the youth and development office rarely faced the same pressure to "buy-in". As civic and business organizations, these entities were understood as holding the keys to students' "inclusion," a power differential that students often boldly confronted by questioning partners' sincerity ("They don't really care about us;" "Why are you *really* doing this?"). However, as I will explore in further depth in the following chapter, the bureaucracy and slow pace of civic change (an example of the racialization of time) at the organizational and structural level shifts the onus of and urgency to see change and the fruits of one's labor, to the individual level. Thus, it is students, their families and communities who assume the responsibility to be "transformed". This perpetuates the circulation of racialized culture of poverty scripts leaving intact schools, civic organizations, and businesses' organizational complicity in oppressive racial formations.

Decoupling progressive organizational commitments from the core functions of organizational actions

In its efforts to support connectivity between cities and schools, civic stakeholders and youth, and in particular, the civic inclusion of economically and racially minoritized youth, CCYE simultaneously reproduced these young people's civic exclusion. While CCYE partner organizations espoused "progressive organizational commitments" such as housing equity, climate resilience, transit accessibility and more, these commitments were often decoupled from the "core functions of organizational actions". As I have shown throughout this chapter and in this section, the slippage that occurred at the intersection of the local and national reform contexts and CCYE's local work-based civic education curriculum amplified long-standing and deeply entrenched ideas about what makes a "productive citizen," to use Dr. Angello's words and relatedly, what the purpose of education and teachers is. Thus, a significant decoupling occurred at the slippery intersection where teachers articulated their roles as employers and students' complex civic experiences in terms of workforce preparation. The civic-economic slippage amplified rather than troubled dominant "racial schemas" whereby students learned that civic inclusion is contingent on economic inclusion, and both are contingent on possessing the requisite cultural, social and symbolic capital, a recursive credentialing of whiteness.

Conclusion: The racialized labor of "facilitating" in the civic-economic slippage
In this chapter I have demonstrated that RPPs like CCYE can perpetuate the practice of understanding civic inclusion as occurring through participation in the workforce and thereby through one's economic viability. In particular, I presented data that shows that interactions between federal (CTE) and state reforms (Linked Learning) with local, "alternative" civic-oriented reforms, such as an RPP like CCYE, can reproduce while attempting to intervene in the structural exclusion of racially and economically minoritized groups. I have referred to this interaction as a "civic-economic slippage," where teachers in CCYE interpreted their role, work and relationship to their students through an economic lens. Teachers referred to themselves and civic and business partners alike as "employers," and referred to students as "employees". Teachers also made sense of students' civic experiences – such as researching housing policies and gentrification alongside anti-black police violence, or how school funding practices and climate change impact school facilities – in terms of preparation for the workforce. This was reflected in the practical choices teachers made while guiding their students through the PAR projects, such as Ms. Vern's careful forming of groups according to ability. In some cases, teachers' choices inadvertently furthered students' exclusion, such as Ms. Long's expectation that her ELL students contribute to the SWOT analysis of a site they were not able to visit, leading these students to feel they were "useless" and positioning them in a differential outsider and subordinate class in relation to their peers. This incident reflects the broader contexts of regional and global inequity that RPPs exist in (Rodriguez, 2019) and that need to be carefully articulated in RPPs' organizational design and ethos of equity.

The data I presented also demonstrates that the civic-economic slippage had differential impacts on teachers. White and non-Black teachers of color accessed a sense of authority and recuperated a sense of loss of agency in their new roles as teachers in CCYE by reframing themselves as employers and bosses and their students as employees and workers. For instance,

while Ms. Long expressed a discomfort with "disappointing people," framing her role as a "boss" preparing "workers to do their job," created a high-stakes environment that she embraced as "good pressure" for herself and her students, where the rewards of *not* disappointing anyone made everyone "so happy". Ms. Vern similarly reflected on changes in her practice as "growth" and felt that her group-making and circulation skills, among others, could confidently guide her through another long-term project. Ms. Saetang, feeling disappointed by the lack of recognition she received from her colleagues for the effort she invested into the PAR project and the lack of institutional incentive there is for teachers to be "ambitious," perhaps recuperated a sense of authority by comparing herself to an "employer" and her students' presentations to delivering a "pitch" in a competitive advertising context.

By contrast, Black teachers recognized a utilitarian transactionalism and racialized tokenization as an unavoidable part of vying for civic inclusion within the existing reform context. Dr. Angello and Mr. Morrison felt strongly that CCYE as well as the industry academies/pathways served as mediums through which students' "brilliance" and "untapped" potential could be recognized and maximized by including students into the "new economy". By the same token, they also recognized that belonging to these organizational partnerships came at the cost of being racially tokenized. Dr. Angello and Mr. Morrison expressed the costs of this belonging metaphorically as being "pimped," objectified as an increasingly bitten apple, and having to be "everyone's teacher". Both teachers articulated the constraining impacts of this tokenization as "necessary" and part of being contingently included into the civil and economic spheres.

I concluded this chapter by discussing instances where CCYE's organizational practices reflected the operative tenets of racialized organizations as delineated by Victor Ray (2019). I did this in the spirit of responding to John Diamond's call to examine how RPP's embeddedness in "institutional histories, power asymmetries, and racialized organizational processes" shape their aspirations to impact systemic issues at the local level. Although my case study and sample size are not large enough to make generalizable claims about how RPPs like CCYE can or do operate as a racialized organization, compelling evidence emerged that shows that CCYE often exacerbated and reproduced rather than ameliorated and intervened in the racialized civic exclusion of the teachers and students with whom it partnered.

CHAPTER SIX

The micro-interactional politics of resistance and discipline in RPP "shop talk"

Introduction

Interactions between varying organizational actors and contexts are key to RPP efficacy (Farrell et al, 2021). Thus, examining interactions has been crucial to understanding the impacts, possibilities and limitations of RPPs. As explained in the introductory chapter, interactions between university researchers and practitioners have been the focus of research seeking to understand how to "translate" research into practice (Penuel et al, 2015) and how to leverage collaborations between practitioners and researchers towards equitable decision-making, policymaking and practice in educational contexts (Farrell et al, 2021). Studies in this area have investigated interactions between various actors such as graduate student researchers, teachers and university partners (Wegemer & Renick, 2021), and teachers, researchers, and district administrators (Severance, Leary & Johnson, 2014; Farrell, Harris & Coburn, 2019). Individuals' interactions and talk are revelatory sources of information of identity, ideology, and positionality, yet empirical research on RPPs has not taken up an interactional or discourse-centric approach to investigating RPPs' impacts and actors' experiences. We know little about the discursive practices that RPP actors draw on to position themselves as a particular type of actor doing a particular type of work.

In Chapters 4 and 5, I examined the intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics that informed teachers' sense-making processes of their role, such as the social and cultural resources teachers drew on from their professional and personal pasts to navigate their position as "facilitator" (i.e., intrapersonal), and the ways in which their interactions with other actors – such as students, clients, colleagues – shaped their sense of purpose and role as "facilitators" (i.e., interpersonal). I also examined the ways that the reform context in which CCYE operated, alongside teachers' past careers and lives, influenced the dialogical strategies they used to make sense of their role and experiences. In these chapters, I drew largely on interview data as well as field observations to understand how teachers make sense of, enact and experience their roles. In this chapter, I take a micro-interactional approach to examine the patterns of conversation and dynamics of interaction that emerged during a focus group discussion intended to allow reflection on practice between teachers. By looking closely at *what* was said and *how* it was said, I examine what actors' communicative and discursive practices reveal about CCYE's capacity to intervene in and/or reproduce the structural inequities it seeks to redress. I build on findings from the previous two chapters by focusing specifically on the variously constraining and enabling, as well as racialized and racializing, contours of actors' "shop talk".

The professional development workshop

The focus group centered in this chapter occurred in a professional development (PD) workshop held in 2019. The one-day workshop is typically led by PLI[38] leadership and is held annually to introduce teachers to what CCYE is, familiarize teachers with the CCYE curriculum, and model implementation. During the workshop, teachers listen to a presentation explaining the CCYE research strategy, are shown examples of projects completed in the past to model teaching and research strategies, have a chance to ask questions, and discuss practice with staff and other teachers. Teachers are also introduced to CCYE resources, such as an instructor guide that comes with lesson plans, a student workbook with activities and assignments for students to complete, and finally, sit down with a CCYE staff member to map their curriculum. Curriculum mapping often involves discussing a match between teachers and the curriculum they are mandated to cover by the state and CCYE, as well as completing week-by-week lesson planning through the five-phase research process. I facilitated the focus group at the suggestion of Alyssa, the Associate Director of PLI, who thought it would be a nice opportunity to hear from experienced CCYE teachers while teachers new to the partnership were introduced to CCYE. Seventeen teachers were present at the PD, three of whom were "experienced"[39] and participated in the focus group. The experienced teachers were Ms. Holloway, Mr. Franklin and Ms. Long, who were introduced in previous chapters[40].

Alyssa is a white woman in her mid 40s. Before joining PLI, she taught middle and high school English and History at urban and suburban schools in California and Massachusetts and completed her master's degree in City Planning at PU. At the time of the PD workshop, Alyssa had worked for PLI nearly six years. When she first proposed the focus group to me, Alyssa was not planning to participate, but in a preparatory meeting before the PD, she stated that she would participate because she was interested in hearing what the teachers had to say. Her participation likely impacted the atmosphere of the discussion. As the Associate Director of PLI, Alyssa has a particularly vested interest in the success of CCYE that may have shaped the atmosphere of the focus group, teachers' responses, and dynamics among the participants.

Focus group as a "stage"

The setting of the focus group might have shaped teachers' talk and the atmosphere of the room. The PD workshop was held at the School of Education at PU in a large classroom; the focus group was held in a smaller conference room. Alyssa felt that hosting the workshop at the school of education would animate the partnership's support of teaching and learning through research-based practices, referring to it as "home" in a debrief meeting following the PD. The location of the meeting, designation of these teachers as "experienced," and the understanding

---

[38] The Planning and Learning Institute (PLI) is the research institute located in Pacific University (PU) out of which CCYE operates.

[39] "Experienced" CCYE teachers were those teachers that had completed one or more projects before.

[40] As previously explained, all three teachers taught at different high schools. Mr. Franklin and Ms. Long both teach in high schools in the Bay Area, while Ms. Holloway teaches at a high school in the Central Valley.

and consent to be asked and respond to a set of questions construct the focus group as a performatively circumscribed space (Smithson, 2000). The focus group arguably emerges as a kind of stage where participants' speech and acts are not so much scripted and prescribed as they are anticipated and proscribed, owing in part to the small size of the group, where teachers may feel obligated to "take a turn" rather than "turn-take" of their own volition. Onwuegbuzie et al (2009) contend that discourse and conversation analysis is an ideal tool for analyzing focus group interactions. The authors argue that using conversation analysis to analyze focus group discussions shifts the tendency in focus group analysis to emphasize individual members' viewpoints while neglecting to consider interactions among and between participants and the moderator as important sources of data. The authors state: "Although conversation analysts have tended to avoid analyzing interview data [Potter, 2004], this form of analysis appears to be justifiable for focus groups because an underlying assumption of this technique is that it is primarily through interaction that people build social context [Heritage, 2004]" (p.13). Indeed, it is precisely the "staged" nature of the focus group that makes it fertile ground for conversation analysis as it is in performance and interaction "where interaction is dependent upon silent assumptions about 'how-to-do,'" that the normative functions of power and ideology make themselves apparent (Halkier, 2010, p.76)).

A conversation & critical discourse analysis of a focus group discussion

The focus group proved to be a rich source of data for better understanding how the interactional dynamics and talk between CCYE actors can function to enhance and diminish agency, structure opportunity and reify hegemonic racial schemas (Ray, 2019). While all teachers participating in CCYE are interviewed in a "debrief interview"[41] following the completion of a project, CCYE teachers rarely have the chance to engage or discuss their experiences with other participating teachers in their school or in other schools[42]. The annual PD was the only setting in which CCYE teachers had the chance to discuss challenges, pose questions, and generally make sense of their CCYE experiences by comparing and sharing stories; although, the annual PD was organized more for teachers new to CCYE, as made evident by the number of "experienced" teachers in attendance at the 2019 PD. The focus group thus offered experienced teachers the chance to hear about each other's experiences and comparatively make sense of their own. In his book, *Talking Shop: Authentic Conversation and Teacher Learning,* Christopher Clark (2001) emphasizes the importance of professional conversation as a way to promote learning among teachers: "A conversation group, in the best of circumstances, becomes a social context for doing the work of reflective practice" (p.180). By applying discourse and conversation analysis to a focus group where teachers were given the

---

[41] Debrief interviews consisted of semi-structured interviews where teachers were asked a set of questions regarding their project implementation, such as how and the extent to which they made use of CCYE curriculum materials (lesson plans, student workbooks, etc.); challenges and rewards of the project; and what worked and what did not about the project.

[42] In some cases, there are groups of teachers who all teach in the same academy or small, career-themed high school, who participate in a project together. In these cases, teachers *do* collaborate and discuss to the extent possible (when their busy schedules do not get in the way of CCYE planning meetings with one another).

opportunity to "talk shop," I show not only what participants (including Alyssa) learned or did not learn from one another, but how racialized meaning, experience and positionality is discursively constructed through CCYE actors' talk.

Critical discourse analysis is widely appreciated for its attention to the ways that language, texts and communicative acts are implicated in the shape and (re)production of power (Fairclough, 2013; Janks, 1997). Critical discourse analysts approach "language as a form of social practice that is tied to specific historical contexts and as the means by which existing social relations are reproduced or contested and meet different interests" (Janks, 1997, p.1). Although debates about the differences and similarities, affordances and limitations between critical discourse and conversation analysis are ongoing and unresolved, conversation analysis is understood by some scholars as a "subsection" of critical discourse analysis (Rogers, Berkes, Mosley, Hui, Joseph, 2005) as it understands "human interaction to be at the center of social life" (Hepburn & Bolden, 2017, p.4). Hepburn and Bolden (2017) define conversation analysis as "an interdisciplinary field of study that investigates the fundamental communication processes that make human interaction possible" (p.4). As such, conversation analysis offers researchers the tools to examine diverse forms of talk and interaction (Wooffitt, 2005). Conversation analysts give primacy to the micro-interactional as a reflection of "the 'here and now' of the interaction" (p.378). Thus, while critical discourse analysis is often understood as concerned with how macro issues or social context map onto language and vice versa, conversation analysis is interested in what the sequential unfolding of naturally-occurring talk reveals about the construction of meaning and context in interaction (Wooffitt, 2005; Heritage, 1998). Conversation analysis pivots off the assumption that as participants utter their turns-at-talk they are simultaneously interpreting and making sense of prior talk.

I use a blended approach of CDA and CA and engage scholarship that recognizes the simultaneity of macro and micro instantiations of context and naturally occurring talk (Edley, 2001; Wetherell, 1998). Thus, I examine how the participants of the focus group intersubjectively built context and negotiated meaning in and through their talk as well as the ways in which they drew on existing scripts, ideologies and narratives to do so. I employ the Jefferson transcription method, which allows researchers to identify the "linguistic resources that constitute interactions" (Rogers et al., 2017, p. 378) such as rising pitch, pauses between speech, laughter, or overlap in talk (see Table 1 for a guide to the notation system).

Focus group context

In preparation for the focus group, I developed a set of questions I was interested to ask the teachers, which I passed by Alyssa. One of the questions Alyssa suggested I remove was "What does civic belonging mean to you?" I found this suggestion curious, especially considering that the cultivation of civic identity, engagement and inclusion is at the core of CCYE's purpose. Alyssa explained that posing the question would "require a lot of prompting" on my part and that she felt the teachers "would [not] have anything to say about that." In this rhetorical move, Alyssa's organizational and ideological orientation towards the teachers became

apparent. Just as she located herself and PU staff within the discursive space of PU as "home," Alyssa now located teachers as outside of a knowledge-producing realm with little or nothing to say about their own or their students' experiences of civic belonging. As RPP scholars point out (Penuel et al, 2013; Trigatti et al, 2018; Coburn et al, 2013), one of the biggest challenges that RPPs face is the way that relations and perceptions of organizational power insinuate themselves on interactions and relationships between RPP actors. University researchers have an institutional affiliation that confers cultural and social capital that public school teachers do not have access to; this disparity generates distrust and disturbs communication between both groups. These power differentials also explicitly and implicitly discipline the production and sharing of knowledge about RPP actors' experiences and RPP work and outcomes.

The following three questions were decided upon for a 45-minute focus group:

(1) What motivates you to participate in CCYE? Why did you decide to return?
(2) Are there aspects of the projects that are particularly rewarding and/or challenging for you?
(3) How – if at all – has engaging in these projects impacted your practice?

The focus group was conducted as a semi-structured discussion, so I asked the additional unscripted question, "What does 'real-world' mean to you?" as a follow-up to one of the teacher's comments. As I discuss below, although the purpose of the focus group was to hear from teachers, Alyssa participated substantially in the discussion, in a way becoming a respondent in the process. As one of the facilitators of the focus group, I asked the questions and participated minimally. Aside from asking these four questions, I contributed comments during the discussion.

In response to the first question Ms. Holloway answered first, emphasizing the importance of the "real-world" exposure she understood her students to receive through the CCYE curriculum, which she also argued "empowers them to make a change." Ms. Holloway discussed the benefits of students engaging in a "self-directed" project that enables them to realize "'Oh, I can do something," which she compared to existing curriculum, where students are constantly asking "'When am I ever going to use' and 'Why do I have to know this?'" For Ms. Holloway, CCYE allowed students to build the skills to complete "real-world" tasks such as "write a proposal for city council that they will listen to or explain to my boss why I need a raise."

Following Ms. Holloway, Mr. Franklin and Ms. Long both began their responses by agreeing with the previous speaker(s). Mr. Franklin began his reply with: "I think I would definitely agree with a lot of that," and Ms. Long with: "Cool. Um – I agree with everything that both of them said." Mr. Franklin explained that, despite some "rough times" he and his students encountered throughout the project, his students probably would not have had the opportunity to do "any group-type of project". He also explained that he discovered "unknown talents" in students through the CCYE research process, such as the artistic talents of one of his students. Ms. Long elaborated on her agreement by explaining she felt the project cultivated agency in students as they were able to work on projects that concerned the community and neighborhoods

many of them lived in, drawing on knowledge she described them as knowing "innately": "They're experts in their neighborhood, and I think it empowered them in different ways to like, 'Oh, they're asking me because I know this. This is something I knew, like innately.' So, I think a lot of them came out super confident, and they're really proud of their work even after we like got all frustrated with each other." These acts of agreement despite some differences in the teachers' discussion of what constitutes "real-world" prompted me to ask the next question: "What does 'real-world' mean to you?"

At this point in the focus group discussion, Alyssa began to participate and the previous one-by-one pattern of turn-taking shifted. Directed towards Mr. Franklin, Alyssa's comments invoked shared knowledge of the project Mr. Franklin and his students worked on. This knowledge was not shared by Ms. Holloway or Ms. Long. Mr. Franklin refers to the "roughness" of the project and Alyssa to the "transformation" Mr. Franklin's students underwent through the project. Mr. Franklin's CCYE project partnered his class with the Regional Transit Agency (RTA). Students were tasked with researching how to improve the rider and youth-friendliness of, access to, and the aesthetic conditions of two local RTA stations. Mr. Franklin described the project as "rough" because students and RTA management clashed during an introductory field trip to the RTA headquarters and stations, which was intended to familiarize students with the civic partner (RTA) and the research sites. Mr. Franklin, RTA management and chaperones struggled with the students' behavior. As Mr. Franklin recounted in a one-on-one interview with me prior to the focus group, when visiting the RTA station, students jumped the turnstiles instead of using passes that had been provided by RTA and put their hands on moving train cars as they pulled into the platform. At the RTA headquarters, students would not quiet down while management tried to present to students and would not take their hats or hoods off when asked to. As detailed in Alyssa's field notes summarizing subsequent email and phone exchanges with CCYE leadership, RTA management described the students as "unappreciative," "rude," and "disrespectful," and expected Mr. Franklin to apologize for the students' behavior. As the excerpts from the focus group discussion below make apparent, this "rough" field trip and the tone it set for the rest of the project constitutes the shared context in Alyssa and Mr. Franklin's exchanges of which Ms. Holloway and Ms. Long do not have knowledge.

Below, I examine two segments of interaction from the focus group discussion, which illustrate the ways that the communicative practices between Alyssa and the teachers discipline the sharing of knowledge and production of narratives about teachers' experiences of CCYE and its outcomes.

Segment 1

In Segment 1, Ms. Holloway and Ms. Long share what "real-world" means to them. Ms. Holloway discussed how students are given "fake context" for solving "real-world problems," and that students are aware that the skills they are being taught do not translate into "real-world" settings, such as needing to write a proposal for city council or explaining to one's boss why they need a raise. She explained that "we need to bring more of that into our classes, and CCYE is a

really great way to do that […] they're doing real-world research to solve a problem that is actually there in front of them." Ms. Long discussed that the action research projects students worked on allowed students to observe the impacts of problems such as gentrification on their built environment, asking themselves "'Okay, what does this neighborhood need? What do we need? I live here. What do we need here?' And then creating those plans that could be implemented there," as opposed to doing "Socratic seminars and all that."

Following Ms. Holloway and Ms. Long's responses there was a brief pause and heads turned to look at Mr. Franklin as it was his turn to respond.

01 *Mr. Franklin*: Uh…I – I – I'm >go – going through my< (1.0) memory ((chuckles)).
02 *Alyssa*:   Yeah, ↑I know↓ ((in knowing tone)).
03 *Mr. Franklin*: And I'm thinking of u:h (1.0) u:h, the RTA project (0.5) a::nd the first time we-we went to RTA
04   heh heh=
05 *Alyssa*:   =HAH HAH hah hah
06 *Mr. Franklin*: I got in there and was like, >'we ain't fooling with ya'll[43],'< right?
07   ['Cause it was rough, right?]
08 *Alyssa:*   [hah hah hah]
09 *Mr. Franklin*: But the {students}are sitting in (0.2) corridors of power (0.2) right? A RTA board meeting,
10   presenting to the City Hall (1.0) Um (0.2) those are (0.5) areas that they might not access or even
11   think are accessible. But (0.5) doing this project (0.7) helped us get here, in this moment.
12   Hopefully, in time, as they mature (0.2) and get a little bit more involved in whatever, you know,
13   life settles down for them (0.5) there won't be a hesitation or a fear of entering into these places,
14   and like, and knowing that (0.5) you have every right – in fact, many times, an obligation – to be
15   in these places, right?
16   {((omitted speech))}
17   So, I mean (.) y-you know, so I- I- I'm just thinking about like (0.7) it's very unlikely (0.2) that
18   many of our {students}would-would have ever gone to city hall (0.2) actually <entered into that>
19   (0.7) building. Like, I'm certain they've been in [Local Plaza] or near there or uh (0.2) uh (0.2)
20   [Local Park]. I'm sure they've been there, but I don't know if they've ever actually (0.5) walked
21   through those doors (.) like, if you live here, this is – and so, like, you know (.) So that's the real-
22   world, uh (0.2) I think, uh (0.2) benefit of doing CCYE.
23   (3.0)
24   And I'm sorry for being long-winded [heh heh].
25 *Group*:   [No, No. Not at all.]
26 *Ms. Holloway*: I love that (0.2) that idea of that access to power (.) giving them the idea that 'You- you have a
27   right to be there.'
28 *Mr. Franklin*: °Mhm° (0.7) ↓And then yeah (.) and >↑they almost kicked us out of RTA, but<
29   [HAH HAH HAH hah]
30 *Alyssa*:   [But the   ] transformation [↑in a month? Two months?]
31 *Mr. Franklin:*   [Yeah in a month] or two. Yeah.

Alyssa's first two interjections in lines 02 and 05 constitute breaches, or disturbances of common sense or expected practices, in the pattern of interaction of the focus group. Breaches are important because it is precisely their irregularity that enables them to be understood as breaches, as speech acts demanding notice (Garfinkel, 1967). Alyssa's first breach insinuates that

---

[43] It is not clear if Mr. Franklin is talking about RTA management or his students here.

she knows the memory Mr. Franklin is planning to share and thus creates the expectation of hearing a particular story. Uttered in a knowing, rising and falling playful tone, the words "I know" not only suggest shared experience and knowledge between Mr. Franklin and her but also serves as a cue that casts this shared context as similarly playful and benign. This rhetorical move disciplines Mr. Franklin's next turn by reorganizing the sequence of turn-taking in the focus group, positioning Ms. Long and Ms. Holloway as expectant spectators to the imminent exchange, with Alyssa as both a respondent and moderator. Mr. Franklin, then, is put in the position of having to deliver a story that not only matches the one Alyssa expects to hear, but also sounds the same playful notes as promised by her tone. Digressing from the script that has been presented would risk Mr. Franklin "losing face" (Holtgraves, 1992; Goffman, 1967) as a source of confusion and dissonance in the discussion. Goffman (1967) defines face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (p.5). Furthermore, Goffman explains that face emerges "in the flow of events in the encounter" (p.7). Individuals' faces can be threatened, maintained, and saved. Although Alyssa's laugh constitutes a breach, it helps her maintain her face by posing a threat to Mr. Franklin's.

In line 03 Mr. Franklin locates his memory in the events around the RTA project. Whether or not this particular memory is the context Alyssa assumed to share with Mr. Franklin, her burst of laughter, like her first breach, similarly disciplines Mr. Franklin's subsequent turns of talk. Alyssa's burst of laughter is notable because, as Mr. Franklin shares with the group in line 07, the project and field trip were "rough." Her laughter does not logically correspond with anything obviously humorous about the field trip. In one-on-one interviews preceding and following the focus group, Mr. Franklin twice shared with me that he dismissed a student in the middle of the field trip because of his disruptive behavior, who was subsequently arrested on his way home. Following the field trip, Mr. Franklin called Alyssa to debrief about the incident. In a field note documenting the events, Alyssa recalled how Mr. Franklin "conveyed his fear that we had just reinforced all the negative stereotypes many of the [RTA] folks held about African American teenage boys. He could tell by the expressions on their faces." Alyssa "disagreed with him. Saying that while there was room for improvement for next year, no one was like that" (field note, 3/7/2017). There is nothing observably laughable or humorous about the field trip. Alyssa's laughter, then, is perhaps a nervous response to her apprehension that Mr. Franklin's story will contradict her belief that "no one is like that." By avoiding to name what "that" is, however, Alyssa seems uncomfortable articulating to herself the possibility of racism existing within CCYE.

In lines 09 through 22 Mr. Franklin explains[44] how he understood the "real-world" affordances of engaging in the RTA project for his students by shifting the framing of the project as "rough."   He discusses his students accessing "corridors of power" such as the RTA board meeting and city hall, spaces with which they may not have otherwise interacted. He expresses his hope that these initial experiences with these spaces will mitigate against any "hesitation or

---

[44] For the purposes of brevity, a few lines of Mr. Franklin's response have been omitted in the segment presented above.

fear of entering into these places" in the students' futures. There is a brief pause following his last words, marking the end of his turn, after which Mr. Franklin fills the silence with an apology for being long-winded in line 24. The other participants rush simultaneously to assure him "no," such that he did not need to apologize for being long-winded. Ms. Holloway then tries to re-enter the conversation and takes the floor to offer an interpretation of Mr. Franklin's story: "I love that (0.2) that idea of that access to power (.) giving them the idea that 'You- you have a right to be there." In line 28 Mr. Franklin rejects Ms. Holloway's interpretation, countering that RTA almost kicked his students and him out of their headquarters, partially divulging the details surrounding the "roughness" of the field trip to which, until this point, Ms. Long and Ms. Holloway were not privy. Mr. Franklin follows his rejection of Ms. Long's interpretation with a loud, boisterous laugh akin to Alyssa's, the tail-end of which Alyssa talks over. Reclaiming the floor in line 30, Alyssa contributes new information about the RTA project, alluding to a "transformation" the students allegedly underwent. The topic of the discussion then shifts to this new information, again relegating Ms. Long and Ms. Holloway as spectators to this aside between Alyssa and Mr. Franklin.

Explicating the function of laughter in interaction, Gail Jefferson (1987) argued that laughter has communicative and interactional meaning. Offering tools to transcribe the many different kinds of laughter, Jefferson demonstrated the ways in which laughter is a "systematically produced, socially organized activity" (p.152) used to accomplish specific interactional tasks. Indeed, scholars across the disciplines have examined the many managerial capacities of laughter such as soliciting laughter from others in order to encourage group cohesion and in-group membership (Coates, 2007) or managing one's own or others' discomfort (Zeamer, 2014). The volume and vigor of Alyssa's burst of laughter overpowers Mr. Franklin's chuckle, rendering it relatively tentative and uncertain. Additionally, the loudness of her laugh again invokes the inside story that Mr. Franklin and Alyssa presumably share, hinted at in lines 9 through 24 and 28 and 29. However, the story Mr. Franklin shares is not meant to be funny. So why do Mr. Franklin and Alyssa both laugh in the presentation of this story?

To understand better the managerial function of Alyssa's face-saving laugh, it might be helpful to consider the tableau of interaction from Ms. Holloway and Ms. Long's perspectives. Confused at the absence of any overtly or observable humor in Mr. Franklin's story, it is possible that Ms. Long and Ms. Holloway understand Alyssa's laughter as responding to the irony of the events. The field trip was "rough," but the students gained access to corridors of power, and according to Mr. Franklin, without the CCYE project, the students may not have otherwise had access to those corridors. The "roughness" then, is perhaps funny because it is ironic, and it is ironic because the students are "transformed" in spite of the anti-Black treatment they received at the hands of RTA management. The possibility of irony is reinforced when Alyssa takes the floor again in line 30 to claim that although RTA almost kicked Mr. Franklin and his students out of their headquarters, the students nevertheless emerged from the experience "transformed." However, Mr. Franklin's revelation that RTA "almost kicked [Mr. Franklin and his students] out" corrects Ms. Holloway's interpretation and extends his prior claim in line 14 that students have "every right to be in these places" by clarifying that their right to these places is contingent

on conforming to racially-codified modes of behavior – such as taking off hats and hoods, not being too loud, and behaving "appreciatively" – or risk getting kicked out.

Laughingly rejecting Ms. Holloway's assessment in lines 28 and 29, Mr. Franklin attempts to offer a counter-representation of the group's construction of what constitutes "real-world" experience and exposure through CCYE. In this move, Mr. Franklin risks losing face again, which is tied to Alyssa's face-management (Holtgraves, 1992). Mr. Franklin's laughter in line 29 might be a face-saving attempt for both Alyssa and him. Mr. Franklin's boisterous laughter may be trying to mitigate the seriousness of getting kicked out with the tonal expectation of playfulness set by Alyssa. At the same time, his laughter may also be a face-saving move to attenuate the possibility of the other participants reading racialized aggression or resentment in his claim about RTA, reflecting a hyperawareness and perhaps discomfort with holding the floor and challenging its implicit terms of engagement.

Just a few moments earlier, in line 24, Mr. Franklin apologized for "being long-winded." His apology is curious because his response was no lengthier than Ms. Holloway and Ms. Long's previous responses to the same question, or even to the first question posed to the group. It could be that he uttered the apology out of discomfort to fill the brief three-second silence following his turn. Even so, managing discomfort with an apology is noteworthy. His apology for being long-winded – which the other participants assured him he was not – might indicate a felt need to calibrate his position as a Black man in a room full of white women with a desire and/or expectation to participate fully, what Brown and Levinson (1987) may refer to as reflective of Mr. Franklin's "negative face needs," or "the desire to have autonomy of action" (p. 143) in interaction. Thus, an awareness of the racial grammar of the context and the need to appear disarming could be another impetus for Mr. Franklin's apology.

An apology for saying too much is also an apology for figuratively taking up too much space. By apologizing for being too long-winded, Mr. Franklin disarms himself verbally, which makes himself physically unassuming as well. Wingfield (2010) found that Black professionals experienced "feeling rules", such as projecting an affable, pleasant demeanor and containing irritation and frustration, as unneutral and racialized "in ways that deny them areas of emotional expression accessible to their white colleagues" (p. 265). Because Mr. Franklin's apology does not match the breach for which he apologizes, it is possible that it is issued as a rhetorical safeguard framing his presence and talk as nonthreatening and cooperative. This apology is echoed in Mr. Franklin's laughter in line 29.

Finally, the laughter does not necessarily indicate that he had completed his thought. In fact, his use of the conjunction "but" suggests he may have had more to say, in which case his laughter may have served as an invitation for others to laugh nervously in kind. Encouraging fellow feeling (Ahmed, 2004), Mr. Franklin's laughter may have compelled others in the room to consider alongside him the contradictory discomforts of "racialized decoupling" (Ray, 2019), or discursive overtures towards the inclusion of historically excluded groups ("giving them the idea that 'you have a right to be here'"), such as Black youth, while materially reifying their structural exclusion ("they almost kicked us out!"). However, Alyssa's overlapping talk ends Mr.

Franklin's turn. Insofar as Mr. Franklin had not completed his turn in line 29, Alyssa's overlapping talk in line 30 can be construed as an interruption that quickly pivots to reframe the unsavory truth of RTA's racially coded threat to expel Mr. Franklin and his students from their headquarters as catalyst for a "crazy" "transformation" in the students. Alyssa's use of hyperbolic and superlative language to describe changes she perceived in the students at the completion of the CCYE project disciplines Mr. Franklin's attempt to render a fuller, more complex narrative of the RTA project. "Transform[ing]" the youth suggests that they became altogether different people, a change validated by her use of the word "crazy," attesting to the "fantastical" (Baum, 2000) social justice desires of CCYE.

This does not suggest that Mr. Franklin felt that the entire experience of the RTA project was negative or that he necessarily wanted to share with Ms. Holloway and Ms. Long in full detail the hardships his students and he encountered during the project. Rather, this exchange calls attention to the ways that the possibilities of rendering any alternative version of the story than the one Alyssa had in mind were foreclosed by the prevailing communicative practices between the participants in the focus group, including Alyssa. Through the interactional context of their work, participants worked to solicit and formulate particular narratives about CCYE work and outcomes and the students and teachers' experiences. However, the talk and interactions exchanged between participants disciplined not only the pattern and manner of talk available to participants, but likewise, the kinds of stories they could tell.

Segment 2

The segment below immediately followed Alyssa's statement about the "crazy" "transformation" the students underwent (lines 30 & 31 repeated for continuity). The statement leads to a discussion about the students' final presentation at city hall and a second, subsequent presentation where the students presented their recommendations to RTA management at the headquarters and were offered internships on site at the General Manager's behest. After briefly discussing progress on the painting of a mural project proposed by students, Mr. Franklin transitions to discuss the passing of two of his students and a third student at a different school in the Empowering Black Boys (EBB) program during the course of the project. Although Mr. Franklin states that he does not believe this to be connected to the CCYE project, Alyssa interrupts to counter that their deaths became "embedded" and "entwined" with the project, to which Mr. Franklin agrees with a repeated "yeah." The sequence of exchanges is followed by a three second pause after which I posed the next question on the schedule.

30 *Alyssa*:   [But the   ] transformation [↑in a month? Two months?]
31 *Mr. Franklin:*   [Yeah in a month] or two. Yeah.
32 *Alyssa*:   [Was] <u>crazy</u> =Yeah, RTA was rough. It was rough. But
33   then City Hall, then they owned it.
34 *Mr. Franklin*: They owned it, [yeah].
35 *Alyssa*:   [And] they went in and they owned it a:nd you know, >so it was striking to me

36	how much they [((inaudible))]<
37 *Mr. Franklin*:	[And then] when we ↑went ↓back to RTA (.) they owned it, [right?]
38 *Alyssa*:	[Yeah!] Yeah. Well [that's when they got-]
39 *Mr. Franklin*:	['JOBS! Give] 'em jobs!' >The interns – w- which is another
40	thing, like they got internships, meaning the {students} got- I can't remember how many, but=
41 *Alyssa*:	=I think there were seven.
42 *Mr. Franklin*:	Seven got internships. They got paid (.) u:m {Student} asked about the mural.
43 *Alyssa*:	Is he still around?
44 *Franklin:*	He's (.) well (.) he's all "Franklin, I haven't seen that mural yet!"
45 *Alyssa:*	I've been asking about that mural.
46 *Franklin:*	OH, so you guys, too? =
47 *Alyssa:*	= It's not do::ne = >I ask her every couple months and she's like< (.) [she's] still working on it
48	and there were lots of issues but they're still – it's not – it's not – it's not over.
49 *Mr. Franklin:*	Alright so I'll tell them – I'll give them an update (.) but so THAT was another real-world -like,
50	they actually got opportunities (.) out of that =And then, during that year, unfortunately, we lost
51	two {students} – no, three, but (2.0) ↓but two {students} they uh (0.5) so they uh (.) you know, so
52	(0.5) ↑that's not connected (.) obviously, to CCYE, but (0.2) I think those are the real (0.2) that is
53	a part of the real world that many of our students live in (0.2) ↓ you know, so.
54 *Group:*	∘Mmm∘
55 *Alyssa*:	>But it became< (.) part of (.) the (.) way [they]
56 *Mr. Franklin*:	[Yeah.]
57 *Alyssa:*	approached the project as well (.) It- It became embedded. >It wasn't (.) It didn't start as part of
58	CCYE,< but it became very much (.) entwined (.) with (.) <that project>.
59 *Mr. Franklin:*	Yeah.
60 *Alyssa:*	For both schools there (0.2) [I think].
61 *Mr. Franklin:*	[Yeah]
62 *Alyssa:*	Because it happened at {another} high school too.
63 *Mr. Franklin:*	Yeah.
64	(3.0)
65 *Blanca:*	Are there aspects of the project that were particularly rewarding or challenging for you as
66	teachers?

Significantly, Mr. Franklin's attempt to bring attention to structural antagonisms that exist in CCYE is marginalized. In both Segments 1 and 2, Mr. Franklin makes attempts to offer complicating perspectives of experience that are reinterpreted and disciplined by the other participants. Alyssa in particular amplifies a narrative of CCYE's unequivocal success, foreclosing the opportunity for change and growth in CCYE's design, partnerships and programming towards its goals of inclusion and equity. In Segment 2, I focus on the structural antagonisms between racialized notions of temporality and the "real world" raised by Mr. Franklin that are then reframed by Alyssa as racial and civic progress narratives (Wright, 2015; Ray et al, 2017).

Referring to perceived changes in Mr. Franklin's students after project completion, Alyssa rhetorically asks in line 30, "But the transformation in a month? Two months?" The question is framed as rhetorical, which doesn't so much invite a response or discussion around student transformation, but provokes implicit agreement or silenced disagreement. Ilie (2015) defines a rhetorical question as "a question used as a challenging statement to convey the addresser's commitment to its implicit answer in order to induce the addressee's mental

recognition of its obviousness and the acceptance, verbalized or nonverbalized, of its validity" (p.5). In line 31 Mr. Franklin claims that students were transformed in as little as one or two-months, evident in the students "owning" their presentations, concurring with line 34. It is impossible to know whether or not Mr. Franklin sincerely agrees with Alyssa on the particular matter of his students' transformation. However, his agreement in lines 34 and then 37 suggests that he was proud of the work the students had done. In particular, Mr. Franklin emphasizes the second presentation students delivered at the RTA headquarters. In line 37 Mr. Franklin stresses the words "went" "back" in line 37. In line 39, he elevates his volume with the word "jobs", mimicking the flourish and exigency with which the general manager of RTA spontaneously demanded the students be offered summer internships. While Alyssa focuses on the students' public presentations at city hall, a hallmark of most CCYE presentations, Mr. Franklin stresses the outcome of the presentations at RTA headquarters as vindication from having previously been "almost kicked out."

In line 42, Mr. Franklin reiterates that seven students were offered internships and then raises the issue of a mural. The mural Mr. Franklin's student asked about was recommended by students in their CCYE projects and one of the assignments the seven interns worked on during their internship. As part of their summer work and of the mural's development, students proposed a concept, toured murals throughout the city and then searched for and located an artist to bring their concept to artistic fruition. Two years later, aside from locating a wall at one of the RTA stations where the mural could be painted, no additional progress had been made. In line 45, Alyssa states that she also has been asking about the mural, after which Mr. Franklin asks, "OH, so you guys, too?" Mr. Franklin's turn echoes in the form of a question what Alyssa just uttered. Ilie (2015) explains that echo questions

> echo or repeat, fully or partially, a preceding utterance in order to elicit a reiteration or clarification […] or in order to convey a qualification or a challenge of the echoed utterance [and] can also convey an attitude of surprise, disbelief, and even challenge with regard to the interlocuter's preceding utterance. By acting as partly questioning and partly challenging, echo questions serve as communicative strategies for controlling and evaluating the interlocuters' interventions, as well as for defending oneself and attacking the interlocuters' ideas and opinions. (p.6)

Mr. Franklin's choice of words, "you guys, too?" intimate a sense of skepticism that the students' recommendations were being pursued with PLI and RTA's support. In lines 47 and 48 Alyssa explains that although there "were lots of issues" stalling the project, the manager overseeing the mural is "still working on it." Later in the discussion, after the group moved on to respond to another question, Alyssa clarified what the "lots of issues" were by reading from an email one of the RTA managers had sent her a number of months earlier. The email explained that the project "kept getting put into the 'get-to' pile," but the contract revision for the artist had made it to "legal," and the manager anticipated the artist would be able to start painting that coming summer[45]. In line 49 Mr. Franklin states that he will relay the update to his students and

---

[45] The artist did complete the mural by the summer of 2020 and an unveiling ceremony was held at the RTA station where it is located. Amongst others and press, in attendance at the ceremony were PLI leadership, RTA managers who oversaw the mural project, Mr. Franklin, another teacher from a different high school whose class also worked on the RTA project, and three of the seven students who worked on the development of the mural. The number of possible attendees was restricted due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

then relates the discussion back to the question I had posed, explaining how he understood the internships to qualify as "real-world" experience before contrasting this in lines 50 - 53 to "part of the real world" many of his students deal with, which is premature death.

The aforementioned structural antagonisms become apparent at this point. I will first explain how antagonisms around time were hedged by the focus group participants and then elaborate how this belied more profound antagonisms, or an ontological incommensurability (Wilderson, 2003; Tuck & Yang, 2012) invoked by Mr. Franklin's distinct uses of "real-world" as an adjective and "the real world" as a noun phrase. The language of transformation transpiring in as little as a few days or two months was common even to actors who did not work within CCYE. For instance, two directors of a grant-issuing institution at PU that had funded CCYE projects wrote a joint field note documenting the "powerful transformation" they observed in students after visiting a classroom once while students prepared their final presentations and then attending the students' public presentations at the PU campus a little over a week later: "We attempt to describe **the powerful transformation** that occurred on the part of the high school students between the two visits, which I think reinforces why we are all committed to this work!!" (field note, 9/4/2019; bold in original). It is likely that youth engaged in critical learning experiences that changed them in some way. In post-project focus group interviews, students often spoke favorably of their experiences and verbalized shifts in their thinking about the civic sphere and their communities. However, this learning occurred alongside the reproduction of racialized scripts that individualize systemic and structural deficits in Black youth (Dumas; 2016; Mahadeo, 2019).

The temporal narratives of change framing CCYE evoke an urgency of change. And yet, the implicit coefficient to these transformations – civic change – is normatively constructed as occurring in a slow and desultory fashion (e.g., "kept getting put on the 'get-to' pile"). This antagonism is captured aptly in Ms. Holloway's characterization: "teen time versus civic planning time." The fleeting, figurative and literal cost of time suffuses students' and teachers' experiences in the CCYE project. A common refrain in students' reactions to project introductions was "Will we get paid for this?", recognizing the impositions on, value, and historical compression of their time (Ray, 2019; Mahadeo, 2019). Moreover, students had to plan and incorporate short and long-term recommendations as well as a cost-benefit analysis in their project proposals, making sense of the civic issues they dealt with in terms of the past, present, and future. While there is a valuable learning experience in investigating the plausibility of an intervention relative to how long it will take to implement as well as cost (figuratively and financially), "teen time," for Mr. Franklin's students, is not solely an undifferentiated youthful impatience to see the fruits of one's labor. Teen time represents a racialized incommensurability (Mahadeo, 2020) with the normalized, assumed to be adult, pace of civic change.

This incommensurability is evident in lines 49 – 53. In line 49, Mr. Franklin concludes the discussion about the progress of the mural project and reorients from the aside between he and Alyssa back towards the focus group by returning the meaning of "real world." After responding that he will update his inquiring student about the progress of the mural project, Mr. Franklin explains "but so THAT[46] was another real-world - like, they actually got opportunities (.) out of that." His use of the coordinating conjunction "but so" suggests that he is transitioning to a new, though related topic, which could be the antagonism between "real-world" (adjective)

---

[46] Capitalization indicates increase in volume of voice, per Jefferson transcription convention. See Table 1 for explanation of transcription conventions.

as a descriptive reference to a normative ideal-type and "the real world" (noun phrase), the differentiated product of material relations. Clift (2001) explains that the use of "actually" in conversation can have "counterpositional" and "counterinforming" functions "used to mark turns produced in response to, and in contrast with, a prior assertion" (p. 258) and to "mark a revision to a previous stance […] to counter a claim or [propose] another" (p. 270). Mr. Franklin emphasizes the first syllable of the dynamic particle "actually" and, by doing so, expresses his surprise that the internships and possibility of the mural materialized as well as his continuing skepticism of CCYE. In the same turn, Mr. Franklin transitions from the "real-world opportunities" offered to students through the project, to the passing of three students throughout the course of the project, a tragic "part of the real world that many of [his] students live in." Although Mr. Franklin explains in line 52 that the students' deaths are "obviously" not connected to CCYE, he volunteers this sensitive information in the context of a focus group discussion about teachers' experiences of CCYE. In so doing, Mr. Franklin delivers a critique of CCYE's capacity to acknowledge and articulate in talk and in design how it understands and aims to reconcile the very structural antagonisms out of which it is born.

In line 51 Mr. Franklin grapples with what to say and how to say it, starting and stopping four times. He says, "but (2.0) ↓but two {students} they uh (0.5) so they uh (.) you know, so." Alyssa quickly follows in line 54 to insist that the students' deaths were "embedded" and "entwined" with the project. In his subsequent turns, Mr. Franklin simply replies "Yeah" in lines 56, 59, 61 and 63, seemingly agreeing with Alyssa's claim. While it is impossible to know whether or not Mr. Franklin's repeated "yeah" indicates wholesale agreement, the sudden appearance of such pithy agreement following his earlier contention that the students' deaths are not connected to CCYE merits further examination. Wong (2000) explains that while the token "yeah" is used by speakers to indicate "listenership" and "display attention, understanding, interest, or involvement on the part of a listener" it is also an "equivocal" cue because although the utterance "yeah" "may claim understanding […] claiming understanding and showing it may be quite different matters" (p.42). This illuminates the possibility of tension despite the apparent consensus. The EBB students likely saw their projects as a way to mourn and honor publicly the lives of their classmates. In fact, McIvor (2016) discusses the civic potential of making racialized grieving a form of democratic practice rather than an individualized, private act that detracts from the systemic and structural nature of racialized loss. However, as Sara Ahmed (2004) cautions, it is dangerous to appropriate racialized loss as part of (racial) and civic progress narratives and practices.

In her examination of the act of "official" speech acts, such as a national apology and admitting shame, Ahmed (2004) examines how the pain and mourning of a group of people (e.g., in her book, Aboriginal people in Australia) becomes subsumed in the project of self-repair of the one admitting shame so that pain and loss become obstacles in the future-oriented projects of recovery, progress and change. The mourning and melancholia of racialized loss are then appropriated into large-scale civic progress narratives. In the same vein, Alyssa's framing of the students' deaths as "embedded" and "entwined" in the CCYE project couches Mr. Franklin's and his students' grief within broader racialized civic progress narratives of "transformation" that

frame CCYE and mobilize its *raison d'être*. In "entwining" and "embedding" the passing of the EBB students with the CCYE project, Alyssa attempts to reconcile the antagonism Mr. Franklin has raised between "the real world" the students experience with the "real-world" ideal type: that is, the disjuncture between the way the EBB students subjectively experience the racialized organization of time and space as civic and racial projects and the descriptive, idealized narrative of civic progress and inclusion.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined how RPP actors reproduce and/or contest racialized practices and ideas when they "talk shop" as well as the ways in which RPP actors' communicative and discursive practices construct CCYE as a racial project (Omi & Winant, 1994). Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1994) defined racial projects as "simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial identities and meanings, and an effort to organize and distribute resources (economic, political, cultural) along particular racial lines" (p.125). Racial projects serve as the building blocks of racial formations, "the sociohistorical process by which racial identities are created, lived out, transformed and destroyed" (p.109). Omi and Winant explain that racial projects occur at micro (individual, interactional), meso (organizational), and macro (institutional) levels and thus take on many forms. A micro-interactional examination of talk between CCYE actors reveals how "shop talk" not only reproduced hegemonic racial narratives about Black civic dysfunction and RPP saviorism at the meso/organizational level, but also disciplined the bounds of what kinds of experiences and emotions are tellable between CCYE actors. This shop talk reinforced discursive and ideological practices CCYE engaged in that had a stake in racially organizing social structures and everyday experiences. The disciplining of Mr. Franklin's explanation of what "real world" means to him through white participants' interruptions, laughter and reinterpretations not only framed he and his students' experiences as incommensurable with the civic sphere, but in-so-doing, also foreclosed the opportunity for change and growth in CCYE's design, partnerships and programming towards its stated antiracist aims.

Omi and Winant explain that there are two kinds of racial projects: *racist* projects and *anti-racist* projects. While a *racist* project reproduces structures of domination based on racial significations and identities, an anti-racist project undoes or resists structures of domination based on racial significations and identities. Ray's (2019) concept of "racialized organizations" is instructive for understanding how many organizations fall into a slippery space between racist and antiracist projects. Ray explains that many organizations make claims to engaging in antiracist practices and efforts in language while the material impacts of their actions largely reproduce existing structures and systems. As explained in the previous chapter, this kind of decoupling between performative claims to equity and actual practice is one of the operative mechanisms of "racialized organizations." Racialized organizations "magnify the power and depth of racial projects and are a primary terrain of racial contestation" (p.30). Racialized organizations are not necessarily squarely racist or antiracist (although they can be) but act as

tenuous sites where meanings around race and racism are negotiated, contested, reified and consolidated through discursive and ideological practices. To the extent that racialized organizations also operate as racial projects, Ray's theory animates and extends racial projects because it affords an understanding of how organizations, particularly those that claim to be doing social justice work, emerge as what Sofia Rodriguez (2020) refers to as a "tenuous racial project."

The prevailing communicative practices that transpired between teachers and the associate director disciplined the talk and emotion of teachers and the stories they shared. In particular, the talk, emotion and stories of the only Black teacher present, Mr. Franklin, were disciplined by Alyssa, the white associate director, in the interest of maintaining narratives of CCYE as invested in and facilitating civic inclusion. I showed how Mr. Franklin's attempts to offer perspectives complicating this view were repeatedly stalled by Alyssa. This dynamic of interaction resulted in the reproduction of racialized narratives of Black dysfunction, the positioning of CCYE as an organizational savior, and the reification of structural antagonisms between EBB students' existence in time and space ("the real world") and an idealization of civic inclusivity and belonging ("real-world"). The tension between CCYE's claims and efforts to produce civic inclusion of racially and economically minoritized youth and the reproductive, racializing practices its actors engaged in make CCYE a "tenuous racial project" (Rodriguez, 2020).

Building on findings presented in the previous chapter, the data presented in this chapter reflects the way in which the micro-interactional dynamics delineated here manifested in broader practices and processes through which CCYE operated as a racial project. For instance, broader structural antagonisms emerged in the way teachers described their sense of organizational role as they mediated between civic clients and their students and CCYE's work-based learning goals of preparing students for college and career. This engendered slippages between the work of civic engagement and constructing students' economic viability.

Table 4. Jefferson Transcription Key[47]

Symbol	Meaning
[word]	Overlapping talk
=	End of one turn and beginning of the next with no gap or pause between.
(.)	Brief interval in talk, less than a second.
(1.0)	Time in seconds between end of a word and beginning of next.
Word	Underlined letters indicate which syllables of the word are emphasized

---

[47] Adapted from Hepburn & Bolden (2013).

Wo::rd	Colon indicates prolonged vowel or consonant.
WORD	Capitalized word indicates words distinctly louder than surrounding speech
∘word∘	Degree sign indicates word distinctly quieter than surrounding speech
↑word ↓word	Up arrow indicates shift in pitch up; down arrow indicates shift in pitch down.
<word>	Left/right carets indicate decreased speaking rate
>word<	Right/left carets indicate increased speaking rate
(word)	Parentheses indicate uncertain words
((word))	Double parentheses indicate analyst comments or descriptions.
{word}	Curly brackets indicate anonymized information.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusion

"Expansive possibility" and "fantastical" aspirations in RPPs

Reflecting growing concerns with questions around difference and power in RPPs, the William T. Grant foundation hosted a panel discussion titled "Power, Possibility and Equity in RPPs" in June, 2021. The ostensive purpose of the discussion was to engage panelists in a conversation about "strategies to develop equitable partnerships including the necessary relational conditions, reconfiguration of power and hierarchy, the role of community, institutional dynamics, and sustainability" (https://sites.google.com/view/powerpossibilityequityinrpps/home). Panelists included a mix of scholars and practitioners engaged in RPPs in both Berkeley, California and Seattle, Washington. Responding to a question from the moderator, president of the Spencer Foundation, Na'ilah Suad Nasir, about the panelists' "vision of equitable partnerships", scholar Ann Ishimaru responded:

> [W]e have a lot of rhetoric about partnerships at all different levels, so this notion that everyone contributes, everyone has expertise, is very much sort of the ideal of partnerships but it's hardly ever the reality of them because we have so many deeply entrenched, historically-rooted dynamics of power that run across all the different kinds of roles that we all play. Some of them come out of institutional, working across universities, school districts, community-based organizations, and of course there's race, gender and all those things. When I think about "equitable partnership", it's not presuming that we are going to automatically put all these people at the table and magically we are going to have reciprocity and equity in those relationships […] just this idea that even in the partnership itself there are all of these interactions and micro-dynamics that are going to play out that are reflections of and also moments to disrupt some of those lines of power and inequities that are in the partnership itself that are also echoes and reflections of those broader dynamics outside of it. So, it's a starting place for thinking about that there's a kind of contradiction in some of the theories that many of us are operating from and being able to surface and recognize those contradictions become a starting place for the kind of learning and change that has to unfold to get us to more equitable partnerships.

President Suad Nasir summarized Ishimaru's vision as the "expansive possibility" of imagining equitable partnerships. My dissertation has sought to pull back the veil of "rhetoric about partnerships," including constructing "fantastical" narratives about the impact of RPPs and the experiences of actors within them (Baum, 2000), to surface and examine the "deeply entrenched, historically-rooted dynamics of power than run across all the different kinds of roles" that RPP actors play, as well as the "interactions and micro-dynamics that […] play out that are reflections of and also moments to disrupt some of those lines of power and inequities that" exist in RPPs. Additionally, by closely examining teachers' experiences in RPPs and attempting structurally to locate RPPs, I have attempted to call attention to the importance of articulating and maintaining an ethic of "expansive possibility" for RPPs, which is distinct from "fantastical" aspirations.

In this dissertation, I documented how teachers' professional and personal pasts influenced the way teachers made sense of working within a multi-organizational partnership as well as the way that they took up their roles. Teachers made sense of their roles dialogically and drew on social and cultural resources from their past careers and experiences to identify organizational boundaries in the partnership and delineate their organizational position and tasks.

My findings also suggest that increasing concerns with the civic empowerment and career and technical education of young people in state (e.g., Linked Learning), and federal-level (e.g., Career and Technical Education) reforms engendered slippages in the way that teachers made sense of their roles and CCYE's goals of civic inclusion, referring to themselves as "employers" and "bosses" and their students as "employees" and "workers". I show that working within these slippages impacted teachers' sense of agency and role in ways that differed across racial lines. White teachers' role negotiation in CCYE involved shifting practices and language to take on employer-like qualities, whereas the discomforts of role negotiation for Black and non-Black teachers of color revealed a fraught relationship with the civil sphere. I trace teachers' differential experiences of discomfort to the underlying logic in current education reform that civic inclusion through school can be achieved through participation in the labor market. Finally, through conversation and discourse analysis, I illuminate the prevailing communicative practices and racializing discourses that CCYE actors drew on to construe and position themselves as social justice actors. I also illuminated the ways that actors disciplined and censored one another through talk and emotional interaction in the interest of maintaining an essential idea of CCYE as a social justice organization.

As Ishimaru and Suad Nasir pointed out, identifying the contradictions and paradoxes that emerge in competing ideologies between actors, organizations, and between shared visions of imaginary impact and impact materialized on the ground, can be spaces from which "expansive possibility" emerges. Omi and Winant (2015) explain that racial projects are necessarily flexible and adaptable, which is what allows these projects variously and/or simultaneously to "reproduce, extend, subvert, or directly challenge" (p.125) social systems. Similarly, Ray (2019) explains that racialized organizations are sites of racial contestation, where ideas and meanings around race are negotiated. As this dissertation has attempted to show, moments of dissonance and contradiction – or "slippages", as I named them, allowed CCYE to vacillate between the fantastical and expansive possibility, and between a reproductive racial project and an anti-racist project (Omi & Winant, 2015).

In Chapter 4, I identified differences between how teachers' roles were articulated in a letter of agreement (LOA) and how they were apprehended by teachers. I explained that teachers did not see tasks as discrete, the way they were listed in the LOA, but rather as inter-implicated. I also discussed how teachers' take-up of duties was shaped by dissonances and contradictions that emerged from negotiating cultural and social knowledge gleaned from their personal and professional pasts and the social-cultural contexts they now navigated as "facilitators". I developed these findings in Chapter 5 where I discussed a broader contradiction that emerged between the civic aims of the partnership and the metaphorical language teachers used to describe the roles of themselves and their students, such as "boss," "employer," "workers, and

"employees". I also discussed the classed and racialized implications of this "civic-economic slippage," where black teachers and poor students of color were emotionally and economically constrained by their participation in various aspects of the partnership. In Chapter 6, I narrowed my analytic lens to examine on a focus group discussion on a micro-interactional scale and the way that talk between RPP teachers and the associate director of CCYE resisted and reinforced racialized narratives of Black disfunction and RPP saviorism.

Throughout these chapters I identified moments of contradiction and dissonance that served variously and differentially to constrain and/or enable teachers. These moments also emerge as sites where tensions can be mined to understand better how actors' past professional lives and social-cultural knowledges influence their interpretation of and uptake of tasks and duties, their interactions with others, and in turn, the broader impact of the RPP. In short, my dissertation has pointed to moments of tension, contradiction and dissonance in an RPP that can shed light on "the kind of learning and change that has to unfold to get us to more equitable partnerships" (Ishimaru, 2021https://sites.google.com/view/powerpossibilityequityinrpps/home). Below, I draw on these moments to identify practical implications for RPPs as well as teachers more specifically.

Implications for RPPs

Recognize tension & have "courageous conversations" around contested issues

RPPs vary in scale and scope (Farrell et al., 2021). This means that there are often many different actors from different organizational contexts carrying out distinct and sometimes overlapping tasks, and from different social locations with competing ideological stances. This also means that understandings and approaches towards what equity is and looks like in RPPs differ. It is important to recognize this variation and have critical conversations around it, rather than assume consensus. For instance, as I showed in Chapter 6, even the verbalization of consensus, as in "I agree," can belie feelings of skepticism, discomfort, or differences in understanding about a shared vision, such as "real-world experience," which can significantly undermine RPP goals and have serious implications for actors involved, including students. In another example, when asked during interviews about their ideas and feelings around "social justice" in CCYE, teachers varied between expressing strong commitments to and feelings about social justice, to cautiousness in responding before identifying differences between social justice, equity and equality, to fatigued laughter at the "cliché" and "trite" nature of the word and stating that "we need a new word for all that". Racial, ethnic, gender, class and ideological differences in RPPs are often identified as posing a problem for "mutuality" and RPP efficiency, although recent boundary-crossing scholarship seeks to shift this approach (Farrell et al., 2021). One way to recognize and productively leverage difference in RPPs is to structure regular, cross-organizational dialogues between actors to have "courageous conversations" around difference, power and contested concepts, such as how actors define and operationalize "equity" or "social justice".

Although Glenn Singleton and Curtis Linton (2006) developed praxis around courageous conversations as a way for educators to facilitate and model dialogue around race and racism with their students, the strategy has been taken up across multiple contexts and organizations as a way to facilitate conversation on intersecting issues of equity more broadly. Singleton and Linton (2006) define "courageous conversation" as "a strategy for breaking down racial tensions and raising racism as a way topic of discussion that allows those who possess knowledge on particular topics to have the opportunity to share it, and those who do not have the knowledge to learn and grow from the experience" (p.18). The authors offer the following agreements to enter into conversation: (1) stay engaged, (2) expect to experience discomfort, (3) speak your truth, and (4) expect and accept a lack of closure.

As the RPP literature has pointed out, this is not an easy task since actors' schedules and workloads often make it difficult to find overlapping availability. However, despite the many tragedies that the COVID-19 pandemic brought and the entrenched inequities it compounded, it also shifted the landscape and practice of education in ways that are still becoming apparent. In one teacher's final project presentations presented over Zoom, participants remarked both verbally and through conversation in the chat feature that remote participation made it possible for many more people and partners to attend, alleviating time and travel constraints, and making it easier to "stop in" for those individuals unable to attend the entire event. Holding meetings over Zoom, or other digital platforms, could be an enduring feature of RPPs, which enables meetings of multiple actors across organizational contexts to hold "courageous conversations". It is important to point out, however, that remote meetings neither assume flattened power differentials between actors, nor do they vitiate against the technologies of racialized organizations, such as theft of time or exertion of emotional labor. Taharee Jackson (2020) has pointed out how the normalization of remote work and learning assumes access to working technology and quiet and presentable space, what she calls "videoclassism" and "videojudgment". Recall, for instance, the student from Chapter 5 who was not able to participate in his final digital presentation because his audio malfunctioned and whose comment, "I can't hear anything," lingered in the chat while the presentations forged on.

Holding courageous conversations in RPPs is a difficult task not only because of the "extraordinary pressure, both implicit and explicit" individuals face to avoid confronting uncomfortable, politicized issues, but as well, because of the extraordinary difficulty of finding time and space for actors from different professional contexts and sectors to convene. Remote meetings, whether through Zoom or another digital platform, present an imperfect work-around to these difficulties and invite continuing innovations towards access. Courageous conversations could be an important resource for continually evolving research on RPPs and a professional development tool that recognizes all actors, including researchers, stand to "learn and grow" from others' knowledges and experience (Singleton & Linton, 2006).

Boundary-recognizing vs. boundary-crossing: Understand how teachers and other actors recognize boundaries

Creating the space to have courageous conversations might also create the space for inter and intra-personal reflection about the cultural and social resources actors bring into their interactions and work that inform how boundaries are perceived and recognized as they are negotiated and crossed. As I hope to have demonstrated in this dissertation, the cultural and social resources one draws on are tied to one's social location. Thus, white, novice women teachers' motivations for joining an RPP like CCYE experience their roles differently from their non-white counterparts. Similarly, former-career teachers' motivations and experiences vary from non-former career teachers. These groups will perceive and recognize boundaries differently.

As I demonstrated in Chapter 3, factors such as teachers' past professions, educational and family backgrounds, age, race, intersected to inform how teachers interpreted and enacted their sense of role, and how they felt professionally enabled or constrained by their participation in CCYE. While some teachers, like Ms. Holloway, navigated boundaries fluidly, other teachers, like Ms. Saetang, encountered boundaries that disincentivized their future participation in CCYE, or a long-term career in teaching altogether. Ms. Holloway's personal sense that students should be equally prepared for the workforce as they are for college, as well her position as a teacher in a career-themed high school made the boundaries between client and teacher permeable. There was a mutually intrapersonal and interpersonal enabling effect in the reinforcement between Ms. Holloway's role in CCYE, her position as teacher, and personal ideologies. By contrast, Ms. Saetang drew on frameworks from her past professional life as a lawyer, where the time and energy one invests in their work has a "pretty clear impact," Ms. Saetang struggled to see the merit or "payoff" in the added time and effort that CCYE required of her as a teacher. Intrapersonal boundaries between her sense of ethics and sense of self as a teacher emerged, as did interpersonal boundaries between herself and her colleagues, from whom she received little recognition or feedback on her work.

Understanding how actors encounter boundaries and the social-cultural resources they draw on to navigate these boundaries presents valuable information and potential tools for RPP actors to collaborate better across organizations' cultural contexts. This may help to elucidate what resources actors feel entitled to or are excluded from, what tasks actors feel compelled or obligated to take on, with whom actors feel able to confide in and/or collaborate with, and how these interactive practices are inflected by one's social location.

Understand teachers and other actors as situated, "historical actors"

In Chapter 4, I demonstrated the ways that teachers acted as "situated" actors who brought various symbolic, material and cultural resources into their work in CCYE, which influenced the way they interpreted and enacted their roles. This led teachers to use a variety of metaphors to represent their sense of role, such as "nucleus," "tripod," "sieve," or the more collective "facilitator". These resources bear on the way that teachers perceived, recognized and crossed boundaries. In Chapters 5 and 6, I built on these findings to demonstrate that teachers are also "situated" in social structures and systems that contributed to what I referred to as "civic-

economic slippage" of teachers' purpose, and CCYE's purpose more broadly. Understanding how teachers are "situated" is important for articulating mutual agreements about what teachers' roles are, anticipating possible ways that teachers might interpret their roles, and making room for discussing how and why teachers enact their roles in particular ways.

It is also instructive to leverage an understanding of teachers and other RPP actors as "situated" towards a consideration how they might be "historical actors" (Gutierrez & Jurow, 2016) as well. Gutierrez & Jurow (2016) explain that historical actors develop "a sense of one's own identity in the broad context of time, including how particular cultural practices came into being and how they have enabled and constrained possibilities for learning, and how these understandings inform future-oriented practices. The coordination of past, present, and future-oriented actions and identities sets the conditions for new forms of agency central to realizing possible futures" (p.3). The authors explain that historical actors work to transform social institutions through the development of a "historicized self […] that develops alongside a person's capacity to use new conceptual tools to interpret his or her experiences as produced through lived history" (p.3). Thus, critical and comprehensive reflection of how actors came to their work and occupy their social location, is crucial to understanding how RPP actors adapt old practices with new while doing "joint work" at the boundaries of organizations" (Penuel et al., 2015, p. 182). Although and perhaps more importantly, applying a "historical actors" framework to work with teachers and other actors would also introduce language and conceptual mechanisms that shed light on how actors are implicated in the problems they seek to redress. As the authors explain, "this is different from understanding history as an unfolding sequence of events; it involves studying how people make sense of their lives in dialogue with history as embodied in conceptual, material, and ideational tools as shaped by historical circumstances" (p.7). This allows for an articulation of social transformation that mitigates against the fantastical by avoiding the construction of oneself as a "design hero" (O'Neill, 2016). Elsewhere, Gutierrez (2008) explains that the work of becoming a historical actor involves "exploiting the dialectic between the individual and the social, between the world as it is and the world as it could be" (p.160). An important part of introducing "courageous conversations," as explained above, could build in practices of critical self-reflection for actors to engage in this dialectic.

Avoid fantasy and articulate possibility

Finally, as I discussed in the introduction to this chapter, it is important for RPPs to avoid the use of fantastical language in setting collaborative goals and expectations. This kind of language is instrumental in saturating RPPs with a moral rhetoric (Ishimaru, 2021) and "virtue that hides their particularity" (Lashaw, 2012, p.16), or structural embeddedness (Diamond, 2021). Baum (2000) explains that "expectations of partnerships are often so grand, and available resources so limited, that those who create partnerships may substitute fantasy about how partnerships will magically create abundant problem-solving resources for realistic analysis, organizing, planning, and funding" (p.234). As other scholars have shown (Baldridge, 2019; Rodriguez, 2019; Farrell et al., 2021; Farrell et al., 2019), it is not just limited resources that

impede the production of "abundant problem-solving resources" in partnerships; issues around difference and power pose significant challenges as well. Fantastical framing and goal-setting also compounds "this notion that everyone contributes, everyone has expertise" that is "very much sort of the ideal of partnerships, but it's hardly ever the reality of them because we have so many deeply entrenched, historically-rooted dynamics of power that run across all the different kinds of roles that we all play" (Ishimaru, 2021).

However, it is important not to eschew an empathic analysis of RPPs, as discussed in Chapter 3. In many ways, RPPs are a utopic project and RPP actors engage not only in problems of practice, but also in imagining an "otherwise" (Greene, 1995). Whereas utopia "attempts to represent reality as better than itself, as having reconciled its tensions and contradictions" and is "characterized by a sense of the sublime" (Leonardo, 2003, p.504), fantasy caricatures this representation in playful ways that toe the line ambiguously between the utopic and the dystopic. As Leonardo explains, "utopia [...] is less a projected fantasy than a concrete possibility" (2003, p.518). Thus, it is important for RPPs to imagine utopically the expansive possibilities without veering into the fantastical. A part of avoiding fantasy is normalizing recognition of RPPs as tenuous racial projects embedded in "critical histories and historicities" (Scarlett, 2021). This means identifying in early design stages how an RPP's purpose is informed by local history, and broader historicities as well (Gutierrez & Jurow, 2016). For instance, for CCYE to claim "transformation" of racially and economically minoritized youth expresses a fantasy that not only ignores decades of community organizing in northern California – the birthplace of the Black Panther and ethnic studies movements – but also places a deficit on young people that overlooks how a history of reform interventions in this area (Prop 209, Prop 13, the small-schools movement, state takeover of school districts, and more) have produced as well as relied on the necessity of this deficit for interventions like CCYE to exist.

Implications for future research

As mentioned in Chapter 3, ethnographic case studies are a popular approach to studying RPPs. Because of the great variability in the focus, design and purpose of RPPs, case studies lend themselves well to an appreciation of RPPs' unique form and place-based specificity. This variability, however, has also made it difficult to build a robust and comprehensive knowledge base about RPPs, although recent studies and reports have comparatively examined case studies of RPPs or employed a comparative case study method to identify commonalities across RPPs (Farrell, 2021; Penuel & Hill, 2019). This approach is a promising way to learn more about the experience and role of teachers in RPPs, which has not been a focus of comparative case studies of RPPs.

When RPP organizational models differ, so too, do teachers' roles and experiences. Future research on teachers' roles and experiences in RPPs should take a large-scale, comparative approach where multiple RPPs in different regions across the country are examined. This will build a more textured understanding of how local, regional and state-level politics and reforms impact schools and communities, which shapes the form, design and purpose of RPPs.

As this dissertation has documented, the intersection of these reforms and RPPs influences teachers' sense-making of their work and identity. Examining RPPs across regional contexts might also provide necessary information about how design choices can be responsive to local social-cultural histories (e.g., of gentrification, industrialization, demographic change). This would also be instrumental in identifying patterns that illuminate how these design choices in turn enable and/or constrain teacher agency. Because there is great political and demographic diversity across and within states, important findings might emerge about how RPPs can design for equity across contexts as well as with specificity to context.

Data from such a study would also encourage conversation around how the political functions and racial identity of RPPs (Ray, 2019) are shaped by actors' roles, or their interpretation of their position within the partnership. It has been acknowledged that RPPs vary greatly in design, form and purpose, but it is less acknowledged that RPPs can have varying racial and political identities (Diamond, 2021; Ray, 2019; Barton & Bevan, 2016; Farrell et al., 2021). These identities are formed not just by the number of racialized bodies that constitute an organization, but as well by the racialized ideologies these actors subscribe to. Additionally, the literature shows how the organizational production of race is tied up with the affect constitutive of one's hierarchical position in an organization (Ray, 2019; Wingfield & Alston, 2014). A cross-regional comparative study of RPPs could shed light on how interpretation of one's position might vary depending on local and regional histories. For instance, the proximity of Ms. Vincent's school to a major technology hub in the country might have contributed to her insecurity about the prestige of a teaching vocation and desire to be connected to exterior organizations that affirmed her sense of professionalism. Likewise, it might also have contributed to her choice to begin searching for work in the education technology industry. As a young, white woman, her sense of entitlement to a vocation greater than teaching (of being an "expert") was reflected in the socio-economic and racial demographics of the quickly gentrifying region. A cross-regional comparative study of RPPs might illuminate how the political economies of varying cities and regions influence how teachers interpret hierarchy within RPPs as well as their experience of their position and role.

Finally, a comparative examination of how the demographics of varying regions inform those of local RPPs might extend questions around what it means for organizations, or in this case, RPPs to be "racialized" (Ray, 2019). More specifically, a cross-regional comparative study of RPPs would be well-poised to examine how whiteness manifests in diverse partnership settings, particularly in a social landscape where the predominance of whiteness affixes liberal interpretations of "social justice" to research, teaching and schooling practices (Tuck & Yang, 2016, 2018; Matias, 2016). This is an especially prescient line of inquiry given the recent censorship and outright banning of the teaching and/or discussion of race and power-conscious scholarship, or critical race theory (CRT) more specifically. If organizations such as schools, universities, and civic agencies are discouraged or forbidden from interrogating the role that race and power play in their design and impact, this complicates existing challenges RPPs already face, such as boundary-crossing across organizational cultures and contexts (Penuel et al., 2019), and poses significant challenges to RPPs' pursuit of educational equity (Farrell et al., 2021;

Diamond, 2021). It is important for the field to understand how RPPs in more liberal states and regions design for equity compared to those in more conservative states and regions. Likewise, developing an understanding of how RPPs negotiate reforms such as the banning and censorship of CRT will have crucial implications for school, community and university relations, research, and teacher agency and practice.

References

Ahmed, S. (2019). *What's the Use?*. Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2004). Collective feelings: Or, the impressions left by others. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *21*(2), 25-42.

Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of educational research*, *81*(2), 132-169.

Akkerman, S., & Bruining, T. (2016). Multilevel boundary crossing in a professional development school partnership. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *25*(2), 240-284.

Akkerman, S. F., & Meijer, P. C. (2011). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and teacher education*, *27*(2), 308-319.

Althusser, L. (2014). *On the reproduction of capitalism: Ideology and ideological state apparatuses*. Verso Trade.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza.

Apple, M. W. (1978). Ideology, reproduction, and educational reform. *Comparative education review*, *22*(3), 367-387.

Apple, M. W., & Jungck, S. (1990). "You don't have to be a teacher to teach this unit:" Teaching, technology, and gender in the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, *27*(2), 227-251.

Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds.). (1981/2015). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. SUNY Press.

Bailey, A., & Hayes, J. M. (2006). Who's in Prison?. *California Counts: Public Policy Institute of California*, *8*, 1-28.

Bakhtin, M. M. (2010). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*(Vol. 1). University of texas Press.

Baldridge, B. J. (2019). *Reclaiming community: Race and the uncertain future of youth*

work. Stanford University Press.

Baldridge, B. J. (2020). The youthwork paradox: A case for studying the complexity of
    community-based youth work in education research. *Educational
    Researcher*, *49*(8), 618-625.

Baldridge, B. J. (2014). Relocating the deficit: Reimagining Black youth in neoliberal
    times. *American Educational Research Journal*, *51*(3), 440-472.

Barton, A. C., & Bevan, B. (2016). Leveraging RPPs to address racial inequality in urban
    school districts. *William T. Grant Foundation*.

Baum, H. S. (2000). Fantasies and realities in university-community
    partnerships. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, *20*(2), 234-246.

Berg, U. D., & Ramos-Zayas, A. Y. (2015). Racializing affect: A theoretical
    proposition. *Current Anthropology*, *56*(5), 654-677.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2019). Feeling race: Theorizing the racial economy of
    emotions. *American Sociological Review*, *84*(1), 1-25.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence
    of racial inequality in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1979). Symbolic power. *Critique of anthropology*, *4*(13-14), 77-85.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and
    culture* (Vol. 4). Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1987). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard
    university press.

Bowles, S., Gintis, H., & Meyer, P. (1975). The long shadow of work: Education, the
    family, and the reproduction of the social division of labor. *Insurgent
    Sociologist*, *5*(4), 3-22.

Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in
    language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.

California School Dashboard. https://www.caschooldashboard.org.

Camardelle, A. (2021). Illusions of opportunity? A critical discourse analysis of Atlanta's opportunity youth initiative.

Clark, C. M., & Florio-Ruane, S. (2001). Conversation as support for teaching in new ways. *Talking shop: Authentic conversation and teacher learning*, 1-15.

Clift, R. (2001). Meaning in interaction: The case of actually. *Language*, 245-291.

Coates, J. (2007). Talk in a play frame: More on laughter and intimacy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*(1), 29-49.

Coburn, C. E., Penuel, W. R., & Geil, K. E. (2013). Practice Partnerships: A Strategy for Leveraging Research for Educational Improvement in School Districts. *William T. Grant Foundation*.

Coburn, C. E., & Penuel, W. R. (2016). Research–practice partnerships in education: Outcomes, dynamics, and open questions. *Educational researcher*, *45*(1), 48-54.

Coloma, R. S. (2008). Border crossing subjectivities and research: Through the prism of feminists of color. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *11*(1), 11-27.

Collins, P. H. (1990). Black feminist thought in the matrix of domination. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*, *138*(1990), 221-238.

Datnow, A. (2020). The role of teachers in educational reform: A 20-year perspective. *Journal of Educational Change*, *21*(3), 431-441.

Davila, O., & Rios, V. M. (2021). Between market logics and resistance logics: the tech boom and high-performing Latino boys in the Bay Area. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 1-18.

Day, C. (2008). Committed for life? Variations in teachers' work, lives and effectiveness. *Journal of educational change*, *9*(3), 243-260.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. The New Press.

Denner, J., Bean, S., Campe, S., Martinez, J., & Torres, D. (2019). Negotiating trust, power, and culture in a research–practice partnership. *AERA Open*, *5*(2), 2332858419858635.

Diamond, J. B. (2021). Racial Equity and Research Practice Partnerships 2.0: A Critical Reflection. William T. Grant Foundation. Retrieved from: http://wtgrantfoundation.org/racial-equity-and-research-practice-partnerships-2-0-a- critical-reflection

Dortch, C. (2012). Carl D. Perkins career and technical education act of 2006: Background and performance.

DuBois, W. E. B., & Mack, H. J. (2017). *Black Reconstruction in America: Toward a history of the part which black folk played in the attempt to reconstruct democracy in America, 1860-1880*. Routledge.

Dumas, M. J. (2014). 'Losing an arm': Schooling as a site of black suffering. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *17*(1), 1-29.

Dumas, M. J., & Nelson, J. D. (2016). (Re) Imagining Black boyhood: Toward a critical framework for educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, *86*(1), 27-47.

Edley, N. (2001). Conversation analysis, discursive psychology and the study of ideology: A response to Susan Speer. *Feminism & Psychology*, *11*(1), 136-140.

Escude, M., Gutierrez, E., Ishimaru, A., Scarlett, K., Vossoughi, S., Suad-Nasir, N. (2021, June 10). *Power, Possibility, Equity in Research-Practice Partnerships.* Zoom panel discussion. William T. Grant Foundation. https://sites.google.com/view/powerpossibilityequityinrpps/home.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.

Farrell, C. C., Harrison, C., & Coburn, C. E. (2019). "What the hell is this, and who the hell are you?" Role and identity negotiation in research-practice partnerships. *AERA Open*, *5*(2), 2332858419849595.

Farrell, C. C., Penuel, W. R., Coburn, C. E., Daniel, J., & Steup, L. (2021). Research-practice partnerships in education: The state of the field.

Farrell, C. C., & Marsh, J. A. (2016). Metrics matter: How properties and perceptions of data shape teachers' instructional responses. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *52*(3), 423-462.

Farrell, C. C., & Coburn, C. E. (2017). Absorptive capacity: A conceptual framework for understanding district central office learning. *Journal of Educational Change*, *18*(2), 135-159.

Fisher-Ari, T. R., Kavanagh, K. M., & Martin, A. (2017). Urban Teachers Struggling within and against Neoliberal, Accountability-Era Policies. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, *13*(2).

Fitzgerald, R., Ottem, R., & Hufford, J. (2016). The Effect of Linked Learning Certified Pathways on Selected Student Outcomes. *Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, US Department of Education*.

Flores, M. A., & Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and teacher education*, *22*(2), 219-232.

Garfinkel, Harold. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gilmore, R. W. (2007). *Golden gulag*. University of California Press.

Giroux, H. A. (2007). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (2013). *America's education deficit and the war on youth: Reform beyond electoral politics*. NYU Press.

Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work. *Interaction Ritual*, 5-45.

Goldin, Claudia. (2016). "Human Capital." In Handbook of Cliometrics, ed. Claude Diebolt and Michael Haupert, 55-86. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer Verlag.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing*

practices in households, communities, and classrooms. Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (2011). *Prison Notebooks Volume 2* (Vol. 2). Columbia University Press.

Greene, M. (1995). Art and imagination: Reclaiming the sense of possibility. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*(5), 378-382.

Guerrero-Hernández, G. R., & Fernández-Ugalde, R. A. (2020). Teachers as researchers: Reflecting on the challenges of research–practice partnerships between school and university in Chile. *London Review of Education*.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading research quarterly*, *43*(2), 148-164.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, culture, and activity*, *6*(4), 286-303.

Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational researcher*, *32*(5), 19-25.

Gutiérrez, K. D., & Jurow, A. S. (2016). Social design experiments: Toward equity by design. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *25*(4), 565-598.

Reed, S., Dougherty, S. M., Kurlaender, M., & Mathias, J. (2018). A Portrait of California Career Technical Education Pathway Completers. Technical Report. Getting Down to Facts II. *Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE*.

Halkier, B. (2010). Focus groups as social enactments: integrating interaction and content in the analysis of focus group data. *Qualitative Research*, *10*(1), 71-89.

Hargreaves, L. (2009). The status and prestige of teachers and teaching. In *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching* (pp. 217-229). Springer, Boston, MA.

Hargreaves, A. (2008). The emotional geographies of educational leadership. *Passionate leadership in education*, 129-150.

Hargreaves, A. (2001). The emotional geographies of teachers' relations with

colleagues. *International journal of educational research*, *35*(5), 503-527.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2017). *Transcribing for social research*. Sage.

Heritage, J. (1998). Conversation analysis: Practices and methods. *Qualitative Sociology*, 208-230.

Hill, L. E. (2012). California's English Learner Students. *Public Policy Institute of California*.

Holtgraves, T. (1992). The linguistic realization of face management: Implications for language production and comprehension, person perception, and cross-cultural

Ilie, C. (2015). Questions and questioning. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1-15.

Jackson, T. (2020). "COVID-19 and Videoclassisim: Implicit Bias, Videojudgement, and Why I'm Terrified to Have You Look Over My Shoulder". Retrieved from: https://cae.appstate.edu/sites/default/files/covid_19_and_videoclassism_by_dr_ta haree_a_jackson_3.27.20_0.pdf.

Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *18*(3), 329-342.

Jefferson, G. (1988). On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation. *Social Problems*, *35*(4), 418-441.

Johnson Jr, D. L. (2020). *Linked Learning: The Black Experience*. California State University, Long Beach.

Johnston, A., Castellano, M., & Darche, S. (2019). Aligning systems for equity in college and career pathways: Report to the field. *UC Berkeley Graduate School of Education, College and Career Academy Support Network (CCASN), Berkeley, CA*.

Joseph, M. (2002). *Against the romance of community*. U of Minnesota Press.

Kelchtermans, G. (2005). Teachers' emotions in educational reforms: Self-understanding, vulnerable commitment and micropolitical literacy. *Teaching and teacher*

education, *21*(8), 995-1006.

Kim, C. J. (1999). The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & society*, *27*(1), 105-138.

Kim, E. H., Flack, C. B., Parham, K., & Wohlstetter, P. (2021). Equity in Secondary Career and Technical Education in the United States: A Theoretical Framework and Systematic Literature Review. *Review of Educational Research*, *91*(3), 356-396.

Kirkland, D. E. (2014). Why I study culture, and why it matters: Humanizing ethnographies in social science research. *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities*, 179-200.

Kliebard, H. M. (1999). *Schooled to Work. Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946. Reflective History Series*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. *The journal of Philosophy*, *77*(8), 453-486.

Konopasky, A. W., & Reybold, E. (2014). Designing for Metaphor in a Study of Adult Educators: An Exploration and Critique of Metaphor Analysis.

Lashaw, A. (2012). How progressive culture resists critique: The impasse of NGO Studies. *Ethnography*, *14*(4), 501-522.

Lashaw, A. (2010). The radical promise of reformist zeal: What makes "inquiry for equity" plausible?. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *41*(4), 323-340.

Lashaw, A. (2008). Experiencing imminent justice: The presence of hope in a movement for equitable schooling. *Space and Culture*, *11*(2), 109-124.

Lashaw, A. (2017). The ambiguous political power of liberal school reform. In *The anthropology of education policy* (pp. 103-122). Routledge.

Lashaw, A. (2006). Social and Cultural Studies Graduate School of Education University of California, Berkeley. *University of California, Berkeley*.

Leonardo, Z. (2016). Tropics of whiteness: Metaphor and the literary turn in white

studies. *Whiteness and Education*, *1*(1), 3-14.

Leonardo, Z. (2013). *Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory of racism and education*. Teachers College Press.

Lanford, M., & Tierney, W. G. (2015). From vocational education to linked learning: The ongoing transformation of career-oriented education in the US. *Pullias Center for Higher Education*.

Leonardo, Z., & Broderick, A. (2011). Smartness as property: A critical exploration of intersections between whiteness and disability studies. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(10), 2206-2232.

Leonardo, Z., & Boas, E. (2013). Other kids' teachers: What children of color learn from white women and what this says about race, whiteness, and gender. In *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 333-344). Routledge.

Leonardo, Z., & Gamez-Djokic, B. (2019). Sometimes Leaving Means Staying: Race and White Teachers' Emotional Investments. *Teachers College Record*, *121*(13), 1-22.

Leonardo, Z., & Grubb, W. N. (2018). *Education and racism: A primer on issues and dilemmas*. Routledge.

Leong, N. (2013). Reflections on racial capitalism. *Harv. L. Rev. F.*, *127*, 32.

Linked Learning Alliance. https://www.linkedlearning.org

Lipman, P. (2011). Neoliberal education restructuring dangers and opportunities of the present crisis. *Monthly Review*, *63*(3), 114.

Lipman, P. (2013). *The new political economy of urban education: Neoliberalism, race, and the right to the city*. Routledge.

Lipman, P. (2013). *The new political economy of urban education: Neoliberalism, race, and the right to the city*. Routledge.

Little, J. W., & Bartlett, L. (2010). The teacher workforce and problems of educational equity. *Review of Research in Education*, *34*(1), 285-328.

Little, J. W. (1996). The emotional contours and career trajectories of (disappointed) reform enthusiasts. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *26*(3), 345-359.

Lizárraga, José Ramón, and Kris D. Gutiérrez. (2018). "Centering Nepantla literacies from the borderlands: Leveraging "in-betweenness" toward learning in the everyday." *Theory Into Practice* 57, no. 38-47.

Lucas, C. C. (2013). *Decolonizing the White Colonizer?*. University of California, Berkeley.

Lugones, M. (1987). Playfulness,"world"-travelling, and loving perception. *Hypatia*, *2*(2), 3-19.

Luttrell, W. (2010). "Good enough" methods for life-story analysis. In Luttrell, W. (Ed.), Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice (pp. 258–278). Routledge.

Mahadeo, R. (2019). Why is the time always right for white and wrong for us? How racialized youth make sense of whiteness and temporal inequality. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *5*(2), 186-199.

Martínez, M. A., Sauleda, N., & Huber, G. L. (2001). Metaphors as blueprints of thinking about teaching and learning. *Teaching and Teacher education*, *17*(8), 965-977.

Massey, D., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Harvard university press.

Matias, C. E. (2016). *Feeling white: Whiteness, emotionality, and education*. Brill.

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Sage publications.

McIvor, D. W. (2016). *Mourning in America: Race and the politics of loss*. Cornell University Press.

McLaren, P., & Giroux, H. A. (2018). Writing from the margins: Geographies of identity, pedagogy, and power. In *Revolutionary multiculturalism* (pp. 16-41). Routledge.

Melamed, J. (2015). Racial capitalism. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, *1*(1), 76-85.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. https://www.merriam-webster.com.

Miron, L. F. (2003). Joint ventures between public schools and city government: Implications for community development. *Reinterpreting urban school reform*, 229-248.

Mirra, N., & Morrell, E. (2011). Teachers as civic agents: Toward a critical democratic theory of urban teacher development. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(4), 408-420.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders*. Duke University Press.

Neoh, J. Y. (2017). Neoliberal education? Comparing character and citizenship education in Singapore and civics and citizenship education in Australia. *JSSE-Journal of Social Science Education*.

O'Neill, D. K. (2016). Understanding design research–practice partnerships in context and time: Why learning sciences scholars should learn from cultural-historical activity theory approaches to design-based research.

Oakes, J., & Saunders, M. (2008). *Beyond Tracking: Multiple Pathways to College, Career, and Civic Participation*. Harvard Education Press. 8 Story Street First Floor, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. Yale University Press.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. Yale University Press.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States*. Routledge.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Duke University Press.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Dickinson, W. B., Leech, N. L., & Zoran, A. G. (2009). A qualitative framework for collecting and analyzing data in focus group research. *International journal of qualitative methods*, *8*(3), 1-21.

Penuel, William R., Cynthia E. Coburn and Daniel J. Gallagher. (2013). "Negotiating problems of practice in research–practice design partnerships." *National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook* 112(2): 237-255.

Penuel, W. R., Allen, A. R., Coburn, C. E., & Farrell, C. (2015). Conceptualizing research–practice partnerships as joint work at boundaries. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, *20*(1-2), 182-197.

Penuel, W. R., & Hill, H. C. (2019). Building a knowledge base on research-practice partnerships: Introduction to the special topic collection. *AERA Open*, *5*(4), 2332858419891950.

Ray, V. (2019). A theory of racialized organizations. *American Sociological Review*, *84*(1), 26-53.

Ray, V. E., Randolph, A., Underhill, M., & Luke, D. (2017). Critical race theory, Afro-pessimism, and racial progress narratives. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *3*(2), 147-158.

Rodriguez, S. (2020). Community-School Partnerships as Racial Projects: Examining belonging for Newcomer Migrant Youth in Urban Education. *Urban Education*, 0042085920959126.

Roediger, D. R. (1999). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. Verso.

Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *75*(3), 365-416.

Rutherford-Quach, S., & Rice, E. (2013). Linked learning in sacramento: Organizing the district and community for sustainable reform. *Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Retrieved from http://edpolicy. stanford. edu/publications/pubs/705*.

Sánchez Loza, D. (2020). *Reading, Writing, and Right Wing (Re) Production: The Teaching and Learning of Settler Citizenship in Ohio* (Doctoral dissertation, UC Berkeley).

Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., & LeCompte, M. D. (1999). *Essential ethnographic methods: Observations, interviews, and questionnaires* (Vol. 2). Rowman

Altamira.

Schneider, M. (2018). "Developing an Evidence Base for Research-Practice
  Partnerships". IES Director's Blog. Retrieved from:
  https://ies.ed.gov/director/remarks/index.asp.

Schram, T. H. (2006). Conceptualizing and proposing qualitative research.

Sengupta-Irving, T., & Vossoughi, S. (2019). Not in their name: re-interpreting
  discourses of STEM learning through the subjective experiences of minoritized
  girls. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *22*(4), 479-501.

Severance, S., Leary, H., & Johnson, R. (2014). Tensions in a multi-tiered research-
  practice partnership. Boulder, CO: International Society of the Learning Sciences.

Shange, S. (2019). *Progressive Dystopia*. Duke University Press.

Singh, M. V. (2018). Role models without guarantees: Corrective representations and the
  cultural politics of a Latino male teacher in the borderlands. *Race ethnicity and
  education*, *21*(3), 288-305.

Singleton, G. E., & Linton, C. (2006). *Facilitator's guide to courageous conversations
  about race*. Sage.

Smith, W. A., Hung, M., & Franklin, J. D. (2011). Racial battle fatigue and the
  miseducation of Black men: Racial microaggressions, societal problems, and
  environmental stress. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 63-82.

Smithson, J. (2000). Using and analysing focus groups: limitations and
  possibilities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *3*(2), 103-
  119.

Spencer Foundation. "Research-Practice Partnerships: Collaborative research for
  educational change." https://www.spencer.org/grant_types/research-practice-
  partnerships.

Stern, D., Stearns, R. (2006). Multiple Perspectives on Multiple Pathways: Preparing
  California's Youth for College, Career and Civic Responsibility. University of
  California, Berkeley. Retrieved from: https://casn.berkeley.edu/wp

content/uploads/resource_files/multiple-perspectives.pdf

Thomas, L., & Beauchamp, C. (2007). Learning to live well as teachers in a changing world: Insights into developing a professional identity in teacher education. *The Journal of Educational Thought (JET)/Revue de la Pensée Educative*, 229-243.

Thomas, L., & Beauchamp, C. (2011). Understanding new teachers' professional identities through metaphor. *Teaching and teacher Education*, *27*(4), 762-769.

Tobin, K., & LaMaster, S. U. (1995). Relationships between metaphors, beliefs, and actions in a context of science curriculum change. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *32*(3), 225-242.

Tobin, K. (1990). Changing metaphors and beliefs: A master switch for teaching?. *Theory into practice*, *29*(2), 122-127.

Tough, P. (2012). *How children succeed: Grit, curiosity, and the hidden power of character*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Trigatti, P., Chukhray, I., & Turley, R. N. L. (2018). Research–Practice Partnerships in Education. In *Handbook of the Sociology of Education in the 21st Century* (pp. 561-579). Springer, Cham.

Tseng, V., Easton, J. Q., & Supplee, L. H. (2017). Research-practice partnerships: Building two-way streets of engagement. *Social Policy Report*, *30*(4), 1-17.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (Eds.). (2018). *Toward what justice?: Describing diverse dreams of justice in education*. Routledge.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1).

Udesky, L. (2015). Classroom coaches critical as teachers shift to Common Core. *EdSource. Retrieved from http://edsource. org/2015/classroom-coaches-critical-as-teachers-shift-to-common-core/73730*.

Ungar, O. A. (2016). Understanding teachers' attitude toward educational reforms through metaphors. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *77*, 117-127.

Vakil, S., & Ayers, R. (2019). The racial politics of STEM education in the USA:

Interrogations and explorations.

Vakil, S., McKinney de Royston, M., Suad Nasir, N. I., & Kirshner, B. (2016). Rethinking race and power in design-based research: Reflections from the field. *Cognition and Instruction*, *34*(3), 194-209.

Villenas, S. A. (2010). Thinking Latina/o education with and from Chicana/Latina feminist cultural studies: Emerging pathways–decolonial possibilities. In *Handbook of cultural politics and education* (pp. 451-476). Brill Sense.

Van Veen, K., Sleegers, P., & Van de Ven, P. H. (2005). One teacher's identity, emotions, and commitment to change: A case study into the cognitive–affective processes of a secondary school teacher in the context of reforms. *Teaching and teacher education*, *21*(8), 917-934.

W.T. Grant Foundation. Research-Practice Partnerships. https://rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org.

Warner, M., et al. (2016). Taking Stock of the California Linked Learning District Initiative: Seventh-Year Evaluation Report Executive Summary. SRI International. Retrieved from: https://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/lly7_executive_summary_0.pdf

Warren, M. (2005). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, *75*(2), 133-173.

Wegemer, C. M., & Renick, J. R. (2021). Boundary Spanning Roles and Power in Educational Partnerships. *AERA Open*, *7*, 23328584211016868.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, *9*(3), 387-412.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, *9*(3), 387-412.

Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology*, *9*(3), 335-356.

Wilderson III, F. (2003). Gramsci's Black Marx: Whither the slave in civil society? *Social Identities*, *9*(2), 225-240.

Williams, J. (2010). Constructing a new professional identity: Career change into teaching. *Teaching and teacher education*, *26*(3), 639-647.

Wingfield, A. H., & Alston, R. S. (2014). Maintaining hierarchies in predominantly White organizations: A theory of racial tasks. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *58*(2), 274-287.

Wingfield, A. H., & Chavez, K. (2020). Getting in, getting hired, getting sideways looks: Organizational hierarchy and perceptions of racial discrimination. *American Sociological Review*, *85*(1), 31-57.

Wingfield, A. H. (2010). Are some emotions marked" whites only"? Racialized feeling rules in professional workplaces. *Social Problems*, *57*(2), 251-268.

Wolcott, H. F. (1999). *Ethnography: A way of seeing*. Rowman Altamira.

Wong, J. (2000). The token "yeah" in nonnative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*(1), 39-67.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. Sage.

Wooten, M. E., & Couloute, L. (2017). The production of racial inequality within and among organizations. *Sociology Compass*, *11*(1), e12446.

Wright, M. M. (2015). *Physics of blackness: Beyond the middle passage epistemology*. University of Minnesota Press.

Yin, R.K., (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods.* Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race ethnicity and education*, *8*(1), 69-91.

Zeamer, C. A. (2014). *Making light of troubles: Evidence for the role of laughter as a prosocial pragmatic device in conversation* (Doctoral dissertation, UC Santa Cruz).

Zembylas, M., & Barker, H. B. (2007). Teachers' spaces for coping with change in the

    context of a reform effort. *Journal of educational change*, *8*(3), 235-256.

Zhao, Y. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A new imperative for teacher

    education. *Journal of teacher education*, *61*(5), 422-431.