



2021

(Re)imagining Community-Engaged Curriculum and Pedagogy: Shifting Subjectivities and Power/Knowledge among Faculty/ Doctoral Students

Anne Catherine Kelly

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kelly, Anne Catherine, "(Re)imagining Community-Engaged Curriculum and Pedagogy: Shifting Subjectivities and Power/Knowledge among Faculty/Doctoral Students" (2021). *Dissertations*. 3872.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3872

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2021 Anne Catherine Kelly

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

(RE)IMAGINING COMMUNITY-ENGAGED CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY:
SHIFTING SUBJECTIVITIES AND POWER/KNOWLEDGE
AMONG FACULTY/DOCTORAL STUDENTS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

PROGRAM IN CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

BY

ANNIE C. KELLY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2021

Copyright by Annie C. Kelly, 2021

All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This doctoral journey was made possible by a variety of individuals who have challenged and supported me throughout my classes and dissertation process. First and foremost, I could not have done this without my best friend and life partner, Kevin. I am indebted to you for always being my biggest fan, and also taking on all of the cooking, cleaning, grocery shopping, and endless dusting during the past year. I could never have made it this far without you.

To Dr. Seungho Moon, my incredible dissertation chair and faculty advisor. I am so thankful you pushed me to be creative in my dissertation and introduced me to new ways of representing research. You have left a lasting impact on my subjectivities, and I am so grateful for your mentorship, guidance, and encouragement during my dissertation. I look forward to more opportunities to connect and collaborate beyond this work!

Thank you to Dr. Charles Tocci and Dr. Patrick Green for providing critical feedback, helpful questions, and creative synergy that has all contributed to forming this dissertation! I feel fortunate to have had the opportunity to learn with and from you during this process.

Thank you to my family and friends for your constant motivation and support, including my parents, Susan and Kevin, sister, Caroline, and in-laws, Pat and Terry, for cheering me on during this academic marathon! My friends Abby, Ashley, Beth, and Brittany, and my Appreciative Advising family (Jenny, Amanda, Mykel, Ben, etc.) whom

have been a huge source of motivation and kindness. To Taylor Swift, who got me through the COVID-19 pandemic with her new music, and who has always served as a source of inspiration.

Last but certainly not least, I wish to thank my doctoral cohort, Ali, Elissa, Kaye, and Wenjin. I have learned so much from each of you, and I will carry your lessons in my heart for evermore.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	vii
(UN)FINISHED LETTERS	1
Dear Doctoral Peers	1
Dear Faculty	7
Dear Foucault	16
DISRUPTION	28
Dear Colleagues	28
Disrupting Structures	31
A Methodological Lens	39
Post Qualitative Inquiry	39
Reconsidering Narrative Inquiry	41
(Re)Imagining Methodology	46
(Re)Thinking Research Methods and Data	51
Reconceptualizing Uprooting Data Analysis	56
Crisis of Representation	61
(Im)Possible Attempts of (Re)Presentation	67
Ethics of Discomfort	77
In Process	79
 APPLICATION: REVISION—INTEGRATION—REVISION OF LITERATURE	
DISCOMFORT IN STORIES	82
Dear Colleagues	82
Julie ⇔ Dr. Sanders	88
Identity Development Politics within Community-Engagement	88
Classroom Interrogations and Disruptions	102
Julie ⇔ Dr. McGrath	112
Governmentality and Power/Knowledge within University/Community	112
Conversations with Foucault	124
Julie ⇔ Dr. Riley	138
Panopticons and Norms within Community-Engaged Research	138
Deconstructing Community-Engaged Scholarship within Review, Promotion, and Tenure	149
FACULTY AND FUTURE FACULTY (UN)DEVELOPMENT	162
DEAR COMMUNITY PARTNERS	175

APPENDIX

A. READER'S THEATER: FACULTY AND FUTURE FACULTY (UN)DEVELOPMENT	178
REFERENCE LIST	187
VITA.....	196

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores new possibilities for researching and representing community-engaged curriculum and pedagogical practices among faculty and their doctoral students. Community-engagement is (re)imagined within nonfiction-fiction writing to provide a line of inquiry that integrates data and theory (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017). I probe, question, and disrupt stable notions of engaged teaching-learning and research. Foucauldian concept of power/knowledge is used to interrogate faculty/doctoral students' shifting subjectivities and discursive construction of community-engagement. Post qualitative inquiry provides a methodological lens to (re)consider new ways of framing community-engagement and acknowledges the crisis of representing research as it is always partial and incomplete. Through the application of poststructuralist ideas and post qualitative inquiry, I create new spaces to examine the norms and sociopolitical and historical contexts of discourse among faculty and doctoral students.

Guided by St. Pierre's (1997a) methodology, I suggest rethinking community-engaged discourse and shifting subjectivities among faculty and doctoral students. Data from interviews, artifacts, and poststructuralist theories are (re)interpreted and entangled inventing four characters, Julie, a doctoral student, and her three faculty members. Julie engages in discourse with her faculty members in various contexts, such as an online class, community partner site, and research team meeting. Within the discourse of these

imaginary figures and spaces, power/knowledge is used to interrogate power operations among faculty and doctoral students. Shifting subjectivities are also analyzed in the pursuit of mutually beneficial and reciprocal forms of community-engagement. I utilize the imaginary figures as a way to examine how we are produced within multiple directions of power circulations and how our own experiences are partial, changing, and incomplete. This new framing contributes to (re)imagining community-engagement within doctoral education. Community-engagement is still in process, ever shifting, and partial in its pursuit of the “not yet.”

(UN)FINISHED LETTERS

Dear Doctoral Peers,

There is not much to do during the COVID-19 quarantine than to work, walk, eat, and memorize the cracks in the floor. How are you managing? I have come to refamiliarize myself with every artifact in our little Chicago apartment. As I look around our third story walk-up, my eyes wander over traces of my southern/Midwest roots. There is a small picture of the Roebling Bridge, which connects Northern Kentucky to Cincinnati, bookends from my Grandma, a picture of my parents, and a clock from my aunt and uncle from our wedding. As I stare at these sentimental pieces, I realize we have not displayed any Catholic-related or religious artifacts (unless the picture of my husband and I in front of the church we were married counts!). In contrast, my parents have a cross in every room of the house, and their yard is decorated with statues of St. Patrick and St. Joseph. While my very large German Irish Catholic family all live in the Cincinnati area, I have not been a permanent resident since I was 18 when I left and continued to move to different parts of the country for education and work. Since moving to Chicago, I have been quick to blame my education and upbringing for not preparing me for the world outside my hometown.

As I walk around our apartment, the most noticeable items are books crammed onto bookshelves and piled on top of one another around my desk. The ones nearest me are all related to my dissertation. Books on community-engaged learning, faculty

development, and poststructuralist works are riddled with post-it notes and wore torn pages. Some of these books were collected before I even started my doctoral coursework and were given as recommendations from former supervisors. I started my doctoral journey part-time while working full-time in a community-engaged learning faculty development center at a mid-sized urban Catholic university. This experience provided a rich opportunity to integrate what I learned in my professional position related to learning portfolio pedagogy and community-engagement with my curriculum and instruction doctoral coursework. As I finish this dissertation, I serve as a visiting assistant professor in a nationally recognized experiential learning division at a large public university. These bookend experiences have complemented and challenged my interrogation of community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship from both a doctoral student and faculty perspective.

I am writing to you today to share my partial, incomplete, and shifting experiences creating my dissertation in the hopes you may provide your critique and insert your own subjectivities into the research. The interrogation of my dissertation are the ways in which community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship is discursively constructed between faculty and their doctoral students. How have you been exposed to community-engagement through your educational experiences? According to the Public Purpose Institute (2021), the Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement refers to the mutually beneficial relationship between higher education and local or global communities to interchange knowledge and assets. I have witnessed and read troubling representations of community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship,

but I also have experienced powerful examples of university-community relationships. They ignite my interest in examining the ways in which community-engaged learning is discussed and normalized between faculty and their doctoral students. As I write this during the COVID-19 global pandemic and racial injustice in America, I find higher education in a unique period to reevaluate public service ideals, ~~create mutually beneficial~~¹ rethink relationships with communities, and problematize how, for whom, and with whom knowledge is created.

As I grappled with community-engaged learning, I struggled to find a theoretical framework that could give me the opportunity to analyze and disrupt the interactions between faculty and their doctoral students. My faculty advisor exposed me to poststructuralist theories which challenged my traditional and humanistic views on qualitative research. When I first read Peters & Burbules (2004) *Poststructuralism and Education Research* in my curriculum theory class, I could not make sense of it. Have you ever experienced this when reading? Through intense study and examination, I decided to use poststructuralist theories within my dissertation research. Specifically, I utilize Foucault's (1980) version of poststructuralist theories to analyze the ways in which power/knowledge operate through discourse. According to Foucault, power is neither good nor bad, but is a way that knowledge and subjects are constructed (Tamboukou, 2008). I apply Foucault's (1980) poststructuralist concept to interrogate the

¹ The ~~striketroughs~~, or what I term *transgressive extracts*, are found throughout my dissertation to interrogate the crisis of representing research and my shifting subjectivities. They are created as a deconstructive reflective pedagogical tool to showcase my own dissonance and ruptures with traditional humanistic qualitative research and create new space to examine the discursive creation of community-engaged learning. I explore this concept more later.

ways in which power/knowledge operate through faculty and doctoral student's community-engaged learning discourse. Poststructuralist theories do not come naturally or easily to me. It has, and still is, a constant struggle, but I also think it is written and analyzed for the site of struggle and the struggle for the unknowingness.

Post qualitative inquiry is used as my dissertation's methodological lens and is a new mode of thinking, reconsidering, and writing of which I never engaged prior to my dissertation. It is rooted in poststructuralist theories and is identified through its problematization of qualitative humanist methodology, non-linear approach, and experimentation (St. Pierre, 2021). The first article I read on post qualitative inquiry was from St. Pierre (2021) and was shared by my faculty advisor. After I finished reading it, I emailed him that it "blew my mind!" Since then, I have shared this article with other doctoral student colleagues, and they revealed similar enthusiasms! While I was exposed to many other forms of research and scholarships from my faculty, this was different. It was exciting, difficult, and new! St. Pierre (2021) directly addresses the impact of doctoral faculty stating, "We academics come to the university for our doctoral studies at a particular time in our lives and learn the truth about this or that from the professors who happen to be there at the time" (p. 2). I could not be more grateful to have been introduced to this complicated and disruptive methodological lens! What research and scholarship recommendations have you engaged from your faculty?

Poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry disrupted my previous held knowledge of qualitative research. Much of the literature I read in graduate school focus on the "right way" for doctoral students to write a qualitative dissertation and conduct

research. Humanistic qualitative research methods are what many doctoral students and faculty, including myself, are taught. Through being fed a steady diet of Creswell and Brickman, while I saw qualitative research as valued in the academy, I also interpreted it as under intense scrutiny and thus had to be constantly validated. The critique stems from positivistic research where data are numericized, quantified, and inserted into systems and machines to be analyzed and interpreted (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). I have read countless qualitative research studies and books that discuss how qualitative researchers underwent a rigorous process for removing their subjectivities through reflexivity, triangulation, and member checking, and implement software, such as NVivo, to better interpret the data. Poststructuralist researchers do not seek to reject these methods but question and problematize them.

The dissertation process was incredibly challenging and made even more so as poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry emphasize research that is new, in process, and has not yet been created (St. Pierre, 2014). There was no roadmap or guide except for the careful study of poststructuralist ideas (St. Pierre, 2018). Poststructuralist research stress the integration of theory in every aspect of the process, including data analysis. I used Jackson and Mazzei (2017) concept of thinking with theory to deconstruct the theory and data binary. Throughout this dissertation, poststructuralist theories, post qualitative inquiry, community-engagement, interview data, and participants' and mine own subjectivities are entangled and folded into one another.

~~The application of~~ Poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry methodological lens create new experimental spaces to examine and explore power

relations between doctoral students and their faculty, as well as university-communities. In this way, power/knowledge is used to interrogate how community-engaged learning is discursively constructed among faculty and doctoral students. The sociopolitical and historical contexts, as well as the norms which operate to encourage doctoral student's adoption of community-engaged learning into their scholarly identity, are interrogated. It is important for you to know as you read my dissertation, I do not have an intended outcome or goal. Instead, this dissertation applies the process of becoming and the pursuit of the "not yet" as poststructuralist research is more concerned about the process than the destination.

The audience I am writing this dissertation is to you, my doctoral peers, for a few reasons. ~~Through designing this research and writing it with doctoral students in mind, my goal is for my peers to understand the application of a theoretical framework, ways of designing research using post-qualitative inquiry, and how community-engaged learning can impact higher education.~~ To be transparent (not that that is possible in poststructuralist research), I crossed out the aforementioned sentence as I initially listed all the points I wanted you to take away from this research. You can see this represented in my ~~striketrough~~. Foucault would be displeased! I have to remind myself that poststructuralist theories do not have an identified research design or outcome, but that this is a process and must be made new each time (St. Pierre, 2021). Just like poststructuralist theories, which do not define terms or use generalizations (Butler, 1992 as cited in St. Pierre, 1997b), it is up to you to examine and interrogate the research and come to your own conclusions.

My imperfect learning process is documented throughout the dissertation as I attempt to interpret, examine, and deconstruct theory, data, and representation. Even as I wrote this letter to you, I do not have an outline. I have at least ten fragmented sentences and paragraphs scattered throughout the page. It is this becoming and the constant evolution of my subjectivities that I approach this research. Foucault believes nothing is ever stable and is always in process. This makes it challenging as research is never an ending process, and it is always in constant motion, shifting, and changing. I share my fragmented and partial experience writing this dissertation to and for you. I hope we talk more soon.

Best,

Fellow Doctoral Student

Dear Faculty,

Whether I was your student or not, I write to you to share my always partial experiences of the ways in which faculty have shifted my subjectivities and experiences. When I think of how you have impacted me over the course of my academic career, I think of the specific instances you shared rules and regulations, affirmed or challenged my goals and directions, and normalized what a teacher should do. The following quotes stand out for reasons I cannot seek to understand:

“As a teacher, if I tell you to write 15 g’s in your planner, you will do as I say.” -

4th Grade School Social Studies Teacher

“I can see you being a good teacher one day.” -High School English Teacher

“Don’t smile until November during your first teaching job.” -College Faculty

As I write you, I am curious to learn what messages have you received from your P-20 teachers? Are they as indiscriminate as mine? Regardless of your response, you have greatly impacted my subjectivities around education, teaching, and working with students. For instance, in grade school, I recall my teachers emphasizing the importance of writing exactly what they told us to put in our daily planners. I recollect my high school English teacher stating I would make a good teacher one day after a class presentation. In college, I pursued a secondary education and history degree where I was told not to smile until November as a teacher so students would not try to take advantage. There are countless one-on-one conversations and classroom discussions that shifted my subjectivities and interrogations on what constitutes a “teacher.”

Many of my conversations with you are situated within Catholic education. When I was growing up, I loved being a part of parochial schools. It was also all I had known. Looking back, my memories are now tainted with years of critiquing the Catholic Church and Catholic education. I recall unsettling memories of grade school field trips to various Catholic-based community services sites. One of the sites was a place where pregnant-out-of-wedlock women could live if they were rejected by their families. Another was to a soup kitchen where I saw more people of color than I had in my entire life. The third site was to a food pantry where we saw stacks and stacks of boxed food for food insecure people. Visiting the sites was not necessarily the issue (or perhaps it was). It was the lack of interrogating power dynamics between the school (including students and teachers) and community, as well as absence of dialogue surrounding the systemic issues of housing and food insecurity or reproductive justice. In my dangerously limited interaction

with the community members, these visits led me to demonized them as “the other” and create wariness (fear?) of their existence. Discussions around service for the poor and praying for those less fortunate than us was consciously or subconsciously integrated within the curriculum. This is the site of my struggle and my discomfort. As you read this example, what experiences related to service and community-engagement impact your subjectivities?

During my doctoral program, I was fortunate to have great teachers in the form of supervisors, mentors, and faculty, who impacted and disrupted my community-engaged teaching-learning subjectivities. During the start of my doctoral journey, my full-time professional position was in a university center focused on community-engaged learning faculty development, curriculum design, and building community partnerships. My supervisor exposed me to foundational knowledge and application of community-engaged learning, including integrative learning and critical reflection, publicly engaged scholarship, and working with and alongside communities. However, as a part-time student, it was challenging to engage in doctoral activities outside of class. I was privileged to have a faculty advisor who invited me to serve on his community-school partnerships research team and involved me in various stages of the process. He also introduced me to poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry and encouraged me to think more critically and creatively with my research. For instance, I had never considered creative modalities to communicate and problematize research with communities, and through this exposure, made me think of scholarship in new ways. Through discourse, these educators have impacted how I view community-engaged

learning, research, and teaching. Perhaps unknowingly, they impacted my research interests in the intersection of doctoral education and community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship.

As I shared, you influenced me throughout my various educational experiences and influenced the trajectory of my dissertation. In the messages I received from you and through the study of engaged scholarship, I learned that community-engaged learning contributes to creating democratic community spaces, challenges how knowledge is constructed, integrates real world application within the curriculum, and when facilitated appropriately, creates mutually beneficial relationships between community and school. I wrote this previous sentence in the early stages of my dissertation proposal, and after discussing community-engaged learning with my faculty participants, reading poststructuralist thought alongside engaged scholarship, and continuing to dialogue with you, my deeply engrained beliefs surrounding community-engaged learning are in process of disruption. As I interrogate this departure from what I previously knew, I am eager to discuss the following questions: What do you mean by “mutually beneficial relationships between university and community”? Is it possible to deconstruct the academic and community knowledge binary? How are communities involved in this experiential “real world application” for students? What is the cost? I look forward to examining these questions with you in the process of becoming.

I was initially intrigued by faculty who integrate community-engaged learning into their academic identity and encourage their doctoral students to adopt these

pedagogical and scholarly practices. I wrote the following excerpt in an earlier version of my dissertation:

O'Meara (2011) states that this exposure is critical as it is improbably doctoral students who are not exposed to community engagement in graduate school will engage with it in their careers. I explore the power/knowledge dynamics (Foucault, 1980) between doctoral students and their faculty, and what research is considered to be "valuable" in the academy. What graduate students are exposed to, or how they are presented what is of value to the academy, will not only impact their scholarship and teaching, but will impact the community, students, and future of higher education. This influences my own subjective interest in this research as I have been exposed to the transformative learning that can come from community engaged learning, but that it needs to be intentional, well-planned, and community driven. In what ways have you been exposed to working with communities, if at all?

I cringe reading this as I unknowingly privileged academic discourse and created the community member as the object under surveillance. During my dissertation writing process, I went through a period of time where I thought all community-engaged learning was bad and deficit-based. How could I research and write unethical, unregulated, and traumatic practices to community? It was not until I was in a faculty meeting at my current institution with service-learning partners that my subjectivities were once again challenged. The community partners shared how our students helped them with projects and implemented skills that they needed to successfully operate during the COVID-19

pandemic. The community partners praised our partnership and thanked us for sponsoring students to work there. I sat stunned during the encounter. Wait a minute, did they really mean this, or did they feel pressured to say thank you? Could this actually have been helpful and productive? Clearly, I will never know what they were thinking, and perhaps their perspectives and subjectivities, like mine, will evolve over time and change. However, in this encounter, it made me pause and reevaluate the power/knowledge relations that operate among community/faculty/doctoral students. The faculty meeting where service-learning partners discussed the ways in which our students assisted in their projects during COVID-19 impacted my subjectivities. Likewise, my readings of community-engaged scholarship alongside poststructuralist thought also shifted and changed my subjectivities. Within my dissertation, I examine the ways community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarly practices are discussed and normalized by faculty and their interactions with doctoral students.

In prior versions of my dissertation, I integrated community-engaged scholarship to validate my research. As I further interrogated and examined poststructuralist research, I began to struggle utilizing community-engaged scholarship as much of it generalized, essentialized, and themed doctoral student, faculty, and community experiences. Poststructuralist research resists this essentialist and generalized thinking (Lyotard, 1984). An example of this is found in Community-Engaged

<p>essentialized, and themed doctoral student, faculty, and community experiences. Poststructuralist research resists this essentialist and generalized thinking (Lyotard, 1984). An example of this is found in Community-Engaged</p>	<p>Community-Engaged Scholarship Deconstructive Space A</p>
	<p>“Students will develop a commitment to a specific identity (e.g., teacher, researcher, engaged scholar) based in large part on the work they do in graduate school, the network they develop, their chosen commitments, and the degree to which the environment around them confirms or rejects these commitments” (Colbeck, 2008 as cited in O’Meara, 2011, p. 186).</p>

Scholarship Deconstructed Space A. Foucault would interrogate these fixed and stable categories of identity and instead examine the discursive construction of identity and these aforementioned experiences (Agger, 1991; Lather, 1992). Subjectivities, identities, and experiences are always partial, shifting, and incomplete (Britzman, 1995; Pillow, 2003). Through this dissertation, when I integrate community-engaged scholarship, I seek to disrupt it and attempt to utilize my dissertation to create new discourses surrounding faculty/doctoral student power/knowledge discourse surrounding community-engaged learning.

Within the remaining paragraphs of my letter to you, I insert *deconstructive spaces* in the form of tables. These include examples of community-engaged literature excerpts I initially wrote but now need disruption. For instance, the deconstructive space A excerpt was initially within the previous paragraph. This is intended as an attempt to represent my shifting subjectivities related to community-engaged scholarship and literature within this dissertation. I also use it to try to showcase disruptions in my thinking and analyze my dissertation as constantly in process.

Poststructuralist theories resist a return to what is already known (Britzman, 1995). It problematizes terms such as “socialization” (Deconstructive Space B) as poststructuralist research examines the power relations between subjects which may not be realized (Foucault, 1980; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008; Miller & Macedo, 2018). For instance,

Community-Engaged Scholarship Deconstructive Space B

My takeaways are faculty have the opportunity to validate the importance of community-engaged learning, its position in the academy, and exposure to their doctoral students. In this way, faculty socialize their graduate students and largely prepare them for careers in academia (Eatman, 2018).

O'Meara (2011) states that it is improbable graduate students who are not exposed to community engagement in graduate school or are affirmed and encouraged to pursue this course of study, will engage with it later on. Foucault would deconstruct this statement to inquire about the ways in which faculty/doctoral student power/knowledge operates to encourage doctoral students to adopt community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship into their academic identities. Foucault (1980) discusses power as productive and relational meaning power does not just come from faculty, but it is also operationalized by doctoral students, too.

Foucault (1977) would also analyze the ways in which norms operate within a sociopolitical and historical context to regulate community-engaged integration into subjectivities. For instance, the quote in Community-Engaged Scholarship Deconstructed

Space C is disrupted utilizing poststructuralist thought. Poststructuralist ideas questions the idea of “professional identity” or “professional orientation” as identity is not fixed and is discursively constructed, as well as always evolving

<p>Community-Engaged Scholarship Deconstructive Space C</p>
--

<p>“They find, as others have, that if graduate students do not have an apprenticeship of sorts in engagement, (Golde 2008) and if they do not develop professional identity as engaged scholars (Colbeck 2008), they will not develop the knowledge, skills, and professional orientation (Austin and McDaniels 2006) to truly become engaged scholars (O’Meara 2008c)” (O’Meara, 2011, p. 186).</p>

(Miller & Macedo, 2018). It would also interrogate the sociopolitical and historical contexts of the doctoral student’s discursive experiences prior to graduate school and analyze the operationalized academic norms in which the subject is exposed. In this way, community-engaged scholarship is constantly disrupted and problematized to resist a return to what is known and essentialist tendencies.

The dissertation examines the sociopolitical and historical contexts that construct faculty's exposure of community-engaged learning to their graduate students. Foucault's articulation of history is different than a linear timeline of historical events and processes. Foucault instead utilizes the term "genealogy" which analyzes a concept throughout time to the current-day and is comprised of discourses, knowledge, and objects (Jardine, 2005). It is often called the "history of the present" (Foucault, 1980). I used to identify contexts as hierarchical and linear as referred to in Deconstructed Space D. Through studying Foucault (1980), I recognize the context he is referring is local and relational. The various contexts discussed in this research includes classroom spaces, research meetings, and a community partner site, operate within power relations where power/knowledge are always in production and process (Foucault, 1980). Through the application of Foucault's (1980) power/knowledge, the study seeks to explore in what ways community-engaged learning is discursively constructed, as well as the norms and historical and sociopolitical contexts it is situated.

<p>Community-Engaged Scholarship Deconstructive Space D</p>
--

<p>While faculty are a significant influence within graduate student exposure to community-engaged learning, the study also seeks to examine the sociopolitical and historical contexts that construct faculty's exposure of community-engaged learning to their graduate students. Contexts include institution context (Boyer, 1990), departmental structure (Glassick et al., 1997; O'Meara, et al., 2011), and community partnerships (Dostilio, 2017).</p>

The aforementioned deconstructive spaces represent my ruptures with community-engaged scholarship and the resistance to generalized and essentialized thinking. Even as I insert these spaces in an attempt to showcase my shifting subjectivities, I recognize that this research and my subjectivities are still in process,

evolving, and continue the need to be reinterpreted and disrupted. Should I continue to write, I am certain that the space contents will grow and change.

Within this process, I still grapple with community-engagement. The various contexts we have engaged, including classes, research teams, and one-on-one conversations, have all shifted my subjectivities related to community-engagement and university-community partnerships. I lean into this site of tension, uncertainty, and troubling as I engage in this research. It continues to be messy and unclear to me whether service is good or whom it is for (Davis, 2006). However, if we apply Foucault's power/knowledge, it destabilizes this good/bad binary and instead provides us with a new space to interrogate the power dynamics among faculty/doctoral students/community. I leave you with this question, in what ways has this letter shifted your subjectivities and challenged your experiences related to community-engaged learning? It is through these power dynamics and power/knowledge we explore this interrogation.

Your former student,

Annie

Dear Foucault,

What do I say to such a notable theorist? I have long wished to talk with you about your concepts of power/knowledge and eagerly write you to share how I am using your work in my dissertation. When I first read your work in Peters and Burbules (2004) *Poststructuralism and Education Research*, I instantly regretted having signed-up to present poststructuralist theories in my curriculum theory research class! According to Peter and Burbules, you do not want associate yourself with poststructuralist or

structuralist thought, of which you are often placed. I interpret that as your resistance to categories and terms which create binaries and rigid structures. While I respectfully acknowledge your refusal of definite categorization, you have impacted my subjectivities surrounding poststructuralist thought, and thus, within my dissertation, I refer to your version of poststructuralist interpretations as Foucauldian ideas of poststructuralist theories. This is an attempt to acknowledge there are multiple frames of knowing and resist categorizing your scholarship. I am still in the process of studying your books, which I consider dense, inaccessible, and without a clear answer.

I am sure you heard this before, but I was initially frustrated by your ideologies. Why not say what you mean? Upon further analysis, I then realized that evading tension is not the point of your thought, nor poststructuralist research. I changed my strategies of studying your work and carefully outlined each article and chapter, reread passages countless times, and relied on curriculum theory encyclopedias. I found examining your works and poststructuralist theories is a personal journey, and since studying your concepts, I sense my subjectivities shifting and changing. It is my own process of becoming and interrogating this scholarship that is intertwined within the study.

I share an excerpt from one of my first papers on poststructuralist thought in graduate school below:

Professionally and personally, I categorize and label my experiences, research, and identities, so I think that poststructuralism will assist me in becoming a “better” researcher as it challenges my fixed classifications of experiences and analyzes it from a social, historical, and political lens. . . Moon’s (2018) research

question challenges the boundaries of an international professor and U.S. native student's relationship and deconstructs the existing binaries between them. Using lived experiences as the design process for deconstructing identity and binary, Moon applies poststructuralist framework of decentralizing power and deconstructing traditional identity and relationship labels. Moon (2018) states, "While using stable labels of self/other, by listing categories of U.S. born/international, native/non-native, and so forth, I may not pay sufficient attention to the discursive practice of the teacher-student relationship" (pg. 3). Moon goes on to indicate that when he uses categories to define relationships or interactions with students, he does not actively examine its intricacies of cause and effect. Foucault discussed one of the key characteristics of poststructuralism is to not categorize and create binaries and instead remove divisions that create categories. While this is a hallmark of poststructuralism, Moon draws from Butler (2009) who adds that one's existence is not independent of another and that through interactions with others, subjectivity is discursively made.

Foucault, I share this excerpt with you in an attempt to capture my shifting subjectivities as it relates to the self/other and my entrenched binary way of thinking. Moon's (2018) article first introduced me to your key concepts of binary deconstruction and subjectivities. Reading articles, such as Moon's, where your work is applied, destabilized my thinking and challenged me to consider educational research in new ways. This application is critical as I deconstruct faculty/doctoral student discourses surrounding community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship. Throughout my dissertation, I

included excerpts from my past doctoral papers to analyze and interrogate my own subjectivities in relationship to poststructuralist thought and community-engaged learning. The use of such artifacts is an attempt to rupture the articulation of research as stable and static. It is always in process and ever changing just like my subjectivities.

As I read about your scholarly works in graduate school, it is not without hesitation that I selected your concept of power/knowledge for my dissertation. I was (and still am) anxious to apply such a complicated idea and push it into my research. I borrow your power/knowledge to interrogate the ways community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarly practices are discursively constructed among faculty and their doctoral students. I find it intriguing that your interpretation of power within the power/knowledge discursive context is not seen as negative or forceful, but as a way of constructing knowledge, truth, and the subject (Tamboukou, 2008). Applying your ideas on power, the research explores the ways in which faculty and doctoral student's discursive construction create norms around community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship within doctoral education. These discourses are historically, socially, and culturally constructed and are further analyzed through their sociopolitical contexts (Miller, 2010). Your provocative ideas are inexplicably integrated into every process of my dissertation research to disrupt and deconstruct methods, analyses, and interpretations.

I have learned much from your scholarship, as well as post qualitative inquiry, which is the methodological lens for this study. ~~I hope you approve of this framework as~~ It is rooted within poststructuralist theories. Post qualitative inquiry emphasizes the study

of poststructuralist ideas as a way to first investigate this form of inquiry (St. Pierre, 2014, 2018, 2021). It is considered a form of experimentation as it does not have a fixed methodology and focuses research efforts on things that have not been created (St. Pierre, 2018). There are no pre-established processes for creating a post qualitative study (St. Pierre, 2014), and it does not have a defined way of creating a research design, data collection methods, or data analysis (St. Pierre, 2021). Because of a lack of defined structure, traditional dissertation and research studies situated in a humanistic qualitative research methodology can come into conflict (St. Pierre, 2018). Foucault, this has been both an intimidating and freeing process as my dissertation introduces a new design, data collection, and analysis, and considers new frames of possibilities and knowing!

Through the application of your power/knowledge concept and post qualitative inquiry, the research is presented in non-traditional ways through non-fiction fiction writing and the creative representation of artifacts to allow the reader to interpret the research through their own discursively constructed experiences and subjectivities. I stress the importance that this research does not have an intended outcome, but raises more questions, tensions, and uncertainty in the research. There are four characters created within this nonfiction-fiction dissertation who have evolved out of the interviews and artifacts of six interview participants, my subjectivities, and poststructuralist theories. No character is based off of one interview subject but is an entanglement of stories and experiences that are positioned against one another to disrupt, problematize, and question community-engaged learning and doctoral student education.

Foucault, you often discuss subjectivities in your research. You posed questions related to subjectivities in your lectures to students at the Collège de France about the evolution of the subject as an object of knowledge and the schemes that shape construction of experience and knowledge (Foucault, 1997b). You create no clear fixed definition of subjectivities, but you call it into being through your inquiry. Through this research, I attempt to interrogate my subjectivities which are integrated into the characters and chapters. Poststructuralist thought indicates that our subjectivities shift and change through discourse and interactions with one another (Davis, 1994; Miller & Macedo, 2018). In other words, the self/other or researcher/researched binary is deconstructed where my researcher participants are discursively created because of me, and I am created through them. I recognize that even inserting my own subjectivities and positioning the “I,” which is never stable or static, is still problematic (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013). I look forward to discussing this more with you.

As I stated, I do not have a desired outcome for the research (not even to complete it), nor do I have preexisting research methods. The readers will come to their own conclusions on how power/knowledge is generated through the faculty and doctoral student discourse surrounding community-engaged learning. This research might not (or does not?), have a clean-cut ending, and if you read it again, you might have new interpretations. Through the application of poststructuralist theoretical framework and post qualitative inquiry methodological lens, I explore faculty and doctoral student power/knowledge discourses to destabilize community-engaged learning norms and

contexts. It is through this creation that new space for discourse is in the process of becoming.

What intrigued me about poststructuralist theories is that such theories challenge the use of fixed definition of terms. Instead, they focus on discursive construction of realities and "truths" and pay attention to a political construction of terms (Butler, 1992 as cited in St. Pierre, 1997b). Poststructuralist theories explore how these truths and knowledge are created within power/knowledge discourse (Moon, 2019; Tamboukou, 2008). Community-engaged learning also has various shifting meanings and contexts. ~~In its essence, it is a partnership between the university and community towards a reciprocal constructive interchange of knowledge (Dostilio et al., 2012; Driscoll, 2008). There is foundational research on the significance of both community engaged learning within undergraduate education and community engaged learning faculty development (Berkey et al., 2018), but little scholarship that analyzes community engagement as discursively constructed between graduate students' and their faculty.~~ Applying poststructuralist thought, this research resists returning to known definitions of community-engagement, and instead, the dissertation provides new direction in literature to interrogate the ways in which community-engaged learning is discursively constructed among faculty and doctoral students.

As I shared with you, Foucault, poststructuralist theories are the theoretical framework that utilizes post qualitative inquiry as the lens for which the study is interrogated and explored. I am both intrigued by this research's ontological and epistemological theoretical framework and find it completely outside my comfort zone.

The theories are complicated, dense, and difficult and disrupt my former ideas of scholarship. My examination of poststructuralist theories pushes me to challenge my own position as a researcher, writer, and educator as I am constantly learning and creating something new, and then, subsequently challenged to deconstruct it again! As soon as I read a new article or book on poststructuralist ideas, I have to rewrite and reimagine this study and deconstruct my own deeply held humanistic methodological practices. An example of a sentence I wrote that I had to initially remove after further exploring poststructuralist theories is as follows:

~~Throughout the study, I have conducted various reflexivities acknowledging and recognizing my privilege identities, biases associated with community engaged learning, and assumptions I make about individuals and their contexts. Through this research, I hope to remove my subjectivity as best as possible through ongoing reflexive approaches and ensuring voices from the participants are centered.~~

I now recognize the statement entirely contradicts poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry. Instead, my subjectivities are inserted, studied, and problematized within the research. Additionally, I interrogate the deconstruction of “voice” (St. Pierre, 2008) along with other commonly held humanistic qualitative research methods as central to this scholarship. I provide more examples of these “removed” sentences as ~~striketroughs~~, which I call *transgressive extracts*, throughout my dissertation. This is intended to demonstrate my epistemological ruptures with traditional humanistic

qualitative methodological approaches and lean into the discomfort of examining the discursive constructs surrounding community-engaged learning.

Transgressive extracts serve as a deconstructive reflective pedagogical tool as I interrogate new frames of exploring community-engaged learning. However, I recognize that experience is not stable, and thus, reflection on it cannot make it known (Miller & Macedo, 2018). This transgressive extract concept came from Lather's (1993) transgressive validity, which focuses on the impossibilities of representation and problematizes the construction of truth. In examining my own rifts and shifting processes, I also recognize my subjectivities are still partial, shifting, and evolving, which makes representing it difficult and impossible (Pillow, 2003). Foucault, I look forward to talking further about these transgressive extracts and ruptures in my learning.

Now for sharing my research questions! Initially, when I wrote the first draft of the questions represented in the transgressive extract ~~strike throughs~~ below, I did not have a specific poststructuralist concept in mind. At the time, I did not think it was noteworthy, but upon further study of poststructuralist thought, I realized that in selecting a theorist and their concept I could open up a more possibilities within the research. I selected your version, Foucault, as I thought that your focus on power/knowledge could assist in interrogating the discursive construction among faculty and their doctoral students around community-engaged learning. I attempted to rewrite them again, and after many iterations, I still do not think they are finalized, but as with poststructuralist thought, are they ever?

Currently, the main research question considers, ~~in what ways are graduate students developed into community engaged faculty, if any, through professional development?~~ in what ways are community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarly practices discursively constructed by faculty and their interactions with doctoral students? Followed-by the sub-questions of:

- ~~What power/knowledge discourses are operating within community engagement professional development of graduate students?~~ In what ways are power/knowledge discourses operating through this exposure to community engaged teaching-learning and scholarly practices?
- ~~What external forces impact graduate students' community engagement professional development?~~ What are the sociopolitical and historical contexts that construct faculty's exposure of community-engaged learning to their doctoral students?
- ~~What norms are upheld and/or deconstructed within graduate students' professional development on community engagement?~~ In what ways are norms constructed and operationalized to encourage doctoral student's adoption of community-engaged learning in teaching and scholarship?

As it stands, this study explores the ways community-engaged teaching and scholarly practices are discursively constructed by faculty and their doctoral students, as well as identifying and examining the sociopolitical and historical context and norms that are constructed to encourage doctoral students' adoption of community-engaged learning. In your writing, Foucault, you talk at length about genealogies and how discourse is rooted

in sociopolitical, historical, and cultural contexts (Foucault, 1980). I attempt to analyze discourse using your interrogations of history.

As I wrote, rewrote, read, and rewrote some more, I attempted to examine how poststructuralist thought, as well as your writings, discussed how subjectivities are constructed through discourse. While doctoral students often write to revise and edit, I write to further problematize my research and fold theory, method, literature, and data together. “Poststructuralist researchers acknowledge contradictions and instabilities in all assemblages of human knowledge most especially their own.” (Miller, 2010, p. 677). This application of poststructuralist thought resulted in the addition of the following research questions as this research is constantly in the process of becoming.

- In what ways have my subjectivities shifted, and thus, discursively constructed in my interactions with the participants and research readings?
- In what ways are faculty subjectivities discursively constructed in their interactions with their doctoral students?

These added questions seek to address in what ways subjectivities are discursively constructed both from my participants and my own interrogations. As previously stated, the takeaways from the research are defined by the reader as they interrogate and explore the study through their own subjectivities and experiences. The research questions went through many iterations, and as poststructuralist thought indicates, are always in process, shifting, and never complete.

Foucault, I am writing to you to share the ways in which your concept of power/knowledge through discourse are applied to my dissertation. Your concepts are

difficult and complex, but I think they also make room for new possibilities and exciting tensions. I only wish I could talk to you about your perspectives. Perhaps we will meet one day and discuss. In the meantime, I can imagine and wonder what it would be like if we crossed paths.

Best regards,

Annie

DISRUPTION

Dear Colleagues,

Have you ever looked back on your old assignments and papers in an attempt to deconstruct your learning over time? As I write my dissertation, I return to former writings in order to create tension and disrupt my subjectivities. I include the following excerpt from a curriculum theory paper where the assignment was to analyze theory-to-practice articles. I selected poststructuralist theories and found an article written by a doctoral student on her graduate school experience. This excerpt of my paper is both a way to further introduce you to poststructuralist theories and attempt to demonstrate my shifting subjectivities on poststructuralist thought knowing they can never be fully represented. (In advance, please excuse the poor writing!):

Graduate students' voices and experiences are often unheard within research on graduate students. Skorobohacz (2014) is a graduate student who wrote about her graduate experiences from a poststructuralist lens. She uses 'Deleuzian-inspire' reflective research questions to explore her own critical graduate incidents.

Within her research design, Skorobohacz uses autoethnography on how life events can be contradictory and disorganized through reflections and interactions (Holman Jones, 2005). She used presentations, course reflections, assignments, and a reflective journal to identify and analyze her own sense of becoming.

Through the use of poststructuralism, Skorobohacz ensured she would not

develop her story as a “grand narrative” (Williams, 2005) and not simplify curriculum and identity construction. She then analyzes two critical incidents. The first critical incident was when her professor gave feedback to use intersectionality framework when discussing social identity categories. Her second critical incident was attending a presentation on academic life in which she realized she was spending almost half of her time within university service instead of the recommended 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. It was recommended she reduce her service load, and in response, she shares her frustrations with how tenure review perceive service as negative. In her analysis, Skorobohacz questions her ability to continue working within higher education to ensure her values are not comprised. In summary, Skorobohacz (2014) states, “I am committed to going beyond course requirements and beyond formal curricula, to listen to others’ stories, and to cultivate opportunities to make meaning of my learning” (p. 68). Through analyzing her own experiences, Skorobohacz problematizes fixed binaries and institutionalized expectations using a poststructuralism lens.

Skorobohacz (2014) applies poststructuralist theories to analyze her graduate school critical incidents. Along with my cringe-worthy writing, there are some key poststructuralist points and critiques missing, but I lacked the articulation of the theories’ ideas to interrogate Skorobohacz’s article. As I analyze poststructuralist scholarship, I return to my original writings to critique my interpretations and open up contradictions within my deeply engrained humanistic research epistemology. I encourage you to do the

same to constantly probe, problematize, and interrogate past writings in an attempt to interrogate current readings and analyses. Poststructuralist theories are dense and difficult, and through critical examination, poststructuralist principles unfold. Skorobohaz's article and my deconstructed analysis provide an example to create questions to explore poststructuralist theories:

- Skorobohaz uses 'Deleuzian-inspired' questions as 'reflective analyses' on 'critical incidents.' In what ways is reflexivity problematized in poststructuralist research?
- Skorobohaz (2014) states, "I use poststructuralist discourse as a springboard to critically examine pivotal moments of learning that have led to transformations in how I understand myself and my experiences in higher education" (p. 63). In what ways, if any, can poststructuralist thought be used to 'understand' the self and experience?
- In what ways can poststructuralist theories be applied to interrogating identity politics (referring to the feedback she received to include intersectionality)?
- Skorobohaz provides an example of discussing faculty expectations with her supervisor. In applying Foucault (1980), in what ways are power/knowledge operating through such discursive construction?

Creating questions that interrogate research using a poststructuralist lens can assist in examining the theories and applying them to our interrogation of community-

engaged scholarship and research. I add footnotes¹ into my own dissertation analysis chapters to insert such deconstructive questions in an effort to disrupt subjectivities and research as stable, as well as problematize humanistic qualitative research methods. Additionally, as I add excerpts from former papers into my dissertation, I hope to create further methods and tools for you to consider using in your own research as a means to constantly analyze your shifting subjectivities, experiences, and attempt to document your process of becoming. Reviewing my own in-process learning, I do not intend to showcase my learning as it was or as it is but that it is in a constant state of movement. Instead, I interpret, reinterpret, deconstruct, and repeat such learning as they are always in process and shifting. The footnotes, excerpts from papers, and transgressive extracts represented in ~~strike throughs~~, are used as deconstructive pedagogical tools to analyze and disrupt my past work, destabilize the research, and situate interrogations in new, evolving contexts. I look forward to discussing poststructuralist thoughts and concepts with you.

Kind regards,

Annie

Disrupting Structures

Foucauldian concepts and post qualitative inquiry are used to frame this study and disrupt traditional humanistic qualitative methodological representations of research. This research seeks to investigate how community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarly

¹ St. Pierre (2016) created ‘asides’ in her dissertation writing that were moments where writing just happened, and she played with the merger of literature, data, and theory. This led her to disrupt and resist traditional linear academic writing, and instead, experiment. In my footnotes, I borrow this concept from St. Pierre to ask questions, interrogate, and invite the insertion of subjectivities within the writing space.

practices are discursively constructed among faculty and the interactions with their graduate students, as well as the sociopolitical and historical contexts and norms that encourage doctoral student adoption of-community engaged learning scholarship and teaching into their academic identity.

Poststructuralist theories are influenced by feminist, postcolonialism, linguistic, literary, and cultural studies but occurred as a response to structuralism's scientific and structural status (Miller, 2010). Structuralism analyzes the science of structures and first emerged in twentieth-century France under the influence of Ferdinand de Saussure, Roman Jakobson, Claude Levi-Strauss, and Jean Piaget. Saussure influenced structuralism by his study of linguistics and how formal language influences speech (Peters & Burbules, 2004). Levi-Strauss, who was introduced to structuralism by Jakobson, analyzed how our cultural background and society consciously or unconsciously construct rules that govern language and speech (Peters & Burbules, 2004). Piaget discussed structures in terms of ideas of wholeness, transformation, and self-regulation. He stated how law-like explanations can be given when analyzed through scientific structures, and he illustrated difference between individual and epistemic subject (Peters & Burbules, 2004). These structuralist thinkers were influential in the emergence of poststructuralist concepts, specifically through discourse, speech and language, rules, and self-regulation.

In comparison, poststructuralist theories, which have multiple versions, and hence, why it is pluralized, came from the work of Nietzsche and Heidegger, who are considered its precursors. In some scholarship, poststructuralist theorists include Michel

Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and Jacques Derrida, who, like many first wave Poststructuralist thinkers, were from France. These theorists were against structuralist's universal frames (Lather, 1992). Derrida stated that language is not static but can be comprised of rules that are temporary and conditional (Miller, 2010). Derrida (1974) analyzes words and their meanings in an attempt to deconstruct and destabilize the structure of the center. Lyotard (1984) contributed to poststructuralist theories with a critique on 'grand narratives' that are defined as the stories told by people about their beliefs in order to provide validity to their culture. Additionally, Foucault's (1980) created the term power/knowledge in that knowledge is embedded and created within power and discourse. These early contributors influenced poststructuralist concept and thought.

The various characteristics and concepts associated with poststructuralist theories is that reality cannot be known, the subject and discourse are intertwined, and truth is problematized (Lather, 2006). My dissertation advisor encouraged me to select one version of poststructuralist theories as there are many and apply the theory's concept to my dissertation. The primary poststructuralist theories I have selected to use is Foucault due to his interrogation of subjectivities, power/knowledge discourse, surveillance and norms, and identity politics. This does not mean other theorists and researchers, such as Derrida and Lyotard, have not impacted this research, but that I primarily use a Foucauldian perspective in the construction and analysis of this dissertation. Below I briefly overview the poststructuralist concepts of subjectivities, power/knowledge,

identity politics, and norms. I elaborate on these concepts later as they are plugged and threaded throughout my analysis.

Poststructuralist researchers believe that subjectivities are always conflicting, situated in a sociopolitical and historical context, and reproduced in discourse whether verbally or in thought (Miller, 2010). Foucault (1997b) does not provide a succinct definition of subjectivities but discusses and interrogates it through the subject's contextual evolution and relationship with knowledge and experience, which he calls 'technologies of self.' In this way, subjectivities are constantly shifting and unstable (Davis, 1994). I added two research questions to my dissertation on subjectivities as I was interviewing participants. They include the following: In what ways have my subjectivities shifted and thus, discursively constructed in my interactions with the participants and research readings? In what ways are faculty subjectivities discursively constructed in their interactions with their doctoral students? I added these questions after my dissertation proposal defense as I began to interrogate the crisis of representing research and my own positionality as researcher. As Miller and Macedo (2018) discuss, subjects are produced discursively and in relation with the other, which can apply to my interview participants. This poststructuralist concept of subjectivity is integrated throughout this dissertation to disrupt a binary and linear way of thinking of self in relation to the other.

Foucault coined the term power/knowledge signifying that knowledge and power are inexplicably connected and arise in discourse (Foucault, 1977). Foucault's concept is applied to my overarching research question of "In what ways are community-engaged

teaching-learning and scholarly practices discursively constructed by faculty and their interactions with doctoral students?” followed by the sub-question, “In what ways are power/knowledge discourses operating through this exposure to community engaged teaching-learning and scholarly practices?” Foucault (1980) believes that a subject cannot be outside of power, power is productive and creates knowledge, and power is exercised over being possessed. In turn, knowledge can impact the power structures that produce it (Gutting, 2005). In this way, power and knowledge produce and modify one another. In the analysis of power/knowledge, Foucault states that discourse be analyzed at the local level to interrogate how they operate within larger systems (Jardine, 2005).

Power/knowledge is applied to examine the ways in which faculty and doctoral student discourse produces and is produced by community-engaged learning practices. As Foucault (1980) discusses, there is no binary structure in power relations, meaning that faculty and doctoral students are a part of a larger machine where they are producing power/knowledge simultaneously. This provides a new framing for how knowledge is produced, regulated, and modified as it resists a top-down approach.

Power/knowledge is contextually embedded into sociopolitical and cultural contexts. I attempt to apply this to the research question, “What are the sociopolitical and historical contexts that construct faculty’s exposure of community-engaged learning to their doctoral students?” As a history and secondary education major in college, how I studied and trained to teach history is very different than Foucault’s interpretation of history, which he calls genealogy. According to Foucault, genealogy examines a provocative idea throughout history into the present (Jardine, 2005). For instance,

Foucault studied the prison system in France throughout time and context. Foucault (1980) described genealogy as,

a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledge, discourses, domains of objects, etc., without having to make reference to a subject which is either transcendental in relation to the field of events or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history. (p. 117)

Foucault (1980) called genealogy the “history of the present” (p. 31). Influenced by Nietzschean thought, Foucault indicated that genealogy is embedded within archival research and focuses on seemingly insignificant information or details with no immediate end (Tamboukou, 2008). Thus, Foucault resisted grand narratives of history and focused on small pieces of information that would have larger impacts (Gutting, 2005).

Genealogy analyzes truth and its commitment to processes and procedures since knowledge is produced through power (Tamboukou, 2008). When analyzing genealogy narratives, researchers assess what is unspoken, the order in which it was spoke, and its historical and social contexts (Tamboukou, 2008). In this way, genealogy is applied to the interrogation of the historical and sociopolitical contexts within faculty and doctoral student discourse around community-engaged learning.

According to poststructuralist thought, identities cannot be placed into categories as they are constantly shifting and unstable, and thus, cannot be fixed (Choi, 2006).

Poststructuralist researchers believe that power relations are always operating and are contextually dependent (Choi, 2006). Thus, power is not contained to pre-established categories (Choi, 2006). Poststructuralist theories contribute a political interrogation of

identities within identity politics and politics of identities. While critical race theories also use identity politics, Poststructuralist ideas differ as they create and disrupt spaces to rethink representing marginalized identities and voices. In this way, identity politics and poststructuralist thought trouble these fixed identities and keep them moving and in process (Lather, 2006). Applying this notion of unstable identities, poststructuralist theories resist identities as given and subjects as the beginning of knowledge (Scott, 1991). Instead, analysis should interrogate the local relationship between subjects rather than identifying the subject's identities, which are unstable (Choi, 2006). Choi (2006) gives an example that instead of only naming the social identities of an educator, the teacher identity is examined in relation to how their subjectivities have changed as a new educator. Within the application of poststructuralist concepts, identity politics destabilizes essentialist thinking of identity, experience, and opens up new frames of investigating discourse.

Foucault investigates the ways in which power/knowledge create norms, including how subjects act and self-regulate (Jardine, 2005). This is represented in the research question, "In what ways are norms constructed and operationalized to encourage doctoral student's adoption of community-engaged learning in teaching and scholarship?" Disciplinary power, such as in the form of examinations and surveillance, enable categories to form, which establish norms (Foucault, 1977). For example, Foucault (1977) states that the normal is reflected in the standardized curriculum within schools that controls and regulates. Normalizing is a concept utilized by Foucault that enable decisions in the form of rewards and punishments to categorize subjects within a

specific norm (Jardine, 2005). Norms can also judge whether a standard is abnormal, which can then restrict and control it (Gutting, 2005). This application of norms is applied to doctoral students' and faculty's community-engaged learning discourse, which is regulated by standards that constitute what is acceptable and what is considered abnormal.

Poststructuralist theories emphasize the process of always becoming and one is constantly evolving (Peters & Burbules, 2004). The process of becoming merges with poststructuralist's troubling of the 'crisis of representation' in research that there is no unified and organized narrative (Britzman, 1995). Because of this, poststructuralist researchers know their research is never perfectly reported because they also grapple with representation in their research (Miller, 2010). Through the study, the process of becoming reflects the contradictions in human knowledge and recognizes that language and the self are always in process (Miller, 2010). In a similar way, this opens up new possibilities and frames for my research participants as they are also just becoming. It is important to be open to the unknown and the possibilities of yet within poststructuralist research (Moon, 2016).

Poststructuralist concepts, such as subjectivities, power/knowledge discourse, identity politics, and norms are applied to interrogate community-engaged discourse between doctoral students and their faculty. It opens up new possibilities to rethink, deconstruct, and frame new ways of analyzing community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship. Through becoming, this dissertation emphasizes the process of constantly changing and evolving rather than specify an intended outcome.

A Methodological Lens

Post Qualitative Inquiry

Post qualitative was a term first used by St. Pierre (2021) to signal her foundational beliefs that ‘the posts’ could not be aligned nor were compatible with humanist qualitative methodology. Post qualitative inquiry came from the posts, specifically poststructuralist theories, and the interrogation of humanistic qualitative practices (St. Pierre, 2021). Post qualitative inquiry is unique as it does not have a validated or existing research design, data collection methods, or data analysis, but it’s core stems from studying poststructuralist theories (St. Pierre, 2021). It’s fitting there are no existing research designs as poststructuralist theories reflects the antithesis of telling a researcher what to do (St. Pierre, 2021). It is the researcher’s role to create new research and methods that have not yet been created. Post qualitative inquiry is described as,

It never exists, it never is. It must be invented, created differently each time, and one study called post qualitative will not look like another. The goal of post qualitative inquiry is not to systematically repeat a preexisting research reprocess to produce a recognizable result but to experiment and create something new and different that might not be recognizable in existing structures of intelligibility. (St. Pierre, 2021, p. 4)

Post qualitative inquiry is difficult and daunting because it is the construction of something original and constantly becoming. In this way, post qualitative inquiry is in alignment with the humanities, philosophy, sciences, literature, history, and art, rather than the social sciences, as the standards of excellence are more associated with those

disciplines (St. Pierre, 2021). Thus, post qualitative inquiry is considered an experimentation as it does not rely on a stable methodology and focuses on things that are in process and not already complete (St. Pierre, 2018). In this way, this dissertation is also an “experiment” born of something new, constantly in process, and thrives off of the not yet.

Post qualitative inquiry is also a response to the tension between humanist qualitative methodology and poststructuralist theories (St. Pierre, 2021). Poststructuralist theories have difficulty connecting with the humanist qualitative methodology as the latter is human-centered and poststructuralist theories are not rooted within a methodology (St. Pierre, 2021). Humanist beliefs center on representing realities and describing the subject and experience in as rich detail as possible with the researcher positioned as knowing (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017). Humanist qualitative methodology emerges from a person’s lived experience and an Enlightenment era focused on humans, language, knowledge, and power among others (St. Pierre, 2014). It is the creation of categories around identities that can be researched and essentialized (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017). Poststructuralist resists generalizing or essentializing the subject like humanistic qualitative methodology.

Post qualitative inquiry uses humanistic qualitative methodology terminology but deconstructs and uses it differently (St. Pierre, 2018). The terms are then disrupted, problematized, and made to take on new meanings (St. Pierre, 1997a). Thus, creating new terms may not be helpful (St. Pierre, 2008). “. . . even if we doubt it is possible or desirable, truth matters, especially in research. It follows, then, that there is no need to

give up on voice but rather to bring into question its authorizing power" (St. Pierre, 2008, p. 323). In comparison, humanist qualitative methodology is not incorrect (St. Pierre, 2014), nor is it the refusal of acknowledging the legitimacy of qualitative inquiry or social science research, but rather, a focus on how post qualitative inquiry is different and cannot be compared to these methodologies (St. Pierre, 2021). For instance, interviews are not discouraged but must be problematized and used differently as a method (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013). To reiterate, qualitative inquiry does not reject humanist qualitative methodology but seeks to problematize, disrupt, and call it into question.

Reconsidering Narrative Inquiry

When I first started considering the methodology for my dissertation, I began reading narrative inquiry. The rare times humanist qualitative methodology is mentioned in post qualitative inquiry studies is to assert why the methodology was not used (St. Pierre, 2018), and I attempt to explain my rationale for not using narrative inquiry in my dissertation. Narrative inquiry initially emerged to rebuke positivist methods (Riessman, 2005). Narrative inquiry researchers Clandinin and Connelly (2000; as cited in Clandinin, 2006) state narrative inquiry is, "a way of understanding experience. It is collaboration between researcher and participants, over time, in a place or series of places, and in social interaction with milieus" (p. 20). Simply put, it is using a story to understand experience (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006). I learned after my dissertation proposal defense that poststructuralist ideas discuss that knowledge and experience cannot be fully understood (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012), and subsequently had to remove all "understanding" words from my dissertation. As such, my dissertation has strikethroughs of ~~understanding~~ as a

transgressive extract to draw attention to this difference with narrative inquiry.

Researchers who use narrative inquiry analyze the storied experiences of people shaped by its “living, telling, retelling, and reliving” (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006, p. 478). In other words, those telling the experience live the story as they tell and retell it (Clandinin & Huber, 2010). In this ‘restorying’ of a narrative, the individual analyzes the experience and considers how a new story could emerge that could impact the experience, meaning, and person’s trajectory (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). Narrative inquiry contains elements of phenomenology used to understand experience through stories, which contradicts poststructuralist thought.

The problematization of phenomenological version of narrative inquiry is difficult for me as I have always felt very connected to stories and inspired by them. I grew up with my grandpa telling us fictionalize tales (which I believed to be true) of people like Hattie the Witch who lived up the hill and wild dogs that lived in the bushes. My family loves to tell ghost stories about unexplained occurrences. I tell stories to my students to articulate a point or provide a rationale for why things are done. It is challenging to deconstruct the purpose and essence of story through a poststructuralist lens. I still use stories in this dissertation but problematize them through nonfiction-fiction writing in order to disrupt and analyze power relations. This problematization of stories includes where and when they take place.

Clandinin and Huber (2010) state there are three commonplaces of narrative inquiry, including temporality, sociality, and place. Temporality roots the experience in a temporary time, such as the present, past, or future, whereas place refers to the physical

space the experience took place (Clandinin & Huber, 2010). Sociality relates to the cultural, personal, and social conditions, which entangle feelings, reactions, environments, and people that relate to the person (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006). It is also the connection between researcher and participant (Clandinin & Huber, 2010). Comparatively, poststructuralist research does not follow this temporary time linear model (St. Pierre, 1997a), nor does it situate the research in a specific physical place (St. Pierre, 1997b). In my dissertation, there is no linear timeline, and place is not tangible but is mental, textual, and theoretical (St. Pierre, 1997b). These commonplaces of narrative inquiry are deconstructed within poststructuralist and post qualitative inquiry.

There are various types of research methods for narrative inquiry, such as interviews, journals, field texts, autobiography writing, and storytelling (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). These processes are analyzed in ways connected with narrative inquiry. Unlike some qualitative methods, narrative inquirers do not try to bracket themselves as separate from their participants (Clandinin, 2006). Clandinin and Huber (2010) utilize reflexivities in order to examine the researcher's position and relationship with the participants. Through this method, there is an expectation the researcher is able to come to a greater awareness of self and how they impact the research study. Bracketing is also not a concept used in poststructuralist research, but poststructuralist research extends this deconstruction to state that subjectivities and experiences are discursively constructed and are constantly in play (Scott, 1991). Poststructuralist and post qualitative inquiry view subjectivities and experiences as unstable and cannot be known or reflected upon (Miller & Macedo, 2018). Telling of experience is always partial and situated within

discourse (Britzman, 1995). Poststructuralist research seeks to further problematize traditional humanistic methods related to bracketing and reflexivity as subjectivities and experiences are unstable and partial.

Analysis of narrative inquiry methods includes various typologies. Riessman (2005) introduces four different types of narrative inquiry analysis, including thematic, structural, interactional, and performative. Thematic analysis focuses on identifying themes in the research with language seen as transparent, whereas structural analysis investigates language and how the story is told (Riessman, 2005). Interactional analysis is on the researcher and participant relationship to understand the storytelling process (Riessman, 2005). The performative analysis addresses storytelling as an act where there are characters, setting, and a connection between the audience and performers (Riessman, 2005). Poststructuralist research critiques Riessman's (2005) narrative inquiry as poststructuralist thoughts highlight a crisis in research representation and resist a fluid narrative of experience (Britzman, 1995). There is also a rejection of fixed and stable structures used within the interpretation of data (St. Pierre, 2013). In the analysis of Foucauldian versions of poststructuralist research, the interrogation lies within power relations rooted in discourse, and representation of this is always in crisis and partial (Britzman, 1995). Poststructuralist research resists a return to what is known, literal, and stable (Britzman, 1995).

Ethics surrounding narrative inquiry include demonstrating respect and willingness to engage in multiple lens and points of view (Clandinin, 2006). Ensuring participant voice and that their story is asked about first in the interview is important for

the participant-researcher relationship (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). Writing stories as fiction is also found in narrative inquiry to keep people and places confidential (Clandinin & Huber, 2010).

When, for example, a narrative inquiry shows the bumping up of participants' lives (and narrative inquirers' lives) with dominant cultural and institutional narratives, various ways of working with fictionalization in research texts can enable these stories to be told without harming participants' lives or the relationships composed by narrative inquirers and participants. (Clandinin & Huber, 2010, p. 13)

In comparison to narrative inquiry's version of fictional writing, I am writing a nonfiction-fiction dissertation to problematize and deconstruct voice and experience as linear and stable. Applying the concepts of thinking with theory (Jackson and Mazzei, 2017) and methodology in the fold (St. Pierre, 2014), I deconstruct the data and theory binary so as to uproot humanistic qualitative methodological concepts and problematize the representation of research. St. Pierre's (2014) methodology in the fold is used as a primary post qualitative concept to deconstruct traditional versions of research methods within this dissertation and the subject/object dichotomy.

There is friction between narrative inquiry and poststructuralist research, and I attempt to explore the ways in which they bristle and turn against one another in order to interrogate my own interpretations and application of poststructuralist thought. Poststructuralist research resists a holistic subject and the transparent sharing of experience and knowledge without analyzing power relations in its interpretations

(Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). Experience is not owned by the subject but has limits in its telling (Miller & Macedo, 2018). While narrative inquiry claims to have multiple truths with the goal of not recreating a past event (Riessman, 2002), it does not, as poststructuralist theories do, deconstruct regimes of truth as neutral, discuss how power operationalizes language, and interrogate the crisis of research representations (Britzman, 1995). For poststructuralist research, there is not a fixed truth, but rather, truth and knowledge are constructed through power/knowledge discourse (Tamboukou, 2008). Control and power are projected through discourse as it regulates the context for which truths are produced (Moon, 2019). The discursively constructed nature of poststructuralist research is inherently different from narrative inquiry.

(Re)Imagining Methodology

Poststructuralist theories are extensively studied if post qualitative inquiry is used in research (St. Pierre, 2014, 2018, 2021). Foucault (2003) asserts that he did not use a pre-created methodology, but that he invented it along the way (St. Pierre, 2021). There is no pre-established process for creating a post qualitative study (St. Pierre, 2014), but secondary and primary poststructuralist sources are first closely analyzed, such as Foucault (St. Pierre, 2018). Studying the foundational thinkers allow researchers to examine the ways in which these concepts, such as Foucault's power/knowledge discourse, can assist in rethinking and considering the research study in new light (St. Pierre, 2014). This is a time intensive and individualized process with emphasis placed on reading, writing, thinking, and immersion into theory (St. Pierre, 2018). Jackson and Mazzei (2017) calls this concept thinking with theory to problematize how knowledge is

often defined, produced, and validated. "Our point is that thinking with theory uses concepts in the making of new assemblages, renders meaning unstable, and allows for multiple entryways and exits in thought" (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017, p. 725). Jackson and Mazzei (2017) discuss four main points when using thinking with theory, including disrupting the theory and data binary, using specific poststructuralist theoretical concepts to create research questions, applying texts to create new meanings, and shifting the research from stages to process. Utilizing a specific poststructuralist theoretical concept, such as power/knowledge, is an example of how I apply thinking with theory in my dissertation. In this way, theory is used to create tension and dissonance in the research, and therefore, not create an easy study that relies on methodology (St. Pierre, 2021). An example of using thinking with theory in my research is through reading and analyzing theory alongside transcripts, field notes, and other forms of qualitative data (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017). I use this concept in my dissertation study to interrupt binaries among theory and data and problematize my research.

As this study interrogates doctoral student and faculty discourse, I examine the ways in which researchers frame poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry to their graduate students. Lather (2006) discusses the five aporias she uses with her doctoral students to assist in their interrogation of humanistic methods within educational research. Within the 'aporias of complicity,' Lather encourages her students to read Foucault and others while also knowing that all research methods are 'dangerous' not just quantitative. Lather urges them to problematize and disrupt essentialized theories of language and validity. The goal for the aporias is to create new ways of producing

knowledge, and for new and different knowledge to be created (Lather, 2006). Post qualitative inquiry believes that if the theories are studied carefully the methodology will create itself (St. Pierre, 2014). Lather exposes her doctoral students to a process for critiquing research methods and examining poststructuralist theories.

The structure of dissertation chapters and other forms of qualitative research are often in tension with the theoretical underpinnings and concepts found in poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry (St. Pierre, 2018). In traditional qualitative humanist research, focus is put on the research's structure, such as research design and research questions, but poststructuralist theories and post qualitative research encourages the research to interrogate fixed research categories (St. Pierre, 2014). "The categories we have invented to organize and structure humanist qualitative methodology . . . assume depth in which the human is superior to and separate from the material – Self/Other, subject/object, and human/non-human" (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013, p. 630). Britzman (1995) discusses using headings that reflected contradictory representations and conflicting narratives to disrupt traditional research structures. St. Pierre (2018) took liberties within her dissertation to create spaces for 'thinking-writing' where she used asides for expression and creativity. Within my dissertation, ~~I continue to use headers and a traditional approach to articulating the dissertation research design~~ problematize my own preconceived notions of structures. As I apply poststructuralist concepts, I deconstruct the framework of a five-chapter dissertation, and instead, utilize writings such as (un)finished letters that are still in process. This assists in problematizing my

research, disrupt traditional headings, and allows the application for other poststructuralist concepts, such as the rhizome and methodology in the fold.

The concept of the rhizome is applied to this disruption of dissertation structures, which stems from Deleuze and Guattari (1980) poststructuralist thought. The rhizome is anti-methodological, which allows the researcher to explore new interpretations outside of constrained structures and stability (St. Pierre, 1997b, 2018, 2021). It is used to reconsider rigor, validity, and reassess what constitutes evidence and truth (Lather, 1993). Lather (1993) cites Deleuze and Guattari (1983) metaphor of a tree to symbolize a modernist representation of knowledge, while the postmodern interpretation, embodied in the rhizome, would have no linear trunk as it has many networks, offshoots, and systems. "Rather than a linear process, rhizomatics is journey among intersections, nodes, and regionalization through a multi-centered complexity. As a metaphor, rhizomes work against the constraints of authority, regularity, and commonsense, and open thought up to creative construction" (Lather, 1993, p. 680). In a conversation with my faculty advisor, he challenged me to represent this research in an image. Ironically, I responded that a tree would be an accurate depiction as poststructuralist research is always growing. Kindly, he encouraged me to continue to think creatively. Soon thereafter, I came upon the reference to the tree metaphor representing modernist research.

St. Pierre (2014) uses the term methodology in the fold as she applies Deleuze (1986, 1988) concept of the fold, which stems from Foucault's work, to problematize and rethink traditional methodological concepts, such as data and interviews. The fold disrupts binaries and dualisms, such as subject/object and inside/outside (St. Pierre,

1997a, 1997b). It informs a subject's lack of binaries or divisions (St. Pierre, 1997a). ". . . a subject who could not be separated from the outside but always a part of it, folding, unfolding, refolding with/in it" (St. Pierre, 1997b, p. 411). In other words, the researcher, researched, data, theory, and other texts are folded into one another in the threshold (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). As an example, St. Pierre (2014, 2018) also found the concepts of traditional headings in her dissertation not in keeping with poststructuralist ideas, so she used the fold to deconstruct it's meaning. During my dissertation defense my committee encouraged me to select a concept as a primary lens for which to deconstruct, create, and recreate my study. I selected St. Pierre's (2014) methodology in the fold to create disruptions and (re)fold and (un)fold my research. I refer to this concept throughout my dissertation.

My application of methodology in the fold began during the construction of my dissertation proposal. When I first created my dissertation proposal literature review, it was neatly divided into three sections. The first two sections focused on community-engaged learning and graduate education literature while the third overviewed poststructuralist theories. My dissertation advisor encouraged me to revise and use poststructuralist theory and post qualitative inquiry to deconstruct and reconstruct the proposal. In the next iteration, I changed the order and put the poststructuralist section first in an attempt to "guide" the proposal. After carefully studying St. Pierre (2014) methodology in the fold and further interrogating poststructuralist and post qualitative inquiry literature, I quickly realized I cannot simply rearrange the chapter order to yield disruption. I began to unravel the entire chapters like a ball of yarn. Using methodology

in the fold, I merged and blended poststructuralist, post qualitative inquiry, doctoral education, and community-engaged learning literature to disrupt the binaries and rigid boundaries I had created in an attempt to play and integrate these various forms of scholarship. After I passed my defense, I kept reading Foucault's works and immersing myself in post qualitative inquiry literature as I conducted interviews. My creation of a nonfiction-fiction involves blending my participant's interviews and artifacts into the literature, juxtaposing, problematizing, weaving, and folding them into one another. In this ever-evolving way of integrating and interrupting literature, data, and structure, I seek to find new connections and frames of knowing through the intersection and interplay of the theory, literature, and interviews.

Post qualitative inquiry is rooted in poststructuralist theories and problematizes humanistic qualitative methodological practices (St. Pierre, 2021). It is also not linked to a particular research design, data collection methods, or data analysis, which allows the researcher to create something entirely new (St. Pierre, 2021). Traditional research terms are also problematized, and concepts, such as methodology in the fold, are applied to ~~discover new meanings~~ interrogate emerging interpretations and deconstruct research boundaries. Post qualitative inquiry provides an entirely different approach to interrogating the ways community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarly practices are discursively constructed by faculty and doctoral students.

(Re)Thinking Research Methods and Data

Post qualitative inquiry does not have established data collection methods or data analysis (St. Pierre, 2021). St. Pierre's (2014) methodology in the fold is used to

deconstruct traditional research, including methods. In this way, theory is used to interrogate how data are collected and what counts as data (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). For instance, data and theory are often seen as separate in humanistic qualitative research, but poststructuralist theories consider them integrated and assists in disrupting common terms, such as data and subject (St. Pierre, 1997b, 2008). Jackson (2017) thinking without method, which is a concept from Deleuzian (1994) thought, is further applied to this deconstruction of methods. Thinking without method is “to be on the outside of method in a space of emergent, fragmented strategies that mutate according to the task at hand” (Jackson, 2017, p. 667). This concept is an “encounter with the outside” and problematizes recognition, such as the subject/object dichotomy, triangulation, reflexivity, etc., and procedures found in traditional qualitative research methods (Jackson, 2017, p. 669). When an “encounter with the outside” takes place, according to Deleuze (1994), it means thought has occurred by force, encounter, or chance, and in doing so, transformation can occur, and past recognitions can be put aside (Jackson, 2017). St. Pierre (2013) reminds us that we cannot answer questions such as, “What is data in Deleuzian inquiry?” (p. 226), because such questions seek to define. St. Pierre’s (2014) methodology in the fold integrates with concepts, such as thinking without method, to disrupt recognized forms of research when encounters with the outside occur in order to achieve transformation.

Post qualitative inquiry critiques traditional data collection methods as it assumes the human and data are separate, and as such, data are available for collection (St. Pierre, 2021). Humanistic qualitative methods, such as interviewing and observation, are also

considered privileged methods to collect data (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013). As such, the words collected from interviews are privileged over other forms of data (St. Pierre and Jackson, 2014). In comparison, poststructuralist research views “voices could no longer reliably secure the truth” (St. Pierre, 2008, p. 321). Within poststructuralists interrogations, language does not directly relate to truth (St. Pierre, 1997a). In other words, since experiences and subjectivities are always partial and constantly changing, the concept of truth is also contextual and produced through power/knowledge (Moon, 2019). Foucault (1980) views truth as the regulation of statements and interrogates the process of truth production versus the outcome (Harwood & Rasmussen, 2004). Further, the collection of words and interviews as data without the consideration of the researcher’s manipulation of the analysis is problematic (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). Instead, poststructuralist research rejects a linear approach to research methodology and leaves room for other forms of data (St. Pierre, 1997a). For instance, St. Pierre (2008) uses Foucault’s words as data and leverages it the same as her research participant’s. She also uses comments from people she talks to about her research as data to further investigate and interrogate her research (St. Pierre, 2008). While I employ a qualitative study, interviews and words ‘collected’ are not privileged or prioritized over other forms of data. Poststructuralist thought is integrated into my research study through constant questioning, disruption, and analyzation.

Post qualitative inquiry questions what counts as data and problematizes privileging certain forms over others. My initial conceptualization of data falls in line with traditional humanistic interpretations where it is collected, analyzed, and objectified

by the researcher. In this sense, the researcher must restrain all form of bias and subjectivity otherwise the data are tainted. It was not until my exposure to post qualitative inquiry that I questioned what counts as data. St. Pierre (1997a) introduced me to new forms of data, such as emotional, dream, and sensual data. I had not considered analyzing our emotions or adding complexity to research through dreams (St. Pierre, 1997a). Jackson (2017) coins the term backflip to showcase data that are by happenstance, unexpected, and violent. She uses the term as she observed an actual backflip from a cheerleader during an observation at a high school game that was out of place and was not a part of the routine (Jackson, 2017). Jackson (2017) did not put it in her dissertation as she did not know what to do with it and only wrote about it until later. "But this backflip was inappropriate, out-of-place: a chance encounter. It emerged as an encounter—an intensity that I sensed—to force thought" (Jackson, 2017, p. 672). These diverse forms of data assist in my ongoing interrogation of research methods.

I used to think interviews were the primary form of data in qualitative research methods. Interviews as a way of gathering data are interrogated by poststructuralist thinking as phonocentrism. This means spoken word and presence is privileged over written word (St. Pierre, 2018). Derrida uses this concept to criticize and challenge the researcher to rethink how interview transcripts, field notes, and other forms of data represent truth (St. Pierre, 2018). Derrida (1974) states that language is not brute, and words are not only present within discourse as they are “laden with theory, values, history, culture, politics, and power” (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 225). Humanistic qualitative researchers often overlook the fact that spoken words are translated into written word

where the privileged presence is then lost (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). St. Pierre (2008) discusses how qualitative inquiry should move away from privileging voice and presence. “I learned that limiting interview data to spoken words and not attending to words that seemed present in their absence limits knowledge production” (Mazzei, 2013, p. 733). In other words, poststructuralist researchers deconstruct discourse in interviews due to the relationship between the researcher and participant (Choi, 2006). As with many elements within research, poststructuralist thought and post qualitative inquiry problematize, disrupt, and deconstruct traditional humanistic qualitative research methods.

Within deconstructing interviews as data, Mazzei’s (2013) uses Deleuze and Guattari’s (1983) concept of BwO, or body without organs, and VwO, voice without organs, to not necessarily reject interviews but to problematize them. Deleuze and Guattari sought to deconstruct the binary and instead seek the ‘and’ with BwO, as well as the application of the rhizome and assemblages (St. Pierre, 2013). Within BwO, voice is produced through different forces, multiple subjects, and “an enactment among researcher-data-participants-theory-analysis” where it disrupts the need to rely on objective representations to convey data (Mazzei, 2013, p. 733). Like BwO, VwO has multiple subjects and is not represented within distinct individuals, but instead, all voices are “entangled” and connected within a larger structure of participants, the researcher, data, etc. (Mazzei, 2013). As a result, voice is then transfigured into something new.

We decouple voice – words spoken and words written in transcripts – from an intentional, agentic humanist subject and move to VwO, voice thought as an

assemblage, a complex network of human and nonhuman agents that exceeds the traditional notion of the individual. (Mazzei, 2013, p. 738)

Post qualitative inquiry challenges the researcher to rethink voice and the interview. For instance, St. Pierre (2008) provides examples of integrating interviews within literature review and theory to disrupt the privileged voice in research. Mazzei (2013) reinforces poststructuralist theories sense of becoming as she enters interviews without an agenda and recognizes she is being reconstructed and reformed during the interview process.

When I first learned of the concepts of Bodies Without Organs, I laughed out loud. What in the world is that all about? What do you mean that voices can be entangled? It took me several days to read Mazzei's (2013) article as I had a hard time digesting it. I continued to read poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry and circled back to the article periodically to apply evolving interrogations to this concept. Within my dissertation research, I apply BwO and VwO to interview data and participant artifacts, such as syllabi and assignments. They are then deconstructed and integrated alongside other forms of data, including poststructuralist theories and community-engaged literature, in an effort to entangle and reconsider how data are communicated and interpreted. BwO is integrated and combined with St. Pierre's (2014) methodology in the fold to disrupt interview methods and problematize humanistic qualitative research.

Reconceptualizing Uprooting Data Analysis

Post qualitative inquiry does not have an established form of data analysis (St. Pierre, 2021). Similar to data methods, data analysis is integrated with theory (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). There are no guidelines for data analysis but to first read

poststructuralist theories and apply them to the research (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). In post qualitative research, “Data became irrelevant and data analysis was writing and thinking and laying out of the field of the text, moving” (St. Pierre, 2018, p. 4). This reconceptualizing of data and data analysis interrogates designing and embodying something that has not yet become through the process of experimentation (St. Pierre, 2021). St. Pierre (2021) cites Derrida’s assessment of deconstruction that it “overturns and displaces a structure to make room for something different” (p. 3). The concept of the threshold is applied to deconstructing data analysis, which focuses on transformation, moving, becoming, and the seeking of the new, and is a space where theory, data, and other concepts are immersed together towards new possibilities (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017). The threshold does not have purpose unless it is “plugged in” to other spaces, such as texts, theory, and other data, and is in a state of transformation (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013). Within the threshold, Foucault sees power between subjects as localized and relational, and when Barad’s interpretations of Foucauldian thought are applied, can occur when the subject is in intra-action with discourse and materials (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). I think of the threshold as a rushing river, ever flowing, and making space for new streams of thought. Within post qualitative inquiry, traditional humanistic qualitative data and data analyses are disrupted, and new ideas are introduced, such as problematizing coding, transgressive validity, troubling reflexivity, and rethinking truth.

Traditional humanistic qualitative methodologies focus on ‘thick, rich descriptions’ and prioritize the voice over transcripts (St. Pierre, 2008). Transcripts are then taken and coded. Data analysis in humanistic qualitative inquiry is often undescribed

unless it is related to coding methods (St. Pierre, 2008). Within post qualitative inquiry, concepts such as coding and thematic analysis do not exist, and representation of data is not the focus (St. Pierre, 2021). Coding is problematized as it undergirds the assumption that words are ‘out there’ to be discovered, collected, and coded (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). Coding also works towards what is already known and does not leave room for something different (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). Within poststructuralist research, categories do not create new knowledge “because our formulation of the categories would have been simply driven by our experience and that of our participants, devoid of any philosophically informed concepts that would jolt us out of received ways of knowing” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017, p. 729). As I study data analysis, I feel jolted by the author’s descriptions, such as “treats words as brute data” and “manipulated by software” and “positivist scientism” (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). It makes me question my previous data collection and analysis methods and views on what constitutes research. Instead of coding, I apply St. Pierre’s (2014) methodology in the fold to deconstruct traditional notions of data analysis, which in turn, calls into question reflexivity and validity.

Reflexivity is another common method of data analysis that is traditionally seen as a product and process for a study’s validity (Pillow, 2003). Reflexivity fails to completely deconstruct the subject, and in buying into such notions, privileges the capacity of critical reflection to reach self-awareness and consciousness (Lather, 1993). Pillow (2003) problematizes reflexivity noting that it does not equate to representation and reflects an unbalanced power dynamic between researcher and participant. It also

prioritizes the researcher's need for truth as central (Pillow, 2003). Instead, researchers should work towards a recognition that there are multiple shifting subjectivities, and the subject is unknown because it cannot be fully discoverable (Pillow, 2003). In other words, a researcher cannot use reflexivity as a way to reveal subjectivity as this would mean that the subject can be known, found, and stable. From this, Pillow introduces a new concept called the reflexivity of discomfort. "A reflexivity that pushes toward an unfamiliar, towards the uncomfortable, cannot be a simple story of subjects, subjectivity, and transcendence or self-indulgent tellings" (Pillow, 2003, p. 192). Through this careful interrogation and deconstruction of reflexivity as a form of validity, I recognize I can never fully articulate my own subjectivities, but instead, lean into the discomfort and messiness of how my subjectivities discursively change and shift over time.

Validity is represented in post-positivistic data analysis through concepts such as debriefing and triangulation (Lather, 1993). The term validity is not rejected by poststructuralist theories so as to "both circulate and break with the signs that code it" (Lather, 1993, p. 674). Within data analysis, post qualitative inquiry questions whether it is even possible to represent the subject and if the representation of data can be valid (Pillow, 2003). Poststructuralist theories position validity as multiple, fragmented, and that which cannot fully represent the research (Lather, 1993). Lather (1993) introduces the concept of transgressive validity (where my transgressive extracts originate), which is comprised of four frames, including validity as simularcra, Lyotardian paralogy, rhizomatic, and situated. These four frames reveal the difficulty in representation of the real and opens up new ventures for creativity and expression (Lather, 1993).

Transgressive validity moves away “from epistemological criteria of truth as a correspondence between thought and its object to criteria grounded in the crisis of representation” (Lather, 1993, p. 686). Post qualitative researchers use this concept to problematize the concept of representation in favor of a more creative and new interpretations of validity. I use this concept in my dissertation to deconstruct validity and interrogate the crisis of representation.

Truth is intricately related to power/knowledge. Before learning about poststructuralist theories, I never considered the problematization of truth in research. From my graduate coursework, research was either true or poorly conducted. I correlated truth with high quality research that appeared to be rigorous, scientific, and well written. Through studying Foucault’s (1980) ideas on truth, I now come to interpret it as intricately related to power, and how it is contextualized in a system of rules and regulations on what statements or declarations count as truth. Foucault (1980) created a ‘new political economy of truth’ based on multiple traits, such as truth as generated and dispersed by governing sociopolitical institutions, such as universities. In this framing, truth is rooted in discourses, rules, and techniques.

Each society has its regime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (Foucault, 1980, p. 131)

This interrogation of truth problematizes traditional research methods, such as voice as truth (St. Pierre, 2008). Through examining Foucault's (1980) political economy of truth, rules and regulations are examined that enforce what counts as truth in the academy.

I assumed after I finished my interviews that data analysis would come easily. It did not, and I think my data analysis and subsequent representation is still in process with the merger, integration, and disruption of what counts as data. Problematizing validity, reflexivity, truth, and voice through a poststructuralist lens did not make my analysis a smooth process. Instead, there have been many moments of unsettlement, discomfort, and questioning if I am doing this *right*. Ironically, of course, there is no right way to conduct poststructuralist research. In the next section, I attempt to demonstrate my crisis of representation as I analyze my dissertation data knowing that it can never be fully revealed.

Crisis of Representation

There is a disorganized heap of books next to me. They include works from Foucault on power/knowledge discourse, community-engaged learning scholarship, traditional qualitative methodology (because in order to critique, you have to study), and teaching and learning literature. I can study all the texts, yet there is no clear-cut path pointing me in the direction of where to take and represent this research. I recognize there is no one route, and contradictions can actually assist my research and open up new possibilities (Lather, 1992). The most daunting aspect of this study is the rethinking and transforming of how to represent data knowing that it can never be accurately represented (Moon & Strople, 2016). Pitt and Britzman (2003) state, "This linguistic turn in

qualitative research is now known as ‘the crisis of representation’ in that the adequacy of language to capture experience is considered an effect of discourse rather than a reflection of that experience" (p. 756). In other words, language in constructing realities is intangible and political and cannot be replicated (Moon & Strople, 2016).

Representation is not neutral as it is discursively constructed and is not capable of mirroring reality (Choi, 2006). My next steps applying post qualitative research are daunting and unclear.

The pile of books and articles grow larger as I continue to study poststructuralist thought and the crisis of representation. Pitt and Britzman’s (2003) scholarship resonated with me through their prioritization of learning and analyzing theory and narrative versus a preoccupation with the content and data of the research (Pitt & Britzman, 2003). It was in reading about process rather than outcome that I sensed my subjectivities and the focus of the research shift towards applying and interrogating thinking with theory. However, as I examine my research process, I continue to struggle with how to represent my data, including participant’s interviews, syllabi, and other artifacts they shared related to community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship. I connect with Choi’s (2006) research, who discusses how she problematized categories, reflexivity, and the discursive construction of her research on student dropouts. Choi (2006) also ran into issues deciding which interviews and information she should use when constructing the text.

Given that knowledge was continually created by my interactions with the subjects, and data were mediated and negotiated by ever-changing positionalities

and the authenticity of the data; it became unclear what I should be writing and why I should be writing others' lives. (Choi, 2006, p. 450)

When I read the above passage, I felt relieved and validated. I, too, struggled with representing my shifting subjectivities in the research and discourse with the participants. I had an unrelenting feeling that if St. Pierre or Lather were to read a page of this dissertation, they would disown my work as fraudulent and not poststructuralist enough.

As post qualitative inquiry focuses on experimentation and the creation of new practices (Lather, 2014), I find it hard to conceptualize what it could mean to push against the constraints of a traditional humanistic research approach. There are three texts that inspired me in my research thinking, and I want to highlight them as they have helped me to rethink and problematize my own deeply held beliefs on research. Each of the texts impacted my subjectivities and have opened up new approaches and ways of thinking that I have not before considered.

The first text is Moon's (2019) *Three Approaches to Qualitative Research through the ARTS: Narratives of Teaching for Social Justice and Community*. This book uses aesthetic examples to display the data, including metaphors, poems, pictures, and collages. This use of 'methodological imagination' allows researchers to explore new possibilities of research design, analysis, and representation (Moon, 2019). Writing this text for graduate students, Moon demonstrates the application of several theoretical frameworks, including poststructuralist theories, phenomenology, and critical ethnography, to explore the ARTS initiative, which was an afterschool program where students could cultivate their exploration of citizenship and community. Through each of

the three theories, Moon explores problematizations in the research and critiques the theoretical framework. For instance, critical ethnography is discussed as creating stereotypes and fixed cultural categories (Moon, 2019). Moon is transparent he is persuaded by poststructuralist theories as these theories, particularly Butler's, are used to destabilized fixed identities, categories, and themes. He also uses Foucault's power/knowledge discourse to analyze how experience is discursively constructed and how storytelling and language are not able to display the truth of the experience. I was inspired by the use of creative modalities in the research. Within this idea, the purpose is not to display an accurate depiction of the ARtS initiative but to use poststructuralist theories to analyze its discursive construction and sociopolitical contexts to open up multiple realities and disrupt predetermined interpretation of experience (Moon, 2019).

A second text I draw inspiration in the crisis of representation is Wang's (2014) *Nonviolence in Education: Cross-cultural Pathways*. Wang intertwines four participant interviews and artifacts with literature and scholarship. Her book focuses on how educators can aspire to teach within a global society. She uses nonfiction-fiction writing in first person to situate the research and provide more textual and complexities to its interpretations. In her multi-year study, she used data from her interviews, classroom observations, syllabi, evaluations, emails, and other documents. Wang shared she would read the articles and scholarship participants drew from and integrate it into her writing. This was a significant takeaway for my dissertation research, and I applied this concept within my own construction of nonfiction-fiction accounts.

Wang's (2014) chapters focus on one participant at a time, and in their unique construction, she changes her writing style and analyses in an attempt to reflect the context of her interaction with the participants and their stories. When applicable, Wang shares how she integrates her own voice into the story's context situating her subjectivity with the participant's subjectivity. She uses poststructuralist theories to interrogate one of her participant, Fen's, subjectivities and experiences. Wang describes how Fen's stories are contradictory and uncategorical. In sharing how she creates various chapters to mirror the participant stories and her interactions with them, Wang discusses deconstructive and disruptive moments in her research where she destabilizes dichotomies and interrupts the research progression. For instance, Fen allowed Wang to deconstruct her China/western dichotomy. In this disruption, new ways to represent research are introduced, including fictionalized accounts, in depth historical research of the context of the experiences, and researcher-participant dialogue threaded with theoretical frameworks. It was helpful to read this deconstructed representation of research, and it disrupted my fixed understanding of what my dissertation research could look like.

The third and final text, *Sentipensante (Sensing/Thinking) Pedagogy: Educating for Wholeness, Social Justice and Liberation* by Lauran Rendón, was recommended during my dissertation defense. When I read her book, I had a feeling the methodology and framework contained unresolved contradictions with poststructuralist and post qualitative inquiry, but I lacked the language and knowledge to put my reactions into words. Having studied Rendón's (2014) work alongside Foucault, I now see where they problematize and reject one other's ideations. Rendón uses two methodological

frameworks to apply to her research, including heuristic (Moustakas, 1990) and transpersonal (Braud & Anderson, 1998). She uses these spiritual and indigenous approaches with her faculty interviewers to integrate ‘intellectualism and intuition’ within teaching and learning (Rendón, 2014). Rendón compares heuristic inquiry to phenomenology’s focus on lived experiences but differs as the researcher and participant both must have the same experience. Drawing from Anderson (1998), transpersonal methods utilize creative ideation, dreams, meditation, storytelling, and emotions into the research. While poststructuralist theories do not reject traditional humanistic qualitative research methods, they seek to problematize them. In this way, poststructuralist ideas conflict with Rendón as they reject phenomenology’s focus on lived experience and storytelling and view experience and subjectivities as shifting, unstable, and discursively constructed. I highlight this text as it assisted in helping me to interrogate key concepts of poststructuralist theories alongside traditional teaching and learning literature.

The various texts allowed me to interrogate and explore new ways of representing research. From Moon (2019), I learned how data can be represented through creative modalities and aesthetic creations. Wang (2014) displayed her research as an entanglement of participant interviews, historical scholarship, articles the participants had read or were affiliated, and theory. Finally, Rendón (2014) gave me the opportunity to interrupt binaries, dichotomies, and attempt to name research that contradicts poststructuralist thought. While my dissertation research is the creation of something new, the scholarship from these various researchers illustrated the crisis of representation and helped me to interrupt traditional humanistic qualitative research representations.

(Im)Possible Attempts of (Re)Presentation

Poststructuralist research resists the return to what is already known or previously created (Miller & Macedo, 2018). As I studied the crisis of representation within poststructuralist research, I decided to create a nonfiction-fiction dissertation that entangles theory, data, and literature. However, I resist a cohesive and straightforward version of representing the data as narrative. Bell (2002) contradicts poststructuralist thought stating, "Narrative inquiry rests on the epistemological assumption that we human beings make sense of random experience by the imposition story structures" (p. 207). In contrast, poststructuralist research situates stories as not told to make sense. Storytelling and portraying data through various modalities do not lend themselves to the exact depiction of experience, truth, or realities (Moon, 2019). This dissertation moves beyond this humanistic ideation of storytelling and narrative and deconstructs its own representations. Drawing from Moon and Strople (2016), I recognize the (im)possible attempts at (re)presenting this research and try to create various spaces to interrogate faculty and doctoral students' community-engaged learning discourse.

~~The setting is within a Midwest, religiously affiliated urban university.~~ Utilizing poststructuralist concepts of nomad and haecceity allowed me to problematize and rethink research sites and participants. "Nomads search for mobile arrangements of space where thought can settle for a time and then multiple and recombine, always displacing the sedentary and unified" (St. Pierre, 1997b, p. 412). Nomadic research encourages the researcher to consider fields that might not be physical, such as mental, textual, and theoretical spaces (St. Pierre, 1997b). Within the application of nomad, the site of the

nonfiction-fiction dissertation is an entanglement of theory, graduate education and community-engaged learning literature, participants' and my subjectivities, and various locations discussed by interview participants. Since all of my interviews took place online due to COVID-19, this unpredictable virtual environment further allowed the opportunity to rethink location, time, and space.

~~A purposeful sampling method targeting information-rich participants who can further address the purpose of inquiry will be studied (Patton, 2015).~~ In the initial draft of my dissertation proposal, I described an in-depth account on my IRB's faculty selection process and the benefits faculty would gain for participating in this research. I quickly realized this linear approach to research conflicted with poststructuralist thought. Afterwards, I applied haecceity, which is a concept derived from Deleuze and Guattari (1980), defined as an assemble that assists in exploring the connection between the field, those who are in the field, and time and space (St. Pierre, 1997b). These connections are intertwined and are in constant play (St. Pierre, 1997b). Using the concept of haecceity, I interrogated my six faculty participant's connections with the field and how time and space assist in the construction. Both the concepts of nomad and haecceity are applied to create the various locations Julie, who is a doctoral student, encounters in interactions with her faculty, including a tutoring program site situated within a Catholic church. For example, this site was created from discourse with participants and my own mental spaces. Post qualitative inquiry challenges a humanistic methodological stance and instead deconstructs research setting and participants. As I continued to read poststructuralist research and post qualitative inquiry, the more I began to critique and

ultimately remove the positivistic and humanistic approaches in my research, including rethinking research sites.

The creation of each of the four characters previously mentioned was not easy as there was extensive time put into entangling my subjectivities, interview data, and theory together. I initially was going to have six characters correlated to the six faculty I interviewed. However, as I began writing, I realized that the structure did not allow for the characters to intersect and interact. It was rigid and confining. Thus, I created one graduate student, Julie, and positioned her with three faculty members in various contexts. This was an attempt at representing shifting subjectivities within discourse in the various sociopolitical contexts of a classroom, community partner site, and research team meeting.

Julie is a doctoral student within an Educational Studies program. Her first year in the doctoral program is socio-politically situated in the transition from a pre-COVID to post-COVID world, racial injustices and the Black Lives Matter movement, and a contested presidential election. Within this context, she engages with three faculty members. The first is Dr. Sanders who serves as an instructor for a course on community-engagement with a focus on identity development. The students are asked to analyze their positionality in relationship to the students and families they serve. The second faculty is Dr. McGrath who has a dual-role of faculty and community partner as she oversees a university-community tutoring program housed in a Catholic Church. The site is a collaboration between the university and community and provides tutoring to local neighborhood children with disabilities. The third is Julie's graduate assistantship faculty

supervisor, Dr. Riley. Dr. Riley serves as the lead primary investigator researching St. Mary's Catholic Church tutoring program.

Each of the four characters, including Julie, is an entanglement of the six faculty research participants, as well as my own subjectivities. Not one character is made up of a single faculty participant interview data or my own partial experiences, but is a folding of theory, literature, and data. I initially considered the idea of making one faculty character a composite of all of the “gold standard” stories faculty participants discussed about community-engagement. Initially, I thought examples of this could include centering community-knowledge, interrogating privileged identities, and deconstructing power dynamics. Then, I would create a “bad” or dangerous faculty character comprised of deficit-based views of community. Instead, utilizing poststructuralist thought, I deconstructed the good versus bad dichotomy and created characters that involved all types of community-engaged learning discourses and shifting subjectivities. Through integrating varieties of experiences and stories, I attempt to create characters positioned to assist in the exploration of community-engaged learning discourses between faculty and their doctoral students.

Julie's character is also an entanglement of faculty participant subjectivities and experiences, as well as my own. Her character is created based on faculty participant's interviews, syllabi and other artifacts, and shifting subjectivities. Within the interviews, faculty participants discussed their interactions with their doctoral students and provided examples of how and in what ways they exposed them to community-engaged learning. I took these examples and folded them into my own shifting subjectivities as both a

graduate student and faculty member. In this creation of Julie, I attempt to disrupt the socialization of graduate education (Eatman, 2018) often found in doctoral education literature. Instead, I create this new space to discuss interactions between faculty and their doctoral students around community-engagement. Similar to the faculty characters, poststructuralist theories keep Julie's character in constant motion, process, and in play.

The three chapters in the following "Discomfort in Stories" section correlate to each of the three faculty members and their different sociopolitical contexts of the classroom, community partner site, and research team meeting. Within each chapter a poststructuralist concept is applied. The first chapter interrogates shifting subjectivities and identity politics within Dr. Sanders online class. The next chapter applies Foucault's power/knowledge discourse to Dr. McGrath and Julie's conversation at St. Mary's Catholic Church tutoring program. The final chapter deconstructs norms and surveillance within Dr. Riley and Julie's research team meeting. Julie transcends each of the three chapters where her subjectivities are in constant process with her faculty members that is contextually, historically, and sociopolitical situated.

The three chapters correlate with the three faculty members, their respective contexts, and subsequent integration of related artifacts. Drawing from Moon's (2019) *Three Approaches to Qualitative Research through the ARTS: Narratives of Teaching for Social Justice and Community* and Ryan, Tocci, and Moon's (2020) *The Curriculum Foundations Reader*, I utilize various artifacts to problematize and destabilize the characters and data. For instance, Ryan, Tocci, and Moon's (2020) portrayed unique representations of primary artifacts and reflection questions within the text to

problematize educational history and make room for new historical discourses. As an example, one chapter examined English-only policies in U.S. public education as a form of power and control. It integrated primary sources, such as policy documents, illustrations, and pictures, and reflection questions in the interrogation of curriculum history. These representation of artifacts and reflection questions created new disruptive practices in my attempts to represent this research.

The examples from Ryan, Tocci, and Moon's (2020) allowed me to leverage my own historical training in the creative attempts at representing community-engaged teaching and scholarly artifacts from the interviews. An example of this is in Dr. Sanders' chapter where she assigns a critical reflection on identity development. The assignment is portrayed in the chapter and asks Julie and her peers to identify and analyze their social identities and lived experiences in order to understand their students and communities. The identity development critical reflection was discursively created from an integration and entanglement of assignments from interview participants and my own graduate education coursework. Within the analysis, it is then subsequently deconstructed in an attempt to explore subjectivities and identity politics within community-engaged learning. The aforementioned examples of scholarly works and their use of artifacts and reflective prompts provided an opportunity to rethink the representation of data in my dissertation.

Through the crisis of representing this research and characters, there are several key elements that are in need of deconstruction, including the "I", reflexivities, and telling of other's stories. Foucault (1998) challenges the "I" when talking about the

‘author function’ of writing, and the problematization associated in deconstructing the subject as an outcome of discourse while not the privileged creator. I have been using “I” throughout this dissertation, and use “I” when writing from Julie’s character’s perspective. This “I” is in need of discussion and deconstruction. Just like qualitative humanistic research terms, poststructuralist research does not reject the “I” but seeks to problematize it and question its ability to reveal the truth (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). Humanist research situates the subject as stable and coherent while post-humanistic research views the subject as multiple, unstable, contradictory, and fragmented (de Freitas & Paton, 2009). It is critical to not return to this humanist lens and create another onto-methodology does not resolve this tendency (Miller & Macedo, 2018). Rather, as Miller and Macedo (2018) state when they wrote their text, it is just one part of a larger intra-action that resists the return to what is known and instead seeks to displace. This displacement and destabilization of the “I” is what I continue to deconstruct throughout my research.

Poststructuralist researchers seek a performative “I.” The performative “I” creates space to allow for a new interpretation of different forms of meanings (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). A performative “I” is inexplicably tied to power relations and is thus not predictable or stagnant but is tied to telling through its articulation (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). This is the “I” that I seek to deconstruct during the continuous in process creation of the four characters.

This “I” does not become paralyzed by the impossibility of the limits of knowing, but is constructed by an ethics as it uses those limits to present complicated voices

and create new ways of understanding for those who read and listen to these performative accounts (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008, p. 314)

I attempt to create a performative “I” through the impossible efforts of representing the faculty interviewees’ partial stories through characters. This is not an attempt at an accurate depiction of the interview data as it is, but a tension in the production of something new to examine faculty and doctoral student discursive interactions around community-engaged learning. While the performative “I” is multiple and shifting, I also do not want to create an entanglement of these characters subjectivities just to deconstruct or complicate them (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). Instead, such an attempt should use Deleuze’s concept of becoming. In this way, the “I” contains an ‘assemblage of multiplicities,’ which destabilize and acknowledges the “I” as containing inconsistencies and instabilities (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). In other words, this performative “I” is in the process of becoming and views experience as “not simply as a foundation for knowledge but as a concept ‘under erasure’ to expose the indecidability of meaning, of self, of narrative — without requiring self-identification or mastery” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008, p. 305). This dissertation seeks such a performative “I” in its process of becoming.

Applying the performative “I,” I inserted footnotes in dialogue between Julie and her faculty that include deconstructive questions. Instead of referring to them as “reflection questions,” I utilize poststructuralist theories to disrupt traditional forms of humanistic qualitative research by inserting *deconstructive questions*. Drawing from St. Pierre (2018) who used ‘thinking-writing’ spaces in her dissertation to experiment, I use

footnotes to pose questions that disrupt stable subjectivities to keep them in constant motion and play. I also use these questions to acknowledge the power dynamics between the reader and I. The questions are inserted in an attempt for the reader to interrogate and destabilize the analysis. Through these deconstructive questions, I continue to problematize the research and keep dialogue and discourse in constant movement.

The performative “I” requires the interrogation of the concept of reflexivity in poststructuralist research. Poststructuralist theories deconstruct the concept of reflexivity stating that it only recenters the power dynamics between researcher and participant and establishes experience as being able to be understood (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). Just like coding is problematized and words are not ‘out there’ to be collected (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014), pre-discursive experience is also not out there for reflection (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). Poststructuralist research work towards Pillow’s (2003) reflexivity of discomfort and attempts to problematize and destabilize the power and authority of the researcher (Choi, 2006). Power and positionality are analyzed between the researcher and participant within poststructuralist research to seek a partial knowledge (Choi, 2006). Through problematizing reflexivity and working towards a reflexivity of discomfort, this nonfiction-fiction dissertation analyzes the power dynamics between the interview participants and myself through the representations of the research. This positionality is deconstructed as I create the characters through the interview data and my own subjectivities.

As I continue to examine the crisis of representation and impossible attempts at representing the research, I utilize the performative “I” and reflexivity of discomfort in

my analysis. After each of the three chapters in “Discomfort in Stories,” I analyze Julie and her faculty’s stories through the creation of new sites where their stories are constantly disrupted, deconstructed, and reinterpreted. For instance, following Julie and Dr. Sanders’ dialogue, I created new characters and setting from my own subjectivities and conversations with faculty participants to analyze Julie and Dr. Sanders’ interactions. In this case, doctoral students and their professor are located within a classroom setting and have just read Julie and Dr. Sanders’ chapter. They discuss the application of poststructuralist concept of identity politics when deconstructing Julie and Dr. Sanders’ discourse. I position myself as part of this discussion and seek to continue to destabilize my own shifting “I” and subjectivities. Within this analysis, Dr. Sanders and Julie’s discursive interactions are continuously deconstructed through the repositioning and reinterpretation of a new sociopolitical context. I utilize this method of deconstructive analysis throughout each of the chapters in an attempt to apply reflexivity of discomfort and the performative “I” within the research’s crisis of representation.

As Julie’s transcends each of the three faculty chapters, I began to wonder what would happen if the faculty participants found themselves engaged in dialogue together. What would they talk about? What new discourses would occur around community-engagement? In what ways would this discourse impact Julie’s subjectivities? Barad (2012; as cited in Miller & Macedo, 2018) discuss diffraction as experiences are not illuminated within a present context but are diffracted in a variety of processes through troubling and turning over. Using this concept within my dissertation research, I continued to turn over and diffract the stories and experiences of my interview

participants and my own subjectivities as I positioned their experiences against one another. Thus, the final analysis chapter is a community-engaged professional development workshop on Zoom. Julie and her three faculty find themselves in the same breakout room and they discuss their experiences. In this way, this dissertation attempts to problematize and contradict the discursive construction of community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship between faculty and their doctoral students through the crisis of representation.

Ethics of Discomfort

The original text of this section overviewed humanistic qualitative research ethical considerations. Confidentiality documents, scripts, and secure storage spaces were all well-articulated and defined. However, upon studying poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry, I realize there are other factors in need of consideration when discussing ethics. Ethical issues arise in qualitative research as it is difficult to become untangled from the work (St. Pierre, 1997b). Like other components of poststructuralist research, ethics is not foregone, but remains complicated and is recreated and redesigned in every new situation (St. Pierre, 1997a). In poststructuralist research, Foucault's (1984) ethical analysis and care of self is applied, which is taken from the Greeks on how people are constructed as ethical beings through interactions with others and themselves (St. Pierre, 1997b).

. . . ethics is invented within each relation as researcher and respondent negotiate sense-making by foregrounding their theoretical frameworks, by risking confusion, by determining to read harder when the text begins to seem

inaccessible, and by willing to attend to the absences in their own work that are made intelligible by the difference of the other. (St. Pierre, 1997a, p. 186)

Putting these ethical considerations into practice, St. Pierre (1997b) attempts to free herself by thinking differently and moving beyond standard forms of ethical considerations. This involves a constant analysis and critique of how to engage with and make sense of the production and context of data and research (St. Pierre, 1997b). This ‘ethics of response’ is different and varied depending on the context and condition (St. Pierre, 1997a). In this way, ethics is contextually based and utilizes theory to deconstruct. Applying St. Pierre’s (1997a, 1997b) interrogation of ethics in poststructuralist research, I analyze not only the context of each encounter with participants, but the entanglement and interactions between theory and data.

Foucault (1997a) discusses an ‘ethics of discomfort’ in the continuous deconstruction of ethical analysis in research. An ethics of discomfort does not attempt to make the research known or to find what is true to make it known (Harwood & Rasmussen, 2004). Foucault does not use a prescribed code of ethics, and the application of an ethics of discomfort does not focus on finding the truth (Harwood & Rasmussen, 2004). Instead, Foucault explores how the connection to truth is generated versus what is the truth (Harwood & Rasmussen, 2004). This discomfort of ethics is used in my research to seek my dissertation’s process and connection to truth, as well as interrogate the power relations between the participants and myself. In this new frame of exploring ethics, I consider ways to move beyond just confidentiality and consent to igniting considerations

for how ethics is made complicated, contextuality situated, and relationally defined in the research.

Ethical considerations within poststructuralist research analyze the relationship between researcher and interview participants. While I cannot fully deconstruct or unveil the power dynamics between my interview participants and I, I attempt to deconstruct the “I”, interrogate shifting and unstable subjectivities, and acknowledge voice can never fully communicate experience (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). In the intersection of ethics and crisis of representation, I acknowledge I cannot fully represent the subjects I interviewed as their subjectivities are always shifting and changing (Choi, 2006). "Questioning the researcher's authority to be able to represent others' lives conceptually is congruent with the researcher as positioned subject, in the sense that both bring us to attend to the 'power' inherent in knowledge production: who represents what" (Choi, 2006, p. 440). As St. Pierre (2008) reminds us, voice cannot accurately portray truth and stories from interviews. Within poststructuralist research, ethical considerations include the representation of participants and power dynamics between the participants and researcher.

In Process

In a Zoom conversation with a dissertation committee member in the final stages of writing, I was asked, “What would you call this type of research?” I shared it was no longer an autobiographical dissertation, which was its initial premise, but something completely new. It no longer even resembled a dissertation, and I struggled with naming it.

He quickly responded, “It is like you are writing a dis-sertation as you are describing your dis-sertation as disruptive, discursive, discomfort. Maybe it is an *in-sertation?*”

As I review poststructuralist theories and post qualitative inquiry’s crisis of representation, thinking with theory, and apply methodology in the fold, I attempt to name what this dissertation research is becoming. I return to and reinterpret transgressive extracts created earlier in my writing process. Lather (1993) inspired its construction with her transgressive validity concept, which contributes to problematizing research representation, truth, and destabilize experience. The transgressive extracts represented as ~~strike-throughs~~ were one of the first deconstructive pedagogical tools I used in my dissertation in an attempt to showcase my shifting and partial subjectivities. I now use these concepts to try to develop a designation for this research.

Upon studying poststructuralist thought and engaging in discourse with my committee member, I call this research *(re)in-sertation*. I think of *in-sertation* as an inverse of a dissertation, or a dissertation that has been disrupted and turned inward on itself. It is a political term that interrogates and deconstructs the fixed and stable structures of a dissertation in order to create space for something new. I added (re) in front of in-sertation to indicate that the research is always in process of being (re)imagined, (re)thought, and (re)interpreted. The research within a poststructuralist in-sertation is never stable or fixed, but is constantly changing, in process, and in need of continued reinterpretation. It is within this new framing that traditional dissertation

expectations are problematized and questioned and where binaries are dissolved to create this new *(re)in-sertation*.

APPLICATION: REVISION—INTEGRATION—REVISION OF LITERATURE
DISCOMFORT IN STORIES

Dear Colleagues,

In past correspondence, I discussed shifting subjectivities, and I attempt to interrogate this concept as it relates to data analysis. I hope to analyze data analysis and research representation with you in this writing. Writing the analysis chapters were very challenging due to the crisis of representing research and shifting subjectivities and experiences. In reimagining and reconceptualizing subjectivity within post qualitative research, ~~I am able to better understand how to situate faculty and doctoral student discourses~~ discourse becomes messy, troubled, and unclear. According to St. Pierre (2008), subjectivity is not stable, which makes it hard to reflect upon and know. “Keeping subjectivity in play, mobile, a line of flight with no referent and no destination is my desire and ethical charge” (St. Pierre, 1997b, p. 413). In this way, St. Pierre (2008) challenges the subjective to move beyond simply pluralizing it and calling it ‘in process,’ but that it needs to be troubled, reformed, and reconceptualized. This troubling and keeping subjectivity in play is what I hope to (im)possibly discuss with you.

In the following “Discomfort in Stories” section, I analyze my findings, which are not actually findings within poststructuralist research, but a constant interrogation and problematization set into action by power/knowledge. Remember, I do not intend to offer a clear ending or outcome. Rather, it is my goal to enrich discourse on community-

engaged scholarship within this poststructuralist dissertation research. In the original writing of my dissertation, I was going to create three separate faculty members working with three distinct doctoral students. One of the faculty members was going to be a “gold standard” faculty meaning I was going to use all of the stories from my interviews that demonstrated community-centered knowledge. I was then going to construct another faculty member who was using community-engaged learning problematically and use stories from interviews that did not center community-knowledge. Upon studying post qualitative inquiry and poststructuralist thought, I quickly realized that I was creating categories of good and bad. Deconstructing this dichotomy opened up new interrogations and analysis for the operation of power. This led to the evolution of the three faculty members of Dr. Sanders, Dr. McGrath, and Dr. Riley, along with Julie, a doctoral student. As I created discourse among their characters, I had no preestablished agenda for what they would discuss. Through using methodology in the fold, reading Foucault and community-engagement literature, and reviewing the interview transcripts and faculty participants’ syllabi, I attempted to create this interplay of subjectivities and discourse. It is my hope you will also insert your own subjectivities and interrogations as you examine the chapters.

Within poststructuralist theories, subjectivity is unstable, multiple, and shifting (Davis, 1994). It is seen as a part of our life histories and the discourses that make up such experiences (Davis, 1994). Moon (2018) reminds us in his application of Butler (2009) that the subject is discursively constructed by the interactions with the other. “Examining an individual’s subjectivity is thus a way of gaining access to the constitutive

effects of the discursive practices through which we are all constituted as subjects and through which the world we all live in is made real” (Davis, 1994, p. 3). The subjectivities of the characters in this section operate discursively, are always in progress, and are interdependent. Drawing from Miller and Macedo (2018), I utilize their ‘subject-in-relationship’ concept that subjects are produced in relation to the other. Additionally, subjects may not be able to narrate their own or other’s experiences as it is impossible to understand the self or other (Miller & Macedo, 2018). In this way, reflection on experience does not make it known or stable as experience and subjects are discursively constructed through power relations which may not be known (Miller & Macedo, 2018). All three faculty members and Julie’s discourse are not unique to a particular interview participant, but the characters are created through integrating different subjectivities and discourses from the interviews and artifacts. My own subjectivities are also inserted into the character make-up, which are also made up of life histories and discourse of which I cannot fully identify as they are always shifting, moving, and in process

Throughout the various impartial stories of the faculty and Julie, I intentionally insert nameless classmates. This is done in an attempt to disrupt and interrogate what happens outside and around discourse among faculty and their doctoral students. Using Barad’s intra-activity, I interrogate how the intra-action between people and things create subjectivities (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017). I use such nameless character’s interjections to push my participants’ and mine incomplete experiences and trouble them. Additionally, when I read Foucault, his ‘subjects’ in discourse are never named. In an attempt to probe

Foucault's faceless and nameless subjects, I use these classmates and other unnamed figures to keep dialogue in play and examine the intra-activity between individuals.

Experience and subjectivities are inexplicably tied together. Similar to subjectivities, poststructuralist theories indicate that experience and the sharing of experience is incomplete and subject to discourse and history (Britzman, 1995). Experience is further investigated by analyzing it through power/knowledge discourse and questioning the ownership of experience (Moon, 2016). Just as subjectivity is discursively constructed, experience is as well, in the sense it is both individual and shared (Scott, 1991). Scott (1991) pushes for redefining the term experience and aligning it with identity formation, political construction, and discursive entanglement.

"Experience is at once always already an interpretation and something that needs to be interpreted. What counts as experience is neither self-evident nor straightforward; it is always contested, and always therefore political" (Scott, 1991, p. 797). In this way, experience is not neutral and non-linear, but rather inexplicably and inarguably tied to language and discourse (Moon, 2016). Experiences and subjectivities of participants, and thereby, the dissertation characters, are discursively constructed and non-linear. As you read their narratives, I hope you consider in what ways are your own experiences discursively constructed?

Through Julie's discursive construction of community-engaged learning experiences with her faculty, I seek to disrupt grand narratives and essentialist post-positivistic representations of data found in community-engaged learning literature. In my early stages of writing this dissertation, I utilized engaged scholarship to validate my

analysis and confirm what is already know. Throughout my study of poststructuralist thought, I came to realize that a return to what is known and the integration of post-positivistic community-engaged scholarship only essentializes and creates a grand narrative of communities, faculty, and doctoral students. Lyotard (1984), who is an early poststructuralist thinker, reminds us that poststructuralist theories critique grand narratives of experience.

This analysis disrupts the grand narratives and essentialist thinking of doctoral education and community-engaged learning scholarship. For instance, I initially was planning on integrating the following sentences into this letter to you:

- Literature on community-engaged learning within doctoral education states that it is improbable graduate students who do not experience, or are exposed to, community engagement in graduate school engages with it in their future careers (O'Meara, 2011).
- Faculty who are involved in community engagement often identify as public service intellectuals, who believe in the democratic ideals of education and are co-learners within communities (Eatman, 2018).
- There are a number of factors, such as faculty epistemology, personal goals, institutional and departmental contexts, that impact why faculty would want to integrate community engagement into their position (O'Meara et al., 2011).

Instead of centering essentialist scholarship of community-engagement as true, the analysis is intended to create new ways to interrogate this scholarship through the

examination of shifting subjectivities and power/knowledge discourse. As an example, Julie's experiences and subjectivities interrogate this grand narrative of the tabula rosa doctoral student since Julie had service-learning experiences prior to graduate school. The following chapters utilize community-engaged learning literature but also seek to disrupt and problematize it. As characteristic of the application of poststructuralist theories, it is turned into something new (St. Pierre 2018, 2021).

I analyze how faculty and doctoral subjectivities are discursively constructed, while also recognizing they are never accurately represented because they are always in process. I added two new research questions ~~emerged~~ in my dissertation process in an attempt to deconstruct grand narratives and interrogate shifting subjectivities:

- In what ways are faculty subjectivities discursively constructed in their interactions with their doctoral students?
- In what ways have my subjectivities shifted, and thus, discursively constructed in my interactions with the participants and research readings?

Subjectivity and experience are concepts studied and problematized in poststructuralist theories literature. In some humanistic qualitative and postpositivist research, subjectivity is seen as something that needs to be detached from the research as it might discredit or invalidate the study (Davis, 1994). However, through applying post qualitative inquiry's methodology in the fold, I position my character's subjectivities as in process and unstable as they are the entanglement of all of my participants and my own shifting subjectivities. I look forward to interrogating subjectivities with you and discussing the impossible attempts at representing this research.

Kind regards,

Annie

Julie ⇔ Dr. Sanders

Identity Development Politics within Community-Engagement

A picture hangs over my desk that reflects four youthful undergraduate students with arms linked outside of a large stone school building. I remember taking that photo when I was a senior in undergrad. We just finished distributing meals with Campus Kitchen as part of a Theology service-learning class. I loved my Catholic undergraduate experience and was deeply involved in every facet of campus life. As an undergraduate student, I was required to take a service-learning course as part of my graduation requirements. At the time, I did not know the purpose of service-learning. While I cannot recall the Theology curriculum or how the service-learning experience was threaded into the class (or even if it was), this was one of my first experiences where I saw my privileged socio-economic status in juxtaposition with the community I was engaging. What I needed at the time was for my faculty (or anyone!) to help me make sense of this experience, to disrupt my own construction of privileged identities, and problematize systematic inequalities and food insecurity. I desperately needed critical integration and reflection, and I still do as I go through my first year of doctoral education.

So far, my first year is challenging and feel like I am mostly underwater. I have a full load of courses and serve as the lead research assistant within a faculty member's research group. Staying on top of schoolwork, research responsibilities, adjusting to a new city, and trying to make new friends is daunting and challenging. I initially wanted

to pursue a doctorate in Educational Studies because I wanted to make an impact on students and the community. I am finding that this program is quite difficult and regret my own naivety as I assumed my previous educational experiences and volunteer work would have prepared me for this moment!

Snapping me from my thoughts of doom and self-pity, my cell phone illuminates with a calendar reminder that class starts in 15 minutes. I stand up, take a quick stretch, and briefly consider moving the stacks of disorganized papers, notebooks, and folders to a place outside the video range. Quickly determining it as a hopeless cause in a tiny studio apartment, I forego the disarray in favor of doing a last-minute skim over the course material. Flicking a few old tea bags off my desk to make room for my laptop, I pull up the assigned course readings and podcasts. I nibble on a semi-stale cracker found behind my pencil holder as I try to jog my memory on what I read about identity development. Glancing at the clock, it is two minutes till. Dr. Sanders does not like us late. I roll up the sleeves of my grey cardigan and sign into the digital video platform. Crossing my fingers I do not have an internet outage like last week, I exhale after seeing twenty faces pop onto the screen. I smile, wave, and make sure I am muted. Dr. Sanders is illuminated by a warm glow from a desk lamp and giant white painted bookcases with hundreds of colorful spines behind her. To the right of the bookcase, she has pictures of her family hung up on deep, orange-colored walls. In late spring's early evening light, I can feel the warmth, security, and peace radiating from her presence and home. Dr. Sanders leans into the camera with her hands folded under her chin and welcomes everyone to class with a warm smile and begins.

“Ok, so today we are going to kick-off with breakout groups. For the first quarter of the semester, we had a lot of reflection and engagement in small group discussion boards around the chapter readings, videos, and podcasts. These modules were designed to focus on who you are, how did you get to be you, how do you know what you know, and other factors on your development. You have your Identity Development Critical Reflection assignment due next week, so the goal is to have a small breakout discussion to help inform what you want to write. You all will take a deep dive into thinking about your social identities and lived experiences and how that impacts how you engage in educational settings and communities.¹ Enjoy your discussion!”

Soon little pop-up notifications entered onto each of our screens asking for us to accept the invitation to go into a breakout room. I click “accept” and teleport into breakout room number two. After a few seconds, three other faces pop up. Two are fellow classmates and the other is Dr. Sanders. My classmates look at each other through the screens with unspoken anxiety as Dr. Sanders listens in.

Dr. Sanders cut through the silence and states, “I think this can be a powerful assignment for students to consider their identities, where you come from and lived experiences, and how integral it is to know yourself when working with students, families, and community members. I actually had to do this type of reflection in graduate school and it helped me realize how much my lived experiences impacted me, especially identifying how being raised by a father in public service influenced my view of communities. He was a very colorful person and always fighting for just causes like living wage for workers. We always

¹ Within poststructuralist theories, in what ways are power/knowledge operating to construct identities and experiences?

had people in my house and those people were our community. People from very different backgrounds coming together. It has certainly made me who I am. What about you?"

I lean back in my chair as my classmates discuss. I glance at the assignment description we are discussing:

Identity Development Critical Reflection²

Purpose: The purpose of this assignment is for you to create and analyze your own background to better assist in making meaning of your identities, communities, and experiences, and how they impact your engagement with students and their families and communities. During class, we have listened to powerful podcasts and compelling stories on identities and experience. Now it is your turn to name and uncover yours.

Questions to answer in your paper:

- Which of your social identities are most salient and why? Examples include race, ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, language, religion, etc.
- In what ways do your identities intersect? How does that impact how you support your students and their communities?
- What educational-related lived experiences have had the biggest impact on you? How do these bias your work with students?
- What are the lived experiences and organizational structure of your family that impact how you were raised? How do these impact your work with students' families?

² Applying poststructuralist concepts, how would you revise the assignment?

- How were power and rules exercised and maintained in the communities you were a part of growing up? How do these influence your work with the communities your students are a part?

My mind wanders as I hear my classmates enthusiastically engage with one another. I nodded my head in agreement slipping back into thought. Twirling a pen in my hand, I start jotting down some notes on what I want to say.

- White, cis-gender, female
- K-12 Catholic education -> Lots of volunteering
- College service-learning experience in Puerto Rico (??)
- Current community-engaged research position

I jolt back to reality when I hear my name being called by Dr. Sanders. “Julie, what are your thoughts?”

“Well, this is really difficult.” I pause. Where do I even begin. “I guess I will start with talking about my educational background. I went to Catholic school growing up and they had a large focus on volunteering. For example, the Catholic sisters who ran my high school brought in speakers to encourage us to do service work whether it was tutoring at a local school or engaging in an international service project! My education and service projects have very much shaped who I am. In fact, I use a lot of what I learned growing up and apply it to my current graduate assistantship with Dr. Riley as we conduct community-engaged research!”

One of my classmates winces, and states, “Where did you do your local service work growing up?”

I respond, “I would tutor in an under-resourced school as part of our church’s partnership.”

“So, did you live where the school was located?”

“Well, no, we went there to tutor.” I have no idea what this classmate is trying to say. I continue, “this is a significant part of the church’s mission, which is to give back to the community.”

“Ok, but you did not live there. And I am assuming the Church was not even located in that community. How much time did you spend in that area apart from tutoring?”

I shift uncomfortably in my chair. “Well, I volunteered there each week for about a year.”

“So, did you even get to know the area or people? Did you go down there on the weekends to get to know the community? The local restaurants? The families?”

I start feeling attacked. Volunteering and helping underserved communities were a part of my upbringing! “I had a great relationship with the kids I was tutoring. I used the education I was given for good.”

My classmate leans into the screen looking agitated, “okay, so, another question for you. Did the kids you were tutoring look like you? Were they white?”

My face flushes, “No.” Dr. Sanders remains silently on the screen watching this unfold.

“I used to have older students like you come into my school to help us.” The student uses air quotations over ‘help us.’ “They never looked like me and always seemed like they never wanted to be there.”

“Well, I am sorry that happened to you, but I can assure you that I looked forward to tutoring every week. It was my break from reality.”

My classmate looks shocked. “Your break from reality? What about the kids you were tutoring? Was that not their reality?”

“Well, no, that is not what I meant.”

“Well, what did you mean then?”

I honestly cannot believe I am interrogated because of giving back to the community. I feel my world ruptured.

Dr. Sanders unmutes herself and interjects, “well that is interesting. I think it’s important we keep each other honest and listen and learn from each other’s experiences.” Dr. Sanders then asks my classmate if they can do a check-in. Their videos zoom out of sight into their own private online room.

I cling to my chair with my fingernails digging into the sides of the seat. I mute my video as silent tears stream down my cheek. I know I need to listen to this. That I need to learn and hear other perspectives. Why does it feel so hard? I take a deep breath and grab a glass of water. Picking a dirty mug that states “Service, Leadership, Faith: Mission Puerto Rico” with a large cross on the side, I rinse, fill it to the brim, and take a long sip. Staring at the mug I trace the chip on the handle with my thumb. I feel a twinge of anxiety and guilt thinking that maybe my classmate is right. Maybe my service projects leading up to this point are harmful. Maybe I am a terrible person. Taking a deep breath and clinging to my mug, I sit down at my computer. Dr. Sanders’ video is the only one I can see.

“Julie,” she states. “Let’s take a step back. I think it is important we have a conversation about what just happened here.”

I nod my head expecting a debrief.

“First, before we dig in, just, how are you doing?” I feel Dr. Sanders warming me up for a big talk. Hmm. That is a tough question. How AM I doing? It can change in an instance.

“I am fine.” I state hesitantly. Apart from class today, I just cannot believe what is going on in the world. That we are living in a global pandemic. “I am having a hard time articulating how I am feeling.”

“It is a difficult time. Who knows how long this is going to go on?” I feel Dr. Sanders studying me through kind, attentive eyes. Pausing to see if I continue my thoughts, she states, “What do you think of our class so far?”

I make eye contact anxious to share what I thought. “I really enjoy the class so far. I think we are lucky that this class was online before the pandemic.” I bit my lip thinking about how we are just a few weeks into our city’s lockdown in an attempt to control the pandemic and virus outbreak. My other classes and research involvements had scrambled to transition online. I am thankful for the stability that this class provided in the midst of the chaos.

Dr. Sanders states, “Well, that is good. What are some of your class takeaways so far?”

Thankful I took the time to do a quick skim of the coursework before our class, I said, “yes, I found the readings and stories insightful and so different from how I was

raised. There is a lot to unpack. I think the concept I am not the expert is really profound and makes me think differently about how I enter schools and work with communities. I feel this internal pressure I am supposed to know everything. I realize that might not be the best position to take.” Not sure my response is what she was looking for, I glance at Dr. Sanders illuminated face through my screen.

Dr. Sanders waits for me to continue. “Um, the TEDx talks that got me thinking about identity development, which I know was a big component of the first half of the course, was Marcus Lyon’s (2016) ‘Is your identity given or created?’ and Chimamanda Adichie’s (2009) ‘Danger of a Single Story.’ The other podcasts you assigned are really good, too.”

“Yes, a lot of students find ‘Danger of a Single Story’ to be poignant. Why did it resonate with you?”

“I thought it was poignant that Adichie talked about the damage of creating a singular story of a person or group of people. She noted she did not have a singular story of America because of its power and situation in the world. Whereas when she went to college in the U.S. her roommate had a singular story of Africa, which is where she is from.” I think for a minute and look at my “Service, Leadership, Faith: Mission Puerto Rico” mug. Perhaps I am missing the mark on something. “Dr Sanders, how do I know if I am creating a single story of people? How do I stop myself from doing that?”

“I teach with conversations and stories to try not to, you know, create a singular picture. As you shared, you heard stories that address issues related to identity, community, home-school collaborations, and parent engagement. My goal for you and our class is to

perhaps understand more clearly what I am talking about. We have lots of podcasts where people are telling their stories so that you go, oh my gosh, is that really what happened? Because it is not something that you have read in a book. So, if I tell you a story of the various real-life experiences I have and witness, I think that helps students understand and help you form not a single story about a group of people.”³

I nod. There were dozens of stories so far in our class told by Dr. Sanders, as well as assigned podcasts and videos. They all have purpose on what it is like to be an educator and understand how our identities and experiences shape us. Learning from the experience of others has been inspiring.

“I really want to hit home in this class that we are not the experts and that we need to work with communities as having an equal seat at the table. Sometimes I will see a former student somewhere and they go, I hear you sometimes on my shoulder!” Dr. Sanders peers at me and moves some papers around on her desk. “Tell me how your identity development critical reflection assignment is going. Where are you with it?”

I look at my notes again. “Well, I have some thoughts on where I want to go with it. I was planning on talking about all of my service work and how much it has shaped me and why it is the reason I am in graduate school. After today, I am not sure how I should frame this, or do I even write about my service experiences anymore?” I bite my lip not really sure how to move forward from here.

Dr. Sanders nods her head. “Sure, well, tell me some experiences you are planning on writing and how they shape your views on education.”

³ In what ways are stories limiting within poststructuralist research? In what ways does this impact community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship?

“You already know about my tutoring experience through my Catholic high school as I just mentioned it, but now I am struggling to understand my college service-learning experience.” I pull my mug into the screen. “Do you see this mug? I got this when I was in Puerto Rico on a service trip. When I was in college, I was highly involved in a service-learning center that housed classes and connected students to non-profit organizations. You might remember me sharing how my undergrad was a religious institution, so it was a very mission-centric center and had a lot of support from faculty and students. I took classes through the faculty director and eventually started working at the Center. Since I was working there, when I decided to do a for-credit immersion experience, the faculty director placed me with a new agency in Puerto Rico.” I pause considering how to frame the next part. “My preparation for the experience was minimal. I took a Spanish class, and the Center offered a seminar on cultural issues and a broad overview of what my independent research project could look like.” I really have never thought of my lack of community-engaged preparation before.

“I did not get a lot of information and just trusted the process thinking my faculty mentor knew what he was doing. When I arrived in San Juan, I was connected with an agency linked to a local church doing public health work and lived with a very nice family. Looking back on it, I really just kind of showed up. I was essentially useless. I did not have nursing competencies or a public health background, and I had minimal Spanish skills. It was really much more of an education for me. But the one thing I could do was create fundraising booklets of images and statistics that could be presented to possible donors.”

Dr. Sander's mouth is partially agape. "Ok, how were you oriented to the actual community?"

I shrug my shoulders. "I did not. I did not get any background about community engagement and how to work with and not for communities. Come to think of it," I pause to rack my brain, "come to think of it, community members were never asked what they actually needed. I was given an example of a possible independent research project, but the conversations never centered on what the community asked for. The Puerto Rico mission was a powerful educational experience, but because of the dialogue from your class, I am rethinking what community-university partnerships should look like."⁴

Dr. Sanders gives a nod and contemplative look. "It is important to use an equity lens and recognize you are not the expert if you are not a part of the community. If I am part of a community, I am that expert and the only way we can help the community move forward is to do it together in reciprocal partnership.⁵ That I am not supposed to have a position of privilege and I am not to have a power differential, but that I am supposed to acquiesce to what the community has to say. Then, I hope to bring them around to my point of view, but not ever say I know better. Community engagement in this process does not work if they think you have power and control over them. Power is not an object like you share some part of cookie to other entities"⁶

⁴ In what ways are Julie's subjectivities shifting in discourse with Dr. Sanders surrounding community-engagement?

⁵ Applying poststructuralist thought, it is possible for communities and universities to achieve a reciprocal partnership? Why or why not?

⁶ In what ways is power/knowledge operating among Julie and Dr. Sanders to construct community-engagement?

I shake my head, “Of course, I should be doing that, and I should be listening to their voices and teaching the community that they have a voice.”

Dr. Sanders continues, “I also think we use deficit language when talking about communities that feel apart from us and exploit them for knowledge. There are some very nice people with very deficit-oriented views. I often feel that it is my professional responsibility to make sure students do not have such thoughts, and that starts with how they actually view the communities that they think they are going to help. Can you think of some language you heard or have used that was deficit-oriented of communities?”

I pause. I have not considered my use of deficit-oriented language around the communities I served. I do not remember saying negative things about the people in Puerto Rico or students I tutored. If I did not use deficit-oriented language, what language did I use?

Dr. Sanders leans into the computer screen to the point I can no longer see the white bookcases with the colorful spines. “Julie, as we think about deficit-oriented language and our experiences in communities, we also have to consider how our identities show up in places. Identifying my own biases and identities helps me to better understand how I relate to my students, colleagues, and communities.”

I nod. “Yes, that makes sense. Dr. Sanders, if I am being honest, I am having a hard time figuring out how I show up as a white ally. Things on the TV with the protests.” I pause. “I have not participated in the city-wide protests because of the pandemic but I am also afraid of participating. What does it look like for a white person like me to show-up as an ally for racial injustices happening in America? For the Black

Lives Matter movement and organization?” I look at Dr. Sanders hoping she has a way to move forward.

“I am glad you brought that up. Right now, we are at this moment in history where we see how much society has to change in order to be a better place for all of us to live. And here in academe, we have a chance to talk about what is going on in the world in our classes. As I watch and listen to all the discussions and protests surrounding racial inequities and police brutality, I see many of the people out there are young people who probably just finished college not too long ago. People who look like you. Well, I cannot help but think they were taught by the people who are my peers. These students learned how to be socially just in college as they might not have learned at home.

My students tell me stories about that, what their parents have said and so on. Some obviously have much more impactful family lives and learnings but many do not, and so colleges is where they learn about social justice and think differently about the world.⁷ So, I - we can have some influence. I keep remarking all the young people out there, but specifically, there are all these white people out there, marching. It is not just Black people like in the Civil Rights movement,” Dr. Sanders pauses. “Well, there were white people marching for civil rights but only a few. I happen to know one of my peers marched with Dr. King.” Dr. Sanders started talking fast. “Perhaps these college students are protesting because they have been exposed to systematic injustices, or they met someone through a service site who changed their life and their worldview, or they

⁷ In what ways does the university’s sociopolitical context operationalize faculty’s community-engaged discourse with their doctoral students?

learned something about housing insecurity in a class and now want to take that up. So, within academia, exposure and engaging in these conversations is a privilege.”

I close my laptop replaying my conversation with Dr. Sanders in my mind. I am starting to recognize the problematic messages I received, and continue to receive, about community-engagement. Perhaps it was all deficit-oriented? I stare at my “Mission Puerto Rico” mug and begin to realize the service-learning experiences that drew me to my doctorate in the first place were dangerous. We did not analyze our identities and experiences before entering a community. Taking a deficit-oriented approach, we arrived with our knowledge, tools, and privilege to identify what *they* needed. I had not considered this before.

Opening a new word document on my computer, there was only one thing now to do and it was to dive into my assignment. In order to make meaning of my identities and experiences, I needed to take time to reflect and think. I review the assignment description again and start to write.

Classroom Interrogations and Disruptions

I finished writing my last few reflection notes on our readings for class and closed my laptop. Exchanging smiles with my fellow doctoral peer sitting next to me, we turn towards our professor.

“So, what do you think of Julie and Dr. Sanders’ story?” Our doctoral studies professor looks at us over wire rimmed glasses.

“Well, I think I am seeing a major white savior complex,” states Zane.

“What do you mean when you say white savior, Zane?” Our professor probes.

Zane explains, “It means when white people who are often from affluent backgrounds feel the need to come into marginalized communities and help them.” Zane uses air quotes over “help them” just like Julie’s classmate in the story. He continues, “I think it comes off as well intentioned, but those people are clearly ignorant of power dynamics and do damage to the community. Just like in Julie’s story, she goes into a community to tutor, calls it her ‘break from reality’ and then leaves. She does not even live there, and the service is clearly set-up by her church.” He throws up his hands in the air and half-laughs adding, “We can deconstruct the Catholic Church’s power dynamics all day!” We all snicker and half-joke, half-serious nod our heads in agreement.

One of my other classmates, Leila, interjects, “I think Zane makes a great point regarding the white savior complex. Reading about Julie’s experience doing service-learning in communities she is not even a part and not critically examining her identities and biases was alarming!”

I chime in, “Leila, I agree with you. One of my favorite readings of the semester was from Tatum (2013) on how identity-based positionality begins with the process of understanding one’s own identities through the categories of race, ethnicity, age, gender, sex, etc., and exploring how these different identities can come from areas of privilege or oppression. I feel as though that is what Dr. Sanders is trying to encourage her students to do, which is to critically assess their identities and experiences in order to understand their students.”

Zane jumps in, “yes, and I think there may have been a missed opportunity from Dr. Sanders to push Julie in critically analyzing her positionalities, especially as a white

cis-gender female, at the Catholic church's service site and Puerto Rico. She does not use this as a critical learning opportunity to talk about privilege, oppression, and positions of power."

"Speaking of Dr. Sanders, you made me think of Vogelgesang et al.'s (2010) scholarship on demographics of faculty who adopt community-engagement into their faculty practices. Do you remember reading how women and faculty of color were more likely to engage in this work than their peers? What roles do you think gender play into this work?" Leila states inquisitively.

We pause thinking for a moment. Our professor uses our pause as an invitation to interject a new question, "That's a great transition to the other readings I asked you to review for today, which focus on identity politics. Let's continue to lean into discussing critical race theory, which you have already mentioned today, and integrate with our poststructuralist theories readings on identity."

There was another pause. The work of Judith Butler and Foucault is intense and difficult to read! I rub my forehead hoping that it would warm up my brain.

Ishmael opens and closes his mouth a few times before stating, "I think Butler (2015) utilizes poststructuralist theories to interrogate the politics of gender and how subjects and identities are discursively constructed. So, we could analyze Julie and Dr. Sanders' story through how their identities are discursively created?" Ishmael leans against the back of his chair, throws up his hands, and raises his eyes to the ceiling to signal defeat. "Okay, that is all I got!" We all laughed. It was a hard reading!

While not confident in my interpretation of the text, I state, “I connected with this quote on page 61 from Butler (2015).” Clearing my throat, I went on, “‘Language exercises a distinct performative effect on the body in the act of being named as this or that gender or another gender, as it does when one is referred to, from the start.’ I think Butler is trying to say that gender performativity examines how discourse and power impact and create the subject.”

Smoothing a page from Butler’s book, our professor probes, “How can we use Butler’s gender performativity to interrogate Julie and Dr. Sander’s construction of identities in the story?”

“Poststructuralist theories interrogates the ways in which discourse constructs identity and experiences and regulates what constitutes norms within the subject,” Zane offers. We all look at each other confused.

Sensing our confusion, Zane continues, “okay, so, how I interpret poststructuralist theories from Judith Butler’s (2015) or a Foucauldian (1980) standpoint is that they discuss how identities, experiences, and subjectivities are discursively constructed. Are you following?”

As if in unison, we all hesitantly bow our heads.

Zane moves forward, “So, discourse produces norms around identities, which, according to Butler (2015), are then operationalized to regulate the subject. In this case, Julie and Dr. Sanders are creating norms around how identities are enacted in the context of community-engaged spaces. Butler (2015) discusses how norms impact and produce the subject, as well as how norms come to exist and are not take them for granted.”

Ishmael hesitantly adds, “I think Butler (2015) is talking about how identities are discursively produced which regulate how they show-up in public spaces. This is contextual, so, Dr. Sanders and Julie are discursively creating norms surrounding how identities and experiences operate in spaces like protests and community service sites.”

“This reminds me of Moon’s (2012) article we read earlier this semester.” Zane states, “Moon (2012) uses poststructuralist thought to create a counter-narrative to interrogate identity and norms through asking ‘who I am’ and ‘what I do’ versus multiculturalism studies which focuses on ‘who they are’ and ‘what they do.’ I think poststructuralist thinking might be asking different questions than critical race theory and identities.”

Our professor cocks his head, thinking deeply. “Yes, poststructuralist theories critique these stable categories surrounding identity. If you take out Choi’s (2006) article from last week, on page 437 it states,” There is a pause as we flurry to open the article to the right spot. ”Poststructuralists offer a paradigmatic critique of the assumptions concerning self, subject and subjectivity, contending a knower’s position is unstable, shifting, multiply situated and situationally contingent, rather than determined by social categories.’ Tell me what you think of that quote.”

“I think Choi (2006) is stating that there are no defined experiences by identity, such as women’s experience or person of color’s experience, but a relationally constructed experience” I offer.

Leaning forward Zane adds, “This reminds me of Moon’s (2018) article where instead of focusing on the fixed categories, such as native/non-native or U.S.

born/international, he interrogates the discursive construction of the teacher-student relationship.”

“Then, how does this conversation around identities relate to the analysis of Julie and Dr. Sander’s story?” Our professor probes.

“If we relate back to Zane’s comment of Moon’s (2018) example regarding interrogating the discursive construction of teacher-student, what if we analyze Julie and Dr. Sander’s relationship? Or we could also analyze the relationship between Julie and the communities she is referring, so in this way, it might be analyzing an outsider-insider relationship?” I offer

Leila interjects, “But, don’t we have to talk about identities as part of this relationship? I just do not think we cannot not talk about identities and how that shapes experience.”

“I do not think poststructuralist researchers want to ignore identities. If I am remembering correctly, Lather (2006) discusses how poststructuralist theories do not attempt to shut down identity politics but to analyze refusals and disruptions within identity conversations,” Zane offers.

Leila rolls her eyes, “honestly, this just sounds like a way to avoid talking about race.”

Zane continues, “Let’s keep talking about this more as I think poststructuralist research very much wants to discuss identities and equity and inclusion. However, it interrogates it in ways that might be different from critical race theory and multiculturalism literature. So, for instance, Agger (1991) talks about how experiences

are discursively constructed and are situated within the context of being a particular identity, such as a person of color within a certain past situation. And then, related to poststructuralist's deconstruction of fixed categories, Agger (1991) adds to this conversation by stating that postmodern social theory refuses the grand narratives of identities."

Ishmael jumps in, "If we apply Dr. Sanders and Julie's story to this idea, we might then analyze Julie's experiences are discursively created with Dr. Sanders and her classmates, and her various identities, such as being a white, Catholic, cis-gender woman, etc. situate her construction of her community-engaged experiences. Scott (1991) adds researchers should examine how subjects and identities are produced instead of assuming subjects are the beginning of knowledge, and thus, create identities with their assumed features."

Our professor leans towards us and says, "Butler (2015) discusses how identities can appear in public spaces related to sexual politics, and I argue, is applied to identity politics. In this way, Butler (2015) is saying that language is used to determine how we enact our identities. Let's turn to Julie's critical reflection assignment, which is seemingly influenced by critical theories. If we were to redesign this assignment using poststructuralist theories and applying our conversation on identity politics, what would it look like?"

I leaned over the page reviewing Julie's assignment and start making notes:

~~Identity Development Critical Reflection~~ A Reflexivity of Discomfort on Identity Politics and Partial Experiences

Purpose: The purpose of this assignment is for you to [deconstruct your experiences and] ~~create and analyze your own background to better assist in making meaning of your~~ [interrogate the discursive construction of] identities, communities, and experiences, and how they impact your [interactions] ~~engagement~~ with students and their families and communities. During class, we have listened to powerful podcasts and compelling stories on identities and experiences. ~~Now it is your turn to name and uncover yours.~~ [Now it is your turn to analyze the power relations and deconstruct the self/other and stable categories.]

I lean back looking over the rest of the questions Julie is asked to answer. I put a big “X” through the entire section and write,

- In what ways am I being produced by discourse, including my identities, experiences, and subjectivities?
- In what ways are norms created and analyzed within identity politics and community-engaged learning? How do these norms operationalize how I interact?
- What possibilities are formed when stable and fixed categories are deconstructed within discourse? How are power relations interrogated and examined?

Our professor turns towards my scribbles and asks, “What have you come up with?”

I think for a second, look down at my paper, and say, “I deconstructed the assigned to cross out fixed and stable categories of identity and experience. Then, I rewrote the questions using poststructuralist theories to analyze the discursive construction of identities, norms, and experiences surrounding community-engaged learning, as well as interrogate the power dynamics at play.”

Our professor probes, “Tell me more about the process of how you came to create those questions.”

I sat thinking, “Well, I think to Leila and Zane’s exchange earlier, I think poststructuralist theories want to add another space to the conversation around identities. They attempt to deconstruct fixed categories, binaries, and dichotomies since they consider experience and subjectivities as already partial and incomplete. Additionally, to points stated earlier, poststructuralist researchers want to interrogate the power dynamics that form among individuals.”

Zane responds, “I go back to Choi’s (2006) point that the researcher’s relationship with the researched is within a unique context. To your statement, poststructuralist researchers view subjectivities as constantly shifting, so naming fixed categories contradicts this idea, but rather analyzes them situationally.”

Leila adds, “It makes me think of a point you said earlier, Zane, which was about Lyotard’s (1984) resistance to the grand narrative within poststructuralist research. Poststructuralist resist this essentialized notion of identity and experience, which does not categorize communities or identities as retaining certain themes or characteristics.”

I say, “To resist this essentialized narrative, I renamed Julie’s assignment to say, ‘A Reflexivity of Discomfort on Identity Politics and Partial Experiences.’ I combine Pillow’s (2003) reflexivity of discomfort, which deconstructs binaries between subjects, and Choi (2006) who analyzes power relations, shifting subjectivities, and questions the authority of the subject. Choi (2006) discusses when a new identity enters the subject, subjectivities are again changed and in constant play.”

Ishmael continues, “Our subjectivities are constantly changing in relationship with one another! They are contextually and situationally created.”

We all nod our head in agreement. I put my pen down as my head spins with disruption. I hoped to integrate community-engagement into my own work as a future faculty member, but it seemed challenging and problematic. I return to Julie’s assignment and continue to make edits crossing out words, creating new questions, and inserting my own subjectivities. I lean back and analyze the questions I want to consider as I interrogate community-engagement:

- In what ways can I deconstruct my position as a researcher and authority within the community? How are these power relations contextually situated and located?
- How can I integrate critical race theory and poststructuralist thought into my research with communities?

Julie ⇔ Dr. McGrath**Governmentality and Power/Knowledge within University/Community**

My alarm buzzes waking me from a deep sleep. I hear paper crinkle and realize I fell asleep on a copy of my critical reflection identity development assignment description. As I fumble to turn off my alarm, I give a silent thanks the paper is not due until much later in the semester. I could still print off a new copy in the education department. What a way to start the morning. Checking the clock, I have one hour until my meeting with Dr. McGrath. Groaning towards another long day I make my way to the kitchen and turn on the coffee maker. There is not enough caffeine in the world to get me through today. While it is only the halfway through my first year in graduate school, I feel overwhelmed and anxious. Pouring a giant mug of coffee, I shiver in early winter's morning and I shove away a pile of dirty sweaters and slide onto my single kitchen chair. After taking a long sip, I review my notes on the tutoring program Dr. McGrath operates within the undercroft of St. Mary's Catholic Church.

I flip open my computer and google the tutoring program to see if I can locate anything on its history, mission, and students served. Disgruntled I cannot identify demographics of the students, I hurriedly pull an old sweatshirt over my head, grab a granola bar, and pour the rest of the coffee into a thermos. Slinging my bookbag over my shoulder, I shove my apartment keys in my pocket and check my watch. Ten minutes till. My building is just a five-minute walk from St. Mary's so I should arrive right on time. I race down the three flights of stairs and kick open the exit door. I immediately head west eager to meet with Dr. McGrath. Even though the Church was in my neighborhood, I had

not noticed its presence. Another left turn and I immediately see the large stone sign of St. Mary's Catholic Church indicating I am in the right place. I walk up the front steps and push open the large wooden doors. Squinting in the dim light, I step into the Church and smell the familiar aroma of incense. Looking to my right, I instantly notice stairs winding downward with a clear label: "Tutoring this way!"

I pull the only door open as I get to the bottom of the stairs. Opening it, I step into a colorful and bright large room with little chairs arranged around tiny tables. I have not seen chairs so small since I was in elementary school! Along one wall are small bookshelves filled with well-loved children's books neatly organized by author. Some tablet-size chalk boards are neatly stacked next to the room's single computer. A large dry erase board hangs on the opposite side of the room listing the tutors for the day and their time of arrival. Next to the tutor's name is a dash with a subject next to it. To the right and above the board is a crucifix. I almost did not notice it as it seemed as familiar and natural as the black and white clock hanging in the center of the wall. On another side of the room are pictures of biblical references, including Jesus surrounded by little children, and inspirational quotes. The room feels warm and supportive but focused. It was a very different setting than where I tutored in high school.

I sat at one of the little tables with the small chairs to wait for Dr. McGrath. I pull out my notes and a pen. Since this is my first meeting with her, I want to be prepared and thorough. My eyes dart over the questions about the history of the tutoring program, its relationship to the university, and the demographics of the students. I pause to write down a question related to her professional trajectory and experiences. Wrinkling my brow,

three young adult faces flash through my mind bringing me back to my own experience tutoring. It was the reason why I went into education. I feel a strong sense that service for others is my life's purpose.

Wrapped up in my own memories, I barely hear Dr. McGrath enter the room. "Hello, Julie?" she says tentatively. Her voice wipes away the memory of my tutees' faces.

"Yes!" I nod enthusiastically and rise from the small chair with some difficulty. I reach out my hand. "Yes, I am Julie, thank you so much for meeting with me!"

Dr. McGrath gave a curt nod and grins, "Let's move to the big kid table, shall we?" And leads me to one of the only tables and chairs in the room that fits a grown adult. "Here we are! Much better for the knees. I have not sat in one of those chairs in decades!" Gesturing to the tiny chair I was seated moments ago.

"Yes, much better!" I exclaim. "Thank you again for meeting with me. I am Dr. Riley's lead research assistant this year as part of my graduate assistantship, and she thought it would be a good idea to do an introductory meeting with you as we work together on the research project involving your tutoring program here at St. Mary's!"

"A fine idea," Dr. McGrath interjects. "Dr. Riley and I have only met a few times, but I am interested to see what this research partnership could look like and how we can use what we find to really help the students we tutor."

I nod again, "yes! I am really excited for this research experience and conducting a study in this site! I have to tell you something," I eagerly lean towards Dr. McGrath. "I was really involved in service work in high school and college. One of my service

projects was actually tutoring through my local Catholic church, and it changed my life and my career trajectory!”

Dr. McGrath smiles and states, “what do you know about that! I also went to Catholic schools and had tutoring experience, too!”

I beam at Dr. McGrath. I feel an instant connection. This is going to be fun.

Flipping to a blank page in my notebook, I ask, “Tell me more about your experiences, Dr. McGrath.”

Dr. McGrath leaned back in her chair. “Well, I always live by the Sisters saying, ‘go where you are needed.’ That is the guidepost of my life’s work. Service was a large part of my family-life growing up and was reinforced in my education. My parents were immigrants displaced after the second World War and they always instilled this great love of community, service, and faith. How – “

Dr. McGrath is cut off by the first few notes of an organ. She glances at her watch and raises her voice, “I am so sorry! Choir practice starts about now.” She lifts her eyes to the ceiling, “We are fortunate to have this tutoring space, but located right under a Church makes it loud sometimes!”

I smile and continue, “So, tell me, how is this tutoring program set up? What is its relationship with the university and this Church? How does this all work?”

Dr. McGrath laughs, “So many questions! So, this tutoring program was started several decades ago by a faculty member from our university. It began as a way to engage Catholic families and provide academic resources to their children. Over time, it

has evolved to supporting the entire neighborhood community, especially elementary-age children with disabilities.”

“That is so interesting.”

Dr. McGrath nods, “The site was founded in the 1990s as a way to form a mutually beneficial partnership between the university and community and reach out to children in the area who might need additional support for school.⁸ The founding director had a sociological and educational background with a strong sense of social justice. He thought through establishing a community tutoring program, it could also allow university education majors to practice their teaching skills!”

“That is awesome! I would love to have participated in this in college!” I muse at the thought.

“Yes, the founding director had a devotion to this neighborhood and university. He wanted to have this site as a kind of present to the community. The university and educational department still fund the operations of the tutoring program. They used to provide space, but clearly, we moved off campus.”

“Where was the tutoring program previously located?” I inquire.

“It used to be housed right on campus, but we realized that it was hard to reach community members as it looked like private property. It was not very approachable, and the site kept getting moved to different buildings. I do not think it demonstrated we were an institutional priority.” Dr. McGrath gives a small frown. “Anyways, when the founding director was about to retire, he reached out to me to see if I would be interested

⁸ In what ways does power/knowledge operate between university and community partnerships to create “mutually beneficial partnerships”?

in serving as the incoming director. I was really kind of shocked! I did not expect it, but he said he liked I had a background working with students with disabilities and their families, which was a demographic on the rise during that time. When I first started, since the founding director left quite a remarkable legacy, it was a delicate balance of honoring his work and adding my own spin.”⁹

Intrigued, I ask, “How have you put your own spin or things? What changes have you made?”

“Mostly, I listen to the suggestions and recommendations of my lead tutors and make changes from there!” Dr. McGrath pauses to think. “For instance, they suggested we cut down the amount of time on tutor trainings and emphasize practicality in orientation. I cut out a lot of the theory and research behind it all and now we go straight into the logistics of the position and how to tutor!”

Jotting down some notes, I continue, “Who are your tutors and lead tutors?”

“Well, many of the tutors are undergraduates, but our lead tutors are doctoral students like you. They supervise the undergraduate tutors and facilitate all the trainings, observations, and mentoring. They are simply the best! When I work with them, I want us to be as equal as possible. No hierarchy! I try to be completely student-driven and implement their input in all we do in the program.”¹⁰

“That is awesome you focus on their recommendations and use that as your driving force for change in the program! That sounds like they are getting some really

⁹ In what ways is surveillance socio-politically and historically operationalized within the community?

¹⁰ In what ways does power/knowledge operate among Dr. McGrath and the lead tutors?

great professional experiences.” I add wistfully, “I am jealous of what they are learning and application to their future professional positions!”

Dr. McGrath enthusiastically nods and taps the desk with her finger, “Yes, it is something I learned over the years working with doctoral students that this experience can help them get a better job! Not that our students work here for their own career advancement, but some alumni have told me that the reason they were hired was their service experience. They shared their experience here and work with students with disabilities was invaluable to their job search!”

I furrow my brow. “Come to think of it, I can relate. Service is the reason why I got into graduate school and received this research assistantship position with Dr. Riley! She said she liked my service focus in undergrad and that it would help in my work with her.”

“Many doctoral students I work with are a lot like you. Very focused on service. Service and community work is now expected in faculty roles along with research and teaching responsibilities.” Dr. McGrath frowns. “I do want to stress they are not working here just to advance their careers because service is something they are passionate. However, it is important to consider marketability.”

I nod my head curtly, “Of course! I actually never knew faculty are expected to have some sort of service component in their role, so I will definitely keep that in mind throughout graduate school and see how I can get involved to make myself more marketable.”

Dr. McGrath raises her eyebrows, “Oh, yes, very good idea! Anything to get you in the door for a faculty position is important if that is the route you want to go.”¹¹

Eager to learn more about what my fellow doctoral students do, I lean in, “So, what do your doctoral students do here as lead tutors? You said something about orientation?”

“Yes, they oversee orientation for the new undergraduate tutors. Would it be helpful to share our orientation schedule?” I give her a thumbs up as a jot down more notes. She opens a binder off the shelf and takes out a piece of a paper with an agenda overview.

St. Mary’s Catholic Church Tutor Orientation Program

- I. History of the Tutoring Program
- II. Demographics of Student
- III. Tutoring students with disabilities
- IV. Family Involvement
- V. Lesson Planning
- VI. Mock Tutoring Session
- VII. Reporting
- VIII. Tour of the Site

“That paper is just the overview.” Dr. McGrath waves her hand over the binders on the shelves and says, “If you want a deep dive, you are welcome to go through these. As you can see, the orientation is very practical. The feedback from tutors and lead tutors

¹¹ In what ways does power/knowledge operate to create norms that encourage Julie to engage in service during her doctoral education? How do these norm construct Julie’s subjectivities?

all emphasized the need for this. Orientation very much focuses on what they need to know when they need to know it. The lead tutors supervise the tutors as they are tutoring, so they really do learn as they go.”

I study the orientation schedule and ask, “How is working with students with disabilities and family engagement introduced? That seems to be an important piece.”

“Let’s see. I will focus on the students with disabilities piece first. In the mock tutoring session, we emphasize the need to focus on what the student is interested in. Are they particularly excited about ballet? Are they into superheroes? Knowing this the tutors can tailor the curriculum to engage them. So, let’s say a tutor is helping a child learn to read. Picking a book out that contains content they might enjoy is the first step.

Really, getting to know the child first is so important. At the same time, I discourage the tutors from bombarding them with too many questions. After all, that can be overwhelming. But the stories the children share about their lives I think makes the tutors feel fortunate and privileged. They may realize that they did not have the same barriers to learning that the children do, and yet the kids display so much resiliency and optimism. The children become very inspirational for the tutors. I think they learn just as much from their tutee as the child learns from their tutor.”

I interject, “This was certainly the case for me. I loved building relationships with my students and learning about their stories. It changed my worldview and career trajectory. I also love how you encourage tutors to get to know their tutees personally to

best assist them! That's a great strategy I am writing down for my future service work! Now, what about the family involvement piece?"¹²

Dr. McGrath nods, "Family involvement is another new element to orientation entirely student driven. My doctoral students came to me a few months ago and asked for it to be added so we can focus more on community and family involvement in the tutoring program. I said sure! They coordinated the presentation and I think it is a great addition." Dr. McGrath adds, "The doctoral students are trying to create ways to connect tutees' parents and families together through the tutoring program. I always say that parents learn best from each other, so I think they have caught onto my mentality." Dr. McGrath gives a wryly smile. "I teach but I don't teach, you know?"¹³

"I was actually just talking about family involvement with another one of my faculty this semester. They told me the new term is 'family engagement,'" I say it slowly as I am not sure how she was going to react to this correction.

"What is that again?"

"The new way to frame working with families is family engagement versus family involvement. It is also talked about in a great book I am reading called *Just Schools: Building Equitable Collaborations with Families and Communities* by Ann Ishimaru. Ishimaru (2019) talks about how schools have often tried to change marginalized families to make them conform to the institution. But Ishimaru provides a

¹² In what ways does power/knowledge operate to discursively construct training practices for tutors who work with students with disabilities?

¹³ In what ways does power/knowledge operate among Dr. McGrath and her doctoral students to encourage them to integrate family engagement into their practices?

new space to critically analyze the policies and institutional systemic barriers that contributes to family disengagement. She interrogates the good/bad parent dichotomy and talks about the tension in creating equitable collaborations between schools and communities. I highly recommend it!”

Dr. McGrath purses her lips, “Ok, well, I am going to have to write this one down.” Reaching for a pen she says aloud as she writes, “*Family engagement.*” Dr. McGrath closes her eyes. “I often tell my tutors a story of when I used to work in K-12 schools with families. In my past role, I was in K-12. Did I tell you that? Well, I used to support parents and coach them on how to be advocates for their disabled child within the school system. I think this story might be an example of family engagement?” She side-eyes me and continues.

“I remember working with a mom and her child who was almost three. He was fabulous but portrayed autistic-like behaviors. So, we had a meeting with the school, and I pushed for a lot of PT, OT, and other tutoring services because I wanted him to go into a blended classroom. Of course, the school was only going to provide minimal services and did not agree to any of my requests. As a result, the mother took a stand, sued the school, and won! She got all the support we asked for her child! She used to come and talk to some of the other parents I was working. She would always say, ‘it is only because of Dr. McGrath that my child is doing so well.’ I said it has nothing to do with me! You did this yourself! She learned everything, and she was the best advocate for her child.”

“Wow, that is an amazing story,” I exclaimed.

“The point I try to make with our tutors is the importance of integrating family into our work with students. Family engagement can take many different forms. In my past work, it was teaching parents how to be advocates for their children with disabilities. In this role, we are trying to provide tools for student academic success and support if they cannot get that readily available in their own schools. Sometimes our tutors may work with a student who needs far more support than they are able to give in their tutoring session, but the point is that we are open to everyone in the community. We want these kids and their parents to be successful.¹⁴

We also serve a lot of undocumented students and their families. I was taught this when I was doing tutoring service work in college, but I learned to never ask for identification. I continue this practice here. We ask for the student and parent’s name but that is it. We do not screen them or do anything that would make them feel unwelcomed.”

“That makes a lot of sense,” I state slowly. “I had not thought about the need to provide identification to receive services, or how that could bar someone from wanting to come into the tutoring program.”

“Yes, we want to make sure those barriers are removed.”

I nod my head and check my watch, “I really appreciate you sharing your experiences and the tutoring program with me today.” I begin collecting my papers and putting away my pen. “Dr. Riley and I will circle back later this semester on the observation protocol to run it by you. I am sorry I have to go as I have to catch the train downtown now.”

¹⁴ How is family engagement discursively constructed among Dr. McGrath and Julie?

Dr. McGrath extends her hand and says, “It was wonderful to meet you, Julie, and I am looking forward to working with you on this research project.”

I smile, “Me too.” I sling my bag over my arm and head up the stairs.

There is so much to unpack in my conversation with Dr. McGrath. I am looking forward to talking with Dr. Riley about my experiences at the tutoring program. I rush towards the station as I hear the train rumble in the distance.

Conversations with Foucault

The train jostles back and forth over the uneven train tracks.

“What do you think, Michel?” I ask.

He flaps the pages of Dr. McGrath and Julie’s story and leans back into his seat.

“Does it matter what I think?”

I pause and look out the window as the German countryside rolls by. The snowcapped Alps take my breathe away. How could his opinion not matter? I wanted to meet him since I first read his *Power/Knowledge* text. I even brought it on my trip to Germany and Austria in the hopes that it would inspire my dissertation proposal. While I knew Michel Foucault had strong ties in France, I could not help but hope that our paths would cross on my journey. The train rattles and jolts as we rush along.

Foucault looks at me under wire rimmed glasses and glances out the window,

“Nietzsche is from Germany.”

I nod. He was, after all, a German philosopher.

“Why did you decide to travel to Germany?” Foucault asks.

Wistfully looking out the window, I state, “My family is originally from a village close to the Austrian border. I hope to explore the places my ancestors lived before they moved to the United States!” Pausing for a moment to carefully frame the next statement, I continue, “I hope to discover myself on this journey, and I hope to gain some understanding of my heritage and past.”

“Do you think it is possible to discover yourself?” Foucault immediately shoots back.

I knew he was going to ask that as soon as the words “discovered myself” passed my lips. “Well, not if you are a poststructuralist thinker!” I laugh and continue, “You discuss how subjectivities are always shifting and changing, so it would not be possible to fully discover myself as I am always in process. I remember reading your lectures on subjectivity and truth at the Collège de France from the early 1980s, and you interrogate how the subject evolves and its different schemes form from experience, which are then operationalized.”

Foucault looks at me thoughtfully, “Yes, that is what I said.” He presses his hands together as if in prayer and says, “You present this story about Julie and Dr. McGrath. I’m interested to discuss how my concept of power/knowledge is applied to this narrative.”

Foucault’s intense stare makes me nervous. Do I know enough about poststructuralist thought to have a conversation with him? I glance at his *Power/Knowledge* book peeking out of my satchel. It was the first item I packed for my trip. Foolishly I thought this was going to be a vacation, but a dissertation never waits. It

always lingers, whispers, and fills up my mental space with imaginary conversations and scenes. I guess now is as good a time as any.

Fighting off feelings of intimidation, I begin, “So, as you read, Julie and Dr. McGrath’s interactions take place in St. Mary’s Catholic Church tutoring program which serves as a partnership between university and community. I wrote this chapter to examine and interrogate the ways in which Julie and Dr. McGrath’s power/knowledge discourse operates within the contexts of the tutoring site.”

Foucault rubs his bald head and looks down at the floor as if in thought.

I continue, “I used St. Pierre’s (1997b) methodology in the fold to create Julie and Dr. McGrath’s dialogue. For instance, their characters immersed out of the entangled discourses and subjectivities among myself and my interview participants.”

Leaning back into his seat and draping his arm across the armrest, he says, “As you created these characters, how did you analyze power relations among the research participants and yourself?”

“Okay, sure.” I stare out the window collecting my thoughts. “It was difficult to dismantle the seamless division of self/other or insider/outsider in this research. I see this self/other approach manifesting in my role as researcher and my participants as the researched. Typically, in humanistic qualitative research, reflexivities are used to attain a level of critical reflection that makes the researcher/researched dynamics known. But as Lather (1993) reminds us in poststructuralist research, this form of reflexivity does not deconstruct the subject, nor does it allow the researcher to attain self-awareness. Instead, Pillow (2003) talks about how reflexivity only reinforces the power dynamics between

researcher/researched. I apply Pillow's (2003) reflexivity of discomfort to this interrogation as it destabilizes this fixed binary of self/other, acknowledges the subject cannot be known as subjectivities are unstable, and recognizes truth is not the goal."

"How does this application of Pillow's (2003) reflexivity of discomfort resist this humanistic version of reflexivity?" Foucault continues to probe.

"Well, poststructuralist theories do not remove the researcher from the research but seeks to destabilize the researcher! I tried to apply the reflexivity of discomfort in my crisis of representing the dialogue with my interview participants. This constant unraveling of the interview data and my own subjectivities created Julie and Dr. McGrath's dialogue. And then, I seek to continue to deconstruct this interpretation in my conversation with you! It is this constant process of deconstruction and reinterpretation that I attempt to apply this reflexivity of discomfort."

Looking at me thoughtfully, Foucault asks, "You discuss this self/other binary and apply a reflexivity of discomfort. As I said in my lectures, subjectivities evolve within various contexts and discourses. Tell me how your subjectivities have shifted and discursively constructed with your research participants?"

I reply, "My participants changed how I analyzed my past community-engagement experiences and my identities associated with being a doctoral student and faculty. There were also different interactions I had outside of the interviews that impacted my research, such as conversations with colleagues and friends about poststructuralist research and community-engagement. I think of when Jackson and Mazzei (2017) discuss Barad's intra-activity where intra-action amongst people and

objects create subjectivities. My subjectivities continue to be impacted through my dialogue with fellow faculty in my new job, conversations around community-engagement with family, and readings on social justice and service-learning. I am within an inter-web of power relations, which many I am not even aware.”

Giving it some more thought, I add, “I will try to give an example of my shifting subjectivities with an interview participant. Throughout the study, I primarily used St. Pierre’s (2014) methodology in the fold but also applied other poststructuralist concepts, such as the ‘backflip.’ According to Jackson (2017) the backflip is something that is happenstance, unexpected, or out of place. Jackson (2017) writes about an actual backflip that happened during her dissertation study when she was observing a football game. It was out of place, spontaneous, and not a part of the cheerleading routine. For me, a ‘backflip’ happened during an interview when a faculty participant discussed how she coordinated a tutoring program within her church and had a student conduct a program evaluation. It was an offhanded comment I did not expect to hear. This casual remark disrupted my subjectivities of faculty only as community-engaged researchers and teachers. Could they coordinate community sites, as well? I thought the idea of creating a faculty character who embodied both of these often at-odds community/academic roles could open up new space for discourse on community-engaged learning.”

Foucault asks, “Are faculty not always community members? Do they not belong to communities? Or do they only belong to academia? If they only belong to academia, do they give up all other community ties?”

I sat perplexed. I never considered those questions. “Well, I remember Miller (2010) discussing the application of Derrida’s deconstruction to remove binaries and Lather (1992) talking about utilizing deconstruction to dismantle fixed categories. I struggle with this academic/community binary deconstruction as faculty can come into communities and do more harm than good. Then, it is replicated by their doctoral students. In some ways, does the academic/community binary help protect communities from faculty?”

Foucault looks thoughtful, “Is it their academic role that is the problem? What if, instead, we analyze how power/knowledge operates between faculty and community?”

I feel intrigue. “Well, yes, in your application of poststructuralist thought from your *Power/Knowledge* 1980 text, all subjectivities and experiences are created from dialogue within relations of power.”

Foucault nods, “Do you know how I created the term power/knowledge?”

My eyes widen. “I read in Peter and Burbules (2004) you created the term power/knowledge as you believed human sciences were not neutral or objective but that they were integrated within notions of power! Peter and Burbles (2004) also states power/knowledge go hand in hand as they produce and create each other.”

“And what is the focus then of my interrogation?” Foucault probes.

“Well, Davis (1994) states that power/knowledge are all formed and constructed through discourse, such that subjects and objects are not studied in research, but their discursive practices are. So, I guess it makes sense that the analysis is on the faculty’s discourse and not their specific academic role.” I make eye contact and Foucault nods to

continue, “According to Jackson and Mazzei (2012), you also focus on the interrogation of power and how it functions, its apparatus, and its effects rather than its source.

Britzman (1995) and Davis (1994) remind us that similar to subjectivity and experience, power is also partial and shifting and forms from discourse.”

He asks another question, “Tell me how you see power operating in this narrative.”

The train jostles over the tracks as I quickly reply, “Dr. McGrath has power as a faculty member over Julie and dictates how Julie views community-engaged learning.”

Foucault quickly holds up his hand. “Stop. You state, ‘Dr. McGrath’s has power.’ Do you mean Dr. McGrath and Julie’s power relations? Power operates among people within multiple directions. In my writing of *Power/Knowledge* in 1980, I mentioned no one is outside of power relations. Try again.”

“I thought power within power/knowledge is viewed as good? For instance, ‘good’ power manifests in the actions of institutions and departments that promote community-engaged learning. The institutional context can serve as a waterfall effect, so it encourages faculty and doctoral students to adopt community-engagement into their academic identities.” I sat unsure of my answer.

Foucault looks bewildered. He points to his book half-falling out of my bag. “Open that to page 119 and read aloud.”

Feeling as if I made a grave error, I take out *Power/Knowledge* and open it to the requested page. Clearing my throat, I read,

What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression. (Foucault, 1980, p. 119)

I stare across the train car hesitantly waiting for him to speak.

“I do not discuss power as a good-bad or normal-abnormal dichotomy. Rather, power is productive. I state in my *Power/Knowledge* 1980 text that there is not a hierarchy of power but a system of power relations and no one is outside of this power. So, I would recommend examining your use of ‘waterfall effect.’”

I pause trying to formulate a comment with this abrupt knowledge. “So, this new reframing of power as productive changes the ways in which I now see power. I go back to my interviews with the faculty participants. Before you explained how power is productive, I thought power was bad or good. In my interviews with participants, I looked for forms of power manifested in the discourse of ‘bad’ or deficit-based views of community because I read so much about universities as a bad partner with communities.”

Foucault looks contemplative and says, “In what ways have your subjectivities shifted and discursively constructed in your interactions within these mentioned readings and participants?”

I reply, “As I studied poststructuralist thought, I started interrogating common terms I heard within community-engaged learning discourse, such as ‘mutually beneficial’ and ‘reciprocal.’ The terms are operationalized in The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, which is an elective classification institutions can pursue. Actually, let me pull up their website now and show you!” I pull out my cell phone from my pocket and do a quick google search. I pull up the website and read aloud, “The Public Purpose Institute (2021) defines this as a, ‘collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.’ They then go on to explain the purpose of community-engagement is to ‘enrich scholarship, research and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.’”

Clicking on another link, I am directed to the Swearer Center Brown University (2020) website. “Michel, this says here the classification used to be run by Brown University Swearer Center. In 2020, they made changes, such as creating an inaugural community partnership survey to allow for partners to provide direct feedback during the classification application process. This elective has been around since 2005! How has it taken over 15 years to include community voices in the application process?!” I exclaim.

Foucault looks unfazed. “Did your participants mention this classification in their dialogue with you?”

“No, but they discussed this mutual partnership-relationship with communities. I integrated this problematic discourse into Dr. McGrath and Julie dialogue on how the university created St. Mary’s tutoring program to serve the community. However, going back to the classification, this is an example of an operationalized norm that may or may not be known by faculty, but is a part of systems of power.”

I took a deep breath and continue, “Dr. McGrath shared the origin story of the tutoring program as created by a faculty member at the university. But in her dialogue with Julie, she framed it was founded as a ‘present to the community.’ Julie did not ask more probing questions about the historical context, so we can only go off of what was said between Julie and Dr. McGrath knowing this in itself is a partial interpretation that is then in need of continuous deconstruction. This is the open-ended space left by discourse. The unknown space that demonstrates there is never clarity or stable responses.”

Foucault sat looking thoughtful, “If we apply my concept that power is productive to Julie and Dr. McGrath, we then ask, in what ways is the university operating within the community to produce power/knowledge?”

“Your questions make me recall Miller (2010) discussing how power regulates what constitutes knowledge, who can generate knowledge, and what power relations impact curriculum or research. Similarly, as Hartley and Saltmarsh (2016) state, community-engaged learning challenges faculty to consider how, where, and in what ways knowledge is created. Power/knowledge operationalizes the ways in which academic/community knowledge is produced and operationalized within community-engaged learning discourse.”

“I am curious to interrogate these concepts of community knowledge and academic knowledge using power/knowledge discourse. Within Julie and Dr. McGrath’s narrative, how is this knowledge produced and operationalized within community-engaged learning discourse?” Foucault inquires.

I think for a moment before starting, “These forms of knowledge have been categorized by the university and community-engaged scholarship. If we apply your analysis on disciplinary power from your 1977 text, this power creates and establishes norms. These norms are then used to regulate when and how communities produce knowledge. For instance, in Dr. McGrath and Julie’s narrative, the norms operate to reproduce academic knowledge through the establishment of the center for the community. Then, the doctoral students reinforce norms when they carry out tutor orientation.”

“In your thoughts, what are the norms that are reinforced, reproduced, and operationalized in this orientation?” Foucault probes.

“I think it is noteworthy to analyze Dr. McGrath discussing her past involvement with parents and families in dialogue with her doctoral students. The doctoral students then created the family engagement part of the orientation based on Dr. McGrath’s discursive construction of the importance of families and parental involvement - or engagement. As we discussed, power does not equate to good or bad, but it is productive. So, what we do not directly see in this dialogue is the ways in which doctoral students impacted Dr. McGrath’s subjectivities and discursive construction around family engagement.”

Foucault clenches his hands, bringing them together, and says, “I discuss in my *The Subject and Power* essay from 1982 how power relations are embedded into societies fabric and networks and do not operate on a hierarchical level but permeates everywhere. As I stated on page 133 of *Power/Knowledge* (1980), ‘Truth’ is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements.’ Contrary to what you stated, I see power operating through Dr. McGrath and Julie as a faculty and doctoral student within mutual, productive, and local power relations. In what ways are power relations operating within Julie and Dr. McGrath’s discourse to produce truth?” Foucault asked.

“As you stated, power permeates everywhere,” I cock my head thinking. “Perhaps power relations and their production of ‘truth’ can be analyzed in the dialogue between Julie and Dr. McGrath in their construction of ‘family engagement’ versus ‘family involvement?’ In this way, the ‘correct’ terms, or language that invokes power and regulates what counts as ‘truth’ or the ‘norm’ operates from Julie. Julie cites that family engagement is now the correct term to use due to recent literature and research. In this way, power is exerted and cycles through both Dr. McGrath and Julie in their discourse.”

Foucault nods. “Norms are produced in tension, are regulated, and operate through surveillance. I discuss surveillance and the panopticon at length in my *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* book from 1977.” Foucault glances thoughtfully at me. “In my 1977 text, I characterize surveillance through what I call ‘the gaze’ which is the internationalization of self-regulating norms operating through power.”

I immediately add, “Yes, I see surveillance operating through the tutoring program and university within Dr. McGrath and Julie’s dialogue. Dr. McGrath mentions the tutoring program was started by a faculty member as a mutually beneficial partnership between the university and community for the dual purpose as being a resource to the community and for school of education students to apply their skills. In this way and so far that I know, the community did not ask for this site, but the university established it anyways. Dr. McGrath discussed how the tutoring site was located on the university premise but was then moved into the community. This location and positioning as embedded into the neighborhood, specifically in the Church, can be an operationalized form of surveillance.”

“The tutoring program is located within the context of a Catholic Church. I am intrigued by this concept. Tell me more about this.” Foucault leaned in intrigued.

I gulped knowing that he has done extensive research on pastoral power, “Religion, particularly Catholicism, was a point of conversation in my interviews with participants. My interview participants brought up what it was like working at a religiously affiliated university and how that shaped their engagement with service and communities. Many of them discussed the role religion played in their lives. In my interviews, I disclosed my Catholic affiliation and shared my experience attending Catholic schools and participating in service.

It was difficult to write because Jackson and Mazzei (2017) reminds me to resist creating categories and themes in my research, such as this trend of religion, which do not create new knowledge and resist what is already known! I attempted to resist this

reproduction of knowledge and instead situate the tutoring program site in the church to create tension in the interrogation of their dialogue's sociopolitical and historical context.”

Foucault leans in towards me with his shoulders slightly hunched, “In my later work, I write about technologies of self and governmentality. What connections can you make between these ideas and Julie and Dr. McGrath's discourse?”

“Well, you talk about various forms of technologies in your seminars from 1988, such as technologies of production, sign systems, power, and self, but you are most interested in the last two. You state in *Technologies of the Self* from 1988 that technologies of power relate to the regulation of the conduct or domination of the subject, while your technologies of self relate to how the subject acts upon themselves in order to transform self. You discuss your term of governmentality when this technology of domination or power interacts with technologies of self.”

Foucault nods his head, “go on.”

“I just read Hammerberg's (2004) chapter in *Dangerous Coagulations?: The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education* about technologies of the self in classrooms.

Hammerberg discusses how teacher's structure learning environments in order to instruct students on self-regulation, which is the embodiment of technologies of self.

Hammerberg goes on to clarify that these learning environments are not created just to self-regulate, but are the functions of engaging, thinking, and conducting self in order to be transformed into the student as constructed within current pedagogical discourse.”

Foucault excitedly grins, “yes, and how does that relate to Dr. McGrath and Julie?”

I respond, “I think in terms of your ideas surrounding governmentality, Dr. McGrath is discursively producing Julie, her doctoral students, tutors, tutees, and others, and their actions and self-formation are constructed in this particular setting and forms of domination. For instance, Dr. McGrath and Julie discuss the experiences doctoral students need to have to help them obtain a faculty position. Dr. McGrath discursively constructs a specific way for doctoral students to obtain a faculty appointment, which then regulates Julie’s actions. Your form of governmentality where technologies of domination and self is reflected in this interaction!”

Foucault leans back in his seat once again. “I have enjoyed our discourse today around my power/knowledge concepts and how it is applied to Dr. McGrath and Julie’s interactions. Tell me about your next steps with your dissertation.”

I raise my eyebrows at Foucault, “Our conversation is not yet complete. It is still in process and constantly in a state of (re)interpretation.”

Foucault smiles and leans forward and asks another question. Church bells chime in the distance as we round another bend and continue on our journey.

Julie ⇔ Dr. Riley

Panopticons and Norms within Community-Engaged Research

The bells of St. Mary’s Catholic Church ring in the distance. I cradle my coffee mug and gaze out the window towards the church lost in thought.

“BEEP BEEP” a notification pops up on my laptop snapping me from my daydream. “New Message from Dr. Riley.” Finally, a response! I was waiting for her reply all day. A little green dot next to her name lets me know she is free. Normally, it was red indicating she is unavailable or not by her computer.¹⁵

DR. RILEY: Hi Julie! I am sorry I missed all your messages! What is up? How can I help?

JULIE: Hi Dr. Riley, thanks for responding! I wanted your feedback on the agenda for our research team meeting in a few minutes. Do you have a second to review it?

Dr. RILEY: Sure, that is fine! Send it over!

JULIE: Ok, here it is. What do you think?

Research Team Agenda, Meeting No. 3 - April 29, 2020

- Discussion of Research Questions
- IRB Approval Update
- Preparing for Research Site Visit
- COVID-19 Observation and Interview Protocol
- Next Steps and Research Timeline

DR. RILEY: Ok, this looks good! Here are a few things I recommend noting in our meeting: 1) We are no longer going to the research site because of COVID-19 restrictions. 2) Can you make sure in the team meeting we discuss revising the

¹⁵ In what ways does technology, as a modern form of disciplinary power, exercise surveillance and control?

observation protocols with COVID-19 restrictions in mind? We may need to resubmit IRB.

JULIE: Ok, sure, I made a note! Thank you and talk to you soon!

I lean back in my chair reflecting on the exchange. While I am glad to receive the feedback, I feel that my interactions with Dr. Riley since the COVID-19 pandemic are few and far between. It was like I am on my own island.

I start making edits on the agenda. I delete “preparing for research site visit” and frown. Dr. Riley and I visited the tutoring program located in St. Mary’s Catholic Church last semester as we developed the research questions. She insisted I meet her on campus so we could drive together. The site was in walking distance, but Dr. Riley told me it was important we drive around the neighborhood. We drove up and down the tree-lined streets while Dr. Riley pointed out things right and left.

“I have lived in the neighborhood for years and years. There is my local grocery store the one with the signs in the window over there,” she says as she gestured to the left. She rolled down her window to yell hi at her flat neighbor, Willie, who was riding his bike down the street. Dr. Riley shared stories of the people who lived in the neighborhood and the community’s history. “Much of the area was public housing, but in the past decade, it was torn down. There is tension between landlords and tenants, and tenants are often evicted with little notice.”

As we drove, it was also the first time I saw a gun not on a police officer. I did not know what to think. Dr. Riley waved her hand and said, “Julie, you are an outsider here. You have to acknowledge that. How are you going to understand and get to know a

community when you are the outsider?” I sat thinking unsure of how to be an insider.

“Julie, what are taking away from this experience right now?” She put on her turn signal to go down another street.

“I guess that I still have a lot to learn about the community? You are right. I am an outsider. I just moved here and even though I live down the street I have not taken the time to really get to know the community.”

“What are some ways you are going to do that?”

I paused, “Well, for starters, learning about the landlords and tenant situation you talked about. That sounds like a pretty significant issue to pay attention.”

Dr. Riley interrupted, “When I was in graduate school, I did research at a local school. I would sit in the parking lot with a notebook and just observe and watch.” She glanced at me. “You shared you came to this doctoral program and wanted to be my research assistant because you had a passion for and experience with community-engagement. How did you get to know and learn about the previous neighborhoods and communities you served?”

I paused. I liked helping people and my religious upbringing solidified my service to others. I felt called to make the world a better place and make a difference. “Um.” I shifted uncomfortably in my seat. “I had not really considered getting to know the surrounding community. I only really thought of the actual site of service and getting to know those individuals.”

Dr. Riley sucked in her breathe. “Julie, the more you can join a community and be a part of the community, the more people are going to see you as a human being versus

someone coming to mine them for information. And the more you are going to learn from the process. Learning about the neighborhood and spending time in places you are not familiar is part of the work. I remember one time I was invited to a social after-work event by a member of the school I was researching. I felt they wanted me there for the research and observe the various dynamics of members in another context. I had to keep in mind that this event is not about me, that I have to play it cool, and get to know others. It is about them and not about my stories. Julie, sometimes you just shut your mouth and listen and watch.”¹⁶

I leaned back in my seat and watched the neighborhood roll past my window.

Another beep brings me back to the present. A message pops up on my screen, “Dr. Riley has started your meeting now.” Rubbing my eyes, I grab a pen, notebook, and take a deep breath. Dr. Riley expects me to lead this, but I have no idea what I am doing. I pull up the Google Doc with the agenda just as I join the online team meeting.

Dr. Riley is already typing away at her computer looking distracted. I clear my throat and awkwardly waive waiting for her to acknowledge my presence on the screen. After a few moments, she appears to notice I joined, “oh, hello there, Julie. I am just finishing one thing...” Her voice trails off as she furiously types, hits a button, and leans into the screen as if to see me better. “How are you?”

A barely open my mouth when I third voice interjects, “Hello, can you hear me?”

Dr. Riley smiles, “Hello, we can hear you just fine! Thanks for taking the call!”

¹⁶ In what ways are norms operationalized through Dr. Riley and Julie’s power/knowledge discourse surrounding relationships with communities and neighborhoods?

The voice states, “No problem! I am excited to be here and join your research team. My apologies my camera is not on as my background is in disarray!”

Dr. Riley smiles, “that is quite alright! I understand and no pressure for cameras to be on.”

I cringe. I wish I could turn my camera off. I had not had time to clean in days.

Dr. Riley looks at me (or assuming she looks at me through the screen?), “Ok, Julie, the floor is all yours. What do you have for us?”

“Uh, hi! I am Julie, Dr. Riley’s other research assistant,” I say to the voice. I feel like my own voice is higher and more strained than usual. “So, I was helping Dr. Riley this semester set up the observation logistics and protocol with the research site, but of course, that now needs modification because of COVID-19 restrictions.”

Dr. Riley gives a knowing nod in the background.

I continue, “I thought we could review the research questions today, give feedback on the current observation protocol, and set-up our next steps.” I pull out the research questions. “Ok, I am putting the research questions in the chat and will read them out loud.” I clear my throat, “The overarching research question is, ‘What is the lived experience of a student with a learning disability in a tutoring session?’ followed by the sub questions of, ‘How do these students experience barriers to learning in a tutoring session?’ and ‘How does the relationship between the tutor and the students impact the students’ academic success?’”¹⁷

¹⁷ In what ways are norms discursively constructed to encourage doctoral students’ adoption of certain research methods within community-engaged scholarship?

I pause to glance at Dr. Riley's screen. The voice yells out, "this sound great! What is the theory or framework used?"

I respond, "Phenomenology as it provides a way for us to really focus on the lived experiences of the students with disabilities in the tutoring session. Dr. Riley, am I missing something?"

Dr. Riley scrunches up her face eyeing what I assume are the research questions, "Nope, that covers it! Those are the research questions we developed and agreed upon. Now, let's turn to the observation protocol. I have not seen this yet, so I am eager to hear what you have come up with!"

"Ok, here it goes! I just created this last night but recognize there will need to be modifications due to COVID-19. It is divided up into three section, which focus on the tutors and tutees, setting, and tutoring session." I read the observation protocol out loud.

Observation Protocol

Here is what to look for when observing the tutoring session:

Tutors/Tutees

- 1) Note the observable demographics of the tutors/ tutees.
- 2) What are the different demographics of the tutors versus the tutees?
- 3) Who is in charge? How can you tell?

Setting

- 1) What does the tutoring space look like?
- 2) Where does the tutoring take place? Where do other activities occur?
- 3) What tutoring supplies are there?

4) How do tutors/tutees enter the tutoring space and leave?

Tutoring Session

1) How long is each tutoring session?

2) What is the curriculum for the tutoring session?

3) Describe the tutoring session from start to finish. What interactions occur?

What attitudes and emotions are portrayed?

By the end of my protocol reading, Dr. Riley is furiously writing down notes. She begins, “This is a good start! How do you see the observation protocol connected with our research questions?”

The voice on the call chimes in, “I think good research links the research questions to the observation protocol. So, if we are studying the lived experiences of students with learning disabilities at St. Mary’s tutoring program, we are looking for how they engage in the tutoring session, how they interact with their tutor, and possible barriers. We also want to make sure their voice is centered and amplified.”

Dr. Riley beams at the screen. “Great response!”

The other doctoral student continues, “I used to run a tutoring program for English language learners.”

“How lucky for us!” Dr. Riley exclaims.

I lean into the camera. This is interesting!

“Coming from a nonprofit sector, I wonder how we plan on co-constructing this research project with the community partner site?”¹⁸

¹⁸ In what ways is power/knowledge constructed within the university and community contexts?

Dr. Riley eagerly leans into the phone, “That is a great and important question. We need to work closely with the site and ensure this research is something they want or need. Unfortunately, often times engaged researchers come in with a deficit-based view of communities. We are lucky we are at an institution that supports community-engaged learning and discuss such negative implications! After all, the university is fully funding this study.”

Dr. Riley starts explaining the funding, “This grant is actually partially supporting my salary and all of Julie’s assistantship. We only have enough money for one year, so we will have to apply for additional grants later. In order to be eligible for next year’s funding, we will have to keep detailed records and make sure the research aligns with the grant’s expected outcomes.”

The doctoral student on the phone asks, “Where is the grant funding coming from?”

Dr. Riley glances at a corner of her computer screen as it dings with a new email alert, “It is actually an internal grant from the university. The grant is in response to additional funding going towards community-engagement research projects between the university and community. It is wonderful the university is spotlighting this important work! It is no surprise given our mission focused on social justice, inclusivity, and experiential learning, but these grants demonstrate the university living it’s mission.”¹⁹

¹⁹ In what ways does power regulate norms through institutions and their missions?

I interject, “The mission of the university is the reason why I came here for graduate school. This grant is making all our work possible this semester, so hope we can do this justice!”

Dr. Riley becomes serious, “It’s not enough to say we are a social justice focused institution but another thing to act on it and provide resources in order to do such work, such as this grant. While internal, it was a competitive application process, where I had to identify the research objective, discuss a complex societal issue the university can assist in solving, and select a community partner. I feel fortunate my department is incredibly supportive of this venture. Many meetings and calls later and here we are!”²⁰

“Dr. Riley, what support do faculty here receive when applying for grants or working with community partners? What does that look like?” I ask. I suppose now was as good a time as any to learn more about faculty life!

Looking thoughtful, Dr. Riley replies, “Well, for starters, the faculty center has a lot of programs and workshops on grant writing, pedagogical approaches to integrating service-learning into the curriculum and writing groups and book clubs. Those are incredibly helpful. I highly recommend participating in things like that when you become faculty.”

She pauses and then continues, “I often contact the faculty center director and ask for advice for my class. For instance, last semester I was having trouble selecting readings for my service-learning class. I typically just select articles on whether I think they relate the course outcomes and assign it, but I got into a rut. Anyways, the director

²⁰ In what ways is disciplinary power exercised through norms operationalized in grants?

gave me a great article about the different types of service projects. The article's author emphasized that it is one thing to work with a person for a few hours. That is just a band aid. In order to really create change you have to get to know the person you are serving and get involved in the culture, the people, and finally, in the community to see what you can do. While it was a good read, I thought it was a little too intensive for my undergraduate students as they did not have that kind of time to be immersed.

Actually, as you are thinking about your futures with community-engaged learning, you have to know that integrating community-engaged learning into your teaching and research is just half the battle. Often times, undergraduate students do not want to do it and are very resistant. I would not recommend either of you to focus on community-engaged teaching at this moment as it is incredibly time constraining and you should be focusing more on your research. If you are interested in community-engaged learning research, well, that is time intensive, too, but research is important for getting tenure. Focus on the research elements early on as that is what really matters.”²¹

I frown listening to Dr. Riley discuss the tenure process in the background. I really only just want to teach, advise students, and work with the community, but perhaps Dr. Riley is right. Research seems to be the most valuable part of the faculty experience and it is highlighted the most in the tenure process. I think back to Dr. McGrath telling me the importance of service work in getting a faculty appointment. I scratch my head in confusion. Where should I invest my time while in graduate school? Research? Service?

²¹ In what ways are norms constructed and operationalized through power/knowledge discourse surrounding tenure?

Teaching? I pause and think. After a moment, I open up a blank email on my computer and start writing an email to my colleagues.

Deconstructing Community-Engaged Scholarship within Review, Promotion, and Tenure

To: FacultyListserv@engaged.edu; DoctoralListserv@engaged.edu;

CommunityPartners@engaged.edu

From: annie.kelly@engaged.edu

Subject: Deconstructing Community-Engaged Scholarship within Review, Promotion, and Tenure

Dear colleagues,

I am writing to invite you to attend a reoccurring meeting to discuss our university's Review, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) process as it relates to community-engaged research. I appreciate our university's emphasis on community-engagement as part of our mission, but we need to further interrogate it as part of the RPT process. I write to you as a faculty, doctoral student, and community member to join me in an ongoing discussion surrounding publicly engaged scholarship and research with communities. While community-engagement is integrated into all facets of our faculty work, this meeting will specifically examine community-engaged research due to its historic and sociopolitical focus within RPT. This invitation is open to anyone in our campus and neighboring community as it impacts future generations of scholars, doctoral students, and community partners.

In advance of our meeting, I am including this dialogue of Julie and Dr. Riley to review and analyze. The goal is to use their discursive constructs of community-engaged research to destabilize and keep our own dialogue in motion as we discuss how we construct and operationalize community-engaged scholarship in the tenure review process. In the partial narrative, Dr. Riley tells her doctoral student Julie, “*Focus on the research elements early on as that is what really matters.*” Julie is exposed to these early messages on the importance of research in the tenure process. As you review this shifting dialogue between Julie and Dr. Riley, consider what ways social norms are organized to encourage doctoral student’s adoption of community-engaged learning in teaching and scholarship. The ways in which we discuss community-engaged scholarship in RPT impacts the norms in which are operationalized within graduate education today. It is an ongoing process of discursively constructing RPT while subsequently being constructed by it. In the following message, I share my own partial and shifting thoughts related to community-engagement in the RPT process using Dr. Riley and Julie’s narrative to destabilize my own frames of knowing.

I apply Foucault’s power/knowledge discourse to examine how norms are constructed and operationalized around community-engaged scholarship within the RPT process. As described by Foucault, discourse describes written or verbal words that are clustered together through various rules and can regulate who can speak and what can count as truth (Miller, 2010; Moon, 2016). In other words, RPT regulates who is eligible to serve as faculty and whether the knowledge they produce is worthy and valid. RPT is arguably one of the most operationalized and regulated norms in academia and is

examined in light of ever-evolving subjectivities, institutional dynamics, and experiences related to community-engaged scholarship. Utilizing Dr. Riley and Julie's story and applying power/knowledge in its deconstruction, we can destabilize and open up new opportunities for rethinking community-engaged scholarship in RPT.

Within this email, I enclose four incomplete ideas to discuss during our meeting related to community-engaged scholarship, including (re)examining its historical and sociopolitical contexts, grants as surveillance, destabilizing faculty authority within the research, and (re)thinking humanistic qualitative community-engaged scholarship. These shifting ideas include references to Julie and Dr. Riley's dialogue around community-engaged research. As we engage in dialogue around norms associated with community-engagement and RPT, my own subjectivities and the subsequent ideas will undoubtedly change over time. I look forward to discussing with you soon.

(Re)thinking Humanistic Qualitative Community-Engaged Scholarship

Poststructuralist theories seek to disrupt generalizations and theming of qualitative data (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013). Within this email, I problematize and deconstruct the norms around community-engaged learning research and scholarship that generalize and essentialize communities. More specifically, I want to discuss and examine the ways in which these forms of traditional humanistic qualitative methods are found and cited in RPT. Humanistic qualitative inquiry in community-engaged research often focus on lived experience, an essentialized and generalized thematic analysis of communities, and an application of reflexivity and coding in an attempt to 'understand' experience and positionality. As an example, Julie is exposed to phenomenology as the

theoretical framework for the study of the lived experiences of students with disabilities. In such types of humanistic qualitative methodology, experience studied is discovered and collected in interviews and becomes data (St. Pierre, 2008). Poststructuralist theories can assist in disrupting humanistic qualitative methods within RPT, which subsequently impacts how we engage, interact, and conduct research with communities. By selecting theories that problematize and disrupt our research, we can change and alter how we construct research with communities.

Julie and Dr. Riley seek to study the lived experiences of students within a tutoring program. Poststructuralist researchers disrupt the idea of “lived experiences,” which is often studied in community-engaged humanistic qualitative literature (St. Pierre, 2014). Poststructuralist version of experience resists traditional humanistic notions that methodology is represented in the lived experiences of people (St. Pierre, 2014). In this way, experience is discursively constructed and does not just happen (St. Pierre, 2008). Originated from Deleuze and Guattari’s (1983), Mazzei (2013) disrupts “lived experience” with the concept of Body without Organs (BoW) to challenge the grand narrative of experience and voice. We can utilize this idea to deconstruct the grand narrative around community-engaged teaching and scholarship, which often studies the experiences of communities with little interrogation around power dynamics between university-community.

Poststructuralist theories problematizes traditional methodological practices of voice and experience, and instead, recognize that “subjects may well be the tellers of experience; but every telling is constrained, partial, and determined by the discourses and

histories that prefigure, even as they might promise, representation” (Britzman, 1995, p. 232). Through this call to problematize traditional norms of researching communities, it is also important to note I am not stating that humanistic qualitative research is wrong or should not be used (St. Pierre, 2014). Rather, when poststructuralist theories are applied, new possibilities occur as theory, research, and data are put into constant play to expose tensions in engaged research instead of the return to what is known (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Lather & St. Pierre, 2013). Instead, poststructuralist research and post qualitative inquiry are tools with which traditional forms and norms of community-engaged scholarship are deconstructed and analyzed. I advocate for poststructuralist theories to be used to provide multiple, shifting angles to revisit community-engaged scholarship. In other words, poststructuralist theories disrupt a whole and unfragmented narrative of experience and voice (Britzman, 1995). I propose we keep engaging in dialogue around deconstructing research methods often amplified in RPT processes as these methods impact the ways in which we engage in research with communities. These interrogations can provide new ways of engaging in community-engaged research and rethink privileging humanistic qualitative inquiry within RPT.

(Re)examining Historical and Sociopolitical Contexts

Foucault discusses discourses and subjectivities are produced situationally in historical and sociopolitical contexts (Miller, 2010). We apply Foucault’s analysis of power relations at the local level (Jardine, 2005) to (re)examine the contexts which construct community-engaged norms. Below is an example of paragraph I wrote in a previous iteration of this email about contextualizing dialogue within engaged institutions

and departments. However, when I applied poststructuralist ideas of power, these hierarchical levels fell apart.

According to the Kellogg Commission Report on the Engaged Institution (1999), engaged institutions are committed to rethinking and recreating teaching, research, and service to serve the community (Hartley & Saltmarsh, 2016). An engaged campus culture is characterized by collaborations with the community, alignment of the curriculum with the university's mission, and a structure of support to allow for engagement to happen (Ramaley, 2014). This is important to acknowledge as it is noted in literature the "perception of institutional support matters, even above and beyond the individual dispositions of faculty members, and even when disciplinary culture is accounted for" (Vogelgesang et al., 2010, p. 458). While our university is supportive, some institutions face barriers for their faculty to integrate community engagement into practice, such as tenure, large teaching loads, and advising responsibilities (O'Meara, 2011). Ideally, departmental goals reflect the larger institutional mission and aims (Glassick et al., 1997). In addition to institutional goals, faculty productivity, satisfaction, and motivation are also reflected within the departmental level (O'Meara et al., 2011). Community-engaged scholarship demonstrates the importance of institutional support and values.

As we engage in dialogue, we problematize hierarchy and categorical levels found in traditional forms of community-engaged scholarship. Foucault (1980) discusses power is not exercised in hierarchies, such as institution or department level contexts, but that it

permeates everywhere. Poststructuralist research resists an essentialize version of what characterizes an engaged institution or culture, but instead, interrogates the ways in which our discourse constructs and operationalizes these norms within our research. In other words, institutional norms and values do not just exist, but they are called into being by subjects within power relations. This disruption turns into a new way of engaging with communities and doctoral students as our next generation of engaged scholars.

In this application of poststructuralist thought, we can ask, in what ways do power/knowledge discourse construct community-engaged norms within RPT? In what ways are norms operationalized to regulate community-engaged scholarship in the RPT process? What are the sociopolitical and historical contexts that construct community-engaged norms for doctoral students? We can apply these interrogations to the following excerpt from Julie and Dr. Riley's interactions:

Dr. Riley becomes serious, "It's not enough to say we are a social justice focused institution but another thing to act on it and provide resources in order to do such work, such as this grant. While internal, it was a competitive application process, where I had to identify the research objective, discuss a complex societal issue the university can assist in solving, and select a community partner. I feel fortunate my department is incredibly supportive of this venture. Many meetings and calls later and here we are!"

Instead of categorizing university and department levels support of community-engagement, we analyze the power relations among Julie and Dr. Riley and their construction of community-engaged norms. In other words, while discourse is

sociopolitical and historically constructed, their discourse is what is studied in poststructuralist thought, not the location or site as the beginning of the interrogation. As we engage in dialogue, we can utilize poststructuralist thought to (re)examine sociopolitical and historical contexts where power/knowledge is operationalized to construct community-engaged norms.

Grants as Surveillance

Similar to Dr. Riley and Julie's institution, while I am thankful our university offers internal grants for community-engaged research as it funds scholarship for RPT, we need to analyze and disrupt how grants operationalize our work with communities and community-engaged scholarship. We can apply this interrogation of grants using Julie and Dr. Riley's discourse, such as through the following excerpt:

“It is actually an internal grant from the university. The grant is in response to additional funding going towards community-engagement research projects between the university and community. It is wonderful the university is spotlighting this important work! It is no surprise given our mission focused on social justice, inclusivity, and experiential learning, but these grants demonstrate the university living it's mission.” – Dr. Riley

We then inquire, in what ways are norms operationalized through grants to encourage community-engaged scholarship? In what ways do norms operate as a form of surveillance within community-engaged research?

Grants are framed in some community-engaged literature to assist in achieving institutional goals, faculty participation, and a way for the university to spotlight

university work within communities (Gravett & Broscheid, 2018). Often, grants are framed as incentives and recognition initiatives for the academic community (Gravett & Broscheid, 2018). As we apply power/knowledge discourse, we disrupt the notion that grants are “good” and examine how grants are used as forms of power operated by institutions to regulate knowledge, construct research norms, and operationalize work with communities. When we come together as a university community, I propose our dialogue discusses how we deconstruct the associated norms and examine power dynamics among the university and community as operationalized through the grant.

Foucault (1980) asks questions related to how power is produced, mechanism of power production, and what power consists. We can consider grants as a form of disciplinary power, or surveillance, which involve an innerweb of power relations among faculty, community partners, students, and institutions. Surveillance is discursively constructed and is used to explore the ways in which grants regulate knowledge, researcher, and researched (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). The knowledge that is produced as a result of the grant is still within this web of control where it is subject to discipline and regulations (Davis, 1994). In other words, grants are a form of surveillance, and when positioned to contribute to faculty’s RPT scholarship, they regulate the ways in which knowledge is produced.

Subjects under surveillance internalize and self-regulate according to the norms and rules of the organization (Moon, 2012). Through disciplinary power, people, such as faculty, learn to evaluate and police themselves (Saltman, 2018). Within this internalization, subjects then begin to survey others and continue the norms and rituals of

the system (Saltman, 2018). Applying this to grants, faculty are working within a web of surveillance where they operationalize grant norms and then continue to produce them within communities and doctoral students. For instance, Dr. Riley was able to apply for the research grant and select a community partner with whom to work. The grant as form of surveillance and disciplinary power is operationalized within Dr. Riley, which impacts her research goals, work with community, and mentorship of Julie. In this example, the community partner was not eligible to apply for the grant, and thus, was subjected to the norms and surveillance of the organization and faculty.

As we apply Foucault's (1980) power/knowledge discourse, norms are discursively constructed to operationalize grants as a form of power and surveillance. Grants can often fuel faculty scholarship that contributes to the RPT process. Through Foucault's surveillance and discipline concepts, we interrogate and deconstruct how power/knowledge creates norms surrounding community-engaged grants within community partners and doctoral students.

Destabilizing Faculty Authority in Engaged Scholarship

I appreciate our university supports community-engaged scholarship through grants, faculty development programs, and other incentives, which in turn, contribute to scholarship for RPT. After all, if those did not exist, it would be far more difficult to integrate community-engagement in teaching and scholarship. Through revisiting the purpose of this email, it is my goal to extend, revisit, and interrogate our university's framing of community-engaged scholarship in the RPT process. As a result of the university's adoption and support of community-engaged learning, the role of the

“boundary spanner” has developed. Dr. Riley and Julie’s community-engaged researcher roles may be considered as examples.

This role of the boundary spanner is the focus of interrogation as more faculty adopt community-engaged scholarship into their identity, which impacts how norms are operationalized and constructed. Within community-engaged scholarship, boundary spanners engage in “boundary work” which are characterized by moving from the individual to the collective boundary zone (McMillan et al., 2016). Boundary work is rooted in critical theories that interrogate dominant ideologies and value diverse funds of knowledge (Giroux, 1992 as cited in McMillan et al., 2016). Boundary spanning is utilized in community-engagement as a way to question knowledge, redefine relationships, and create learning environments for students related to skill development (Ramaley, 2014). Ramaley (2014) also discusses that boundary work can involve identifying “wicked problems” that can unite institutions and community partners around tackling complex societal and global issues. Community-engaged literature highlights this boundary work as spanning the academic/community binary.

When I first read about boundary spanners, I immediately identified myself as wanting to align my practices with their goals and ideations. I initially saw myself as a boundary spanner and ‘public intellectual’ who focuses on the democratic principles within education and resists the ivory tower mentality (Eatman, 2018). As I continued to engage in self-identified boundary work, I began to question whether I actually bridge or conduct “boundary spanning” to unite academic and community knowledge, or if I am further reenforcing problematic research collaborations. Through applying the

poststructuralist concept of power/knowledge and destabilizing faculty authority in community-engaged scholarship, I attempt to deconstruct this role and plan to discuss with you when we meet.

In rethinking the evolving norms of boundary spanning, we can analyze Dr. Riley and Julie's discursive interactions. The following excerpt is used as an example:

Dr. Riley waved her hand and said, "Julie, you are an outsider here. You have to acknowledge that. How are you going to understand and get to know a community when you are the outsider?" I sat thinking unsure of how to be an insider.

Dr. Riley discusses with Julie how to get to know the community through observations and community immersion experiences. In this way, power is operationalized through conditioning and self-regulating norms (Foucault, 1980) in the form of getting to know the community, such as through observations, which can be interpreted as surveillance. According to Foucault, surveillance operates through a gaze that self-regulates. "a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself" (Foucault, 1980, p. 155). As we interrogate Dr. Riley's encouragement of "getting to know the community," in what ways do our boundary spanner roles operate as surveillance and disciplinary power within the community? In what ways is RPT operationalizing norms within the boundary spanner's role?

Poststructuralist ideas deconstruct the role of the boundary spanner and interrogate the authority of faculty in community-engaged scholarship. Foucault states

that there is not a “dominator” and a “dominated” but that there are various forms of power relations and systems present as power is produced (Foucault, 1980). In other words, the boundary spanner is not the “dominator” and community under study is not the “dominated” but they create and produce one another. This examination of power operates through everything and everyone (Foucault, 1980). Within poststructuralist research, faculty authority is deconstructed within community-engaged research norms.

Poststructuralist theories provide a way we can discuss, problematize, and disrupt traditional notions of community-engagement in our RPT process. To echo St. Pierre (2021), theory should be challenging, difficult, and make a researcher rethink and create new ways of knowing. As we engage in discourse around RPT and community-engaged scholarship with doctoral students and new faculty, we position ourselves to analyze the power relations that operate to encourage adoption of community-engagement as part of our academic identity, enact disciplinary power in the form of surveillance on the community, and deconstruct humanistic qualitative methods. These various forms of power are interrogated as they impact our research with communities. As It is not enough that community-engagement is a part of our RPT process. We need to constantly examine the norms and power that construct community-engaged scholarship with each other, our doctoral students, and community partners. I look forward to our future conversations.

Best,

Annie

FACULTY AND FUTURE FACULTY (UN)DEVELOPMENT

I highlight the words on page 19 of Boyer (1996), “Increasingly, the campus is being viewed as a place where students get credentialed and faculty get tenured, while the overall work of the academy does not seem particularly relevant to the nation’s most pressing civic, social, economic, and moral problems.” I put my pen down and look out the window at the bustling cityscape. My interactions with Dr. Sanders, Dr. Riley, and Dr. McGrath, as well as the books and articles I am reading on teaching and learning and community-engagement, have all ruptured my ideas and thoughts on the purpose of community-engaged teaching-learning and research. I feel as if I am in a constant tug of war of how I feel about university-community partnerships, and now I even question the point and purpose. It is all unclear to me.

I stare at Boyer’s (1996) scholarship and feel fortunate I registered for the Center for Teaching and Learning’s workshop today. I have found these professional development events critical to my development as a future faculty as they assist in formulating competencies around curriculum design, assessment creation, and integrating community-engagement into my work. Today’s workshop is covering the intersection of foundational scholarship on teaching and learning with community-engagement, including Barr and Tagg’s (1995) *From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education*, Boyer’s (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, and Glassick et al.’s (1997) *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the*

Professoriate. We were also asked to read excerpts from Post et al.'s (2016) *Publicly Engaged Scholars* related to community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship. I grin with excitement as I neatly stack the readings next to my laptop in preparation for the workshop.

Grabbing my headphones from my bookshelf along with a notebook and pen, I settle into my single kitchen table chair and open my laptop. Making sure I am muted, I click "Join Meeting" on the workshop's calendar invitation. Over thirty small boxes filled with faces pop up. This is a great turnout!

The Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning says, "Welcome! I am so thrilled to have so many of you join us today for our workshop on the intersection of teaching and learning and community-engaged scholarship. The purpose of our workshop is to give you an opportunity to discuss the assigned readings and apply them in your creation of transdisciplinary learning environments for our students and in connection with our social justice mission!" He pauses and adds, "In the chat, please put your own learning goals for what you hope to discuss with your colleagues today."

There was a flurry of action in the chat with participants stating:

"My learning goal is to identify how the scholarship of teaching and learning and community-engagement influence one another."

"I want to learn more about foundational teaching and learning scholarship and how it can further inform my teaching."

I took a second to collect my thoughts. I put in the chat: “I want to better interrogate the goals of community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship. Who is this really for? Students? Faculty? Community partners? What are the tensions at play?”

I lean back in my seat and frown. I just do not know. Ever since starting my doctoral program, I feel like my past service experience has been turned upside down and I cannot make sense of it anymore. Why had I even participated in service in undergrad? Sure, it was a part of the curriculum and I wanted to help. But had I really considered the power dynamics between myself and the community? Did the community partner site really want me there? Or did they just need me because they lacked funding and resources?

The Director acknowledges the chat stating, “These are excellent learning goals, and as we engage in dialogue today, let’s keep these in mind. I am going to open up the breakout rooms now and have everyone discuss the following introductory prompt, which I will post in the chat, *‘What were your initial reactions to the assigned readings for today? How did this scholarship influence your subjectivities? What questions did it raise?’* Now, I am going to open up the breakout rooms! Have a wonderful discussion!” The Director waved his hand goodbye as I clicked the button that says, “Join Breakout Room 13.”

I teleported into breakout room number thirteen and was met with three familiar faces. “Dr. McGrath, Dr. Riley, and Dr. Sanders! It is so great to see you! I cannot believe we got so lucky to be in the same breakout room!” I was astonished at my luck and what was sure to be an invigorating conversation.

Dr. McGrath unmutes herself first and says, “It is great to see you, too, Julie, and wonderful to see you again, Dr. Riley and Dr. Sanders!”

Dr. Riley and Dr. Sanders unmute and simultaneously say, “Good morning!”

Dr. Sanders adds, “I am so happy we get to discuss the articles we read for today. Julie, do you want to go ahead and respond to the Director’s prompts and get us started?”

Flushed I have to go first, I reply, “Certainly! So, I never read Barr and Tagg (1995), Boyer (1990), or Glassick et al. (1997) before today, and I think every future faculty should read them! I loved how Barr and Tagg (1995) framed the idea of a learning paradigm, which prioritizes the students’ holistic learning experience and provides an environment that allows for a transfer of learning across contexts. They discuss the instructional paradigm as the antithesis, which is teacher-centered, and learning happens in departmental silos.”

Dr. Riley interjects, “I actually think Barr and Tagg (1995) create a dangerous learning versus instructional dichotomy!”

I can imagine I look startled as Dr. Riley adds, “Julie, you make great points, but I think there is more to unpack here.”

Dr. McGrath adds, “I agree to an extent, Dr. Riley. From both a faculty and community partner position, I most connect with Post et al.’s (2016) reading as it discusses how transdisciplinary learning and collaborative engagement, which are concepts that integrate disciplines, connect with real-world problems, and fosters a collaboration between faculty, students, and community. I thought this work frames what

I am trying to do in connecting the university with the community around a common goal. These concepts move beyond just a learning or instructional paradigm.”

I shake my head. “Dr. McGrath your comments make me think of my learning goals for this session, which is to interrogate the purpose of community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship. Who is this really for?” I exclaim. “I interpreted the readings for today to focus on maintaining learner-centered spaces for students without really acknowledging the role of the community. Are we only using community partner sites as training spaces for students?”

I pause and continue, “I am currently in a curriculum theory class right now and we are studying poststructuralist thought.” All three of my faculty’s heads nod in recognition. “Let me rephrase the question if we were to apply Foucault’s power/knowledge discourse. How would our conversation change if we interrogate the *power dynamics* within community-engagement and the power relations that operate among faculty, community, future faculty, and students to discursively construct community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship?”

Dr. McGrath quickly speaks up, “From what I remember in graduate school, which was a very long time ago,” the other two faculty laugh and nod. “Poststructuralist thought is used to interrogate power dynamics and analyze the power/knowledge discourse that operates between subjects. Am I remembering that right?”

Dr. Riley jumps in, “yes! I remember it that way, too. I also recall Foucault (1997b) discussing subjectivities as constantly shifting and changing over time related to

our contexts, experiences, and schemes. We can never fully know ourselves or understand our experiences.”

Dr. Sanders continues, “That is right! And I think this was Scott (1991), who said how we cannot reflect back on our experiences as they are always partial, incomplete, and change in discourse!”

I grin. My classmates and I just had this conversation the other day! “So, if we apply poststructuralist thought to this discussion, in what ways is our community-engaged learning teaching-learning and scholarly practices discursively constructed?”

We all pause collecting our thoughts.

Dr. Riley starts, “That question certainly changes the dynamics of our dialogue! I think about interrogating my own subjectivities over time as it relates to service, and how my faculty in graduate school trained me to be a researcher,” Dr. Riley interjects. “I was taught that being a great ethnographer was seamlessly going into communities, observing, getting to know them, and learning all I can. Community-engaged scholarship is full of researchers trying to mine communities for information, and I do not know if there is a perfect representation of a community-university reciprocal and mutual beneficial relationship. There are so many layers to this conversation, including what counts as community-engaged scholarship, grants, and other stipulations. This is really complicated.”

“What I think we are missing from this conversation is community partner voice,” Dr. Sanders states. “They should be at the table whenever dialogue is happening about teaching-learning or research in or with the community.”

I add, “I agree, Dr. Sanders, but does poststructuralist research also problematize and disrupt voice and experience as all-knowing? To clarify, I absolutely think community partners should be involved in every part of the process, but how do we resist essentializing their voice and experience in the narrative? Especially that they do not speak for all community members when they voice their perspectives?”

Dr. Sanders looks thoughtful, “That is a great point, and I suppose then we need to analyze the local power relations and discursive constructs of the community-engaged process when working with communities. They may have a traditional notion of ‘power’ to try to make their voice heard. Yet, the community partners are also in power relations with their community members who might not have this direct connection to universities. In other words, in what ways are we interrogating our individual university-community power dynamics and discourses?”

“I think about how the community is producing us as we are producing the community!” I say.

Dr. McGrath nods, “Exactly. I have not thought about community-engaged learning this way before, and it adds new, shifting angles in discourse. From this lens, we can interrogate not what are ‘good’ or ‘bad’ partnerships or whether communities have a ‘voice’ at the table, but that it is an analysis of the discourse we create together on community-engagement in every local interaction.”

Dr. Riley jumps in, “That makes me think of Emily Janke’s article from 2013 called *Increased Community Presence is Not a Proxy for Reciprocity*. Janke talks about the importance of community voice and gives an example of a time she did not have

community voice in her design of a conference on community-university partnerships. As you can imagine, it did not go over well. She discussed learning from this experience and working towards a true reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship with communities in future conference outcomes and planning processes.”

Dr. Sanders asks, “I think I read that one. And Janke discusses Jameson, Clayton, and Jaeger’s (2010) scholarship on thick versus thin reciprocity where thin is transactional and thick is characterized by collective power, co-constructing knowledge, and sharing ideas. What do you think Foucault would say about these readings?”

I respond, “I think Foucault would destabilize the thick and thin reciprocity spectrum as he deconstructs binaries. Instead, he would interrogate the ways in which community partners and faculty are all within a web of power relations and examine the ways in which community-university power dynamics produce knowledge and truth. For instance, he would examine the process and how power is exercised in the pursuit of trying to work towards this reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship. For Foucault, it is not about the end goal, such as reciprocity, but that there is never an ending point to anything. It is about the process and constant exercise of power relations.”

Dr. McGrath adds, “Yes, Foucault (1980) would be much more interested in investigating the process of how ‘mutually beneficial relationships’ and ‘reciprocity’ came to be interpreted within power relations and social bodies. Foucault also discusses power/knowledge discourse is sociopolitical, historical, and cultural. In what ways does context impact our discourse?”

“I think the fact we are in this dual and intersecting COVID-19 and racial injustice pandemics and welcoming in a new United States presidency all impact our discourse around community-engagement,” I offer.

Dr. McGrath continues, “I agree, and I think we need to look even more locally as we analyze our power relations.”

Dr. Sanders says, “Dr. McGrath, that is a good point. I think since our university’s mission is so tied to social justice, and the fact we even have faculty development workshops on community-engagement, impacts our subjectivities and discursive construction of community-engagement in these various sociopolitical and historical contexts.”

I lean back thinking and then say, “As we think about contexts, I want to interrogate the different contexts you and I have all engaged in together. Dr. Sanders and I have engaged in discourses around identities within her classroom. Dr. McGrath and I had conversations about service, Catholicism, and the tutoring program in the context of a university-community research collaboration. Dr. Riley and I have met to discuss our research on Dr. McGrath’s tutoring program. As I situate each of our conversations separately and in relation with one another, according to Foucault, my subjectivities are discursively constructed in my interactions with you and how I have come to examine and interrogate community-engagement!”

Dr. Riley immediately responds, “Julie, of course! And you have impacted ours!”

“What?!” I say. “I have impacted your subjectivities?”

Dr. Sanders grins, “Well, yes, if we are applying Foucault’s (1980)

power/knowledge discourse, you are also in this machine of power relations and have impacted my subjectivities. We continue to deconstruct this teacher/student binary when we apply poststructuralist thought.

Dr. Riley adds, “We have also engaged in discourse around community-engagement together. But just because we have discussed it does not mean it is stable. Experience, subjectivities, and discourse is constantly in flux and every changing. It will never be the same.”

I sat stunned. I had not even considered my role in this web of power relations. “I did not realize I had power,” I slowly stated. “I always thought you had power and that it was projected upon me. Now I see if we apply Foucault that does not make sense!”

Dr. McGrath states, “This is an example, Julie. Remember when you corrected me on the terms I was using? The ‘family engagement’ versus ‘family involvement?’ You exercised power there, and I have been thinking about the power of language ever since. I even told my tutors this update to language and what this means for our work with community.”

Dr. Riley adds, “According to Foucault, disciplinary power operates norms, too. Julie, I think about this through the grant that funds your position and operationalizes our work with community. We discursively create these grants, and they create us in this web of power relations.”

My mouth hangs open agape, “Wow, I never considered Foucault’s disciplinary power as exercised through surveillance and norms! Dr. McGrath, I immediately think back to our conversation on what it is going to take to be a faculty. You discussed the

importance of doing service in graduate school for marketability. Would you consider that an operationalized norm?”

Dr. McGrath adds, “Julie, I think so. I mean, I did not consider discursively constructed faculty norms when we were talking. How could I? But you are probably right. In our discussions with doctoral students, we unknowingly or knowingly create norms around academia.”

“Another example of power/knowledge is through the readings for today! We have discursively created what are coined ‘foundational reads’ for teaching and learning and have decided these texts contain truth and knowledge faculty and future faculty should know,” Dr. Sanders exclaims.

I excitedly point out, “If Foucault were here, he would be more interested in the process for which these became ‘foundational reads’ versus the books content or intended outcome.”

“Yes, and if Foucault had read Boyer’s (1990) four dimensions of scholarship, he would say it had too many fixed and stable categories and would subsequently attempt to deconstruct it!” Dr. Riley adds. “He would also disagree with Glassick et. al’s (1997) research on assessment criteria that focus on concise goals, rigorous post positivistic research methods, and articulated outcomes. Poststructuralist research resists all of these components noting that the experience that creates the research is always partial, incomplete, and changing within sociopolitical and historical constructs”

We all nod our heads in agreement. I continue, “It makes me think of all the emphasis we place on generating ‘rigorous’ scholarship. I never considered this norm’s

impact on our research and teaching-learning with communities. If we constantly privilege research in the academy, does that position communities as secondary?" I look directly at Dr. McGrath and Dr. Riley's faces through the screen. "What do you think Foucault would say about this?"

Dr. McGrath looks thoughtful. "Well, I think Foucault would remove the language of 'primary' and 'secondary' to destabilize the self/other or university/community binaries. I think we are also making assumptions that the community has less or more power than other institutions or stakeholders. The bottom line is that we are all within power relations producing knowledge within our own discursive interactions."

I reply, "But power can take on many forms, like regulating norms and operating as surveillance, right?"

Dr. Riley responds, "Up until this point, we have talked about universities operating as surveillance within the community through research and grants. Even the location of the university can operationalize surveillance. However, this looks like one-way power relations of surveillance from the university onto the community. How does the community also produce knowledge that controls and regulates the university? In what ways does that regulate our teaching-learning and research?"

Dr. McGrath says, "As I told Julie, our tutors, who are doctoral students, learn so much from their tutees. I often say that the tutors learn just as much from their tutees. They serve as a source of inspiration to the tutors and this impacts the tutor's subjectivities and discourses around their experiences." She pauses and continues, "I

mentioned earlier that Julie and I discussed doctoral students who engage in service are more marketable for faculty positions. Within this example, the doctoral students need the community in order to obtain such a position. Communities exercise their power through their interactions with doctoral students who need them to conduct service for employability. It is a cycle of power relations.”

“We are all in this machine of power relations,” I say. “Faculty, communities, and doctoral students. We all exercise power/knowledge where our subjectivities are constantly shifting and changing in discourse with one another.”

A notification pops up on our screen inviting us back to the main room.

“Who wants to share out what we discussed?” Dr. Sanders asks.

“I vote Julie!” Dr. McGraths says smiling.

“Well, these thoughts are still in process and incomplete. Thank you so much for the conversation, all. I am excited to continue it.”

We wave to each other and click “accept” to transport back to the main room. I grab a pen and a paper to record my thoughts and shifting accounts of what transpired.

DEAR COMMUNITY PARTNERS

It is with remorse that it took me to the end of my dissertation journey to write to you. I wrote (un)finished letters to my doctoral peers, faculty, and even Foucault, explaining my process of writing about community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship. Why is it that we have not yet corresponded? The answer is constantly changing, just like my shifting subjectivities on community-engagement. Initially, I think it was because I thought you wanted to partner with the university, and thus assumed your passive role within community-engagement. I then left you out in an attempt to protect you from the problematic higher education politics (we are still trying to figure it out, too). As I reread my (un)finished letters to my peers and faculty, I now think I did not write to you because I did not know what to say.

Since I began my doctoral journey, I have focused on faculty development and graduate education. In one of my independent studies, I was gifted Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* and Glassick et al.'s (1997) *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. I was inspired reading about the four dimensions of scholarship and rethinking rigorous assessments of research. Through reading community-engaged scholarship, I then became entranced with the idea of public service intellectuals and how university-community partnerships can assist in solving society's most complex problems. It was an exhilarating feeling to think about removing

the confines of traditional classroom walls and bridging community and university together in pursuit of the common good! When I imagined these possibilities, I thought about how it would benefit myself and students. Not necessarily you.

My initial imperfect and partial reasons for interrogating faculty and doctoral student power/knowledge was to consider the ways in which community-engagement is discursively created in the sociopolitical context of the academy. As a doctoral student and faculty member, I engaged in discourse with my own faculty who have shifted my subjectivities and operationalized norms around these pedagogical and curricular practices. As I created Julie's character out of the partial experiences and subjectivities of my faculty interview participants and myself, I did not realize you *have been* a part of the conversation this entire time through Julie. You created Julie and impacted her subjectivities and becoming. Through providing Julie opportunities at your site, you give her experiences she brings back to our university to be reproduced in discourse. What were your conversations like with Julie? What knowledge was generated through this discourse? You are a part of Julie's educational experiences, too, whether you were consciously or unconsciously aware.

I now write to you confusedly sitting in the muddle of my shifting subjectivities, partial experiences, and deconstructed theory/data binary. If we had conversations about our teaching-learning and scholarly partnerships would you be truthful? I suppose poststructuralist researchers would say that there are not fixed truths, but truth is produced through power/knowledge discourse (Tamboukou, 2008). I want you to know that we are both tied within relations of power that produce each other, just like with

Julie. Through our discourse, we call each other into being, create knowledge and truth, and reproduce our own shifting experiences.

There is not a perfect ending or a tidy bow to wrap-up my (re)in-sertation. This (un)finished letter to you still leaves much unresolved with the research still constantly in process, shifting, and partial. I hope you will insert your own subjectivities into this research as you interrogate the ways in which power/knowledge operates among you, as the community partner, and the university community. Your own subjectivities are in process and are a part of this web of power relations. I look forward to our conversations.

Best regards,

[Name]

APPENDIX A

READER'S THEATER: FACULTY AND FUTURE FACULTY (UN)DEVELOPMENT

Julie is sitting at a small kitchen table in her studio apartment overlooking the bustling cityscape. A book is in front of her and she holds a highlighter in her hand.

JULIE (reading from the text): “Increasingly, the campus is being viewed as a place where students get credentialed and faculty get tenured, while the overall work of the academy does not seem particularly relevant to the nation’s most pressing civic, social, economic, and moral problems” (Boyer, 1996, p. 19)

Julie looks puzzled and puts her highlighter down.

JULIE (to herself): My interactions with Dr. Sanders, Dr. Riley, and Dr. McGrath, as well as the books and articles I am reading on teaching and learning and community-engagement, have all ruptured my prior ideas and thoughts on the purpose of community-engaged teaching-learning and research. I feel fortunate to have registered for the Center for Teaching and Learning’s workshop today. Perhaps talking with colleagues will continue to challenge my thinking.

Julie glances at the stack of readings next to her laptop. Looking at her watch, she grabs her headphones from her bookshelf along with a notebook and pen. She settles into her single kitchen table chair and opens her laptop. Checking to make sure she is muted, she clicks “Join Meeting” on the workshop’s calendar invitation. Over thirty small boxes filled with faces pop up on the screen.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING: Welcome! I am so thrilled to have so many of you join us today for our workshop on the intersection of teaching and learning and community-engaged scholarship. The purpose of our workshop is to give you an opportunity to discuss the assigned readings and apply them in your

creation of transdisciplinary learning environments for our students and in connection with our social justice mission! We will transition to breakout rooms and have everyone discuss the following introductory prompt, which I will post in the chat, *'What were your initial reactions to the assigned readings for today? How did this scholarship influence your subjectivities?'* Have a wonderful discussion!

The Director waves his hand goodbye as Julie clicks the button that says, "Join Breakout Room 13." Julie teleports into breakout room number thirteen and is met with three familiar faces.

JULIE: Dr. McGrath, Dr. Riley, and Dr. Sanders! It is so great to see you! I cannot believe we got so lucky to be in the same breakout room!

DR. SANDERS; Good morning, all! I am so happy we get to discuss the articles we read for today. Julie, do you want to go ahead and respond to the Director's prompts and get us started?

JULIE: Certainly! So, I never read Barr and Tagg (1995), Boyer (1990), or Glassick et al. (1997) before today, and I think every future faculty should read them! I loved how Barr and Tagg (1995) framed the idea of a learning paradigm, which prioritizes the students' holistic learning experience and provides an environment that allows for a transfer of learning across contexts.

DR. MCGRATH: From both a faculty and community partner position, I most connect with Post et al.'s (2016) reading as it discusses transdisciplinary learning and collaborative engagement, which are concepts that integrate disciplines, connect with real-world problems, and fosters collaboration among faculty, students, and community. I

thought this work frames what I am trying to do in connecting the university with the community around a common goal. These concepts move beyond just a learning or instructional paradigm.

JULIE: I am currently in a curriculum theory class right now and we are studying poststructuralist thought. What if we were to apply Foucault's power/knowledge discourse to this conversation? How would our conversation change if we interrogate the *power dynamics* within community-engagement and the power relations that operate among faculty, community, future faculty, and students to discursively construct community-engaged teaching-learning and scholarship?

The four individuals pause collecting their thoughts.

DR. SANDERS: What I think we are missing from this conversation is community partner voice. They should be at the table whenever dialogue is happening about teaching-learning or research in or with the community.

JULIE: That is a great point, Dr. Sanders. Poststructuralist research problematizes and disrupts voice and experience as all-knowing. I do think community partners should be involved, but how do we resist essentializing their voice and experiences? Especially as they do not speak for all community members when they share perspectives.

DR. MCGRATH: I have not thought about community-engaged learning this way before, and it adds new, shifting angles in discourse. From a poststructuralist lens, we can interrogate not what are 'good' or 'bad' partnerships or community 'voice,' but that it is an analysis of the local discourse we create together on community-engagement.

DR. RILEY: That makes me think of Emily Janke's article from 2013 called *Increased Community Presence is Not a Proxy for Reciprocity*. Janke talks about an example of a time she did not have community voice integrated into her design of a conference on community-university partnerships. It did not go over well, and she discussed learning from this experience and working towards a true reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship with communities in future conference outcomes and planning processes. She also discussed Jameson, Clayton, and Jaeger's (2010) scholarship on thick versus thin reciprocity where thin is transactional and thick is characterized by collective power, co-constructing knowledge, and sharing ideas. What do you think Foucault would say about these readings?

JULIE: I think Foucault would destabilize the thick and thin reciprocity spectrum since he deconstructs binaries. Instead, he would interrogate the ways in which community partners and faculty are all within a web of power relations and examine the ways in which community-university power dynamics produce knowledge and truth. For instance, he would examine the process and how power is exercised in the pursuit of trying to work towards this reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship. For Foucault, it is not about the end goal, such as reciprocity, but that there is never an ending point to anything. It is about the process and interrogating the exercise of power relations.

DR. MCGRATH: Yes, Foucault (1980) would be much more interested in investigating the process of how 'mutually beneficial relationships' and 'reciprocity' came to be interpreted within power relations and social bodies. Foucault also discusses

power/knowledge discourse is sociopolitical, historical, and cultural. In what ways does context impact our discourse?

JULIE: I think the dual and intersecting COVID-19 and racial injustice pandemics, as well as welcoming in a new United States presidency, all impact our discourse around community-engagement. As we think about how this transcends to our localized contexts, which Foucault focuses, it makes me rethink the different contexts *we* have interacted.

Dr. Sanders and I have engaged in discourses around identities within her classroom. Dr. McGrath and I had conversations about service, Catholicism, and the tutoring program in the context of a university-community research collaboration. Dr. Riley and I have met to discuss our research on Dr. McGrath's community tutoring program. As I situate each of our conversations separately and in relation with one another, according to Foucault, my subjectivities are discursively constructed in my interactions with you and how I have come to examine and interrogate community-engagement.

DR. SANDERS: And, Julie, you have impacted our subjectivities! If we apply Foucault's (1980) power/knowledge discourse, you are also in this machine of power relations and have impacted mine. We continue to deconstruct this teacher/student binary when we apply poststructuralist thought. Experience, subjectivities, and discourse are constantly in flux and every changing. They will never stay the same.

JULIE: After all this, I did not realize *I* had power, too. I always thought you had power and that it was projected upon me!

DR. MCGRATH: This is an example, Julie. Remember when you corrected me on the terms I was using last semester? The 'family engagement' versus 'family involvement?'

You exercised power there, and I have been thinking about the power of language and terms ever since. I even told my tutors this update and what it means for our work with community.

DR. RILEY: According to Foucault (1980), disciplinary power operationalizes norms and surveillance. Julie, I think about this through the grant that funds your graduate research assistant position and our engaged research project, which then impacts the scholarship put forth for tenure. We discursively create the norms that operate the grants, and then they create us in this web of power relations. As we have to abide by grant rules and regulations, they also control our work within community-engaged research.

JULIE: I never considered Foucault's disciplinary power exercised in this way before! Dr. McGrath, I immediately think back to our conversation on what it is going to take to be a faculty. You discussed the importance of doing service in graduate school for marketability. Would you consider that an operationalized norm?

DR. MCGRATH: Julie, I think so. I did not consider this when we were talking, but you are probably right. In our discussions with doctoral students, we unknowingly or knowingly create norms around academia.

DR. SANDERS: Another example of power/knowledge is through the readings for today. We have discursively created what are coined 'foundational reads' for teaching and learning and have decided these texts contain truth and knowledge faculty and future faculty should know.

DR. RILEY: If Foucault had read Boyer's (1990) four dimensions of scholarship, he would say it had too many fixed and stable categories and would subsequently attempt to

deconstruct it! He would also disagree with Glassick et. al's (1997) research on assessment criteria that focus on concise goals, rigorous post positivistic research methods, and articulated outcomes. Poststructuralist research resists all of these components noting that the experience that creates the research is always partial, incomplete, and changing within sociopolitical and historical constructs.

All four individuals nod their heads in silent agreement.

JULIE: It makes me think of all the emphasis we place on generating 'rigorous' scholarship. I never considered this norm's impact on our research and teaching-learning with communities. If we constantly privilege 'rigorous' research in the academy, in what ways does this impact the community? What do you think Foucault would say about this?

DR. MCGRATH: Well, I think Foucault destabilizes the self/other or university/community binaries. I think he would also say we are making assumptions that the community has less or more power than higher education institutions. We are all within power relations producing knowledge within our own discursive interactions.

DR. RILEY: Up until this point, we talked about universities operating as norms and surveillance within the community through research and grants. Even the location of the university can operationalize surveillance. However, this looks like one-way power relations from the university onto the community. How does the community also produce knowledge that controls and regulates the university? In what ways does that regulate our teaching-learning and research?

DR. MCGRATH: As I told Julie, our tutors, who are doctoral students, learn so much from their tutees. I often say that the tutors learn just as much from their tutees. They

serve as a source of inspiration to the tutors and this impacts the tutor's subjectivities and discourses around their experiences. I mentioned earlier that Julie and I discussed doctoral students who engage in service are more marketable for faculty positions. Within this example, the doctoral students need the community in order to obtain such a position. Community members exercise their power through their interactions with doctoral students who need them to conduct service for employability. It is a cycle of power relations.

JULIE: We are all in this machine of power relations. Faculty, communities, and doctoral students. We all exercise power/knowledge where our subjectivities are constantly shifting and changing in discourse with one another.

A notification pops up on the screen inviting the four individuals back to the main room.

JULIE: Well, these thoughts are still in process and incomplete. Thank you so much for the conversation, all. I am excited to continue it.

The faculty and Julie wave to each other and click "accept" to transport back to the main room. Julie grabs a pen and a paper and starts to write.

REFERENCE LIST

- Adichie, C. (2009, July). The danger of a single story [Video]. TED Conferences.
https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story
- Agger, B. (1991). Critical theory, poststructuralism, postmodernism: Their sociological relevance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17(1), 105–131.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.17.080191.000541>
- Anderson, R. (1998). Intuitive inquiry: A transpersonal approach. In A. Braud & B. Anderson (Eds.), *Transpersonal research methods for the social sciences: Honoring the human experience* (pp. 69-94). Sage.
- Barad, K. (2012). Natures queer performativity. *Kvinder, Køn & Forskning*, 1-2, 25-53.
- Barr, R. B. & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 27(6), 13-23.
- Bell, J. S. (2002). Narrative inquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2), 207–213. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588331>
- Berkey, R., Meixner, C., Green, P. M., & Eddins, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. (1996). *The scholarship of engagement*. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 1(1), 11–20.
- Braud, A., & Anderson, B. (1998). *Transpersonal research methods for the social sciences: Honoring the human experience*. Sage.
- Britzman, D. P. (1995). “The question of belief”: Writing poststructural ethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8(3), 229–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839950080302>

- Butler, J. (1992). Contingent foundations. In J. Butler & J. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 3-21). Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of war: When is life grievable?* Verso.
- Butler, J. (2015). *Notes towards a performative theory of assembly*. Harvard University Press.
- Choi, J. (2006). Doing poststructural ethnography in the life history of dropouts in South Korea: Methodological ruminations on subjectivity, positionality and reflexivity. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(4), 435–453.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390600773163>
- Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative inquiry: A methodology for studying lived experience. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 27(1), 44–54.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X060270010301>
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. Jossey-Bass.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Huber, J. (2010) Narrative inquiry. In B. McGaw, E. Baker, & P. P. Peterson (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (3rd ed., pp. 436-441). Elsevier.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780080448947013877?via%3Dihub>
- Colbeck, C. L. (2008). Professional identity development theory and doctoral education. In C. L. Colbeck, K. O’Meara, & A. Austin (Eds.), *Educating integrated professionals: Theory and practice on preparation for the professoriate* (pp. 9–13). Wiley.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative inquiry. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 477 - 487). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Davis, A. (2006). What we don’t talk about when we don’t talk about service. In A. Davis & E. Lynn (Eds.), *The civically engaged reader: A diverse collection of short provocative readings on civic activity* (pp. 148-154). Great Books Foundation.

- Davis, B. (1994). *Poststructuralist theory and classroom practice*. Deakin University Press.
- de Freitas, E., & Paton, J. (2009). (De) facing the self: Poststructural disruptions of the autoethnographic text. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 15(3), 483–498.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800408318419>
- Deleuze, G. (1986). *Cinema 1: The movement image* (H. Tomlinson & B. Habberjam, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1983)
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical philosophy* (R. Hurley, Trans.). City Lights Books. (Original work published 1970)
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. (P. Patton, Trans.). Athone Press. (Original work published in 1968).
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1980). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *On the line*. (J. Johnston, Trans.). Semiotext(e).
- Derrida, J. (1974). *Of grammatology*. (G.C. Spivak, Trans.). The Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Dostilio, L. D. (2017). *The community engagement professional in higher education: A competency model for an emerging field*. Campus Compact.
- Dostilio, L. D., Brackmann, S. M., Edwards, K. E., Harrison, B., Kliwer, B. W., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Reciprocity: Saying what we mean and meaning what we say. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19(1), 17-32.
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Intentions and insights. *Change*, 40(1), 39-41.
- Eatman, T. K. (2018). Faculty as colearners: collaborative engagement and the power of story in faculty development. In R. Berkey, C. Meixner, P. M. Green, & E. Eddins (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice* (pp. 59-81). Stylus Publishing, LLC
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books. (Original work published 1975)

- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings: 1972-1977*. (L. Marshall, C. Gordon, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). In C. Gordon (Ed.). Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777–795.
- Foucault, M. (1984). *History of sexuality: The care of the self* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16-49). University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997a). For an ethics of discomfort. In S. Lotringer & L. Hochroth (Eds.), *The politics of truth: Michel Foucault*. Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (1997b). Subjectivity and truth (R. Hurley, Trans.). In P. Rainbow (Ed.), *Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984: Vol. 1. Ethics, subjectivity, and truth* (pp. 87-92). The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1998). What is an author? (R. Hurely, Trans.). In P. Rainbow, & J. Faubion (Eds.), *Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984: Vol. 2. Aesthetics, method, and epistemology* (pp. 205-222). The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76* (D. Macey, Trans.). In M. Bertani & A. Fontana (Eds.). Picador. (Original work published 1997)
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. Routledge.
- Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Maeroff, G. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. Jossey-Bass.
- Gravett, E. O., & Broscheid, A. (2018). Models and genres of faculty development. In R. Berkey, C. Meixner, P. M. Green, & E. Eddins (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice* (pp. 85-106). Stylus Publishing, LLC
- Gutting, G. (2005). *Foucault: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

- Hammerberg, D. D. (2004). Technologies of the self in classrooms designed as “learning environments”: (Im)possible ways of being in early literacy instruction. In B. Baker, & K. Heyning (Eds.), *Dangerous coagulations: The uses of Foucault in the study of education* (pp. 359-383). Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Hartley, M., & Saltmarsh, J. (2016). A brief history of a movement: Civic engagement and American higher education. In M. A. Post, E. Ward, N. V. Longo, & J. Saltmarsh (Eds.), *Publicly engaged scholars* (pp. 34-60). Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harwood, V., & Rasmussen, M. L. (2004). Studying schools with an “ethics of discomfort.” In B. Baker, & K. Heyning (Eds.), *Dangerous coagulations: The uses of Foucault in the study of education* (pp. 305-321). Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Holman Jones, S. (2005). Autoethnography: Making the personal political. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 763–791). Sage Publications.
- Ishimaru, A. M. (2019). *Just schools: Building equitable collaborations with families and communities*. Teachers College Press.
- Jackson, A. Y. (2017). Thinking without method. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(9), 666–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417725355>
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2008). Experience and “I” in autoethnography: A deconstruction. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 299–318. <https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2008.1.3.299>
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2013). Plugging one text into another: Thinking with theory in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(4), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800412471510>
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2017). Thinking with theory: A new analytic for qualitative inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 717–737). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Jameson, J., Clayton, P., & Jaeger, A. (2010). Community engaged scholarship as mutually transformative partnerships. In L. Harter, J. Hamel-Lambert, & J. Millesen (Eds.), *Participatory partnerships for social action and research*. Kendall Hunt.

- Janke, E. (2013). Increased community presence is not a proxy for reciprocity. *eJournal of Public Affairs*, 2(2), 2-22. <https://doi.org/10.21768/ejopa.v2i2.13>
- Jardine, G. M. (2005). *Foucault and education primer*. Peter Lang, Inc., International Academic Publishers.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.
- Lather, P. (1992). Critical frames in educational research: Feminist and post-structural perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 87-99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543529>
- Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(4), 673–693.
- Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 35–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390500450144>
- Lather, P. (2014). To give good science: Doing qualitative research in the afterward. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(10), 1-14.
- Lather, P., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2013). Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 629–633.
- Longo, N. V., & Gibson, C. M. (2016). Collaborative engagement: The future of teaching and learning in higher education. In M. A. Post, E. Ward, N. V. Longo, & J. Saltmarsh (Eds.), *Next-generation engagement and the future of higher education* (pp. 61-75). Stylus Publishing.
- Lyon, M. (2016). Is your identity given or created [Video]. TEDxExeter Conferences. <https://www.tedxexeter.com/speakers/marcus-lyon/>
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington, & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Mazzei, L. A. (2013). A voice without organs: Interviewing in posthumanist research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 732–740. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788761>

- McMillan, J., Goodman, S., & Schmid, B. (2016). Illuminating “transaction spaces” in higher education: University-community partnerships and brokering as “boundary work”. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 20(3), 8–30.
- Miller, J. L. (2010). Poststructuralist research. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of curriculum studies* (pp. 676-680). Sage.
- Miller, J. L., & Macedo, E. (2018). Políticas públicas de currículo: Autobiografia e sujeito relacional. *Praxis Educativa*, 13(3), 948–965.
<https://doi.org/10.5212/PraxEduc.v.13i3.0018>
- Moon, S. (2012). Disciplinary images of “Korean-Ness”: Autobiographical interrogations on the panopticon. *SAGE Open*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244012455649>
- Moon, S. (2016). Poststructural theorizing of “experiences”: Implications for qualitative research and curriculum inquiries. *Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 2(1), 33–65.
- Moon, S. (2018). Belonging to the U.S. academia without belonging to it: The journey of “international” faculty. In A. Kemp (Ed.), *Dignity of the calling: Educators share the beginning of their journeys* (pp. 101-105). Information Age Publishing.
- Moon, S. (2019). *Three approaches to qualitative research through the ARTS: Narratives of teaching for social justice and community*. Brill.
- Moon, S., & Strophe, C. (2016). (Im)possible identity: Autoethnographic (re)Presentations. *The Qualitative Report*, 21(7), 1320-1350.
- Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic research: Design, methodology and applications*. Sage.
- O’Meara, K. (2011). Faculty civic engagement: New training, assumptions, and markets needed for the engaged American scholar. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 177-198). Temple University Press.
- O’Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, Jr. D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, 36(2), 83-96.
- Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Peters, M. A., & Burbules, N. C. (2004). *Poststructuralism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield Education.

- Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000060635>
- Pitt, A., & Britzman, D. (2003). Speculations on qualities of difficult knowledge in teaching and learning: An experiment in psychoanalytic research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(6), 755–776.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001632135>
- Post, M. A., Ward, E., Longo, N. V., & Saltmarsh, J. (Eds.) (2016). *Publicly engaged scholars: Next-generation engagement and the future of higher education*. Stylus Publishing.
- Public Purpose Institute. (2021, March). *Community engaged classification*.
<https://public-purpose.org/initiatives/carnegie-elective-classifications/community-engagement-classification-u-s/>
- Ramaley, J. A. (2014). The changing role of higher education: Learning to deal with wicked problems. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(3), 7–22. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1043282.pdf>
- Rendón, L. I. (2014). *Sentipensante (sensing/thinking) pedagogy: Educating for wholeness, social justice and liberation*. Stylus Publishing.
- Riessman, C. K. (2002). Analysis of personal narratives. In J. Gubrium, J. Holstein, A. Marvasti, & K. McKinney (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft* (1st ed., pp. 695-710). SAGE Publications, Inc.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218403.n26>
- Riessman, C. K. (2005) Narrative analysis. In N. Kelly, C. Horrocks, K. Milnes, B. Roberts, & D. Robinson (Eds.), *Narrative, memory and everyday life* (pp. 1-7). University of Huddersfield. (pp. 1-7).
- Ryan, A. M., Tocci, C., & Moon, S. (2020). *The curriculum foundations reader*. Macmillan.
- Saltman, K. J. (2018). *The politics of education: A critical introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Scott, J. W. (1991). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry*, 17(4), 773–797.

- Skorobohacz, C. (2014). Negotiating notions of self, culture, and curriculum throughout graduate school: One student's reflexive explorations. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 5(3), 62-70.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (1997a). Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 10(2), 175-189.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (1997b). Circling the text: Nomadic writing practices. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(4), 403-417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107780049700300403>
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2008). Decentering voice in qualitative inquiry. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 319-336. <https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2008.1.3.319>
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2013). The appearance of data. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 13(4), 223-227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708613487862>
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2014). A brief and personal history of post qualitative research: Toward "post inquiry." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 30(2), 2-19.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2018). Writing post qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24(9), 603-608.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2021). Post qualitative inquiry, the refusal of method, and the risk of the new. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 27(1), 3-9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800419863005>
- St. Pierre, E. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 715-719.
- Swearer Center Brown University. (2020, July). *College and university engagement initiative*. <https://www.brown.edu/academics/college/swearer/programs/college-and-university-engagement-initiative-cuei>
- Tamboukou, M. (2008). A Foucauldian approach to narratives. In M. Andrews, C. Squire, and M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing narrative research* (pp. 102-120). SAGE Publications, Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9780857024992
- Tatum, B. D. (2013). The complexity of identity: "Who am I?" In M. Adams, W. Blumenfeld, C. Castañeda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice*. Routledge.
- Vogelgesang, L. J., Denson, N., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship?. *Review of Higher Education*, 33(4), 457-472.
- Wang, H. (2014). *Nonviolence in education: Cross-cultural pathways*. Rutledge.

Williams, J. (2005). Understanding poststructuralism. In J. Reynolds (Ed.),
Understanding movements in Modern Thought (pp. 1–180). Acumen Publishing.

VITA

Annie Kelly was born and raised in Fort Mitchell, Kentucky outside of Cincinnati, Ohio. Prior to Loyola University Chicago, Annie earned her Master's degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs from the University of South Carolina in 2013 and a Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education and History from Saint Louis University in 2011.

While she pursued her doctorate, Annie served in various full-time professional roles at Loyola University Chicago within the fields of academic advising, experiential learning and ePortfolio pedagogy, and learning and academic support. Previously, she worked with new student and family programs at the University of Kentucky. Within each of her positions, Annie taught first-year seminars, learning support courses, and service-learning and academic internship classes. Annie has also served as a faculty member at the annual Appreciative Advising Institute since 2016 where she trains faculty and higher education professionals on applying the Appreciative Advising framework to create strength-based learning environments for students.

During her doctoral program, Annie was involved as a graduate research associate in the SUCCEED Lab (Schools, Universities, & Communities Collaborating for Equitable Educational Development) and served as a teaching assistant for a curriculum and instruction course.

Annie Kelly currently serves as a visiting assistant professor in University of Cincinnati's Division of Experience-Based Learning and Career Education. She advises students and teaches courses. She lives in Evanston, Illinois with her husband.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

The Dissertation submitted by Annie Kelly has been read and approved by the following committee:

Seungho Moon, Ed.D., Director
Associate Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Charles Tocci, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Patrick Green, Ed.D.
Clinical Assistant Professor, School of Education
Executive Director, Center for Experiential Learning
Loyola University Chicago