“Life is What You Make It”: African American Students’ Self-Practices in Negotiating the Curriculum of a Majority-White High School

by

Stacey S. Levin

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2016 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Donald Blumenfeld-Jones, Chair
David Lee Carlson
Jennifer A. Sandlin

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2016

©2016 Stacey S. Levin
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This study enters on the heels of a trend of public school closures across the United States. Using qualitative methods, the study concerns the curriculum experiences of six African American students attending a majority-white high school in a white, middle-class community in the Midwest, one year after the closure of their predominantly Black high school in their hometown.

The study draws from Michel Foucault's philosophy on care of the self as an analytical tool to look at students' care of the 'racialized' self, or more specifically, how African American students are forming a 'self' in a majority-white school in relation to the ways they are being racialized. Background of the schools and a description of the conditions under which the school change occurred are provided for context. Data collection involved conducting life history interviews with students, observing students in their classes, and shadowing students throughout their school day.

Findings show that African American student-participants are contending with what they describe as a "them"/"us" racial, cultural, and class divide that is operationalized through the curriculum. Students are in a struggle to negotiate how they are perceived and categorized as 'racialized' bodies through the curriculum, and, their own perceptions of these racializations. In this struggle, students enact self-practices to make maneuvers within curriculum spaces. A student can accept how the curriculum attempts to constitute her/him as a subject, resist this subjectification, or perform any combination of both accepting and resisting. In this way, a curriculum, with its distinctive and potentially polarizing boundaries, becomes a negotiated and contested space. And, because this curricular space is internally contradictory, a student, in relation to it, may

practice versions of a ‘self’ (multiple ‘selves’) that are contradictory. Findings illuminate that in this complex process of self-making, African American students are producing a *curriculum of self-formation* that teaches others how they want to be perceived.

For my family.

For my Grandfather Julian who teaches me through the eyes of an elder, and for Damian, Eliana, Maya, and Ruby who teach me through the eyes of children.

For the Washington students…your resilience is truly inspiring.

Dedicated to the memory of Rosalyn Podgorsky and Lauren Smith Beam.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation was made possible through the support and guidance of many special people.

I am truly grateful for the remarkable scholars on my committee. A special thank you to Donald Blumenfeld-Jones, my committee chair and mentor, for believing in me. Your dedication and support of me in conducting and completing this project are more than any Ph.D. candidate could hope for. You kept me on course, pushed me at every step, stretched my thinking, and taught me to always question. I am so honored to be your last student before your retirement.

David Lee Carlson, your help and guidance were immeasurable. You taught me to dig my heels in as a scholar, prepared me for the field, and offered support in the toughest moments of my dissertation process. I am so grateful for your encouragement and incredibly fortunate to call you a friend.

Jenny Sandlin, thank you for sharing your helpful insights. Your questions challenged me to dig deeper and search for new knowledge. I thank you for rooting for me throughout this process.

My sincerest gratitude to the student-participants who shared their stories with me. You are incredible and taught me so much. Thank you to the school administrators who granted me access and the cooperating teachers who welcomed me in their classrooms. A special thank you to the Washington community leaders who helped me in recruiting participants and securing interview locations.

I want to acknowledge my dear friends and wonderful colleagues who provided tremendous support: Kelly Roderick, Linda Doyle, Anthony Koutsoftas, Dianne Guenin-

Lelle, Mark Lelle, Dyron Dabney, Karen Erlandson, Cliff Harris, Kyle Shanton, Suellyn Henke, Daryl Schendel, Rich Nunziato, Stacy Lynn, Tanya Kelly, and Erica Susser. A special note of thanks to Omar Marquez for his invaluable help in developing ideas in Chapter 4 and to Adam Lutzker for his Foucauldian insights. Special thanks to Seanan Kelly and Jayne Lammers for sharing their advice about the doctoral process and to the Foucault reading group led by Dr. David Lee Carlson. My gratitude to Linda DeFato for her research assistance and Linda Thompson for her administrative help.

Finally, I want to acknowledge my amazing family who encouraged me throughout my doctoral journey. To Michael, my parents, my sister Laurie, my brothers Mark and Jason, and my extended family, I am so blessed to have your love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Overview 1

Statement of the Problem 2

Research Questions 3

Purpose and Significance of the Study 3

Methodology 4

Sampling Strategy 4

Data Collection 5

Interviews 5

Observations 6

Alternate Sources of Data 6

Data Analysis and Interpretation 6

2 METHODS 10

Literature Review: Foucault and Race 12

3 ANALYSIS 45

4 DISCUSSION 71

Literature Review: African American Students in Majority-White Schools 75

5 REFLECTION 102

Page

REFERENCES 109

APPENDIX 116

A THE SCHOOLS 117

B THE STUDENTS 123

C IRB APPROVAL 129

D INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 131

E INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 136

F OBSERVATION SCHEDULE 138

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

In the Spring of 2013, Washington High School, located in a small working-class rural town in the Midwest, closed its doors. Washington students attending the predominantly African American high school were made to move to Central High School, a majority-white school located 13 miles in a neighboring white, middle-class town. This arrangement stems from a necessity for the Washington School District to propose a doable plan to recover from a 1.1 million dollar deficit, low enrollment, and underperformance. The School Board voted to partner with Central to pool educational and financial resources. This is unlike most postclosure scenarios where there is little to no relationship between the feeding and receiving schools. Washington School District is not simply sending students to Central High School. Rather, both districts are working in collaboration.

In community presentations, both district superintendents have emphasized the benefits of the partnership. Closing Washington High School has allowed Washington School District to consolidate its remaining elementary and middle school into a K-8 school and focus on improving its State performance status. Central High School, in agreeing to take in Washington students has enabled the school to increase enrollment, accrue more state funding, and diversify its student body. As it currently stands, the contractual agreement is renewed annually unless a district chooses to opt out.

Both district superintendents have worked to implement strategies to ease students into the transition. For example, in the summer just before the start of the transition year, the superintendents organized a three-day Youth. The purpose of the event was for

Washington and Central students to introduce themselves and build community. The volunteer program included a "glasswing" dialogue where students discussed race, class, prejudice, and what it means to operate in a diverse world. Other activities encouraged students to collaborate on a community service project, design a logo combining both schools' mascots, and participate in social mixers such as a dance and karaoke night. This event has continued to take place each summer. Other current initiatives include an effort to align cultures and curricula across the two school districts, provide a positive behaviors support system, and implement a restorative justice program.

Statement of the Problem

There appears a gap in curriculum scholarship on how *contemporary* Black students experience a curriculum in a white-majority high school *after* experiencing the curriculum in a predominantly Black high school. A related body of educational literature exists in the area of contemporary Black students' curriculum experiences in white-majority high schools and it paints a bleak picture. Many empirical studies report that Black students consider white high schools as hostile, unsupportive learning environments (D. J. Carter, 2007; Carter-Andrews, 2012; Gordon, 2012; Harper & Davis, 2012; Ogbu, 2003; Strayhorn, 2009). The common conclusion is that Black students are disenfranchised in white-majority schools that do "very little to foster a positive representation of Blackness and Black identity" (D. J. Carter, 2007, p. 543). Research identifies a host of explanations including: (1) multiculturally inadequate teachers (P. L. Carter, 2009); (2) culturally unresponsive curriculum and pedagogy (Harper & Davis, 2012; Heariold-Kinney, 2009; hooks, 1994; Jackson, 2011; Price, 2011; Taylor, 2007); (3) being 'othered' and devalued (D. J. Carter, 2007; Tatum, 1997); and (4) exclusive

Eurocentric approaches to education (Carter Andrews, 2012; Gordon, 2012; Pinar, 1993). Few studies offer positive outlooks. Gordon (2012) and Harper & Davis' (2012) studies show that some Black male high school students in white learning spaces have been able to turn negative perceptions and low expectations into motivating factors to achieve academically. However, these same studies also report that Black students attending white-majority schools contend with a range of obstacles not experienced by their white counterparts. The studies confirm what majority of the literature puts forth: Black students in white-majority schools "struggle in the experience of being a minority in a sea of White people" (D. J. Carter, 2007, p. 553). Given this research and the reality that more minority schools are projected to close, there is an alarming concern for the wellbeing of Black students having to transfer to majority-white schools.

Research Questions

The research questions that guided this study are:

1. What is the experience of the curriculum for African American students in a majority-white high school after transferring from a predominantly Black high school?
2. How are students utilizing the curriculum to fashion a 'self'?

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this work is to present how African American students are negotiating the majority-white receiving high school they are now attending one year after the closure of their predominantly Black high school. The study draws from Michel Foucault's scholarship, particularly *care of the self*, to gain a sense of what kind of

‘selves’ students are fashioning in their new school in relation to the ways they are being racialized.

This study offers contributions to the existing educational scholarship on African American students’ curriculum experiences in majority-white schools. In taking up a Foucauldian methodological and analytic trajectory, it offers another incision into the conversation of the role of ‘race’ in African American high school students’ experiences at a majority-white school by presenting examples of care of the ‘racialized’ self.

Another significance is the study’s reliance on students to identify what social factions have bearing on their self-fashioning. This is especially significant as majority of the media coverage and official speak concerning the school closure has privileged adult views thereby delegitimizing Washington students’ perspectives.

The underlying assumption of this work is that students on the frontlines can offer an intimate picture of their daily school-life (Giroux, 1997; Wexler, 1992). Given the current trend of public school closures across the United States, and the imminent possibility of transferring more students of marginalized populations to schools variably different from their home schools, it is increasingly valuable to talk to students experiencing such post-closure situations.

Methodology

This qualitative study enters in the second year of Washington students’ transition to Central High School investigating Washington students’ “day-to-day” activities at Central High School (Cole & Knowles, 2001, p. 11).

Sampling Strategy

Through purposeful criterion sampling, 6 African American high school students were selected who met the criteria that they: (1) have lived in Washington for most of their lives, (2) were students at Washington High School during its closure, and (3) are now attending Central High School. The recruitment strategy involved enlisting the help of a Washington School District "At Risk" Coordinator, a Central High School Academic Coach, a Central High School Guidance Counselor, and a Washington community Youth Advocate. All had worked closely with Washington students and were able to identify a pool of students who met the criteria. Each was asked to generate a list of 5-10 students who would be open to discussing their transition experiences and to provide a brief explanation as to why they chose the particular students. Six participants were selected based on those students who appeared on multiple lists.

Data Collection

The data collection methods included life history interviews, class observations, and shadowing of students. Alternate sources of data included field notes, informal talks, and research notes.

Interviews.

Four one-to-one interviews were conducted with each of the 6 students: a broad life history interview, two focused school-life history interviews, and a stimulated recall interview. The broad life history interview was an "unstructured, informal" "interview-conversation" with students about their lives where students did most of the talking (Goodson & Sikes, 2001, p. 27). To elicit talk, open-ended prompt questions were asked in the areas of family, culture, home-life, friends, hobbies/activities, work, self-identity, romance, and church. In the focused school-life history interviews, an outline of topics

was used as discussion prompts. Questions were asked in the area of perceptions of 'self'; class subjects; formal and informal knowledge being learned; school culture; teacher and school expectations; academic performance; logistics/travel to and from school; education goals; interactions with new classmates, teachers, and administrators; and school experiences) (Atkinson, 1998; Kvale, 1996). In the stimulated recall interviews, students were asked to talk about a particular class session that occurred (and the researcher observed) so they could reflect on a concrete curriculum experience. These interviews also took the form of interview-conversations.

Observations.

To investigate students' school-lives, students were observed in their classrooms and shadowed throughout their school day. Observations of students in their school setting served as both a complement and supplement to students' interview accounts to gain a more holistic picture of their school-life.

Alternate sources of data.

Field notes, informal talks, and researcher's journal entries served as alternate sources of data. The purpose of collecting this supporting data was to inform, expand, and shed light on the primary data. Field notes included any notes jotted down in the field while conducting observations. Informal talks included conversations and informal exchanges with students as they were shadowed throughout their school day. The information from these exchanges was recorded in the researcher's journal, which also served as a data source.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Foucauldian constructs were employed to analyze the data. Foucault's (1995) notion of *discipline* was used to understand Central's curriculum as a disciplinary strategy to shape the thoughts and actions of students. We can locate these disciplinary strategies within the physical layout of the school (e.g., the placement of doors, the size of the windows, the arrangement of classrooms); the management of time (e.g., clocks, bells, semesters, calendars); the techniques of observation (testing and monitoring students); the forms of analyzing students (classifying students into grades and tracks, issuing grades and report cards, determining class ranking); and so forth, All of these disciplinary strategies are designed to train and condition students to behave in particular ways (Foucault, 1995; Olssen, 1999).

Foucault's concept of an *ethical formation of a 'self'* was used to understand the ways Washington students form a 'self' at Central High School. Here students are enacting *self-practices* or strategies and tactics to form a 'self'. Self-formation is 'ethical' for Foucault because individuals are forming a 'self' *in relation* to others. Foucault (1985) outlines a four-part process of this ethical self-formation: (1) *determination of the ethical substance*—the ways in which individuals balance obligations and desires which constitute their moral conduct, (2) *mode of subjection*—the ways in which an individual establishes a relationship to a particular set of rules, thus complying to it and "preserving it as a custom" (p. 27); (3) *forms of elaboration*—the practices that an individual performs on oneself in order to not only adhere "to a given rule" but also to "attempt to transform oneself" (p. 27); and (4) *telos*—an individual's commitment to become the self she aims to be (p. 28).

Foucault's notion of *race* was used to understand race not as an essential category, but as one strategy in a web of strategies to demarcate bodies. Foucault (2003a) explicates that race emerges through a convergence of disciplinary practices. For example, at Central High School, race is a strategy that is used to classify Washington students as racialized bodies. Yet in students' self-fashioning, they can choose to accept and/or resist this racial classification as they navigate through Central.

Foucault's ideas on *resistance* were used to analyze how students accept and/or resist 'race' in their self-practices. For Foucault (1978) resistances are the ways in which individuals resist *power*. Foucault understands power as "the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society" (p. 93). With this definition, Foucault makes clear that power is not just an "institution", a "structure", or held by an individual, but located in all of the strategies coming from "everywhere" to control individuals in a society (p. 93). For Foucault, power is in relation to the individuals who encounter it and he refers to power as *relations of power* to emphasize this dynamic.

These Foucauldian constructs are used as analytical tools to make sense of the data. What follows are chapters fashioned as individual journal articles that apply these tools to offer an understanding of six African American students' struggle in their transition from a predominantly African American high school to a majority-white school. In Chapter 2, I discuss the marginalization of Foucault's work in race-based studies and present how I employ Foucauldian concepts. Here I use Foucault's four-part framework on the *ethical formation of a 'self'* to present the ways two student-participants are fashioning a self in their new school. Through this work, I urge scholars

to (re)consider the substantiality of Foucauldian concepts in thinking with and through data that counts race as a central dimension.

In Chapter 3, I illustrate the ways in which African American students are engaging in self-practices to form a 'self' at a majority-white school. What I find is that students, in their self-formation, are negotiating a "them"/"us" division of space that is part of the school curriculum. As they negotiate this space, they construct their own spaces. I argue that this relation is one way that students are practicing a curriculum of self-formation.

In Chapter 4, I conduct Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Foucauldian analyses of how one student-participant is negotiating a 'self' at the majority-white school. I argue that a CRT reading of his practices arrives at 'self-formation' through its predominant lens of 'race' and a Foucauldian reading of his practices arrives at 'race' through its predominant lens of 'self-formation'. I discuss what is revealed through the presentation of both CRT and Foucauldian analyses, what new openings appear when using a Foucauldian analysis, and the possible limitations of each frame.

Fashioned as separate journal articles, each chapter contains specific discussions on the various practices students employ in their formation of a 'self' within the context of transitioning to a majority-white high school. Taken together, the chapters build an image of the school-lives of Black students who are negotiating a 'self' as they navigate a majority-white high school. I take the title header of this dissertation, "life is what you make it", from one of the student-participants' interview transcripts. The statement captures students' struggle in a forced school-change situation and their resilience through their practice of forming a 'self'.

CHAPTER 2

(Re)considering the Substantiality of Foucauldian Concepts in "Thinking with and Through" Qualitative Data in Race-Based Studies

Abstract

In this article, I argue that Michel Foucault's later scholarship on ethics can serve as a key methodological and analytical trajectory to talk about race. In the first section, I discuss the marginalization of Foucault's scholarship in qualitative education *field studies* as well as scholars' hesitance to use Foucault's work as a substantial critical method for examining race. Next, I revisit education studies that utilize Foucault's work on ethics, particularly his four-part framework of ethical self-fashioning that informs my analysis. Finally, I present a sketch of how I "fashion" a presentation of fieldwork on African American students attending a majority-white high school after the closure of their predominantly Black high school. I employ Foucault's self-fashioning framework in order to present two student-participants' accounts of how they fashion a 'self' in their new school. Through this work, I urge scholars to (re)consider the substantiality of Foucauldian concepts in thinking with and through data that counts race as a central dimension.

Introduction

While Foucault's work is not often associated with race, or credited as providing a sufficient enough framework to talk about issues of race in qualitative research, the 2003 release of English translations of Foucault's later lectures at the Collège de France presents a call to scholars to (re)consider the substantiality of using his work in race and

education discussions. Using my fieldwork conducted in the rural Midwest with African American students attending a majority-white high school after the closure of their predominantly Black high school, I explore what Foucault's four-part framework of ethical self-fashioning brings to our understanding of how students fashion a 'self' in their new school, illustrating that Foucault's work on ethics, specifically, care of the self, can stand up as a key methodological and analytical trajectory to address issues of race.

Other scholars have addressed the need to explore new possibilities in present approaches to research. Alecia Jackson and Lisa Mazzei's (2012, 2013) in their work on alternative qualitative methods, call for researchers to work with data in ways that go beyond conventional practices of data interpretation and analysis. Borrowing philosophical concepts from Deleuze and Guattari, the authors urge qualitative researchers to "use theory to think *with* their data (or use data to think *with* theory)" so as to avoid what they view as methodological and analytical pitfalls of "simplistic" and reductionist interpretivism, (i.e., stripping data of its complex context, its relation to other sociological phenomenon, its relation to texts and theories, and so forth) (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013, p. 261). Sara Childers (2014) takes on this challenge in her recent essay, *Promiscuous Analysis in Qualitative Research*. Here she discusses her methodological decision to analyze her ethnographic case study research at a "high-achieving high-poverty" urban high school (p. 820) using Foucault's theories of power/knowledge and discourse in conjunction with Critical Race Theory. Childers argues that applying only a Foucauldian framework would have failed to fully capture the "racialized practices of schooling" at the particular research site under study (p. 822).

Yet, we must be cautious that in our assemblages we do not overlook the full potentialities of the theories we apply. While Foucault's philosophies are often attributed to gender and sexuality and not typically associated with race, or in Childers' (2014) study, not deemed sufficient enough to fully capture racial dynamics at play, I show how Foucault can significantly contribute to studying issues of race. I do so by using Foucauldian concepts *to think with my data* and using *data to think with* Foucauldian concepts in a qualitative study that counts race as a central dimension.

The Marginalization of Foucault's Theories in Education

While philosophical and theoretical essays applying Foucault's philosophies to various aspects of education exist, Foucauldian field studies in education are not abundant. Perhaps this is not entirely surprising since Foucault "never wrote an extended statement on education" (Hillier & Hillier, 2012, p. 49). However, there has been a significant increase in Foucauldian scholarship in educational research since the time James Marshall called educational theorists to consider the links between Foucault's work and education (Olssen, 2014). Current works including Stephen Ball's (2012) *Foucault, Power and Education*, Gail Jardine's (2005) *Foucault and Education*, and Bernadette Baker and Katharina Heyning's (2004) *Dangerous Coagulations?: The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*, join notable texts such as Ball's (1990) *Foucault and Education: Discipline and Knowledge* and Tom Popkewitz and Marie Brennan's (1998) *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge, and Power in Education*, in demonstrating Foucault's influence on various education issues. In these texts among others, Foucauldian themes such as power/knowledge, discipline, and subjectification are utilized to analyze schooling.

Yet as Mark Olssen (2014) states, “in many places, Foucault’s ideas are still marginalized within the mainstream discourses of educational scholarship” (p. 215). Moreover, Foucault’s later work on ‘care of the self’ is sparse and takes a backseat to the more popularized use of Foucault’s disciplinary power (see for example Jardine, 2005). It is in *Discipline and Punish,* where Foucault (1995) introduced the link between school and disciplinary power, describing schooling as a method of disciplining its subjects. Since it is in this text where Foucault writes most extensively about schools, education scholars tend to reference it, thus under-citing Foucault’s other work (Dussel, 2010; Wain, 1996). Inés Dussel (2010) notes, “At least in continental Europe and Latin America, it has almost become commonplace to quote bits and pieces of *Discipline and Punish* to denounce the fact that schools discipline (in the sense of repress) children” (p. 27).

There are two main issues with this practice. First, in speaking only of the repressive effects of schooling, scholars have failed to see the “productive” aspects of disciplinary power that Foucault himself emphasizes in *Discipline and Punish* (see part one and part three). For example, in part three he declares:

> We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it ‘excludes’, it ‘represses’, it ‘censors’, it ‘abstracts’, it ‘masks’, it ‘conceals’. In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production. (Foucault, 1995, p. 194)

In this passage, Foucault argues that power cannot be reduced to just its repressive effects but rather that power operates in a complex relation to its subjects. Here the subjects of power can answer back, acting in ways that negotiate power, therefore producing “possible positive effects” (Foucault, 1995, p. 23).

An exclusive focus on *Discipline and Punish* in discussing schooling poses a second issue: it fails to address the entirety of Foucault's body of work that offers key insights within and beyond disciplinary power in schools. Recognizing this limitation, Foucauldian scholars have called for educationalists to look at Foucault's later work, particularly his philosophies on ethics (Wain, 1996; Mayo, 2000; Leask, 2012). They make a case that Foucault's work on ethics is not only essential to understanding his earlier conceptual iterations, but also an invaluable tool for conducting Foucauldian analyses that extend beyond the repressive aspects of schooling. Justen Infinito (2003) notes, "Foucault's consideration of ethics, which deals specifically with the process of self-creation, proves most valuable for use in education" (p. 155). Extending this argument, I forward that employing a Foucauldian framework on ethics is also worthy in discussing issues of race in the school setting and holds up as a substantial method in which to think with and through data.

Foucault, Race, and Education—A New Frontier

David Macey (2009) argues that "there are many who do not associate [Foucault's] work with the problem of race" (p. 186). These scholars believe that Foucault's emphasis is solely on gender and sexuality. Yet Macey's (2009) scholarship along with the work of Pal Ahluwalia (2010), Kim Su Rasmussen (2011), Ann Laura Stoler (1996), Joseph Tanke (2005), Chloë Taylor (2011), among others, demonstrates Foucault's connections to race. Their arguments illustrate that upon closer inspection, Foucault's work, specifically the end of *The History of Sexuality Volume 1* along with the *Abnormal* and *Society Must Be Defended* lectures presented at the Collège de France, lay bare his thoughts on race and racism. The lectures in particular, which were not readily

available at first, but translated to English transcripts in 2003, have now led scholars to "become aware that [Foucault] made more extensive and provocative observations about race than had previously been believed" (Taylor, 2011, p. 746).

In *Race and Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*, Ann Laura Stoler (1996) states that Foucault's theoretical contribution to race work is largely ignored (p. 19). According to Stoler, this is a perplexing oversight, given his "carefully positioned, signposted, if not elaborated" discussions of racism in *The History of Sexuality Volume 1* (p. 21). Stoler (1996) puts forth that while *The History of Sexuality* is not necessarily "a book about racism", it is one that looks at "how a discourse of sexuality articulates and eventually incorporates a racist logic," (p. 22). With volume 1, Foucault lays the foundation for future volumes he intended to produce, the sixth, but never produced volume, being a genealogy of race entitled *Populations and Races* (Macey, 2009; Rasmussen, 2011; Stoler, 1996; Young, 1995). It is at the end of volume 1, Stoler illustrates, where Foucault presents his preliminary ideas on race and racism for the planned sixth volume. Here Foucault (1978) locates the development of modern racism, using Nazism as an example. He describes the "eugenic ordering of society" employed by the state—a disciplinary power to control the masses (p. 149). This regulation on the levels of cultural practice (e.g.. "family, marriage, education, social hierarchization, and property") and the physical body ("conduct, health, and everyday life") became a matter of the state in the name of "protecting the purity of the blood and ensuring the triumph of the [Aryan] race" (pp. 148-149).

Such a discussion on Nazism and eugenics may appear peripheral when considering Foucault's emphasis on gender and sexuality in the entirety of *The History of*

Sexuality Volume 1, but Stoler (1996) points out that race is not a passing thought. Rather, Foucault's "linking of the history of sexuality to the construction of race" is "strategic" and quite deliberate, thus necessitating more attention in his other works (Stoler, 1996, p. 19). For example, Foucault's discussion of race in *The History of Sexuality Volume 1* is revisited in his lectures, *Abnormal* and *Society Must Be Defended*. Here Foucault links race not to sexuality but to biopower (Macey, 2009; Stoler 1996).

In the 1974-1975 *Abnormal* lectures, Foucault takes care to illustrate a genealogy of psychiatry marking psychiatry's 19th century transition from a medical practice that cures mental illness to that of a form of social control. From this view, psychiatrists become experts on making the distinction between normal and abnormal behavior, and, are called upon to identify dangerous subjects who might cause harm to society. According to Foucault (2003a), this is how psychiatry cements itself as "the discipline of the scientific protection of society", regulating, 'medicalizing', and arresting social behavior deemed abnormal or dangerous (p. 316). This 'racism against the abnormal', as Foucault refers to it, was an 'internal racism', a "detection of all those within a group who may be the carriers of a danger to it", (Foucault, 2003a, p. 317).

Stoler (1996) argues that the concepts of an "'internal enemy' and of the 'dangerous individual' both framed within a 'theory of social defense," serve as the foundation for Foucault's particular description of "the racisms of modern states" (p. 34). In the 1975-1976 *Society Must Be Defended* lectures, Foucault distinguishes between disciplinary power and biopower and then "shifts his emphasis from biopolitics to governmentality" (Rasmussen, 2011, p. 37).

Foucault begins this work by extending his genealogy of psychiatry to a genealogy of race, tracing racism's roots to "the history of race war discourses beginning in the 17th century" (Taylor, 2011, p. 749). For Foucault, race in the 17th century referred to hierarchical differences between members of a population, or internal race wars. Such race wars were ongoing even in seeming times of peace, since for Foucault, there always exists unrest within the social body. The unrest he maps here stemmed from monarchical control or sovereign power that always bred resistance from the oppressed. As Taylor (2011) points out, in resituating internal racism as an internal race war, Foucault makes clear how "society is divided into *two* parts: them and us, oppressor and oppressed" and how such "binary parts" begin to formulate race divisions (Taylor, p. 750), becoming a "historico-political divide" (Foucault, 2003, p. 77). In Foucault's genealogy, 'race' in the 18th century took on a biological meaning where "race had come to be about skin-color, bodies, and morphologies" (Taylor, 2011, p. 750).

Foucault (2003b) argues that by the end of the 19th century into the 20th century, race and "race struggle" transformed into two forms: (1) the Nazi iteration—"a State racism that is responsible for the biological protection of the race" and (2) the Soviet-style iteration—where "the class enemy becomes a biological threat" (pp. 82-83). These examples of modern racism, or 'neoracism', combined traditional Western ethnic racism and internal racism, whereby the State distinguished between "those who will be made to live from those who must die" (Tanke, 2005, p. 694). In this new form of racism, out-group members were targeted along with 'abnormal,' 'genetically inferior' in-group members.

Foucault builds upon these ideas in his subsequent lectures. Yet as Stoler (1996) observes, Foucault appears to have abandoned his genealogy of race, shifting back towards "sex in the governing and care of the self" in his post 1976 work (p. 25). She surmises that this "abrupt shift in trajectory," may be one explanation as to why Foucault's work is not often referenced in race discussions (p. 24). However, as Rasmussen's (2011) shows, it is not that Foucault abandons racism after his 1976 lectures but rather that his genealogy of racism is "situated precisely at the intersection of biopolitics and governmentality" (p. 35). Thus, "this shift of emphasis from biopolitics to governmentality…is crucial for an understanding of Foucault's genealogy of racism" (Rasmussen, 2011, p. 37). Rasmussen (2011) furthers that Foucault understands racism as emerging from "disciplinary technologies that target the body" onto "biopolitical technologies that target the population" (p. 37). Foucault next rearticulates these technologies of power into governmentality.

Tanke (2005) makes clear that Foucault's theoretical shift from disciplinary power, to biopower, and then to governmentality, need not be considered discrete and detached. According to Tanke (2005), Foucault's notion of biopower "does not develop independently of disciplinary power", but rather *from* disciplinary power (p. 695). The following quote from Foucault's *Society Must Be Defended* lectures demonstrates:

> Now I think we see something new emerging in the second half of the eighteenth century: a new technology of power, but this time it is not disciplinary. This technology of power does not exclude the former, does not exclude disciplinary technology, but it does dovetail into it, integrate it, modify it to some extent, and above all, use it by sort of infiltrating it, embedding itself in existing disciplinary techniques. (Foucault, 2003b, p. 242)

Accordingly, Foucault demonstrates in his later lectures, that biopolitical power operates in relation to, and as a form of governmentality (Rasmussen, 2011; Tanke, 2005). Thus, while some scholars have inaccurately treated these trajectory shifts as isolated, unrelated moves, they are concepts that build upon each other (Tanke, 2005). As such, these relative shifts are significant to any discussion of race. Rasmussen (2011) explains that by the time of the *Society Must Be Defended* lectures, Foucault views racism as "a biopolitical mechanism that aims at the 'purification' of the population and as a governmental technology that juxtaposes and combines various regimes of power" (p. 41). Put differently, modern racism "operates *between* different kinds of power", which taken together, constitute governmentality (p. 40). So, while the terms 'race' and 'racism' may disappear from Foucault's work after his 1976 lectures, his notions of biopolitical governmentality make reference to racism and therefore keep 'race' in conversation.

Stoler (1996), along with other scholars (see for example Hindess, 2010; Spivak, 1988; Young; 1995), offers another possible explanation as to why Foucault's work is not typically associated with issues of race. They claim that Foucault's work on imperialism is Eurocentric, thus limiting his discussion of racism to European history and culture. Scholars maintain that this work on European colonialism is short of any "substantial discussion" on "the history of the idea of race" (Rasmussen, 2011, p. 35). Yet Rasmussen (2011) asserts that Foucault's work "deserves appreciation due to the highly original suggestion that modern racism is a form of biopolitical government" (p. 35). By framing racism this way, Rasmussen explains, Foucault calls upon scholars to rethink forms of resistance and invent "new and more effective anti-racist strategies" (Rasmussen, 2011, p. 47).

Ahluwalia (2010) too notes that while Foucault has often been dismissed as "an essentially Eurocentric thinker who had little to say about the world outside of Europe" this is not necessarily the case (p. 598). According to Ahluwalia (2010), Foucault was impacted by his "self-imposed exile from France", in particular his time spent in postcolonial Tunisia from 1966 to 1968, and that this experience influenced and politicized his work (p. 598). During this exile, Foucault was a professor at the University of Tunis writing the *Archaeology of Knowledge*. Between 1967 and 1968 a student uprising "protesting the paternalism of the government and also its pro-American, staunchly anti-Communist foreign policy" was occurring and Foucault witnessed demonstrations, violent riots, and clashes between students and police, which led some students to imprisonment (Miller, 2000, p. 170). Foucault denounced the anti-Semitic and Marxist underpinnings of the first series of students' revolts. The later March 1968 riots, however, had a lasting impact on Foucault as he was taken by students' collectivity, passion, and commitment to their cause (Miller, 2000). In Ahluwalia's (2010) view, "the impact that Tunisia had on Foucault cannot be underestimated" (p. 600) as this experience "provided the impetus for him to develop frameworks which could comprehend the complexity of the political scene post 1968, forcing a rethinking of key social and political institutions" (p. 601).

As a result of his travels, Foucault was able to widen his gaze, permitting him to look at French and Western culture more critically. While his Tunisian experiences cannot necessarily be located in the text of Foucault's work, they are marked throughout. Foucault's influences are evident and become, in a sense, autobiographical footnotes that mark his evolving course of direction (Miller, 2000). Ahluwalia (2010) provides the

example that while Foucault never mentions Tunisia in his writing, the impact of his Tunisian experiences can be traced in his politically engaged writings on the Iranian Revolution in the late 1970s. These experiences, he furthers, “paved the way” for Foucault’s work on governmentality (p. 601), whereby governmentality, along with his “analysis of power, authority, [and] modes of surveillance…have been vital to understanding the dynamics of the colonial world” (p. 600). As such, Foucault’s work has influenced various fields including colonial studies and subaltern studies. However, the irony is that Foucault appears to have *written around* race and colonialism leaving the question as to whether this may have been a direct strategy (Young, 1995). It is perhaps intentional since Foucault does not work with essential categories. Rather for Foucault, race is a location point on the map of various machinations of power that work with and through each other at particular moments and in particular spaces. However scholars (see for example Edward Said’s (1978) work on Orientalism) demonstrate that Foucault’s work can serve as a substantial conceptual model to examine issues of race.

Foucault’s Ethical Care of the Self

With Foucault’s concepts of race in mind, I draw from his scholarship on ethics to discuss fieldwork I conducted with African American students who are now attending a majority-white high school due to the closure of their predominantly Black high school. Influenced by Foucault’s notion of care of the self, my study looks at the care of the ‘racialized’ self. It employs Foucault’s four-part framework of ethical self-fashioning as a means to address how students are negotiating, through their formation of a ‘self’, the ways they are racialized in their new school. Here ‘self’ does not refer to one’s ‘true’

essence as in a reified identity. Rather for Foucault, ‘self’ refers to a continual and changing process of self-fashioning in relation to others.

In *The Use of Pleasure*, Foucault (1985) discusses self-fashioning or composing oneself as an “ethical subject” in relation to a prescribed set of cultural rules, laws, and values or “codes” (p. 26). Here individuals engage in self-practices that seek to “understand” and “transform” one’s ‘self’ (p. 27). Foucault (2005) elaborates in his later work on governmentality explaining that the governing of society implies the ways individuals govern themselves. Individuals employ “technologies of the self” or self-practices on their “bodies, souls, thoughts, conduct” in relation to others (Foucault, 1997a. p. 225). In other words, governmentality refers to “the whole range of practices…that individuals in their freedom can use in dealing with each other” (Foucault, 1997b, p. 300).

In the case of this study, Washington students are engaging in a process of self-formation or “form[ing] oneself as an ethical subject” (Foucault, 1985, p. 26) in their new school. For Foucault (1985), self-formation, involves a four-part ethical process: (1) *determination of the ethical substance*, (2) *mode of subjection,* (3) *forms of elaboration*, and (4) *telos*. Scholars such as Richard Niesche and Malcom Haase (2010), Darla Linville and David Lee Carlson (2010), and Barbara Bycent Hennig (2010) have employed this framework in their respective works. I revisit these field studies because they are pertinent to the school context of my study, and as such, inform my methodological and analytic approach.

Foucault’s Self-Fashioning in Previous Education Field Studies

I begin with Niesche and Haase's (2010) analysis of the interview transcripts of a teacher and principal in two separate Australian schools. Here the researchers use Foucault's four-part framework of ethical self-fashioning in order to look at how a teacher and principal cultivate a 'self'. They begin by providing an overview of Foucault's notion of ethics along with Foucault's four-part ethical framework: ethical substance, mode of subjection, forms of elaboration, and telos, as explicated in Foucault's (1985) *The History of Sexuality Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*. Briefly, ethical substance refers to an individual's identification of the part of the self that should be addressed. Mode of subjection refers to an individual's recognition of certain moral obligations. Forms of elaboration are the particular practices an individual "performs on oneself, not only in order to bring one's conduct into compliance with a given rule, but to attempt to transform oneself into the ethical subject of one's behavior" (Foucault, 1985, p. 27). Finally, telos denotes an individual's version of 'self' they desire to become. After this theoretical overview, Niesche and Haase (2010) analyze the interviews of the teacher and principal by identifying aspects of the transcripts that fit within Foucault's four-part framework. What they conclude is that each participant engages in an ongoing process of self-discipline, or self-governing in the form of controlling their emotions, in order to meet their own expectations of an ethical professional.

Linville and Carlson's (2010) study has a similar theoretical approach. They use Foucault's four-part framework of ethical self-fashioning to analyze the data they collected from twelve students representing six high schools in the New York City area. The researchers take care to explicate that "ethical for Foucault means how one relates to oneself in relation to others" as opposed to seeking one's true 'self' (p. 250). They further

that for Foucault, ethical self-fashioning refers to an individual's negotiation of the sociocultural norms and possibilities placed before them. Cris Mayo (2000) also notes this in his work stating: "Foucault's work in ethics is not the return of a liberal subject but rather a subject formed in relation to others" (p. 116). In the field aspect of Linville and Carlson's (2010) work, they examine "how both queer and nonqueer students talked about LGBTQ peers as sexual subjects and talked about sexuality and gender as discursive territory in their schools" (p. 250). Students were asked to write letters to an imaginary LGBTQ new student about what to expect in their school, participate in a focus group or one-on-one interview, and keep journals of their thoughts on the topic. The researchers first analyzed the data by identifying themes that emerged from the data. They then re-coded their initial analysis by locating how the data speaks to the four aspects of Foucault's framework. The following is Linville and Carlson's (2010) organization of Foucault's framework that they configured in question format: (1) "Ethical substance: Which part of myself do I focus on to alter or shape in order to be an ethical subject?"; (2) "Mode of subjection: How am I invited or encouraged to fashion myself in a certain way to be an ethical subject?"; (3) "Self-forming activity: What practices do I engage in order to fashion myself as an ethical subject?"; and (4) "Telos, or goal: What kind of being do I want to become?" (p. 250).

A third study that utilizes Foucault's four-part ethical framework is Hennig's (2010) study of twelve Chinese undergraduate language students at a university in Hong Kong who, though proficient in English as a second language, selected German as their major. Hennig collects data through a series of interviews and focus group sessions as well as diary entries over the course of two semesters. While Hennig (2010) intended to

use a theoretical approach more commonplace in language-learning motivation research, "the findings of the participants' interviews and diary entries suggested an alternative model to capture notions of the self that kept surfacing through the data" (p. 307). Enter Foucault's concept of ethical self-formation. Hennig (2010) applies Foucault's "four axes of ethical self-formation" to "the context of language learning" in the following way: "(a) ethical substance: what parts of the learners' self are concerned with language learning? (b) mode of subjection: what ethical values, attitudes and beliefs do learners attach to their language learning? (c) self-practices: what practices do learners engage in to apply the new language? and (d) telos: what are the learners' absolute goals in their language learning?" (p. 309). Similar to Linville and Carlson (2010), Hennig organizes the data by placing excerpts under the corresponding ethical category.

Informed by the methodological and analytical strategies of these three studies, I fashion a presentation illustrating how two African American high school students are forming a self in a majority-white high school.

Fashioning a Presentation Using Foucault's Self-Fashioning Framework

This presentation is derived from a larger study on how African American students are fashioning a 'self' at Central High School, the majority-white school they are now attending after the closure of their predominantly Black and hometown school, Washington High School. When Washington, located in the rural Midwest, closed its doors due to the interrelated issues of a 1.1 million dollar deficit, low-enrollment, and low-performance, Central High School became the destination school for Washington students. I collected data in the second year of the school transition working with six African American students over a three-month period. Data collection included four

interviews per each student: a life history interview, two focused school-life interviews, and a stimulated recall interview where students were asked to talk about a particular class session that I observed. Data also included field notes based upon observations, shadowing students in school, and informal talks.

For this presentation, I focus on two students, Jeremy and Cole because they are both juniors, high-achieving, and have similar backgrounds, yet present different approaches to fashioning a 'self' at Central. To use theory to think with data and data to think with theory (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013), I draw from Foucault, particularly Foucault's four-part framework of ethical self-fashioning to present Jeremy and Cole's self-fashioning practices. The resulting format is that I present, within each of the four modes of Foucault's framework, a description of the mode, Jeremy and Cole's corresponding quotes, and a weaving of my commentary throughout. In more general terms, I use in combination, a telling, describing, and showing, to elicit reader response. Through this effort, I aim to show how Foucault's ethics, particularly his philosophy on *care of the self*, serves as a key methodological and analytical trajectory to talk about race. The following presentation serves as an illustration:

1. Determination of Ethical Substance - an individual's identification of the part of the 'self' that should be addressed.

Here, Jeremy and Cole identify the "prime material" of their "moral conduct" or the part of the 'self' that each identifies as needing attention (Foucault, 1985, p. 26). In their interviews, Jeremy and Cole discuss the self-fashioning strategies they use to maneuver within a majority-white high school after having attended a predominantly

Black high school. I begin with Jeremy. He is a high honor roll student taking AP and Honors classes at Central and currently ranked second in his grade. He is the drum major of Central's marching band, a member of the cross country and track teams, and the captain of the swim team. There is specific evidence of the part of the 'self' that Jeremy addresses in his response to my question, "How would you advise students who just like you started off at a different high school but will have to attend another high school outside of their home community?"

> *Jeremy:* My advice for them is to let that experience be their own. Don't let it be somebody else's…Don't have this wall where nobody can break through and try to interact with you, and you not interact back…Also, don't be so focused on the loss of your high school that you can't learn. Really, high school is about learning. It's not about all these different things. We just encounter these different things…That's my other advice…to grow as a person.

Jeremy's strategy involves taking ownership of his own experience. This entails focusing on learning and not allowing obstacles he encounters to derail him. More specifically, this can be located in the specific areas of the 'self' he addresses as part of his process of maneuvering within Central: working to interact with new people, moving past the loss of his high school, pushing himself to learn in a new environment, and to grow as a result.

In contrast, Cole describes the feeling that while he was at the top of his game at Washington, his transition to Central has been a challenge. An honor roll student, he strives to raise his 3.5 GPA so that he can make the high honor roll. He too is a member of Central's cross-country, track and swim teams, and, he is one of the fastest runners in the County. He identifies working to find success at Central as the part of himself that needs addressing so that he can better negotiate his Central school experience:

> *Cole:* Freshman year I had a 4.0, number two in the school, honor roll, student of the month. I was doing big things [at Washington]—cross-country team, made it to state, and we were regional champs. I was just like, "Wow, this is perfect." Then I get over to Central and last year was alright…but this year, it's really getting to me…it really is a struggle to get up every morning when you know you have to go to a different city to go to school.

Here Cole identifies his "struggle" to adjusting to a different school in another city. He compares his experience to being at his old school where things were "perfect" to his experience at his new school where it's "getting to" him. He attributes his struggle to having to transition to a school far from his home community and along with travel, he identifies racism as a roadblock to his success at Central:

> *Cole:* Parents from both sides [were against Washington students attending Central], but I know a majority from Central did not agree at all…They were like, "No, I don't want my child going to school with a black kid, or for that matter, 100 or 200 or 300 black kids. It's just not gonna work." When you hear and think about racism like this, it really makes you wonder if I really will be successful because I don't feel very successful right now going to Central.

Here Cole recalls that he felt a backlash from Central parents who did not want Washington students attending Central. Central parents' attitudes about Black students continue to play in his mind and he sees this as a possible reason why he is struggling to perform at a level of success at Central that he was able to achieve at Washington. Yet despite this obstacle, Cole uses it as motivation to push on, as I discuss later on.

Jeremy and Cole's accounts reflect two students' identification of the part of the 'self' to be addressed centered on a need to maneuver within a new school situation. For Jeremy, this involves keeping a focus on his learning and continuing on his path to school success. Here he does not align with Washington parents' critique of the systemic issues of racism at Central. Instead Jeremy believes success comes from an individual's

commitment. For Cole, the part of the 'self' he wants to address involves working to achieve a level of success in the face of a difficult school situation where he now finds himself an 'other'. Here Cole holds some critique of systemic racism issues at Central and is motivated to set goals to achieve despite these obstacles.

Jeremy and Cole's commitment to their self-work is rooted in a *mode of subjection*, or a moral code that guides their conduct, which comprises the second mode of Foucault's four-part framework of ethical self-fashioning.

***

2. Mode of Subjection – an individual's moral code; the way in which an individual holds herself to a particular set of rules, thus complying to it and "preserving it as a custom" (Foucault, 1985, p. 27).

Jeremy and Cole both identify Christ's teachings as their moral code. Jeremy's devotion to Christ is reflected in his involvement in the African Methodist Episcopal church he attends where he directs both the youth and gospel choirs and serves as the church's drummer. He recites the following bible verse as a guiding principle:

> *Jeremy:* Something that my mom really instilled in me was my favorite scripture, Philippians 4:13. "You can do all things through Christ, that strengthens you".

Along with a devotion to Christ, Jeremy points to his mother and his pastor as influential figures in his life. As Foucault (1997b) notes, "Proper care of the self requires listening to the lessons of a master. One needs a guide, a counselor, a friend, someone who will be truthful with you" (p. 287). In the following transcript excerpt, there is a melding of two of Jeremy's guiding figures:

Jeremy: My Mom…she really tells me every day that anything I set my mind to shouldn't be limited to what people think. If I have the mindset that I'm gonna do it with the help of God, I will do it…That's something that she instilled in me.

Like Jeremy, Cole seeks guidance in his faith. A member of a New Life Ministries Church, Cole describes God as influential in his personal success and in his behaviors towards people:

Cole: When I get a good grade, I don't say, "Wow. I'm really smart." I say, "Thank God for the knowledge that you have implanted in my brain." When I do something good for people, it's not me. It's the humbleness inside my heart that allows me to present myself to a person, and open myself up to people, and try and become the person that I'm supposed to be.

Cole also mentions his appreciation of God in assisting him to make changes to his conduct in school so that he can succeed:

Cole: All my life I've been expected to not succeed in high school. For me to do a 360 degree change, some people looked at me and they were like "What did you do?"…in my honest opinion nobody did it. Nobody did it but me…and God.

In their statements, Jeremy and Cole express that their Christian faith provides a particular set of rules by which they abide. Both credit Christ as a major influence on how they think and conduct themselves, or what Jory Brass (2010) calls "'self-steering' techniques" (p. 705). Here Jeremy and Cole's self-work can be attributed to a moral code derived from the practices of Christianity. Through this moral code, Jeremy and Cole self-govern, or exercise practices in ways that not only constitute themselves as particular subjects, but also work to transform themselves. Foucault defines these practices as *forms of elaboration* in the third mode of his framework.

***

3. Forms of Elaboration - the practices that an individual performs on oneself in order to not only adhere "to a given rule", but also work towards an "attempt to transform oneself" into the 'self' they aim to be (Foucault, 1985, p. 27).

These forms of elaboration refer to the actions Jeremy and Cole take to form a 'self' at Central. For example, Jeremy's has maintained a positive outlook on attending Central. This contrasts with the attitudes of some of the Washington parents who strongly opposed sending their children to Central. Jeremy explains that before the vote to have Washington students attend Central, he spoke up at a Washington School Board Meeting:

> *Jeremy:* I got up and I said, "We should give Central a chance because we don't know what's gonna happen."…They [Washington adults] were like, "Oh, If you go over they're not gonna give them an equal chance in sports. They're not gonna give them the right type of education"…Some parents were angry with me about saying we should give it [Central] a chance, saying, quote/unquote, I'm a 'white' black kid and I'll fit in well…my grades are well enough.

In this transcript excerpt, Jeremy shares that Washington parents felt that while their children might be treated unfairly at Central, it would not affect Jeremy because in their view, he is "a 'white' black kid". This is reminiscent of the notion of 'acting white' in Signithia Fordham and John Ogbu's (1986) study of African American students and school success. Fordham and Ogbu found that some Black students viewed other Black students as 'acting white' because they had adopted what were considered white attitudes and behaviors, therefore abandoning a Black identity. Jeremy recalls defending himself to the parents who labeled him as acting white:

> *Jeremy:* I kinda looked at them and I said, "When was the last time that anybody could act a shade of color, a hue of color? What is white? It's a color. What is black? A color. If you assume that all blacks are ignorant and they don't know how to behave and they aren't very good at learning and things, I will have to disagree with you…If you're calling me very

intelligent, fine. But to say that I'm acting white is something totally different." I told them that I agree with them that I wouldn't have a hard time [at Central], not because I'm intelligent, solely, but because I have not already made up my mind that I'm going to fail.

In Jeremy's challenging the notion that he is acting white, he feels he is choosing to forge ahead with a positive attitude. He believes that he will succeed because he has the confidence to do so. As he mentioned earlier in describing his mother's influence and his faith in Christ, he tries not to be limited by others but rather keep focus on what he sets his mind to accomplish. One of the actions he takes in fashioning a 'self' at Central is to bridge a divide between the communities:

> *Jeremy:* We just want them (adults from both Washington and Central communities) to not be so focused on sayin', "Oh, the Washington students," or "These are the Central students." No. If we come together, we're gonna be one. We're not gonna have this clash that happened 50,000 years ago when you guys were in high school because we are not like you. We are in a different generation.

In this excerpt, Jeremy mentions a historic conflict between the Washington and Central communities due to race and generational differences of how these race tensions play out. He talks about choosing to focus on being one group of students as opposed to a division between the two students populations. He goes on to explain that he and his peers, unlike their elders, do not hold the same perceptions about race:

> *Jeremy*: In this generation, there is more interracial dating… you start to see more mixed friend groups, one white, one black, one Mexican, one Chinese. That's what my friend group is made up of now. We don't care about skin colors. Skin color is what? Somethin' that just happens with cells, the way our melanin is expressed. We don't care about that. We care about getting to know people, networking, finding friends that can possibly be lifelong friends, going there, and getting our education. It's high school. Don't make it into somethin' that it's not and startin' a race war because we're not about that…we can handle it, so let us handle it.

In this excerpt, Jeremy feels he and his peers can "handle" attending a majority-white school as African American students. He notes that at Central he is embracing difference, something he says his generation is more custom to do. What he "care[s] about" at Central is meeting new people, "networking", finding "lifelong friends", and getting an education. He finds that Washington adults are casting the situation into "a race war". In his view, students do not necessarily agree with their parents' view and if it were left to students, they would be able to handle things just fine.

Cole also comments on race tensions among adults. He discusses the racial stereotypes coming from Central folks:

> *Cole:* Central thought it was a bad idea for us to come to their school because they figure, when you mix a majority-white school with a majority-black school, obviously, bad things are bound to happen…they did not believe in the Washington students, that we were successful and capable, and that we had home training. They thought we were gonna come and ruin their school.

Here Cole identifies some of the attitudes of Central parents and community members. He explains that Central did not "believe in Washington students" that perpetuated false assumptions that Black students are deficient. He recalls his first day at Central that set the tone in placing Washington students on the defensive:

> *Cole:* I remember the first day of school…at the front of the door there was a police officer standing there. I'm like, why is there a police officer here?..."why does it have to be like this?" Why can't Central just accept us for the way that we are? We came to your school, not to ruin it, but to build it…if not make it better, which is what we've done so far.

Cole views the police officer posted at Central's door as a message that Washington students do not fit the Central norm. In Foucauldian terms, Washington students are the "abnormals"—marked as potentially dangerous, deficient, and delinquent until they are

disciplined in Central's way of life (Foucault, 2003a). As such, Central is prepared to discipline by means of police presence, those students who deviate from Central's expectations.

Perceptions that Washington students are deficient run counter to the way Cole perceives himself and his Washington peers. In his view, Washington students are "successful and capable", and, handling their time at Central in ways that will not "ruin", but benefit Central. Cole provides an example of how he conducts himself as a student:

> *Cole:* I academically hold high standards for myself. This is gonna sound weird, but I say a B is failing in my mind…a B is failing. When I see a B I'm like, " I have to get it up. I have to". It's the only way to be more successful and to feel like I'm actually doing something and proving to myself that I can be successful.

Cole's description of his academic practices demonstrates a commitment to his studies. Despite the negativity surrounding the school transition, Cole talks about pressing on. His motivation comes from knowing how far he has come in terms of his background:

> *Cole:* I've always been moving…If I'm not after school studying, I'm at somebody's house studying. If I'm not at somebody's house studying, I'm at the library…because of my background and where I know I've come from. I can't give that up in an instant. Life is what you make it. Some people reach the highest point in their life and then they just let it all go to waste. I can't do that.

For Cole, anything short of "moving" runs the risk of letting his hard work "go to waste". He describes his self-practices as pushing himself to achieve even in the face of racial stereotypes. Put in a Foucauldian light, while Cole contends with Central's subtle and not so subtle "micro-physics of power", or more specifically the coercive techniques that produce him as a racialized body, he continues to perform self-practices that enable

him to transform himself. (Foucault, 1995, p. 139). He states, "life is what you make it" to explain that he will not give up his struggle to succeed.

What I find is that both Jeremy and Cole are motivated to highly achieve at a majority-white school even in the face of adversity. Yet, their individual self-practices point to a distinct difference in their particular self-maneuvers. For Jeremy, his self-practices involve refraining from giving attention to racial stereotyping coming from both inside and outside of his community, therefore making the choice to keep positive. Through the use of this strategy he tries to minimize any potential negative effects from detractors to continue to highly achieve. For Cole, his self-practices involve using the racial stereotyping and micro-physics of power he encounters as motivation to push himself to better perform. Cole's strategy is to spin the negativity, although it may wear on him at times, into motivation that pushes him to achieve. In the following fourth mode of Foucault's framework, Jeremy and Cole's self-practices are driven by their *telos* or the endpoint to which their self-practices attend. Here they have a particular vision of the 'self' they aim to be.

***

4. Telos - an individual's commitment to a particular mode of being or moral conduct. Here, an individual works to "monitor, test, improve, and transform" herself to become the 'self' she aims to be (Foucault, 1985, p. 28).

Telos refers to the imagined 'self' that an individual aims to become. Jeremy and Cole's attitude to make the most of their high school experience. They both spoke of seizing the moment and shared career goals of wanting to mentor young people. I begin with Jeremy who is heavily involved in various activities at Central:

> *Jeremy:* I get interested in things, and then I make time for it because I know that in the end—and I always get told this, that you only experience high school once, so you might as well just go and have a great time while you can before you have to grow up and have so many responsibilities.

In this statement, Jeremy makes it a point to become the 'self' he aims to be by taking advantage of the various opportunities Central offers and to enjoy his time there before he contends with the responsibilities of adulthood. Jeremy is committed to being involved especially given that some of these opportunities may not present themselves in the future. For Cole, being the 'self' he aims to be requires a similar practice in seizing the moment. He takes the advice that his friend's brother shared:

> *Cole:* His advice, and I love it, it was "don't blink", because when you blink you miss it…I can definitely say I have blinked so many times…Don't blink. I mean it made so much sense…The more that I think about running out of time it's like I cannot blink. I have to stay focused.

Cole is expressing sense of urgency—that he is "running out of time". The phrase "don't blink" reminds him to appreciate the present. This is evident when he reflects on what he has accomplished in his schooling given the many obstacles he has had to overcome:

> *Cole:* I'm getting to…the hardest part of my school year…At this point in time I wanna cry because I just I think about everything that I've overcome. It's like there's no way I'm supposed to be where I am today and doing what I'm doing and how I'm doing it today…I don't even know how I made it this far. It just, it's amazing to see what you can do when you actually put your best foot forward.

Along with making the most out of their time in high school, Jeremy and Cole express a desire to not only improve themselves, but also improve others. Both view helping people as part of their own growth. In Foucauldian terms, part of their process of self-governing, or "monitor[ing], test[ing], improv[ing] and transform[ing]" themselves

as ethical subjects, involves the governing of others (Foucault, 1985, p. 28). For Jeremy, this means providing support for individuals in times of need:

> *Jeremy:* I really do have a heart for helping others and just being that person that's the head of difficult times, the person that somebody can rely on when they feel like…they can't do something. Everybody can do it if you have that positive mindset.

For Cole, any help he provides even in the form of mundane tasks is valuable not only to the person he is assisting, but also his own growth and success:

> *Cole:* I need to feel like I'm succeeding, like I'm growing as a person, like I'm growing successfully and being more beneficial to other people, whether it's helping people, assisting the teacher, helping somebody, opening the door for somebody, carrying somebody's books.

This desire to help people translates to Jeremy and Cole's passion to work with young people as a career. In the case of Jeremy, he aims to attend a four-year college to study music and then pursue a masters degree in education. With this schooling, he aspires to become a high school music teacher and bandleader. In the following excerpt, Jeremy makes a connection between the practice of helping people and being a teacher:

> *Jeremy:* I see teachers all the time helping people who are the outcasts of different groups. Those people, even in our school…they come to me all the time…It can be totally not related to school and they'll talk to me about it. It makes me feel good that I can help somebody get through something that's hard for them and for them to keep trusting me.

Jeremy views teaching as a way to help others, especially "outcasts" who might be facing difficult situations. Jeremy points out that he is already engaging in this process by being a support for "outcast[ed]" students at Central.

Like, Jeremy, Cole feels enriched by helping people. After high school, he aspires to attend a four-year college to earn an undergraduate degree. His career goal is to become a sports coach in order to help young athletes:

> *Cole:* One of the main reasons why I wanna be a coach is because I feel like I can share the potential that I have with other athletes, boys and girls, who may have this same potential as me, who may have the same story as me, who may have been told the same things as me. I really wanna help somebody else reach their potential, reach their highest point.

In this statement, Cole expresses his desire to help children, especially those who come from similar backgrounds, to reach their full potential. Both Jeremy and Cole's responses illustrate their dedication to helping people, which plays a major role in their choice of career paths. Their telos, or the 'self' they aim to be, involves building relationships with others. These relationships span various social domains and include relationships with family members, community members, friends, mentors, and in this particular discussion, potential mentees. Foucault (1997b) notes this as such: "Care of the self is ethical in itself; but it implies complex relationships with others insofar as the ethos of freedom is also a way of helping people" (p. 287). What Foucault highlights here is that fashioning a 'self' is a social endeavor, one that relies upon relationships. It is a productive process—individuals practice their freedom of transforming themselves to become the selves they wish to be while also engaging with others.

In considering how race appears in the other three modes of the framework discussed above, there are connections to Jeremy and Cole's desire to help young people who in Jeremy's words may be "outcast[ed]", and in Cole's words may "have the same story as me". Jeremy and Cole share an interest in helping children that points to the support that they feel is necessary in fashioning a 'self' at Central. Through their relationships with future mentees, Jeremy and Cole can continue to transform themselves in their practices of guiding youth who may be facing similar circumstances.

(Re)considering the Substantiality of Foucault's work in Thinking With and Through Data

In my application of Foucault's four-part framework of ethical self-fashioning, I demonstrate that Foucault's later work affords not only new understandings of his earlier conceptual iterations, but also provides constructs for conducting Foucauldian analyses that extend beyond the repressive aspects of schooling. My presentation features two African American students engaged in the process of self-fashioning or producing themselves as subjects to negotiate the ways they are racialized in a majority-white school. Here Jeremy and Cole are not passive but rather active in governing themselves—in thinking and acting in ways that constitute who they are, in relation to the 'selves' that are imposed upon them.

While both Jeremy and Cole identify self-practices that aid in maneuvering within their school situation, they are employing different strategies. Jeremy is fashioning what he describes as a "positive" 'self' by refusing to subscribe to what he finds are parents' hang ups about racism. He believes that individuals are responsible for their successes or failures. He relies on his self-motivation and support from his faith and his mother to highly achieve. In this move towards individualism, Jeremy is not moving away from race but acting in a particular Western enlightenment way that makes it seems as if race is not a definer. Here any failures on the part of a person are due to her/his inadequacies, not institutional racism. In other words, Jeremy is participating in a particular Western ideology that makes race invisible without confronting the ways in which race remains one of the great dividers.

Through a Foucauldian lens, Jeremy appears to be fashioning a 'self' that prefers not to be marked by 'race'. By taking an individualistic stance, Jeremy resists the notion of 'Blackness' that is more community oriented and less individualistic. He also seems to be pushing back against the deficiency model of 'Blackness' that he says he senses from both Central and his own community: Central's stereotypes that Black individuals are less intelligent and Washington's notions that he is 'acting white' that according to Jeremy, is a critique of acting intelligently. Moreover, he attempts to remove himself from the racial tensions of the past that he attributes to the previous generation. By making such moves, Jeremy seems to be attempting to unburden himself from the ways race is in play.

The Foucauldian question is how power is in play, or in this case, how much Jeremy's individualistic stance is imposed upon him versus self-cultivated. Central looks to Jeremy to encourage his Washington peers to adapt to Central. Here Jeremy plays the role of unifier. Yet such moves have serious, possibly negative consequences. There are costs to Jeremy's stance as it masks Jeremy's self-struggle with race. He is knowingly being placed in the position of having to rally his community of Washington peers and accepts this positioning, but seems to unknowingly be disciplined to downplay race issues and minimize his race-consciousness.

In contrast, Cole is fashioning a 'self' determined to achieve despite having to contend with race issues he encounters at Central. Here Cole holds some critique of systemic racism. He recognizes the ways Central parents have stereotyped Washington students and how this has become operationalized in the curriculum. His self-struggle

involves contending with racism where he turns the adversity he faces into motivation to highly achieve.

Jeremy and Cole are practicing active strategies to fashion a 'self' at Central, albeit in different forms. Here the play of race is subtle, but persistent and pervasive and each student is fashioning a 'self' in relation. I find that their self-practices or maneuvers within a majority-white school are driven by their commitment to highly achieve. I also find that both are also driven to help others. Foucault (1997b) notes that care of the self involves care for others. For Jeremy and Cole, their self-transformations are reliant upon extending help to individuals in need and this desire to help others informs their career choices. Both Jeremy and Cole plan to mentor young people as a music teacher and athletic coach respectively. As future mentors, Jeremy and Cole can continue to become the 'selves' they aim to be while potentially guiding their mentees to navigate similar race-related situations that they find themselves encountering at Central High School.

Through this presentation I make a case that Foucault's work can stand up as a key methodological and analytical trajectory to address race. While Foucault's philosophies are often attributed to gender and sexuality, not typically associated with race, or not deemed sufficient enough to fully capture racial dynamics at play, this article challenges such notions. I argue that while we can use theory to think with data and use data to think with theory (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013), we must be cautious that in our assemblages we do not overlook the full potentialities of the theories we apply. I use Foucault's philosophy of care of the self to offer another incision into the conversation of the role of 'race' in African American high school students' experiences at a majority-white school by presenting examples of care of the 'racialized' self. Through this work, I

urge scholars to (re)consider the substantiality of Foucault's work in thinking with and through qualitative data in studies that count race as a central dimension.

References

Ahluwalia, P. (2010). Post-structuralism's colonial roots: Michel Foucault. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 16(5), 597-606.

Baker, B. M., & Heyning, K. E., (2004). *Dangerous coagulations?: The uses of Foucault in the study of education.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Ball, S. J. (Ed.) (1990). *Foucault and education: Discipline and knowledge*. London, England: Routledge.

Brass, J. (2010). The sweet tyranny of creating one's own life: Rethinking power and freedom in English teaching. *Educational Theory*, *60*(6), 703-717.

Childers, S. M. (2014). Promiscuous analysis in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 819-826.

Dussel, I. (2010). Foucault and education. In M.W. Apple, S. J. Ball, L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 27-36). London, England: Routledge.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of 'acting White'. *The Urban Review*, *18*(3), 176-206.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality volume 2: The use of pleasure*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1986). *The history of sexuality volume 3: The care of the self*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1997a). Technologies of the self. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 223-251). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1997b). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 281-301). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2003a). *Abnormal: Lectures at the College de France 1974-1975*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2003b). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975-1976*. (D. Macey, Trans.). New York, NY: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2005). *The hermeneutics of the subject: Lectures at the Collège de France 1981-82.* (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hennig, B. B. (2010). Learning language as practice of self-formation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *7*(4), 306-321.

Hillier, H. C. & Hillier, C. E. (2012). Foucault and education: Power, pedagogy, and panopticon. *Didaskalia, 23*, 49-67.

Hindess, B. (2010). Liberalism: rationality of government and vision of history. *Social Identities 16*(5), 669-673.

Infinito, J. (2003). Ethical self-formation: A look at the later Foucault. *Educational Theory, 53*(2), 155-171.

Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. London, UK: Routledge.

Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2013). Plugging one text into another: Thinking with theory in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 19*(4), 261-271.

Jardine, G. M. (2010). *Foucault and education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Leask, I. (2012). Beyond subjection: Notes on the later Foucault and education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44*(S1), 58-73.

Macey, D. (2009). Rethinking biopolitics, race and power in the wake of Foucault. *Theory, Culture and Society, 26*(6), 186-205.

Mayo, C. (2000). The uses of Foucault. *Educational Theory*, *50*(1), pp. 103-116.

Miller, J. (2000). *The passion of Michel Foucault*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Linville, D. & Carlson, D. L. (2010). Fashioning sexual selves: Examining the care of the self in urban adolescent sexuality and gender discourses. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 7*, 247-261.

Niesche, R. & Haase, M. (2010). Emotions and ethics: A Foucauldian framework for becoming an ethical educator. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *44*(3), 276-288.

Olssen, M. (2014). Framing and analysing educational research: A recent history of transactions from a Foucauldian perspective. In A. D. Reid, E. P. Hart, & M. A. Peters (Eds.), *A companion to research in education*, (pp. 215-228). New York, NY: Springer.

Popkewitz, T. S. & Brennan, M. (1998). *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Rasmussen, K. S. (2011). Foucault's genealogy of racism. *Theory, Culture and Society, 28(5)*, 34-51.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

St. Pierre, E. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 715-719.

Stoler, A. L. (1996). *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Tanke, J. (2005). Michel Foucault at the College de France, 1974-1976. *Philosophy and Social Criticism, 31*(5-6), pp. 687-696.

Taylor, C. (2011). Race and racism in Foucault's College de France lectures. *Philosophy Compass, 6*(11), 746-756.

Wain, K. (1996). Foucault, education, the self, and modernity. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 30*(3), 345-360.

Young, R. J. C. (1995). Foucault on race and colonialism. *New Formations, 25,* 57-65.

CHAPTER 3

Fabricating Spaces: How African American Students at a Majority-White High School are Practicing a Curriculum of Self-Formation

Abstract

This is a study focused on the *curriculum of self-formation* practiced through a relation to, and making of, *irreal fabricated spaces*. The study carries on and extends the work of Philip Wexler and his study of three high schools in Rochester, N.Y. The idea of *self-formation* is borrowed from Michel Foucault's philosophies on *care of the self* and *power-knowledge*. The concept of *irreal fabricated spaces* is derived from the work of Nikolas Rose who draws from Foucault's scholarship on governmentality. These interconnected ideas are used to make curricular sense of the lives of six African-American students in their transition from a predominantly African-American high school to a majority-white high school.

Introduction

Six African-American high school students and their classmates, underwent a wrenching change in their lives in the Spring of 2013. Their school, Washington High School, which had been in existence for 150 years in their small, diverse Midwestern working-class town, closed its doors. Plagued by low enrollment, low academic performance, and financial struggles, and, facing federally mandated restructure, the Washington School Board chose to close the school and partner with Central, a neighboring district's high school. Central High School is a majority-white school located in the white, middle-class town of Central. Upon taking in Washington students, Central

High School receives funding from the State for its increased enrollment. As part of this agreement, Washington students are being bused 13-miles from Washington to Central High School. As it currently stands, the contract is a one-year agreement between both districts that will renew annually unless one or both chooses to terminate the partnership.

In this study, I worked with six Washington students in the second year of their transition to Central High School. I conducted life history interviews with each student, observed the students in their classes, and shadowed the students throughout their school day.

This work carries on and extends the work of Philip Wexler (1992) and his study of three high schools in Rochester, N.Y. Wexler studies the social worlds at a white working-class suburban school, a white middle-class suburban school, and a predominantly Black school with white teachers and administrators in an under-privileged urban area. My work is in conversation with a particular point that Wexler makes about students in the predominantly Black high school: "Student life…from the students' point of view is, at best, a testing ground in self-determination and at worst, 'a battle' to defend against what they experience as an assault on the self" (p. 76).

Wexler refers to the predominantly Black school as Washington High School and I retain this pseudonym to continue conversation. Yet I modify Wexler's account due to the particular context of my study: (1) Washington is a working-class rural suburb in the Midwest; (2) Washington High School is no longer in operation; and (3) due to the school's closure, Washington students are now being bused to Central High School, a majority-white middle-class school located outside of Washington.

To understand how Washington students are enacting self-practices at their new school, I employ a Foucauldian frame. In particular, I draw from Foucault's work on *care of the self* and *power-knowledge* to analyze how students are negotiating Central High School. What I find is that students, in their process of forming a 'self' at Central, are negotiating an irreal fabricated "them"/"us" division of space that is part of Central's curriculum. As they negotiate this *irreal fabricated space*, they construct their own irreal fabricated spaces. I argue that this relation is one way they are practicing a *curriculum of self-formation*. The following is a discussion on theoretical constructs used to unpack the analysis.

Theoretical Constructs

In Wexler's (1992) study, he finds that students across three schools are engaged in a process of "becoming somebody" (p. 155). He argues that schools serve as environments where students are in a struggle to discover themselves, invent who they are, and formulate who they want to become:

> [Schools] are places for making the core meaning of self or identity among young people…students are trying to 'become somebody'…their central and defining activity in school is to establish at least the image of an identity. (p. 155)

The students in each of the high schools are fabricating ways to get through the system, to negotiate their place, and 'become somebody'. In an effort to expand on this concept of becoming somebody, my study focuses on students' formation of a 'self'. I explore this notion of self-formation through Foucault's philosophies on *care of the self* and *power-knowledge*. Foucault (1988) views 'self' as the ongoing process of attending to one's self. Here Foucault makes a distinction between 'identity' and 'self'. For Foucault, identity implies a reified or stable 'self'. He instead prefers the concept of a 'self' because

he argues that an individual's 'self' is not stable, but rather always in the making. Here an individual constructs an ever-changing 'self' in relation to others within different environments. For example, each Washington student is fashioning a 'self' in every moment as she relates to different peers, teachers, and administrators within Central's different environments. A Washington student may fashion a studious 'self' among her peers and teacher in class, but fashion a casual teenager 'self' when she gathers with her friends after class. It is perhaps more helpful to think of each student as fashioning multiple 'selves' in relation to others at specific times and spaces.

For Foucault, the 'self' is produced through regimes that are disciplining the individual as a subject. Yet Foucault (1997b) notes that these regimes, or routines, are internally contradictory. For example, in the case of Central, there may be curriculum mechanisms that classify Washington students as 'lower achieving' while at the same time aid students in their achievement. As such, in a Foucauldian view, students' 'selves' emerge through Central's contradictory disciplinary techniques. Such contradictions present Washington students with choices that they can make in their practice of forming a 'self'. Here Washington students negotiate the range of possibilities that appear as they move through Central's environment.

Since the 'self' for Foucault is a negotiation, the 'self' is constantly in motion. Foucault's idea of *power-knowledge* helps to further explain. Foucault (1995) argues that power does not just repress, but also produces knowledge. Identifying this relation as *power-knowledge,* Foucault explains: "there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (p. 27). Applying this logic, each

Washington student is involved in knowledge-production insomuch as she is both responding to the knowledge(s) Central has produced about her, and, enacting self-practices that produce knowledge(s) about her 'self'. Note that from a Foucauldian perspective, this does not imply that Washington students can act completely free from Central's mechanisms of discipline. Yet according to Foucault (1997d), this does not mean that students are "always trapped" in their particular situation either (p. 167). Rather, students on some level have "possibilities of changing the situation" (p. 167). Here students can work within the limits of Central's disciplinary power to fashion a 'self' that may be resistant to how they are disciplined (Linville & Carlson, 2010).

Note too that a student may not be completely cognizant of the range of disciplinary tactics Central employs to govern her, nor the particulars of the resulting knowledge(s) that Central's governing produces. These *power-knowledges* abound, and can be subversive or so minute that they do not even appear as disciplinary tactics. Here they may move students in certain directions in their self-fashioning, yet the work of self-fashioning is never ending. At Central High School, students are always fashioning a 'self' in relation to the knowledge(s) the curriculum produces through its disciplinary efforts.

In this process of fashioning a 'self' to negotiate Central's curriculum, students enact *self-practices* to make maneuvers within curriculum spaces. A Washington student can accept how the curriculum attempts to constitute her as a subject, resist this subjectification, or perform any combination of both accepting and resisting. In this way, a curriculum, with its distinctive and potentially polarizing boundaries, becomes a negotiated and contested space. And, because this curricular space is internally

contradictory, a student, in relation to it, may practice versions of a 'self' (multiple 'selves') that are contradictory. For example, a student may fashion a certain kind of 'self' in one encounter with Central's curriculum that contradicts the 'self' she fashions in her next encounter with the curriculum.

I view the phenomenon of Central's curriculum disciplining Washington students to behave in particular ways, and students enacting self-practices in response as a *curriculum of self-formation*. Note that my use of 'curriculum' presents a different image of what is happening in schools than the typical image of teaching children subject matter. Rather, I focus on the idea that Washington students are practicing a 'curriculum' in the process of forming of a 'self'. It is a curriculum because students, through their self-formation, (knowingly or unknowingly) are teaching others how they want to be perceived.

The *curriculum of self-formation* that each Washington student is practicing involves different self-practices. I concentrate here on the self-practice of constructing *irreal fabricated spaces*. I borrow the idea of "irreal fabricates spaces" from Nikolas Rose. In *Powers of Freedom*, Rose (2010) draws from Foucault's work on governmentality and finds that there is a phenomenon of constructing *irreal fabricated spaces* in order to govern populations. He describes *irreal fabricated spaces* as: "a matter of defining boundaries, rendering that within them visible, assembling information about that which is included and devising techniques to mobilize the forces and entities thus revealed" (p. 33). Referring to these as "governable spaces", Rose says that individuals are responsible for the construction of different spaces (p. 31). Here conceptual ideas of partitioning space are fabricated into actual spaces through "material procedures" that

then operationalize boundaries (p. 32). Rose uses the example of 'the economy', an economic space that is brought into being through numbers, calculations, and statistics that make it visible. Rose borrows the term "irreal" from Nelson Goodman's (1978) work on psychological imagining, but clarifies that he is using 'irreal' in a nuanced way. For Rose, spaces are "irreal" in that they are not constituted until individuals bring them to life. *Irreal fabricated spaces* are 'fabricated' because individuals enact practices and discourses to create them. *Irreal fabricated spaces* are 'spaces' because individuals designate specific boundaries for the space.

In this work, I focus on three different kinds of *irreal fabricated spaces* that are constructed by individuals: (1) *bodily irreal fabricated spaces*, (2) *geographic material irreal fabricated spaces*, and (3) *geographic immaterial irreal fabricated spaces*. *Bodily irreal fabricated spaces* are spaces that individuals construct through their bodies. These include how individuals fashion themselves in terms of dress, decoration, gesture, posture, gait, speech, and so forth.

Geographic material irreal fabricated spaces are physical spaces. In schools, these include the material partitions within the school building (e.g., classrooms, hallways, offices, the auditorium, the cafeteria, the gym); the physical objects organized within these partitions (e.g., placement of doors, size of windows, arrangement of desks, etc.); the school's exterior spaces (e.g., the athletic fields, parking lot); as well as spatial extensions of the school (e.g., the school bus).

Geographic immaterial irreal fabricated spaces are conceptual spaces that can be found in a specific location but are not material. In schools, these include the management of time (e.g., bell sounds, semesters, calendars); techniques of observation

(testing and monitoring students); and forms of analyzing students (classifying students into grades and tracks, issuing grades and report cards, determining class ranking) (Foucault, 1995; Olssen, 1999).

Following Rose's (2010) logic, these *irreal fabricated spaces* are 'irreal' because they are constructed and operationalized by individuals. In this study, I found evidence of each of these forms of irreal fabricated spaces. I first turn my attention to the irreal fabricated space that Washington students describe as a "them"/"us" divide at Central that manifests in Central's curriculum spaces.

"Them"/"Us": An Irreal Fabricated Space Manifesting in Central's Curriculum Spaces

In this study, students report that there is a "them"/"us" divide between Central and Washington. This divide is a *geographic immaterial irreal fabricated space* that is operationalized through Central's curriculum. Its function is to discipline students to think and act in particular ways. For Foucault (1995), discipline involves partitioning space and arranging individuals within these spaces. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1995) calls this "the art of distributions", where "discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space" (p. 141). In other words, a fundamental component to disciplining individuals, is to break up a space into smaller parts and arrange individuals within these spaces.

On a macro-level, Central High School's curriculum is functioning in relation to the "space" of its location within the Central community. In this positioning, all students are being disciplined in a majority-white school that is located in a majority-white,

middle-class neighborhood. Where Central had operated as a majority-white space prior to the school transition, the transition forced an integration situation, merging a Washington space within Central's space that has created a tension between the school populations. For Washington students in this study, the tension is a "them"/"us" divide that manifests in Central's various micro curriculum spaces.

Across interviews, students describe the "them"/"us" divide between themselves and the Central population in terms of race, class, and culture. This divide is embodied in their words, particularly in their use of pronouns. When the students use "we" and "us" it is often representative of themselves, along with their Washington peers and community members. "We" and "us" reflect what students identify as their community, their people, and their place. Conversely, when students use the pronouns "they" or "them" it denotes Central High School students, teachers, and administrators, as well as the Central community at large.

In the interviews, students report that they were contending with a Central-Washington divide before becoming students at Central High School. They explain that it was due to community tensions that surfaced early on in the conceptual stages of the school transition. One student, Cole, recalled hearing complaints about the possibility of Washington students attending Central:

Cole: They [Central] said, "Look, if we bring all these Washington students in, our academic scholarliness is going to go down. Our school is gonna go from a B school to a D school, instantly,"…They thought that we were gonna fight at their school.

Cole explains that themes that Washington students are academically inferior, or that they are likely to start fights were common in many public Central School Board meetings

before the school transition. Another student, Omari, offers some insight into issues of fighting. He explains that there is a historic rivalry between the schools that is fueled by racial tensions:

Omari: Most of the Central students would say that we were rivals. Every time we had met up for a sport, it was always a fight afterwards… because we were predominately black. We're African American, and they're predominately Caucasian. I guess it was a racism thing or there's a battle of the races.

Omari's use of the phrase "battle of the races" provides some context. Omari is commenting on some of the negative identity constructions imposed upon Washington students. Based upon these perceptions, another student expressed that Washington students were uneasy about attending Central:

Malika: We would hear terrible things that Central community members would say about Washington. That made me even more frightened, that people just weren't gonna want us there.

In the Fall of 2013, when the school transition was underway, Washington students said their encounter with the "them"/"us" divide intensified. Cole describes his first day at Central High School:

Cole: I remember the first day of school…at the front of the door, there was a police officer standing there…The message was…they want us to mess up…where they can say, "Oh you're all out of line so all of you must leave our school now because this isn't gonna work out".

For Cole, the police officer at Central's front door sent clear a message: Washington students are not welcome on Central's turf. A year after the school transition, most students report that they feel they are on Central's turf. They feel like "outsiders" and find it difficult to claim Central as their "home" school:

Malika: I feel like we're still outsiders because of the fact that these people have been together forever.

Denise: I'm not comfortable there [at Central]…I'm not adjusted because I can't be myself around them.

Omari: I feel like they don't want us there…and I feel like they don't trust someone like me to be around in their city.

Yasmin: I don't feel at home…We just don't fit in. We don't have friends from Central…I just feel like an outcast.

Across responses students are expressing that they do not feel a sense of belonging at Central. The words, "their school", emphasize this. Students describe various other forces within the intersecting domains of race, class, and culture that contribute to their feelings of "outsider" status, making it difficult to bridge the "them"/"us" divide. For example, Malika states:

Malika: People just think [Washington] was unwealthy because of the town that we live in, which was wrong. I mean maybe not everybody has six cars in their driveway, but everybody was doing fine and if they weren't, then I mean you knew who those people were and you did everything you could to try to help them; even the teachers, the community, the faculty, the students, everybody. I guess Washington wasn't what people thought it was…Everybody [from Central] uses "ghetto" as like an unwealthy dump…which isn't what Washington was at all. I mean we had a school; we had classrooms; we had books. It's not like we were in a school with holes in the ceiling and rats running around everywhere.

Malika's statement bears resemblance to the "assault on the self" experienced by the Washington students in Wexler (1992) study. In Wexler's study students felt placed in the position of having "something to prove" to dispel stereotypes and defy expectations (p. 76). Malika seems to be in a similar position. Malika tells of having to clear up rumors that paint Washington as "ghetto", dilapidated, and lacking in resources. From her perspective, students at Washington High School were "doing fine" and had a supportive network of teachers, staff, and community members .

This comparison of having a supportive network at Washington appears throughout Malika's interviews and across several other students' interviews. The

common sentiment is that Washington students do not feel Central is invested in building relationships with them and from their perspective, Central's lack of investment further perpetuates the "them"/"us" divide. Malika explains:

> *Malika:* In Washington, everyone was either working for the school or working through some after school program, [but] in Central…they don't really take the time to know us.

Malika compares her experience of having a sense of community and a support network at Washington to feeling neglected at Central. In her view, no one at Central seems to be making an effort to genuinely get to "know" her and her Washington peers. She explains that the struggle of not having a sense of belonging is tied to a loss of community. This is echoed in most of the other students' interviews. Students report that their transfer to Central High School interrupted the networks they valued at Washington High School, where an "us" community arrangement was replaced with a "them"/"us" divide.

This irreal fabricated "them"/"us" divide is operationalized through Central's curriculum spaces. For example, students identified the parking lot at Central High School as an emphasis of class difference:

> *Malika:* You can tell in Central that there's definitely some separations…because their parents have a lot of money…You can tell by the way they act, the people they surround themselves with, even the cars in the parking lot.

In this example, Central's parking lot is a *geographic material irreal fabricated space.* The lot itself is a material space and the luxury cars that flow in and out of it are material objects that mark Central as middle-class and Washington as working-class. Malika says the parking lot "tell[s]" her she is not like her Central peers. She continues:

> *Malika:* This girl, she's a sophomore…She's 16 and got an Audi for her 16th birthday.

Malika contrasts the reality of the Central sophomore whose parents gifted her with an Audi, to her reality that as a senior, she takes the school bus or a carpool ride to school. Central's parking lot appeared in my interviews with another student:

Yasmin: They're rich…some of the highschoolers, they drive SUVs to school and Mercedes Benzs. It's just like "Why is your parent either giving you this car or buying you this car?" Seriously, I have a little Malibu 2000 car.

Like Malika, Yasmin identifies the cars she sees in the school's parking lot as a demarcation of class, where Central is "rich" and Washington is not. She also understands Central students' luxury cars to be in contrast to her family's older, economical car. In questioning why Central parents gift luxury cars to their children, she is identifying Central students' privilege. The parking lot is one example of how the "them"/"us" irreal fabricated divide manifests in Central's curriculum spaces. It is a space that is fabricated through a confluence of practices: Central students' practices of parking luxury cars in the lot and Washington students' practices of experiencing the lot.

Fabricating Spaces: Students' Self-Practices in Negotiating Central's "Them"/"Us" Curriculum Spaces

As Washington students encounter the "them"/"us" irreal fabricated divide that manifests in Central's curriculum spaces, they make negotiations of how to think and act. Foucault (1997b) conceptualizes this as self-governing or fashion a 'self' and refers to this process as "the ethical practice of the 'self'" (p. 300). For Foucault (1985), self-practices are ethical because they are always in relation to others. The individual enacts these practices to "understand" and "transform themselves" as social actors (p. 27). These kinds of self-practices are multiple and abundant yet I focus on the particular ways

students are enacting self-practices in their negotiation of a "them"/"us" irreal fabricated divide that manifests in Central's curriculum.

In this study, I experiment with casting the "them"/"us" divide in a Foucauldian agonistic light. It illuminates Washington students' self-fashioning as a production of Central's curriculum and the kinds of resistances students produce in negotiating Central's disciplinary mechanisms. In this Foucauldian reading, the power relation is agonistic. By agonistic, I mean that while Central works to discipline Washington students in particular ways, Washington students are struggling, or engaging in practices to form a 'self' in their own ways. Here students are not just experiencing these curriculum spaces but also negotiating these spaces through a constructing of their own *irreal fabricated spaces*. These are spaces that Washington students carve out within Central High School so they can "be themselves'" (Denise, personal communication, April 7, 2015). The following is a discussion of different examples.

What appears in the interviews is that different students relate to these curriculum spaces in different ways. In other words, students are not necessarily experiencing the same space consistently or equally. Let us take the example of the *bodily irreal fabricated space* of fashion. How students come to fashion themselves in terms of dress shows up in the interviews with reasonable frequency and appears to be a central disciplinary feature of Central High School's curriculum. For example, two students discussed Central's rules on wearing "leggings", or tight-fitting spandex pants:

Malika: If you're wearing leggings, you're supposed to wear shorts, or a skirt, or a shirt that covers your butt.

Yasmin: We're not supposed to wear leggings, but all the white people wear leggings. [The Principal] made sure he'd be on the Black people about it. I'm not

saying anything racist or nothing, but I don't get why he says something to us.

In these statements, students are interacting within Central's *bodily irreal fabricated space* of fashion in different ways. Malika views wearing leggings as allowable, as long as another garment is worn over it. Yasmin on the other hand understands the legging rule as only being enforced on Black students. She finds that Central's Principal targets her and her friends and views this as a direct assault. She is reluctant to call the Principal's actions "racist" because she explains in the interview that she is frustrated by it but trying not to get herself angry about it.

Students' different interactions within these *bodily irreal fabricated space* of fashion are also evident in their accounts of wearing "sweatpants" to school. The three students who discussed it identified the implications of wearing sweatpants quite differently:

Jeremy: You couldn't really wear sweatpants because you were seen as poor from those people in Central that felt they were higher and mightier than everybody else…but in Washington you could wear what you want.

Jeremy explains that wearing sweatpants to Central can imply socioeconomic status. If a Washington student were to wear them, then a Central student may view the student as "poor". Jeremy also makes the distinction that at Washington High School, wearing sweatpants was inconsequential. In his view, students were able to wear what they wanted without judgment from their peers.

Another student has a different experience with this *bodily irreal fabricated space* of fashion. While she is vocal about feeling a sense of a "them"/"us" divide in other

curriculum spaces, she seems not to be contending with any markers of class status in her practice of wearing sweatpants:

Denise: I wear sweatpants at least once a week, usually Mondays or sometimes Fridays because I am just happy it's Fridays. I wear them when I'm lazy and I don't feel like getting dressed for school.

For Denise, wearing sweatpants is more a marker of laziness. Yet a third student declares that when she wears sweatpants to Central, she is resisting pop-cultural fashion norms taken up by some of her Central female peers:

Malika: I think pop culture in general is probably the biggest influence on our generation. Everybody has to look a certain way. Your hair has to be curled every day. You have to wear 20 pounds of makeup every day. You walk into Central High School and you will see 50 girls in tiny skirts and tights in negative 30-degree weather because it's cute. Then I'm in sweatpants and boots and they're like, "Why are you wearing that?" Because it's comfortable and it's warm.

Malika opts to wear sweatpants to school for practical reasons (they are "comfortable" and "warm") yet she does so knowing that she is also challenging a particular *bodily irreal fabricated space* of fashion. In her view, pop-culture defines the discourses and practices of this *irreal fabricated space*. The Central female students who are disciplined by its techniques adopt it at Central. However, Malika resists and when she is questioned for her choices, she resists again.

Along with a *bodily irreal fabricated space* of fashion, students are fabricating irreal spaces in the form of *geographic material irreal fabricated spaces* and *geographic immaterial irreal fabricated spaces*. For example, Malika and her friends are fabricating a *geographic material irreal fabricated space* at the second floor heaters. The heaters are nestled against a pale-yellow painted wall, caddy corner to a stretch of lockers. Malika

and her friends have established it as the hangout for their group comprised of seven Washington students (Malika, personal communication, May 8, 2015). Malika elaborates:

Malika: My group is everyone. We've got geeks in our group. We've got rockers in our group. We've got ghetto people that are our friends. We're a melting pot…We call ourselves "The Island of Lost Toys" because we just don't fit anywhere.

Malika describes her group as "a melting pot" of Washington students who have different tastes and interests. "The Island of Lost Toys" is a reference to "The Island of Misfit Toys" from Christmas folklore, specifically, the story of "Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer". In the story there exists an island filled with toys that have various defects. The island is where the toys gather since they are not fit to be delivered to children on Christmas. For Malika and her friends, the members of "The Island of Lost Toys" do not have to conform to a singular "clique" designation (e.g., jocks, nerds, goths, etc.). They are not "lost" so much as claiming their nonconformity, and joining together as one group of nonconformists. When they meet at the second floor heaters, they bring "The Island" to life.

At "The Island", Malika and her friends can warm up from the Midwestern cold. Yet beyond its practical function, Malika finds comfort in being in a space where there is a sense of belonging. She explained that "The Island" is a Washington space, a space where she and her friends can congregate throughout the school day and maintain their Washington 'selves'. Malika's Washington community is important to her because she feels that she does not have the same kind of history with Central peers:

Malika: You're inserting yourself into someone else's life that they've been building up for the past 12 years.

Malika finds that her presence at Central is imposing upon friendships that Central students have been building since elementary school. On “The Island” there is no concern for “inserting” because its members established their friendships in Washington. Yet Malika also applies the idea of “inserting” to those students from Central’s community who might attempt to join the “Island”:

Malika: I’ve got a close group of friends…I guess we don’t really try to mix and people don’t try too hard to mix with us…I have friends in my classes that I talk to but I wouldn’t necessarily hang out with them outside of school.

Here Malika and her friends are “marking out a territory” (Rose, 2010). The Washington students who occupy “The Island” are “defining who or what can rightfully enter” (Rose, 2010, p. 34). While Malika may be friendly with some of her Central classmates, she makes clear that the “The Island” is strictly a Washington space, an example of what Wexler (1992) calls “cultural territories” (p. 135).

This “Island of Lost Toys” is an *irreal fabricated space* in motion. As the students fluctuate between gathering in Washington spaces and gathering at Central High School’s heaters on the second floor, the “The Island” moves with them. In this way, “The Island” at Central serves as an extension of its manifestations in Washington.

Another student, Omari, negotiates Central’s curriculum spaces in quite a different way. He is fashioning a *geographic immaterial irreal fabricated space* that is his own world “in the shadows” (Omari, personal communication, May 4, 2015). In one of the interviews, he likens himself to Jay Gatsby, the main character in F. Scott Fitzgerald’s novel, “The Great Gatsby”, making particular reference to Gatsby’s practice of concealing his identity:

Omari: I'm the one kid everyone hears about but doesn't know who he is. Have you read *The Great Gatsby*?…You know how…no one has seen him through the party? That was me. I could be standing right next to you and you heard about me, but you don't know that that's me.

Omari elaborates that he does not want much attention on himself and that he prefers to keep a low profile. Instead of gathering in spaces like "The Island", he tries to remain unseen. This makes it difficult for Central students to identify him. Like Gatsby, people may know Omari's name and know of him, but they cannot necessarily point him out.

Omari explains that his reason for operating this way is due to the school transfer that he feels was "forced" on him (Omari, personal communication, March 12, 2015). He wishes that Washington High School had not closed and that he were still attending. He resists having to be at Central by keeping his presence low-key. He does not take up any friendships with Central students:

Omari: I don't fit in with anyone really, so I just stay to myself.

Opting to remain in his own world, Omari makes reference to Washington students who have befriended Central students:

Omari: They [Central students] try to test you to see what group [clique] you'll be in…They [Washington students] try to fit in with the people at Central…They [Washington friends] stopped talking to me and started trying to make [Central] friends, and I didn't want to make friends.

Omari is trying to retain his Washington 'self' even at the cost of losing some of his Washington friends. He refers to the Washington students who have befriended Central peers as "they". He is indicating that they have crossed the aisle to join the "them" (Central) side. According to Omari, "they" have sold out and abandoned their

Washington selves. For Omari, making friends at Central is the final nail in Washington High School's coffin.

Omari's self-fashioning involves a practice of concealing and "masquerading" (D. L. Carlson, personal communication, March 23, 2016). He resists making Central friends in order to keep some remnant of Washington High School alive. Omari's irreal fabricated space may be one "in the shadows" but it is no less real than the world he is opposing.

In contrast, Jeremy negotiates the curriculum spaces at Central by attempting to unify Washington and Central students. He is constructing *geographic immaterial irreal fabricated* bridges to eliminate the "them"/"us" divide. His goal is for all students to feel comfortable at Central. In the cafeteria, for example, Jeremy engages in the practice of "table-hop[ping] where he "bounce[s] around" to different tables (Jeremy, personal communication, April 1, 2015). Here he moves from table-to-table, talking to different Central and Washington students in order to establish a variety of constituencies. He carries this table-hopping practice outside of the cafeteria as he moves about Central's other curriculum spaces. In one interview, he shared his solution to bridging the "them"/"us" divide:

Jeremy: If you want us to get over the fact that we're not at our high school anymore then don't say "Washington students". Say "Central students" because that's what we are now. Recognize us as that now. Then we'll be more comfortable".

In this statement, Jeremy takes issue with some of the language at Central that continues to classify Washington students as a different population. He argues that in

order for Washington students to "get over" the loss of their school and feel "more comfortable", there should be no distinctions between the groups of students.

Fabricating bridges between Washington and Central is a self-practice Jeremy has been enacting for quite some time. In one interview, Jeremy recounts a pep talk that he gave to his Washington friends before they transferred to Central:

Jeremy: I said, "You may hate me. You might not wanna be my friend. You might not think I'm cool no more. You thinking I'm tryin' to switch out on you. But really if we wanna get an education we have to give them [Central] a chance. We can't listen to our moms and dads because we're in a different time. We're in a different place. And if we wanna be successful, we have to make up in our minds that we're gonna go over there and we're gonna do this thing".

This statement illustrates Jeremy's philosophy that it is in Washington students' best interest to keep an open mind about their time at Central High School. For Jeremy, Washington students can choose to be successful at Central regardless of their parents' attitudes. He fabricates irreal bridges that work to insure that he and his peers have positive experiences at Central.

In the examples above, students, in their negotiation of Central's "them"/"us" curriculum space are enacting self-practices to fabricate their own spaces and they do so in different ways. Students are fashioning a *bodily irreal fabricated space* in what they wear to school that may or may not resist Central's expectations of how to dress. Malika and her Washington friends are fabricating "The Island", a *geographic material irreal fabricated space* at the heaters, so they can be their Washington 'selves' in the moments that they are there. Omari is fabricating a *geographic immaterial irreal fabricated space* "in the shadows" to preserve his Washington 'self'. Finally, Jeremy is constructing *geographic immaterial irreal fabricated* bridges to unify Washington and Central

students into one student body. All students are engaged in these practices in relation to the “them”/“us” divide that contributes to their loss of a sense of belonging. I argue that this relation is part of their practice of a curriculum of self-formation and I now turn to a discussion.

Implications of the Curriculum of Self-Formation

In Wexler’s (1992) study of Washington students, students are “in defense against social absences, not in welcoming acceptance” (p. 134). Here students are negotiating a multitude of forces that mark them as subjects who are deficient and in “social lack” (p. 134). Students feel they need to prove that they are “‘good and not bad’, that they are worthwhile, that they can achieve, that they have respect, that they are decent…that they can be somebody” (p. 76).

What I find in my study, is that Washington students did not have to contend with perceptions of deficiencies at their old high school. As one student points out, Washington had resources, it had supportive networks, and students were “doing fine” (Malika, personal communication, April 10, 2015). Only until their high school closed, and they were made to move to a majority-white school outside of their hometown, did students begin to encounter perceptions in school that paint them as deficient in class, culture, and “academic scholarliness” (Cole, personal communication, March 10, 2015). One year after the school-transfer, students report that there is still a “them”/”us” divide at Central and they sense it in the various curriculum spaces through which they move.

Core to students’ struggle at Central is the loss of a sense of belonging and community that they had at their old school. To negotiate this terrain, students are enacting self-practices to construct *irreal fabricated spaces* while they are on Central’s

turf. Malika and her friends construct "The Island of Lost Toys" so that in the moments where they meet at the second floor heaters, they can be Washington High School students again. Omari, in Gatsby fashion, conceals his identity from Central students by fabricating his own world in the shadows to preserve his Washington 'self'. Jeremy fabricates irreal bridges between Washington and Central students to attempt to eliminate the "them"/"us" divide. In his view, Washington students should be addressed as Central students "because that's what we are now" (Jeremy, personal communication, April 13, 2015).

Foucauldian constructs help show how Central's curriculum disciplines students through a multitude of spaces within, around, and beyond, the school site. As students maneuver in and out of these spaces, they negotiate their positions. They are active in forming 'selves' that accept, resist, or any combination of both accepting and resisting the different ways the curriculum attempts to constitute them as subjects. This study focuses on how students are enacting self-practices to construct irreal spaces, in order to resist the "them"/"us" divide that manifests throughout various curriculum spaces. In this process of negotiating Central's *irreal fabricated spaces*, and fashioning a 'self' in relation, students are practicing a *curriculum of self-formation*.

This *curriculum of self-formation* is always in the making. It is nomadic in that students' subject positions shift as they move through different irreal locations. In this way, *the curriculum of self-formation* is multiple. Students engage in a constant interplay between a variety of forces, discourses and practices within a multitude of irreal spaces. In other words, the students are negotiating who they are in relation to the curriculum spaces they are occupying in the moment. This means the 'self' that they fashion in one

space, may be variably different from the 'self' they create in another. For example, the 'self' Malika presents in her classes at Central is a different presentation from the 'self' she presents on "The Island". In her classes, she assimilates to formal expectations of discourse and behavior to make a "good" impression and do the "best" she can in class (Malika, personal communication, April 28, 2015). On "The Island" she is more comfortable. It is a refuge. Here, the pressure is off and she can just be a Washington kid.

All of the Washington students want to find a sense of belonging in their new school. Whether fashioning a certain 'self' through their clothing, designating Washington spaces within Central, hiding in the shadows to preserve a Washington 'self', or building bridges so that Washington students are recognized as Central students, the students have a longing for some sense that they 'belong'; that they 'fit in'; and that they are 'wanted'. Wexler (1992) notes: "'Making it' in school is less openly, but more extensively about establishing a sense of self worth *within* institutions…that represent other worlds" (p. 143). Like the Washington students in Wexler's study, the Washington students in this study are enacting self-practices in order to make their way in a white-majority school where they feel racially, socioeconomically, and culturally different. I find that Washington students in my study are crafting 'selves' in relation to Central's "them"/"us" irreal fabricated divide, not in an effort to 'become somebody', but in an effort to say, 'we are somebody'.

References

Carter, D. J. (2007). Why the Black kids sits together at the stairs: The role of identity-affirming counter-spaces in a predominantly White high school. *Journal of Negro Education*, *76*(4), 542-554.

Carter, D. J. (2008). Achievement as resistance: The development of a critical race achievement ideology among Black achievers. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(3), 466-497.

Carter, P. L. (2005). *Keepin' it real: School success beyond black and white*. New York, NY: Oxford.

Carter, P. L. (2009). Equity and empathy toward racial and educational achievement in the Obama era. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(2), 287-297.

Carter Andrews, D. J. (2012). Black achievers' experiences with racial spotlighting and ignoring in a predominantly white high school. *Teachers College Record 114*(10), 1-46.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The use of pleasure*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1997b). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 281-301). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1997d). Sex, power, and the politics of identity. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 163-173). New York, NY: The New Press.

Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmakng*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Harper, S. R., & Davis III, C. H. F. (2012). They (don't) care about education: A counternarrative on Black Male students' responses to inequitable schooling. *Educational Foundations*, *26*(1-2), 103-120.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement for US schools. *Educational Researcher*, *35*(7), 3-12.

Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. F., IV. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), 47-68.

Linville, D. & Carlson, D. L. (2010). Fashioning sexual selves: Examining the care of the self in urban adolescent sexuality and gender discourses. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 7*, 247-261.

Olssen, M. (1999). *Michel Foucault: Materialism and education*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Rose, N. (2010). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2009). Different folks, different hopes: The educational aspirations of Black males in urban, suburban, and rural high schools. *Urban Education, 44*(6), 710-731.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *'Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Watkins, M. (2010). Discipline, diversity and agency: Pedagogic practice and dispositions to learning. In Z. Millei, T. G. Griffiths, & R. J. Parkes (Eds.), *Re-theorizing discipline in education: Problems, politics, and possibilities* (pp. 59-75). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Wexler, P. (1992). *Becoming somebody: Toward a social psychology of school*. London, England: The Falmer Press.

CHAPTER 4

Critical Race Theory and Foucault in Conversation: 'Race' and Care of the 'Racialized' Self

Abstract

In this article, I conduct Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Foucauldian analyses of how Jeremy, an African American high school student is negotiating a 'self' at a majority-white school. I argue that a CRT reading of Jeremy's practices arrives at 'self-formation' through its predominant lens of 'race' and a Foucauldian reading of Jeremy's practices arrives at 'race' through its predominant lens of 'self-formation'. I begin with some background on CRT and Foucauldian frames in the context of education. Next, I show how CRT and Foucault present different conceptualizations of power, resistance, self-formation, and race. Following this, I use data from interviews to present, within each of these constructs, CRT and Foucauldian analyses of Jeremy's practices. Finally, I discuss what is revealed through the presentation of both CRT and Foucauldian analyses, what new openings appear when using a Foucauldian analysis, and the possible limitations of each frame.

Introduction

> We're fine with going to a different school. It's not the end of the world. We know that we have to get our education, so we're more than fine goin' to a different school, gettin' to know different people, gettin' to know different teachers. We just want them to not be so focused on sayin', "Oh, the Washington students," or "These are the Central students." No. If we come together, we're gonna be one. We're not gonna have this clash that happened 50,000 years ago when you guys were in high school because we are not like you. We are in a different generation. In this generation, there is more interracial dating. That should say somethin' in itself...In this

> generation, you start to see more mixed friend groups, one white, one black, one Mexican, one Chinese. That's what my friend group is made up of now. We don't care about skin colors. Skin color is what? Somethin' that just happens with cells, the way our melanin is expressed. We don't care about that. We care about gettin' to know people, networking, findin' friends that can possibly be lifelong friends, goin' there, and gettin' our education. It's high school. Don't make it into somethin' that it's not and startin' a race war because we're not about that. You guys may be about that, but we're about just going and proving that what we've learned at Washington is sufficient, and we can handle it, so let us handle it.
>
> —Jeremy
> High School Student

Jeremy, an African American high school student, is speaking to his experience at Central High School, a majority-white school located in a white middle-class neighboring town. Jeremy is a participant in a larger study of six African American students, all of whom have been moved to Central High School after the closure of Washington High School, their hometown predominantly Black high school. Jeremy appears to be an outlier among the six students. While most students report that they are outsiders at Central High School and identify structures at Central that benefit their white counterparts, Jeremy presents a complicated case. Unlike his peers, he claims full membership in his new school and when he encounters racial injustices, he does not attribute them to systemic racism, but instead ascribes them to individuals' actions.

I analyze Jeremy's practices at Central High School using two distinct analytical trajectories: a Critical Race Theory (CRT) framework and a Foucauldian framework. A CRT framework applied to the school context makes 'race' the central focus of students' life situations and asks the question: How do Students of Color negotiate the white supremacy and racism they encounter in school? A Foucauldian framework, on the other hand, makes 'self-formation' central (based upon Foucault's philosophy of *care of the*

self) asking the question, "How does an individual cultivate an ethical 'self' within the society of which s/he is a part?"

I begin with some background on CRT and Foucauldian analytical frames in the context of education. Next, I show how CRT and Foucault present different conceptualizations of power, resistance, self-formation, and race. Following this, I use data from Jeremy's interviews to present, within each of these constructs, CRT and Foucauldian analyses of Jeremy's practices. Finally, I discuss what is revealed through the presentation of both CRT and Foucauldian analyses, what new openings appear when using a Foucauldian analysis, and the possible limitations of each frame.

CRT and Foucauldian Analytical Frames in the Context of Education

CRT originated in Critical Legal Studies in the 1970s and gained momentum in the late 1980s as legal scholars Derrick Bell, Alan Freeman, and Richard Delgado, began to write about the embeddedness of racism in U.S. liberal structural foundations and the subtle ways racism seeps into everyday life (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Influenced by these scholars' work, Gloria Ladson-Billings and William Tate (1995) brought CRT to Education in the mid-1990s with their call for a more aggressive analysis of race in education than Multiculturalism and class-focused Critical Pedagogy approaches offered at the time. CRT in Education scholars are influenced by the following CRT tenets that serve as an overall critique of liberalism: (1) racism is an everyday occurrence in the U.S. (supported by *myths of colorblindness and meritocracy*); (2) whites benefit from racism where whiteness is a property right protected by the law (*whiteness as property*) and where whites permit advances in Black equality when these advances converge with the

interest of whites (*interest convergence*); (3) race is a *social construction*; (4) racial experience intersects with other identities (*intersectionality*); and (5) Persons of Color have a shared history of oppression. All of these tenets are complimented, in CRT, by the act of what CRT scholars call *counterstorytelling)* – the telling of stories that counter invisible white privilege, social construction of identities, the complexity of multiple simultaneous identities (*intersectionality*), and the everydayness of racism in African-American lives (Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Harris, 1995; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Zamudio, Russell, Rios, & Bridgeman, 2011).

Michel Foucault's work has presented various analytical tools within his projects of archeology in the 1960s, genealogy in the 1970s, and ethics in the 1980s. I focus on his later work in ethics, particularly his philosophy on *care of the self*, because it concerns the process of how an individual forms a 'self' in relation to others. Education scholars who use Foucault in this light, make 'self-formation' central to their analyses. These studies focus on an individual's self-fashioning that negotiates the sociocultural norms and possibilities placed before them in the school context (see for example, Hennig, 2010; Linville & Carlson, 2010; Niesche & Haase, 2010). For example, Darla Linville and David Lee Carlson (2010) use 'care of the self' as a tool to understand how queer and nonqueer high school students fashion 'sexual selves'.

Education scholars have also employed 'care of the self' to examine how students and educators fashion 'racialized' selves. For example, Gada Mahrouse's (2005) work looks at how minority teachers fashion a 'self' that either takes up or resists the ways dominant discourse positions them as subjects. According to her research, these

subjectivities construct the minority teacher as having "'cultural awareness' and a heightened understanding of racism regardless of their individual backgrounds and experiences". These social constructions also assume minority teachers have been granted educational advantages based not upon their competence but on skin color (p. 28).

Another study is M. Francyne Huckaby's (2007) work with five professor-scholars of education. The professors (of which all but one are Persons of Color) cultivate a 'self' that is committed to resisting the status quo in education in order to transform it. The status quo, Huckaby explains, operates as a "technology of biopower that subjugates some and confers privilege on others", thereby setting up a system of inequality (p. 516). Biopower is a form of Foucault's (1997b) notion of power that refers to the ways in which governments manage populations and discipline their bodies (thus the "bio" of biopower) along the domains of "health, sanitation, birthrate, longevity, and race" (p. 73). Huckaby finds that all of the professors "put forward the truths of specific communities" affected by the inequities in their college institution (p. 524).

CRT and Foucauldian frames present different conceptualizations of power, resistance, self-formation, and race that inform their analyses. In the following I explore how each (CRT and Foucault) frame and elaborate these domains.

CRT and Foucauldian Theories on Power, Resistance, Self-Formation, and Race

Power

Power, for CRT scholars, refers to racial power, or the hierarchical, top-down arrangement of white supremacy where dominant White culture oppresses and

marginalizes People of Color. The following statement by Zamudio, Russell, Rios, et al. (2011) demonstrates:

> Students of color do not have the advantage of walking into a classroom as individuals; they walk in as black, brown, or red persons with all the connotations such racialization raises…where their histories and cultures are distorted, where they feel confused about their own identities…There is no level of liberal reforms that can alter these experiences for students of color without directly challenging the larger systems of society. (pp. 18-19)

The 'larger systems of society' in this quote refer to the racial power structures that permeate institutions and everyday life. CRT scholars in Education begin their work from this location. They identify overt and subtle forms of racism that Students of Color contend with in school and campaign to fight these injustices. For example, CRT in Education scholarship on Black students in majority-white schools argue that white schools are microcosms of larger U.S. societal structures plagued with systemic white supremacy. The studies report that white schools fail to be supportive environments for Black students, as they are not typically spaces that valorize Black history and culture, or affirm Black identity (D. J. Carter, 2007; Carter-Andrews, 2012; Gordon, 2012; Harper & Davis, 2012; Strayhorn, 2009; Tatum, 1997). The literature points to a number of reasons including multiculturally inadequate teachers (P. L. Carter, 2009; Kunjufu, 2012; Sleeter, 1993), culturally unresponsive curriculum and pedagogy (Harper & Davis, 2012; Heariold-Kinney, 2009; Jackson, 2011; Price, 2011; Taylor, 2007), and a racialized, Eurocentric learning environment (Carter Andrews, 2012; Gordon, 2012).

These studies report that Black students remain disenfranchised in white-majority schools (Gordon, 2012; Howard, 2008; Kunjufu, 1995, 2012) that do "very little to foster a positive representation of Blackness and Black identity" (D. J. Carter, 2007, p. 543). It

is argued that schools remain sites where Black students are confronted with conscious (deliberate) and dysconscious (uncontested acceptance of white norms) racism (King, 1991; Strayhorn, 2009). CRT scholars have referred to these acts of racism as 'racial microaggressions' (Carter Andrews, 2012; Howard, 2008, 2010; Solorzano, Ceja, & Yosso, (2000): Tyrone Howard (2010) defines racial microaggressions as "subtle insults (verbal, nonverbal, and/or visual) and insinuations directed toward people of color, often automatically or subconsciously" (p. 105) (see also Pierce (1974). Howard further asserts that while isolated microaggressions may appear inconsequential, when endured repeatedly over time, they have damaging impacts on Black students' self-identity and academic performance.

As examples there are the studies of Dorinda Carter Andrews (2012), Beverly Gordon (2012), and Lori Price (2011). In Carter Andrews' (2012) study of nine academic achieving Black students attending an affluent predominantly white suburban high school in Massachusetts, she found that students experienced racial microaggressions in the form of 'racial ignoring' and 'racial spotlighting' "across all three school domains—classroom, social, and extracurricular spaces" (p. 4). In the instances of racial ignoring, Black students felt white peers and teachers devalued their ideas, white peers displayed minimal acknowledgement of and interaction with Black peers, and teachers failed to discipline white students who used racial slurs. In the instances of racial spotlighting, Black students experienced unwanted attention that took the form of being: (1) singled out by white teachers and peers as experts on black history and culture; (2) placed in the position of having to be a racial representative, spokesperson, and native informant; (3) objectified

and ‘othered’ as black bodies; (4) stereotyped or deemed “guilty by association” (p. 26); and (5) visible as the only Black person, or one of the few Black people in the classroom.

In Gordon’s study (2012) of four African American male students attending a white suburban high school in the mid-Atlantic, students voiced feeling ‘othered’ and not having a sense of belonging in their dominant white environment. Students report feeling like “minority poster boy[s]” and targets of peers’ racist remarks that go unchallenged by teachers (p. 9). In Price’s (2011) study of Black students attending two predominantly white high schools in Southern Appalachia, students expressed their frustration with being the only Black student in some of their classes, having to contend with white peers’ racial slurs and stereotypes, being ignored at times or treated differently by teachers, and learning a curriculum that pays little attention to Black history and culture. From this CRT research, power is presented as a top-down binary operating on institutional, structural, and individual levels to privilege whites and oppresses Students of Color.

Foucault conceptualizes power differently. For Foucault, power is distributed not just through an institution, a structure, or an individual but through all of the strategies operating to control individuals in a particular societal arrangement (Foucault, 1978, p. 93). Foucault disperses power “everywhere” that operates in relation to individuals at every moment and at every turn (Foucault, 1978, p. 93). Foucault often refers to power as *relations of power* to emphasize this dynamic.

Foucault’s work has been appropriated to studies in education to show how schools discipline students (see for example Jardine, 2010). Discipline, for Foucault is not simply a power imposition upon someone. Rather, as discussed in *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault, 1995) power is not a one-way scenario. In the context of schools,

schools are enforcing their power but students too are active agents in negotiating this power. As Dan Butin (2001) notes, power "is not something done to her, it is done with her" (p. 168). Here power relations are present but are malleable and can be leveraged.

Resistance

CRT scholars report that in response to enduring mechanisms of institutional and individual racism, students enact resistances, or exhibit behaviors that oppose the ways they are treated. For example, students may speak out against the racial microaggressions they are experiencing, choose to stay silent, push themselves to achieve despite the low expectations they encounter, and/or create counter-spaces that become places of refuge within a hostile school environment (D. J. Carter, 2007/2008; P. L. Carter, 2009; Carter Andrews, 2012; Tatum, 1997). CRT in Education scholars, Daniel Solorzano and Dolores Delgado Bernal (2001) conceptualize students' resistances along four types of oppositional behavior. The first type, *reactionary behavior*, accounts for students who act out in school. Solorzano and Delgado Bernal explain that these behaviors are not resistances because students are not critiquing their oppression or carrying out a purpose of social justice. The examples they provide are students who "behave poorly in class" or "challenge authority figures 'just for kicks'" (p. 317).

The second type, *self-defeating resistance*, accounts for students who may recognize their oppression in school but rather than attempt to transform their situation, engage in resistances that end up being self-defeating. An example of self-defeating resistance is a student who drops out of school.

The third type, *conformist resistance*, accounts for students who are committed to the struggle for social justice, or the wellbeing of themselves and others, but operate

within the social conventions of liberal society. Students who are practicing conformist resistance "hold no critique" of their oppressive conditions and instead believe individuals are responsible for their choices in life (p. 318).

The fourth type of oppositional behavior, *transformational resistance*, "offers the greatest possibility for social change" as it refers to students who hold a critique of their oppressive conditions as well as make a commitment to campaign for social justice (p. 319).

For Foucault (1978), resistance is an inevitable part of power-relations. He states, "where there is power, there is resistance" (Foucault, 1978, p. 95). Foucault (1997d) argues that within relations of power, individuals always have, on some level, possibilities to change situations or to act within power relations. In the case of self-formation, *resistance* refers to the kinds of options an individual can choose when fashioning a 'self'. Here an individual "is not passively made by power", but forms a 'self' "by being able to resist within power relations" (Butin, 2001, p. 169). Foucault points to resistance throughout the various iterations of his work. For example, in *The History of Sexuality Volume 1*, Foucault describes resistances that are "present everywhere in the power network" (p. 95). In *The Subject and Power*, Foucault (2000) suggests looking to the resistances to power as "a starting point" to understand and transform power relations (p. 329). In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault talks about the resistances built into the disciplinary power mechanisms that attempt to constitute the subject. In his later work on ethics, Foucault focuses on the resistance of the individual who fashions herself/himself as an ethical subject. In these works, Foucault sees resistance as part and parcel with power. Applying this notion to the school context,

schools impose upon students a particular kind of 'self', but if students are aware of these subjectivities, they can choose to affirm, accept, and/or reject this positioning.

Self-Formation

In a CRT frame, social transformation does not occur on the individual level but on the collective level. As such, ideas of 'self' and self-formation are community oriented and theorized as part of a collective identity that is affirmed in same-race gathering. For example, while Black individuals in the U.S. may define and experience their 'Blackness' differently, a CRT frame connects Black individuals to a larger Black community context due to a shared history of oppression in terms of slavery, Jim Crow Laws, and new manifestations of racism that insure the perpetuation of racial inequality (Bonilla-Silva, 2014).

Foucault's idea of self-formation involves a process where individuals engage in self-practices or maneuvers to form a 'self'. Foucault refers to this process as the *ethical formation of a 'self'*. Self-formation is 'ethical' for Foucault because individuals are forming a 'self' *in relation* to others. Foucault (1985) posits that the ethical formation of a 'self' involves a four-part process: (1) *determination of the ethical substance*—the ways in which an individual balances obligations and desires to determine the part of the self that needs addressing; (2) *mode of subjection*—the ways in which an individual agrees to be subject to a particular set of rules, thus complying to it, "preserving it as a custom", and becoming a subject (individual person) in the world through that agreement (p. 27); (3) *forms of elaboration*—the ways an individual elaborates upon the offered rules, making them her/his own even as s/he is subject to their control. Forms of elaboration refer to the practices an individual performs on oneself in order to not only adhere "to a

given rule" but also to "attempt to transform oneself" into the self s/he aims to be (p. 27); and (4) *telos*—an endpoint toward which an individual's actions tend. Here, the imagined 'self' or the 'self' an individual aims to be is the telos of the process of self-formation (p. 28).

Race

CRT scholars view race as a social construction that has historically been used to privilege white people and deny People of Color equal rights, access, and status. CRT scholars such as Gary Peller (1995) challenge liberal cures for racial inequality arguing that liberal visions of universalism (racial integration) and progress end up masking the racism and "historical debt" or history of inequities that continue to exist (Ladson-Billings, 2006). Such integrationist thinking that stems from Civil Rights Reform programs perpetuates the myth of a post-racial society. The belief is that the U.S. has progressed from an oppressive system of slavery to an integrationist society in which all people are equal. With the election and re-election of President Obama, this post-racial narrative has gained momentum. Yet, CRT scholars such as Education scholar Prudence Carter (2009) challenge the notion that the U.S. has become "a racially healed society in the Obama Era", as disparity in educational opportunities for Students of Color as compared to their white counterparts are prevalent (p. 288). For reasons such as this and the fact that race is a historic, divisive, and pervasive aspect of U.S. culture, CRT scholars choose to retain racial categories. This emphasis on race is a central strategy in exposing racial injustices in order to move towards social justice.

In Foucault's (1997b/1991) work on biopower and governmentality, race appears as a strategy in a web of strategies to demarcate bodies and manage populations. Unlike

CRT scholars, race is not Foucault's central concern. Yet this does not mean he writes race out of the equation. Rather, in his conceptualization of power as dispersed everywhere, race is one of the many ways individuals are disciplined as subjects. Foucault (2003a) explicates that race emerges through a convergence of disciplinary practices. For example, in the context of Central High School, the parents from both Central and Washington communities have set up a racial opposition. Washington parents have raised concerns that their children will not have equal opportunities and be safeguarded from racial discrimination. Central parents have raised concerns that Central's academic rating will suffer and that fighting between Washington and Central students will occur. Here race is a measure of security for both populations and Central has operationalized this through disciplinary means (Foucault, 2007).

In sum, CRT scholars contend that U.S. society is an oppressive system of power that upholds structures of domination over People of Color in order to privilege whites. CRT in Education scholars apply this stance to their critique of schooling. They demonstrate that Students of Color enact different types of resistances in negotiating their school environments. They believe that to ultimately transform the social conditions of Students of Color they must expose the systemic problem of racism in order to move towards its eradication.

Foucault views power, resistance, and self-formation as interconnecting constructs. Foucault posits that individuals fashion a 'self' in relation to the strategies of power working to discipline them as a certain kind of subject. Individuals can resist by fashioning a 'self' that either affirms, accepts, and/or rejects these subjectivities. They do so through the four actions of determining what work they need to do on themselves,

adopting a moral code, and enacting practices that both adhere to their moral code and work towards a vision of their imagined 'self', in order to become the 'self' they aim to be. Here an individual negotiates how s/he is racialized among other subjectivities.

I now turn to a discussion of data to present CRT and Foucauldian analyses of Jeremy's practices within the constructs of power, resistance, self-formation, and race.

Analysis of Jeremy's Thoughts and Actions Through CRT and Foucauldian Frames

Power

On a societal level, Jeremy acknowledges that racism is prevalent in the U.S. and how African Americans are mistreated in U.S. culture. He emphasizes that his father is in prison, his single mother is raising him, and he has grown up with modest financial means. Yet he places these circumstances within a broader global context of human struggle. He states, "Lots of people are suffering in this world". Jeremy believes that the severity of injustices is a matter of perspective and this carries over into how he views racial targeting in the school context.

Washington students in the study report that a "them"/"us" racial, cultural, and class divide between Washington and Central is perpetuated in various ways such as the luxury cars Central students drive to school, cultural clashes they have encountered with Central peers, teachers, and administrators, and enforcement of the school dress code that they feel more often targets Black students. Jeremy has a different take on the "them"/"us" divide.

He explains that while he is aware that his Washington peers feel Central's administration targets them because they are Black, it is not necessarily always the case.

He states:

> "Because I'm involved in school, I'm in the main office all the time and white students are in there getting in trouble. It's not just Black students who are in there."

Jeremy furthers that his peers need to recognize that not everything they experience at Central is an attack on their race. He attributes encounters with race in school to individual school members' actions, not to larger structures or institutional racism. He says that Central school administrators are working to help Washington students. Jeremy believes in keeping a positive attitude and giving people "the benefit of the doubt".

From a CRT perspective Jeremy's denial of systemic racism may be the result of understanding racism in its past manifestations and not its present manifestations. Here Jeremy seems to view racism in its extreme forms of slavery and Jim Crow Laws and not recognize its new subtler microaggressions. While his peers identify feeling targeted by administrators because they are Black, he seems to view this microaggression "at a high level of abstraction…to transcend the bias of particularity" (Peller, 1995, p. 130). In other words, Jeremy finds that Washington students are subject to the same treatment as Central students.

From a Foucauldian perspective, Jeremy is likely refusing to accept that Washington students are being racialized at Central because he wishes to be considered a Central student. By fashioning a 'self' that is not based on skin color, Jeremy is assimilating, maintaining the status quo. Data from the interviews supports the inference that Jeremy's action may be the result of pressure to lead his peers. Jeremy explains that prior to the school transition, he was sought out by administrators from both schools

districts to lead his peers and encourage them that the school-change scenario would be beneficial. The following excerpt is an example of how he was first appointed a leader by the Washington Superintendent:

> "When we initially found out that the high school was closing we were hurt and we had said things like, "We're not gonna ever forget Washington. If we go there it's not gonna be good."…Then one day, the Superintendent sat me down and she told me basically, 'You are a leader. Whatever you say affects your entire class—this entire school because honestly they look at you and they see what you are gonna respond and say first.'…I didn't know that they initially looked up to me as a leader. I always thought so but it didn't really, really hit me until she spoke those words to me."

In this statement, Jeremy provides background as to how he was positioned as a 'leader of his peers'. Jeremy furthers that this leadership role has followed him to Central where Central administrators expect him to set the example. With this leadership role, there are benefits, such as being spotlighted as an exceptional student but also costs, such as the pressures of being held to a different standard than one's peers and being assigned the responsibility of minimizing problems. These benefits and pressures point to why Jeremy thinks and acts in particular ways as discussed below.

Resistance

Jeremy tells the story of his first day at Central where one of the teachers in his classes assumed that he would not be a conscientious student. He explains that as she was reviewing her expectations of students, she targeted him as someone who would not follow her rules:

> "She was explaining her rules and she looked at me in a negative light. I talked to her afterwards. You just have to let the person know it, 'look I don't like the way you're singling me out'. Yes, I may be Black but that doesn't mean I have 'stupid' written across my forehead. I had the highest test scores all year."

In this statement, Jeremy acknowledges that one of his teachers held low expectations of him but he chose to stand up for himself by talking to her after class. Jeremy explains that he views these kinds of incidents as individual acts rather than part of a systemic problem. He says that once he confronted the teacher, the issue was resolved:

> "I had to say something or that person would have power over me. My Mom didn't raise me that way. You never settle for less. I just had to speak, calmly and collectively and let the teacher know she was passive aggressive to me, to tell her, "help me help you make this comfortable."

In Jeremy's view, people act freely and individuals have choices that are not constrained by structural barriers. He makes a distinction between being positive or negative in difficult situations:

> "Initially I get fired up or anxious but people experience different things, outcomes, and opinions, and some of them are passionate. You just have to be positive. If someone lived their whole life here [in Washington] and they're told the school is going to be moved, their gonna be upset. But positiveness is better than negativeness."

The anxiety Jeremy expresses in this statement stems from knowing that his opinions are not the majority among his Washington peers. He says he insists on staying positive because it is better than the alternative. I asked him to elaborate on how he defines "positive" and "negative". For Jeremy, being "positive" means trying to find a way to understand the opposition and being proactive. "Negative" he explains is "being selfish" and "thinking you're solely correct" without being open to discussion or having a willingness to find resolutions. He emphasized that "you always have a choice". He states:

> "The positive thing is to say something or the negative thing is to go to blows. You always have a choice. We're highschoolers. You handle things like an adult regardless of your skin color or class."

According to Jeremy, Washington students have choices as to how to handle themselves at Central.

From a CRT perspective, Jeremy is enacting a form of "conformist resistance" (Solorzano & Delgado Benal, 2001, p. 318). Here, Jeremy is motivated to speak up for social justice but does so within the system, thus conforming to it. He does not critique the ways Central racializes Washington students but instead enacts resistances on an individual level. This gives reason as to why he believes that students can "handle" the injustices they encounter and why after confronting his teacher for making assumptions about him, he felt the situation was resolved.

Through a Foucauldian lens, Jeremy's resistance is not determined by power, but in relation to power, or how he forms a 'self' "by being able to respond within power relations" (Butin, 2001, p. 169). Here Jeremy subscribes to an enterprise of choice. His individual resistance strategies within the school context are not, in his view, responses to institutional racism, but are part and parcel with individual human interactions that may or may not present racial misunderstandings.

When he tells his teacher, "I may be Black but that doesn't mean I have 'stupid' written across my forehead", he is resisting being singled out for how his teacher perceives his 'Blackness' as 'less than'. Yet this also plays into how Jeremy internalizes this deficiency model of 'Blackness'. Jeremy seems to be fashioning a 'self' that resists his teacher's perceptions, but speaks to his own internalization that Black implies 'stupid'.

While Jeremy resists being singled out for his 'Blackness", he does want to be spotlighted as a leader and for his achievements such as earning second in his class, being

the school's drum major, and having success in sports. In other words, from a Foucauldian perspective, part of Jeremy's 'self' is a desire to be singled out: he wants control over the characteristics that he wishes to be associated with his 'self' and those that he does not.

Self-Formation

Jeremy states: "I'm a student at the end of the day. The City of Washington doesn't define me" claiming that he is just like any other Central High School student. He declares that "we are all Central" and insists that he and his peers "break out from our shells". He tells of continually reminding his peers: "don't let anyone else define you", a declaration that Central is now their school too and to claim full membership. To gain a sense of how Jeremy positions himself in his school, I asked what his connection might be to the Black Lives Matter movement, a youth led activist movement campaigning to end violence on Black people. He states:

> "Yes, Black people are mistreated. Sometimes we have to be aware that it's not always that. Yes, there are people who want to hurt Black people like the KKK but it's not just Black lives, it's all lives. We've gotten over that hump in Civil Rights…Yes, it's important to fight for an ongoing movement for Black lives and Civil Rights. In my household you care about everyone who gets mistreated. It's a caring thing. It's not one group of people getting mistreated. There are so many people in this world that suffer. Police brutality is pretty rough but think about the bombings of people."

Jeremy sees himself as part of a larger human race that transcends social categories. He notes that he has a "caring" for all people instead of a focus on one race of people. Jeremy explains that this "global love for all people" is taught in the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) church that he attends and is practiced in his household. Jeremy

elaborates that God doesn't discriminate or "care about a specific race of people" stating "as children of God, all lives matter".

He mentions that his church has discussed the Black Lives Matter movement at length. During these discussions, he says the biblical story of Rahab is recited as a reminder to be inclusive of all people. Jeremy explains that Rahab is a prostitute who is judged by others for being unclean. One day when she is fetching water from a well, Jesus appears. Rahab is shocked as most people keep their distance from her. Jesus states that he is not judging her but saving her by offering her the chance to repent. Jeremy explains that while others judged Rahab, Jesus did not exclude. As a result, Rahab testifies of Jesus' teachings and becomes a prominent figure. It is Jesus' way of refraining from judgment and valuing all lives that Jeremy says is practiced in his church. Jeremy's interpretation of the Black Lives Matter movement is that it can further divide people rather than unify all people to be one race in an ongoing struggle against the devil's work. He notes, "The devil is busy so we must all be mindful and help each other."

From a CRT perspective, Jeremy is knowingly and/or unknowingly practicing historical indifference. By linking Black people to all people, he is subscribing to a liberal ideal of universalism that promotes the notion that all people are the same. Yet this ideal erases the years of slavery, struggle, and the continual mistreatment of Black people in the U.S. From a CRT perspective, Jeremy's statement, "We've gotten over that hump in Civil Rights" indicates that he is supporting the post-racial myth that racism is a thing of the past, attributed mainly to slavery, and was mostly resolved by the Civil Rights Movement.

From a Foucauldian perspective, Jeremy is enacting strategies to form a "self" in relation to the various ways the school curriculum attempts to discipline (e.g., classify, order, mark, monitor, etc.) him as a subject. He adopts what he interprets as his church's teachings as his *mode of subjection*, or the particular rules by which he abides. Thus his interpretations of his church's teachings, in this case, a "global love for all people" influences his *forms of elaboration* or practices. Here he enacts practices to transcend racial differentiations in order to achieve his *telos* or goal of having a "global love for all people".

Jeremy's appointment as a leader by administrators also factors into how he forms a 'self' at Central. Here he is positioned to set the example for his Washington peers, to encourage them to take full advantage of the opportunities at Central, and to unify both Washington and Central student populations.

Race

When I asked Jeremy to talk about how Central peers perceive him in terms of race he states:

> "Yes, I'm Black but you can't point out characteristics and make generalizations. I'm Black because of my skin tone. That's just the way God painted me to be."

When I probed further to get a sense of how he views his 'Blackness' he tells of being questioned by members of his Black community who have criticized him for "acting white". He explains that some of the parents of his Black peers have claimed that because he carries himself in an "educated" way and he has found academic success, he is more apt to assimilate to a white school environment. Jeremy had this to say in response:

> "Oh, I'm Black. Ignorance does not define Black. I don't like that. My people are my people. I speak slang in my house and I can still speak with slang and be educated."

Jeremy goes on to challenge the idea that while he may seem a certain way in a school space, this does not mean that he is not connected to his 'Blackness'. He explains that he attributes his drive to be academically successful to the parenting he has received, and as such, not a rejection of his 'Blackness'. He says of his mother who raised him, "When someone tells you every day that you can succeed, you believe it." For Jeremy, academic success is a choice that is nurtured in the home. When I asked Jeremy to relate this to his experiences at Central High School, he explained that he and his peers were able to bring "cultural diffusion" to an otherwise white, middle-class school:

> "It is a two-way street culturally. We were able to educate them on a social class aspect. Central is pretty much middle-class and then they're introduced to people that aren't the wealthiest. We showed each other that peoples' value is not based on economic value. It's individual. They were in a bubble. They're loving people once we broke the bubble."

Jeremy makes clear that both the Washington and Central student populations have gained from being in the same school. They have learned from each other that social class does not determine a person's value. He explains that until Washington students began attending Central High, Central students were in a "bubble" or operating in a homogenous place where people are generally of the same background and share the same values. Jeremy further states that he and his peers have brought "the spirit of Washington over to Central" meaning that they have introduced new values of what it means to be a teenager making her/his way in high school. Here he says Washington students share the same concerns about making friends and being successful. Jeremy also notes that Washington students have been able to dispel racial stereotypes such as "the

Black guy known as athletic, not intelligent". This is something Jeremy finds particularly important because of encountered others' assumptions that he might not be as intelligent as his Central peers.

From a CRT perspective, Jeremy is operating on a level of 'integrationist thinking' (Peller, 1995). Here he subscribes to the idea of "treating people as individuals free from racial identification" (Peller, 1995, p. 129). This kind of neutrality is Jeremy's attempt to transcend race consciousness but in doing so, denies the oppressive conditions he and his peers face on both the "macro-structural" level of society and the "micro-individual/local" level of their schooling at Central (Brown & Brown, 2015, p. 106). Jeremy also seems to hold deficit notions of his community where white supremacy is informing him about what it means to act 'white' or act 'Black'. Core to these meaning constructions is the notion of intelligence. Referred to in CRT literature as a counter-discourse of Black student achievement: *oppositional culture theory* (an offshoot of Signithia Fordham & John Ogbu's (1986) "cultural-ecological theory") suggests that some African American students are resistant to mainstream education because it privileges the dominant culture, thus serving as a threat to their cultural identity (Brown & Brown, 2012). Jeremy defends himself against parents in his Washington community who claim that he is acting 'white' but makes sense of his behavior within the same deficit model of intelligence that he is trying to disrupt. From a CRT perspective, this is another instance of the subtle and pervasive ways white supremacy operates.

From a Foucauldian perspective, Jeremy is fashioning a 'self' that connects to a broader notion of 'humanness' as part of his 'Blackness'. Jeremy seems to resist notions that he is different from his Central peers and adopts a vision of 'humanness' akin to

liberal ideals of universalism. A Foucauldian analysis questions what taking up this position affords Jeremy in a majority-white school context and asks to what degree this positioning is imposed upon him since he is appointed 'leader of his peers' by administrators.

Discussion

In this final section, I discuss what is revealed through the presentation of both CRT and Foucauldian analytical stances, what new openings appear when using a Foucauldian analysis, and the possible limitations of each frame.

A CRT analysis frames Jeremy's practices as "conformist resistance" where he wishes to promote social justice but does not hold a critique of the ways Central is racializing Central students. Jeremy is subscribing to the myth of a post-racial society and operating on a level of "integrationist thinking" that aims to transcend essentialisms of race and promote universalism (Peller, 1995, 131). By doing so, he is attempting to minimize his 'Blackness'—a move that is brought on by and maintained by white supremacy. Here a CRT reading of Jeremy's practices arrives at 'self-formation' through its predominant lens of 'race'.

A Foucauldian analysis, based upon Foucault's philosophy on *care of the self*, frames Jeremy's practice as part of his formation of a 'self' in relation to how he is being racialized in a majority-white school environment. His self-fashioning involves adopting a vision of 'humanness' akin to liberal ideals of universalism. By doing so, Jeremy is struggling with notions of his 'Blackness' not just in relation to the systemic and institutional white supremacy in play but through all the local and micro strategies of power that work to discipline him as a 'racialized' subject, such as his appointment of

‘leader of his peers’ by administrators. Here a Foucauldian reading of Jeremy’s practices arrives at ‘race’ through its predominant lens of ‘self-formation’.

While Foucault makes race less central, he does not make it less powerful and this de-centering of race can be of value when considering Brown and Brown’s (2012) warning to be cognizant of the possible limitations of leading educational theories. These scholars argue that counter-discourses “unintentionally” have become fixed frameworks that “homogeniz[e]” the experiences of Black students in school. In essence, Brown and Brown argue racial discourses can be useful in theorizing about African American student experiences, but they also dangerously perpetuate the notion of a totalizing, universal experience of African American students in school.

Brown & Brown (2012) echo Michael Omi and Howard Winant’s (2005) assertion that there is a danger to “treat[ing] race as a discrete variable” (p. 6). In their racial formation theory, they point to the complexity of race and argue that race is a “sociohistorical construct that is deeply unstable and internally contradictory” (p. 6). In other words, there can be variations in individuals’ same social memberships where racial identity and racial meanings shift across members. For example, a student may identify as African American but experience her racial identity differently than her same-race peers. Moreover, there is a “processual and relational character of racial identity and racial meaning” where an individual’s racial identity does not stand apart from her other social identities (p. 6). Racial identity and racial meanings shift across members, and operate in relation to other social factions (e.g., class, age, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) to which participants may categorize themselves. Equally important is to consider

how individuals like Jeremy subscribe to a 'humanness' that may transcend these social categories.

Craig Calhoun (1995) makes a similar point. He notes that human beings do not "usually live in one social world at a time, but rather…inhabit multiple worlds simultaneously" (Calhoun, 1995, p. xix). There is a need to address "the full impact of the cultural diversity" of students' experiences and to consider how race operates in relation to other social factions (e.g., class, age, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) to which students may categorize themselves (p. xviii).

Scholars who use CRT have offered work that accounts for such intersectionality. I am thinking here of Kimberlé Crenshaw's (1991) work on the convergence of race and gender, Ann Ferguson's (2000) education study on race and masculinity, among other scholarship such as Mitsunori Misawa's (2007) work on sexual orientation and race. Yet the boundaries of these intersecting social categories are fixed from a Foucauldian perspective.

Foucault removes the notion of essentialisms altogether and presents a vision of omnipresent power relations. Here power seeps into every location, disciplining individuals but presenting at each moment, a particular range of possibilities from which individuals can choose to form a 'self'. Thus, race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and so forth, represent shifting locations in a network of power—social mechanisms in motion working in tandem to categorize individuals and distribute them in various social positions. In this study, a Foucauldian analysis-critique, opened up the data to reveal that Jeremy's response to the "them"/"us" racial, cultural, and class divide at Central, is part

of his formation of a 'self'. Here he is enacting practices in response to not only the ways he is racialized, but also all the ways he is being disciplined as a 'leader of his peers'.

Yet, as with the application of any frame, using a Foucauldian frame has possible limitations. Scholars such as Ann Laura Stoler (1996) among others argue that Foucault speaks from a Eurocentric lens. Given Foucault's specific European vantage point, using a Foucauldian frame to study U.S. race relations carries the risk of producing a 'race-light' analysis to a race-based study in the context of U.S. culture where "race is an impermeable part of our identities" (Omi & Winant, 2005, p. 5). However, as this article shows, if applied with attention to "care of the 'racialized' self", a Foucauldian approach can serve as a key analytical strategy to talk about race through a lens of 'self-formation'. While in a Foucauldian analysis, race may be one strategy in the various machinations of power at work, as well as one of the many possible contingencies in forming a 'self', race is no less a powerful presence as Jeremy's practices in a majority-white school demonstrates.

References

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2014). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (4th ed.). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brown, A. L., & Brown, K. D. (2015). The more things change, the more they stay the same: Excavating race and the enduring racisms of U.S. curriculum. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(14), 103-130.

Brown, K. D., & Brown, A. L. (2015). Useful and dangerous discourse: Deconstructing racialized knowledge about African-American students. *Educational Foundations*, *26*(1-2), 11-26.

Butin, D. W. (2001). If this is resistance I would hate to see domination: Retrieving Foucault's notion of resistance within educational research. *Educational Studies*, *32*(2), 157-176.

Calhoun, C. (1995). *Critical social theory: Culture, history, and the challenge of difference*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Carter, D. J. (2007). Why the Black kids sits together at the stairs: The role of identity-affirming counter-spaces in a predominantly White high school. *Journal of Negro Education*, *76*(4), 542-554.

Carter, D. J. (2008). Achievement as resistance: The development of a critical race achievement ideology among Black achievers. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(3), 466-497.

Carter, P. L. (2009). Equity and empathy toward racial and educational achievement in the Obama Era. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(2), 287-297.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and the violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241-1299.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2012). Critical race theory: An introduction (2nd ed.). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Dixson, A. D. & Rousseau, C. K. (2006). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. In A. D. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 31-54). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ferguson, A. A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of Black masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of 'acting White'. *The Urban Review*, *18*(3), 176-206.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality volume 1: An introduction*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1997b). The birth of biopolitics. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 73-85). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1997c). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 281-301). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1997d). Sex, power, and the politics of identity. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 163-173). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2000). The subject and power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984* (pp. 326-348). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, and population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: Palgrave.

Gordon, B. M. (2012). "Give a brotha a break!": The experiences and dilemmas of middle-class African American male students in White suburban schools. *Teachers College Record*, *114*, 1-26.

Harper, S. R., & Davis III, C. H. F. (2012). They (don't) care about education: A counternarrative on Black Male students' responses to inequitable schooling. *Educational Foundations*, *26*(1-2), 103-120.

Harris, C. I. (1995). Whiteness as property. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*, (pp. 276-291). New York, NY: The New Press.

Heariold-Kinney, P. (2009). *Black students' voices: Experiences and perspectives around attending an affluent majority White suburban high school*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3379004)

Hennig, B. B. (2010). Learning language as practice of self-formation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *7*(4), 306-321.

Howard, T. C. (2010). *Why race and culture matter in schools: Closing the achievement gap in America's classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Huckaby, M. F. (2007). A conversation on practices of the self within relations of power: for scholars who speak dangerous truths. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*(5), 513-529.

Jardine, G. M. (2010). *Foucault and education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Jackson, D. A. O. (2011). *Perceptions of school: Black males in a suburban high school.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 876182807)

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*, *60*(2), 133-146.

Kunjufu, J. (1995). *Countering the conspiracy to destroy Black boys*. Chicago, IL: African American Images.

Kunjufu, J. (2012). *There is nothing wrong with Black students*. Chicago, IL: African American Images.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement for US schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12.

Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. F., IV. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), 47-68.

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

Linville, D. & Carlson, D. L. (2010). Fashioning sexual selves: Examining the care of the self in urban adolescent sexuality and gender discourses. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 7*, 247-261.

Mahrouse, G. (2005). The construction of 'minority teacher' subjects: a Foucauldian exploration. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 13*(1), 27-42.

Misawa, M. (2007). Political aspects of the intersection of sexual orientation and race in higher education in the United States: A queer scholar of color's perspective. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 4*(2), 78-83.

Niesche, R. & Haase, M. (2010). Emotions and ethics: A Foucauldian framework for becoming an ethical educator. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *44*(3), 276-288.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2005). The theoretical status of the concept of race. In C. McCarthy, W. Crichlow, G. Dimitriadis, & N. Dolby (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (2nd ed.), (pp. 3-12). New York, NY: Routledge.

Peller, G. (1995). Race-consciousness. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*, (pp. 127-158). New York, NY: The New Press.

Pierce, C. (1974). Psychiatric problems of the Black minority. In S. Arieti (Ed.), *American Handbook of Psychiatry* (pp. 512-523). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Price, L. J. (2011). *Expectations and experiences of Black students at two predominantly White high schools in Southern Appalachia*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3493346)

Sleeter, C. E. (1993). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (pp. 157-171). New York, NY: Routledge.

Solorzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, *69*(1-2), 60-73.

Solorzano, D. & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education, 36*(3), 308-342.

Stoler, A. L. (1996). *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2009). Different folks, different hopes: The educational aspirations of Black males in urban, suburban, and rural high schools. *Urban Education, 44*(6), 710-731.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *'Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Taylor, K. W. (2007). *Exploring academic achievement among African American students in a predominately White suburban high school*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3258443)

Zamudio, M. M., Russell, C., Rios, F. A., & Bridgeman, J. L. (2011). *Critical race theory matters: Education and ideology*. New York, NY: Routledge.

CHAPTER 5

Reflection

Each of the three chapter articles concerns how six African American students, who were made to move from a predominantly Black high school to a majority-white high school, are forming a 'self' in their new school. I have organized the chapters in the order in which they were written. I hope for the reader to notice how I develop my thinking from one article to the next —how I expand on ideas, make modifications and clarifications, and find new developments. Some of the articles are more theoretical focusing on constructs such as *ethical formation of a 'self'* or *irreal fabricated spaces* to develop ideas, but all of the articles are theoretical. Some of the articles are more empirical in quality, grounded in the study of lived experiences, but all of the articles are empirical.

Each article stands as a sole document with its own specific discussions. In the first article (Chapter 2), I present a sketch of how I use Foucault's four-part framework on the ethical formation of a 'self' to analyze how two high-achieving African American student-participants are fashioning a 'self' in relation to how they are being racialized at a majority-white school. The analysis reveals that the students are fashioning a 'self' in different ways. One student is fashioning a 'self' that prefers not to be marked by 'race'. He is knowingly being placed in the position of having to rally his community of peers and accepts this positioning, but seems to unknowingly be disciplined to downplay race issues and minimize his race-consciousness. In contrast, the other student is fashioning a 'self' that holds some critique of systemic racism (e.g., stereotyping) where he turns the

adversity he faces into motivation to highly achieve. Through this work, I urge scholars to (re)consider the substantiality of Foucault's work in race-based studies.

In the second article (Chapter 3), I illustrate the ways in which African American students are fashioning multiple 'selves' as they fabricate irreal spaces within the school in order to resist the "them"/"us" divide that manifests in a majority-white school's curriculum spaces. In this scenario, students are fashioning a 'self' in relation to the ways the curriculum attempts to discipline them as racialized subjects or condition them to be a certain kind of 'self'. I refer to this relation as the *curriculum of self-formation*.

In the third article (Chapter 4), I conduct Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Foucauldian analyses of how one student-participant is negotiating a 'self' at Central. I argue that a CRT reading of his practices arrives at 'self-formation' through its predominant lens of 'race' and a Foucauldian reading of his practices arrives at 'race' through its predominant lens of 'self-formation'. I discuss what is revealed through the presentation of both CRT and Foucauldian analyses, what new openings appear when using a Foucauldian analysis, and the possible limitations of each frame.

All of the articles are in conversation with each other and build an image of the school-lives of African American students who are now in the position of having to navigate the curriculum of a majority-white school after the closure of their predominantly Black hometown high school. Across the articles, findings indicate that African American student-participants are contending with what they describe as a "them/"us" racial, cultural, and class divide that is operationalized through various curricular spaces and they negotiate the divide in individual ways.

I use a Foucauldian lens to conceptualize this arrangement as an agonistic relation. In this light, the curriculum is not being "done" to students. Rather, students are in relation to it. They are engaged in a struggle to negotiate both how they are perceived and categorized as 'racialized' bodies through the curriculum, and, their own perceptions of these racializations. In this struggle, students enact self-practices to make maneuvers within curriculum spaces. A student can accept how the curriculum attempts to constitute her/him as a subject, resist this subjectification, or perform any combination of both accepting and resisting. In this way, a curriculum, with its distinctive and potentially polarizing boundaries, becomes a negotiated and contested space. And, because this curricular space is internally contradictory, a student, in relation to it, may practice versions of a 'self' (multiple 'selves') that are contradictory.

In this study, African American students are negotiating a multitude of social relations as they move through different curricular spaces. In this complex process of self-making, African American students are (knowingly or unknowingly) producing a *curriculum of self-formation* that teaches others how they want to be perceived.

While this study looked at how the curriculum of self-formation occurs in school, the curriculum of self-formation is happening everywhere in our social functioning. Individuals are continually negotiating, shifting, and maneuvering in various social situations (as mundane as shopping at the grocery store). Individuals form a 'self' in relation to others and in relation to the ways they are labeled, classified, and marked by social forces. In other words, the 'self" is a struggle as it is always in relation to the powers that be.

What I find most significant in this study is that African American students, who have been forced into a school-change scenario where they are now attending a majority-white school, are practicing their own ways of negotiating a difficult situation. Each student is demonstrating resilience, making her/his own way, in the face of obstacles. In their new school situation, students are having to negotiate their racial positioning that presents challenges such as 'outsider' status. In many ways, I found my role to be that of a confidante where students could open up to me and talk out loud about some of their struggles. What I learned is that students wanted and needed to talk. They never missed their interview appointments and in almost every case, the interviews ran well over the one-hour time scheduled because students wanted to continue. While my study did not set out to find prescriptions for the school, I do notice that the fact that students needed to talk, along with some of the data, points to the need for adult allies from the student-participants' community to have a presence within the school and/or perhaps serve in the capacity of transition coordinators.

Contending with Struggles and Tensions

A dissertation marks the culminating document of a host of intellectual exercises that comprise a degree seeker's graduate school journey. Upon producing this dissertation, I feel that this is only the beginning and a springboard for future work. My dissertation chair and advisor lifted a heavy weight off my shoulders when he advised that I should look at the dissertation as "chapter one", that I will have more to say on the matter as I continue my work in my academic career. With this dissertation, I present "chapter one". There were definite struggles and tensions along the way, some resolved, some unresolved, and I take this moment to share some of these with you.

Document Organization and Structure

While organizing the dissertation in the form of three journal articles made the write-up of a large collection of data (twenty-four interviews, two-months worth of classroom observations, and data gathered form shadowing students) seem doable, it was no less difficult. In reviewing all the data, it was a challenge to decide what to include, what to spotlight, and what to leave on the cutting room floor. This is not to say that in producing a traditional dissertation this kind of process is not involved, yet there is a significant difference. With the article approach, I was limited in space, as I could not exceed the particular word counts that each publication requires. In writing a traditional dissertation, there exists the luxury of space to be relatively exhaustive in presenting ideas and defending arguments. In contrast, the dissertation structure of three journal articles requires the presentation of ideas and arguments to be succinct. In my case, I had to make my points relatively quickly and in a concise fashion. However, this proved to be a worthy exercise, as it resembles the practice of writing for publications that I will engage in as a scholar.

Building Relationships with Student-Participants and Their Teachers

In the first year of the transition, a reporter from a local news magazine interviewed various students and teachers about how the transition was going. What resulted was a controversial report that painted Washington students as poor students saved by the auspices of Central. When I entered the scene in the second year of the transition, the news article remained a fresh topic on students' and teachers' minds and many were reluctant to participate in my study.

A significant factor to my being able to recruit Washington student-participants is that I am a Washington community member. Some of the student-participants knew of me, had met me at one time, or knew someone who could vouch for me. This lent me affordances to be able to find a contingent of students willing to open up to me and share about their lives. I received a tremendous amount of support from the Washington community in selecting students for the study, securing locations for interviews, and other logistics. It was my connection with some Washington community members that allowed me to meet with the Superintendant of Central Schools who granted me access to Central High School.

It was difficult to build relationships with some of the Central teachers. Some feared that I would be collecting "anecdotes" from Washington students that might incriminate them as "bad" teachers with no way to tell their side of the story. As much as I tried to reassure teachers that the study was a focus on students, some teachers chose to opt out, limiting my access to some of the classes. I found this roadblock to be part of a larger story of the climate at Central—a tension between the majority-white school and an influx of African American students transferring from another community. It was out of the scope of my study to research this phenomenon but I did find it to be a contributing factor to the "them"/"us" divide, fueling fears and tensions that surround it.

Method and Analysis

Taking up a Foucauldian trajectory in a race-based study instead of the more common frameworks of Critical Race Theory and Critical Pedagogy is an unconventional move. I cannot say that I was "comfortable" in this move and I do not at all romanticize this endeavor. As a nascent scholar, there were definite moments of panic, that in using a

Foucauldian frame, I would fail to see something that another method can afford. Yet this is just the point—a lesson from "qualitative inquiry 1.0": different analytical strategies "make the world visible in different ways" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 4). Therefore, my aim with this work is to add to the conversation on African American students' curriculum experiences in a majority-white school though a Foucauldian study on the care of the 'racialized' self. Through this alternate lens, I show students' struggle in a forced school-change situation and students' resilience through their self-practices.

References

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

REFERENCES

Ahluwalia, P. (2010). Post-structuralism's colonial roots: Michel Foucault. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 16(5), 597-606.

Atkinson, R. (1998). *The life story interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baker, B. M., & Heyning, K. E., (2004). *Dangerous coagulations?: The uses of Foucault in the study of education.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Ball, S. J. (Ed.) (1990). *Foucault and education: Discipline and knowledge*. London, England: Routledge.

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2014). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (4th ed.). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brass, J. (2010). The sweet tyranny of creating one's own life: Rethinking power and freedom in English teaching. *Educational Theory*, *60*(6), 703-717.

Brown, A. L., & Brown, K. D. (2015). The more things change, the more they stay the same: Excavating race and the enduring racisms of U.S. curriculum. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(14), 103-130.

Brown, K. D., & Brown, A. L. (2015). Useful and dangerous discourse: Deconstructing racialized knowledge about African-American students. *Educational Foundations*, *26*(1-2), 11-26.

Butin, D. W. (2001). If this is resistance I would hate to see domination: Retrieving Foucault's notion of resistance within educational research. *Educational Studies*, *32*(2), 157-176.

Calhoun, C. (1995). *Critical social theory: Culture, history, and the challenge of difference*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Carter, D. J. (2007). Why the Black kids sits together at the stairs: The role of identity-affirming counter-spaces in a predominantly White high school. *Journal of Negro Education*, *76*(4), 542-554.

Carter, D. J. (2008). Achievement as resistance: The development of a critical race achievement ideology among Black achievers. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(3), 466-497.

Carter, P. L. (2005). *Keepin' it real: School success beyond black and white*. New York, NY: Oxford.

Carter, P. L. (2009). Equity and empathy toward racial and educational achievement in the Obama era. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(2), 287-297.

Carter Andrews, D. J. (2012). Black achievers' experiences with racial spotlighting and ignoring in a predominantly white high school. *Teachers College Record 114*(10), 1-46.

Childers, S. M. (2014). Promiscuous analysis in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 819-826.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and the violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241-1299.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2012). Critical race theory: An introduction (2nd ed.). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dixson, A. D. & Rousseau, C. K. (2006). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. In A. D. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.) *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 31-54). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dussel, I. (2010). Foucault and education. In M.W. Apple, S. J. Ball, L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 27-36). London, England: Routledge.

Ferguson, A. A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of Black masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of 'acting White'. *The Urban Review*, *18*(3), 176-206.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality volume 1: An introduction*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality volume 2: The use of pleasure*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1986). *The history of sexuality volume 3: The care of the self*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1997a). Technologies of the self. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 223-251). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1997b). The birth of biopolitics. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 73-85). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1997c). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 281-301). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1997d). Sex, power, and the politics of identity. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: subjectivity and truth: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1* (pp. 163-173). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2000). The subject and power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power: The essential works of Foucault 1954-1984* (pp. 326-348). New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2003a). *Abnormal: Lectures at the College de France 1974-1975*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2003b). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975-1976*. (D. Macey, Trans.). New York, NY: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2005). *The hermeneutics of the subject: Lectures at the Collège de France 1981-82.* (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, and population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: Palgrave.

Giroux, H. A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmakng*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Gordon, B. M. (2012). “Give a brotha a break!”: The experiences and dilemmas of middle-class African American male students in White suburban schools. *Teachers College Record*, *114*, 1-26.

Harper, S. R., & Davis III, C. H. F. (2012). They (don't) care about education: A counternarrative on Black Male students' responses to inequitable schooling. *Educational Foundations*, *26*(1-2), 103-120.

Harris, C. I. (1995). Whiteness as property. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*, (pp. 276-291). New York, NY: The New Press.

Heariold-Kinney, P. (2009). *Black students' voices: Experiences and perspectives around attending an affluent majority White suburban high school*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3379004)

Hennig, B. B. (2010). Learning language as practice of self-formation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *7*(4), 306-321.

Hillier, H. C. & Hillier, C. E. (2012). Foucault and education: Power, pedagogy, and panopticon. *Didaskalia, 23*, 49-67.

Hindess, B. (2010). Liberalism: rationality of government and vision of history. *Social Identities 16*(5), 669-673.

Howard, T. C. (2010). *Why race and culture matter in schools: Closing the achievement gap in America's classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY Routledge.

Huckaby, M. F. (2007). A conversation on practices of the self within relations of power: for scholars who speak dangerous truths. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*(5), 513-529.

Infinito, J. (2003). Ethical self-formation: A look at the later Foucault. *Educational Theory, 53*(2), 155-171.

Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. London, UK: Routledge.

Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2013). Plugging one text into another: Thinking with theory in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 19*(4), 261-271.

Jardine, G. M. (2010). *Foucault and education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*, *60*(2), 133-146.

Kunjufu, J. (1995). *Countering the conspiracy to destroy Black boys*. Chicago, IL: African American Images.

Kunjufu, J. (2012). *There is nothing wrong with Black students*. Chicago, IL: African American Images.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement for US schools. *Educational Researcher*, *35*(7), 3-12.

Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. F., IV. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), 47-68.

Leask, I. (2012). Beyond subjection: Notes on the later Foucault and education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44*(S1), 58-73.

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

Linville, D. & Carlson, D. L. (2010). Fashioning sexual selves: Examining the care of the self in urban adolescent sexuality and gender discourses. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 7*, 247-261.

Macey, D. (2009). Rethinking biopolitics, race and power in the wake of Foucault. *Theory, Culture and Society, 26*(6), 186-205.

Mahrouse, G. (2005). The construction of 'minority teacher' subjects: a Foucauldian exploration. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 13*(1), 27-42.

Mayo, C. (2000). The uses of Foucault. *Educational Theory*, *50*(1), pp. 103-116.

Miller, J. (2000). *The passion of Michel Foucault*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Misawa, M. (2007). Political aspects of the intersection of sexual orientation and race in higher education in the United States: A queer scholar of color's perspective. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 4*(2), 78-83.

Niesche, R. & Haase, M. (2010). Emotions and ethics: A Foucauldian framework for becoming an ethical educator. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *44*(3), 276-288.

Olssen, M. (2014). Framing and analysing educational research: A recent history of transactions from a Foucauldian perspective. In A. D. Reid, E. P. Hart, & M. A. Peters (Eds.), *A companion to research in education*, (pp. 215-228). New York, NY: Springer.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2005). The theoretical status of the concept of race. In C. McCarthy, W. Crichlow, G. Dimitriadis, & N. Dolby (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (2nd ed.), (pp. 3-12). New York, NY: Routledge.

Peller, G. (1995). Race-consciousness. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*, (pp. 127-158). New York, NY: The New Press.

Pierce, C. (1974). Psychiatric problems of the Black minority. In S. Arieti (Ed.), *American Handbook of Psychiatry* (pp. 512-523). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Pinar, W. F. (1993). Notes on understanding curriculum as a racial text. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (pp. 60-70). New York, NY: Routledge.

Popkewitz, T. S. & Brennan, M. (1998). *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Price, L. J. (2011). *Expectations and experiences of Black students at two predominantly White high schools in Southern Appalachia*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3493346)

Rasmussen, K. S. (2011). Foucault's genealogy of racism. *Theory, Culture and Society, 28(5)*, 34-51.

Rose, N. (2010). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Sleeter, C. E. (1993). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (pp. 157-171). New York, NY: Routledge.

Solorzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, *69*(1-2), 60-73.

Solorzano, D. & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education, 36*(3), 308-342.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

St. Pierre, E. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 715-719.

Stoler, A. L. (1996). *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2009). Different folks, different hopes: The educational aspirations of Black males in urban, suburban, and rural high schools. *Urban Education, 44*(6), 710-731.

Tanke, J. (2005). Michel Foucault at the College de France, 1974-1976. *Philosophy and Social Criticism, 31*(5-6), pp. 687-696.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *'Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Taylor, C. (2011). Race and racism in Foucault's College de France lectures. *Philosophy Compass, 6*(11), 746-756.

Taylor, K. W. (2007). *Exploring academic achievement among African American students in a predominately White suburban high school*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3258443)

Wain, K. (1996). Foucault, education, the self, and modernity. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 30*(3), 345-360.

Watkins, M. (2010). Discipline, diversity and agency: Pedagogic practice and dispositions to learning. In Z. Millei, T. G. Griffiths, & R. J. Parkes (Eds.), *Re-theorizing discipline in education: Problems, politics, and possibilities* (pp. 59-75). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Wexler, P. (1992). *Becoming somebody: Toward a social psychology of school*. London, England: The Falmer Press.

Young, R. J. C. (1995). Foucault on race and colonialism. *New Formations, 25,* 57-65.

Zamudio, M. M., Russell, C., Rios, F. A., & Bridgeman, J. L. (2011). *Critical race theory matters: Education and ideology*. New York, NY: Routledge.

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND OF THE SCHOOLS

BACKGROUND OF THE SCHOOLS

Background of Washington High School and Its Closure

Washington High School is located in a small, diverse working-class city in the rural Midwestern United States (due to IRB requirements, pseudonyms are designated for all cities, schools, and districts). From the early 20th century up until the early 1980s, Washington served as a factory town. In the mid-1970s, factories began to close and the city experienced an out-migration. Presently, Washington is the most economically depressed city within its county.

Washington High School had a nearly 150-year history establishing itself as a historic institution. Surviving a long tenure, the school was not without its troubles. For more than a century, Washington High School's enrollment fluctuated with booms that led to expansion and busts due to hard economic times. Throughout its operation, the school would mirror the sociopolitical climate of the times including: a long period of segregation from 1910 through the early 1970s; desegregation, social unrest, and walkouts during the Civil Rights Era; and school violence leading to high administrative turnover during the 1970s and 1980s. The Schools of Choice movement in the mid-1990s would play a major role in sealing Washington High School's fate. Schools of Choice (part of No Child Left Behind) negatively impacted enrollment by allowing students to choose to attend schools outside of their city of residence.

From 2000 until 2013, Washington Public Schools suffered an exodus of an average of 104 students per year because parents of the students opted to send their children to schools outside of Washington with "better" performance records. By 2013, nearly half of the approximate 1400 school-aged children residing in Washington

attended schools in neighboring cities. Low enrollment led to a perpetual loss of state funding. In Washington High School's final 2012-2013 year of operation, the school had a majority African American population, housing 256 students in grades 7-12 combined. The last graduating senior class was comprised of 53 students. Enrollment projections beyond 2013 were bleak, reflecting a steady student decline. In its final year, the Washington Public School District had amassed a one million dollar deficit.

In addition to underenrollment and financial struggles, Washington High School was battling low academic achievement. From 2006 until its 2013 closure, Washington High School had not met "adequate yearly progress" as per No Child Left Behind (NCLB). It was identified by the state as a low-performing school and placed on the state's list of priority schools designated for restructure. Under the NCLB federal mandate, any school that has not made adequate yearly progress after four years must restructure, whether it relinquishes control over to the state or to a private organization, reopens as a charter school, or implements other turnaround strategies such as reconstitution (replacing school staff), consolidation (merging schools), conversion (dividing a school into smaller schools), and school closure. Given the pressure to restructure, the Washington Public Schools Board of Education searched for solutions.

Numerous school board meetings were devoted to discussing strategies. One proposal favored by a majority of the school board members, was to shift the district from a K-6 and 7-12 model to a K-8 model. This would entail closing down the high school and elementary schools. Under this model, the K-8 school would be Washington's sole school housed in the high school building. Students in grades 9-12 would have the option

of being bused to Central High School, a high-performing school in a neighboring district, or attend another high school of their choice.

Other proposals included working with the Washington High School's Alumni Organization to fundraise and collect donations for the school, cutting teacher pay, continuing to operate on a deficit, and recruiting students back into the district. Another strategy involved laying-off administrators and dispersing administrative duties to appointed teachers.

At almost a dozen school board meetings, parents, residents, school staff, and students debated the issue. Proponents of the closure model argued that the district would be able to redirect its resources and improve its services for a K-8 school while providing better opportunity for students in grades 9-12 at Central High School. Those opposed to the closure raised concerns about disruptions to students' academic performance and social connections as well as the issue of logistics in terms of school transportation and traveling distance. Others felt that with the loss of the city's industry and hospital, the closure of the high school would be yet another major setback affecting the city's population and business growth.

The most pressing concerns centered around race and class integration. Many Washington residents argued that closing Washington would be a direct assault on its African American community. Protestors held a rally that succeeded in delaying the school board's voting decision by one week. A final push to convince the board to postpone its decision for one year in order for organizers to launch a "Save our Schools" campaign was unsuccessful.

Residents in Central's District expressed mixed opinions about incoming Washington students. These ranged from full support of bringing diversity to the school, to concerns about the impact on social relations, competition for spots on sports teams, and school academic rankings.

At the time of the vote, the school closure model seemed favored by a majority of the seven-member Washington School Board. One board member opposed the proposal, and overcome with frustration quit moments before the impending vote. The remaining board members voted 5 to 1 for a K-8 remodel, closing Washington High School. After the vote, the school board officially reached out to Central High School to be a destination school for Washington students. Central accepted and a Washington-Central Cooperative was formed. As it currently stands, the contract is a one-year agreement that will renew annually unless one of the districts opts to terminate the partnership.

Background of Central High School and Comparison to Washington High School

Central High School is located in a majority-white middle-class neighborhood about 13 miles from Washington High School. According to a statewide public school top to bottom rankings list for the 2011-2012 school year, Central High School had a rank of 89, as compared to Washington High School's rank of 40. The results are based upon students' scores on state standardized exams, achievement gap data, and graduation rates. From these percentiles, Central High School was named a "Rewards School" (a school successfully making adequate yearly progress in the top 5% of the top to bottom ranking or in the top 5% of schools making achievement gains), while Washington High School was identified as a "Priority School" (a school failing to make adequate yearly progress and in the bottom 5% of the top to bottom ranking).

In contrast to Washington High School's 256 students in grades 7-12, Central High School houses over double the amount in grades 9-12, with a total of 750 students. The school's demographics for the 2012-2013 year reflected a student body that is 92% white and 8% minority as compared to Washington High School's student enrollment of 67% minority and 33% white. In the same year, 20% of Central High School's students were classified as economically disadvantaged as compared to 100% of Washington High School's students.

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDENTS

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDENTS

Six African American students (three females; three males) were participants in this study. All met the criteria that they: (1) have lived in Washington for most of their lives, (2) were students at Washington High School during its closure, and (3) are now attending Central High School.

Denise is a senior and mainly an "A" student with a couple of "B"s in her classes. She credits her mother for teaching her the importance of doing well in school so she can be successful later in life. At Washington High School, Denise was a cheerleader and would have preferred to continue at Central but chose not to try out because she "didn't know the people" on the team (Denise, personal communication, March 12, 2015). She is not involved in sports or clubs at Central but describes herself as happy with keeping her focus on academics. Over the past two summers, she has worked at the local library. After high school, she will be attending a local college where she was awarded a full tuition scholarship. She has always been interested in studying nursing but has lately been reconsidering this course of study. What she is sure of is that she wants to be successful so she will not have to struggle. She wants to be able to give back to her mother who she feels worked hard to provide for her and her family. She aims to move out of the Midwest to a warm place like Florida. She aspires to have "the biggest house ever and have a perfect family and have a lot of money" (Denise, personal communication, March 12, 2015).

Jeremy is a junior and is currently ranked second in his class at Central. He takes honors and Advanced Placement courses. He is one of two African Americans inducted into the Honor Society. He is a percussionist in the marching band and Central High's

drum major, the school's first ever African American drum major. He is captain of the cross-country running team and a member of the swim and track teams. During Homecoming, he was crowned "Junior King" alongside his girlfriend, a white Central student, who won "Junior Queen". At his church, he is the leader of the choir and the president of the youth group. After high school, Jeremy plans on earning a bachelors and a masters degree to become a high school music teacher and band director. His dream is to attend Julliard to study music and to become a professor there. His "ultimate dream" is "to be the conductor of the Philharmonic" (Jeremy, personal communication, March 9, 2015).

Omari is a junior and Jeremy's best friend since early childhood. Unlike Jeremy, Omari is having difficulty socially adjusting to Central. Omari does not often see Jeremy in school because he is tracked for mainstream classes. He describes feeling like an outcast. Aside from hanging out with his cousin and another Washington friend at Central, he says he keeps to himself. He is disappointed in some of his Washington friends who he feels have befriended Central students at the cost of not being their true selves. Academically, he finds it more challenging at Central but says he is averaging about an "A-", "B+", up from last year's "C". He is a member of the cross country and track teams and a top diver for Central's swimming and diving team. Omari's goal in life is to achieve the "American dream" (Omari, personal communication, March 12, 2015). For him, this means studying sports medicine and athletic training at a state university, to "graduate with a Master's in that field of study", and "have an actual career that's fun and have a family of my own hopefully" (Omari, personal communication, March 12, 2015).

Cole is a junior at Central with a 3.5 grade point average (GPA). He aims to elevate his GPA to a 3.7 to achieve high honor roll. Cole was awarded a "Most Improved in Social Studies" Award by his U.S. History teacher at Central's Academic Awards event. He is a member of Central's cross-country running and track and field teams. He is the second fastest runner on his track team and a ranking runner in the county finals for the one-mile. He aspires to become an athletic coach to "help somebody else reach their potential, reach their highest point" (Cole, personal communication, March 10, 2015). He is conflicted with his decision to attend Central oftentimes describing it as a struggle to get out of bed and attend school. This is partly because he feels he pushes himself to meet high standards whether in school or on the track but feels he is always just shy of reaching the summit and earning distinction. He describes holding high standards for himself and refusing to give up his goals because he has come a long way from his behavior in elementary school, which included "suspensions, getting kicked out of school for up to ten days, fighting, arguing, talking back with the teacher" (Cole, personal communication, March 10, 2015).

Malika is a senior who splits her school day between Central High School and a Career Training Center where she is in a specialty program studying Law Enforcement. In the morning, her best friend Joe picks her up and they drive from Washington to Central High. After her morning classes, she takes a bus from Central to the Career Center. She is an "A" student in majority of her classes and a cheerleader for Central. She plays French horn in the symphonic band and has acted in the school's theatrical productions. After high school, she will be attending a local college on a full-tuition scholarship and plans to study psychology. She also plans to continue her education in

criminal justice and law because she has “always wanted to work in law enforcement” (Malika, personal communication, March 10, 2015). She aspires to become a police officer and eventually a criminal profiler because she is interested in the psychological aspects of solving crimes.

Yasmin is a senior and describes having “senioritis” (Yasmin, personal communication, March 13, 2015). She calls herself “the lazy type” with some Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder that has caused her to act out in school in the past (Yasmin, personal communication, March 13, 2015). She is often pushing the clock, cutting it close to catch her bus to Central, or missing the bus completely. When the latter is the case, her Mom drops her off at school but she is often late to her first class. In school, Yasmin describes just trying to get by and graduate: “I’m gonna graduate...oh, well, I slacked off my ninth, and tenth, and eleventh grade. I mean like just passing, but I’ve never not passed the class” (Yasmin, personal communication, April 6, 2015). She was a member of the cheerleading team but the cheerleading seasons are over. Now after school, Yasmin works three to five hour shifts at McDonald’s and spends time at her boyfriend’s house. After graduation, she is eager to join the army. She must retake the army’s entrance exam because she was just short of passing it the last time. Her goal is to have a career in the army, travel, and make money to raise a family. Yasmin has seen her single mother work hard to make ends meet and she aims to make enough money one day so that she and her family won’t have to struggle. As a back-up career, she mentioned becoming a phlebotomist or getting involved in her passion, dance. “If I don’t go to the Army, I was gonna go get my phlebotomy certificate [at a college] and then transfer [to a

university] or something and do their dance major" (Yasmin, personal communication, March 13, 2015).

APPENDIX C

IRB APPROVAL

IRB APPROVAL

APPROVAL: EXPEDITED REVIEW

Donald Blumenfeld-Jones
Division of Educational Leadership and Innovation - Tempe
480/965-0999
dbj@asu.edu

Dear Donald Blumenfeld-Jones:

On 12/15/2014 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	African American Students' Curriculum Experiences at a Predominantly White Receiving School
Investigator:	Donald Blumenfeld-Jones
IRB ID:	STUDY00001987
Category of review:	(6) Voice, video, digital, or image recordings, (7)(b) Social science methods, (7)(a) Behavioral research
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Parental-Permission_Form.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Consent:AssentForm.docx, Category: Consent Form; • HRP-503a - TEMPLATE PROTOCOLSOCIAL BEHAVIORAL_q.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • InterviewQuestions.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions);

The IRB approved the protocol from 12/15/2014 to 12/14/2015 inclusive. Three weeks before 12/14/2015 you are to submit a completed Continuing Review and required attachments to request continuing approval or closure.

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

D1: LIFE HISTORY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is the ethnic or cultural background of your parents?
2. What was growing up in your house like?
3. What beliefs or ideals do you think your parents tried to teach you?
4. How would you describe religion in terms of importance to you and your family?
5. What is it like to grow up with or without siblings?
6. What was growing up in your neighborhood like?
7. What is different or unique about your community?
8. What would you say has been the most significant event in your life?
9. What clubs, organizations, athletics, and/or jobs do you participate in?
10. What is it like being a teenager? The best part? The worst part?
11. What pressures do you feel as a teenager and where do these come from?
12. How would you describe your identity?
13. What do you do for fun?
14. How is making friends easy or hard for you?
15. How would you describe the special people in your life?
16. What are your hopes and dreams for your future?

D2: SCHOOL-LIFE INTERVIEW #1 QUESTIONS

1. How would you describe the town where your new school is located?
2. What is your impression of the neighborhood there?
3. How does it compare to your hometown?
4. What is travel like to your new school?
5. What can you tell me about your new school?
6. How would you describe your interactions with your new peers, teachers, and administrators?
7. What are your goals for your education?
8. What kinds of school experiences do you want to have?
9. What, if any, kinds of sports, clubs, or organizations do you plan to join, or have joined?
10. What is best about your new school?
11. What is worst about your new school?
12. How do you compare your new school to your old school?
13. What, if anything, would you change about your new school-life if you had the power to do so?
14. What do you think people should know about your old school?
15. What do you think people should know about your overall experience at your new school?

D3: SCHOOL-LIFE INTERVIEW #2 QUESTIONS

1. What do you think about education?
2. What kinds of classes and level of classes do you take?
3. What is your favorite class and why?
4. What is your worst class and why?
5. How do you think are you doing academically?
6. What can you tell me about the content you're learning in school?
7. Is there something you would add or change?
8. At what point, if any, did you feel culturally and socially adjusted to the school?
9. Would you say you have carved a space for yourself at your new school? How would you describe it?
10. What self do you wish to be at your new school? Have you achieved that?
11. What are some school rules or obligations you are supposed to abide by?
12. Do you follow them? Have you ever broken the rules?
13. What, if any, external rules must you abide by in relation to your schooling and education such as family expectations?
14. Do you have self-rules, or expectations of yourself, in terms of your schooling and education? If so, what are these rules?
15. What is the best part of your overall school experience? The most challenging?
16. Knowing what you know now, if you were able to go back in time and talk to your 9th or 10th grade self about leaving your old school to attend your new school, what would you say?
17. What advice do you have for a student who will, just like you, switch schools?

D4: STIMULATED RECALL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What can you tell me about the class that I observed you in today?
2. How is what I saw today the same or different from a typical day in the class?
3. What can you tell me about the classroom atmosphere?
4. What do you imagine an ideal classroom to look like? Does the classroom have those qualities? Why/Why not?
5. Can you describe the vibe of your class?
6. Can you describe any routines and expectations for behavior in the class?
7. Why do you sit in that particular seat in your class?
8. What did you think of the information being taught in class today?
9. What was going through your mind during class? For example, were all thoughts focused on the lesson?
10. Do you have friends in your class? Is that important to you? Why/Why not?
11. What is your identity at school? Is there a clique that you belong to?
12. How do you think other students see/perceive you? Teachers? Administrators?
13. How might your self-identity and the way others see you play out in class?
14. What does it mean to be an “ideal” student? Would you say that you have these qualities in your class? Why/Why not?
15. Would you say that you are comfortable in class? Why/Why not?
16. How are you academically performing in the class?
17. What are some things you would change about your class and why?

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Pseudonym	Interview 1	Interview 2	Interview 3	Interview 4
Jeremy	March 9, 2015	April 1, 2015	April 13, 2015	April 24, 2015
Cole	March 10, 2015	March 27, 2015	April 26, 2015	May 7, 2015
Omari	March 12, 2015	March 30, 2015	April 8, 2015	May 4, 2015
Malika	March 10, 2015	April 10, 2015	April 28, 2015	May 8, 2015
Denise	March 12, 2015	March 27, 2015	April 7, 2015	April 14, 2015
Yasmin	March 13, 2015	March 31, 2015	April 6, 2015	May 19, 2015

APPENDIX F

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

Monday / Wednesday/ Friday Schedule "A" DAY											
	Time	**Time**	**Student**	**Course Name**	**Dates**						
1	7:35 – 8:35		Malika, Cole, Jeremy	Symphonic Band					5/6	5/8	
2	8:40 – 9:40		Jeremy, Yasmin	Concert Band		4/27	5/1		5/6		
2	8:40 – 9:40		Omari	Physics	4/24			5/4			
2	8:40 – 9:40		Malika, Denise	English						5/8	5/11
3	9:45 – 10:45		Jeremy	English Honors	4/24				5/6	5/8	
3	9:45 – 10:45		Cole	US History			5/1				
	A Lunch	10:45 – 11:15									
4	1st Floor Class	10:50 – 11:50	Jeremy	Pre-Calc Honors	4/24				5/6		
	2nd Floor Class	11:20 – 12:20									
	B Lunch	11:50 – 12:20									
5	12:25 – 1:25		Cole, Jeremy	Spanish I			5/1		5/6		
6	1:30 – 2:30		Denise	Art							5/11
6	1:30 – 2:30		Yasmin	Intro to Theatre			5/1	5/4	5/6		

Tuesday / Thursday Schedule "B" DAY								
	Time	**Time**	**Student**	**Course Name**	**Dates**			
1	7:35 – 8:40		Malika, Cole, Jeremy	Symphonic Band			5/7	
2	8:35 – 9:25		Jeremy, Yasmin	Concert Band				
2	8:35 – 9:25		Omari	Physics	4/28			
2	8:35 – 9:25		Malika, Denise	English		5/5	5/7	5/12
3	9:30 – 10:20		Jeremy	English Honors				
3	9:30 – 10:20		Cole	US History		5/5	5/7	
SEM	10:25 – 11:15							
	A Lunch	11:15 – 11:45						
	1st Floor Class	11:20 – 12:10	Jeremy	Pre-Calc Honors		5/5		
4	2nd Floor Class	11:50 – 12:40						
	B Lunch	12:10 – 12:40						
5	12:25 – 1:35		Cole, Jeremy	Spanish I			5/7	
6	1:40 – 2:30		Denise	Art		5/5		5/12
6	1:40 – 2:30		Yasmin	Intro to Theatre				