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ABSTRACT

RE-IMAGINING SCHOOL REFORM AND MOVEMENT MAKING THROUGH A FEMINIST POLITIC OF RESISTANCE AND DIGITAL STORYTELLING

Linnea K. Beckett

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

University of California, Santa Cruz

This dissertation grapples with dominant ideas of school reform and social movement making. I argue that school reform efforts that remain within the discursive and institutional domains of schooling often reproduce social inequities. This qualitative case study focuses on Adelante, a collaborative effort among researchers, teachers, community leaders, and first generation Latino parents, who collectively worked to resist deficit discourses, imagine community and student success, and mobilize community members and district personnel to make the schools and community more responsive to the needs of the most disadvantaged students. This study extends beyond a tracing of modernist conceptualizations of resistance that define social change as occurring through organizing oppositional forces against institutional bodies and people in power, to explore the ways in which Adelante collectively produced a feminist politic of resistance. This politic rested in the inevitability of failure based on a masculinist definition of success and turned toward non-modern knowledges and practices as the ethos from which to organize. This analytic frame attends to the perceived
failures, productive tensions and disquieted affect of the organizations’ history of formation, the process of digital storytelling, the anthology produced, and the quieter movements of social change.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION
LOCAL WORLDS OF DIFFERENCE

In the fields

In June of 2002, I moved to the Central Coast of California to become an intern on a small organic farm in the hills a few minutes outside of Watsonville. I moved into a yurt on the southern slope of the farm, next to a raspberry field and an apricot orchard. I had no experience working on a farm, and I moved there to learn how to grow food and to “reconnect with the land.” I had not yet imagined a life as a farmer, but I wanted to explore what farming looked like in the organic movement. I moved with the intention of staying for a season. I ended up staying for three years.

I arrived at the farm on an anomalous year, when the farm had no other interns. I was often asked to work by myself or to integrate with the farmworkers in their planting, weeding, and harvesting tasks. Over the next few years of work with other interns, it became clear to me that the division of labor rarely afforded interactions between the farmworkers and the interns and reproduced mechanisms akin to a colonial province.¹ These divisions of labor, although justified by the farmer as a way to maintain the farmworkers’ pace and work ethic, and thus farm productivity, and also to maintain an ethos as a learning center for beginning farmers,

¹ This is a common practice on small organic farms that have interns.
² This concept of the coloniality of power locates “the origins of modernity in the Conquest of the Americas and the control of the Atlantic after 1492” instead of Enlightenment (Escobar, 2002, p.
reproduced the labor stratifications of modernity/coloniality\textsuperscript{2} (Escobar, 2002; Lugones, 2007, 2010; Mingolo, 2007; Quijano, 2007) in the highly segregated alternative farming industry.

Interns typically were white, middle class young women and men filling a gap year, or exploring the “experience” of working on a farm, and they hoped to integrate into the environmental justice movement by gaining knowledge and experience in alternative marketing models for small farms and growing and marketing organic food. At the time, the career path into the alternative food movement, organic farming, and related food production, occurred through apprenticeship-like experiences where workers, often informally,\textsuperscript{3} would work on farms that practiced biodynamic, organic, and other sustainable cultivation methods.

\textsuperscript{2} This concept of the coloniality of power locates “the origins of modernity in the Conquest of the Americas and the control of the Atlantic after 1492” instead of Enlightenment (Escobar, 2002, p. 4). As a hyphenated system, modernity/coloniality exist on two inseparable axes and modernity highlights the residues of colonialism that are insidious, active and dehumanizing today. This hyphenated concept highlights to the historical, economic, and geopolitical links between colonialism and capitalist world systems (e.g. globalization) and constructs of modernity. Throughout the study, as I refer to modernity, I am signaling this theoretical framing of these systems of oppression that extend historically and epistemically into world perspectives. For example, modernity/coloniality positions modernity as a world perspective and not an “intra-European phenomenon” (Escobar, 2002, p.4). Modernity/coloniality connects the global exploitation of resources and peoples as “a necessary dimension of modernity, with the concomitant subalterization of the knowledges and cultures of these groups” (p. 5).

According to Lugones (2010), the term coloniality is “not just a classification of people in terms of the coloniality of power and gender, but also the process of active reduction of people, the dehumanization that fits them for the classification, the process of subjugation, the attempt to turn the colonized into less than human beings” (p. 745) Eurocentrism is an epistemology of modernity/coloniality, “a hegemonic representation and mode of knowing that claims universality for itself” (Lugones, 2010, p. 5). Therefore, when I write about non-modern knowledges, I draw upon this lineage of theoretical work and specifically Maria Lugones (2010) decolonial feminist perspective that complicates the concept of modernity/coloniality by centering gender and the coloniality of gender that “infiltrates every aspect of living through the circulation of power at the levels of the body, labor, law, imposition of tribute, and the introduction of property and land dispossession” (p.754). Informed by these genealogies, I theorize the histories of coloniality that capture the land and peoples of Watsonville and the theories of change informed by modern and non-modern perspectives.

\textsuperscript{3} This informality was racialized and based on informal networks and cultural capital.
In contrast, the farmworkers were all first generation Latino immigrants. There was a core group of about ten farmworkers, three women and the rest men. Most were part of the same extended family (with a couple of family friends interspersed) with a diasporic thread back to a small town just outside of Guanajuato, Mexico. A few were full time and year round employees of the farm and the rest found work in the winter to tide them over until the growing season began again, or they went back to Mexico for the winter season.4

Integrating interns with the farmworkers not only raised concerns regarding productivity (interns often required time to learn how and what to harvest), it also revealed clear race, class, language, and gender divisions that kept these groups separate. The different subject positions of the intern and farmworker were both producers and products of distinct socioeconomic trajectories that sustain a racialized and stratified neoliberal global economy. It was convenient for maintaining the colonial structure of Watsonville to keep these laborers separate. Not only did we come from different worlds, we would continue on in different worlds. Minimal interaction and comingling of cosmologies5 supported the reproduction of the modes of production that sustained the global/colonial economy.

---

4 In 2002, border militarization was increasing due to the 9/11 attack and it became even more difficult to travel back to Mexico. At that time, a few of the men returned to Mexico and did not come back the following season.

5 In an address at the Gloria Anzaldúa Conference at the University of California, Santa Cruz in 2014, Maria Lugones explored “philosopher/shaman/world maker” as “keepers of particular cosmologies” and interpreters of these worldviews. She uses the concept of cosmology to share how “cosmologies and philosophies of western modernity and postmodernity are embedded in an ‘intersectional matrix of domination’” to use Hill Collins framework,” and she continues to define the relation of the oppressed to the “Western modern ‘makers’ of the Western world and the weight of their gestures, blockings, erasures, violations, dehumanizations, diminutions, constant attempts at disintegration of [the oppressed]” (Lugones, 2014, p. 4). She builds a matrix of embodied interactional and intersecting
As the only intern of the season and a Spanish speaker, I began to share a work environment with the farmworkers, despite our separate worlds. As a white, liberal, middle-class woman who grew up on occupied lands in California, I was conditioned by and benefited from “capitalist modern colonial normativity” (Lugones, 2010). I was comfortable in a white middle-class imaginary of conserving the environment and of expanding the organic movement, and unaware that this imaginary materially reifies white supremacy and settler colonialism. For example, I wished to integrate into a labor market that I had not conceptualized as dehumanizing and exploiting Latino farmworkers; and I romanticized going “back to the land” to cultivate food, a narrative that can be used to invisibilize the seizure of this land from indigenous peoples and produce a settler’s fantasy and title to the land (Harris, 1993).  

On one particular early foggy morning, I was harvesting spinach with a crew of six. I was lagging behind, due to my lack of skills in harvesting and Miguel stayed

oppressions that are linked to particular cosmologies. Not just philosophies, but worldviews that join the sacred with the profane to describe a way of being in the world and a way of knowing. I engage this term to express that Western modernity and coloniality are not only intimately tied with each other in historical and epistemological ways, but Lugones gestures toward sacred, psychic, and material connections. I also use this term “cosmology” because it suggests that the dominant Western cosmology is a configuration of beliefs, therefore, truth is not universal and alternative epistemologies and ontologies may integrate to create different and sometimes contradictory cosmologies.

According to Cheryl Harris (1993), “even in the early years of the country, it was not the concept of race alone that operated to oppress Blacks and Indians; rather, it was the interaction between concepts of race and property that played a critical role in establishing and maintaining racial and economic subordination” (Harris, 1716). Reification of whiteness with regards to Native Americans was related to the “seizure of land.” Defining indigenous people as “savages,” white cultural practices called upon agricultural practices, land enclosure and “private” property to delegitimate Native American dwelling on the land before white colonizers. According to this logic, the “land that had been ‘conquered’ was vacant” (Harris, 1726). Whites then seized the land and the government legitimated the “second possession” as the first, with title.
behind with me to help catch me up with the crew.\textsuperscript{7} While working and talking, he looked at me and asked sincerely, “Why are you here?” With this question, Miguel showed how my presence as a college educated, white, native English speaking person working in the fields with him did not fit. Why would someone who has access to economic and social capital choose to work in the fields? Many folks who ended up working in the fields chose the work as a matter of necessity. It is hard physical labor with minimal financial compensation. Not only did Miguel’s question expose how my white privilege provided me access to working in the field of Latino farmworkers, but also how white supremacy and settler colonialism conditioned my motivations to be there and my ability to choose when to leave. Miguel’s question produced a pedagogical moment for me. It set into relief how different our worlds were due to our conditioned subjectivities and lived experiences. The question invited reflection, which then yielded a moment of rupture.

According to Paulo Freire, a Brazilian philosopher and educator, material and social realities harbor the conditions for oppression and liberation. When humans become aware of the contradictions latent within this reality and interrupt the dominant structures and ideologies that dehumanize, this interruption ruptures “imported schemes and prefabricated solutions” (Freire, 1970b, p. 464). In effect, a simple question mediated by our histories, bodies, current work, and environment, incited a momentary embodied dissonance accompanied by an emerging recognition

\textsuperscript{7} Miguel was one of the fastest harvesters, often times harvesting almost twice as much as everyone else. On the farm, the only crop that the workers get individualized commission for are strawberries and green beans, so Miguel’s choice to lag behind the group did not have any economic repercussions for him.
of some of these contradictions, an ah-ha moment accompanied by a breaking through of layers of conditioning that helped me better understand myself in relation to the world. I questioned my assumptions.

I begin this dissertation with this story for three reasons. First, I draw from feminist theory (Harding, 1993, 2009; Lugones, 2003) to historically situate myself in this study. I recognize that my perspective is always partial and positioned and I reveal some of this partiality and positioning through this moment with Miguel in the fields. Years later, I would return to the same land and community as a researcher and begin this study.

Secondly, this study takes place in the community adjacent to the field where Miguel and I harvested spinach that morning. Miguel’s question revealed a historical legacy of inequity and injustice in the fertile valleys of the Central Coast and Watsonville. While the Central Coast is a place of vast agricultural wealth, a thriving organic agriculture industry alongside industrial agri-business, and a hub for alternative farming methods, its underbelly is labor exploitation and severe poverty. There are distinct worlds (Lugones, 2003) unto themselves in Santa Cruz County that maintain socioeconomic and racial hierarchies much like a colony. In this dissertation, I will describe the present economic and political histories of this rich agricultural area, exploring generational migrant flows, the capitalist colonial dynamics of neighborhood segregation, and resistance struggles to begin to articulate the institutional arrangements that condition everyday lives in Watsonville.
I recreate the moment where Miguel asks me the question while working in the fields as an event productive for analytic framing and reflective exploration. In Chapter VI, I theorize rupture as an important, yet often quiet, moment of critical consciousness raising (conscientização) and social movement making. The rupture alone cannot compel consciousness raising where people, “as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives and their capacity to transform reality” (Freire, 1970b, p. 455). However, elements of consciousness raising are present in the recognition of the rupture. I suggest Miguel’s question inspired a pedagogical moment that engaged my own process of questioning my cosmology of Western modernity and settler logics (Lugones, 2014). In this dissertation, I give productive attention to and theorize pedagogical moments of rupture as they occur for parents, teachers, and university researchers in a university-school-community collaboration.

Return as a researcher

After three years living and working on the farm and another year living in a home in the mountains outside of Santa Cruz and working at farmer’s markets, I left the region. Four years later, I returned to Santa Cruz County as a Ph.D. student in education. My research interests positioned me at the nexus of schools, families and communities, where I grappled with Tyack and Tobin’s (1993) challenging questions for school reform: “How did some reforms become so institutionalized that they became the standard matrix for schooling”? And “why did challenges to this basic
grammar fail?” These questions challenge the degree to which schools can change if the images, structures, and practices of “schools” and “schooling” are historically and socially constructed and politically influenced to produce a standard matrix of schooling, or a “grammar” of schooling.\(^8\) In other words, if schooling as a signifier is imbued with certain attributes such as age-based grades, classrooms, a division of knowledge into ‘subjects,’ evaluative grades, and other forms of dividing time and space, then how can schools change if their “grammar” or very meaning is dependent upon these same attributes?

I tracked decades of research that found the standard matrix of schooling that Tyack and Tobin (1993) describe as unequal and inequitable for many students. Scholars argued standardized schooling produced deficit frames (Menchaca, 1997; Valencia 1997; Valencia & Black, 2002; Valenzuela, 1999) and an “achievement gap,” which was really an opportunity gap (Carter & Welner, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2006). Schools reproduce the raced, classed, and gendered inequities in society (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985). Therefore, schooling does not produce equal outcomes for students, and, without a critical stance, academic success correlates with the racial, classed, and gendered hierarchies present in US society.

Research also shows that changing schools is very difficult. Tyack and Tobin (1994) identify some reasons for why it is difficult to alter the standard patterns of schooling. In the cases they examined, they noticed that reformers “fell out of touch

\(^8\) The “grammar” of schooling was a set of reforms that produced a standardized model of schooling. This standardization was assumed to provide equal education for all through access to standardized ‘real schools’ (Tyack & Tobin, 1994).
with the opinions of school boards and parents,” they “did not cultivate the kind of broader social movements that might nourish educational and social change,” and they needed community support. The “[f]ailure to enlist the support and ideas of the community was especially harmful for fundamental reformers’ that wished to deviate from the grammar of schooling (p. 477). In sum, reform is difficult, but not impossible. They argue that the cultural construction of schooling can change over time; they state,

To do this deliberately would require intense and continual public dialogue about the ends and means of schooling, including reexamination of cultural assumptions about what a ‘real school’ is and what sort of improved schooling could realize new aspirations. Shared beliefs could energize a broad social movement to remake the schools. To do so would require reaching beyond a cadre of committed reformers to involve the public in a broad commitment to change. This would require not only questioning what is taken for granted but also preserving what is valuable in existing practice (p. 478).

All these findings point to the need for reform efforts to extend beyond the school walls and engage pedagogically in diverse settings and even more so if reformers wish to change the grammar of schooling.

In the same decade of Tyack and Tobin’s work, other education scholars began to study school change through the interactional dynamics of schools and communities. Some of the literatures that examine these dynamics include parent involvement/engagement, community organizing for school reform and popular education. Discourses on parent involvement are mired in institutional logics of conformity and standardization based on white supremacist patriarchal imaginaries.
These imaginaries construct racialized, gendered, and classed figures of a “good parent” and a “good home,” where academic success can thrive. Through literature on parent engagement and specifically Latino parent engagement, researchers explore how parents have resisted these types of “neodeficit discourses” (Baquedano-López, Alexander & Hernandez, 2013, italics in original) that frame parents as supportive of staff, puppets of the school, “pretzel sellers” (Gold, Simon & Brown, 2002, p. 6), and advocates for the school at the district level. Research in LatCrit and cultural organizing documents narrative interventions in home spaces, investigating how parents organize to create counternarratives to push back against binary constructs of good/bad parent and the racialization of the deviant parent (see Delgado Gaitan, 2001, 2012; Dyrness, 2007, 2011; Hurtig & Dyrness, 2011; Fuentes, 2009, 2012; Villenas, 2001).

The change effort documented in this dissertation worked to intervene through analyzing and re-writing personal narratives. At the same time, Adelante9 was a community mobilizing effort that built a university-district-community collaboration that persisted for nearly eight years. Therefore, I draw on community organizing for school reform as a body of literature that informs this study. The literature on community organizing for school reform arose shortly after a broad national shift among leading community organizing networks (IAF; PICO) to focus on schools as sites of reform. These community organizing efforts turned their focus to public schools as a response to the growing awareness of the link between neighborhood

---

9 The pseudonym for the case.
revitalization and the quality of schools; they began to use statistics such as
disappearance rates, penitentiary tracking, and college eligibility to call for school
reform (see Lopez, 2004; Mediratta, 2007; Shirley, 1997, 2002; Warren 2005; Warren
& Mapp 2011; Zachary & olatoye 2001). These efforts typically derive from an
Alinsky model of community organizing that intentionally builds power among
stakeholders (parents, young people & residents) to change the relationship between
school and the community it serves (Mediratta, 2007; Warren & Mapp, 2011).

While community organizing for school reform literature provides a nuanced
analysis of the social and organizational terrain of community organizing and the
need to position the agendas of reform in communities, the theory of change (the
model of resistance and organizing) produced in these literatures did not fully align
with the range of Adelante’s operations. Consequently, I turn toward scholarship
about popular education efforts. I focus on the pedagogical strategies of these efforts.
Informed by Paulo Freire’s emancipatory pedagogy and women of color coalition
building, these studies reflect efforts to create centers of cultural organizing in
community settings to influence school change (see Beckett, Glass & Moreno, 2013;
Delgado Gaitan, 2001, 2012; Dyrness, 2007, 2011; Reyes & Torres, 2007; Snell,
Miguel & East, 2009; Villenas, 2001; Wong & Glass, 2009). I situate this
dissertation study in this nexus of literatures.
The study and the case

While studying at the university and immersing myself in these literatures, I became involved in a project, called “Adelante”\(^\text{10}\) that brought together different community leaders, teachers, parents, and district administrators in Watsonville, CA in an effort to change the school and community to better serve low-income, racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse (LI/RCLD) students.\(^\text{11}\) What became apparent in my work with Adelante was that the social and temporal frames of the phenomenon of school and community change in school reform, parent involvement/engagement, and community organizing for school reform literatures were not sufficient for describing (1) the relationship individuals in Adelante had with the change effort, (2) the collectivities that were forming, (3) and the ways people were changing. I became interested to learn more about how people of Adelante (veteran teachers, researchers, parent leaders, community organizers, and district administrators) were making sense of Adelante, specifically how members of Adelante were theorizing their work together.

This study focuses on three central research questions:

1. How do Adelante members articulate the theory of the pedagogical strategies, educational interventions, and practices of Adelante?
2. As a dialogical space and organizational entity, how do Adelante members make sense of the organizational context of Adelante?
3. How do Adelante members utilize the cultural productions (i.e. digital stories) as a reflective device in order to make sense of their individual relationship to Adelante and their collective mission as a group?

\(^\text{10}\) Pseudonym
\(^\text{11}\) This acronym of LI/RCLD students comes from Pia Wong and Ronald Glass (2009).
The first question seeks to identify how people were theorizing the work of Adelante. Specifically, how did people understand social change and how did they explain the different types of work that were important to produce this change? The second question addresses Adelante’s organizational structure. Adelante had an evolving and flexible organizational structure, it was never fully absorbed into any institutions, yet interacted with many institutional arrangements through fluid stakeholders and their operationalization of the work of Adelante in their profession domains. This question explores how people conceptualized Adelante as an organizational body and what expectations people attached to the social change possibilities of this effort that were complimentary to or in contrast to these conceptualizations. The last question addresses a central practice of Adelante. Among other cultural production activities, participants created and used digital stories as pedagogical tools to initiate community dialogue. Through this question, I examine how people made stories together, what this process meant and how it related to the larger intentions of the social change effort.

This dissertation is a qualitative case study of this collaborative effort among researchers, teachers, community leaders, and first generation Latino parents, which worked to resist deficit discourses, imagine community and student success, and mobilize community members and district personnel to make the schools and community more responsive to the needs of the most disadvantaged students. Adelante was a collaborative attempt to “mount a comprehensive approach to the challenges facing the schools and communities” (Adelante website). During the first
year, Adelante focused on posing questions, engaging in dialogue, and building relationships. The group had numerous meetings where it asked questions of what it might do as an organizational body and engaged membership from the local school district, adult and parent educational leaders, the local community college, a family services agency, the teachers union, the central labor council, and several community-based organizations. Comprised of leadership from parents, teachers, district personnel, community center staff, the teacher union and a local university, Adelante became a space for creating an ever-evolving agenda of social change at the nexus of the school and the community.

Devoted to an analysis of the interconnected nature of the struggles of Watsonville students and community members, Adelante dreamed of changing the school system to better serve the community, and in doing so, imagining another community. Adelante members conducted focus groups with community members asking about their hopes and dreams and the barriers to those hopes and dreams. Adelante members distilled themes from the community dialogues and created autobiographical digital stories related to these themes, with the intent of using the digital stories in community dialogues with different stakeholders to incite conversation around the everyday inequities within Watsonville and inspire change. Adelante continued from 2006 – 2014, however in 2009, Adelante experienced a variety of losses including stunted growth opportunities and forfeitures of participation due to the 2008 fiscal crisis. These events fundamentally shifted the capacity and scope of the work.
Toward a feminist politic of resistance

As suggested by its title, “Re-imagining School Reform and Social Movement Making through a Feminist Politic of Resistance and Digital Storytelling,” this dissertation grapples with dominant ideas of school reform and social movement making. I argue that school reform efforts that remain within the discursive and institutional domains of schooling often reproduce social inequities. Scholars, practitioners, and community members should seek change strategies outside of these domains to pursue school and community change. In turning toward ideas of resistance, I argue that certain dominant forms of resistance elide potentially rich notions of resistance that can fundamentally shift how to imagine school reform, social movement making, and the relationship between these two phenomena.

Social change that occurs through organizing oppositional forces against institutional bodies and people in power is an idea of resistance rooted in modern notions of progress (Aptheker, 1989). The scene of social change where a political actor is situated in the public sphere and fights against the dominant institutions and actors for political and economic power (Aptheker, 1989; Lugones, 2003, 2010), is an imaginary that tends to rule how both academics and people in the US assume the nature of social change. This scene is sanctioned by the nation-state, to allow its citizens the democratic access of public assembly and protest in order to change societal structures to better serve the people.
In this dissertation I trouble this imaginary and call upon a feminist politic of resistance to read histories and explore school and community change. Many Adelante members animated desires for the kind of collective action based on “masculinist inventions” of resistance and social change (Aptheker, 1989). However, this dissertation extends beyond a tracing of those annunciations and actions to explore the ways in which Adelante failed to achieve the collective actions of the prevalent imaginaries and collectively produced a feminist politic of resistance not easily legible in modern theoretical frameworks. I re-imagine social movement making by exploring how Adelante members (throughout time and reflection), troubled normative notions of social change and utopias, suggesting additional temporal, spatial, and pedagogical framing for imagining school and community change.

This re-imagining is part of a methodological move to analyze the artifacts and practices of Adelante and Adelante member’s reflections on their work. Born from a need to “take stock” as a group, this dissertation also portends to serve Adelante as a reflective moment for Adelante to decide if and how the group will choose to proceed. Within the study, I ask participants of this collaborative school-community change effort to reflect back and share their memories of Adelante. Members shared moments where Adelante failed, powerful moments of connection, common dreams, hopes, and frustrations. In Chapter IV, I code a descriptive history of Adelante’s organizational formation and I draw from in-depth reflective interviews of key Adelante members to reveal some of the shortcomings of the epistemological
and ontological moorings that secure ‘successful’ school reform. This unsettling generates “productive tensions” (Simon-Kimar & Kingfisher, 2011) in the conceptualizing and cultural organizing of Adelante.

Inside a school and community change effort

I position this dissertation inside a multimodal school and community change effort for three reasons. I asked Adelante members to theorize or “take stock of” Adelante. This required a looking inside, or self-examination along with an examination inside the group and the work the group had done over nine years (2006–2014). Secondly, I collected meeting minutes, digital stories, field notes, over twenty interviews (2008, 2011, 2014), and other documents that I would not have been able to access if I was not also a participant in Adelante.

Lastly, “inside” suggests an engulfment. Adelante began with political actors gathering in spaces and on land with legacies of resistance to corporate capitalism and the commodification of land. The desires of Adelante members for imagining social change was not contained to Adelante, but Adelante was one instantiation of this work and imbued with these desires. While Adelante may have ended (a few times), the end of the work of Adelante is difficult to define. People carry their experiences and trainings beyond Adelante and into other institutional and social contexts.

In the end of this study, I explore the immeasurability of this work and highlight ways in which people use what they learned in Adelante in their personal and professional lives ten years after the initiation of Adelante. In recognizing the immeasurability of this work and the ways in which the feminist politic extends
beyond Adelante, it is very difficult to “step outside” or “look into” projects like Adelante. This is not to suggest a flattening of difference, but a recognition of the interconnectedness of histories, land, people and actions.

Adelante participants created and used digital stories as a pedagogical modality to incite dialogue in different community settings. These digital stories are multimodal texts that can engage the viewer beyond the cognitive to incite embodied reflection. Adelante began to build an anthology of diverse stories from different community perspectives. Adelante members came to identify the digital stories as central to their work.

This effort was a multimodal school and community change effort. I call Adelante a school and community change effort because Adelante’s work happened outside of the context of schools with employees of the schools such as district personnel, administrators and teachers, and not just parents. The effort was about creating connections between the schools and the communities. Adelante attempted to center local knowledges and non-modern perspectives and intentionally moved away from school-centric analyses of the problems students face to see the community and school as interconnected. They developed a long-term in-depth study of the links between the school, families, communities, and service providers through local stories.

No one within Adelante ever defined Adelante as a reform effort, or a transformative project. This lack of definition afforded freedoms for Adelante to morph and change through time and space. Within this study, I refer to Adelante as a
change effort. The members of Adelante gathered to change the conditions of the schools and their jobs within the district and schools. Within any social change effort, hegemonic structures and discourses will always be reified and change does not always go as planned. In this study, I focus on the changes that were unplanned, the “failures,” the powerful and quieter moments that kept participants unsettled and connected.

Overview of the chapters

This dissertation is comprised of five chapters. Chapter II situates this study in a network of literatures that engage critical analyses of school reform and a diverse set of pedagogical and organizational interventions to inequities in the US schooling system. I explore how parent involvement/engagement literatures critique dominant ideological constructs of “parent” and “home” (according to school), homogenize family and home spaces and police families into performing particular types of participation with and in school-related practices. There are scholars who write with Latina/Chicana feminist perspectives in education that propose “el hogar” to value knowledges and epistemologies of the ‘home’ space to counter deficit frames. This critique opens alternatives for thinking about education and school change beyond the physical and discursive domains of the school.

I then review community organizing as a space for mobilizing outside of schools for school reform; however these efforts tend to promote certain types of collective actions, are often school-centric in proposed outcomes, and the success of
these community organizing efforts are measured by the capacity building and strategic actions that affect institutional structures, which do not account for findings from this study. Lastly, I explore the theoretical disposition of popular education and women of color educators and theorists to propose strategies for mobilization, parent participation, and school change that could address some of the shortcomings from prior literatures and open a space to theorize the findings from this study.

Chapter II details the methodology of the study. I engaged a qualitative, single case study with ethnographic methods for data collection. The single case study allows for an engagement with this change effort in context. I draw from feminist methodologies to construct an analytic framework for data analysis of colonial histories and legacies of resistance, pedagogical processes of exclusion in the formation of a digital anthology, and non-modern forms of resistance. As I recognize feminist methodologies, I also recognize that I am studying with overly studied communities and this research runs the risk of subjecting participants and cultural artifacts produced in Adelante to an empirical regime of visibility, epistemic violences, and troubles in representation. 12

Feminist methodologies have been a resource to mitigate some of these concerns, but by no means have they been tamed. Some of the continued questions I grapple with throughout the study are: How do you study a community mobilizing effort? How do you bracket the study? Where should the study begin and end? What data should you collect? What is/are your unit(s) of analysis? What will be the

12 The fact that Adelante chose to engage digital stories as pedagogical tools shows that Adelante, as a collaborative change effort, runs these similar risks. I address these briefly in Chapter V.
products of this research? What obligation do you have to your subjects? How can your research resist extracting knowledge from and be useful for the continued production of knowledge in the organizing effort? Who benefits from this research? Are participants compensated for their time? These are all very important questions for me.

Chapter IV traces the history of Adelante over nine years (2006 – 2014), identifying institutional alliances and dissociations that occurred through a myriad of local and global shifts. In the tracing of this history, I emphasize the resilience and amoebic nature of this change effort and identify the power in and challenges of creating dialogical and physical spaces that are not fully institutionalized. I create a timeline to document change over time. The membership involved in this change effort evolved over time, as did the effort’s capacities. I focus on a feminist politic of resistance that emerges through this chapter and provides an orientation toward Adelante’s organizational formations.

A primary element of Adelante’s strategy was to tell stories and digitize them. Adelante sought to create an ever-evolving community digital archive. Through a collective participatory process, participants would write, revise and digitize 3-4 minute autobiographical vignettes that would then contribute to Adelante’s organizing effort as pedagogical tools for community dialogues. Additionally, Adelante members explored ways to use the digital stories as pedagogical tools, not only in creating more stories, but also as analytic devices to

---

13 Fully institutionalized means to be integrated into institutional structures or Adelante forming its own organization within institutional arrangements.
incite dialogue among groups of parents, teachers, students, not-for-profit professionals, local and international conferences, and other local groups in Watsonville.

In Chapter V, I examine this process of writing stories together and explore how this process built collectivities. At the same time that people were sharing their stories and connecting with each other, the digital stories joined in an ever-evolving process of anthologizing with ethical dimensions and hermeneutical challenges and possibilities. I draw the history of when and how the digital stories became a topic of conversation and I explore Adelante member’s reflective accounts of why participants decided to tell their stories with Adelante. Throughout I note how stories clustered to create a politically driven anthology. I map the anthology’s continued formation, the absences within the anthology and the refusals to participate in the anthology’s formation. Adelante members commented upon these absences, yet they had little control over resources to systematize the thematic trends represented in the digital stories, some tropes became over-represented while others never manifested in the anthology at all.

Once the stories were created, Adelante members sought to use the digital stories to generate dialogue about the historical, social, and economic realities of people in Watsonville and the situations of parents, students, and teachers interfacing with the schooling system. The intention was to create dialogue that would transform into actions for social change. In Chapter VI, I explore the ways in which Adelante members changed perspectives of themselves, each other, and the world via writing
their stories and sharing the digital stories in dialogue circles. While Adelante members engaged inclusionary logics for imagining social change, in their frustration about not institutionalizing and incorporating into current institutions, they spoke of “powerful moments” and their reasons for staying in Adelante. These expressions animate what I call quieter movements of social change that move participants otherwise, into spaces and imaginaries that cultivate lateral attachments and critical consciousness. Moments of rupture and relation propelled Adelante members into becoming otherwise through a framework of social change that relies on quieter movements that elide standard measures.

As a researcher, I am compelled to try to articulate what this moving otherwise looks like, or to capture the impact of Adelante and render it a complete story, but I cannot. This story is by no means complete. In the conclusion of this study, I will elaborate on the immeasureability of the impact of this change effort and highlight the generative nature of Adelante. While some folks wished to render the project complete in “failure” or otherwise, it continued to evade these closures and reproduced itself in a variety of different ways in people’s work. This was a reflection of the people and ethos cultivated in Adelante. The desire to be a participant in Adelante was not contained by this effort. This dissertation attempts to explore the shifts in social relations and subjectivities of a group of individuals who committed themselves to a school and community change. If we understand these shifts as pedagogical moments, this dissertation is about learning processes to form counter-hegemonic collaborations.
In *The One Best System*, David Tyack (1974) provides a historical overview of the nineteenth century rise of US schooling as a standardized system, imbued with values and beliefs from elite, white, protestant, Anglo-Saxon men. These elite individuals invested in and shaped public schooling into a corporate model and rationalized bureaucratic organization for functionalist purposes: to prepare people to participate in the national economy.\(^{14}\) Tyack and other historians of the US public schooling system argue that this institutionalization of the US public schooling system fundamentally shaped the structure and practices of US urban schooling today (Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Tobin, 1993; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Labaree, 1997; Ogawa, 2015). Constructed through an ongoing dialectic, these corporate elite founders and the subsequent institution of US schooling were products of their time in history and continue to retain attributes, values, and beliefs reflecting in the institutional structure and practices of US schooling (Stinchcombe, 1965).\(^{15}\)

\(^{14}\) These individuals were part of an “interlocking directorate” (Tyack, 1974, p. 129), a social group of “experts” in charge of the K-12 education system. The individuals that influenced the creation of the school system were connected across foundations and corporations. This organizational oligarchy allowed a small group of people to represent the same agenda at multiple levels and across many organizations. In the late nineteenth century, the urban social situation challenged these “experts.” As a response to this challenge, professional elites discursively walled the educational system off from politics by arguing that schools should be apolitical spaces whose practices should be designed according to the rational and scientific research conducted by scholars. They created a bureaucratic model coupled to administrative science. According to Tyack, the “common school [was] run for the people, but not by the people” (Tyack, p 77).

\(^{15}\) For example, industrialization and mass migrations to the US from Eastern Europe supported the production of a mass schooling system with a ‘factory’ structure and an assimilationist function.
In following this argument, US public schooling “functions to prepare categories of students for participation in different strata of society’s social, political and economic order” (Ogawa, 2015, p. 5), privileging white, middle and upper class, males through structural and discursive forms of discrimination. As a standardized system that codified structures and practices that privilege a white supremacist capitalist colonial social order, it may be an understatement to find along with Tyack (1974, p. 11) that US schooling has “ill-served the pluralistic character of American society”. Although US schooling espouses rhetoric of “equal educational opportunity,” schools have rarely taught the children of the poor effectively – and this failure has been systematic, not idiosyncratic” (Tyack, 1974, p. 11) and often ‘blame the victim’ or the ‘agents,’ such as school personnel and teachers. Following Tyack’s argument, if the reform effort relies on an analysis of the problem that places the blame on the families, students, teachers, or school personnel as that which needs to be reformed, “rather than system change – and concurrent transformations in the distribution of power and wealth in society as a whole” (p. 10), then reform efforts will inevitably fail to address the inequities of the US schooling system.

This move to ‘blame the victim’ or the ‘agents’ of the school system is commonly referred to as deficit thinking within educational literatures (Valencia, 16 Examples are the hidden curriculum (Anyon, 1980), perceived ability and tracking (Oakes, 2000), teacher bias (Rist, 1973), new forms of segregation (Butrymowicz, 2013), etc. 17 Historically reform efforts that attempt to address these inequities rarely focus attention on the systematic failures of schooling for low income, racially, culturally and linguistically diverse (LI/RCLD) students and families. However, if schools are meant to reproduce a colonial social order (see Collins, CMMU 102), then schools do not need reformation, because they are meant to fail LI/RCLD students.
Deficit frames ignore the structural and ideological inequities of schooling and attribute “poor academic performance” to the intelligence and/or motivation of youth and their “socialization” within their families and communities (Valencia, 1997). Over the past half century, the policy ethos regarding families from low-income, racially, culturally and linguistically diverse (LI/RCLD) communities has been mired in deficit frames, which privilege school culture and knowledge over home, familial or local “funds of knowledge” (González, Moll & Amanti 2005). As such, deficit frames are racist discourses (Menchaca, 1997) that often script education reform in the US. Examples such as A Nation At Risk (1983), the war on poverty (Katz, 1995), and No Child Left Behind (2001), highlight a trend in policy and educational reform that equates difference to inferiority (Delgado-Gaitan, 2001) and represents LI/RCLD students, parents, families and communities as lacking the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in the 21st Century school system and society at large.  

The purposes, values, and structures of the ‘one best system’ of schooling, as manifest in the institutional structures and practices of and in schools systematically marginalize LI/RCLD students, families, and communities (Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Tobin, 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). In this chapter, I argue that sanctioned forms of parent participation (known as “parent involvement”) are part of the institutional matrix of schooling that reproduces deficit frames and discriminates against LI/RCLD...

---

18 As a result, the goals of education reform of recent decades focus on closing the ‘achievement gap,’ which includes developing deficit driven parent involvement strategies to engage parents in the schooling of their children.
students, families, and communities. Specifically, Latino parent involvement is part of a legacy of education reform that continues to produce an analysis that locates the “problems” of schooling in the innate abilities of the parents and their interactions with schools. From this perspective, parents need to change in order to better relate to and be involved with school.

This assimilationist perspective mirrors the standardized institutional structure of schooling as explained by new institutionalism. In order to move beyond the reproduction of deficit frames and thinking to reimagine schooling in the US, reform efforts should call upon alternative institutional histories other than schools, “to afford broader opportunities to learn for all students from underserved communities in particular” (Ogawa, 2015, p. 5). These alternative reform efforts could engage multifaceted approaches that extend beyond the school grounds, include and center community knowledges and stakeholders, incite dialogue around the functions and structures of schooling (Tyack & Tobin, 1994; Cuban & Tyack, 1995). In effect, by producing different analyses of the “problems” that reform seeks to resolve, the change effort would seek to disrupt the historical institutional reproduction of nineteenth century schooling structures and practices, including deficit logics.

In the first part of this chapter, I focus on dominant parent participation models that replicate these structural and discursive inequities and highlight empirical studies that use parent involvement as a measurement of success and in doing so

---

19 Currently, most education reform is wrought with “neodeficit discourses” on parents and parent involvement in schools (Banquedano-López, Alexander & Hernandez, 2013, italics in original) and even some reform efforts that attempt to move away from deficit framing end up reproducing it through the enactment of the reform.
reproduce deficit logics. I analyze parent involvement discourse and practices in school and out-of-school. In the second section, I shift the theoretical frame from parent involvement to Latino parent engagement in school reform (see Delgado Gaitan, 2001, 2012; Dyrness, 2007, 2011; Hurtig & Dyrness, 2011; Villenas, 2001). Parent engagement works to disrupt deficit frames of the “parent” according to school and attempts to produce more equitable and inclusive forms of participation. However, parent engagement does not disrupt the basic “grammar” of schooling (Tyack & Tobin, 1994). If I attend to Arthur Stinchcombe’s (1965) argument that the people, historical moment, and social environment at the time of an institution’s inception tends to compose the functionality of an institution and the “rules of the game” (North, 1998), then, the US schooling system and its reforms will continue to produce colonial, racist and sexist structures and practice. However, aligning reform efforts with feminist and radical social movement theories and in institutional matrices that exist beyond the institution of schooling could prove fruitful for imagining parent participation and general school and community change that does not rely on deficit logics. In the last section of this chapter, I explore a variety of change efforts and feminist popular education strategies that begin in community settings, utilize social movement strategies, and through a diverse array of community, district and university collaborations mobilize to create school change.

20 For example, Ogawa (2015) turns to “design systems that do not bear the historically institutionalized approaches to teaching and inequities that are baked into the structure of the existing system of schooling” (p. 5) to explore school change beyond reform efforts that “tinker” with the institution of schooling.
Part I: The “parent” according to the school

In the last three decades, parent involvement\textsuperscript{21} has become a promised remedy to the “problems” of the US public schooling system (Becher, 1984; Eccles & Harold, 1996; Henderson, 1987). Extensive research links parent involvement with student achievement, grades, test scores, school success, and higher participation in advanced courses and college enrollment (see Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Perna & Titus, 2005). Even within schools that enrolled a high percentage of students of color, educators and policy makers see parent involvement as a solution to overcoming academic achievement challenges (Delgado-Gaitan 1990, 1994). As a result, national policies such as No Child Left Behind, Head Start, Even Start and other programs draw on this connection between parent involvement and student achievement and require family involvement in schooling (Epstein & Dauber, 1991).

These national policies loosely define parent involvement as attending school-based activities like open house, Parent Teacher Association (PTA/PTO) meetings, parent-teacher communication, or other voluntary forms of participation in school events. Out of school parent involvement includes home visits and parent’s supporting homework (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). Defined as “school-driven

\textsuperscript{21} Parent involvement can include many different contexts, goals and practices. Multiple studies map out typologies of Latino parent involvement and engagement (Baquedano-López, Alexander & Hernandez, 2013; Rodela, 2013; Delgado-Gaitan, 2012; Olvidos, 2006), however the intention of this chapter is not to recreate a typology of parent involvement/engagement or address all the forms in which it manifests. Instead, I trace the discriminatory logics deployed through parent involvement, explore the benefits of engagement, and look towards other forms of parent and community participation that are not defined by the school for models of equity-oriented school and community change.
involvement practices,” these forms of participation suggest that if a parent or guardian does not subscribe to these forms of involvement, then s/he is part of a “problem of noninvolvement” (Lopéz, 2003). This assumes student academic achievement relies on parent involvement in these particular ways and supposes an ideological logic that places the locus of responsibility on families and disregards the institutional forces that create such rules.

In this section I explore these in-school and out-of-school forms of parent involvement to investigate how LI/RCLD parents are positioned as lacking the ability to participate and support student academic success without the school’s support (Hidalgo, 1998; Baquedano-López, Alexander & Hernandez, 2013) and how within parent involvement, schools are seen as neutral and parents need to assimilate to the practices sanctioned by the schools in order for their children to succeed. Similar to new institutionalism’s historical explanation of US public schooling as relics from the industrial era, geared toward “mass production and hierarchical control” (Ogawa, 2015, p. 4), which function to assimilate populations to white supremacist capitalist structures and practices, parent involvement is a racialized and classed discourse and practice designed to assimilate families and parents from non-dominant communities to a system of schooling that produce inequitable outcomes for students from these backgrounds.
In school participation

Epstein & Dauber’s (1991) review of research identifies six types of parent involvement. All are defined by the school system and require school personnel to: a) assist with parenting and child-rearing activities that can prepare the child for school; b) communicate with parents; c) organize volunteer activities for parents that support the school in school activities; d) ask parents to “assist their own children at home on learning activities that are coordinated with the children’s class work” (p. 291); e) involve parents in decision making through PTA/PTO, advisory councils and other forms of representation at the school, district or state level; and lastly, f) collaborate with communities through connecting with “after-school care, health services, and other resources” that support children’s learning (p. 291). This definition of parent involvement links these forms of participation to indicators of school success for the students and explores ways in which school personnel can motivate parents to become involved.

Many studies and literature reviews in education, sociology and psychology examine the multivariate links between parent involvement and student academic success. According to Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2005) literature review, parent involvement is “positively linked to indicators of student achievement, including teacher ratings of student competence, student grades, and achievement test scores” (p.105). In addition Hoover-Dempsey et al. link parental involvement to general

---

22 At the time of the study, Epstein & Dauber had not determined whether this sixth form of involvement was a separate form of involvement or whether it provided strategies for thinking about the five other forms of involvement. The study cited does not engage this form of involvement. It only suggests that it could be a subset of the five other forms of involvement or may be it’s own form of involvement.
student success and personhood, such as the student’s sense of personal competence, efficacy for learning, “self-regulatory knowledge and skills (‘I know how to do this work’)” adaptive school behavior, and beliefs about education (p. 106). But all of these indicators rely on a particular definition of parent involvement that is supported and understood by the school and school personnel, which may differ for LI/RCLD parents and families.

Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2005) sought to determine the motivations for parent involvement and found that the “role construction for involvement,” how parents are invited to be involved, and “school’s responsiveness to life-context variables” as important markers that strongly influence parent participation (p. 123). For example, Trubull, Rothstein-Fisch and Hernandez (2003) determined that teachers who developed a deeper understanding of their own culture, the US school culture, and the cultures of their immigrant Latino students, changed their professional practices and their relationship with parents, which also changed parent involvement in schools. This suggests that the relationship between school and families is not a unilateral relationship of school acting upon families and parents, but that school personnel and teacher actions influence how much and in what ways parents participate in school sanctioned involvement. For example, race and class differences can incite mutual distrust between teachers and parents with regard to parent participation (Lightfoot, 1978). Teachers tend to engage middle class parents more

---

23 For example, teachers can “view parent involvement in terms of attendance at parent-teacher conferences and other formal meetings” and consequently do not engage parents as decision makers and agents in the co-construction of the student’s educational experience (Yap & Enoki, 2001).
than working class parents (Mager, 1980), and a lack of teacher preparation to integrate parents into classroom practices can create awkward and challenging dynamics (Unger & Powell, 1980). Similarly, cultural and language differences can contribute to these forms of alienation.

Many studies cite parent involvement strategies as useful for LI/RCLD parents, however the measurement (“involvement”), is a narrowly defined repertoire of participation determined by the school, requiring parents to be active and supportive of the school’s activities and agendas. This form of parent participation is historically imbued with white, middle-class values and beliefs. For example, the Parent Teacher Association (PTA), helped “Americanize newcomers to the country and to teach middle class parenting” (Davies, 1992, cited by Hiatt-Michael, 2001, p. 254) and today is an important channel and measure of parent involvement in schools. This type of parent association reflects an involvement in which more affluent and white parents are likely to be involved. This marker of involvement is strongly influenced by factors such as race, class, and culture and associated with student achievement. As a result, if empirical studies use this definition of parent involvement as a measure to explore a potential correlation between parent involvement and student achievement, the studies will most likely produce positive links between these variables. However, I suggest closer scrutiny is needed to examine the race and class

---

24 I argue alongside Yap and Enoki (2001), that “most parental involvement activities are only tangentially, if at all, related to children’s cognitive development and school achievement,” which obfuscates the variables of parent involvement that may correlate with heightened academic achievement.
biases embedded in these notions of parent involvement and the role of the school in producing narrow and hierarchical forms of participation.

Parent involvement activities are based on what the school and teacher should do to the parents to get them engaged. These specified forms of participation not only restrict parent’s agency in determining how they can become involved in the school, but also construct the parent as lacking in motivation or in need of encouragement if they do not participate in these specified ways. Defined by school officials, researchers and policymakers (Olvios et al., 2011), these forms of involvement disregard the variety of ways in which LI/RCLD (including Latino) parents are involved in their children’s schooling (Delgado Gaitan, 1991; Snell, Miguel, & East, 2009) and highlight specific ways in which parents need to be involved in their children’s schooling with the underlying threat that if they do not comply with these forms of involvement, the academic success of their children is at stake.

*The discourse of parent involvement*

The discourse of the parent involvement model constructs “parents” as homogenous subjects defined by school policy and does not account for the multiple compositions of families, the differing value systems, and everyday ways in which families may operate. The “parent” is a singular subject that is acted upon by the school system which minimalizes agentive possibilities and often forecloses potential for real dialogue. As such, parents are “to be manipulated or without power to position themselves as they see fit” (Barton, 2004, p. 4). White, middle-class
hegemonic imaginaries have historically sculpted the values and terrain of participation (Zachary & Olatoye, 2001), thus, forms of involvement mirror and favor the image of a “parent” as a white, middle-class, Protestant, female from a heteronormative nuclear family. In this model, family structures that deviate from this imaginary must learn how to “fit” within these forms of participation. This is a task, which is laden with implicit and often invisible cultural practices and in the case of single parents and guardians, may be impossible (Carvalho, 2001; Vincent & Tomlinson, 1997). The discursive landscape shows how the family is an ideological space in which dominant ideology disseminates regulative norms through the definition and implementation of parent involvement.

Kathryn Nakagawa (2000) describes the discourse of parent involvement as one that has contradictory messages, making it difficult for families to comply and/or engage with conventional forms of involvement. For example, the first strategy for parent involvement (Epstein & Dauber, 1991) states that the school should assist in child rearing and parenting, suggesting parents cannot adequately fulfill their role as parents. Yet, parents are also viewed as “protectors,” and “parents must protect their children’s interests because schools will not” (Nakagawa, 2000, p. 448). These representations of parents as inadequate or “problems” (Dyrness, 2011; Lopez, 2004; Olvios, 2006; Zarate, 2007) and “protectors” or advocates for their children, situates them in what Nakagawa calls a “double bind,” wherein the parents have two alternatives, but either one or both can potentially compromise the role of parents or positions them as inadequate:
[parents] must choose to be involved in the way that the school dictates or else they will be constructed as a problem; alternatively, they may choose to protect their children’s interests. In which case they will still be seen as a problem – overly involved and unable to turn the school around (p. 449).

Labeled a “good” parent if they are complicit in the forms of involvement dictated by the school and labeled a “troublemaker” or “bad” parent if they deviate, LI/RCLD parents that do not mold themselves to the hegemonic construct of “parent” described earlier, have little choice but to accept the label of “bad” parent, regardless of their participation.

Similar to Nakagawa’s study, Andrea Dyrness (2011) uses Patricia Hill Collin’s (2000) concept of “controlling images” to articulate the ways in which parents are positioned in a good/bad binary.25 These stereotypical images of the good and bad parent were designed by and served the interests of the dominant group and schooling is an institution that serves the purposes of the dominant group. Accordingly, “good” parents are supportive of staff, puppets of the school, “pretzel sellers” (Gold, Simon & Brown, 2002, p. 6), and advocates for the school at the district level. Good parents participate in body, but not in mind, supporting the production of schooling through their physical presence (Dyrness, 2011). With regard to the mothers in Dyrness’ work (2007, 2011), teachers and school personnel would ask the parents to be present for district meetings or activities where the parents’ presence was a form of consent to the school’s agenda, but when the parents

---

25 This good/bad binary allows for the school to have a discursive authority to perpetuate dominant ideologies such as nationalism (policing transnational migration), neoliberalism, and individualism.
wished to voice their disagreement with school policies, they were quickly labeled as “bad” parents. In essence, “parents who named the problem were the problem” (Dyrness, 2011, p. 112). This included anyone that vocalized dissent with the school’s policies.

In addition to this double bind or good/bad parent binary, parents are also framed in a neoliberal discourse as consumers (Borg & Mayo, 2001; Gold, Simon, & Brown, 2002). In the climate of an overrepresentation of “social mobility” (Labaree, 1997), good parents and their children are seen as consumers; they “buy” certain schools and school programs. Parent as consumer mollifies the parent’s role and constricts the parent’s agency. Paired with the discourse of parent involvement that polices parental behavior through labeling parents as “bad” if they deviate from these parent involvement activities, it becomes apparent that most “parent involvement efforts are intended to endorse the school policies with little regard for parent’s understanding of the schools” (Delgado Gaitan, 2001, p. 187) and do not intend to engage parent concerns that may deviate from the school’s agenda.

**Part II: The “home” according to the school**

Traditional avenues of parent involvement and community-school relations do not provide opportunities for LI/RCLD parents and community members to address their concerns with the school (Gold, Simon, & Brown, 2002; Mediratta, 2007; Zachary & olatoye, 2001). Based on white, middle-class ideological constructs of “parent” and “family,” this involvement model requires LI/RCLD parents and
families to learn to act like white middle-class compliant parents. Dominant discourses and the structure of school fabricate this image and definition of parent involvement, which systematically excludes and silences certain families and students.

For example, Lareau (2003) concludes that most low-income children do not have childhood experiences that provide a “concerted cultivation” for an institutional advantage when entering schools. She concludes that school-centric spaces have a particular class, race, culture ethos that are more congruent with certain home cultures. For the children from these home cultures with “concerted cultivation” (white, middle-class), the movement between home and school is seamless – each reinforces the other. For children from LI/RCLD home cultures, the movement between home and school presents barriers. When each space presents a differing ethos that is often in conflict with the other, this is not only challenging for the child who traverses these spaces daily, but also for the parents.

Other scholars emphasize cultural values and “funds of knowledge” (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) of LI/RCLD communities to expose an ineffectiveness on the part of schools to respond to multiple and diverse publics (Delgado Gaitan, 1992; Valdés, 1996; Valencia, 1997; Valencia & Black, 2002). This includes the school’s inability to recognize knowledge valued within the school (i.e. math and science) as part of the funds of knowledge within LI/RCLD communities. Therefore, researchers, policymakers and school personnel need to acknowledge the school and school policy as mired in dominant value systems (i.e.
white, middle-class imaginaries) and re-conceptualize parent involvement to include an ecological vision that links family, school and community factors, specifically for LI/RCLD communities (Barton et al., 2004; Li, 2008; Baquedano-López, Alexander & Hernandez, 2013).

In addition to parent involvement of in-school activities and parent-teacher communication, schools often implement strategies for home learning, where school personnel ask parents to participate in schooling practices at home. The most common activities include homework and home visits. Some critical scholars argue that these forms of schooling in the home are invasions of privacy. Schools, as social agents of the state, intrude upon the private sphere and through regulative and controlling activities such as homework, the family must comport itself in specific state-sanctioned ways within the home (Carvalho, 2001; Torres & Hurtado-Vivas, 2011).

With regard to homework, Maria Eulina de Carvalho (2001) argues that a parent involvement model is based on antiquated familial roles and these days, parents or family members have little time to “play school” at home. She explains the home as a place for informal education and the school as the place for formal education. As such, formal education should not be the responsibility of the family. However, parent involvement mandates formal education to become the concern of the family.

This re-positioning of school activities within the sphere of the home shifts both parent and teacher roles. Teachers become the “supervisors” of the parent’s
schooling techniques and the role of teacher shifts to the parent. This results in a de-
professionalization of teachers (Carvalho, 2001) and asks parents to take on a role
beyond that of guardian or parent of their child. Parents become inspectors for the
school at home (Carvalho, 2001) and provide surveillance of the student (Torres &
Hurtado-Vivas, 2011). This shift into the home, diverts the task of educational
improvement from the context of the classroom to the home and consequently,
blames families that may not consent or be able to “play school” at home (Carvalho,
2001). Thus, Carvalho (2001) sees homework and other schooling activities
mandated to the home space as a form of symbolic violence of the school over the
family and a state imposed regulation of private life. In her analysis of homework,
Carvalho acknowledges the undesirable distance between home and school, but does
not see homework as a way to lessen this distance.

Home visits are another strategy school personnel use to bridge the gap
between school and home. In his work on Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF)
community organizing for school reform, Denis Shirley (2002) reports on a
community-based reform effort where teachers implemented home visits. Within this
study, Shirley highlights different cases where home visits facilitated a connection
between the teacher and the family and noted the changes in teacher’s perceptions of
students after the teachers began to visit student’s homes. When Palmer Elementary
School implemented home visits,

teachers reported a greater sense of reality and
compassion for the children, and they became aware
that while some children lived in secure middle-class
homes, others were moving from one dilapidated shack
to another as they were repeatedly evicted due to their inability to pay rent (Shirley 2002, p. 27-28).

Teachers said they began to “admire” the kids after they saw their everyday lives and while this move exposed teachers to the realities of their students, it can be a dangerous moment where teachers judge a household based on their value system and easily contextualize students and families in deficit frames, providing another rationale for why certain kids will not succeed. However, within this account, Shirley similarly highlights ways in which parents actively engaged beyond conventional forms of parent involvement, providing an example of parents expressing their perceptions on how the schools need to change.  

Part III: El hogar

In an ecological vision, parent involvement takes into account the multiple ways in which LI/RCLD (including Latino) parents engage in their children’s schooling at home (Barton et al., 2004; Snell, Miguel, & East, 2009). In response to the deficit frames that contextualize Latino parents as problems or subjects that need to be socialized to the ways of school, scholars have begun to reclaim the home space as one full of knowledge and educational value (Dyrness, 2007, 2011; Delgado-Bernal, 2006; Valdés, 1996; Valencia & Black, 2002; Villenas, 2001). In her book Con Respeto, Guadalupe Valdés (1996) centers home knowledges and pedagogies to

26 This is reminiscent of Norma González, Luis Moll and Cathy Amanti’s (2005) work, where teachers went into homes and learned about families’ funds of knowledge to incorporate in classroom knowledge production. In Chapter IV, I explore conversations in Adelante to highlight a theme of honoring knowledge that contrasts with how people spoke of “funds of knowledge,” illustrating how “funds of knowledge” potentially produces a conceptual unidirectional relationship of teachers extracting funds or knowledges from communities.
show the cultural value systems at play within Latino households. Similarly, Sofia Villenas (2001) emphasizes a “claiming el hogar in the midst of the English-speaking community’s attempts to define their families and childrearing practices as ‘problem’” (p. 12). In response to the assault of normative cultural values that threatened to change the Latina mothers and their families, Villenas documented how these mothers promoted a strong moral education in the household (Villenas, 2001).

Together, Valdés and Villenas represent a growing body of literature that acknowledges and values knowledge and epistemologies of the ‘home’ space to counter deficit frames (see Dyrness, 2007; González, Moll & Amanti 2005; Hurtig, 2005). In this same vein, Dolores Delgado-Bernal (2006) moves beyond the recognition of cultural and pedagogical practices within the Latino home to show ways in which “pedagogies of the home provide strategies of resistance that challenge the educational norms of higher education and the dominant perceptions held about Chicana students” (p. 113). Not only does Delgado-Bernal refute deficit frames, she proposes that the home is also a productive space of resistance wherein Latino families can resist assimilation into dominant cultural values and create alternative ways of participating in and with the school.27

This scholarship calls for a reconceptualization of parent participation that acknowledges and values the cultural, historical knowledges of parents within the school. If the intention of parent participation in school is to bridge the gap between

---

27 For more theorizing on Chican@/Latin@ resistance in the home and school, see Daniel Solorzano & Dolores Delgado-Bernal (2001). In this writing, authors create a map of resistance from self-defeating to transformational, or Julio Cammarota’s (2004) work where he analyzes the differing ways in which Latin@ resistance manifests in a high school context based on gendered and racialized trajectories.
the world of the home and community with that of the school, then parent participation in and with schools needs to contend with the power differential between the home and the school. There must be a democratic and dialogical interaction between the school, the families they serve, and the communities in which they are situated to bring about equitable change (see. Oakes, Rogers, & Lipton, 2006; Dyrness 2011). This process begins with refuting deficit models of parent involvement, exposing the multitude of knowledges that exist within *el hogar* (including knowledges and skills valued in school), and then operationalizing dialogical models of community-school interactions that move towards and produce more equitable outcomes.

*From involvement to engagement*

In a movement away from parent involvement, scholars developed the term “parent engagement.” Parent engagement delineates a form of participation that, in contrast to parent involvement, integrates parents in a more equitable way into the schooling of their children. Often parent engagement definitions promote an equity oriented ecological model of viewing the school in the larger community context (Barton, 2004). Although the definition continues to be mired in the beliefs and values that constitute school culture (white, middle-class), it is more inclusive for LI/RCLD parents and families.

Denis Shirley (2002) states, although “[p]arent involvement is often stressed as an important component of the work on school reform” (p.37), “[p]arent
involvement – as practiced in most schools and reflected in the research literature – avoids issues of power and assigns parents a passive role in the maintenance of school culture” (p. 73). The work of parent involvement does not “…expand the repertoire of possibilities open to parents so that they can not only support the traditional work of the school but also transform it through civic engagement” (p. 37). Shirley recognizes the importance of parent involvement and challenges the ways in which schools implement parent involvement. He suggests parent participation must include a form of civic engagement that looks to community action to change the school. Parents participate on their own terms and engage in the public sphere through civic activities that promote more equitable outcomes for schools and communities. However, Shirley’s definition does not interrogate the purpose of schooling, nor does it move the locus of reform away from the school. In this sense, parent engagement broadens participation in a system that reproduces social inequities.

According to Barton et al. (2004) parent engagement differs from parent involvement models in that it “frames parents both as authors and agents in schools” and their participation is a “dynamic, interactive process in which parents draw on multiple experiences and resources to define their interactions with schools and among school actors” (p. 3). This shift in frame centers parent agency in order to interrupt traditional parent involvement strategies of participation, but situated within...
the institutional constraints of schooling, parents cannot redefine their mode of participation on their own. They cannot carry the burden of this conceptual shift by themselves. According to Fine (1993), even when parents attempt to engage in transformative ways,

[if] they are alone, they will be read as marginalized and hysterical, especially if poor and of color. Unless the dynamics of power are addressed, unless the range and consequences of cultural capital are supported, and unless a deep vision of schools as community-based democracies of difference is engaged, parental involvement ‘projects’ will be transformed into crisis-intervention projects, into moments of having a voice but not getting a hearing, or into public contexts that slip into bankruptcy (Fine, 1993, p. 707).

In addition to Shirley’s notion of civic engagement, parent engagement projects must diligently center and re-center equity at the heart of their agendas in order to not “slip into bankruptcy” or become coopted by reform efforts that reproduce conventional methods of parent involvement. Therefore, parent engagement practices often include multiple stakeholders (in the community-school context) in a collective investigation of the function and purpose of schooling alongside a “deep vision of schools as community-based democracies of difference.” However, if the school does not promote and support these practices, parent engagement will ultimately need

29 Cooper & Christie (2005) provide an example of the work necessary to center equity at the core of a reform effort. In their evaluation of parents’ and educators’ notions of empowerment, they shifted their research agenda to highlight parent voices and emphasized the need for educators to learn how to be sensitive to culturally relevant values of parents and to share power. The effort on the part of the researchers to refocus the study and the implications for educators shows that a deep sustained equity driven shift towards parent engagement requires the participation of actors from the community, school and university.

30 The change effort documented in this study attempted to engage multiple stakeholders in dialogue about the function and purpose of schooling alongside dialogue regarding multifaceted community issues.
to conform to the practices and structures of schools (Wong, Glass, 2009; Dyrness, 2011).

Part IV: The “school” according to community voices

Latino parent engagement and parent engagement in general describe a form of parent participation that is more inclusive, but does not challenge the basic structures of schooling, which I argue at the start of this chapter are inequitable and wrought with race and class biases. In this section, I join conceptual frameworks of community organizing for school reform with Latino parent engagement to reframe parent participation and school reform in general from a school-centric policy focus to a community-centered model. I begin by exploring the different models of community organizing for school reform found in the literature. I then argue for a form of parent participation within a community organizing strategy of popular education, informed by the work of Paulo Freire and feminist theorists. I highlight examples of parent participation within a popular education model built to transform the school and the community and emphasize important elements of this reform that center parent and community voices, create space for collective agency, and strategically resist dominant ideological and structural barriers that prevent LI/RCLD parents and families from fully participating in their children’s schooling.
Community mobilization

There are multiple historical legacies of community mobilizing for school control. When confronted with an assimilationist school system, many interest groups rejected US public schools and fought for community control of schooling (see Tyack, 1974). Dating back to reconstruction, African American individuals and communities understood schooling and education to be deeply political, and many worked to gain access to schooling that was not based on “Anglo-conformity” of the “one best system” (Tyack, 1974; see Anderson, 1988). In the 1960’s the black power struggle emphasized schooling as a central issue in black liberation.

The current iteration of community organizing for school reform is predominantly a response to the market-driven reform movement of the last twenty years. The standards movement in the form of educational initiatives at the local, state, and national level have exposed the disparities of schooling and provided a platform for community members in neighborhoods with low performing schools to argue for community engagement in school change (Cuban & Usdan, 2003; Mediratta & Fruchter, 2001). Community organizations turned their focus to public schools in response to the growing awareness of the link between neighborhood revitalization and the quality of schools and have begun to use statistics such as disappearance rates, penitentiary tracking, and college eligibility to call for school reform (Mediratta & Fruchter, 2001; Oakes, Rogers, & Lipton 2006; Shirley, 1997, 2002; Warren, 2005, 2011; Zachary & olatoye, 2001).
In contrast to parent involvement methods and goals that are based on the individual child’s success in schools, community organizing can include helping individual children and schools, but its focus is on system change (Warren & Mapp, 2011). Typically derived from an Alinsky model of organizing, community organizing intentionally builds power among stakeholders (parents, young people, and residents) to change the relationship between school and the community it serves (Fuentes, 2009; Mediratta, 2007; Warren & Mapp, 2011). As stated by Lopez (2004), the “primary issues addressed by community organizing include accountability, parent engagement, school environment, equity, standards and performance, special programs and quality of instruction (National Center For Schools and Communities, 2002)” (p. 1).

In the same manner that community organizing for school reform expands beyond the traditional structure for parent involvement, it provides a different theoretical perspective that illuminates issues, goals, and strategies beyond the scope of traditional school reform (Gold, Simon & Brown, 2002; Oakes & Lipton, 2002; Oakes, Rogers & Lipton, 2006). The literature uses terms such as “traditional,” “technical,” “professional” and “organizational change” to explain the currently accepted reform model. Typically the organizational change model relies on technical strategies, professional educators, experts and the educational system to support and implement change (Gold, Simon & Brown, 2001). This model functions within the school and focuses on issues such as new teacher support, professional
development, standards implementation, and instructional strategies (to name a few) (Mediratta, Fruchter, 2001; Warren, 2005).³¹

The technical model deploys parent involvement, which tends to not account for conflict.³² A functionalist conception of schooling and institutions characterizes schools, school personnel and families as cohesive and any changes that should occur are technical in nature and require a simple “fix” to realign teachers and school personnel into their “expert” positions. This ignores conflicting perspectives between teachers, school administrators, school boards, and parents and families about what should be done to improve schools. The technical change model rarely provides physical or discursive space to hear the voices of parents and community members, often seeing them as part of the problem or unqualified (Gold, Simon & Brown, 2002).

The issues and goals of the technical model focus on raising technical capacity that often does not include concerns that parents and teachers raise with regard to changing the school, which are often issues of equity such as the distribution of resources, tracking, high stakes testing, safety, and curriculum inclusiveness (Ethnic Studies, etc.) (Mediratta & Fruchter, 2001; Warren, 2005; Warren & Mapp, 2011).³³

---

³¹ Other issues central to the learning community of educators in school reform include: professional collaboration and creating learning communities, authentic assessment and examination of student work, new teacher support, standard implementation, role of the district in reform, site management, academic support programs and interventions, literacy development, instructional strategies for English learners, block scheduling, academic grouping and other structural forms of creating smaller and more personalized units for learning.

³² See Oakes & Lipton (2002) account of Wilson High School where white parents rose up to stop a reform effort in the school to detrack students. Authors explain the educational change literature does not address conflict and therefore does not provide strategies or a conceptual frame for understanding.

³³ Different from organizational change issues, the issues central to the agendas of community organizing groups and their constituencies include: discipline and the criminalization of youth,
The institutional histories of the nineteenth century model of schooling are deeply entrenched in the structures and practices of schooling. So much so, that even if policy driven reform efforts have an equity agenda, they tend to be compromised through the process of implementation (Gold, Simon & Brown, 2002; Oakes & Lipton, 2002; Wong, Glass, 2009). In the same way, parent engagement strategies that do not focus equity at the center of the agenda can easily “slip into bankruptcy” (Fine, 1993).

Toward popular education for school and community change

While popular education efforts and community organizing efforts often share a focus on system change, there are notable differences in method. Alinsky methods typically “focus on leaders or organizers and plays out in the public sphere as organizing for power,” while Paulo Freire-influenced (popular education) models often focus on the construction of knowledge and relationships within the community and from that new center, move to affect change (Fuentes, 2009, p. 70). 34 The Freire-influenced model, or loosely referred to as “popular education,” 35 allots dialogical

distribution of resources, tracking, high stakes testing, curriculum inclusiveness (Ethnic Studies, etc), youth empowerment, safety, quality of teaching/relationships, language access and bilingual education, facilities (repairs, overcrowding, toxics, etc.), quality of treatment of children and parents, superintendent selection, and school privatization (Mediratta & Fruchter, 2001; Warren, 2005; Warren & Mapp, 2011)

34 I do not suggest that the Alinsky-influenced model, or community organizing for school reform do not integrate these dialogical and physical spaces, however the methodology prioritizes discrete actions and agitation in the public sphere.

35 In their review of the literature, Patricia Baquedano-López, Rebecca Anne Alexander, & Sera J. Hernandez (2013) provide some salient critiques of popular education models of reform. They suggest that while dialogue provides opportunity for silenced voices to express their perspective, there may not be equitable representation and some voices may be privileged over others. In addition, the facilitators of the dialogue are in a unique position of power that needs to be problematized. Facilitators can
and physical space to the process of community building which can yield more agentive subjectivities and imaginaries and parents can actively resist deficit frames imposed by conventional parent involvement (Harper, 2008; Beckett, Glass, & Moreno, 2012). The dialogical and physical space opens room for unpredictable outcomes, creative resistance of deficit frames, and the potential adoption of norms of schooling.

Some studies document programs that contest deficit frames and promote a re-imagining of the home, community and school through counternarratives. For example, Sofia Villenas (2001), Andrea Dyrness (2011), Janise Hurtig and Andrea Dyrness (2011), Concha Delgado Gaitan (2012) and Emma Fuentes (2013) all emphasize the importance of parents generating dialogue and creating counter-narratives in community settings that extend beyond the school and school-sanctioned events. In each of these studies, parents productively resisted normative constructs of parent involvement, and built forms of engagement that operate outside school-centric domains or frames. This occurred through activities in which participants investigated their social worlds, contested deficit frames that limited them, and created counter-narratives that positioned them as historical subjects. Through

create false hope and lead community members to believe that they are empowering themselves “while highly unequal power relations remain in place within the educational system” (p. 166, cites Rocha-Schmid, 2010). These issues, along with the complexity of developing a clear way to document transformational change from an inter-relational, to structural level, need further study. 36 I use this term based upon Freire’s definition of dialogue. “Dialogue is the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world” (Freire, 1970c, p. 88). Dialogue can only occur when all parties have regained their right and capacity to speak. It is a communal praxis and cannot be a simple transaction of ideas, a debate, or imposition of one’s ideas upon another. It requires an openness to listen, courage to be heard, and a commitment to enter into a process of discovery and creativity with others. I explore this idea of dialogue throughout chapters IV – VI.
dialogue, participants can explore their everyday lives and their community with a collective rising criticality of how their lives are interconnected not only with one another, but how their lives are situated in social, cultural, and economic structures. In this process, participants can begin to understand themselves as embedded and positioned, constrained by the dominant ideological limits, but always with possibilities of acting against and beyond those limits to open up possibilities for transformed futures (Freire, 1970).

Similar to other community mobilizing efforts, parent engagement that deploys popular education pedagogies must move beyond the school walls. Resistance takes place on a terrain already defined by and permeated by dominant ideologies (i.e. white, patriarchal, middle-class imaginaries), therefore it is difficult for conversations to arise that are not tainted by inequitable power relationships that re-inscribe dominant/subordinate subjectivities and thus constrain the transformative potential embedded within the situation. When resistance and transformative change arise they are generative, creative and operate from an axis different from that of the school. According to Maria Lugones (2003), resistance goes beyond a physical, psychological, or logical reaction\(^{37}\) to encompass an embodied, cognitive, and reflective response that is a creative, clever, complex and imaginative engagement with “the very intricacies of the structure of what is being resisted” (Lugones, 2003, p. 29). Dyrness (2011) uncovers this form of resistance in her study with Latina

---

\(^{37}\) According to María Lugones (2003), “reaction does not add anything creative to the meaning contained in that which is resisted, except some form of ‘no’” (p. 29). Reaction remains within the confines of existing social constructs, merely negating the unjust impositions of the dominant order.
women working for school reform. These women do more than challenge the narrative of reform that continues to position them at the margins; they establish their own spaces of learning and solidarity that enable them to crystallize their perspectives and become agents of change in their local context.

Even when schools or education authorities are explicitly trying to reach out, to be inclusive, to provide spaces for parental involvement, parents can be silenced (Baquedano-López, Alexander, & Hernandez, 2013). These dynamics are present in studies by Andrea Dyrness (2007, 2011) and Sofia Villenas (2001) that describe the ways school-sponsored forums, activities, and outreach projects continue to position LI/RCLD and immigrant parents as problems to be addressed, or as disruptive to the processes of reform. In these spaces, it seems that the voices and concerns of parents can easily become too loud, noisy, questioning, and assertive and the very parents who are ‘included’ and ‘involved’ get re-marginalized, and only those parents who are docile and fit the prescribed roles are welcomed into the process (Dyrness, 2007, 2011; Hurtig & Dyrness, 2011; Villenas, 2001). Therefore, this physical space is crucial for cultivating dialogue (Harper, 2008). Often ‘home’ spaces such as the kitchen table (Dyrness, 2011), or community centers (Beckett, Glass, Moreno, 2013; Villenas, 2001), are spaces parents and community members can speak more freely about their experiences.

Creating spaces for parents and teachers

Teachers are important agents in parent involvement, parent participation and
ultimately community mobilizing efforts to change schools and communities. Teachers interface with parents and are agents of the school system at the same time they are subject to it. Pia Lindquist Wong and Ronald Glass (2009) document a collaboration across five districts, a teacher’s union, a public university and a few community-based organizations. The intervention happened through professional development schools that organized educators through the K-12 system and strategized curriculum to intervene in the standardized testing mandates and for educators to interact with their students in more meaningful ways. Similarly, this dissertation study offers empirical insight into collaborative change efforts across institutions and the potential barriers and affordances to parent/teacher solidarities.

**Into the study**

Parent involvement, as defined by the school, plays out larger neoliberal, national, gendered and racialized discourses and this discursive landscape has material effects on the ways in which LI/RLCD parents are systematically policed and/or excluded from participating in the schooling of their children. The discourse of parent involvement produces the nineteenth century function and goal of schooling: to reproduce racial, classed, and gendered hierarchies that maintain a stratified society and economy.

Although the concept of parent engagement expands the scope of reform beyond the schools and integrates an equity agenda, the conceptual frame and definition maintains the school at the center of the reform effort and does not
challenge the underlying purpose of schooling. In addition, this definition does not go far enough to interrogate the underlying assumptions of the role of parents in schools and the role of parents in students’ lives. Even though the outcomes of these efforts are more humanizing than parent involvement efforts for LI/RLCD students and families, they still perpetuate multiple inequitable forms in which LI/RLCD parents are situated in relation to schools.

In their exploration of the history of school reform, Tyack and Tobin (1994), propose that the “grammar of schooling” is the fundamental logic in how the US public conceptualizes school. A school reform effort cannot deviate too much from this “grammar,” because in doing so, the effort may create schooling practices or structures that do not fit the collective historical imagined criteria for a school (the grammar) potentially delegitimizing the school-ness of the effort. Based upon a factory model and built during mass migrations to the US, schools functioned in part to “Americanize” and homogenize (I would add colonize) publics into dominant value systems (Tyack, 1974). Thus, as school reform efforts remain within this “grammar” of schooling, such efforts will continue to reproduce this ideological agenda of assimilation into the dominant culture and continue to experience persistent tensions with non-dominant communities.

Parent involvement/engagement is part of this “grammar.” Therefore, if reformers wish to change parent participation, parent engagement needs to be reframed within alternative institutional histories to interrupt this historical reproduction of the structures and agents of schooling (see Ogawa, 2015). While
community organizing for school reform provides the contexts and goals for this shift, feminist and popular education frames of community building provide sites for further exploration. Specifically, the context and logic of social movement making (Oakes & Lipton, 2002; Mediratta, 2007; Warren & Mapp, 2011) in the form of community mobilization and popular education may prove useful for reconceptualizing parent participation and broader structures of schooling. Popular education efforts could support the physical and dialogical space for parents and community members collectively analyzing the purpose of schooling and the assumptions that define parent roles in relation to the schools and their children’s lives.

Fundamental to this shift is a call to legitimize community knowledges and recognize the community as a resource and an ally in the process of raising student learning outcomes. I situate the equity agenda beyond the school walls and in the contexts of communities, parents, and school personnel coming together in a community engaged effort. Differing slightly from community organizing models for school reform grounded in Alinsky processes of organizing (see Lopez, 2004; Mediratta, 2007; Shirley, 1997, 2002; Warren 2005; Warren & Mapp 2011; Zachary & olatoye 2001), this study examines a Paulo Freire and Myles Horton (1990) influenced generative process of community and school stakeholders coming together and talking about their lives (see Beckett, Glass & Moreno, 2013; Dyrness, 2007, 2011; Fuentes, 2009; Hurtig & Dyrness, 2011; Olmedo, 2003; Snell, Miguel & East, 2009; Reyes & Torres, 2007; Villenas, 2001). This case study seeks to document this
community mobilizing effort’s project to build community, district connections, and a strong center of gravity in the community to acknowledge and integrate different “funds of knowledge” (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; see Wong & Glass, 2009). I explore how the effort creates ‘home’ spaces from which community members and district people re-imagine and re-create the “parent” according to school and the “school” according to community.

Throughout this chapter I argue for a space outside of the institution of schooling for parents, teachers, and other school agents (administrators and students) to come together and discuss the purpose and function of schooling. Latina/Chicana feminist writings express the importance of spaces for Latina mothers to share stories and collectively construct counter-narratives that interrupt deficit frames of motherhood, parenthood, and the family. These women call upon histories that exist outside and beyond white supremacy and the social order historically codified within US public schools and share experiences and stories to carve a space for counter-narratives to exist. In addition to these spaces, scholars have begun to explore what would it mean to work collectively across universities, districts, and community organizations to provide a pedagogical space that institutional arrangements do not easily afford; a space for learning across difference with the intention to shift the institutional arrangements and/or the subjects of those arrangements to better serve LI/RLCD students and families.

Scholarship in this area is relatively new, with community mobilizing efforts identifying outcomes of building “relational power” (Warren, 2005), developing
community leadership, and raising critical consciousness (Wong & Glass, 2009; Warren & Mapp 2011). This study seeks to add to these literatures through an exploration of the ways in which participants in a critically informed collaborative community mobilizing effort theorize their work together, how they make sense of the organizational contexts of their mobilizing, and how the participants utilize dialogue and storytelling as reflective devices to create the vision and actions of the effort.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

For this investigation I conducted a single-case study (Yin, 2003). I utilize a case study as a methodology to explore Adelante as a unique ‘bounded system’ (Stake, 1998). Adelante had an evolving and flexible organizational structure and was situated in a community setting with fluid and diverse stakeholders representing interests of different institutions and political forces. A single case study allowed me to circumscribe Adelante as a case of study of a political formation, while tracing the dynamics as the case evolved. I positioned the members of Adelante as embedded units of analysis (Yin, 2003) to account for the differing perspectives of the actors in the case and the differing aspects of the case (e.g. program components) without compromising the bounded-ness of Adelante as a case under study.

Rationale for a single-case study

Most misconceptions about case study research are derived from a positivistic framework, which imposes predictive experimental design expectations upon a case study design. Flyvberg (2006) challenges these misconceptions and suggests it is time to shift our understanding of the “role of the case and theory in human learning” to explore (1) how context-dependent knowledge is imperative to human learning and the development of experts and (2) how case studies, as the studies of human affairs, generate only context-dependent knowledge (p. 4). While “general, theoretical
(context-independent) knowledge” is considered more useful in scholarship, Flyvberg (2006) argues that ‘context-dependent’ knowledge collected throughout the case study is “more valuable than the vain search for predictive theories and universals” (p. 7). This argument toward the particular supports Haraway’s (1988) call to conduct research that contends with irreducible difference and the radical multiplicity of local knowledges while finding a way to speak with and across these differences and knowledges.

A single case study is a study of a single case, not a comparative case study or multiple case studies where there is a focus on the similarities and potential for generalizability. This methodology supports a documentation of ‘context-dependent’ knowledge. Stake (1998) explains a single case study deploys an “epistemology of the particular” (p. 94), which allows for an engagement with the particular nature of the case. This epistemological framing can align with feminist epistemologies in noticing counterhistories, non-modern resistance, exclusions, and absences as part of the methodology because these expressions differ depending on the context of the case.

Adelante was a social change effort informed by the literatures in parent involvement, school reform, and university-district-community collaborations. Designed as a popular education effort, the project sought to reimagine and redefine what school and community can look like in a small agricultural town in the Central Coast region of California. This was a unique intervention that could contribute to research literatures through descriptions and analyses of the people, practices, and
vision of Adelante. Therefore, a case study of this unique intervention required a focus on the particular theories, practices, and pedagogies deployed in Adelante.

In addition to the unique agenda and composition of political actors, Adelante was situated in sociohistorical and political context that shaped the people and practices of Adelante. A single case study affords the opportunity to ethnographically trace the colonial histories and legacies of resistance in and around Watsonville to provide the historical lineages of the peoples in Adelante. As Ronald Glass (2001) states, “the praxis that defines human existence” is historicity, which is “dialectic interplay between the way in which history and culture make people even while people are making that very history and culture” (p. 16). Therefore, in order to understand the political formations of Adelante, I must document the histories of the region and how they have defined the social, political and economic terrain in which this study takes place. This examination of the particular will not detract from the potential to generate theory. Quite the contrary, if I do not attend to these important elements of a case and give primary attention to generalizability and theory making, I may miss the components of the case that make it unique and worthy of study (Flyvberg, 2006; Stake, 1998).

Generating the theoretical framework

This case is inductive and informed by a pilot study conducted in 2010. Although I cannot know “at the outset what the issues, the perceptions, the theory will be” (Stake, 1998, p.93), this study is based on a pilot study, and the theoretical and
empirical literatures that inform this study (Chapter II). With this prior research and extensive literature review, I arrived to this research with theoretically informed questions to guide my inquiry. In 2010, I conducted a pilot study of Adelante. It was exploratory case study (Yin, 2009) that examined the use of a learning tool (digital story) as a pedagogical tool in the community-based school reform effort. I asked:

*How are people learning about themselves and the community through creating a digital story?*

*How are people learning about themselves and the community through using the digital stories as learning tools for investigating their community and local schools?*

I interviewed individuals to learn about their processes of creating digital stories, and I observed and interviewed individuals that participated in a collaborative effort to use the digital stories as learning tools for investigating their community and local schools. I collected the following data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>6 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>16 hours of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>11 1-2 page memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Website and meeting minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the pilot phase I conducted six semi-structured interviews (Bogden & Biklin, 1998) and observed approximately sixteen hours of meetings; many of the meetings and interviews occurred in Spanish. After repeatedly listening of the recordings, I selectively transcribed and coded three interviews and approximately eight hours of meeting time for analysis. I chose three individuals (two parents and one local district employee) to interview who were integral in the discussions during the meetings, had high attendance, had gone through the process of making a digital
story and experienced others seeing their stories. I selected the eight hours of meetings to code because it was during this time that the group learned and modeled the use of the digital story as a learning tool. In the pilot phase, my data set included three in-depth interviews, eight hours of field notes and audio recordings from meetings, and all writings on the history and current work of Adelante that I was able to collect to that point (a much larger archive was to be collected later).

For the pilot interviews, I selected key informants with the purpose of gathering in-depth information on personal histories, participants’ knowledge of and beliefs about Adelante, and on the processes of curriculum creation (LeCompte, 1999, p. 128). Throughout the data collection process I wrote analytic memos to myself regarding theory, data, methodology, reflexivity and any other general topics of interest (Saldaña, 2009).

This pilot study was conducted during the fourth year of what became nearly a ten-year life span of Adelante (2006 – 2014). Because my timing sample was restrictive, my data was representative of a singular perspective in time and did not account for other moments in Adelante (Bogden & Biklen, 1988, p. 98). While collecting data, I utilized the constant comparative method from grounded theory (Glasser & Straus, 1967) and emerging themes guided my data collection over the five months, narrowing in focus over time. My formal analysis did not happen until after data collection was complete, but emerging themes guided my inquiry through the process (Bogden & Biklen, 1998). What arose from the data was the start of an
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38 Further description of this curriculum development can be found in Chapter IV between 2009 and 2011.
analytic framework informed by writings from women of color theorists that called for a closer examination of the epistemological elements that arise in critical consciousness raising. While the scientific element of critical praxis is imperative to have a knowledge claim of injustice and to avoid being overcome by oppressive forces, additional epistemologies (embodied and relational) must be equitably interwoven into the rational process to better understand the ways in which consciousness develops into more critical forms. This requires a conceptual broadening of consciousness raising and an investigation of subsequent actions that may arise within the context of social movement making.

This analysis held promise for potential contributions to the literature on parent engagement, and community-school collaborations, although I was constricted by the size of the data set. The analysis from the pilot study informed the current study. At the end of the study, I concluded that the theory and empirical studies within the area of parent engagement, community organizing for school reform, popular education, and pedagogies of social change did not account for the multiple and various aspects of Adelante, and I became curious to explore how Adelante members, both past and present (at the time of the study), were making sense of the work of Adelante and what it meant to them. These conclusions ordered my dissertation research, aimed at building on current theories of school reform (parent and community participation), social movement making, pedagogies of social change, and school-community collaborations.
The case: Adelante

At the start of my dissertation data collection, Adelante was in its ninth year (2014). For this study, I expanded my pilot inquiry beyond an investigation of the creation and use of digital stories within the change effort to engage Adelante members in a structured reflection of the group’s history, perceived effectiveness, experiences of the participants (learners), and Adelante’s process of cultural production, which spanned beyond the creation of the digital stories. My primary research question explored how Adelante members described the pedagogy of Adelante’s work in different community settings.

Research question #1: How do Adelante members articulate the theory of the pedagogical strategies, educational interventions, and practices of Adelante?

In the case of Adelante, members interfaced at different points of the change effort to conceptualize, collectively articulate, mobilize, and produce specific forms of educational interventions and practices intended to engage community members in reflecting upon their daily lives and imagining alternative and better realities. Participants built the theory of Adelante informed by Freire’s pedagogical strategies (Brown, 1978; Freire, 1970; Glass, 2001; Wong & Glass, 2009). Participants mobilized the guiding theoretical framework of Adelante through pedagogical strategies, educational interventions and other practices in Adelante. This research question seeks to qualify how Adelante members engaged and mobilized these theories in their work together.
Adelante began with a gathering in 2006 of Watsonville community leaders at a conference, which was held at the University of California, Santa Cruz and involved scholars, community organizers, and activists. How did Adelante members take up the theories and examples from the conference and utilize them for their change effort? How do they conceptualize and articulate the mission of Adelante? And in reflecting upon the past nine years of Adelante (from 2006 – 2014), how do members articulate their understanding and implementation of their theoretical dispositions within the work of Adelante?

My second research question supports the first question through an inquiry into the organizational contexts of Adelante that both enabled and constrained the pedagogical possibilities of Adelante.

Research question #2: As a dialogical space and organizational entity, how do Adelante members make sense of the organizational context of Adelante?

1. How do Adelante members explain how Adelante functions as an organizational body?
2. How do Adelante members talk about the successes/challenges of Adelante? What critical moments in the group’s life do they identify and why?
3. How are issues of race, class, gender, age, citizenship, education and power animated in the dynamics of the membership and events of Adelante?

The pedagogy of Adelante exists outside the institution of schooling with political actors from the institutional arrangements of schooling, the university, the teacher’s union, and community-based organizations. This question explores the political formation of Adelante. Because knowledge production and pedagogy are
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39 I document this meeting in closer detail in Chapter IV, part II in 2006.
situated, I examined Adelante members’ conception of Adelante as an organizational body and how members identify and describe the successes and challenges of the organization.

In their review of the literature on parent engagement, Baquedano-López, Alexander, and Hernandez (2013) provide salient critiques of popular education models of reform. They suggest that while dialogical and physical spaces provide opportunity for silenced voices to express their perspective, there is no equitable representation and some voices will be privileged over others. Therefore, this study explores the different roles of Adelante members and how these roles reproduce subject positions within a hegemonic structure and/or create new subject positions.

The critiques of popular education mirror the array of feminist critiques of Paulo Freire’s theory and practice including the problematic of the binary of oppressor/oppressed (Weiler, 1991), the outsider/insider dynamic of the facilitator/educator (Ellsworth, 1989), and the privileging of rational over relational and embodied epistemologies within critical consciousness raising (e.g. Beckett, QE, 2013; Glass, 2001; Grande, 2000; Weiler, 1991). Informed by these theoretical discussions, I explore potential ways through some of these issues with the support of feminist theory.

The third research question that drives my inquiry is closely aligned with the pilot study to enrich the data set and to engage a deeper exploration of the creation and use of digital stories in Adelante. In the pilot study, I analyze the experiences six
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40 Feminist pedagogy grapples with these complex power dynamics in learning settings (e.g. Macdonald & Sánchez-Casal, 2002)
Adelante members in creating their digital stories and six months of meetings (16 hours in total), where Adelante members utilized two digital stories as learning tools to create a curriculum for community dialogues. These two snapshots into Adelante’s pedagogical strategies inspired a deeper and broader investigation into the cultural productions, beyond the digital stories and digital storytellers captured in the pilot study.

Research question #3: How do Adelante members utilize the cultural productions (e.g. digital stories) as reflective device in order to make sense of their individual relationship to Adelante and their collective mission as a group?

In the first phase of my dissertation research I compiled an archive of all the cultural productions that Adelante members used as pedagogical tools. These include parent letters, student letters, two plays, and approximately twenty digital stories. In the interviews and during phase three of the data collection of the dissertation study, I asked Adelante members to discuss the creation and use of pedagogical tools in their reform effort. Specifically, I asked Adelante members to identify moments (if any) while creating and using these pedagogical tools that changed their way of seeing themselves, each other and the world.

Access

I attended my first Adelante meeting in June of 2010 and continued to attend every meeting for the next six years. Initially, I volunteered in these meetings as a note taker and to help organize meetings via email and phone conversations. I am not
from Watsonville, nor do I live there, which raised questions regarding my agenda of working with Adelante throughout my five years (2010 – 2015) of involvement. Initially, members were skeptical of my presence as a researcher and continued to question the role of research in Adelante’s mission. Throughout the data collection and analysis I reflect upon my positionality as a researcher inhabiting the “outsider” identity in analytic memos (Saldaña, 2011).\footnote{Example in Appendix A.}

In September of 2010, I proposed a small pilot study to Adelante members. At the time, Adelante members were beginning to develop curriculum for using the digital stories in community dialogues. At a meeting, I offered to document the process of curriculum development that Adelante members could use for future reflection and development. Adelante members unanimously consented to this study. The study lasted approximately six months. To disseminate my findings, I initially had a small meeting where I talked a bit about what I found. In the meeting, I was not very successful in translating the academic language into comprehensible prose and we had low attendance. Instead, I had informal conversations with Adelante participants regarding my findings from the study, much of which confirmed assumptions Adelante members had regarding the power of creating and using the digital stories, but it also raised questions about how to move from talking about the digital stories and each other’s experiences to a concrete community action plan.

After the pilot study in 2010, I continued my involvement in meetings, events, a curriculum development team for a standards-based 8 – 12 grade social studies
curriculum, and parent literacy workshops. I was a co-facilitator in the Spanish and Indigenous speaking parent literacy workshops and integrated with the teachers as an Adelante member for the curriculum development team. Through these forms of engagement, I gained a rapport with Adelante members and felt comfortable suggesting a dissertation study that could potentially support Adelante’s work as a community-engaged educational reform effort.

By 2011, Adelante often did not have a consistent, sustained, and multifaceted agenda for creating digital stories and using them in community contexts. The work of Adelante developed in six month to one-year spurts, with lulls in activity interspersed. As a volunteer effort, Adelante was comprised of many different committed stakeholders, each utilizing their professional and personal connections to create opportunities for Adelante to work in different institutional and community contexts. Without financial support, these efforts were often left at the mercy of institutional agendas or the workloads of individuals involved. Sometimes the opportune moment to engage was not available due to logistics and constraints in resources. In 2013, Adelante members began to question the vision and efforts of Adelante. Similar to the pilot project, I proposed a study that could support the reflective process for Adelante members and possibly provide insight into the vision and efforts and potential future of Adelante.

In January 2013, I proposed a year-long study of Adelante where I would collect past and present Adelante members’ perceptions of the vision and work of Adelante and provide feedback to Adelante to either clarify or recreate the collective
vision. Depending on the realities of stakeholders, Adelante members would then decide whether and how Adelante should move forward as a collaborative school-community change effort. Members determined the process would be useful and consented.

Validity and reliability

I use ethnographic methods (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995) for data collection. In order to establish validity I collected five of the six sources of evidence outlined by Yin (2003): documentation (agendas, announcements, meeting minutes, written reports, etc.), records material (budgets, lists of names and other quantitatively relevant items), semi-structured interviews (Bogden & Biklin, 1998), participant-observation (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995), and physical and cultural artifacts (these are the cultural productions of Adelante). I include analytic memos (Saldaña, 2011) that I wrote before, during and after data collection. These analytic memos reflect upon the events, and ruminate on theoretical questions and/or my positionality. The reflective gathering of the group in the process of data collection will also serve as a collective member check. Below is a table that indicates which data sources were analyzed to answer each research question.

| Research question #1 | • 2010 Semi-structured interviews (n = 6)  
• 2014 Semi-structured interviews (n = 14)  
• 2010 Field notes (n = 16 hours)  
• 2010 and 2014/15 Analytic memos (n = 21) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research question #2</td>
<td>• Documentation (agendas, announcements, meeting minutes, written reports)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to open the potential for external validity, I use theory in this single-case study. Generalizability in a case study depends on the potential for analytic generalization (Yin, 2003a): the ability to “generalize a particular set of results to some broader theory” (P. 37). Analytic generalization is contingent upon the use of the theory in future case studies and depends on whether the theory can be replicated (Yin, 2003a). However, I do not place the success of this study upon its external validity, nor does the research design require generalizability beyond the immediate case (Flyvberg, 2006). I chose the case of Adelante because it was intentionally designed to engage with a variety of issues identified in Chapter II, it had a large archive, participants were available to be interviewed and I participated in the effort for more than five years.

There is not a single set of reliability measures for a case study therefore in order to determine the stability and quality of the data, I outlined interview protocols\(^{42}\) (Yin, 2003). These guided the collection of data and minimized the potential for error and bias. I documented my procedures of data collection. This

\(^{42}\) See Appendices B
provided a transparency to my process, which diminishes the potential for bias and fortifies the study’s reliability (Yin, 2003).

**Data collection**

Data collection occurred in 3 phases: a) creating an archive of all of Adelante’s documentation and pedagogical tools, b) interviewing key participants in Adelante, and c) participant data collection and presenting emergent themes to key participants.

**Phase One**

In the first phase of this dissertation study, I gathered all the documents and pedagogical tools Adelante created over the past seven years. A parent and professor who had paper and electronic files of materials could account for almost all of the materials from Adelante. Documents included: over 100 parent letters to teachers, final and drafts of digital stories, a parent-written play, audio and transcripts from focus groups (with parents, youth, and teachers), meeting minutes and agendas, photos of events, audio and a few transcripts of interviews with Adelante members conducted by local students. I digitized and chronologically organized these cultural productions into an archive on an external hard drive.

**Phase Two**

While creating the archive, I conducted semi-structured interviews (Bogden &
Biklen, 1998) with past and present Adelante members and any affiliated persons who played integral roles in Adelante’s lifespan. I identified eighteen key informants to interview and I conducted fourteen half-hour to two-hour interviews in total. Two members of Adelante declined to be interviewed, although I was able to interview both of them in the pilot study in 2010. One was a parent, the other a parent and district worker. Each had been very committed to the work of Adelante, but neither was able to be present for this particular project, and they did not object to inclusion of their pilot phase interview in the dissertation study. In addition, there were two undergraduate alumni of the university that had been involved in Adelante in 2008. They had made digital stories, and both volunteered with Adelante for a six-month service-learning program at which time they also conducted interviews with some key early participants in Adelante. I was not able to get in touch with either of these undergraduate alums.

I conducted interviews to investigate each Adelante member’s relationships with Adelante (personal and interpersonal and ideological), their perceptions of the organizational successes and challenges of Adelante, and powerful moments they remembered, when participants saw themselves, their community, and the world differently. Based on an emergent design (Creswell, 2009) of a single-case study (Stake, 1985; Yin; 2003) I conducted a “first cycle” emic coding (Saldaña, 2011) of these interviews to explore what meanings participants place on Adelante, their relationships with Adelante, the mission of Adelante, the organizational work of Adelante, their perception of the successes and failures of Adelante, and “powerful”
moments they felt while participating in Adelante (Creswell, 2009). First cycle coding methods occurred during the initial coding of data and can be separated into seven subcategories (Saldaña, 2011), however, I utilized three of these seven subcategories.43

I deployed Attribute Coding (Saldaña, 2011) in the first phase of data analysis to create a chronological map of the activities and cultural productions of Adelante based on the stakeholders involved in the activity, what the activity was, and how long it lasted. I developed a database of these materials. Although I did my best to gather documents, there are a few documents that are missing. This is represented in moments where I write “No Audio,” “No Notes,” or “NOTHING.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Folder Name</th>
<th>Description of contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative materials</strong></td>
<td>These are documents such as: job descriptions, donation letters, MOUs etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of the Project</strong></td>
<td>Throughout the database, there are dated floating descriptions of Adelante. Most of the grant proposals have descriptions. (Probable overlap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagrams</strong></td>
<td>Storage for praxis cycle graphic and other graphics used to explain Adelante’s pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital stories</strong></td>
<td>• 2007 April (n = 4)  \n• 2008 Summer (n = 9)  \n• 2010 May (n =6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Focus groups**           | • Youth  
  o Youth focus group schedule  
  o Focus group facilitator guidelines  
  o Focus group facilitator training notes  
  o Youth audio (11 files)  
  o Youth transcripts (n=1)  
• Parent |

43 According to Saldaña (2011), the seven subcategories (Grammatical, Elemental, Affective, Literary & Language, Exploratory, and Procedural) can overlap and mix, just as long as the methods are compatible for the analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funding</strong></th>
<th>Contains proposals, cover letters, budgets, presentations, projects for funding applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Interviews** | • Alejandra’s Interviews (2008)  
  o George  
  o Phoebe  
  o Michelle  
  o William  
  o Elise  
  • Martin’s Interviews (2008)  
  o Bloom-S (with transcript)  
  o Elizabeth S (with transcript)  
  o Jose (with transcript)  
  o David P (only transcript, no audio)  
  • Linnea’s Interviews (2010)  
  o Sheila  
  o Phoebe  
  o Luisa (with transcript)  
  o Luis (with transcript in Spanish)  
  o Claudia (with transcript in Spanish)  
  o Gabriella (with transcript in Spanish)  
  • Linnea’s Interviews (2014)  
  o Daniel  
  o Mark  
  o Edgar (with transcript)  
  o Michelle (with transcript)  
  o George (with transcript)  
  o Jose (with transcript)  
  o Omar (with transcript)  
  o Richard (with transcript)  
  o Elise (with transcript)  
  o Luisa (with transcript)  
  o Cristina (with transcript)  
  o Claudia (with transcript in Spanish)  
  o William (with transcript)  
  o Phoebe (with transcript) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>All materials for IRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Letters</td>
<td>106 letters from parents. (Yet to be organized beyond focus groupings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Adelante Meeting Minutes | • 2006  
  o (10 meeting minutes, 7 agendas)  
  • 2007  
  o (5 meeting minutes, 7 agendas)  
  • 2008  
  o (2 documents – Research documents - Live Oak & Watsonville)  
  o No meeting minutes  
  • 2009  
  o (2 meeting minutes)  
  • 2010  
  o (4 meeting minutes – planning and creating digital stories)  
  o Overview of Adelante meetings 2010 – 2011 – creating questions for dialogue circles  
  • 2011  
  o (NOTHING)  
  • 2012  
  o (6 meeting minutes)  
  o GIIP meeting notes  
  o Adelante Proposal workshop series  
  • 2013  
  o (8 meeting minutes)  
  o Neighborhood Services Planning minutes  
  • 2014  
  o (1 meeting minutes)  
  • Teacher meetings  
  o 2007 (7 meeting minutes)  
  o (NOTHING MORE)  
  • Parent Meetings  
  o (NOTHING) |
| Outreach            | Brochures, flyers, event materials, contact info, outreach letters                    |
| Pictures            | Storage for all photos                                                               |
| PPTs                | PowerPoints from conferences and presentations  
                      Examples include: American Education Research Association, New York, NY  
                      American Education Research Association, Denver, CO  
                      Presentation at local high school |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research materials</th>
<th>Surveys designed for parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>2 theater pieces, written with parents in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Literature reviews from creating documents about Adelante for funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Workshops          | I have yet to date and sort out these documents. There are quite a few with similar titles. Some of these materials may go within the digital storytelling folder, others will be part of a folder on workshops/focus groups regarding facilitation training (including audio and transcripts from creating the digital storytelling facilitation questions, i.e. curriculum)  
  - Digital Story Facilitation Workshop  
  - Digital Story Workshop Readings  
  - Digital Story Workshop Scrip Drafts  
  - Digital Storytelling Training  
  - DS Facilitation Training Agenda & Notes |

I coded the documents using a mixture of Descriptive Coding and Holistic Coding. Descriptive Coding “summarizes in a word or short phrase – most often as a noun – the basic topic of a passage of qualitative data.” This coding schema allowed me to identify the topic without an “abbreviation of the content” (Saldaña, 2011, p. 70, italics in original). Holistic Coding allowed me to chunk broad themes while identifying topics. This created a basic vocabulary, rooted in the participant language (In Vivo) and allowed me to track, over time, the organizational and participant shifts. For example, I used Descriptive Coding throughout the 48 documents of meeting minutes from 2006 – 2014 to create a timeline of descriptive
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44 For example, I coded for “honoring knowledge” with regards to the moments when participants talked about parent knowledges, teacher knowledge, and community knowledge. I categorized broad themes of knowledge as they related to the different perspectives of participants while identifying the conversations regarding knowledge was focused on how to “honor” and engage diverse knowledges.
events that occurred throughout Adelante.  

I then created a physical representation of the timeline (10 feet by 5 feet poster), designating the activities of Adelante along with larger economic and social phenomena and local politics, specifically the teacher’s union, the school district, and the community center. I integrated the chronological map of activities and cultural productions of Adelante from the first phase of Attribute Coding onto the timeline and created a color-coded key of the different stakeholders activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Adelante meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green</td>
<td>Teacher engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light purple</td>
<td>Parent work through El Centro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark purple</td>
<td>Youth engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light blue</td>
<td>LPUSD Parent literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep blue</td>
<td>Digital storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light green</td>
<td>Events, presentations &amp; conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Research &amp; collaborative inquiry (e.g. curriculum development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Institutional connections and losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Quotes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I coded the interviews from 2010 and 2014 with first cycle coding and a mixture of Elemental, Affective, and Exploratory Methods (Saldaña, 2011, p. 46). Specifically, I used Initial, In Vivo, Emotion, Values, and Holistic Coding throughout the interviews (Saldaña, 2011). Initial Coding, also known as “Open coding” is a  
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45 While creating the descriptive timeline, I coded for the identifying topics and integrating them into the themes.
46 In the first round of coding I used Attribute and Holistic Coding to sort the data and organize it. I then organized the historical documents based on Descriptive and Holistic Coding, to determine general emic codes in the documents (Descriptive) and to cluster these themes based on potential stories emerging (Holistic). Elemental, Affective and Exploratory methods are three of the seven subcategories of coding that Johnny Saldaña (2009) suggests as subcategories that can be mixed and overlapped, just as long as they align with the analysis. To code the interviews from 2010 and 2014, I use Initial (Elemental), Invivo (Elemental), Emotion (Affective), Values (Affective), and Holistic Coding (Exploratory).
general, emic form of coding. I prioritized the participant language, emotions, values, attitudes, and beliefs. In Vivo Coding, the codes in quotes are the actual words participants used. Emotion and Values Coding allowed me to focus on the expressions of emotions, values, attitudes, and beliefs to identify how participants were making sense of Adelante. This was important because individual and collective values and perspectives may not be in harmony with individual actions or projects within Adelante (Saldaña, 2011). This coding schema allowed me to trace these themes. While coding the interviews, I thematically coded (Saldaña, 2011) relevant archival materials (e.g. meeting minutes) that accompanied some of the emergent themes. Three main themes emerged after identifying codes and subcodes (see Tables 1, 2, and 3).

Theme #1: Descriptors of pedagogy and practices of Adelante

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>SUBCODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection through dialogue</td>
<td>• share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• tell stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• create conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• hear, listen, silenced voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common vision</td>
<td>• create a common vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• community building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for critical reflection</td>
<td>• thinking critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• raise consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor community knowledge</td>
<td>• from the “ground-up”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• parent knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• community knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 The majority of the Affective codes were descriptive and I could code easily for their descriptive presence in transcripts. Participants often articulated their emotions. I sometimes would prompt a question to incite an explanation of the emotions. I add Affective codes to account for less direct emotions.
**Theme #2: Productive tensions in Adelante’s organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>SUBCODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopes, fears, frustrations &amp; skepticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure (plans, goals &amp; objectives)</td>
<td>“scheduling”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknowing</td>
<td>• lack of clarity/definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• no specific goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• no location for Adelante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>• outreach and developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• lots of turn-over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• who should be involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (energy and time)</td>
<td>• volunteer effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• temporary or outside labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• compensation for parents and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “another job”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• making the work of Adelante your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>• leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “no leadership”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• parent leadership/ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme #3: Locating Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>SUBCODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerful moments: Changes in perspective</td>
<td>• opening up and sharing stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• creating connection and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “hope”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “passion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• self-reflection &amp; develop thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Raised consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Still alive”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operationalizing “action”</td>
<td>• structural change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “getting into the system”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• institutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• community space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• different locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• lack of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I produced two posters of the three themes. The posters were organized around the titles of “How do we imagine social change?” and “Tracking the impact: What did Adelante (not) do?” These themes, and the timeline provided visual representations of the data that were based upon the questions Adelante members raised in 2013 meetings and became the foundation for phase three of data collection.

**Phase Three**

In the last phase of the research process, I presented the emergent themes to current and past Adelante members at a half-day gathering. These themes related to the research questions of pedagogy, organization, and cultural productions of Adelante. We held the gathering at the Teacher’s Union Office in downtown Watsonville from 9:30 – 12:30 on a Saturday. I extended an invitation to all the members that participated in the study.

Attendees: George, Edgar, Omar, Elise, Luisa, Phoebe, Michelle, Daniel, Sheila, Claudia, Gabriella, and Cristina

Regrets: Jose (lives out of the area), Mark (lives out of the area), Richard, Jack, and Luis

To set up the meeting, I placed two posters with the interview data and the timeline along a wall in the Teacher’s Union office. I then organized all of the parent letters, photos, student letters, and plays on a table next to the posters.
The agenda for the gathering

9:30 - 10: People arrive in the space and conduct their gallery walk.48
10:00: Gather around a table and fill out a cue card
   - Prompt for cards: Why are you here today? What do you hope will happen? How are you
     feeling?
Brief overview of visuals
   - Ask folks: What are the intentions for the day? What are we doing here? I provided two big
     questions on the posters that arose from the interviews and a space for folks to add to the
     questions and structure the agenda.
10:10 – 10:30 Gallery walk
10:30 – 12:30 Discussion
   - What caught your eye? What did you see? What was missing?
     o This is a moment to focus on description and how people engaged the materials.
   - What is the “work” of the Adelante? What are the strengths and weaknesses of Adelante?
     o Dialogical space, physical space, longevity, space to critique each other’s subject
       position, unknowing, hope, labor, doubt, skepticism
   - Tracking the impact: What did Adelante do? What did Adelante not do?
     o Powerful moments, relationships, changes in perspective, “moved” people, limits to
       dialogue, perspectives of action
   - Looking back: QUESTION
     o Historical moments, attempts to institutionalize, lost connections, tracing the
       agendas, public achievements/events, what is missing?
Follow-up questions:
   - What were some of the tensions you saw between ideas?
   - What was an “ah ha” moment?
   - If you could say something back to these quotes, what would you say?49

I audio recorded the gatherings upon receipt of participant consent.50 After creating
an archive of the documents from Adelante (phase one), gathering participant
perspectives through interviews (phase two), and codifying the first cycle of coding
into three visuals, I built a third phase of data collection based on a participatory
model of member-checking that involved a codification of the materials gathered into
visuals and then a re-presentation of that material for participants to interact with the
data in a museum-like framework. With the materials spread throughout the room, I

48 Much like curating a museum, I chose to facilitate a space where participants could read and look
through materials from Adelante. The gallery walk was an opportunity for people to walk around and
browse the materials at their own pace. I provided post-it notes for people to respond back to
something they saw by adding an opinion or thought or commenting on something missing.
49 I will describe the activities in which participants were involved in the narrative. I will place this
agenda in the appendix.
50 See Appendix D for informed consent forms.
asked participants to take some time and move through the room. Participants could pick up pictures, the play, and parent letters and look through them. I provided post-it for participants to interact with the visuals through written responses. Once they had about 20 minutes to peruse the room, I asked everyone to gather and share what they noticed, which generated dialogue. This gathering provided an opportunity for Adelante members to reflect and dialogue about their individual and collective work within Adelante, the organizational process, the successes and challenges, and future of Adelante.

**Theoretical relevance of reflective gatherings**

In the half day reflective gatherings, I presented an array of the themes generated from interviews and relevant archival material for a collective reflection about the history, functionality, and future of Adelante as a community-based school and community reform effort. I developed the third phase of data collection to resemble Freire’s praxis cycle and dialogue circles (Brown, 1978), where participants reflected upon the process of their very own cultural productions within Adelante.51

In Chapter 3 of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire outlines a framework for implementing codifications in a methodology of thematic investigation for critical consciousness raising. Although examples of these interventions are few (Brown, 1978; People’s Workbook, 1980; IDAC 1975, 1977, 1979), they highlight the use of codifications as learning tools for groups investigating their community.

51 I set up the interactive agenda for the third phase of data collection to mirror a museum exhibit and considered myself a curator of this process. This was a museum of the cultural productions of the artists and producers who were asked to reengage their productions in a reflexive mode.
As coded existential situations, codifications re-present the everyday situation to the oppressed and link the social, historical and cultural conditions of the individual “reader” of the codification to broader societal realities, creating, through dialogue, the possibility for a collective investigation of the participants, the local community and the world. As such, codifications can be understood as social texts that participants collectively ‘read’ and through reading (the process of investigation), participants learn how to re-write themselves and the world. Adelante has used forms of this methodology in many different contexts over the past seven years. In proposing this study to Adelante members, we decided to utilize a similar methodology.

In the culture circles set up by the Popular Culture Movement throughout the 1960s, Freire, his colleagues, and local informants developed a sequence of ten images that accompanied a structured process towards literacy (Brown, 1978). Through these images, Freire introduced the anthropological concept of culture as what distinguishes the human world from nature. Participants then engaged in discussions that highlight the distinction between culture and nature, while the structured process aids in the “discovery that they are makers of culture as much as literate people are, that aspects of their lives are manmade and therefore subject to change” (Brown, 1978 p. 6).

The tenth image in this set incites the group to “look at itself and reflect upon its own activity” (Brown, 1978, p. 19). The tenth image is of a culture circle.

52 Freire asked Francisco Brennand, a well-known artist from Recife, to create the 10 images.
examining one of the earlier images. When shown this image, the group discusses the function of the culture circle, “what the experience has meant, what dialogue is, and what it means to raise one’s consciousness” (Brown, 1978, p. 19). Similarly in this dissertation study, the individual interviews with Adelante members produced a variety of themes, and these themes guided the creation of the visuals that were intended and used to produce self-reflexive dialogue among Adelante members.

Data analysis & interpretation

As stated earlier, I analyzed the interviews, documents and cultural productions for emergent themes. In phase one, I sorted and organized the data for analysis. I transcribed all interviews, scanned Adelante materials to make a digital archive, and typed up field notes (Creswell, 2009). I read through the data and used first cycle coding strategies outlined by Johnny Saldaña (2011). Once I presented these initial findings to the group, I began a second phase of analysis. I went through multiple iterations leading up to the final coding schema.

After the first round of coding, I recoded the data by overlaying the pedagogies and practices of Adelante (Theme #1) with the productive tensions (Theme #2) and situated an analysis in a timeline of Adelante. I did this to explore chronologically how the productive tensions related to the events and ethos of Adelante as the effort evolved over time. I connected the codes of knowledge, community power, and feeling moved, as they arose in the documents and interviews, to a model of collaboration that also produced unknowing, skepticism, frustration,
and (im)patience. These codes arose in the timeline and the interviews of Adelante and pointed me toward productive tensions of the political formation of Adelante.

I recoded locating change (Theme #3) to focus on powerful moments. In the code of powerful moments, I coded for concern about writing stories, sharing stories, emotional experiences of sharing stories, moments where people spoke about their story as part of a collective, and refusals, absences and opting out of sharing stories. These codes began to expose a coherent story about how Adelante engaged digital storytelling as a modality for political conversations and forming a collective. Lastly, I coded the locating change (Theme #3), specifically operationalizing “action” as a type of theory of change and looked for ways that Adelante was expressing other theories of change in the data. Throughout this process, I wrote analytic memos.53

Positionality

Within this qualitative study, I am the main instrument of data collection and data analysis. Before the start of this study, I had no direct connections to Adelante or the participants, although from 2002-2005, I lived a couple of miles outside of Watsonville. During this time, I worked in agriculture, a driving industry in Watsonville and a major source of income for a large portion of the population. As a farm intern on a small organic farm, I shared both work and social spaces with the farm workers. The farm workers that I worked with were all Mexican-born immigrants, both men and women, although predominantly young men. Most were

53 Example of Analytic memo in Appendix E
from the same town in Mexico and were part of an extended family. Through working in the field, gardens, farmers markets, deliveries and educational projects, we shared stories and I developed an understanding of some of the intersecting issues that comprise the reality for farm workers and low-income families within Watsonville.

In addition to working as a farm intern, I worked as an education coordinator for the farm, interfacing with school districts and private schools throughout the county. I brought third, fourth and fifth graders to the farm for day tours. Through networking with teachers, administrators and working with children from Las Palmas Valley School District, I familiarized myself with not only the population, but with the public school system and some of the reforms and standards of the time.

With this background, I approach this research with an awareness of the larger socioeconomic context of the region of Watsonville. This awareness does not negate the fact that I am an outsider to the community. I am a white woman researcher from a middle-class background. While being an outsider may impair the depth of my data collection, it also opens the possibility I may collect data or perceive a nuance that members of the community would, through a normalized lens, overlook. I am conscious of my partiality and positioning and through this study engaged reflexively as a researcher.

In this study, I view culture as fluid, socially and historically constructed, and “cognitive and affective, as reflected in shared meaning and as expressed in common language, symbols, and other modes of communication” (LeCompte & Schensul,
1999, p. 49, see also Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003; Rosaldo, 1989). From this perspective, the researcher is implicated in the research process. As Geertz (1973) would say, “what we call our data are really our own constructions of other people’s constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to” (p. 9). As such, I utilize feminist standpoint theory (Harding, 1993), which originates from feminist epistemologies and the writings in critical and feminist ethnography to grapple with the fluid nature of Adelante.

“Critical public pedagogies” and community-based activist agendas can be compromised by the presence and work of researchers imposing meaning making upon the emergent dialogical spaces. If I hold tightly to certain theoretical and organizational constructs, I will recreate the colonial act within the communities and spaces in which I strive to have a ‘response-ability’ (Lugones, 2003). Leigh Patel (2016) calls for “answerability as a construct and cognitive tool” to think through how this research works to try to “undo coloniality and create space for ways of being in relation that are not about individualism, raking and status” (Patel, 2016, p. 73). My primary objective of this work is to support Adelante and doing so from a place of answerability, where I work to “maintain the coming-into-being with” and “being in conversation with” (Patel, 2016, p. 73) simultaneously. Therefore, I “offer up my epistemologies and professional identities to be eclipsed by the research” (Burdick &
Sandlin, 2010), understanding that the primary objective of this work is to support Adelante.\(^5^4\)

**Limitations of the study**

There are multiple limitations to this study’s design and implementation. As a single case study, I will not be able to generalize, create hypotheses or suggest predictive theories. In addition, limitations arise from my outsider and researcher status. It is possible that the researcher’s bias will interfere with data analysis and interpretation. Broader evaluation of the study will be a final check against my own attention to validity and credibility issues, including a member-check, and all of these have certainly helped correct errors and misinterpretations in my work.

I constructed a research design relative to the press of time demands and the limited energy Adelante members could extend. This type of investigation could have produced fruitful results with an even deeper participatory methodology, where all Adelante members engage in an investigation of Adelante, but there were not enough resources (time, energy and funds) for Adelante members to participate at that level of engagement. Instead, I built the methodology with traditional ethnographic elements and within the unfolding organizational constraints. A participatory methodology could have provided a more diverse data set.

Limitations regarding the implementation of my methodology consisted of scheduling challenges and time constraints. Adelante was comprised of busy people

\(^{5^4}\) Throughout the study, I reflect upon critical, indigenous methodologies (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Smith, 2012) to continually unsettle my position as a researcher.
with many volunteer and community-based commitments. It was very challenging to schedule meetings, especially with work and family commitments. I believe the research gathering in phase three suffered from these constraints. To engage in a deeply generative conversation, Adelante members needed much more than four hours to talk about an almost ten year long project and the many types of cultural productions and programming engaged in. However, due to scheduling constraints, Adelante members could only commit to a four-hour gathering.
CHAPTER IV
HISTORIES OF RESISTANCE AND SITUATING ADELANTE

All too often legacies of resistance are written into history books and memory as a compilation of events with beginnings and ends. These stories of struggle coalesce around historic events with charismatic protagonists and are domesticated by the past tense. What is often overlooked are the collective capacities and interconnectedness of the land, peoples, and histories that accumulate power over time to support such events. The stories of Adelante should be told in harmony with the present-histories of Watsonville and the organizational histories represented by the different stakeholders that participated in the eventfulness of what became Adelante. Although I will not be able to “capture” all the moving parts that explain the coalescing of Adelante and its subsequent dissolutions, I dedicate this chapter to a feminist assembling of Adelante as a project in a university-school-community collaboration for social change.

Watsonville is a small town with historical legacies of struggle. I begin the chapter with a brief overview of the land, political economic history, and current demographics of Watsonville and Santa Cruz County. I argue that Watsonville and the surrounding areas exist under a power structure and political economy akin to a colonial province. I focus on the colonial, classed, gendered, and cultural dynamics of the area by exploring the annexation of California, the commodification of the land, continued migrant flows, labor struggles, and neighborhood segregation. I
provide a history of the shifting political and economic terrain of Watsonville area and identify moments where political and economic power shifted yet institutional arrangements remained the same, to recognize the present presence of these histories in the making of the colonial context in which this university-school-community collaboration took place and how this context constricted certain forms of resistance.

In the second section of this chapter, I provide a thematic timeline of Adelante.\textsuperscript{55} I explore chronologically how Adelante evolved in its expressions of resistance. I code for honoring knowledge, continued concerns and (im)patience, connecting to community power, and feeling moved, within 2006. I focus on building capacity in 2007 and examine how things fall apart in 2008. From 2008 – 2014, I investigate how Adelante evolved into a smaller, yet still dynamic change effort. I compile these data into a storyline of more than just events; one that includes capacity building, affective responses to the collaboration, and situates Adelante in a larger social and historical context.

Throughout the timeline and in the last section, I identify productive tensions from meeting minutes and interviews with Adelante members, which describe aspects of Adelante’s political formation. In these accounts, Adelante members express desires to change existing institutions or to institutionalize Adelante within the political and social landscape of Watsonville. These desires echo what Bettina

\textsuperscript{55} I frame the history of Adelante in a chronological telling in an effort to articulate the multiplicities of Adelante. Different stakeholders can take up concepts and act upon them in different ways, depending on their subject positions, relations, knowledge constructs, and intentionality. And Adelante, as an organizational body, shifts and evolves over time. A chronological telling of Adelante with a focus on multiple events of analysis embedded in planning and Adelante members’ sentiments can prove generative to imagining the productive tensions over time and how they were in relation to the organizational efforts of Adelante.
Aptheker (1989) terms “masculinist inventions”\(^{56}\) that produce resistance as oppositional and contesting for political, economic, and institutional power. This form of resistance is tied to a modern\(^{57}\) progressive notion of social change and reinforces public/private binaries (Aptheker, 1989).

At the same time Adelante members sought to integrate into institutional arrangements and institutionalize, Adelante members describe participant dispositions and practices within Adelante that articulate a feminist politic that is not easily legible within these masculinist inventions of successful resistance and measures of social change. I propose an analytic that gives productive attention to the perceived failures, disquieted affect, and emergence of a feminist politic of resistance in Adelante. I explore how the “failures” of Adelante were more than just failed attempts at achieving goals, but supported a production of an ethos based on the inevitability of failure. This inevitability of a failure illuminates the colonial status, power structure, and subsequent coalitional work needed to change the political and economic power structure of Watsonville.

\(^{56}\) Regardless of the subject’s gender, an individual can have masculinist and/or feminist perspectives (sometimes both at the same time). Aptheker (1989) defines the masculinist inventions as “informed by various theories of social change, some of which arise liberal ("pluralist") ideas and seek to affect the policies of those in power. Otherwise theories arise from more radical traditions, most notably the Marxist, and seek to remove a ruling class from power. It is useful also to note here that these theories of social change (as they have been constructed by men) women, if they have seen them at all, generally have been considered objects of oppression: either as the victims of circumstances to be rescued, educated, and brought into productive and public life; or as the backward and misguided pawns of reactionary (or counterrevolutionary) forces to be won over to progressive and revolutionary movements. In neither case are women seen as an autonomous purposeful, active force in history” (Aptheker, 1989, p. 170).

\(^{57}\) As described in footnote #2 (in the Introduction), I operationalize the term “modern” and “modernity” in relation to coloniality. The terms cannot be conceptually de-linked.
Within this feminist politic, Adelante members invited skepticism, wrestled with uncertainty, and did not fit into neoliberal temporalities and colonial spatial arrangements. They produced ambiguity in the agendas, goals, and products of Adelante. These dispositions are suggestive of a feminist ethos that positioned Adelante as a singular instantiation of an open, unending, and everyday lived effort on behalf of the participants to resist the colonial realities of Watsonville and to struggle for a better life.

A feminist politic

Throughout woman’s liberation movement, women participated in consciousness raising groups. Together women built “theories of oppression” that “contested boundaries of what is political,” suggesting that private and individual injustices were also social and political, and that resistance did not have to be “counterposed to ideas about accommodation and collaboration” (Aptheker, 1989, p. 170). Women drew from and created ideas of resistance that were not privileged by male political theorists, but by women in everyday struggles for liberation. The “theory of oppression” linked to this definition of resistance could be located in the political struggle for liberation in individual, personal, and infra-political spaces; “in a women’s history connected to, but also distinct from History as it has been recorded and told by those in power” (Aptheker, 1989, p. 169).
Drawing on these non-modern\textsuperscript{58} epistemologies and practices, subjects can become conscious of the ways they are made by and makers of history and culture (Glass, 2001). Therefore, resistance is often expressed in the tension between subjectification (being written into the capitalist modern colonial norm as “parent,” “teacher,” and “student”), and “that minimal sense of agency required for the oppressing $\leftrightarrow$ resisting relation being an active one, without, appealing to the maximum sense of agency of the modern subject (Lugones, 2003)” (Lugones, 2010, p. 746). In other words, resistance is in the subject’s active engagement with a “colonized, racially gendered, oppressed existence” and the critical praxis (Freire, 1970) of waking-up to the other ways of being, knowing, learning, and living that are other than hegemonic reproductions.

Resistance from a feminist politic is an ontological, epistemological, relational, metaphysical, psychological praxis grounded in the everyday histories and lives of people subjected to what Maria Lugones (2010) calls “capitalist, modern, colonial normativity.” This praxis differs from progressive conceptualizations of resistance. A feminist politic is not primarily oppositional, or focused on “a struggle for power against those responsible for maintaining social injustice” (Aptheker, 1989, p. 170). Resistance is not defined by notions of progress rooted in modernity (Aptheker, 1989), but defined by “non-modern” knowledges and practices that resist “categorical dichotomous hierarchical logics” that compose “modern, colonial, capitalist thinking about race, gender and sexuality” (p. 742) She makes a point to not name this “pre-modern” but non-modern.

\textsuperscript{58} Lugones (2010) defines non-modern as the “social organizations from which people have resisted” “categorical dichotomous hierarchical logics as central to modern, colonial, capitalist thinking about race, gender and sexuality” (p. 742) She makes a point to not name this “pre-modern” but non-modern.
capitalist thinking about race, gender and sexuality” (Lugones, 2010, p. 742). This is an everyday resistance, a resistance that rises from an “interwoven social life among people not acting as representatives or officials,” but interacting in non-hierarchical relation. This form of resistance is not a goal, or a measure, but a politic found at the beginning, before the beginning and after the events of historical movements.

In this chapter, I describe, expressions of this feminist politic through the history and reflections on Adelante. I highlight instances where participants grapple with and sometimes argue for masculinist inventions of resistance and discussions and actions that animate a feminist politic. In the last section of this chapter, I redefine “failure” using Judith Halberstam (2003) queering of failure to identify it as a “way of being in the world” and “failure as unbeing” (p. 23). This queer notion of failure articulates an ontological disposition aligned with the feminist politic visible in Adelante and initiates a theoretical move to denunciate failure completely. This analytic affords alternative readings of “successful” community mobilizing by focusing on Adelante members expressions of skepticism, unknowing, and the ways in which Adelante members interrupted modernist neoliberal temporalities. I begin with an overview of the colonial present histories of the region.

Part I: Colonial histories of the region

The history of the geographic, political, and economic terrain of Watsonville provides important context for the rise of Adelante. Adelante was one instantiation of a historical and ongoing struggle of different and converging interest groups to fight
for the rights of laborers, poor people, and equitable schooling for their children. In this section, I begin with an overview of the land and powerful agricultural economy that molds the land and politics of the region. As agribusiness and large corporate conglomerates shaped the economy, a wake of labor exploitation and racial discrimination molded the social, political, and institutional landscape of Watsonville and surrounding areas. This political economic configuration is analogous to a colonial structure within the US. The United Farm Workers and Cannery worker strikes were powerful responses to these deleterious sociopolitical and economic conditions that demanded the rights of workers and their families. While these movements have since quieted, legacies of these struggles remain in the people who participated and in the infrastructure of Watsonville with the presence of El Centro, a community center and hub for social and political activity.

I then briefly explore a shift of political terrain in the region with the rise of the University of California, Santa Cruz in the mid-1960s. I describe the overall demographics of the region and focus on the racial segregation in and across neighborhoods. Schools and school districts are organized based on zip codes and consequently the schools within Watsonville reflect these racial segregations and income disparities. I track some of the political struggles of low-income and Latino families to fight for equitable schooling that occurred in the last decade and the mobilizing of the Latino community in Watsonville to raise representation and visibility in local government.

---

59 Pseudonym
This section provides a brief glance at the political and economic formations and movements to combat corporate capitalist configurations and racialized towns. Lastly, I take note of an important qualification of the term “Latino” as it is often constructed within California’s agricultural lands and towns. Because of the legacy of the Bracero Program and Latino farmworker visibility, “Latino,” as a category, often invisibilizes the political history of Latino migrant flows and the multiple generations of Latinos that lived on the land before the US occupation of California and the generations that settled in the area since. This history is an important nuance to understanding the complexities of the Latino (national and indigenous) histories and stories that Adelante attempted to gather and tell within their work.

*The land, labor, and political terrain*

This study takes place in the small agricultural town of Watsonville on the California Central coast. The town is located in an area of great agricultural wealth. Murals throughout the town depict ripened fruits and vegetables with field workers and agribusiness company names framing the produce. Watsonville is an agricultural hub in the Monterey Bay Area. Previously inhabited by the Costanoan indigenous tribe, European settlers arrived in the late 18th century. A second wave of European settlers arrived in the mid 19th century (after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo) and in 1848 the gold rush in the Sierra Nevada Mountains brought wealth to the area for
large purchase of land by European settlers. The city of Watsonville was founded in 1852 and incorporated in 1868.60

Watsonville is located adjacent to the Salinas Valley, one of the richest agricultural valleys in the country. In the 1870s, Chinese laborers cleared the rich agricultural lands that surround the Monterey Bay and Salinas Valley that were owned by European settlers. They “dug out the tules, cattails, and sedges, uprooted the willows, cottonwoods, elders, and sycamores, and used shovels, spades, and steel forks to dig the ditches that rained the water away so this rich land could be ravaged by commercial agriculture” (Bardake, 2011, p. 28). In tandem with the construction of the Hoover Dam in 1931, the diversion of the Colorado River to cultivate the Imperial Valley (previously named Valley of the Dead) and rise of agribusiness across the lower half of California, the Salinas Valley and Watsonville area became a center of agribusiness, wage laborers (braceros) and industrialized agriculture. This was a significant colonial moment in which agribusiness began to buy up and profit off of the land throughout California.

Agribusiness is comprised of a “series of separate but related businesses that specialize in different products,” (Bardake, 2011, p. 25) each business grows different crops and specializes in the cultivation, production and distribution of those crops. Similarly, the lands of the Central Coast are marked by this economy. A small population of white elite controlled the political economy of the region. Absentee landowners own most of the land and a small number of big growers manage and

---

60 There is a violent history regarding the mission era that is left out of this account.
benefit from the business (Bardake, 1994, 2011). This separation of the land from the owners and products is further exemplified by Bardake’s account that “farm managers lived in ranch-style homes, not farmhouses, and bought their food at the supermarket” (Bardake, 2012, p. 28). This highly stratified political economy mirrors a colonial province.

The Salinas Valley and Monterey Bay were unique climates for almost year-round food production. Farmworkers traveling primarily from Mexicali to different locales throughout California for agricultural work could find work in the Salinas and Monterey Bay area for ten months out of the year (Bardake, 2011). This resulted in farm laborers making permanent homes in the region. While migrant flows continued throughout California, many generations of Latinos settled in the Central Coast. Frank Bardake (2011) argues a connection between the topography of the region and the rise of the United Farm Worker’s (UFW) strongest and most long-lasting hub centralized in the Salinas Valley.

A legacy of discrimination

Today, over three quarters of the population in Watsonville is Latino, primarily of Mexican descent. In 1848, Mexican citizens who lived on and owned land in California were displaced from their land through settler transgressions of some tenets of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The Treaty stipulated that Mexican citizens would retain their property and would not be subjected to taxes (Zavella, 1987). However with increasing capitalist interest and the industrialization of
agriculture and mining in the southwest of the United States, Mexicans faced fraud
and crushing taxes, and as a consequence, many had to forfeit their property. During
the late 19th century, Mexicans were proletarianized into a “colonial labor system”
(Zavella, 1987; see Barrera, 1979). Chicanos were commonly paid lower wages than
their Anglo counterparts, often segregated into cheaper housing, required to speak
English, and excluded from local political participation (Zavella, 1987). This legacy
of discrimination and repression continues.

Since European settlement, agriculture has been the primary economy of the
region. More than eighty varieties of crops can be grown in the rich soil and many of
the crops fill grocery stores across the nation today. In addition, canning and frozen
food factories abound in the Watsonville area. In 1942, the US-Mexico Bracero
Program continued the colonial legacy of labor exploitation that began in the late 19th
century. It was created to bring low-paying agricultural jobs to California, which
promoted wage laborers to seek work in the region. Although the Bracero Program
had supposed safeguards\textsuperscript{61} to protect Mexicans and domestic workers, many of these
safeguards were not followed or enforced. Thus, Latino immigrants who worked
through this program settled into Santa Cruz County under less-than humane work
and living conditions. Decades of discrimination towards Latino field workers

\textsuperscript{61} “[F]or example, guaranteed payment of at least the prevailing area wage received by native workers; employment for three-fourths of the contract period; adequate, sanitary, and free housing; decent meals at reasonable prices; occupational insurance at employer’s expense; and free transportation back to Mexico at the end of the contract. Employers were supposed to hire braceros only in areas of certified domestic labor shortage, and were not to use them as strikebreakers” (http://braceroarchive.org/about).
ensued, with continued cultural repression, as well as continuing institutionalized racism through the criminalization of Latino youth.

After the Bracero Program was repealed, the United Farm Workers (UFW) union gained momentum (Zavella, 1987). Notably, “since the 1930s, Watsonville workers (Filipino, Mexican, Anglos) have been the militant core of several farmworkers movements” (Bardake, 2011, p. 24), which demonstrates that Watsonville has a rich legacy of union organizing and resistance that arose from the adverse labor conditions and colonial structure of the land and economy. Watsonville and the Salinas Valley were strongholds for the United Farm Workers federation (UFW), even through periods of decline in the UFW’s power.

*Cannery strike*

In 1970, the United Farm Workers (UFW) called for a strike in Santa Cruz County. Fifteen years later, Latina women cannery workers from Watsonville stood up against a barrage of scare tactics for eighteen months to demand their rights as workers and won. Led predominantly by women, the strike received national attention. Watsonville cannery workers all lived in the same area and by joining forces and supporting each other, they were able to resist the cannery’s threats and stand by their demands. Bardake’s newspaper coverage of the event in El Andar provides an account that exemplifies the strength of the community’s collective resistance. A Chicano mechanic was offered a job that would require he cross the picket line. When asked why he did not return to his job, he stated, “There is no way
for a striker to cross the picket line and live in Watsonville.” The community had united and joined the struggle to the extent that people who crossed the picket line would be refused service in some shops and they become pariahs in the community.

Mexican women were at the forefront of this struggle. Their solidarity and ability to unify Watsonville was, according to many, what won the struggle (Zavella, 1987). A group of families that emerged from the 1985 cannery strike organized to build El Centro, the community center in Watsonville. The center was built to renew learning about the Watsonville community with a focus on the root of problems in the community, not just service provisions and to create cross-community connections.

**Demographics, school districts, and university**

Watsonville is a small agricultural town at the southern end of Santa Cruz County. With a population of approximately 51,000 residents, 81% identify as Latino, 42% foreign-born persons, and 75% speak a language other than English (70% Spanish) at home (2011 Census data). \(^{62}\) Las Palmas Unified School District, \(^{63}\) which serves the Watsonville community, is one of the lowest performing districts in the state. As a low performing school district, teachers are forced to work under high-stakes conditions of program improvement status and students contend with deficit frames and inequitable structures and practices every day, which contributes to poor student learning outcomes. In the 2012-13 academic year, 80.5% (n=16,093) of
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\(^{62}\) These numbers underestimate due to a considerable population of undocumented persons in Watsonville and the surrounding area. I also use Census data from 2011, when Adelante was active.  
\(^{63}\) Pseudonym
students identified as Latino, 44% (n=8,805) are English Language Learners (Ed-Data, 2013), and 72% percent of students receive free/reduced lunch (Kidsdata, 2013).

The school district that serves the Watsonville community has a history of being one of the lowest performing school districts in the state, where teachers are forced to work under high-stakes conditions of program improvement status and students contend with deficit frames and inequitable structures and practices. Due to Watsonville’s colonial status, agribusiness and the economic stakeholders of the region have little interest in educating wage laborers (and their children) except insofar as to educate the population to keep it sanitized from anti-colonial and revolutionary ideas. The school district remains impoverished, similar to the segregation of colored schools in the south from reconstruction till 1954. Part of the contradiction of this colonial status is that state and federal law requires standards of education that Las Palmas School District cannot meet and teachers, school personnel, parents, and the community are always found at fault for this lack.

Segregation in North and South County

Watsonville is at the southern half of a county that is racially segregated. The city of Santa Cruz is approximately 20 miles north of Watsonville and has 62,041 residents: 74.5% identify as White and only 12.5% are foreign born persons (2012 Census data). This racial and cultural segregation between the north and south of
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64About 85% of English Language Learners speak Spanish. Other languages include Mixteco (n=240), Arabic (n=39), Tagalog (n=24), Ilocano (n=17), all other (n=49).
Santa Cruz County is a representation of a legacy of racism and discrimination within the county. In 1965, the political terrain shifted with the introduction of the University of California, Santa Cruz. The old landowners, Italian families and agribusiness shifted south and Santa Cruz became a center for a more liberal politics due to the influence of the student and faculty vote.

*Complicating the term Latino: indigeneity, migration, and Latino political influence*

Since the end of the US-Mexican War and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, California has been a land constantly traversed by migrations. Mexican nationals lived in the area before the treaty and at no moment since 1848 has the flow of migration to and from Mexico stopped (Gutiérrez & Zavella, 2009, p. 1). Across California and Mexico, people moved from ancestral lands because of industrialization and rapid modernization. The railroad brought wage labor and industry and the agricultural industry brought a flow of workers to and from Mexico and many Mexicans fled to California during and after the revolution in Mexico from 1910 – 1917 (Gutiérrez & Zavella, 2009). In a global/colonial economic system, Mexico has operated as a colony of the US since its inception, providing labor and goods at the expense of its own economy. US foreign policy has a legacy of manipulating the political power to serve the interests of the US, so Mexico can remain a colony. Regarding the political economy, Watsonville has a similar colonial construct however the town exists within the US.
In addition to this history of constant migration, Watsonville’s Latino residents have diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds and epistemological orientations different from modern colonial epistemologies. On June 17th 1992 in Pinto Lake Park, Tonantzin (an Aztec mother/fertility goddess) appeared on a Live Oak tree. Syncretized with the Virgin Guadalupe, she appeared to Anita Contreras Mendoza, a leader of the cannery worker’s strike. Anita said, “I now go on my knees before God, but I go on my knees before no man” (Bardake, 1994, p. 7). The cannery strike was a deep and long struggle that required many women to work together and mobilize the community to support each other while strikers were unemployed for a year and a half. For Anita, the Watsonville community and many people who traverse migrant networks and communities, “Our Lady of the Live Oak” was and is a symbol of the divine which recognizes social injustices and offers the strength for people to fight such injustices. The salvation of Tonantzin (La Virgen) is “collective, public, historical and very much of this world” (Bardake, 1994, p. 9).

Although Watsonville has a geographical distance from Mexico, it is not so distant in other ways. There is a large indigenous presence in Watsonville and approximately five to seven indigenous languages represented, Mixteco and Zapoteco among the most prevalent. With the rise of diversity in indigenous languages, the schools and communities in Watsonville struggle with discrimination toward indigenous peoples and a lack of infrastructure at the schools to accommodate indigenous parents and students.
Watsonville shares a long history of combating colonial injustices, however in the contemporary context, those injustices remain. A small, white elite has most of the political and economic power in the region, yet the Latino population has begun to make symbolic and substantial inroads into gaining political influence. For example, Luis Alejo, previously a Brown Beret and organizer of the Peace and Unity March, worked his way through local and regional politics to become a state assemblyman. Karena Cervantez, the daughter of farmworkers, has also served as mayor and continues to gain political momentum. She and Luis Alejo have political agendas that could support a larger political shift. It is within this context that Adelante began.

Part II: The formations and dissolutions of Adelante

In his book *Trampling out the Vintage: Cesar Chavez and the two souls of the United Farm Workers*, Frank Bardake (2011) tells the story of the rise and fall of the United Farm Workers and positions farmworkers, children of farmworkers, and local folks from Watsonville into the story, “[n]ot as noble victims nor as adjuncts to the grand work of one great man, but as political actors who helped make their own history” (Bardake, p. 17). By situating Adelante in the colonial histories and resistance struggle of Watsonville and the surrounding areas, I begin the story of the rise of Adelante in the social and historical contexts. Adelante began through the actions of multiple political actors who were working in their own lived contexts to
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65 Luis Alejo worked with many Adelante members on Adelante projects and with Adelante members in other community contexts.
shape the histories of Watsonville and to cultivate cultural spaces, raise awareness about inequitable conditions and shape the schools to better serve the Latino population.

As a collaborative effort, Adelante signaled a convergence of local and university-based political actors. Many of the participants in Adelante lived dynamic lives, active in the arts, cultural and community organizing, and labor union work. These differing lived contexts influenced the theories of change and the visions of the future for each participant in Adelante. As Adelante began, the participants would contend with these differing visions and other productive tensions that arose among and sometimes within individuals.

In the first section of this account of Adelante’s history I explore the people that comprised Adelante. I emphasize the organizational ties of stakeholders, their political dispositions, and the multiple ways in which they were political actors in different community, school, and university settings. This provides a foundation for a timeline of Adelante and suggests that Adelante did not simply begin with the first meeting, but evolved from a series of (un)documented events, interests, conversations, and connections prior to the first convening.

In April 2006, Adelante held its first meeting. During the first year, Adelante worked to build a shared vision across the different stakeholders and to develop relationships with and across community, district, and university contexts. In the first year of Adelante, members grappled with questions of how to honor knowledge; they raised concern and impatience with the methodology of community mobilization; and
different stakeholders worked to connect to community power beyond Adelante. At the end of the year, participants felt moved into their collaboration together. Each of these themes point toward an emergence of a feminist politic of community mobilizing and social change.

For the years of 2007 and 2008 I describe how Adelante worked to build capacity and how the group suffered a convergence of events that resulted in the loss of connections, capacity and resources. I overlay important moments of entrance and exit of different stakeholders with their organizational affiliations and individuals that shifted the composition of the group. These movements of key people shifted the composition of Adelante as a university-school-community collaborative and changed the dialogue in meetings.66 Throughout the rest of this section, I document events,67 conversations and sentiments over time till 2014.

The people of Adelante

The people within Adelante did not fit into discrete demographic descriptors. Adelante members participated in multiple spaces as teachers and parents, as dancers and district personnel, and as graduate students and teachers, to name a few. In this
section, I trace a few of the organizational and political convergences that happened among stakeholders before the initiation of Adelante.

When asked how Adelante formed, participants often cite an event in April of 2006, when scholar-activists, educators, and community members gathered at the University of California, Santa Cruz for a symposium organized by Daniel, a recently hired tenured faculty member. The symposium was titled “Education, Community, and Democracy,” which highlighted popular education collaborative projects in the U.S. and Brazil and provided a space for community leaders to gather and explore creating a popular education effort in Watsonville.

Daniel organized the symposium and brought specific people whose scholarship was significant to his vision of a future collaborative effort. Invited activist-scholars worked in school, community, university change efforts in multiple professional and geographic contexts. Much of their work included coalition building among teachers’ unions, and parents to fight neoliberal policies (e.g. Pauline Lipman); collaborative university-community-district teacher education reform effort (professional development) (e.g. Pia Lindquist Wong); citizen schools in Brazil (e.g. Luis Gandin); and the global educative cities movement (e.g., Gustavo Fischman). This one-day symposium created a collective discursive terrain for a converging of prior conversations about a potential collaborative school and community change.

Daniel had many different active roles in the emergence of Adelante. He was Richard’s advisor, the director of the EdD program, convened the conference and the visiting scholars were his friends and colleagues. He facilitated the meetings of Adelante for at least the first two years and in the first year of Adelante, he would respond to uncertainty or questions about the work of Adelante with brief explanations of the work of Adelante. He had also worked with Paulo Freire and Myles Horton and his lived experiences and philosophical disposition aligned with the vision of Adelante.
effort in Watsonville. Adelante was an outcome of these interactions and an attempt to “mount a comprehensive approach to the challenges facing the schools and communities” (Adelante, website). However, upon further exploration of stakeholder’s accounts of their interests in participating, multiple converging origin stories surface.

Individuals who would eventually become involved as pivotal members of Adelante were predisposed in their theoretical orientations, their activist sensibilities, and their professional and social networks and almost everyone was looking for some form of intervention that was different from previous strategies. Three of the core members were working on their EdD in the Education Department at UC, Santa Cruz prior to or concurrently with the beginnings of Adelante. Daniel was a recent hire and became the director of the EdD Program at UC Santa Cruz when the three EdD students who would become core visionaries of Adelante were in the program. They shared similar analyses of the problems in Watsonville and critical perspectives that required a denunciation of “deficit” models of thinking within the district and social service sector, which became normative and shared perspectives within Adelante meetings.69

Richard, who was one of the doctoral students and advisee of Daniel, had conducted his research with Mexican-American parents in adult school programs. He worked in the adult school and he asked Mexican-American parents about their concepts of education in Mexico compared to their concepts of education in the United states and what was
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69 I do not cite their dissertations in order to maintain their anonymity.
happening to the kids in schools related to that, to the concepts, their ideas about what schools were for and what their connection to schools were and ought to be (Richard, 2014).

The subject matter, population, context and process aligned well with Adelante. He states,

Then the research itself that wound up in what I call a symposium was absolutely aligned with what Adelante was developing as its goals. It had the parents themselves say what they need and want and figure out how to respond to them in that way (Richard, 2014).

Richard continues to explain that as a district administrator he had access to different people in the district. He became a liaison for Daniel to create connections with community, district, and labor leaders in Watsonville. However, throughout his account of these events, Richard is clear to say that his pedagogical and professional framework is deeply committed to and aligned with adult education models that utilize similar participatory structures and pedagogies that he used in his dissertation to gather data (Participatory Action Research). He saw Adelante as an extension of that theoretical legacy.

Elise, a classroom teacher and EdD student enrolled at the time of Adelante, recalls that before she became involved in Adelante meetings and activities she was having conversations with Jack, a professor, in the Education Department around issues of school reform that became foundational to the conversations that emerged in Adelante’s first meetings.

I think even before that though, that, I don’t know if Daniel is aware of it but even before that when we were
in our doctoral classes with Jack you know we were developing reforms, school reform models and it always came up that we need to do something, we need to do something. And so in our eyes, for some of us, what, you know what Daniel began was that something that we were looking for. That we needed to do something, something different and so that, you know it kinda became that way (Elise, 2008).

She continues her recollection by situating Adelante in a history of “failed” reform efforts in Watsonville.

…we were looking for something and, in most school districts the, they especially in school districts that have low income high minority students they go through a new reform every year, “Now we’re gonna try this, now we’re gonna try that,” you know looking for the magic bullet and having been in education for twenty years I knew that there was no magic bullet because the problem is much more complex than a certain reform model or a certain textbook or a certain this, it’s about people getting underpaid, its about people not having medical, its about people feeling disenfranchised and not seen in a curriculum (Elise, 2008)

Elise had been a teacher in Watsonville for twenty years; long enough to see waves of reform efforts that promised to fix the schools, yet often fell short of their promised goals. She was not looking for another “magic bullet” that she knew would not deliver. Elise was familiar with the concept of the “grammar” of schooling (Tyack & Tobin, 1993) and the inevitability of school reform failure. Not only had she studied this in the EdD program, she had witnessed the failures of these “magic bullets” first hand. She rooted her grievances and struggle in the day-to-day efforts to fight for a better life.
Elise was not the only one to express disenchantment with the status quo of change within the schools. Cristina was a parent and community organizer who had previously participated in school board meetings. She expressed her interest in Adelante based on her frustration with not being heard at the school board meeting as a parent and the promise that Adelante would be something different.

I was disillusioned by the school board meetings. There were very few Hispanics that would raise their hands. Adelante was a way for us to be involved as parents. Being involved in the school board was a good experience... but I realized that there was not much that parents can do. When I would come with an idea, they would say, “That is a good idea Mrs. Lopez, but we can’t do anything about it.” (Cristina, 2014)

Cristina continues to explain that the people on the school board were interested in her helping with fund raising and other auxiliary tasks that would contribute to the status quo and normative operations of the school board. When Cristina would offer alternative outreach methods, she was silenced. “They want parents to be there, but when you offer ideas, I got the impression that...maybe they don’t want all the parents to be there.” She kept helping at the school board meetings, but redirected her energies elsewhere. It was at that time that she found Adelante. According to Cristina, Adelante participants “wanted to work directly with the parents to make changes in the schools” and she was very interested.

In addition to disillusion with the status quo of parent participation and school reform strategies, Elise expressed that she was looking for “something bigger,” something that would be long lasting and she determined that the strategies for this “something” else, needed to be different than prior efforts. The effort needed
to extend beyond the district, the school board, the city council, and masculinist ways of organizing. She says,

So I knew it was something bigger and what was that something we were looking for, and we had, I have to say that we in Watsonville you know we have organized a lot along the traditional modes of changing the school board, you know doing those kinds of political changes. We have the city council, we have a majority Mexicano, we’ve changed the school board and I saw for one year we had a progressive school board and then the next year a large business owner in Watsonville put his money into candidate campaigns and got a change or flipped the school board over and so now it’s conservatives.

Elise was disillusioned by the mobilizing efforts that had worked within the political channels in Watsonville. She understood the white, elite landowners and political power structure would not relinquish its power so easily. Elise was looking for other forms of organizing that deployed different strategies.

So I saw how quickly that those kinds of traditional ways of organizing and changing weren’t working ‘cause we were, yeah we were, because it’s just this machine, you know? And we were coming up against the same kind of thing that the Chicano movement came up with in the 1960s when they tried community control. You know I saw the same, you know, where you’re depending on just a couple of leaders and then if they’re out then, you know, you’ve got nothing. So I saw that that, you know that traditional kind of organizing that came out of the civil rights movement and our particular, speaking of the Chicano movement, it wasn’t really getting there (Elise, 2008).

Elise was seeking a movement with a diversified power base and a more horizontal structure. She was not interested in just a couple leaders determining the outcomes of
the school and community. Her critique of the strategies from “traditional organizing” signaled her feminist politic and affinity with Adelante.

Within the EdD program, students studied Paulo Freire and popular education and had advanced analyses of the importance of dialogical and physical space in conceptualizing social change. In 2009, during a conversation in her school district office, Phoebe, one of the EdD students, offered me a book to read by Paulo Freire on critical literacy. Although Richard never cited Paulo Freire directly in conversation or throughout historical documents of Adelante, his philosophy of adult education and research methodologies strongly aligned with popular education pedagogies. For Elise, in addition to her analysis of the history of school reform within Watsonville and the revolving door of political activity that inevitably reproduced the status quo, an effective reform effort that could draw her interest had to be different.

I’ve lived here and worked here for a long time now. It’s pretty much the status quo has been going on for as long as I’ve been here and I’m sure it’s been before that too. I’ve been studying the community. I was looking for something that was different that would raise consciousness in the community. (Elise, 2014)

Elise did not direct her attention to shifting the political economy and power structure in Watsonville. She was more interested in raising consciousness in the community.

I mean, when I said the community, I mean students, teachers, parents, everybody. Just raise consciousness of the issues in our schools and bring about some kind of dialogue around those issues not necessarily come up with a magic solution but just to open up a forum for dialogue about that… (Elise, 2014)
Whether she was aware of it or not, Elise’s politic aligned well with the woman’s liberation movement and resistance strategies in everyday life. She was not taken by the oppositional politics because she had seen these strategies fail. Instead, she focused her vision of social change in dialogue among community members about their daily lives and experiences interfacing with the schooling system.

While Daniel brought folks together for an event at UC Santa Cruz, the people that would continue on to become pivotal actors in Adelante were predisposed to disenchantment with the current institutional and political channels that could bring about change in the school and community. Some shared theoretical orientations toward popular education and dialogue, and three had enrolled in a four year EdD program at UC Santa Cruz, creating the beginning of a nucleus of teachers, administrators and professors that would evolve into Adelante.

Adelante was a convening of people that already knew each other. The EdD students formed one of the first cohorts at UC Santa Cruz and many of the parents were invited to Adelante because of friends they knew who were already attending. Phoebe, one of the EdD students was the founder and director of a twenty-year-old baile folklórico dance troupe in Watsonville. Approximately one quarter of Adelante was comprised of dancers in this group and Adelante meetings were often scheduled around dance rehearsal and performances. This group knew each other outside of the context of Adelante before Adelante began.

Before Adelante, Daniel reached out to El Centro, the local community center where Mark and Edgar were directors of the center. Mark and Edgar both expressed
a desire for a community center that provided more than a service delivery model that had become the norm for El Centro. The leadership was seeking other forms of community work and social change for the people of Watsonville. In addition, before Adelante started the teachers in the district were without a contract. This would continue for about two years before there was a change in leadership that represented a more progressive shift in the teacher’s union.

These events, people, and their dispositions were some of the prominent elements for conceptualizing the composition of Adelante as an organizational body. Daniel brought people together, but the dispositions toward participating evolved from a broader base of people that knew each other before Adelante began. The networks of dance, school, and other community and professional contexts positioned Adelante as one of the many things that people did in the community and in their lives. In a sense, the desire to participate in change efforts was not contained within Adelante, but Adelante was imbued with shared desires for school and community change that extended beyond the constructs of Adelante.

2006: Naming ourselves

During the first year, Adelante focused its energy on developing a common language, building relationships, mapping out the organizational landscape of Watsonville, and planning emerging projects within Adelante. The first convening occurred on April 6th, 2006, shortly after the symposium of “Education, Community,
and Democracy” that occurred at UC Santa Cruz. The visiting activist-scholars⁷₀ were present at this meeting, along with representatives from Dos Manos School District, Las Palmas School District, and the UCSC Center for Equality.⁷₁ Elise recalls that there were “a lot of administrators” at the first meetings. The president of the Teacher’s Union was there, “political people like Luis Alejo,⁷₂ Michael Watkins,⁷³ and other community leaders.⁷⁴

At the start of the meeting, Daniel outlined the purpose; namely to take the ideas from the symposium held the day before and think about how they might apply to the formation of a long term strategic project for community and school development (linking such things as school reform, teacher professional development, adult education, and community capacity building). The near-term objectives are to enter into an expanding dialogue over the next six to nine months to give shape to such a project and bring key community organizations to the table to participate (meeting minutes).

Daniel then situated this strategic project within a critique of “the context that has emerged over many years in which low-income schools have struggled to create successful reforms without engaging the broader community,” which echoed Elise and other’s challenges with the history of attempted and incomplete reform efforts within Watsonville. Everyone in the meeting had experiences of working with low-

⁷₀ Gustavo Fischman, Arizona State University, Phoenix; Luis Gandin, Federal University of Rio Grande de Sol, Porte Alegre, Brazil; Pauline Lipman, DePaul University, Chicago; and Pia Wong, California State University, Sacramento
⁷¹ All pseudonyms of school districts and UCSC research center.
⁷₂ An activist lawyer and Brown Beret leader in Watsonville during early days of Adelante and then became California State Representative.
⁷₃ During period of Adelante, Michael Watkins became Santa Cruz County Superintendent of Education, the first African American to be elected to that post in California history
⁷₄ The meeting minutes do give a list of names at the meetings, however Elise provided additional names that were not in the meeting minutes.
income, racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse (LI/RCLD) students. To begin the meeting, he asked everyone to share suggestions, concerns and cautions to forming a collaborative effort.

This format where Daniel offers a brief overview of the purpose for convening and introductions of new participants continued for the first two meetings, until May 31st, 2006 and opened a conversational tone in the meetings. These share-outs, followed by dialogue continued throughout 2006 and contained themes of honoring knowledge, continued concerns, (im)patience, connecting to community power, and feeling moved. Each of these themes contend with an emerging feminist politic that disrupted dominant notions of community mobilization. Throughout this account, participants took time to dialogue and plan diverse ways Adelante could be “something different.” In 2007, Adelante began to establish itself and members split into different subgroups: teachers, parents, and students. They would gather each month to update each other on their progress. This was a time of diversified growth and planning. However, Adelante fundamentally changed in 2008 and existential questions would persist till 2014, which gave rise to this study.

_Honoring knowledge_

Participants and visiting scholar-activists spoke of the importance to spend time at the beginning of the effort to acknowledge and integrate the funds of
knowledge brought from different stakeholders. For example, one participant stated that “teachers must feel ownership,” and the effort must “create spaces for teachers to reclaim their knowledge and competence in the face of policies that tell them they are failing as teachers.” In the second meeting, a group of participants said, “neither school reform, nor community reform alone will work,” arguing that “schools and communities have to work together to make real change; communities are composed of different communities and different conceptions of what needs to be done, so we need to be cautious about scripting what they want” (meeting minutes, 5/2/2006). Families have “powerful funds of knowledge that we need,” and that need to be represented in the planning and work of Adelante.

Along with these suggestions, participants raised concerns as to how Adelante would create a space to honor diversified funds of knowledge (González, 2005) and subjugated knowledges (Foucault, 1980, 2003) without exploiting or harvesting such knowledge. Understanding that “everyone participating in Adelante brings a certain
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75 Additional concerns from the first meeting consisted of: Researchers addressed that the collaborative effort needed to find ways for non-tenured faculty members to “develop ways to validate their work in Adelante so it gets counted in their review process” and to solicit involvement from faculty outside of the department of education to diversify the disciplinary compositions within the group. Others addressed the concern of studying with the community and the exploitative possibilities of collaborative community-engaged research as exploitative. Adelante must “research WITH the community,” find ways to link the community with “university capacities for research and action” so that the “research are tied to genuine community needs and interests.” Caution was raised to not consider this work as a way of “fixing deficits” within the community. Lastly, a scholar-activist gave a conceptual orientation for Adelante to “stand on two legs, one grounded in specific communities, and the other for collaboration across sites and across groups.”

76 Throughout the meeting notes, participants would often incite the concept of “funds of knowledge,” (Gonzáles, Moll, 2005). However, I chose to think about knowledges with the perspective of Foucault’s subjugated knowledges.

77 In Funds of Knowledge, Norma González, Luis Moll, and Cathy Amanti (2005) write about how to integrate the diversified knowledges of communities into the classroom to bridge the gap between the school and communities. González describes an important element to this concept when she states, “the ultimate border – the border between knowledge and power – can be crossed only when
kind of expertise that is essential to the overall success” of Adelante (meeting minutes, 5/31/2006), participants engaged in continued reflection about what it meant to link up with diverse sets of expertise from the university, to the district, to different communities. In August, Adelante received $5,000.00 from a foundation to conduct parent focus groups.

Michelle (representative from Cabrillo College), Sheila (teacher, parent and parent liaison for the district), Richard (administrator) and Elise (teacher) all raised concerns about the intention behind these focus groups. How would “these kinds of dialogues” link “to communication with LPUSD and to action in line with the desires and needs of the community”?

---

educational institutions no longer reify culture, when lived experiences become validated as a source of knowledge, and when the process of how knowledge is constructed and translated between groups located within nonsymmetrical relations of power is questioned” (p. 42). I want to avoid a reading of the term “funds of knowledge,” to describe the need for teachers and school personnel to legitimate knowledges within the school system. This stance does not take into account the insidiousness of the colonial structure that is US public schooling and domesticates González’s definition. I add Foucault’s ‘subjugated knowledges’ to contend with the issue of the relationship of knowledge to power. Subjugated knowledges “refer to historical contents that have been buried or masked in functional coherence of formal systemization” that can be revealed through scholarship and “a whole series of knowledges that have been disqualified as… insufficiently elaborated knowledges: naïve knowledges, hierarchically inferior knowledges that are below the required level of erudition or scientificty” (Foucault, 2003, p. 7). In other words, the knowledges that can and cannot be revealed through scholarship and that have been systematically marginalized as they relate to power. I flag this distinction because of how easily the “funds of knowledge” concept can support a commodification of certain knowledge from communities and be worked and reworked in classroom contexts without attending to the complex relations between knowledge and power.

78 The meeting minutes read as follows: “Adelante received $5,000 out of a total request of $15,000, with the remainder deferred until October or November when we have been asked to report back on the further development of the research and the partnerships. The initial distribution of the grant, in line with the proposal that had been approved at the previous meeting of Adelante, will be: $2,250 to El Centro, $2,250 to Dos Manos Community Center (pseudonym), and $500 for food and other things needed for meetings.

Daniel and Mark met to discuss El Centro portion of the grant. They decided it would be used to support some focus groups with parents around questions pertaining to the theme: “what would schools look like if they cared for their children?” The findings of the focus groups will be codified in some theater pieces that would be used as a kind of “provocation” to dialogue within the larger community that would be facilitated through gatherings at El Centro. These dialogues will be a foundation for the community to critically analyze the relationships among family, community, and school.”
People noted that Watsonville parents had raised and organized their voices in the past with no discernable outcomes as a result, so there has been widespread disillusionment. With this in mind, the following sort of questions were posed by Michelle and Sheila: How would the work done with El Centro actually impact schools? What will be the district connections, and how can district leadership be incorporated? Will there be any board presentations?

Michelle and Sheila were concerned with how the information gathered would be presented to the district. In what ways would the information be disseminated to the district and how would Adelante accompany this process?

Sheila proposed that we be sure to build confianza in order to make a real connection with the parents and establish the power need to make sure that the families will not “just go through the motions” again without being really heard.

Sheila raised concern about the need to build deep, long-lasting connections with the parents and community members. Types of connection that would build trust and respect and not harvest knowledges from the community for district or university gain.

Richard reminded us that we need to acknowledge and connect with the previous, and ongoing, community work, and that we also need to make sure that the school district “stays at the table.” Elise provided a reminder that we should think in terms of “communities” and not “community” in our work (meeting minutes, 8/10/2006)

Richard also chimed in to remember the historical knowledges, tap into the movements that are already in motion and not polarize stakeholders. Each of these suggestions diversify the ethical concerns of engaging knowledge within Adelante.
Many participants in the group had experience with watching collaborations like Adelante promise to change conditions for low-income Latino families or shift the academic outcomes for low-income racially, culturally and linguistically diverse students, yet never deliver. Everyone in the meeting recognized the importance of honoring family, teacher, parent, researcher knowledges, yet how do you recognize these knowledges in a way that contends with the different registers and languages in which they are expressed, taken up, and represented? How does the sharing of these knowledges in a collaborative project offer opportunities for some or empty promises for others? This moment is representative of a continued critique and reflexivity of the work that arose from Adelante. The people that posed the concerns and cautions continued to be active in the conversation and committed to the dialogue and development of Adelante. People were interested in exploring together how to honor the different dominant and marginalized knowledges that would be engaged throughout Adelante, however many questions remained.

Continued concerns and (im)patience

In September 2006, Adelante continued to organize its first mobilizing effort around parent focus groups. After leadership from the two community centers

79 The focus groups would happen at El Centro and Dos Manos Community Center. The leadership from these centers and Daniel came together to write an “agreement between the projects that states the objectives and what each will contribute.” Following the explanation of the work that is planned as well as going on in the two sites, questions were asked about 1) the processes used to communicate to the district about the work that is going on, 2) what will happen after social knowledge is gathered, 3) what prompts or questions are going to be asked, and are the two sites asking the same questions. Mark pointed out that these are just the first steps of a process of gathering information with the community. He noted that there are no current
explained how they would conduct the parent focus groups, Adelante members expressed concern again that Adelante could collect “information and social knowledge” that would never return to the community to help change people’s everyday lives for the better. How would Adelante engage with these knowledges and uphold an ethical commitment to honor diversified knowledges? What would that look like? Who would decide what that looked like?

Some members addressed these apprehensions by suggesting “it would be a good idea to have a plan of action (for example, go to the district to show what is happening at the sites).” To which “there were some concerns shared about jumping right into action without developing an overall strategic plan.” This iterative tension of (im)patience (urgency and patience) would continue to appear throughout Adelante effort. Often, when participants expressed an urge toward action, or a concrete goal, representatives from the university (primarily Jack and Daniel, sometimes Richard) would remind participants of the need to interrupt normative temporalities and propose timelines of a “long haul” or long-term effort. In response to the desire for “plan of action” to the parent focus groups,

    Jack noted that Adelante itself enabled some communication between various stakeholders (e.g., various Districts), and that quite a number of organizations are part of the conversation already. However, he urged us to be cautious about pre-existing,

plans for precise follow-up steps to gathering of the information – that is, he does not yet know what to do with the information once armed with it, since we can’t know in advance what we will discover. However, the concern shared about gathering information and social knowledge is that often times, more often than not, this leads nowhere. Therefore, it would be a good idea to have a plan of action (for example, go to the district to show what is happening at the sites). Finally, it was pointed out that having questions aligned in Dos Manos (pseudonym) and Watsonville will help in producing a plan for further action/next steps” (meeting minutes, 9/28/2006).
conventional, communication channels/avenues/modes because that may lead us to similarly conventional and predictable results that don’t get us where we hope to go. We also need to engage the communities in determining actions and creating new channels of communication (meeting minutes, 9/28/2006).

Jack actively resists the urge to engage in the “pre-existing, conventional, communication channels/avenues/modes,” which also includes the temporalities of these modalities. If Adelante chose to take the data from the parent focus groups to the district to “show what is happening at the sites,” this action could reproduce normative organizational power dynamics and traditional parent involvement models by providing information to the district without a clear idea of how the parents would be involved or benefit from this action. Before finding out what is said in these focus groups, or what knowledge arises, the action suggests that the participants of Adelante know that this knowledge will be useful for the district. Based on Jack’s suggestion, this urge to define an action through pre-determined channels truncates or potentially forecloses the possibility of creating results that are not “conventional or predictable.” Daniel chimed in after Jack to remind the group that Adelante was still young and

still the preliminary stages of a long process, and that the conversations we are starting now will reveal things that require a much deeper level of analysis. Therefore, (im)patience is crucial because not only do we have to keep reminding ourselves of the goals of Adelante and pushing ourselves toward these goals, but we also need to establish a genuine basis for having dialogues among schools, teachers, students, and community members at the deep levels needed for real transformative work (meeting minutes, 9/28/2006).
Similar to Jack’s caution, Daniel reminded everyone that Adelante’s time frame for action and conceptualization of action did not adhere to institutional temporalities that are often defined by progress and consequently, there would be an unsettledness among people who are used to certain outcomes before beginning a project. At this point, the “goals” of Adelante were ill defined, “vague” and “unclear” (meeting minutes, 5/31/2006) and Daniel invited people to suspend the urge to action in order to go deeper to “establish a genuine basis” for having dialogues. This was an iterative process that would take time and could not be completed with taking the findings from parent focus groups to the district. In a previous meeting at the end of May, Daniel explained,

…vagueness at the beginning of large projects is inevitable and even necessary in order to create space for the participants to define collaboration. It is hard work to find out what’s really needed, even when we think that we know the problems very well (meeting minutes, 5/31/2006).

In both the May and September meetings, Daniel referred to the work of Paulo Freire to ground this orientation. His vision of Adelante was deeply influenced by the work of Paulo Freire and Myles Horton (Highlander School) The lessons from this 75 year tradition show that a large vision is necessary to change schools and communities, and that perhaps some kind of large, proudly participatory social movement would be an outcome of our work together (5/31/2006).

With this background from a meeting in May, Daniel continues to respond to the concerns about what will happen with the parent focus groups by suggesting that the focus groups are just the beginning of a long process of investigation, where
participants will come up against what they do not know, what they think they know and this investigation will extend beyond discrete actions to be a project of collective consciousness raising.

Following a Freirean approach means to engage in deeper level conversations and taking the time to conceptualize a range of actions/strategies before we make demands on particular constituencies (such as a school board). We need to think long term and transformative of the system as a whole. Daniel explained that we will be doing well if by January or February we have a better idea of what we’re doing. But we have to be patient and keep ourselves focused (meeting minutes, 9/28/2006).

Jack and Daniel oriented this unknowing, unsettledness, and uncertainty as an interruption of the status quo that potentially extended beyond participant’s conscious awareness of their levels of conditioning. This orientation aligned with a feminist politic of ambiguity and unknowing. This unknowing dissolves contradictions and opens space for unknowing. Jack and Daniel asked people to suspend their conditioned responses, their desires for clear goals, and to trust that over time, the work of Adelante would be revealed.

Another instantiation of this happened when Daniel invoked a “soccer field” story of Paulo Freire and his research team in Africa early on in Adelante’s development. This story is about leaning into the uncertainty, the unknowing and getting lost to what the goals may be of a community working for social and economic development. People continued to call on the metaphor of the soccer field throughout the effort, and referenced it in interviews in 2014. It held a conceptual
significance to the work of Adelante. In May 2006, at he very beginning of Adelante’s existence, Daniel told the story.

[A] Freirian team that went into a very poor community in Africa with some knowledge of what the community needed (health care, education, sanitization, clean water, economic development), but when they got the community together to discuss its needs, the community decided that a soccer field was most important. Although reluctant at first, the Freirian team agreed. The community built the soccer field, organized a team, and established new and productive relations with surrounding communities. At the same time, the newly organized community began to address its development in ways “the experts” would never have theorized. Daniel asked, so did they NEED a soccer field? How can Adelante find out “what is the soccer field” for Watsonville?

Daniel would invoke the symbol of the soccer field throughout Adelante to respond to desires for immediate change, or concrete actions. In November, 2006, Daniel stated, “we don’t know yet what we are doing, but we will arrive at something,” which was an example of the continued invitation and reassurance to Adelante members that social change could happen in a different temporality, one that intentionally resisted product-driven outcomes and legibility. Through these invocations, Adelante began to settle into a temporality that rejected neoliberal notions of time.

Daniel was not the only person to invoke the soccer field. There are a few different places where the soccer field is used to resist institutional temporalities and processes – January 18, 2007 (p, 4 & 5)
**Connect to community power**

Another theme that arose throughout the first year of Adelante, was the need for Adelante members to collectively map out what is happening inside and outside of the schools, build relationships with key organizations and constituencies, to involve the teacher union, parents, and other community constituents as soon as possible. At the first meeting, people acknowledged that this was an incomplete collaborative of people and more outreach was needed to invite Indigenous leaders and organizations to the meeting to integrate in the collaboration.

Adelante held its second meeting on May 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2006, one day after one of the largest immigrant rights protests in the US, where millions of people took to the streets. During this meeting, a representative of the local community college attended along with stakeholders from the districts and university. In the introductions, one participant who worked for LPUSD expressed a desire to have “people from within the community to participate in Adelante in order to make change.” After the May 1\textsuperscript{st} protests, she emphasized the need to “tap into the communities that are already working together, because together we can work to create new things.”

By August, the directors from the two community centers in Watsonville and Dos Manos were involved in organizing the parent focus groups. There was strong representation from the districts and university, yet there were “still no students or parents in the group and their voices are crucial for Adelante” (meeting minutes,
The first parent would arrive to an Adelante meeting on November 9th, 2006. Claudia was a parent and community advocate who attended school board meetings, sometimes officially as part of the ELAC and DELAC committees.82 She was hired by Adelante to organize and conduct parent focus groups at El Centro. She arrived with Jose (UCSC graduate student) and Edgar (El Centro staff) to the meeting to discuss how to conduct the parent focus groups. In addition to El Centro, Dos Manos Community Center was working with parents by “providing them prompts in order to elicit consciousness of the school’s role in the education and schooling in their children.”

In the Dos Manos Community Center the prompt used to elicit this type of awareness consisted of parents sharing a story where they felt cared for or not in school. In El Centro, the prompt is: “What dreams do you have for your children? And what can parents, teachers, and the school do to realize those dreams” (meeting minutes, 11/9/2006)?

Conducting their meetings separately and under different professional ethos and community organizing orientations, Dos Manos Community Center and El Centro developed very different projects. In the next section, I trace some of the work and conversation around El Centro’s parent focus groups and dialogues that occurred at Adelante meetings.

81 This was an interesting comment because there were quite a few parents in the room that had students in the school district, but they showed up in the space as district personnel or teachers; therefore their parent identities were often not recognized.
82 ELAC is the English Learner Advisory Committee. It was established to promote connections between parents of English learner students and the school. DELAC is the District English Learner Advisory Committee. Each ELAC committee at each school can elect a member to DELAC, which is a district-wide committee. The purpose of DELAC is to advise district local governing boards with regard to services and programs for English learners.
Feeling moved

The Adelante meeting that occurred on November 9, 2006 marked the beginning of in-depth discussions about the parent focus groups and a shift in tone. The meeting’s agenda was set to cover a report back about funding, learn more about the parent outreach work at El Centro and Dos Manos Community Center, and to study a recently published book titled, *Learning Power* (Oakes, Rogers & Lipton, 2006). Claudia and Edgar shared their proposed work at El Centro. They planned to reach out to parents from nine schools. Their strategy was to use non-formal channels to reach out to parents to solicit participation from parents that do not have a history of school involvement. Claudia and Cristina would recruit parents “informally during drop-off or pick-up of the children from school” (meeting minutes 12/7/2006). They would stand outside of the school, either on the sidewalks or at the entrances to the schools and ask parents if they would like to be involved in parent

---

83 In addition to a study of this book, on February 15th, Daniel conducted a study of the Praxis Cycle. He provided a handout with a visual of the praxis cycle. The theoretical framework of the praxis cycle comes from the work of Paulo Freire and Myles Horton at the Highlander School. Meeting minutes read as follows: The praxis cycles describes “ways of making peoples’ actions more imbued with theory and critical perspective….In Adelante we are trying to identify codifications of these communities’ common sense knowledge (represented reality), so reality can be understood differently – offering new critical knowledge that can demonstrate where to strategically intervene to create change.” These moments of study within Adelante mark the influences of Daniel’s (and others) theoretical framework on social change. When asked, Daniel often referred to Adelante as a “Horton and Freire-influenced project.”

84 This was Claudia’s first meeting.

85 Edgar explained why they sought non-formal channels of outreach: “The purpose behind not utilizing traditional ways of reaching out to parents is twofold: first, we would like to tap into seemingly unseen networks by not confining to activities that only involve schools, and second, we do not want to confine the types of parents that are involved in meetings (it is usually the case that traditional ways of reaching out to parents taps into parents who are already involved with the school). We understand, as Daniel pointed out, that kids not only learn a lot outside of schools but they also learn about schools in their communities. Therefore, by using non-traditional ways of reaching out to parents we hope that we reach and tap into unseen support networks which may eventually include the whole community in a community wide event at the end of the focus group meetings in March” (meeting minutes, 11/9/2006).
conversations about education. If the parents said yes, Claudia and Cristina would take down their name and number and organize the meetings.

These parents were then “part of conversations about the dreams that they have for their children and how schools and teachers are helping (or not) to achieve those dreams” (meeting minutes, 11/9/2006). The schools targeted were elementary, middle and high schools, and alternative schools in the Watsonville area. The agenda for the focus groups was as follows:

[P]arents will share their stories and cultures, they will write two letters…to schools-teachers explaining their dreams and how school are achieving or not those dreams…

Claudia, Edgar and Jose then asked the group to help them think through how to keep parents engaged and talking to each other beyond the focus groups. A discussion followed around how parents were identified and what would be done with the letters.86

It was after the introduction of the parent focus groups that the group studied Learning Power together. At the end of the study session, Daniel shared an experience he had with working with teachers. A teacher shared with him that “she feels tension and contradictions working as a middle class teacher and the students she teaches. The message of the story was that we need to come to a space where we feel that we are not living in two places but that we are part of one community.” This began a conversation to qualify the space of Adelante.

86 I address what comes of the letters and this process in the 2007 notes.
Shortly thereafter, Claudia shared some thoughts about parent involvement with schools. She stated,

Padres crecen en diferentes culturas, en diferentes maneras de vivir (parents are raised in different cultures and different ways of living). For this reason, we have to find maneras de hablar sin faltar al respeto para obtener cosas deseadas (we have to find ways of speaking without being disrespectful in order to obtain the things that we want). Padres están perdiendo lo más importante por el afán de la vida cotidiana (parents are losing the most important thing due to the toil of everyday life). Padres quieren la mejor educación para los hijos; la prioridad es los hijos (parents want the best education for their children. Children are their priority). La renta asfixia la familia, la manera de vivir (rent suffocates the way of living). Necesitamos [la comunidad] alguien que nos diga que es lo que esta pasando, lo que verdaderamente esta pasando (we [the community] need someone to tell us what is happening; what is really happening).  

Claudia begins by acknowledging the differences among parents and between parents and the school district. She emphasizes the need for Adelante members to find ways to communicate that respects these differences, that recognizes parents care deeply for their children’s education, yet the socioeconomic realities of many parents make it difficult for parents to advocate for their children. She speaks to Adelante to say that parents need support to learn what is really happening. “Claudia’s last comments were that the community needs to be motivated; it needs to be jolted into action.” In the closing statements, Adelante members were appreciative of Claudia sharing these

87 Translation in meeting minutes
perspectives and Elise acknowledged that El Centro is a good place for parents to begin this involvement.\footnote{Elise speaks of the importance of El Centro in her 2014 interview: “El Centro, that was a really positive part because it was like there was funding not like money coming down the pipe but there was that support in the heart of Watsonville. That changed a lot when they left because there was a lot going on at El Centro as far as focus groups and support from El Centro. Then that’s where we’re meeting at El Centro. It was like neutral ground too to meet at where we didn’t have to go up to UC or we weren’t at the district office.” (Elise, 2014)}

After Claudia shared, Michelle “gave a powerful and moving speech about how she has experienced youth’s outlook on education.” She spoke of the need to facilitate youth claiming their education and the urgency to “create a safe and healthy community and it is crucial that we start with the ‘youth, because even young children are in danger of being influenced by gangs, as was the case in Muir\textsuperscript{89} Elementary school.” Daniel then asked, “When did the struggle for education become negative? What happened to the long history of communities of color struggling for education as a right? How did it come to be that achieving in school became identified as “acting/being white”? He ended by stating, “We need to reclaim the right for a quality education for all the children in the community.”

Without more data beyond the suggestive meeting minutes and traces of memories shared in the interviews, it is challenging to know how these stories arose, but the tone of the meeting takes a turn after these stories and statements. Interestingly enough, each story focused on the three primary identity groupings of Adelante’s work: teachers, parents, and students. People thanked Claudia and Michelle for sharing stories, Edgar stated that it is “good for the self to come out,” others pointed out that the meetings have become a safe space for people to be

\textsuperscript{89} Pseudonym
together, Jack said, “we have reached a new level,” Mark saw this as the “beginning of something special,” and others expressed excitement for what was to come. However, even in this moment where many Adelante members felt moved, Richard acknowledged the power of these ideas and said, “we need to be honest about ourselves as well,” voicing caution in this moment of emotion. “Overall the group agreed that Adelante had reached a new level that evening thanks to the honesty and passion that was shared by Claudia and Michelle about the love and commitment they have for the community” (meeting minutes, 1/9/2006).

Since initiating Adelante in April 2006, the meetings focused on identifying who was in the room, clarifying processes, and developing a shared vision and language. This was the first documented moment where people began to open up, shift away from their institutional identities to relate to the challenges of teachers, parents and students. This moment required a certain amount of time to have passed for participants to settle into the institutional and social arrangements in the room and begin to listen to each other. The stories were not part of the meeting agenda; they were not instantiated by the organizational structure, yet they anchored the sentiments of the meeting and set a precedent for building community and closeness among the Adelante members. In essence, there had been a lot of conversation thus far and now people started to open up and share stories and the heart of the work. This space would continue to show up throughout the effort; however it would constantly be policed by the desire to be “productive” and conform to institutional schedules and temporalities.
In December 2006, Adelante members expressed their sentiments to one another to mark the end of the year. They included appreciation for the conversations, one member stated, “We are going into the unknown,” and another mentioned, “We are working on a theme, we don’t know what it is, but it is a powerful opportunity for the community to engage in action.” These sentiments share gratitude, uncertainty, and hope. Adelante members arrived earlier in the year curious and skeptical of the possibilities of Adelante, that it would be “just another immigration project.” However, throughout the year the group developed feminist politic, which consisted of a space to critique, to caution, to add concern, to think through their work together, to suspend action, and to dwell in the unknown.

This move to suspend the action and reside in the (im)patience and uncertainty of the work is an aspect of a feminist politic of social change. Establishing a promised goal limits the possibilities of being in the process, getting lost, losing course, and potentially arriving at a different goal. The defined future constricts the possibilities of the political actors to shape the present and thus create possibilities for different futures and histories. The pre-determined goals will haunt the project throughout, reminding the participants of the reality that has since passed. If Adelante intended to do transformative work, uncertainty and unknowing were important themes to unsettle normative presents and futures.

Paulo Freire (1970) deploys the terms radical and sectarian to discuss a similar point. In the start of Pedagogy of the Oppressed he uses this typology to explain the difference between individuals committed to human liberation, in the case
of radicals, and those who wittingly or unwittingly participate in the subjugation of others, in the case of sectarians. I suggest that people interested in defining determined goals are like sectarians that unwittingly reproduce their subjugation. While Freire believed that radicals could only be positioned on the left, he positioned both rightist and leftist sectarians as “obstacle[s] to the emancipation of mankind” (p. 37). He states,

Sectarianism mythicizes and thereby alienates; radicalization criticizes and thereby liberates. Radicalization involves increased commitment to the position one has chosen, and thus ever greater engagement in the effort to transform concrete, objective reality. Conversely, sectarianism, because it is mythicizing and irrational, turns reality into a false (and thereby unchanging) “reality” (p. 37).

Both rightist and leftist sectarians distort history; the rightist mythologizes the present while the leftist mythologizes the future, each constructing history as certain. A certain present or future denies the radical and ineliminable human capacity to make history and culture. In this closed system of certainty, a sectarian alienates him/herself in “his/her” truth. Conversely, “[t]he radical, committed to human liberation, does not become the prisoner of a ‘circle of certainty’ within which reality is also imprisoned” (p. 39). The radical fights for liberation through entering “into reality so that, knowing it better, he or she can better transform it” (Ibid). For, Freire, and similarly, for the feminist politic emerging in Adelante, participants looked to embrace the present, the unknowing of the future and the dissolution of certain futures. This radical move unsettles the past as well, a past in the present.
**2007: Building Capacity**

By the start of 2007, Adelante had begun to establish regular participation and a group of organized projects. In December 2006, members started a conversation around a youth component and in February, participants would begin to strategize a teacher component to parallel the parent and youth developments that also consisted of imagining a teacher pipeline to bring more teachers into the classrooms in Watsonville. The members divided up into these three groups and Adelante’s meeting spaces became feedback loops for members to return from their planning and share back to the whole group with updates and to receive feedback. The teacher and youth group spent months developing a collaborative structure, institutional ties to the university and school district and reach out to teachers, undergraduates and youth. During this time, the meeting minutes lengthened with planning, discussion, and concerns regarding outreach to youth, grappling with how to develop infrastructure and sustain the youth component. Similarly, teachers gathered to explore ways to reimagine and create an innovative teacher pipeline. While Adelante worked through the planning for both efforts, the parent focus groups began to expand.90

---

90 The teacher and youth components were short lived organizing efforts. I continue with the parent thread of Adelante because it was through the parent workshops that more people interfaced with Adelante and entered as members. The two other project did not develop past the fall of 2007. In February of 2007, an untenured professor at UC Santa Cruz took on the task of shaping a youth component to Adelante. She organized the structure for undergraduate students to work with youth from Watsonville, however just before she would implement the program in March 2008, she did not receive tenure and left the area.
Parent letters: “A day without students”

On January 18th, 2007, Jose shared back to Adelante about the parent focus groups. Claudia and Cristina had done much of the recruiting via word of mouth (standing in front of schools). By January, there had been eight focus group meetings thus far and there were more than 65 people that had participated in focus groups. Regular participants were beginning to return and about five to seven of the parents had shown interest in becoming leaders and being trained to conduct more focus groups.

Jose stated, “It is not that these parents do not have a voice, but they do not have the space to share it.” In the latest meeting, Oaxacan parents raised concerns about how to communicate with their children’s teachers and with their co-workers at work. These parents were trying to learn English and Spanish, posing significant linguistic challenges with little support. Another focus group raised concerns about how to advocate for children with special needs.

After sharing this information, Jose posed the question to Adelante, “what are the alternatives for special needs programs?” Daniel suggested “not to look within the school district for these solutions, but beyond.” He then was reminded of a theme that was brought up at the beginning of Adelante to “train parents in how to create change.” The meeting notes are unclear as to whether this was taken up as an agenda item, or continued in other discussions, however Adelante defined the next steps would be to find themes from the focus groups with the intention to create a “community gathering and posing these themes back to the community.” Although
the community gathering was scheduled for March 31st, Adelante did not make that projected date.

On March 11th a group of 25 previously involved parents and two guests from Teatro Campesino came together for Adelante’s parent workshop. They came together to analyze letters from parents that had been generated earlier in parent focus groups. “These parents broke into smaller groups and each analyzed five letters. In this process, the parents were able to reflect on the letters and were connecting to other experiences expressed through the letters.” On March 15th, the focus groups expanded. Edgar said, they were “taking on the stories as their own,” relating to the stories. Edgar reminded the group that “this work will lead to the development of creating a larger story (a theater piece) that will be presented back to the larger community.”

On April 19th, Edgar shared with Adelante that the “parent leadership work was gradually taking shape.” He continued,

These parents met every other Sunday to work in creating actos (or acts) from about 75 letters that were collected from different parent and student focus groups conducted during the last couple months. The theme that parents created from reading the letters was “A day without students.”

Adelante had reached out to over a hundred parents within a few months time, engaging many in deep conversation about their hopes and dreams and the barriers to

---

91 The main challenge that parents are facing is finding a way of putting the parent experience (as expressed in the letters and during the focus group meetings) at the center of the actos (acts). What is the best way of representing these experiences—that is, what do they want (and what do we want) to communicate to other community members? Who is the audience? Can this be achieved through different theatre pieces? Or actos, which consist of monologues?
those hopes and dreams. For a few parents, these powerful conversations inspired them to become involved in Adelante. Throughout 2007, Adelante would gain 5 new parents as members of its core group, some of whom had never been in leadership positions before.

Support through attrition

Many of the teachers that participated in Adelante were active in the teacher’s union in Watsonville. As Adelante began, the teachers were out of contract and would remain out of contract for two years and the union negotiated a new contract. There was a lot of tension around teacher issues and teachers in Adelante were very vocal about their discontents. In 2007 George, an Adelante member, would be elected to become president of the teacher’s union. This was a bitterly fought change of leadership and George would incite a wave of proactive and progressive measures in Watsonville. Adelante supported George’s campaign and rejoiced in his election, however when he was elected the demands on his time meant he could no longer participate regularly in Adelante.

Digital storytelling workshop #1

On March 15th, Adelante members decided to pilot a digital storytelling process to see if it could be a modality to engage in cultural organizing, much like the parent letters. “Mark commented that he found it was important for those in the core groups of Adelante (who represent the different elements of Adelante at the meetings)
to test out/experience the use of digital stories before using this platform with the community – to see how appropriate it was.” 92 On April 27th, Daniel, Edgar, Mark, Sheila, representatives from Dos Manos Community Center, and Claudia participated in a digital storytelling workshop. On Sunday, April 29th, participants presented their work. People shared that the storytelling process made them vulnerable, and it had “great capacity for building community.” 93

The documentation of the meetings end in April 2007; however Adelante meetings continued through the year. In May, Adelante met to talk about the digital stories that were created in April, and in June the group met to celebrate the end of the academic year. Over 2007 the teachers developed a project titled “Reminaging and Recreating Teaching: From Communities to Classrooms,” which involved teacher outreach and creating a teacher pipeline. Teacher themes included:

- Anger about NCLB
- Losing first language
- The soft racism of low expectations
- Teachers are being remediated like kids
- Teachers feel demoralized
- Teachers want to connect personal stories to the classroom

Some mentioned frustration with the discourse, “you’re not a team player if you disagree with the administration,” and being told “you’re lazy” and “not willing to work hard.” Similar to parents, teachers felt like they were not being heard, that they were being dehumanized and deprofessionalized. Adelante sought to leverage the UC

---

92 The digital storytelling process was an intensive weeklong full-time activity where Adelante members would write their stories, share them, and refine the stories to 350-400 words with a collection of images and video. In the nine years as an organizing body, Adelante created a little over twenty stories.

93 I explore the digital storytelling process in depth in Chapter V.
Santa Cruz Education Department connection to create a cohort model that would involve mentors and families in training teachers for Watsonville. The idea would be to create a career ladder and professional development from paraprofessionals to certified teachers to create more bilingual professionals, more teachers from the community. The teacher group planned to link middle and high school youth services to recruit students to teaching professionals, all of this with the intention of building deep connections between the communities and the schools. Sometime during 2007, this effort lost momentum and was no longer referenced in meeting minutes.\textsuperscript{94}

\textit{2008: Things fall apart}

The year 2008 began with facilitator trainings, attending an international education conference in New York, and a local conference titled, “Recovering the Wisdom Tradition in Education.” Each of the subgroups of parents, teachers and youth were in diverse yet strong stages of developing capacity and moving toward funding prospects. However, in 2008 Adelante sustained multiple losses of key stakeholders that fundamentally changed the work of Adelante.

On March 1\textsuperscript{st}, Adelante members participated in a focus group facilitator training lead by Daniel. The training happened at UC Santa Cruz’s Education Department. The idea was to “learn from one another’s expertise in: leading focus groups, one-on-one interviews, field notes, etc” with the goal to “move the learning

\footnote{Adelante worked with the County Office of Education which hired a grant writer to write a federal proposal for the teacher portion of the project, but the proposal was disqualified due to technical data issues pertaining to the federal undercounting of undocumented peoples in Watsonville area.}
A couple of Adelante members reflected back on this training as an important moment for understanding the intentions of the work in Adelante. Luisa remembered how impactful it was for her to learn how to contend with silence as a facilitator, that silence did not need to be perceived as a disinterest or loss in the group, but that it could be a productive moment to go deeper. This focus group training would follow the participants into their professional work and aided their ability to take up problem-posing pedagogies into facilitations and hold a space for dialogue.

Over the years of Adelante, the members organized themselves to attend two international education conferences, one in 2008 and one in 2010. In the spring of 2008 a group of Adelante representatives traveled to New York to participate in the Annual meeting of the American Education Research Association (AERA). They went to present on “Community Based Education Reform.” In 2010, another group of participants went to Denver, Colorado for the same conference to present their work titled, “Developing Public Learning Processes for School and Community Change.” Adelante members had diverse feelings about going to academic conferences. In general, people went because of their relationship with Daniel and to experience the conference, however Jose and Elise both raised questions about why they were there. They both remember conversations that they had with other Adelante members to try to identify how the international conference would help them reach their goal as a social change effort to support the community in Watsonville.
In addition to this academic conference, Adelante attended a conference at Mt Madonna Center in May of 2007 titled, “Recovering the Wisdom Tradition in Education.” This conference was grounded in:

- Life stories as a basis for deep learning
- Oral histories
- Remembering forgotten wisdoms
- Valuing voices and stories usually not heard
- “Opening public space for people to bring forward the deepest parts of themselves, their spiritual yearnings, feelings for their children and families. It is what makes communities, what binds us with one another”
- “Education is MORE THAN book learning”
- “Parent wisdom denied by schools”
- “To transform oppression requires tapping into basic human-ness”

Based on these themes, this conference seemed to align with a feminist politic that was emerging in Adelante. The focus was to listen to voices and stories not often heard, open space for people to articulate their deepest parts of themselves, connect with the wisdoms denied by institutions, and connecting with each other’s “human-ness.”

**Digital storytelling workshop #2**

In June 2008, Adelante conducted another digital storytelling workshop. There were 17 participants and Claire and Daniel facilitated the story circles and creation of the digital stories. When Claudia reflected on the process she said, “I knew it was my life, but I didn’t know until I saw my [story].” Adelante members shared that the “The digital stories have a different power. Its text, its knowledge in itself. It is a different kind of knowledge that communicates so much.” The digital
stories were special to the group and would become a focal point of most future work after 2008.

The fall

In March of 2008, the professor leading the youth focus groups of Adelante did not get tenure. Jack, who had been a consistent presence with Adelante, went on indefinite medical leave. Mark and Edgar left El Centro and Adelante lost connection with the community center due to a change in ideology and the new leadership focus on providing direct services to the community. Richard lost the race for superintendent and took another job outside of the school district, which severed Adelante’s ties with a network of adult education and all of the other social capital and institutional clout that each of these stakeholders held.

Michelle reflected on this time remembering that her “job responsibilities quadrupled.” With all of these converging events, other members felt the impact of the 2008 fiscal crisis with many of their university, district, and community jobs at risk. Workloads intensified. With more than half of Adelante members and the community connection to El Centro gone it was questionable whether Adelante would continue.

Throughout the fall of 2008, two undergraduate students conducted interviews with Adelante members as part of a research assignment. They asked people from Las Palmas Unified School District and Dos Manos Unified School District a series of questions, which included:
Why did you get involved?  
What are the key moments in Adelante?  
Why is Adelante necessary?  

Some of these interviews were transcribed. However there is no documentation of why the different participants were selected for interviews. At the same time that the two undergraduate students conducted these interviews, Daniel and a UC Santa Cruz graduate student in psychology made an effort to continue the youth engagement of Adelante and conducted approximately ten focus groups with Watsonville youth.

2009: Another life cycle

Adelante lost organizational ties with El Centro due to imposed staff turnover, ideological shifts, and El Centro’s pressure to provide services for community members. In addition to the loss of a centralized community-based meeting space for parents, where Adelante members were employed by the community center, district teachers and administrators and university collaborators bore the brunt of the 2008 economic collapse, many doubling, if not tripling their work load. As a volunteer effort, Adelante fell captive to the fiscal realities of many participants and lost both capacity and momentum. However challenging this moment may have been, eight dedicated leaders (parent, teacher, district, and university) battled scheduling issues to find time to meet. From 2009 to 2014, the group met approximately once a month with breaks in the summer and winter school holidays. While Adelante’s collective and institutional force lessened and Adelante was nowhere near the capacity when it started, members still found productive outlets for what would become the central
focus and key practice of Adelante’s work: to create and use digital stories as pedagogical tools for community dialogue.

Adelante met for the first time in 2009 on September 13th. The theme for the meeting was to focus on “Re-energizing Adelante” and to imagine how a new research center at UC Santa Cruz could be an outlet for revitalizing the work. Participants explored ways that Adelante could be funded through the research center as a pilot project. People brainstormed how Adelante could continue to support the work of the parents and to find “systematic ways to use the digital stories within the community. Even with these proposed ideas, Adelante members felt the lack of support. For example, a member mentioned during the September meeting, “We have already reached out to others, yet we have not been able to sustain such relationships…sometimes it is hard to get a foot inside since there is no organizational structure supporting [us].” The district had made a commitment to support Adelante, however there was no follow through and people expressed an urgency, a need for “more intensity” that “requires compensation.”

Given these challenges, Adelante members asked, “How do we re-organize Adelante? How can leaders emerge from Adealante?” People were diligently exploring ways to revitalize the effort. On October 4th, Adelante met at the teacher’s union office and Adelante members planned to continue the youth element and brainstorm outreach. Daniel was able to bring in a UC Santa Cruz student to support

---

95 A few people during interviews suggested that a way that Adelante continued was because people integrated the work into their professional work. However, what is interesting is to see how many people claim that to be true for them. Only Luisa was able to integrate Adelante into her work by writing a digital storytelling component to parent literacy into a district grant that received funding.
this effort, however within a month the graduate student moved onto another research project. This reflected one of the challenges in Adelante and a frustration of Adelante member of the “transience” of undergraduate and graduate students, a danger that participants were afraid of at the beginning of the collaboration.

In November 2009, Adelante participated in the annual Peace and Unity March. According to the Santa Cruz Sentinel (November, 1, 2014),

The inaugural march in 1994 came in the wake of the deaths of 9-year-old Jessica Cortez, her 13-year-old brother Jorge Cortez and [Rosa De] Ramirez’s, Antonio Ramirez Valdivia. The thee were fatally shot within months of each other and community members rallied to organize the first march to call for action.

George recalled the march as a powerful moment where Luis and Gabriella of the Adelante parents stood up and addressed the crowd. One parent, Gabriella, was a quiet mother and had found Adelante through the parent focus groups with Jose and Claudia in 2007. George recalled the moment that Gabriella stood up to speak at the march. Through her time at Adelante she had become less and less timid. He said, “Gabriella is so quiet. That’s amazing that she… We were all amazed at that, that she got up there and spoke.” They shared their experiences as first generation Latino parents.

Digital storytelling workshop #3

In the first two weeks of February, 2010, four parents (including Luis and Gabriella) participated in a digital storytelling workshop. Two youth, Lupe (in middle school) and Elena (Lupe’s cousin) tell their stories in the group. Adelante members came together to organize the story circles and storytelling workshop of a very tight budget. After this workshop, movement in Adelante slowed. A parent reflected in June, “It has been a year and we don’t do nothing.” There was no youth element and no other activities happening.

Curriculum development

In the fall of 2010, the remaining Adelante members (four parents, two teachers, a parent liaison for the district, Daniel, and one graduate student) came together to develop a curriculum to facilitate dialogue circles with the digital stories. This could be a systematic way to use the digital stories in the community. On October 3rd, Daniel provided a four-hour tutorial on Paulo Freire’s work in Brazil and elsewhere in the global south and the pedagogy of using codifications97 as a literacy tool. He proposed that the group could develop questions that could incite investigation into the digital stories as codifications. On October 7th, the group viewed a digital story

97 As coded existential situations, codifications re-present the everyday situation to the oppressed and link the social, historical and cultural conditions of the individual “reader” of the codification to broader societal realities, creating, through dialogue, the possibility for a collective investigation of the participants, the local community and the world. As such, codifications can be understood as social texts that participants collectively ‘read’ and through reading (the process of investigation), participants learn how to re-write themselves and the world. Codifications were used as a form of critical literacy to connect personal experience with larger social, historical and economic structures through collective reflection and de-coding codifications (Freire, 1970; Brown, 1978; Glass, Ball & Crain, 2008).
and generated questions to accompany the digital stories. Participants watched a story and discussed the story in groups and then as a whole group. Three main sets of questions emerged:

1) What do you see/hear/feel?
2) How is this story like or unlike your story or the story of someone you know?
3) Why are things this way? What are the power relations within the situation?

On October 10th the questions were revised. People focused on the “description of the experiences” Adelante members had watching the film, how the “personal is the social,” and the “power to make history and culture.” On December 8th, 2010, Phoebe tested the curriculum on a group of professional development teachers that she had worked with for over a year in the district. The teachers understood the link between the personal and the social, but they jumped to solutions.

This curriculum process became a central feature of the work of Adelante. Adelante began to brainstorm ways to show the digital stories that had already been created and engage community members in dialogue around variations of the questions developed. The central focus of the curriculum was to incite people into dialogue about their everyday lives and how aspects of their lives and the challenges (or lack of challenges) they face are linked to larger social, economic, and historical structures and discourses.
2011: Can Adelante survive?

On January 16th, 2011 Adelante members gathered with a central question: Can Adelante survive? The stakeholders at the meeting were representatives of UCSC Education Department, Las Palmas Unified Migrant Education, LPUSD Parent Literacy, and parent leaders. In this meeting, Adelante initiated a partnership with a Las Palmas Unified School District Parent Literacy Program to create digital stories of recently arrived Latino immigrant parents through parent literacy workshops. Using the framework previously deployed within Adelante, a member and director of the Parent Literacy Program facilitated workshops over a sequence of four months that culminated in the creation of four digital stories. At the end of 2011 and into 2012, Adelante members collaborated to support the first annual Watsonville Film Festival. Adelante selected digital stories and a group of six experienced middle and high school teachers worked together to create a standards-based curriculum for the digital stories selected for the film festival. Reading Together98 offered the curriculum to teachers in the school district to engage the social issues that were raised within the digital stories and participate in meaningful and relevant discussion within the classroom. In addition, Adelante members conducted a workshop and dialogue circle at the second annual Watsonville Film Festival in 2013. In 2012, Adelante began outreach to the Watsonville Consortium of Community Advocates.

98 Pseudonym.
(WCCA)\textsuperscript{99} to explore ways to offer dialogue circles within community organizations and service learning contexts.

Still suffering the losses of the 2008 fiscal crisis and subsequent austerity, frustrations arose among members at the unsuccessful efforts to reinvigorate and bring a new momentum that mirrored the dynamic the project had before 2008. Yet, along with this aggravation came the knowledge that they themselves and others in the group did not have the capacity to take on one more project. Adelante was then absorbed into the day to day work of it’s members, where they would gather monthly and explore ways to share the digital stories through venues from which they already had access. This frustration also produced existential questions about Adelante that were brought up in the meetings from 2012 to 2013. These existential questions lead me to the two threads of conversation that can illuminate distinctly different ways to conceptualize the work of Adelante and social change efforts in general.

\textit{Part III: A feminist politic to reframe success/failure and open new futures}

At first glance, Adelante appears to be a university-school-community collaborative effort that tapered out and dissolved due to a myriad of converging unfortunate events. The fiscal crisis constricted participation, sometimes tripling workloads. In addition, one stakeholder did not receive tenure, another fell seriously ill, and at least three found jobs elsewhere. Each individual in Adelante was a strategic representative of an institution and/or organization within Watsonville.

\textsuperscript{99} Pseudonym
When someone was displaced from their institutional arrangements or lost the ability to participate in Adelante due to competing job responsibilities, Adelante’s effectiveness and capacities suffered. Because of this breakdown, Adelante could be seen as a failed change effort; it did not achieve what it set out to accomplish.

However, this form of failure rests on a masculinist invention of success, where failure assumes loss and defeat. What if I “turn the meaning of failure in another direction” (Halberstam, 2009, p. 23) and examine it through a feminist politic of social change? In *The Queer Art of Failure*, Judith (Jack) Halberstam (2009) queers failure to explore the domain as an “unbeing and unbecoming that proposes a different relation to knowledge” (p. 23). As such, this definition of failure is an ontological disposition and proposes a different orientation that produces and is a product of different knowledges and practices. This type of failure is an “alternative way of knowing and being that are not unduly optimistic” or “mired in nihilistic critical dead ends,” but generative of “failing well, failing often and learning, in the words of Samuel Beckett, how to fail better” (Ibid, p. 24). The data suggests Adelante may be a singular instantiation of Halberstam’s notion of failure within a larger ethos of a continued multifaceted and dynamic lived struggle, defined by the continued presence and certainty of masculinist inventions of failure. Throughout the participant interviews, themes arose expressing productive tensions of Adelante’s
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100 This idea of the inevitability of failure, a rejection of optimism, and refusal of nihilism reminds me of literature on critical hope in educational studies. Many scholars-activists-teachers write about hope such as an edited volume by Vivienne Bozalek, Brenda Leibowitz, Ronelle Carolissen and Megan Boler (2014), Julio Cammarota (2011), Jeff Duncan-Andrade (2009), and bell hooks (2003).
formation as an organizational body and Adelante’s formation in relation to institutional arrangements in Watsonville. These themes articulate a feminist politic.

While not successful in codifying knowledge generated within Adelante into a singular organizational matrix or producing political events to affect institutional arrangements in Watsonville, Adelante’s repeated productive “failures” signaled a feminist politic that Adelante members lived and practiced. In this section I begin by describing how Adelante members animate this feminist politic that redefines failure. I then examine the productive tensions in Adelante and provide orientation toward skepticism, uncertainty, and ways in which Adelante members challenged modernist neoliberal temporalities as elements of a feminist politic that articulates a powerful form of community mobilizing that was never fully articulated within Adelante, but present none the less.

Beyond masculinist “success”

While Adelante members were displaced by institutional arrangements throughout their history, they also explained failures of Adelante in relation to having not produced change on an institutional/organizational level. This critique is based on a masculinist notion of success within neoliberal and progressive models of reform. As suggested earlier, Halberstam’s definition of failure as an analytic thread can support an articulation of a feminist politic. When asked what Adelante should have done or what it did not accomplish, participants identified these masculinist notions of success as markers of whether Adelante succeeded as a mobilizing
Adelante did not have institutional structures, “action plans” or goals, an office or central space. It did not “get into the system” or get funded. These are all markers of organizational formations that point toward masculinist notions of resistance and success.

Adelante members talk about the need to emulate the institutional structures, to align with the ethos of institutions, such as the district office to integrate and benefit from the community and institutional resources. They describe the importance of Adelante integrating with practices and structures of institutions and institutionalization. For example, Michelle and Phoebe explain the power of institutionalization as follows,

Well, becoming institutionalized to me means that it has to be part of the structure. Be it a department or it is some kind of office connected to some kind of office. The district already has things like I think it has an after school program, I think it has a parent education program, I think it has things it could connect to. [Adelante] just has to find a way to be connected and institutionalization essentially means resource allocation. It means that part of that institution’s

---

101 However, at the same time people animated this masculinist idea of oppositional resistance against a political, economic power structure as a measure of success, they articulated a feminist politic sometimes in conversation and sometimes the same person would express multiple perspectives across time.

102 Adelante received approximately $30,000 – $40,000 in total. Some of this came from different research funds at UC Santa Cruz. There was a small grant from El Centro via a foundation grant. Several proposals were turned down that were submitted via the community center; and some efforts with the district also foundered. “One key conversation with an ‘invitation only’ major funder for the community organizing element to get attached got scuttled with the forced change in leadership at the community center” (Daniel, 2016).

103 For example, Luisa is accustomed to the institutional practices of the district and was challenged by the ethos within Adelante. She describes

I need structure. I need agendas. I need goals. I need action plans and beyond something in writing. I'm the kind of person who wants to do something versus talk about it. (Luisa, 268-270)
resources are dedicated to the needs and activities of the organization. (Michelle, 2014)

Michelle identifies the need for a resources and Adelante linking into institutional channels that deliver resources. Phoebe continues,

But it would have been really nice to have seen Adelante have a central part in our community that our district would have embraced Adelante and said, "Here you can have an office space, work out of here, you have access to the district resources and here's our teachers, come and speak at a board meeting, come and be a part of". Looking outside the box, the district doesn't look outside the box… Have a space, have a central office, this is the project and have people that are either volunteering or working even half part-time to keep it going. Even if became a non-profit or don't know, that it could have been something bigger. (Phoebe 2014)

Both Phoebe and Michelle define institutional structure as: office space, non-profit framework, agendas, goals, “action plan,” “embraced by the district,” “resource allocation,” activities of Adelante supported (resources, financially, and ideologically) by institutions (such as the district office) and the community.

At the same time Adelante members expressed a need to reproduce the structures and practices of institutions in order to gain favor and entre into the existing institutional arrangements in Watsonville, some members expressed a subversive character to getting “into the system.” Instead of assimilating into the institutional matrix of Watsonville, some explained the need to integrate into the institutional arrangements in order to get things done.

Broaden the circle. It became a little “us” at a certain point. …Broaden the circle might also mean get into institutions more readily rather than just let’s stay on
Richard defines a way “into the system” by expanding the membership with strategic people that hold positions of power within institutional contexts. Adelante began with that agenda, however people that were gatekeepers or key institutional stakeholders moved from their positions and Adelante lost these strategic interlocutors. Later in his interview, Richard sees that Adelante could have scaled-up to link into the teacher’s union and other community spaces, but was ultimately unable to expand.

As members identified El Centro as an important space to interface with community, they saw the teachers’ union as a lynchpin to broker their interfacing with institutions. However, Adelante faced difficult questions about ‘neutrality’ among the district, union, community spaces, the university, and meeting spaces that did not align with gang territory (Daniel, 2016). Participants saw the importance of working “inside” the system and working “outside” the system too. Richard said, “Get into the system,” “you got to work outside too, but you got to work inside, then inside you get funding, you get time…” (Elise, 2014). Working within the institutional channels would alleviate the burden of unpaid labor for all participants by linking up to funding sources that could compensate their time, however getting “into” the system would also amplify masculinist inventions of resistance, requiring Adelante members to create deliverables and define models of success. Adelante members identified the benefits of working “inside” and “outside” of the system,
however all but one saw working inside of the system (with funding and resources) as necessary.

This desire to institutionalize and/or to affect institutions highlights the confrontation of social movement logics and institutional logics. In a masculinist frame of resistance, the goals of Adelante became the measure. Modern neoliberal ideas of accountability and effectiveness dominate this inclusionary project to bring Adelante into the fold of Watsonville’s current political economy and reform it from the inside. For Halberstam (2012), failure is “a category levied by the winners against the losers and as a set of standards that ensure that all future radical ventures will be measured as cost-ineffective” (p. 24). Therefore, resistance that does not “succeed in the masculinist sense, is destined to fail. However, what if a feminist politic embraced “failing, losing, forgetting, unmaking, undoing, unbecoming, not knowing” as “more creative, more cooperative, more surprising ways of being in the world” (Ibid, p. 2) and more powerful for envisioning the resistance.

Throughout Adelante’s history, members built dialogical and physical spaces to talk about their concerns, grapple with what it meant to honor knowledges, and deconstruct the everyday lives of participants through their cultural activities of focus groups, parent letters, and digital stories. These creative engagements were not oppositional in nature, but focused on inciting dialogue and raising consciousness among divers stakeholders. These “failures” that Adelante members identify can be read as a “map of political paths not taken, though it does not chart a completely separate land; failure’s byways are all the spaces in between the superhighways of
capital” (Halberstam, 2011, p. 19). I finish this section with an overview of themes of skepticism, unknowing, and interrupting modernist neoliberal temporalities contribute to the different ways that Adelante inhabited the “byways” of community mobilization and conducted necessary and powerful resistance work from a feminist politic.

*Skeptical and critically hopeful*

Since Adelante’s initial meeting in 2006, participants expressed concerns and cautions about the legacy of damage that university and district projects had done to the communities of Watsonville. People were skeptical that Adelante would not just be “another immigration project,” that it would begin and end and “no change is going to happen” (Jose’s reflections on meeting conversations). This skepticism never went away, yet it was also accompanied by a willingness to dialogue. According to Richard, “critical reflection was one of [Adelante’s] values,” people were often asking, “What are we doing?” which opened generative and continued space for exploring new possibilities and addressing ethical concerns in Adelante’s strategies.

Although people were skeptical and constantly assessing the risks of the work for parents and students (people that had less institutional power), Adelante members continued to do the work together. They did not leave. Richard recalls a moment when Adelante members began to talk about using digital stories as pedagogical tools for dialogue in Adelante. He remembers someone saying,
'Okay, I’m really uncomfortable about showing these pictures and these poor people and their horrible stories’ Then it just feels like a replication of a power dynamic. ‘I feel so sad for them.’ That challenge I think was actually one of the elements that attracted me to Adelante. That somebody like Elise was there, just challenging and questioning you every step...Sheila in her way sort of challenging in a more gentle way. That was an element of Adelante that really… this isn’t just this overlay or this grant or occasionally the academics coming down and meeting with people. It was a group of people working together…104

After Claire from the Center for Digital Storytelling shared how to create a digital story and shared some digital stories from previous projects, Adelante members began to discuss whether they wanted to use this as a modality for their work together. Many members brought up a variety of ethical concerns regarding the objectification and exploitation of the people represented in the digital stories. People were not afraid to share their criticisms and cautions about digital stories and the examples of the digital stories that they saw. Not only was this representative of a dialogical space where people could discuss these concerns, but it drew in other critically minded educators, such as Richard. In a sense, because of the skepticism and criticality, Richard stayed in the effort.

104 Richard continued his statement with a theoretical question: “It’s just really challenging our motives, being respectful about are we doing something to them or are they with us. Are we them? Are they us?”
Unknowing

Adelante members explained that sometimes they didn’t know what they were doing or where they were going. They got lost. Halberstam (2012) suggests that getting lost can disrupt normative spatial and temporal arrangements.

While some of us who have escaped our cages may start looking for ways back into the zoo, others may try to rebuild a sanctuary in the wild, and a few fugitive types will actually insist on being lost… On behalf of such a detour around ‘proper’ knowledges, each chapter that follows will lose its way in the territories of failure, forgetfulness, stupidity, and negation. We will wander, improvise, fall short, and move in circles. We will lose our way, our cars, our agendas and possibly our minds, but in losing we will find another way of making meaning in which to return to the battered VW van of Little Miss Sunshine, no one gets left behind (p. 24).

Halberstam begins The Queer Art of Failure with this orientation. She suggests that the structures of the zoo and cages, or even the desire to build a sanctuary in the wild (re)articulates a certainty and control by bracketing and defining the environment. It is the few fugitives who are the radicals who move away from the structures and definitions that express “colonized, racially gendered oppressed existence” (Lugones, 2010, p. 746). Halberstam calls the reader to get lost, to lose the tools that could help the reader find their way. In feminist politic, this denunciation (or deconstruction) of the overrepresentation of promised modernist futures is necessary to open space, or create a “metamove” (Sandoval, 2000) for an annunciation from non-modern orientations.
Adelante members expressed their unknowing and uncertainty often in their reflections in 2014. Edgar stated, “there was nothing really defined.” Jose remembered that “people had a lot of questions…[such as] what’s the objective behind it.” Sometimes Luisa “didn’t know what needed to be done.” Adelante did not fit into “what we already had in our heads, like okay this is such and such a project” (Jack, 2014). The change effort defied definition, so much so that people struggled to name Adelante. However, I argue that this unknowing and undoing was a necessary and powerful element of Adelante’s work to re-imagine and re-create themselves, each other and the community. It produced a “fractured locus” (Lugones, 2010) for participants to potentially perceive themselves as constructed by the colonizer and coloniality, yet not determined by it (Freire, 1990).

(im)patience and interrupting institutional temporalities

A dominant theme thus far is time. There were many moments throughout Adelante where people expressed impatience at how fast the group moved. I begin an analysis of how Adelante challenged modernist neoliberal temporalities with their (im)patience; however many participants reflected upon this theme in 2014. In professional spheres, modern colonial institutional constructs of Watsonville and the professional spheres of labor, the notion of efficiency turns time into a resource. When a task or a goal takes too much time or other resources to achieve, then the task or goal is criticized as inefficient. This can be generalized to less formal activities and settings, where people are “wasting time” if they do not accomplish a goal.
Similarly in Adelante, some participants (especially teachers and administrators) had a challenging time participating without feeling like they were “wasting time.”

Luisa said, “I felt like we never moved along… our meetings weren’t structured so that we could move forward and set goals…” she was challenged by the lack of orderliness that she had learned was a marker of success at her job. At the same time, as Adelante members were challenged by impatience, Jack and Daniel continued to remind everyone of the “long-term” nature of this type of work. Adelante may “may yield less marketable results, but may also, in the long term, be more sustaining” (Halberstam, 2012, p. 9). As an organizational formation, Adelante members worked to interrupt modern neoliberal temporalities to open space for dialogue across differences, a dialogue that could deconstruct present histories of coloniality and build different futures for the people of Watsonville.

Moving into the story

This chapter traces a feminist politic throughout the mobilizing of Adelante and people’s reflections about the effort in 2014, after the monthly meetings had ceased. Throughout the history of Adelante, there were many projects that were begun and not continued. For example, the play titled, *A day without students*, or the teacher and youth organizing. It would be easy to focus on the potential lost in the leaving behind these promising projects. This chapter is an account of the moments where Adelante fell apart and the larger social and economic issues that supported these moments. However, I do not end the story with the falling apart, or the death of
the multiple organizing efforts. The framework of a feminist politic allows for an exploration between the events of Adelante to identify an ethos of resilience that withstood all of the dissolutions of Adelante’s organizational formation.

This feminist politic is embodied in the histories and the land of Watsonville and the surrounding areas. I write Adelante into this history to attempt to interrupt normative readings of coalitional work that restricts the power of the work in the events and coming together of the people involved. The feminist politic that anchored Adelante for so many years, albeit not clearly articulated in the change effort, existed before the eventfulness of Adelante and would continue to exist in the people and the land after Adelante. This is one of the powers of the feminist politic. It lives in the everyday lives of the people involved, it lives in their way of being in the world, their epistemological and metaphysical visions, and in a sustained understanding that the coalitional work needed to overthrow the colonial structure of Watsonville would require, in the words of Myles Horton, a “long haul” of multiple efforts sustained over a long period of time.

This change effort was not focused on agitating in a traditional Saul Alinsky sense. While participants animated masculinist inventions of resistance, the efforts that occurred in the dialogues, focus groups, play and digital stories were focused on conversations. Adelante built dialogical and physical spaces for parents, parents and teachers, and parents and teachers and some district administrators to speak about their everyday lives, share experiences, and come to better understandings about themselves, each other and the community. In Chapter V I examine the radical effort
of Adelante members to create an anthology of digital stories. I expand on the three
digital storytelling workshops represented in this chapter and go into depth in the
ways that people learned to tell their stories, why they chose to tell their stories, and
how they operationalized their telling of these stories as a political act to fight for
themselves and their community.
CHAPTER V
TELLING STORIES: TRACING THE FORMATION OF A COLLECTIVE AND A PROJECT OF ANTHOLOGIZING

Approximately four months into the collective’s monthly convening, a university professor invited Claire, a digital storytelling expert that worked at the Center for Digital Storytelling (CDS) to an Adelante meeting. As the professor introduced the work of CDS, he proposed that Adelante could partner with CDS and use this media platform as a venue for Adelante’s work. After some discussion, Adelante members agreed to hear a presentation by Claire to learn more about CDS and the process of digital storytelling.

This was the first time digital storytelling was introduced as a modality to Adelante and the start of a conversation about creating and using digital stories as a practice of Adelante. In the first section of this chapter, I sketch a historical backdrop to the collective motivations of creating what would become an ever-evolving community digital anthology. I integrate meeting minutes from 2006 – 2007 and interview data from a pilot study in 2011 to describe how the digital stories were introduced to Adelante as pedagogical tools. I examine the challenges of representation as they arose in the CDS presentation and Adelante’s subsequent discussion about using digital stories.

---

105 Pseudonym.
106 Formed in 1998 when the San Francisco Center for Digital Media moved to Berkeley and became the Center for Digital Storytelling.
Adelante members approached the idea of creating digital stories with curiosity and concern, raising questions and engaging in discussion about the potential to objectify the participants and explored rationales for sharing these stories digitally. These conversations were the beginning of imagining the pedagogical work that the digital stories would perform in Adelante and a commitment to a type of anthologizing. At the same time, Adelante members were engaging in and imagining the pedagogical work of the digital stories, they were creating a collective, an anthology of cultural artifacts that would be central to this pedagogical work. After deliberation (much of which is not documented but anecdotally referenced in interviews), Adelante members decided that they wanted to pilot a digital storytelling workshop\(^{107}\) to explore this modality for future cultural work within Adelante.

In the second section, I provide documentation of the 2010 digital storytelling workshop and interview data from Adelante member’s description of what it was like to participate in the workshops and why they chose to tell their stories.\(^{108}\) The

---

\(^{107}\) Over the next three years (2007, 2008, and 2010), Adelante hosted three digital storytelling workshops.

\(^{108}\) The data set for this chapter is limited. There is no systematic data from Adelante from the years 2006 - 2010. Different graduate students who were participating in Adelante’s meetings wrote most meeting notes taken during this time, therefore the perspectives are sometimes divergent and the meeting minutes lack uniformity. I incorporate accounts from interviews about the digital stories that I conducted in 2010 and 2014 to corroborate the data from the meeting minutes. However, even this is lacking. In a 2011 pilot study, I conducted six interviews of primary stakeholders in Adelante. Five of the six interviewees were parents and had created digital stories about their experiences as parents in the school system. Two of the five were also veteran teachers in the school district. In these interviews I asked the parents to describe what it was like to write their digital stories and why they chose to create them with Adelante. These questions were not central to the 2014 interview protocol and this study, however through triangulation of interview data and multiple documents (specifically meeting minutes and documentation from one of the digital storytelling workshops with three of the four parents represented in this chapter), I was able to gather a cross-section of rich data about the introduction of digital storytelling as a modality (meeting minutes), a storytelling workshop (2010 workshop notes), and evidence of six storytellers as to why they told their story and what it was like to
context of the workshops coupled with the facilitators and participants produced and enacted a type of collectivity that is instantiated in many forms throughout the data. I theorize the process of writing stories together as a polyphonic, testimonio-like process where singular authors faded and stories evolved and changed to represent elements of an imagined collective. In the digital storytelling workshop and participant’s descriptions of why they told their stories this imagined collective continued to emerge. Participants understood the stories of me to be the stories of we. They saw their experiences to be shared with others in Watsonville and that an imagined audience who was part of the collective would relate to their stories and join in the effort to create another community and school. This process was politically driven and often required storytellers to relive challenging and painful life events. I examine the accounts of four parents (three from the same workshop), one teacher and one district worker’s descriptions of the challenging emotional labor and their theorizing of the political work of Adelante that they explained justified their remembering.

This is a story about creating stories for cultural organizing. Together, Adelante members created a dialogical space to re-write dominant narratives through storytelling and through this re-writing and making of digital stories, a collective of

tell their story, four of whom were present for the 2010 workshop and three of whom told their stories during this workshop. This, by no means, is a comprehensive re-writing of the process of choosing digital stories. For example, it is likely there were many side conversations that Adelante members had to explore their concerns and excitement about using the digital stories within Adelante that I cannot capture. However, the data reveals that the digital stories of Adelante were not just a collection of stories, but representative of the creation of a collective. There were three digital storytelling workshops in total and storytellers from each of those workshops expressed similar sentiments about the political necessity to write their stories.
representational structures (i.e. stories) emerged, and an anthology began to form. Similar to Ann Stoler’s (2003) definition of archives as “epistemological experiments,” or sites of knowledge production and repositories of constructed social and cultural belief systems (p. 87), I argue that Adelante built an ever-evolving archive, yet a particular type of archive: an anthology. Written from distinct subject positions of parent, teacher, and students, the stories clustered with similar narrative trajectories and similar themes. As the archive grew to represent somewhat diversified narratives within the community; the narratives challenged the dominant paradigms of “parent,” “teacher” and “Latino student,” revealing, through everyday lived experiences, the “limit situations” that the digital stories emphasized.

I engage women of color feminist anthologizing/anthologies to emphasize the collective (counter)archival process that could push back against dominant notions of Latino parents and Latino parent involvement in school that could support the political formation of Adelante. The collectivities moved people beyond themselves to tell sometimes-painful stories together. It was this understanding of the relationships and connections that people shared with others and the Watsonville community (other parents, other teachers, other students, etc.) that motivated Adelante members to share their stories, to digitize them and then consent to use them as pedagogical tools for community dialogue circles. These motivations parallel the “urge to anthologize” (Anzaldúa, 1990).

I conclude the chapter with an exploration of the limits to the collectivities that workshop facilitators and Adelante members mobilized. The process of
anthologizing narratives within Adelante also produced absences and refusals to participate in the matrix of representations present within the emerging anthology. I attend to these silences within the anthology.109

Part I: Introducing digital stories

During the first year of Adelante, there was a constant flow of new people attending the meetings. In the meeting minutes, new people were documented along with their affiliated organizations. “Each one bring one,” was a common phrase and even noted in the meeting minutes toward the end of the first year of work together. Parallel to the discussions about the goals and process of Adelante, there was a running list of names referenced during meeting discussions that Adelante members identified as potential allies that could be doing similar work, provide access or capital to the effort, or would be good partners. It became part of the beginning of each meeting together that new people would introduce themselves and the organization(s) they represented.

In August 2006, during the introductions of new participants, Daniel introduced Claire and the work of the Center for Digital Storytelling (CDS). Daniel suggested Claire should give a presentation of the work of the CDS to see if Adelante members would be interested in collaborating.

After some discussion of the Center’s work, it was decided that they should make a presentation to

---

109 Another point to mark is the process of dissemination or “reading” the anthology. For example, who are the audiences? What does it mean to take these individual stories out of the political contexts in which they were made?
Adelante so that we can think about a formal collaboration in both helping to articulate the voices that are part of Adelante and helping to document the work and history of Adelante (meeting minutes, 8/10/2006).

This was the first time that the idea of digital storytelling was introduced or discussed at the meetings.

Two months later, on October 19th, 2006 at a local resource center, Adelante members gathered and started their meeting with an activity. Participants were asked to pair up and “share a story of a person who cared about them in school.” The purpose of the activity was to “see how well the question prompted discussion about how school actors cared for the schooling of people” (meeting minutes, 10/19/2006). A couple members created this exercise as a practice elicit dialogue in focus groups with community members in an unincorporated area of the county. After this activity, Claire presented on the Center for Digital Storytelling.

As a “California-based non-profit… arts organization rooted in the art of personal storytelling, [CDS] assist[s] young people and adults in using the tools of digital media to craft, share and value the stories of individuals and communities, in ways that improve all our lives” (meeting minutes, http://www.storycenter.org/index1.html, 10/19/2006).110 Through a “participatory approach” CDS provides “voice/representation of the members of the community” and “transform[s] the lives of those who create the stories as well as the lives of those who watch it” (meeting minutes). CDS facilitates the digital storytelling workshops

---

110 It is unclear if Claire had a formal presentation and read this quote or if the person at the meeting found the website and added this information.
to create the digital stories and proposes that through the creation and viewing of the
digital stories, people’s lives are transformed.

The Center for Digital Storytelling is often referred to as the birthplace of
digital storytelling. CDS was formed in 1998 when the San Francisco Center for
Digital Media moved to Berkeley and became the Center for Digital Storytelling.
The non-profit pursues a social justice oriented mission to “support people in sharing
and bearing witness that lead to learning, action and positive change” (CDS website)
through digital storytelling workshops. CDS partners with community
organizations\textsuperscript{111} to “surface authentic voices through story”\textsuperscript{112} (CDS website). Within
this partnership, CDS conducts a needs analysis, plans the structure of a program, and
implements the program in the form of a digital storytelling workshop. Each step is
co-determined by the community organization and CDS, which shapes the objectives
and process of the digital storytelling workshop.

Claire then showed some digital stories to illustrate the work of CDS. She
showed three documentaries of Latinos who have gone through foster care. Before

\textsuperscript{111} The Center for Digital Storytelling partners with community organizations, not the people
represented within those community organizations. If the community based organization’s non-profit
framework is based on a system of “elite” participation or “service,” as explained by Jennifer Wolch
(1992), then the community based organization could easily exploit the stories of the “clients” to
perpetuate the mission of the organization over the empowerment of the community members, thus
reproducing the non-profit industrial complex. The people represented in the digital stories can end up
performing representational work for marketing purposes and other purposes that may extend beyond
the storyteller’s consent. This representational work can dehumanize the person by imposing a liberal
progressive story of triumph out of abjection and into a type of “well being” that is based on white,
middle-class imaginaries to solicit concern around a “damage-centered” story (Tuck, 2009) and to raise
money from philanthropic entities. Claire is a global leader in raising and considering these ethical
and political issues in digital story work. However, even with conscious pre-planning and
implementation of the story development and production still produced challenging issues of
representation.

\textsuperscript{112} What constitutes “authentic”? In other words, what stories are they trying to tell and for what
purpose?
showing the videos she provided a disclaimer. She explained that she was showing the videos as a way to demonstrate “how the Center for Digital Storytelling works,” but these videos “have specific purposes and audiences in mind” (meeting minutes, 10/19/2006), which was not the Adelante audience. The videos were made for social workers and foster parents, however Claire needed examples of digital stories to show to the people at the meeting. She explained she was aware that she was taking the videos out of context and asked the Adelante members to accompany her in viewing these videos knowing that they were intended for other audiences and other representational work.113

A moment of concern

After Claire showed the video, meeting minutes state,

113 These stories were meant for former foster youth, the makers of the stories, to work thorough issues and to heal. Claire ran a program designed for digital storytellers to work through trauma. Claire showed these videos for instructional purposes; to demonstrate what a digital story looked like and what it felt like to watch an autobiographical multimodal composition. However, when extracted from the intended audiences, the digital story can perform unintended representational labor. In this case, the digital stories were not meant for that representational work. Claire was aware of this, and troubled the act of showing the digital stories before Adelante members watched the videos, but did her disclaimer mitigate the potential damage? When the digital stories are taken out of context or shown to audiences they are not intended for, what kind of potential representational betrayals occur? Are there analytic costs that certain stories must incur in order for CDS to invite people to understand the process of their work? The moment Claire showed digital stories to Adelante members so they could learn about the form and content of a digital story throws into relief the representational tensions of a digital autobiographical story. Claire wanted Adelante members to experience what a video composition looked like, to see what images were represented, to hear the voice of the protagonist, and to feel the story. Although Claire had commitments to the individuals represented in the digital stories she showed, her accountability to the analytic costs incurred in the process of showing these digital stories to Adelante could easily be invisibilized or even go unnoticed by her desire to use the digital story for explanatory work with Adelante. I raise this analysis to attend to the constraints of the digital form and the politics of representation that autobiographical digital storytelling elicits. Claire battled with these issues when presenting the digital stories to Adelante and these ethical concerns would continue to persist throughout the creation, use, and archiving of the digital stories within Adelante.
Concerns were shared about the broader purpose(s) or outcome(s) of the videos. For example, some comments were made on how community members are already in the process of sharing stories, but what are the impacts of these stories on actual policies? What are the ends to these stories? And does this process objectify the participants?

The data does not provide detailed accounts of the concerns of digital stories, however Richard recalled this moment in a 2014 interview. He said,

…these good intentions videos from Berkeley were showing this … it’s such a fucking danger. All these good white people being missionaries to the poor little brown people, I mean that’s not okay. You really need to challenge that… There are some self-stories about my mom, “I’m a drug addict.” That whole range of people just feeling bad for little people and Sheila and Elise just said, “Uh-uh, that’s not okay.” I remember saying “Somebody said it.” That just because it’s well intended that doesn’t mean you can also enter in to figuring out what’s really in this structure here. Are we supposed to just feel sorry for the little brown person on and on? There was the surprise. It was like “Wow, okay.” Then a bunch of people had known each other and shared values and trusted each other’s goodwill, that kind of challenge was heard in a constructive, positive way.

Richard regarded the work of CDS and presenting the videos as exploitative, however the critique by Sheila and Elise was productive for bringing to the surface these concerns. Richard expressed his appreciation of these critiques and continued to explain that it was this awareness in the group to not follow “good white people” “missionary work” that kept him engaged. Adelante worked to resist “benevolent racism” (Villenas, 2001) or “false generosity” (Freire, 1970) or the good intentions that feed the non-profit industrial complex (INCITE, 2007).
Clair responded to these concerns by stating that the “work of the Center is geared to the transformative work of particular organizations and the people who participate intend for the stories to be used in making change” and “[w]hile she is skeptical of concepts such as ‘empowerment’ she noted that the workshop process provides a collaborative setting through which individuals work out their stories in order to address larger socio-political issues” (meeting minutes). After discussion and continued concern of whether the digital storytelling process and using the digital stories would objectify the lives and people represented in the stories, Adelante members decided to pilot a “half workshop” of three days (6 hour per day) with six people from Adelante so that the concerns about the process of creating and using digital stories could be discussed openly before asking people outside of Adelante to write and create a digital story. The workshop theme would be “how have our personal stories shaped our dreams for Adelante?” Participants hoped that the workshop would offer a “concrete sense” of if and how they could “integrate this approach into the ongoing work of Adelante,” and it would produce a DVD that Adelante members could “use for explaining Adelante to other audiences (including funders)” (meeting minutes, 12/7/2006).

In March 2007, a month before the digital workshop occurred, Adelante members watched more digital stories and continued to explore the modality of digital storytelling and the possibilities in the work of Adelante. Grappling with the

---

114 The meeting minutes continue: “Daniel added that these processes could be used to document the work that Adelante is undertaking but also be articulated to whatever struggles to change schools and communities get shaped through the work.”
unknown consequences of creating digital stories, the director of El Centro confirmed that it was “important for those in the core groups of Adelante (who represented the different elements of Adelante at the meetings) to test out/experience the use of digital stories, before using this platform with the community, to see how appropriate it was” (meeting minutes). He did not want to use an organizing tool without knowing its effects and he was concerned about subjecting El Centro’s families to the process and production of digital storytelling before someone from Adelante had experienced the process.

With the digital storytelling workshop on the horizon, more concerns arose about whether and how the digital stories would be accessible to communities and how the digital stories would be viewed. In 2014 interviews, few Adelante members recalled the negotiations that resulted in using digital storytelling within Adelante. One member remembered the initial wave of skepticism and concern about creating stories with images and voices of community members, yet, when the Adelante members began the process of telling their stories, these concerns subsided.

---

115 Meeting minutes 3/15/2006: “Mark commented that he found it was important for those in the core groups of Adelante (who represented the different elements of Adelante at the meetings) to test out/experience the use of digital stories, before using this platform with the community – to see how appropriate it was. He further spoke on the discomfort that El Centro would have in putting their families’ stories out there before someone (a rep) in the core group had tested out the process. Daniel explained that this digital storytelling is a proposed way to do work in the community. He also reported that he had been working on a funding proposal to develop the youth element of Adelante and trying to secure the funds for the set-up of a mobile media lab. Daniel supported the need for this medium/tool of digital storytelling to be tested by the core group members, especially before the commitment (ie. money) has been made.” That lab was to be based at El Centro and to be funded via the youth element of Adelante but also integrated with their various other programs and projects.

116 Meeting minutes 3/15/2006: “Jose raised the concern of how accessible the viewing of digital stories would be to the communities—for instance, if some households did not have the media technology to play DVD/VHS? Some suggestions were made by others in the group that public viewings could be held or the stories could be broadcast on public television to address this concern of access. Daniel also pointed out that the digital stories could be attached to foundation proposals and could be used to gain resources for the communities.”
Once Adelante had their first digital storytelling workshop in April 27, 2007, no more references show up in the meeting minutes about fundamental representational concerns of using digital stories as cultural productions.117

The story circles

Throughout the seven years of Adelante, there were three rounds of digital storytelling that occurred under the auspices of Adelante (April 2007, June 2008, March 2010). Two members of Adelante were so moved by the digital storytelling process that they found ways to incorporate the digital storytelling into their professional work with parents and parent literacy. Approximately twenty digital stories were created as part of Adelante. Utilizing meeting notes from a 2010 story circle and interviews from Adelante members who created digital stories, in this section I analyze the process of telling stories within the story circles of Adelante as a polyphonic, testimonio-like process that formed a collective. However, this is not to say that the process of telling stories was easy. Unanimously, Adelante members spoke of the challenges of telling their own stories and witnessing the struggles others experienced when trying to tell their stories. In this regard, I explore tensions between the impulse to tell a personal story and the challenges of telling it within the context of Adelante. Throughout the data, it becomes clear that Adelante members

117 People talk about whether to blur faces for safety for people without documentation and for minors. It was agreed at the start of the digital storytelling process that the digital stories would not be shown without the consent of the people who made them – if possible for folks to be there when their story was shown – this latter position changed over time – through discussion about the dialogue circles, it was suggested that folks not be there when their stories were shown. People talk about this in their interviews (Claudia, Sheila, Phoebe, Luisa)
conceptualize the work of writing, sharing, and watching the digital stories as forming a type of collective, an imaginative space where people are no longer alone and a physical space where people can talk about their experiences. People shared their stories and experienced the pain of remembering the stories because of this collective.\(^{118}\)

In February 2010, a group of parents gathered to tell their stories along with a small team of Adelante volunteers who facilitated the process. Most of these parents had been in Adelante for a while; others were affiliated with parent focus groups that had occurred at El Centro from 2006 to 2007. Adelante members had conducted a little over a year of focus groups at El Centro with parents and students in Watsonville asking, “What are your hopes and dreams? And what enables or blocks those hopes and dreams?” In many of the focus groups with parents, they were asked to write letters. With the data gathered from these focus groups and letters, Adelante members compiled a list of themes that articulated the social, economic, cultural, and historical landscape of Watsonville.\(^{119}\) Some of the themes were: respect; safety; food; books; talking to teachers; teacher’s appearances; cultural clashes (story circle meeting notes, 2/7/2010). With these themes in mind, facilitators from Adelante organized a digital storytelling workshop for approximately six parents to tell their stories.

---

\(^{118}\) The need for a space to talk was a finding of a dissertation conducted by Bob Harper (2008) with Mexican mothers in the Watsonville area. This theme is also present in the meeting minutes when Jose tells Adelante members that parents in Watsonville have a voice, “they just don’t have a space to share it” (meeting minutes, 1/18/2007).

\(^{119}\) In 2007, parent leadership group was creating a theater piece based on the themes they analyzed from the letters.
The workshop would not be as long as prior workshops due to financial constraints, but the parents would share in the process of writing their stories in “story circles” and would digitize their stories. This was the last digital storytelling workshop of Adelante.\footnote{There was one more workshop in the spring of 2010 with four parents and two students.} To begin the meeting, digital storytelling facilitators (Claire and Daniel) conducted an overview of “Digital Storytelling Elements” (story circle meeting notes, 2/11/2010). Beginning with the main message the author wishes to convey through the story, facilitators highlighted compositional elements of a digital story that can help convey this message. Elements included where a story can begin. Often people think about stories chronologically, but a digital story can start and end at different points in our lives. For example, protagonists could begin in Mexico where many were children, or they could begin the story in Watsonville.

The multimodal composition of the digital story diversified the tools authors could use to express their stories. They could convey their feelings through words, pictures, or music. The speed, dynamic and modulation of the voice can bring people into the fold of the story, transmitting sentiments along with the music, sound effects, and moments of silence. Facilitators sought to orient parents to tell a story as simply as possible with few words and few images and not too many shifts in sounds to produce a profound expression.

After an overview of the elements involved in telling a story, facilitators explored “different types of stories” (meeting minutes, 2/11/2010). They spoke of “our grandparent’s stories,” Bible stories and fables that have a moral to impart upon
the reader, and stories about our own lives. Parents shared general themes of crossing the border, spending a week in the desert, being undocumented in the US, leaving a child behind in order to come here to work; powerful stories about loss, death, dreams and longing. Facilitators remarked,

These are the kinds of stories we want to tell in Adelante. These are the stories…These are your stories and they’re very personal stories… but they’re also the stories of many others because you are not alone in these stories.

Facilitators recognized the themes within these stories extended beyond the personal experiences of the people in the room to be shared experiences of many. It was a common theme throughout the workshops and meetings for people to operationalize the digital stories as vehicles to provoke thought and conversation around common every-day lived experiences (hopes and challenges). The stories were personal, but they were also common among people within Watsonville.

Part II: Sharing stories

After this overview, the group spoke of the importance of respect and confidentiality. While the intention was to create stories that could be shared with the community, facilitators set parameters to the process of writing stories. The story circles would be confidential,\(^{121}\) participants could stop at any time, people would

---

\(^{121}\) To respect the confidentiality of the participants, I will not divulge any information about what occurred in any of the story circles. I gathered data to account for the general process of telling stories. Participants will be identified by their affiliation as parents or teachers, but no other identifiers, such as references to their stories will be shared.
need to listen to and respect each other, and at any time participants could revoke Adelante’s rights to the story. Participants could also create stories without using personal information.

With this understanding, participants watched a couple of stories that had already been created and deconstructed the stories together to identify the main themes of the stories, explore the modalities that the protagonist used to convey these themes. People then began to share their stories within the story circle. Each person took time to share. For the first day, participants just spoke their stories while others listened. Participants opened up and shared personal and sometimes painful stories. All the workshops to create digital stories within Adelante shared a similar structure and facilitators. When reflecting on her experience of creating her digital story in a workshop from a couple years earlier (2008), a teacher and parent participant stated, “The process of going through telling your story, going through the, all the steps that we went through, I think were really important. Sharing the emotional part, crying about it before we even started writing was all part of that.” She continued to say that, for her group, it wasn’t until the second or third day of the workshop that participants began to use the computers. Similarly Edgar, a prior student and community organizer in Watsonville who participated in a workshop in 2008, reflected upon the story circles as a “very emotional experience” and “an intellectual experience,” a space where people learned from each other.

---

122 At the end of the workshop, participants signed a release form to authorize Adelante’s use of the story. This release form is Appendix F.
123 Due to confidentiality, I share general reflections from digital storytellers from all three workshops that Adelante sponsored.
The group focused on listening to each other’s stories, witnessing, holding space and supporting the telling. The process of storytelling was seemingly dialogical. For example, Luisa, who wrote her story in June 2008, stated, “I think I knew what topic I wanted to go in with. It was through the circle that people’s questions and curiosities gave me the direction.” The storyteller arrived with an idea of the story s/he wished to tell, shared these stories and the group would respond with sharing parts of the story that they found powerful and asking participants to expand on themes in the story that moved them. This iterative process of telling stories created a polyphonic environment where the stories being told were from an individual’s experience and remembering of that experience, but through the telling the story evolved to include questions, ideas and perspectives from listeners.

Although Mikael Bakhtin (1984) was exploring the polyphonic novel and theorizing how a unifying narrative voice can flatten the consciousness of the character, his explanation for the polyphonic novel as an art form can help to articulate the phenomenon of storytelling that seemed to be occurring within the story circles. Polyphony, literally meaning “many voices” is a term that Bakhtin developed to explore a storytelling that is not determined by a single authorial voice. Polyphony requires dialogism. Contrary to monologism, which is “a tautological closure of dominant discourse” and signals a “discursive death of the ‘other,’” dialogism opens space for meaning to be constructed through the recognition of multiple voices and perspectives. Storytelling as an “[a]rtistic form, correctly understood, does not shape already prepared and found content, but rather permits content to be found and seen
for the first time” (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 43). Similarly, Paulo Freire’s (1970) concept of dialogue requires the subjects to interact in relation, and this relation cannot be one of domination, but rather one in which a recognition of the subjects as participants in the dialogue create meaning together.

However, this relationality requires a new conceptualization of identification, or what Lugones calls, “world” traveling. Similar to Freire’s concept of dialogue, “world” traveling can only occur through loving perception. Oppressive structures maintain semi-intransitive consciousness through the illusion of separateness. Arrogant perception is a lack of loving perception and an act of a failure to identify. This failure to identify transforms individuals into objects of arrogant perception, alienates the other and constricts the possibility to relate. Within his explanation of dialogue, Freire identifies the distortion of the word love by capitalist logics and describes it as a “pathological form of love rather than real love” (Freire, 1970b, p. 469).

Arrogant perception, much like Freire’s idea of “pathological love” serves the same cause: to divide and conquer. In this state, the oppressed’s gaze remains on the oppressor and not only does not turn in solidarity towards others of the oppressed, but it remains blinded by ideological and material resistance to that turn (Lugones, 2003). To respond genuinely to an ‘other’, there must be an exploration of the vertical or “top down failures of love and their logic” between the oppressor and the oppressed and an investigation of the interrelational failures between the oppressed (Lugones,
The exploration of this constructed isolation must occur through *loving perception*. Loving perception stems from an understanding that

> [w]e are fully dependent upon each other for the possibility of being understood and without this understanding we are not intelligible, we do not make sense, we are not solid, visible, integrated; we are lacking. So traveling to each other’s “worlds” would enable us to *be* through living each other (p. 86).

Through *loving perception* and this new form of identification she calls “‘world’ traveling,” we can begin to see ourselves as interdependent in resistance, building relationships and solidarities in the process. “World” traveling necessitates a desire to relate, an openness to break through “ready-made sense” and understand meaning making to be embodied, and situated in relation.

Bakhtin’s concept of polyphony, dialogism, Freire’s notion of dialogue with loving perception produce a kind of praxis that supports the formative nature of the story circles. The composition of the group, the intention of the storytelling, and the trust among participants produced a space and framework for the types of stories that could take shape. When the storyteller spoke, they may have been speaking to the people in the room, gauging the registers of others; when others responded, it was through their understandings of the story and their interest in specific elements as they related to the collective intention of writing stories. This collaborative process obscured the singular author and produced a somewhat polyphonic backdrop to the stories.

---

125 The end product of the digital story shows a single protagonist, where these voices merge into a single perspective, whereas polyphony does not allow the multiple and divergent narratives to be subsumed into a singular or master narrative.
Some stories changed substantially in their re-telling. For example, Luis shared a story about domestic violence and the pervasiveness of it within his community. He was moved to share his experiences with domestic violence. Through the process of sharing those stories and others, he focused on the parent-school relationship, advocating for students, attending parent meetings, etc. He stated, it was “important to say I live this situation in Mexico and I had to immigrate to Mexico City for this situation, but at the end the question is why I am attending the school meetings.” In this moment, the collective understanding of the purpose of Adelante shifted the participant’s narrative.

Writing stories

Before gathering images and imagining the multimodal composition, participants shared their stories and then were asked to write them down. The writing and re-writing of the stories was a continuation of the dialogical process of the story circles, however the objective was to scale down a text narrative to approximately 350 – 400 words. Participants would write out several drafts of the story, sharing it along the way, until the draft was a seemingly complete story. When reflecting upon this process in 2011 and 2014, storytellers spoke of remembering that they showed up to the workshop on the second day with many pages of text. Through the sharing and re-writing of their text, a cohesive story emerged. One woman recalled how the process of telling her story clarified what the message of her story was. She said,

I had this huge text that was so different. It was really… I don’t even know what I started with. I think
I found one of the original texts, but I didn’t really
know until it was, the message was, maybe the message
was not one like one point, it was going all over the
place.

Another participant stated, “Escrevi mucho mucho mucho, escrevi, dice como tres
hojas llenas, Escrevi y de alli fue sacando lo que fue mas importante para mi.” (I
wrote a lot, a lot, a lot, I wrote, about three full pages. I wrote and from there we
pulled out what was most important for me). Similarly another parent stated, “The
next day when we go back it was, I brought like ten pages. Ten pages of writing and
we were talking and they were helping me cut it up…and only take the most
important part.” These three accounts suggest the writing and re-writing together
allowed for a story to emerge from the pages. In effect, the stories that the
storytellers came in to tell changed over the process of telling into coherent narratives
with a beginning, middle and end.

Luisa, an Adelante member, stated that she knew the stories that she wanted to
tell before she began writing, yet through the process of telling, her relationship with
the story evolved.

…the process of getting it down to the core essence of
the story that I wanted to tell, I felt that it was a very
cathartic process for me and it ended up being like
almost like therapy, and the story at the end, I had a
much clear view of that part of my life, what a gift that
part of my life was versus how tragic it was or what
injustice it was to me.

The initial three participants did not give the impression that they knew exactly the
story that they wanted to tell, but had many aspects of their lives that they shared
through writing pages and pages of texts and it was through the sharing of their
stories, receiving feedback, that they found a story to tell. In contrast, Luisa knew what she wanted to say before she began telling her story, yet when she completed her story, she no longer was angry about the story, but felt a sense of peace. Even though her story did not change in the telling of it, her relationship to her story changed. She was no longer angry.

Testimonio-like process

These accounts are not a complete representation of all of the people that participated in creating digital stories for Adelante, yet they are representative of a testimonio-like process (see Beverely, 2004). Participants witnessed the testimony of individuals in story circles and each created first-person stories that gave an intimate view into their lives. This intimacy is typical of testimonio with roots in the “Christian public declaration of faith” (Franco, 2010, p. 217). Similar to testimonio, people did not participate in the story circles just to share their stories. All referenced the political imperative behind sharing their stories.

Throughout the workshops, people reminded each other of the reason for telling stories, even the facilitators. Participants would receive feedback to sculpt their stories around general themes that parents, teachers, and students dealt within Watsonville and often references were made suggesting the personal is political; that one person’s story was the story of many. At the end of the first day of story circles

---

126 I was not able to interview everyone that made digital stories within Adelante, nor was I able to get information about the process of telling their stories within the interviews that I was able to conduct. Around twenty stories were told. Six people who had told their stories were still in Adelante when I began to collect data. Some people had moved away and I was not able to contact them. I was able to ask nine people about their experiences making their digital stories.
in 2010, once all the parents had shared their stories, people shared closing remarks that directed emphasis on the political power of these stories.

These are the stories that people who control the schools and who control the canneries, and the farms—they don’t want to have told. They don’t want us to tell these stories. There’s suffering in our past. It’s necessary for people to hear these stories. We have the opportunity to release that suffering and to make change.

Although the speaker is anonymous, this statement is exemplary of the political perspective throughout the digital storytelling workshops. There was a common understanding that stories were powerful and could move others if they were told.

According to Bevereley (2004),

Testimonio is poised against literature; its collective denunciatory tone distinguishes testimony from the personal development narrative of standard autobiography, and it tends to erase the elitist author who mediates the narrative. This allows for a ‘fraternal or sororal’ complicity between narrator and reader; in other words, a tighter bond of intimacy that is possible in manipulative or evasive fiction (p. 117).

Adelante members who wrote their stories knew these narratives to be “poised against literature,” written to interrupt or speak back to dominant narratives of “Latinos,” “Indigenous peoples,” “parents,” “teachers,” “Latino students,” “Mexican culture” and other dominant stereotypes. People with economic power in Watsonville “don’t want us to tell these stories.” Framed this way, telling your story in an Adelante story circle127 was an insurgent act and through these collectives, participants were re-

127 I do not suggest that the story circles were not fraught with power dynamics that may have limited participant’s engagement or ability to share their stories. Due to confidentiality, I cannot extrapolate
writing themselves and each other in contrast to the dominant narratives.\textsuperscript{128} The
digital stories braid these generative themes with the experiences of the storyteller in
a participatory creative process that culminated in semi-autobiographical stories. By
definition, this process blurred authorship and challenged the notion of the story of an
individual.

\textit{Political imperatives of remembering through the pain}

All but two storytellers who shared their experience telling their story shared
that it was emotionally challenging to share their stories. The stories required
participants to relive the experiences of their past. Yet, each had a poignant
explanation for why they chose to move through the challenges to tell their story, all
for political reasons. I was able to gather data from nine out of approximately twenty
people that participated in the three digital storytelling workshops. The majority of
the data came from a 2011 pilot study with Adelante parents. In this section, I
highlight four parent’s accounts of why they chose to tell their stories and their
experiences telling their stories and I integrate data from other participants who
commented on the process in interviews done in 2014. Each account describes a

\textsuperscript{128} This argumentation is suggestive that the digital storytelling process produced counter-narratives. I
am reluctant to use the term counter-narrative because I believe “counter” is too simplistic of a notion.
I think we are in a counter- counter- moment, where descriptive counter-narratives are all too often
consumed by the structures of representation for hegemonic productions. These particular counter-
narratives were not meant just to describe ways of life. The digital storytelling process produced
digital stories that have dialogical content. This dialogical content is not didactic, it requires an
entering in relation with the digital story, its narrative and how the people in the room understand it in
order to open up the alternative analyses and imaginings of the social, historical, cultural and
psychological conditionings of the protagonist represented in the digital story and the viewers.
desire to interrupt stereotypes of Mexican parents, to remind people of the value of their knowledge, to support people in recognizing that they are not alone, that their story is similar to others, and to inspire hope among other parents.

The digital stories were first-person accounts of economic, social, cultural, and generational challenges that were often emotionally challenging. A teacher expressed this challenge well when she was reflecting on telling her story. She stated, “It is really hard to go in and look at yourself culturally, ethnically and feel like you feel safe enough to share that…there is a part of, I think all of us, that wants to hide sometimes.” It is hard to remember, to “look at yourself” and to do that with a group of other people. This requires a space that is “safe” enough to become vulnerable with your story. Understanding the challenges of remembering and reliving potentially painful and uncomfortable memories and doing so in a space with others, begs the question, why would someone choose to tell their story? Why would someone choose to go through the pain of remembering and the vulnerability of sharing private stories?129

Sheila

Sheila, an Adelante member that had been part of the project since its inception stated, “I do believe in the power of the written word and the spoken word

---

129 Similarly, what safeguards were in place for Adelante to not fall into the same practices of “good intending white people” that Richard and others critiqued at the start of considering using digital stories as cultural tools for the political work of Adelante? Daniel had several decades of experience working in community organizing and Claire had many years of experience working on digital storytelling production that supported the space for people to open up and share their stories.
and when this became a part of the project, it felt like a natural thing to do. I wasn’t hesitant to do a story.” She went on to explain,

The stereotypes that are out there that people are so much more willing to believe about Mexican people, you know the whole romanticized view of the culture and the folklore, you know, that is pretty embraced… but you know when people see someone who is working in the field, you know, that maybe knows how to make [that art, that culture] they are just so dismissed right off the bat because they don’t have that “beauty.”

She critiques how Mexican cultural objects are romanticized, however the Mexican farmworker is denied this same cultural value. The same person who produces culture is seen by others as not having it. She sees Mexican farmworkers being dehumanized while their culture is appropriated, fetishized and commodified. She then shifts her perspective to being a parent.

Parents especially, parents teach their kids so much, and that we, we also need to remember, as parents, that we have a lot to teach our kids…I wanted to validate my folks also and what they are able to give me…them and the work that they have done in the field, in the strawberry fields and trying to validate not only what they’re doing but what so many other families are doing. Because you know, the concepts of respect and the work ethics and all these things, I think are still very much, still a part of the Mexican culture and I don’t think people stop realize that. They don’t stop to realize what it takes to wake up at five in the morning and work till six at night. What that takes to do that, but media and everybody is quick to say ‘oh they drink so much’ and ‘they are loud’ or whatever.

For Sheila, her story was about speaking back to these stereotypes of the Mexican farmworker and parent while validating Mexican parents’ “funds of knowledge”
(Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2005). She wants people to realize the discipline, the labor, and the cultural values of Mexican parents and value and respect these virtues.

She then shifted to explaining the message she wished to convey as a parent to the schools. She wished to say,

> You have my treasure. Every parent feels that, I believe that in my heart. That every parent feels like they are sending their little jewel into the school and all we can do is hope that everyone from the custodian, to the librarian to the classroom teacher puts their little tiny piece of sand into the development of who this person is going to become.

Her story had a message for the people in the school district to recognize her child as a person in the process of becoming, a jewel, a pearl. This message evolved from a sophisticated critique of the stereotypical representation of Mexicans and farmworkers and the school system’s ability to dehumanize students. Not only was her story about reminding parents of their knowledge and validating that knowledge, but she was also asking the school personnel to recognize the humanity of the children that were walking in their school gates as whole human beings that needed to be cared for and valued. Other Adelante parents shared similar sentiments in wishing to break down common stereotypes of Mexican families, yet their stories did not convey messages to the school personnel or teachers.

---

130 Sheila has very specific critiques of the school system and a message that she wishes to relay to the audience of her digital story. Her story, in contrast to the other stories, is didactic. Her story is more prone to generate issue-focused dialogue, whereas the other stories tend to elicit personal and experience based conversations. Bakhtin is “suspicious of authorial intent” because it “fails to respect the autonomy of the other’s voice,” this is a critique of Sheila’s story because she wishes to share a message, whereas the other stories tend to be more dialogical, engaging the experiences of the audience.
Luis

Luis is a parent leader and had worked for many years with parents in the district. When he saw his story for the first time, it took him back to his life and it was painful to remember. He understood that Adelante may show his story in varying locations and he felt comfortable with others seeing his story, but he did not want to be in the room when his story was viewed. He was concerned that people would make things up and say things because he was present, but

…it is really hard for me to remember what has passed in my life…I am ok with [people viewing my story], because that is why I do it, because I am in other people…If my story can help other people… I want to help people, even if I don’t have time or the resources.

Luis chose to reflect back on his life and experience the challenges of re-living those memories in order to do something for his community. He understands that he is “in other people,” that his story is a shared story that others in Watsonville can tell. Luis decided to write his story and move through his pain of reliving memories because he believes his story can provoke conversations with other people that will move them toward bettering their lives. He saw it as a duty to share his story. According to Luis,

someone needs to show something…so, if I was to help
I needed to do something. One thing was to show my story. How I lived in the past, what my goals are and how hard it was for me to come here and what I needed to do in order to make my goals.

If he told his story through Adelante, Luis understood that this could help others. He saw this narrative trajectory of his past, his goals, the challenges of arriving in the
United States and the lifestyle he had to live in order to achieve his goals as familiar to other’s life experiences.

He saw his story as a venue to speak to other parents and inspire them to reflect. He continues,

[The digital story] is to make the people be conscious on why we come here and then what we are doing here and what we need to do. Most of the people when we come here, we only have one idea: to make a house in Mexico. Ninety nine percent of the people don’t have a house in Mexico, in the small village. It was what everyone I know they want, to build a house in Mexico. Most of them already build the house, but I think that may change because everyone now brings the family cause they don’t want to be alone they are building house here or buying house here, including me, and their family are here, but they job is keeping all [of their time]… they keep forgetting the life they wanted… because we are still living alone, going alone.

Luis sees his community and his projected audience with similar stories to his own.

His story is about migration. Why do people immigrate from Mexico to Watsonville? What do they do once they get to Watsonville and what are some of the challenges that individuals and families face when they settle down in Watsonville? These preoccupations are the central focus on Luis’ story. He sees the economic challenges of supporting a family and explains that even if people bring their families from Mexico to Watsonville so that they can be together, the need to work often trumps time with family and people still feel isolated and alone. This isolation creates more problems.

By telling his story and showing it to others, Luis explained that it would make an impact.
He sees his audience as other parents who have immigrated to Watsonville for similar reasons, families who have similar life experiences. His story is a point of reflection for people to remember why they moved to Watsonville and to question whether they are living up to their dreams. He wants people in his community to remember that they came to Watsonville for a better life and to wake up to how much people are sacrificing time with their families in order to work. Luis was willing to experience the discomfort of remembering his life in the hopes that other Mexican parents will stop, reflect, and explore their life situations.

**Claudia**

Similar to Luis, Claudia felt very sad when she finished writing her story. She was not sad that people were going to see her story, but her sadness came from realizing how many things she had to struggle through to "be that woman that I am now." She explained that she thought of all the aspects of her life that she could put into the story; everything that she left out and the way that she chose to frame the story and she had a chance to see herself and see how her story shaped the woman who she had become. This realization left a deep sadness.
However, in spite of this sadness, Claudia saw it was very important to share her story. She often referred to her story as “our stories” and spoke on behalf of the Latino community, however her experiences highlighted first generation immigrant families and mothers over other Latinos. She explained,

…some of the people they feel very depressed, very sad to be here in this country. Some of the people don’t have a picture of the future. They say, ‘What am I going to do in this country?’ ‘Who is gonna help me?’ ‘Who is gonna listen to me?’ ‘I cannot do some things.’ And I think when they see something in somebody’s experience, I think it gives them a little power.

Claudia speaks to the emotional challenges of migration. She sees the people in her community as sad and depressed because they are in the United States and struggling with the emotional weight of relocating. She highlights the constriction, pain, challenge, and disorientation that many immigrants feel when they move to Watsonville. She also insinuates a lack of infrastructure and connections to support to help people establish themselves, feel comfortable and begin to dream of futures in Watsonville. According to Claudia, some people have given up hope, but she believes that through witnessing other people’s experiences of relocation, people can have “a little power” and recognize that “they are not alone.”

Claudia believes that this feeling of isolation is a structural effect of migration. She sees the similarities in people’s experiences and the need for people to share their experiences to recognize that they are not alone, however the opportunities for these conversations are rarely available.
...that people are having the same problems, the same, the same problems in the past and still... because sometimes (sigh) sometimes we don’t have an opportunity to talk with a lot of people. Yeah, to tell them “I want the same with you, don’t be sad, you can do it. You can go to the schools and you can find a way to talk to the teachers. Only you can do something in your children’s life, only you, nobody else.

She understands the problems to be the same among parents and these problems have lasted for a long time, she said with sadness and exasperation. Since there are few opportunities for parents to have conversations about these difficult topics, to connect and find ways to support each other, the problems persist. Claudia believes that if she tells her story and shares it with others, that will open up more dialogical space for parents to begin to talk about their feelings, to recognize that they are not alone, and to find ways to “talk to the teachers” and advocate for their children.

_Gabriella_

Gabriella became part of Adelante through other parent relationships. When Gabriella was first asked to tell her story, her response was “no.” She was scared to talk about her life. However, this changed.

Me invitaron... les paraceron [la historia mia fue] interesante porque, de como puedo sobrevivir aqui sin documentos. Y yo, no no queria [contar mi historia]. Decia ‘no, no.’ Me da miedo y pena de hablar de mi, de mi vida. Pero despues ja dijeron [vamos ajudar] para escrivir su historia…
_They invited me... they thought [that my story was] interesting because, how could I survive here without documents. And I, no, no, I did not want [to tell my story]. I said ‘no, no.’ It makes me scared to speak_
about me, about my life, but after they said [that they would help] write my story.

People in Adelante told Graciella that all she had to write was 350 words and she thought that was not much at all, so she decided to do it.

When Graciella wrote her story, she was not alone. She shared a story circle with four other parents. They took three days to complete their stories as they wrote their stories together. Even with the support of other parents in the room, writing her story was challenging. It was

muy difícil, porque, bueno casi siempre yo soy muy muy timida, como que no me gusta hablar y menos de mi vida. Pero poco a poco, este, empezamos a platicar cada quien nuestra historia antes de grabarla y yo creo que todos nos fuimos entendiendo y nos estamos apoyando.

...very difficult because, well almost always I am very very shy, I don’t like to talk, much less about my life. But little by little, we started to talk, each person told their story before recording it and I believe we all were understood and supported.

When asked why she decide to write her story, she said:

Porque ya había visto la historia de Claudia, dijemos que mi historia, no no es igual y yo creo que es importante de contar una historia como la mia porque se van a identificar muchas personas que estan igual como yo...muchas personas van a sentirse identificadas con esta historia. Que se van a dar cuenta que no son las unicas. Entonces se desyanvelven, la sacan y otros padres pueden o podemos hacer algo con mi historia pues de ayudar a mas personas.

I saw Claudia’s story and my story is not equal. I think it is important to tell a story like mine because many people will identify with my story because they are the same as me... many people will identify with this story. They are going to realize that they are not the only ones. Then they develop, they create [the story] and
other parents can or can do something with my story as to help more people.

Gabriella saw her story as different from Claudia’s and one that had not been shared yet. Similar to Luis, she constructs her audience as other parents who have similar life experiences as she does, specifically undocumented mothers and fathers. She is confident that when these parents see her story, they will easily relate to the experiences she describes and recognize that they are not alone, that there are other people out there that struggle with the same issues of isolation, labor, language, housing and how to advocate for their children at school. She hopes that her story will

...dejar [los padres] de ser tan timido, de que hablen, de que no importa si no tenemos papeles o porque mas que nada de hablar en las escuelas de que no se quedan callados en lo que es injusto porque muchas personas se quedan calladas y ya no hablan ni con la directora, ni con nadie ya.

...let the parents not be so shy, for us to speak, and not care if we have documentation or not, more than anything to speak in the schools and not stay quiet in what is unjust because many people stay quiet and do not speak, not with the director, not with anyone.

Gabriella sees her story will inspire people to speak and to reveal the injustices that she sees between the parents and the schools. She believes in telling her story, as an undocumented parent, she will incite other undocumented parents to step forward and begin to advocate for their children. She goes on to say that she believes that many parents who do not have documentation do not believe that they are allowed access to education. She thinks this is one of the reasons why parents stay away from the schools. Similar to Claudia, Gabriella hopes that her story can promote dialogue
among parents, specifically undocumented parents to speak about issues that may inhibit their participation in schools.

**Part III: Building collectivities: From me to we**

In each of the parent accounts, they justify moving through the pain of remembering to tell their stories based on an analysis of “limit situations” (Freire, 1970). Limit situations are “perceived obstacles” to liberation (Freire, 1970, p. 99). In this case, the limit situations are rooted in the day-to-day suffering of the storyteller: dehumanization of Mexican farmworkers, appropriation and fetishization of Mexican culture, disrespect of parents and students, feeling isolated due to culture, language, money, and feeling overworked. All of these issues were products of the colonial histories of Watsonville.

It was in the story circles that storytellers identified limit situations and harnessed these as elements of their digital stories. In the telling and writing of the stories, the individual did not construct their stories alone. Often individual authorial voice blurred through the context set by the facilitators, sharing stories together, receiving feedback about important and powerful elements of the stories, writing the stories and editing them to fit in a three to four minute multimodal video. This participatory writing process infused multiple voices into the singular, constructing a non-totalizing representation for political purposes, a foundational element to testimonio (see Franco, 2010, p. 216).
I suggest the dialogical, polyphonic and testimonio-like nature of the digital storytelling workshop built a collective of shared stories. Participants surrendered intimate moments for a political discussion, to connect with others and to share their hopes of action. They saw their stories as vehicles, as artifacts to mediate this collective, where people could identify and discuss the common inequities or “limit situations” in Watsonville and begin to imagine “limit acts” together. The forming of the collective was fundamental for the epistemological work of Adelante. Adelante members found the space to move from *me* to *we*. In *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Feminists of Color*, Anzaldúa (1990) explains this movement.

In our self-reflexivity and in our active participation with the issues that confront us, whether it be through writing, front-line activism, or individual self-development, we are also uncovering the inter-faces, the very spaces and places where our multiple-surfaced, colored, racially gendered bodies intersect and interconnect. This book aims to make accessible to others our struggle with all our identities, our linkage-making strategies and our healing of broken limbs (p. xvi).

Anzaldúa links the material and political struggles of the writers of this anthology with the intention of this writing to connect to others.

However, this process was not free of ethical and epistemological concerns. While accounts of writing stories often depict a process of creating a cohesive story as a therapeutic and revealing process for the storyteller (e.g. Luisa and Claudia’s stories) there was the potential for epistemological violences to occur in the “cutting” or “pairing down” the stories. Creating a complete story, one with a beginning,
middle and end can foreclose other stories. How much of the voices of participants silence the storyteller or shift the story? Similarly, if the stories were written with the intention to use them in political work, how much of the stories remain stories of the individuals if they are framed to represent larger social, historical, economic, cultural and psychological themes for discussion? These questions remain unanswered by the data, but inspire further investigation into the foreclosures of expression on the production of digital stories within Adelante and formation of a collective.

Echoing the critiques and concerns that Richard, Sheila, Elise, and others raised about the potential dangers of digital storytelling, these stories once finished are cultural artifacts that abstract the flesh as the story moves from embodied experience to a digitized object. Through inscribing orality into the written word and a multimedia project, the digital story commodifies the previously embodied knowledges and potentially reenacts the colonial event. Consequently, the form of the digital story will always commit the initial colonial act through the separation of its form from the body and objectification of knowledge. However as a living anthology, dissemination can mitigate the hermeneutical weight and analytic costs of the stories. The digital stories can be read through pedagogical practices that work to recover the body, albeit not the material body, but other bodies. For example, by remaining within the community that the digital stories represents and through the multimodal elements of voice, sound, and images, the digital story calls to the

131 There is a precarity in the form and content of the digital stories and I seek to explore the ways this precarity is mitigated through the pedagogical strategies of disseminating the stories and the ethical commitment to the anthology as a whole to tell a more complete story with many actor’s stories that describe the people that live in Watsonville.
familiar embodied experiences of the viewer, qualifying the story in closer proximity to the context and community of it’s creation. The ethical commitment of how to use the digital stories and with whom lies in how Adelante deploys the digital stories as pedagogical tools.  

Reading together

Adelante was building a collective, but what kind of collective was forming? Anthologizing is a theoretical framework that helps explore how the collective stories of Adelante extend beyond the individuals and amplify the collective beyond context or time. Writing and reading stories were important elements in Adelante for building a movement and social change, however the reading of anthologies can be a troubling practice. Gloria Anzaldúa (1990) writes in her introduction to Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Feminists of Color of the power of anthologizing.

In this anthology and in our daily lives, we women of color strip off the máscaras others have imposed on us, see through the disguises we hide behind and drop our personæ so that we may become subjects on our own discourses. We rip out the stitches, expose the multi-layered ‘innerfaces,’ attempting to confront and oust the internalized oppression embedded in them, and remake anew both inner and outer faces. We begin to displace white and colored male typographers and become, ourselves, typographers, printing our own words on the surfaces, the plates, of our bodies. We begin to acquire the agency of making our own caras. (p. xvi)

132 Digital stories capture fictions and facts from the past and preserve them for future reference. People actively write their stories and read the stories within the community, but only time will tell how the digital stories will be read in the future.
*Haciendo Caras* has a political objective as a women of color anthology. Anzaldúa writes of the building solidarities, healing, and taking back the agency to make “our own caras.” This is a battle of narratives and in this anthology; the women of color take back the narratives that write their bodies into history. Similarly, the writing of a digital story offered Adelante members a space to write themselves into history in contrast to and in relationship with stereotypes that write them everyday. People wrote their stories to offer counter stories, to write their bodies into history and to create a body of stories that could write counter to history and create another community and another school. These stories were not written for white people, similar to the stories anthologized in women of color coalitional writings. As Anzaldúa (1990) explains in her introduction to the anthology, *Haciendo Caras*, Contrary to the norm, [the story] does not address itself primarily to whites, but invites them to ‘listen in’ to women-of-color talking to each other and, in some instances, to identities (since academic institutions omit, erase, distort, and falsify them) and to unbuild and rebuild them (p. xvii).

The stories had political purposes, but were not primarily organized to speak to whites.

Similar to the stories within the women of color anthologies, the digital stories are (also) stand-alone representations. Each is a single digital story that, when joined with other stories comprise the beginnings of an ever-evolving never-complete
However, the power of the collective voice of Adelante and the representational work of the digital stories can be fragmented when the stories are extracted from their intended audiences or shared as independent stories and not as a larger anthology of stories representative of a political project. Gloria Anzaldúa (1990) writes of her frustration with the dissemination of *This Bridge Called My Back: Radical Writings by Women of Color* within the university. People began asking her for reading lists or pieces of women of color writings that could be used within women studies curriculum.

I got tired of hearing students say that *Bridge* was required in two or three of their women’s studies courses; tired of being a resource for teachers and students who asked me what texts by women of color they should read or teach and where they could get these writings.

People were asking for a canon, a specific few texts to embody the movement. Anzaldúa actively resists this reduction and proliferation, arguing that the same bodies of knowledge were being read and re-read and halting the growth of the movement. A similar dynamic could ensue with Adelante. The anthology retains its political power by remaining intact and alive. Women of color anthologies (especially the anthologies from the 1980s and 90s) were numerous and seemingly

---

133 Adelante members saw the digital storytelling process as never done. Everyone knew there were an infinite amount of stories to collect and write about, each with similarities and differences to the next. Therefore I express this anthology as something that was ever-evolving and never-complete.  
134 Anzaldúa “had grown frustrated that the same few women-of-color were asked to read or lecture in university classrooms, or to submit work to anthologies and quarterlies. Why weren’t other women-of-color being asked? Repeatedly tokenizing the same half dozen *mujeres* was stymieing our literary/political movement” (Anzaldúa, 1990, p. xvi). How did Adelante’s digital anthology succumb to similar dynamics in who was asked to write their stories and the use of these stories in community dialogues? These are questions that do not lie in the scope of this study, but are important political and ethical questions to examine.
never exhaustive. Stories continued to join the anthology of digital stories that built the collectivities of Adelante, yet little direct attention was given to the reading of these stories as collectivities. Were some stories forgotten? Were some stories never written or never read? Were the same few stories viewed or talked about? What stories carried more representational weight than others and why? What implications could this have for the collectivities represented in Adelante and the political work of Adelante in Watsonville?

Refusals and absences

The digital story can reify some representations through rewriting the same history that many people are already aware exists. For example, the reaffirmation of the tropes that script the life of the Latino immigrant in Watsonville, leaves the possibility for viewers to overlook resistance in the formation of the collective and respond with “arrogant perception,” pity, or ambivalence (Lugones, 2003). The space between writing and reading leaves vast hermeneutical possibilities that may not follow authorial intent due to the instabilities in form and content of the digital story. As Arondekar (2009) states, “[t]he return to the archive may carry futurity as its promised overture, but the break between what it desires and what it otherwise (re)covers renders its promise inevitably incomplete” (p. 5). Consequently, even if the digital stories of Adelante are made to speak back to dominant narratives, they will always run the risk of deviating from their intended effects because the authors of the stories cannot control how they will be read. Given this challenge, how can
elements of archival reading resuscitate the epistemological possibilities and political contexts of the archive as a counter-narrative in light of its compliance with traditional archival logics?

There were instances throughout the data where Adelante members shared memories of when participants chose not to share stories. They recalled experiences they had in digital storytelling workshops. For example, during a 2014 interview, Omar a UC Santa Cruz undergraduate who spent quite a bit of time working with parents to design their stories reflected on the process. He said, you are asking “them to look into themselves and experience these things that they might not want to experience and be critical of their own life, but you’re asking them to do that with other people.” He clearly understood the challenge of this work.

Luisa had a history of working with parents in parent literacy had many stories of parents opting out of telling their stories. These were parents that “are very engaged in the district in terms of parent leadership roles.” She was surprised about how many wrote their stories but reticent to share them. Given the fact that they were parent leaders and had a role to live up to and a rapport to maintain, I see their reticence indicative of their desire to uphold their status in their professional/social networks. There is a certain level of exposure that the storytellers have to contend with when writing their stories and some people are not willing to take that risk, nor should they be.

In Mohawk Interruptus, Audra Simpson (2014) mobilizes a politics of refusal, refusing the structures of recognition that deny sovereignty or strategically leveraging
these representations for other needs and purposes. One Adelante member took this stance of refusal with the explicit purpose of negating the representations and systems of recognition that accompanied the representations. When asked why he did not create a digital story, Jose, a UC Santa Cruz graduate student said,

I felt I didn’t want someone to take my story and share it with somebody and I don’t know how it would be shared. Under what circumstances, as an example of what? I never wanted to be like the successful example. Whatever that means. This immigrant from Guatemala… look at him now, he graduated and he is doing a PhD program. I didn’t want to do that.

If Jose positioned himself in a narrative of success, he risked the possibility of reproducing myths of meritocracy and the American Dream. He refused the image of the “success story” and although he had the privileges of the university, he did not believe this story would support his politics.

… a part of me was like that’s not the whole story. There is more to it than that… I didn’t want to be vulnerable like that. Up till now too, I’m really hesitant to be displayed. It feels pretty much like that, to be displayed for the public…I received a scholarship; they wanted to take a picture of me because they put it on their website. As stories of success or stories of like, look at the students of color and their achievements or whatever. Like feel good stories. I don’t contribute to that so I said no. I don’t want my picture taken, but I understand that it’s good to have people out there who do want to share their stories because they’re important. I just feel like mine should be at my own time and my own conditions…

Jose speaks of feeling like he is being put on display, tokenized and his image, body or story used.
In addition to opting out and refusal, there were many stories that were absent and never showed up. This was a product of haphazard outreach and also the economies of stories, some carrying more currency than others. For example, Sheila noted that only first generation parents were represented in the stories, which invisibilized Chicana third and fourth generation youth and families. Many of who are “getting lost in everything that happens in life and we see a large drop out rate, a large percentage of youth getting involved with gangs and illegal activities that has to do with this population” (Sheila). This disappointed Sheila. She states,

So in my mind, I am thinking, this is the community that I represent, or what have you. I am not am immigrant situation, I am not a Spanish speaking situation, my first language was English, I work in that community, I have taught the children of those families and I think I relate and can identify with those families, but it is not my reality, so I had a thought that Adelante was going to be a little bit more inclusive, so it seems that we have gotten narrow so that we are just looking at immigrant, Spanish speaking, first generation, actually recent arrival type families. Which is, there is a need there…I feel there is a segment of our community who seems to always get left out of the picture.

These moments of opting out, refusal and absence reveal some of the ways in which this anthologizing effort was incomplete and limited in its scope. It was never articulated during Adelante that the intention was to create an anthology that was representative of all people who lived in Watsonville, however archival logics inspire a totalizing effect on a cluster of texts. Not only can singular stories be coopted into tropes of representation that reproduce normative discourses, but the anthology itself
can be read as a totalizing collection of stories that are representative of Watsonville. This foreclosure was a dangerous prospect for conceptualizing the digital anthology.

The digital stories posed dangerous in their representational work, yet through these practices that were wrought with ethical concerns Adelante members expressed a political collectivity and solidarity among each other. This relational, interpersonal space where stories were shared and formed a strong foundation for the persistence of their work together and the digital stories, as an anthology and as individual stories became “epistemological experiments” (Stoler, 2003) that could traverse time and space; creating precarious and powerful possibilities.
In 2014, I interviewed core members of Adelante. I asked them to reflect back upon the change effort and share their perspectives on the work, if and how it changed them, and if or how it changed the schools or communities in Watsonville. Some members expressed frustration in the lack of action or institutional change that resulted from creating the digital stories and the public viewings of the digital stories that sometimes accompanied community dialogues. While Adelante members expressed frustration with the lack of “concrete” action and significant change, Adelante members expressed other powerful moments that merited their continued engagement with the change effort. One participant expressed this well when he said,

I’m not saying nothing or anything came out of this, but I can’t put my finger [on it] and say these are concrete things that were changed. I’m sure people changed. The people who participated… I have to say that people kept participating for a long time, so they were engaged. They were motivated [by] something that happened inside for them to continue to participate (Edgar, 2014).

Edgar was sure people had changed and this must have been why they continued to participate for so long. He located change within the Adelante members themselves.

In this chapter, I identify the forms of action that Adelante members thought were important yet lacking in the mobilization effort. They were described as collective actions with/in institutions situated in the public sphere. I locate these actions and this frustration as a site of departure. In light of people’s frustration,
when asked: What was inspiring about Adelante? What was powerful about the work? Members identified moments that either shifted their conceptions of themselves, others, and the world or created deeper connections with fellow participants. These were some of the reasons that Adelante members continued to return to meetings and participate over the eight years of the project’s efforts (2006-2014). These moments, if understood as actions were important pedagogical markers for imagining new forms of life, developing non-hierarchical social relations, and forming an “incarnated peopled memory” (Motta & Esteves, 2014, p. 3) that could spawn new subjectivities that are not determined or defined by institutional arrangements within the public sphere.

Adelante used digital storytelling with an accompanying pedagogy that emphasized a collective narrative analysis that engaged the whole body. This engagement set into relief the ways in which participant’s lives are shaped by their histories and subject positions, but are not determined by them (Freire, 1990). Dialogue occurred often ‘after hours’ in community spaces with the opportunity for participants to reflect upon their lives together. Throughout the chapter, I think through the digital storytelling of Adelante as a specific modality that can support imaginaries of social change rooted in embodied and relational ways of knowing, to develop thick lateral relations,135 and open a hermeneutical space where subjectivity

135 In her essay, Slow Death (Sovereignty, Obesity, and Lateral Agency), Lauren Berlant (2011) begins with the Foucauldian concept of biopower to suggest that sovereignty is a neoliberal fantasy. Contrary to individual notions of agency, “lateral agency” defines what “someone is doing when they are not acting in a life-building way—the way that liberal subjects are supposed to do” (p. 759). She says this lateral agency is “an activity of maintenance, not making; fantasy, without grandiosity; sentience without full intentionality; inconsistency, without shattering and embodying, alongside embodiment"
is not determined by subjection; where participants are “unlearning [hegemonic] relationships and practices and learning new ones by building upon fragments of good sense and the fractured locus between the processes of subjectification and active processes of subjectivity” (Motta, Esteves, 2014).

In the first part of this chapter, I begin with an exploration of the frustration and “lack of action” within Adelante. In the second part, I explore some of the powerful moments within Adelante. A quality of the power within these moments came from the reflexive and dialogical space that Adelante cultivated. I voice Adelante member’s accounts of this space to characterize the power of Adelante as a space for conversation. I then explore sometimes concomitant and complimentary moments of rupture and relation to describe embodied and relational forms of critical consciousness raising that can be located within social movement making.

This chapter has two objectives: (1) to ruminate on the complex capacities of Adelante members to embody and grapple with differing notions of “action” simultaneously and (2) in light of the frustration for the “lack of action,” to give productive attention to the quieter pedagogical moments of epistemological and relational shifts and to argue that these actions are foundational to imagining radical

---

(p. 100). This agency is a type of almost defiant subjectivity to the normative, a self-interruption to the notions of agency as uplift. I bring her term in here and expand it to suggest a relational configuration of subjects and their agency. When I draw upon Berlant’s notion of lateral agency, I am interested in the non-sovereign subject in relation. I do not engage a Foucauldian analysis, but a Marxist/Gramsci analysis to explain how social relations are in and of themselves productions of our situatedness and to intentionally seek alternative relations – lateral relations – is a form of resistance and agency that is necessary for producing new worlds.

136Often participants in research are rendered monolithic, generalized or read through deficit frames (Tuck, 2009). I rely on Avery Gordon’s (1997) notion of “complex personhood” to give extra ethical attention to the rendering of the research participants in this study.
social change that extends beyond the episteme of capitalist coloniality (Mingolo, 2007; Quijano, 2007; Lugones, 2007, 2010). I hope this chapter does not read as a project to render a better, more totalizing story of what social change should look like, but, in contrast, as an effort to blur current concepts of school reform and social change in order to open possibilities for future praxis. I begin with situating this inquiry and providing some background on Adelante and the context from which Adelante grew into a social change project.

Frustration and “lack of action”

In 2014, when Adelante members reflected upon the work of Adelante, they were clear that the work was important, yet asserted that it “lacked action.” Some animated frustration for this lack, others curious about why “nothing happened.” After 2008, most everyone involved in the change effort that expressed frustration or curiosity around the lack of action also mentioned that there were multiple moments where Adelante did not have sufficient resources or capacity to amplify its efforts within the public sphere.

Adelante members were all too familiar with the initial skepticism that they felt and received when initiating a social change project that partnered with university professors in a community accustomed to social justice efforts that revolved on grant cycles and empty promises. At least one in three participants (primarily district

\[137\] I use the notion of blurring boundaries from Gloria Anzaldúa (1990). She states, “Necesitamos teorías that will rewrite history using race, class, gender and ethnicity as categories of analysis, theories that cross borders, that blur boundaries-new kinds of theories with new theorizing methods” (p. 26).
personnel and community members) remembered saying or hearing others say that
the work would start, fizzle out, and then amount to nothing, resulting in no
significant change.

The people that were involved…were a little weary in
terms of not wanting to get something started and then
just abandoned, because that tends to happen with
schools, it tends to go in cycles … If you’ve been
around long enough, it just looks like the same stuff
again.

This was the voice of Michelle, an administrator of a local community college who
supported the work of Adelante by providing space and attending the initial planning
meetings. She, like many other participants, understood the potential of this work to
fall into the revolving door of good intentions and not enough time.

One member expressed his frustration of Adelante’s lack of action in relation
to this skepticism, angered by the fact that the skeptics may have been right. “We got
a lot of good conversation started and I think we got a lot of interest… I was not there
for the conversations or for interest. I think I really wanted to be part more of a
concrete situation action” (Edgar, 2014). He was not alone in his frustration. Other
participants longed to be part of concrete actions, whether those actions were “house
meetings,” “concrete steps toward changing something in our school district,” to
“form groups or subcommittees” around the areas of concern identified in dialogue
circles to affect change at the district level, or to create a “more formal…action
through local government and beyond.” Adelante members had ideas from their own
experiences working with the school district and organizing work and even though
they noted that the components were not present for these actions to become a reality for Adelante, frustration remained, just the same.

Adelante lacked the capacity and resources to scale-up, however the majority of Adelante’s members envisioned concrete large-scale district and community changes as outcomes of Adelante. This scene of social change where the actors are subjects situated in the public sphere and engaged in practices to shift institutions and policies to become more equitable is an imaginary that tends to rule how our society assumes the nature of social change. This scene is sanctioned by the nation-state, to allow its citizens the democratic access to public assembly and protest in order to change societal structures to better serve the people. The scene rests in the acreage of the institutions that already exist and focuses actions on capacity building and utilizing legal channels to agitate institutions. This conception of change repositions subjectivities in relation to the nation-state and a necessary component of social change, however this repositioning does not account for Adelante and its modes of creating a resistant sociality (Lugones, 2010), developing new ways of being, and social relations that could support active subjectivities (Lugones, 2003) through their practices of creating and using digital stories.

138 Alternative or resistant socialities are spaces where people can cultivate “resistant intentionality… for moving against the interlocking oppressions that animate oppression as intermenshed” (Lugones, 2003, p. 216). Lugones explains active subjectivity is possible because of “alternative socialities that have unseen, hidden quality to them” (p. 217).
139 Lugones (2003) suggests “active subjectivity” as a theoretical intervention to the concept of individual agency. She explains that individual agency suggests “[intentionality] is understood as residing and emanating from the individual or from monolithic collectives” and “successful agency is a mirage of individual autonomous intentional action” (p. 210-211). Lugones continues by stating that the “oppressed cannot exercise agency since they either enact a subordinate or resistant intentionality,” and also “lack institutional backing” (p.211). “[S]ince the modern conception of agency as autonomous subjectivity cannot countenance resistance by the oppressed, and since agency is a
In the next section, I suggest the process of collectively telling, digitizing, and watching stories created a dialogical space for people to reflect together (on themselves, each other and the world). The space, conversation, watching and listening to each other’s stories allowed for people to develop counter-hegemonic social relationships. When asked to locate powerful moments, Adelante members identified dialogical spaces and moments of reflection. I theorize that these powerful moments produce actions of rupture and relation. Rendered “unfinished” (Freire, 1990), ambiguous (Anzaldúa, 1990), and potentially plural, Adelante members collectively participated in a pedagogy full of reflection, rupture, and relation that did not rely on fixed future subjects, but engaged in an analysis of the structural, discursive, and embodied ways in which people are always already becoming conditioned subjects in sometimes contradictory and fragmented ways, yet never completely determined.

precondition of modern understandings of morality, resistance to oppression is conceptually disallowed as moral” (p. 211). Lugones moves away from agency to “mark a greater dispersion of intentionality” and “to stress the meeting of oppressing ↔ revisiting” (p. 233, footnote 8). Active subjectivity (Lugones) and lateral agency (Berlant) are two concepts that while doing very different theoretical work, engage in a similar analytic move to suggest that individual agency is a neoliberal fantasy, that for Lugones is founded on modern understandings of morality. Lugones departs from agency as a concept entirely to suggest that “active subjectivity” turns toward a dialectic from and within resistant socialities.

Lugones (2003) constructs a positionality of a streetwalker (Estrategias Tácticas de la Callejera) to explain a worldview with ontological multiplicity. She joins binaries that otherwise rearticulate dominance and theorizes beyond modern concepts of agency. Here, I play with the idea of ontological pluralism to question the liminal moments (Sandoval, 2000) and ambiguity (Anzaldúa, 1990) of the self. When intentionality, knowledge production, and resistance are no longer located within the individual, what happens ontologically?
**Powerful moments**

At the same time Adelante members expressed frustration and skepticism and grappled with the lack of “concrete action” or “significant change,” most Adelante members remained engaged and dedicated to their work together for nine years (2006–2014), which in fact did produce a variety of pedagogical experiences for the community. While some of the motivations for continuing to show up to meetings and participating in dialogues arose from the hope for “concrete action” someday, there were other motivations for their continued work together.

When asked about the powerful moments Adelante members experienced or their reasons for continued involvement, given the constraints of their busy lives, participants identified “ah-ha” moments where they felt as if they learned more about themselves, or their community, or moments where they felt more connected to each other (developed deeper relationships). These two genres of powerful moments animated themes of reflection, rupture and relation that I argue are fundamental to unsettling normative personhood, by deconstructing the technologies that reproduce these “mechanisms of power” and developing lateral attachments which are non-hierarchical social relationships that are not dependent upon the production of capital, and support counter-hegemonic world building (Berlant, 2007, 2011).

These actions provide an important element to this social change effort, a process of “affirmative co-construction of becoming otherwise to [capitalist coloniality] logics as communities and subjects” (Motta & Esteves, 2014, p. 5, italics not in original). The theme of reflection in dialogical spaces qualifies the spaces
produced by Adelante. Rupture identifies moments where participants began to see themselves and each other differently through the collective writing and viewing of their stories and the theme of relation produced conceptualizations of community and solidarities based on thick affective lateral attachments.

Reflection in dialogical spaces

People identified the importance of a space to “talk,” to share, and reflect together. Phoebe, a veteran teacher in the district reflected on her experiences sharing digital stories with a group of teachers. She explained that “there is not really a place in the district for teachers to have the opportunity to look inward” to reflect and “to look at a digital story like Lupe’s story or Gabriella’s story or Luis’ story and to really come to terms with, these are parents in our community, these are students in our community, so how do we as teachers make sense?” Adelante provided a pedagogical tool and training for Phoebe to show the digital stories with teachers in the district and solicit conversations about their work, their lives and the composition of the communities they serve. It was as simple as “[t]eachers just having conversations about their stories and then it brought out their own stories,” which provided a reflective space for conversations about their subjectivities as teachers and their preconceived notions of the students and families they serve.

---

141 Lupe is indigenous Oaxacan middle school girl deals with the deportation of her father, racial bullying at school and fighting for a teacher teacher to support her language development.
142 Gabriella tells the story of a young woman that found her way to Watsonville from Mexico in search of employment. She is an undocumented mother learning to advocate for her children in school.
143 Luis is a greenhouse worker at a major grower and a parent leader at the schools.
To “create alternative spaces” (Edgar, 2014) and generating conversation about education was a seemingly simple task, however Jack qualifies the power of this quieter act. “We shouldn’t minimize something, because on the surface it just seems like a recreational activity, deep down it's political activity, it's an economic activity, it's a social activity, it's a cultural activity” (Jack, 2014). These physical and dialogical spaces (Beckett, Glass, Moreno, 2012) produced the possibility for a resistant sociality (Lugones, 2003, 2010; Cruz, 2014) to form; a space to understand “you,” the subject, “as thoroughly socially constructed in terms of power” (Lugones, 2003, p.9).

Edgar, a staff member at El Centro, reflected upon the quality of the dialogical space Adelante members created together.

What it meant to me also was a possibility for me to have a conversation… open conversation about what education really means to me, as opposed to what it needs to be, what kind of curriculum, what kind of structure, what kind of ladder it needs to lead up to. I think it also meant that there was a space for everyone to participate as well because we all had dealings and experience with the education system generally.

Edgar identifies an openness for conversation and a space for all to participate by bringing their different experiences to the conversation.

I think there was also space for learning and also a space to create community because I think I got closer to other members of Adelante and this process because there was a … We gave ourselves that possibility to really talk about what was important to us… I think at the end, there was just exploration of my person, my world and how that came to be. I think I had an
Edgar identifies the “space for everyone to participate” and to have meaningful conversations as a generative space that allowed for him to “get closer to other members of Adelante.” For Edgar, the space produced an openness for everyone to participate and develop relationships with each other, as people with different and important experiences.

Similarly, Luisa told a story of a training facilitated by Adelante where she learned how to facilitate focus groups. She explains how it impacted the space she later worked to cultivate for parents to tell their stories and share with each other.

When I went to the training, those two days at the university where we were not ever allowed, we were told clearly that you never impose your beliefs. But instead, you learn to sit back and name the silences rather than naming your goals or the answers, the responses you want…Then you start to hear what people really need and what people, what they want to tell you. That, to me... It's never about agreeing. It's simply about respecting people's opinions and allowing people the time they need to tell what they want to tell. That was the biggest surprise for me. (Luisa, 2014)

Luisa saw a space where people would do their best to listen to each other, not with any desires to agree with their account, but to allow space and time for the story to happen, to be heard. The notion of not acting upon the story, or moving into solutions was both surprising and profound for her. These descriptions help explain a dialogical space that can produce resistant socialities. Edgar experienced this dialogical space, while Luisa received training within Adelante to facilitate building a dialogical environment. The dialogue was a communal praxis and cannot be a simple
transaction of ideas, a debate, or imposition of one’s ideas upon another. It required an openness to listen, courage to be heard, and a commitment to enter into a process of discovery, unknown and creativity with others. The dialogue that arose in Adelante was a creative process that calls for a sense of mutual trust from all involved. As Edgar states, the space created was not one where people imposed a kind of agenda or “ladder” that everyone would then have to climb. There was an openness to talk through people’s experiences and be with each other.

During his interview, Jose reflected upon the process a woman went through who started coming to the meetings and over time began to open up. As she began to frequent the meetings, the she would bring her daughter and her husband. She was quiet. As time passed, she began to talk and share more about herself.

She would share a little bit but the more she became more involved with it, the more she started to understand more of her role in her community and her role in house education and schooling. The more she start to ask questions and realize that stuff was going on in her child school in her schooling process that it wasn’t right for her. I began to notice that she would talk more and more and she would feel more confident speaking and … To me I that was powerful because I don’t feel like it was something that we … That I didn’t know about, I set out to do, that we set out to do. We did set out to prepare society, thinking deeply more about schooling.

As this woman became more involved, her exploration of her role in her community, education and schooling became more apparent, and she became more involved in the schools. Adelante provided a space for this young mother to listen to others, reflect on and share her experiences and articulate a critique about her child’s schooling.
For Lugones (2003), social fragmentation “keep[s] our lines of resistance away from each other” (Lugones, 2003, p. 85) and holds us back from traveling into each other’s “worlds”. She suggests that in order to overcome this social fragmentation and break from the logic of oppression, we need to reconceptualize identification to understand it as something “that comes from seeing ourselves and one another’s interrelating ‘worlds’ of resistant meaning” (Lugones, 2003, p. 85). In other words, identification must come from perceiving the similarities and differences in how various people resist dominant constructs. It is through bringing together these “lines of resistance” that meaning can be made collectively through sharing and listening to the different ways in which people resist dominant constructions. Through this interweaving of the “two sides of resistance,” the “solitary” and “collective social” (Lugones, 2003, p. 227), that humans can locate their freedom. From this understanding, Adelante’s work together in these dialogical spaces was a formidable political action. The emergent resistant sociality grounded the possibility for people to connect, break social fragmentation and change how they saw themselves, each other and the world.

Rupture

During the process of telling, making, and sharing stories in public settings, some Adelante members experienced powerful moments that shifted perceptions they

---

144 Throughout Bridge and Haciendo Caras, many authors integrate writings of their fellow women of color, quoting as they write. When reading, the relationship is explicit. These women are in conversation with each other, weaving each other’s texts into their own and making meaning together. In addition, Cherrie Moraga has been known to mention that she does her thinking in relation with others, in a collaborative way. This challenges commodified notions of individual authorship.
had of themselves. This shift happened through embodied dissonance, or rupture. In some cases, they learned that they were not alone in their experiences and they no longer had to feel isolated in their struggle. In other cases, they learned their shame was based upon classist, racist or gendered notions that they had internalized. During these moments, the participant experienced being physically and/or emotionally shaken from a new or sometimes reoccurring awareness of their submersion within what Maria Lugones (2003) calls “ready-made sense.”

These moments emerged unpredictably, with others through the process of engaging each other’s stories. The method of digital storytelling can offer a space for a critical and participatory process that engages multiple epistemologies to explore subjectivities. I suggest that, within the collective process of telling and sharing stories, Adelante members engaged affect alongside analytic exploration of their subjectivities, which supported exposure to contradicting existential logics and opportunities to go deeper into imaginings of alternative futures.

One community member who works in the district parent literacy program created a story she titled “Privilege” that was about growing up in the large family of a farm foreman. Her father’s status separated her family from the other Mexican immigrant farmworkers, and contributed to complex and conflicting feelings. Initially she was scared to tell her story because it might prompt negative judgments from people who saw it, but as she worked on her story in dialogue with others in Adelante her perceptions shifted. “[What] I remember about my story was that it was really angry, it was really angry...” As she wrote and rewrote her story, it not only evolved
into a less angry tale, but she also talked with her family about the events of her past. In the process, she not only reconciled her anger, but also developed a deeper understanding of her positionality as a Mexican American woman at one time alienated from her native tongue and culture by class status.

The anger that initially mobilized her understanding and her desire to tell her story became transformed into a critical grasp of the intersecting dynamics of oppression. Recognition of the subjectivities into which we are “thrown,” (Heidegger, 1927) requires a rupture from assuming these subjectivities as determined. Through the telling of her story, and her emotional engagement with it, she developed an analytic of her conditioning that not only moved her emotions, but opened more possibilities for her to see herself as “unfinished” (Freire, 1990).

Moraga explains, “to assess the damage is a dangerous act” (p. 32). Deep investigation is revolutionary in that it continues to usurp conditioned perspectives that may be deeply embedded in and constitute identity. The damage can be understood as the conditioned perspectives of the individual and the danger is to see how deeply entrenched we really are. To recognize that we are implicated and complicit in our situated oppressions and to profoundly participate in investigating ourselves requires the individual (and others) to recognize their ethical responsibility and, as Moraga (1981) states, to remember a humanity that is deeper than the oppression.

I use Heidegger’s notion of “thrownness” or “being thrown,” to emphasize his explanation of affect as something that “comes neither from ‘outside’ nor from ‘inside,’ but arises out of Being-in-the-world, as a way of such being” (Heidegger, Being and Time, p. 176). My argument throughout will bridge the Cartesian divide to emphasize becoming as an embodied, relational, and cognitive phenomenon.
Another example of rupture came when Phoebe shared one of the digital stories with a group of teachers. She recalls,

I was sharing a story with a group of teacher and teachers were in tears talking about how they came over illegally and had a similar experience as some of our parents, but were afraid to share that in the district, as now credentialed teachers and even administrators. That they were afraid but that they had that experience and that came out in our groups.

In this account, the previously ‘closeted’ teachers chose to open up and share about their experiences crossing the border, facing challenges with documentation, and the fear of sharing these experiences in professional spaces. The teachers moved through their fear and through their tears, they shared these challenges. This moment has potential for critical consciousness raising. Not only are bodies a space of investigation to explore the experiences and sensations that arise, in order to, as Lorde states, give rise to thought, they are also spaces that thought must move through in order for it to be uttered.

For silence to transform into speech, sounds and words, it must traverse through our female bodies. For the body to give birth to the utterance, the human entity must recognize itself as carnal – skin, muscles, entrails, brain, belly (Anzalduá, 1990, p. xxii).

Here Anzalduá emphasizes the importance of the body in the process of making language. The body is a part of material reality and in order for a true word to be spoken, the individual must recognize her position within material reality; the action of the word is this integration of the thought with the body to form the action of speaking a true word. When the praxis is critical, it interrupts the reproduction of the
dominant ideologies. In the case of the teachers, their choices to share their stories that resembled the stories of some of the parents, was a choice to move away from the silence and fear of sharing these stories, to sharing them with other professionals.

This rupture can then open up more and more space for investigation and possibilities for change and the body can be a place for this interruption. However, rupture is not necessarily critical or a part of critical consciousness raising. People can experience emotion without it linking to a criticality or movement toward change. One Adelante member, Cristina suggested that sometimes this work may have “stayed in the emotion” and that people were maybe not able to move past these emotive expressions into harnessing action beyond the moment. Consciousness raising most likely occurs when these ruptures are also sites of analysis and integrated into a process of investigation where the individual seeks to know better what s/he already knows (Glass, Ball, Crain, 2008). In this investigatory process, rupture accounts for the emotions and the dissonance that occurs in the disarticulation (Gramsci) or denunciation (Freire).

**Embodied subjects**

Often, the body and emotions are sites of criticality that are overlooked. Acknowledging these sites renders the subject as knower and producer of knowledge. This episteme challenges the notion of a fixed future subject, because it renders the subject as a site of exploration and analysis. If we dwell in the body, movements generate meanings that can either reproduce or counter dominant ideological
constructs, sometimes reproducing and countering at the same time. But what does it mean to dwell in these sites?

If subjectivities are in-and-of-themselves also wrapped up in our subjugation, these subjectivities must also be sites of analysis, which requires “a moment of perception and volition,” a conscious intentionality or reflective element that allows people to “unveil the world of oppression and through the praxis commit themselves to its transformation” (Freire, 1970, p. 54). In order to “unveil the world of oppression,” one must have the capacity to reflect upon it and gain knowledge – from cognitive, relational, and embodied sources—about the causal elements that comprise that reality so as to intervene in the logics that reproduce it (Freire, 1985; Glass, Ball & Crain, 2008). This intentional and directed state of reflection is a way of gaining ‘distance from’ or ‘depth into’ the material and immaterial elements that comprise reality.

If coloniality is a kind of total experience of becoming that includes feelings, thoughts, dreams, emotions, intuitions, sensations, bodies in toto, where every aspect of one’s being and body is to some degree caught up in the hegemonic structures and imaginaries, and if all humans are conditioned, then our analysis of our situations needs a ‘metamove,’ (Sandoval, 2000) that strives to account for multiple epistemologies. Chela Sandoval (2000) explains the moment of reflection, or shift of consciousness as a “metamove” and a key component to social movement making. She states, “without making this metamove, any ‘liberation’ or social movement eventually becomes destined to repeat the oppressive authoritarianism from which it
is attempting to free itself, and becomes trapped inside a drive for truth that ends only in producing its own brand of domination” (p. 59). A consistent engagement in this ‘metamove’ – to critically reflect upon the self and the world in order to perceive the world differently and critically – is imperative to a liberatory struggle. Without this ‘metamove,’ cultural action would be forever in reproductive rotation.

Consciousness is not only a landscape where external meanings become internalized, such as in the form of internalized oppressions, “where the object of oppression is not only someone outside of my skin but the someone inside of my skin,” (Moraga, 1981, p. 30), but a space of possibility for transcending oppressive constructs. I contend that a theory of change and subsequent actions needs to include a “turning towards” or an attention to the embodied and relational epistemologies in the process of interrupting the process of becoming subjects in history.

I propose a conceptual shift of consciousness raising with and beyond the cognitive to account for embodied consciousness and relationality. Similar to Sylvia Wynter’s (2003) call to unsettle the coloniality of being, truth and freedom, I also want to highlight the “overrepresentation” of a particular ethnocultural discourse of secular humanism, which privileges cognitive and rational processes of knowing or coming to know (i.e. consciousness raising). Rationality is an epistemic strategy found in western science and philosophy. As such, I do not propose that the notion of scientific rationality itself is suspect, but the emphasis upon (not the use of) evidence, logic and argumentation is a modern/colonial construct of rationality. This construct privileges the ‘ego-politics of knowledge’ over the ‘geopolitics of knowledge’ and the
‘body politics of knowledge’” (Grosfogel, 2006, p. 214) that create a hierarchy of knowledge production. This hierarchy is defined and deployed by modernist/colonial histories and ideology, which place white, Eurocentric male bodies and knowledge as the universal from which all epistemologies are measured as inferior and sometimes elided (Wynters, 2003).

Relation

With ruptures came moments of relation where Adelante members entered into sometimes new, deeper, or different relations with each other and the world, or into a different awareness of the relations that already animated their ways of being. This occurred through writing stories together and also viewing the stories in public spaces with strangers. In this section, I will explore a few of these actions of “becoming otherwise,” (Motta & Esteves, 2014, p. 5) where Adelante members expressed a deeper or different relationship to each other that created lateral attachments that supported a type of re-imagining of each other and the community that could interrupt hegemonic forms of life, social relations, and subjectivities.

The subject within the nation-state sanctioned theory of change is in relation to other liberal subjects, the public sphere and institutions. The primary relationship is between the subjects and the institutions, therefore all other relationships and forms of life should complement and support the reproduction of the nation-state. Regardless of our positionality, or rendering within this world, each of us grows into webs of attachments that secure the ways of being, social relations and subjectivities.
we inhabit. I suggest, that through the sharing of stories together and viewing of the digital stories in public forums, the conditioned attachments that rendered Adelante members and community members as particular persons, even if momentarily, could be overridden by nascent lateral attachments, that, if developed, could support new ways of becoming that are not as determined by the ontological and epistemological frameworks of capitalist coloniality.

To create the digital stories Adelante members spent long hours together, sharing stories about their lives that they had written with the intention of condensing these stories to 350-400 words and gathering images and music to accompany the story. During story circles, it was often a small group of a mixture of parents, teachers, and community members, all with different life experiences and stories. The story circles were private collaboratives that lasted for many hours. When a person shared their story, which often gave intimate views into their lives, participants would offer feedback, expressing what they thought was powerful about the story. This exchange and collective writing process engaged testimonio-like

---

146 The process of creating and using digital stories raises many ethical concerns. During the creation, storywriters were asked to pare down their short vignettes. I pursue these ethical dimensions in other writings. I explore this element in (1) the creation of the digital stories, (2) the viewing of the digital stories, and (3) the digital story as a cultural product. I am concerned with who is carrying the hermeneutical weight and analytic costs of these representations and the danger of the digital story as digital media that can traverse different spaces and times without a pedagogical component that may mitigate these violences and contextualize the intended “work” of the digital stories.

147 This intimacy is typical of testimonio with roots in the “Christian public declaration of faith” (Franco, 2010, p. 217). Created for political reasons, Adelante members saw their stories as vehicles for people to begin to discuss the common inequities among people within Berryvale, thus surrendering intimate moments for the price of political discussion and potential action. Although the stories have an individual author, the participatory writing process infused multiple voices into the singular, constructing a non-totalizing representation for political purposes, a foundational element to testimonio (see Franco, 2010, p. 216).
elements (see Beverley, 2004), where participants witnessed each other and listened deeply to each other.\textsuperscript{148}

When asked about these processes, often Adelante members would talk about an experience they had of realizing someone in the room was not who they thought they were. For example, Luisa who identified as Mexican-American and local to Watsonville described how she was initially intimidated by a young white university woman with whom she worked, until she heard her story. She describes, “That was the moment when I realized that, I wanted to know these people, beyond what I already knew about them.” Her engagement with the story moved her into a deeper relationship with someone that she already knew and had worked with for a long time, yet she found, during the storytelling process a different way to relate with is woman that was not pre-determined by her race or educational status.

George explains two moments where his perceptions of members of Adelante changed once he saw their digital stories. He had worked with Edgar in cultural activities in Watsonville. “I think at the time, we were doing like arts performances at the plaza on Fridays. That's how I knew him. Just working with him on that stuff and then when I saw his story, it was like a whole other side of him that I didn't know” (George, 2014). Correspondingly, he reflected upon watching Lupe’s story, “I didn't know her but I knew who she was but I didn’t know that Spanish was her second language. Again, like there's like this whole other life that really makes ... Made me realize that people have a very different ... Like, different lives that most of

\textsuperscript{148} I explain the story circles in depth in Chapter V.
the time we can identify with” (George, 2014). George acknowledges the surprise and respect that arose when he watched Edgar and Lupe’s digital stories. He concludes stating that although we live different lives, there are similarities in our experiences that we can relate to.

When Phoebe, a teacher and teacher educator saw Claudia’s story for the first time, she was deeply moved.

…when I first saw Claudia's story and it really impacted me. I think I just thought, "Wow!" I've worked with our parents in our community but I just, to know somebody in a personal way, and to know how they have really made that journey to this country. I think knowing Claudia's story and then knowing Claudia, I think had a lot of just deep emotional impact for me. Maybe I related it to my family, I'm not sure. I think for me it just, that emotional feeling of pain for a young girl, just what she experienced, I think I felt empathy, I felt compassion, I felt tremendous, what do I want to say, just appreciation for how much she has, been able to achieve in spite of all of the difficulties that she experienced. I could say that for so many of the other stories too but Claudia's was the first one that I saw.

Phoebe makes a distinction between knowing and knowing Claudia. Through Claudia’s digital story, Phoebe learned more about Claudia and came to “know” her differently. She could not identify the location of this knowing, but felt it as a powerful and impactful experience.

Luisa has worked for many years with first generation Latino parents in Watsonville. She has facilitated and shared many workshop spaces where parents discuss their experiences through a storybook. The books often incite
parents to share their own stories about their immigration experience and often they are undocumented workers and they will tell us about that and often it is really emotional and in real detail. So, we will get to hear bits and pieces of their life struggle, or beautiful things in their life they will share based on what they are reading and how they interpret it.

She then reflects upon the parent stories of the parent leaders within Adelante that had written their stories.

But, um, again I think I made assumptions of these people, these parents in leadership roles in the district, parents specifically, right now I am talking about. Um, that maybe their experiences had been better because maybe because they were confident and they had the motivation and the drive and the skills to put them into these leadership roles, but with Claudia’s and Luis’ story I find out that they both had the same struggles, very difficult struggles and that it was through the learning process and just sheer will that got them to where they are…

Both Phoebe and Luisa had spent many years working with parents in diverse capacities. Luisa is of Mexican descent and fluent in Spanish (she learned in adulthood), however upon watching the digital stories, they developed deeper understandings of the people represented in the digital stories.\(^{149}\)

\(^{149}\) Love is an analytic useful to think through the moments that Phoebe and Luisa reflect upon. For Sandoval, love is the movement into rupture, it is what facilitates the “‘rupturing’ in one’s everyday world that permits crossing over to another” (Sandoval, 2000, p. 140). Citing multiple US third world feminists, Sandoval explains love as a hermeneutic that helps citizens-subjects shift toward a differential consciousness (p. 140). Sandoval (2000) saves the concept of love from “romantic” or capitalist renditions that articulate love as a commodity that can be given and taken away. Using the work of Roland Barthes, she explains “the true site of originality and strength” does not exist within the lover or the self, but in the relation. This relation is one of the sites of meaning making. Therefore, when one falls in love, one submits “however temporarily to what is ‘intractable,’ to a state of being not subject to control or governance.” (p. 142). S/he submits to the relation. It is at this moment that the person is able to move into another state (Sandoval defines this state as “erotic” as she relates it to Barthes notion of the “no-place… the place we know, but that continually defies definition by words
Just the act of spending long hours together sharing stories with an analysis of the intersecting nature of oppression and the intention for political change, Adelante members began to know each other beyond common sense or stereotyped ways of seeing each other. Together, they were developing deeper understandings of community and creating another community. One person stated, “I think Adelante introduced me to a lot of people so now I change a lot of my vision of community, what it meant to be in a community, what it meant to be part of communities, what it meant to create communities” (Jose, 2014). Edgar explained his shift in understanding the community when he said, “Again, with the conversations, with the relationships that we built, in knowing a little bit more of what the struggles are, particular members that were participating in Adelante, that changed my perspective, like, who is part of our community.” Adelante members gave the project the dialogical and physical space (Beckett, Glass, & Moreno, 2012) to “really talk about what was important,” and through discussing these important issues members began to understand community differently.\footnote{One example of understanding the community and community power differently came from Edgar. He stated, “I think I perceived as often that authorities were important for us to really think about how do we change things or how do we move things from one place to another, how to really re-imagine things. Authority is something that got demystified for me, like we have community members, we have ourselves, we have our own experiences. How do we put them to use is more important than bringing authorities to do this work.” Clearly, Edgar recognized through Adelante that the community}
These movements into relation were actions that often produced lateral attachments and commitments to new life. The process of becoming otherwise does not happen alone, as Maria Lugones (2003) states, “Her knowing is necessarily dialogical; it does not lie in her” (p. x), it is created in relation. M. Jacqui Alexander (2007) would argue: “there is no other work but the work of creating and re-creating ourselves within the context of community” (p. 282). And in “creating and re-creating ourselves,” we are also creating and re-creating our understandings of community. Adelante members identified the relationships they developed as “life long” and important, these relations were partially responsible for the longevity of Adelante’s work. Even if at times, Adelante members did not see these relations as actions that were part of their theory of change.

Toward the immeasurable

In 2008, Adelante was a flourishing social change effort, with multiple meetings every week and interfacing with hundreds of community members in deep and generative ways. At that time, Adelante had the capacity to scale-up and diversify its efforts. Shortly after this historical moment, Adelante lost momentum and the work of Adelante was channeled into the strategizing how Adelante members could use the tools and methods from Adelante (digital stories and other cultural productions) within their day-to-day contexts. As institutional actors, Adelante members found seemingly ordinary ways to integrate the creation and use of digital...
stories into their professional spheres. One member developed a grant to work with first generation parents through a parent literacy program that sponsored the creation and use of digital stories as a tool for parent literacy and cultural competency. Another member joined a group of six veteran teachers to create culturally relevant curriculum that adhered to standards for 8th – 12th grade social science and history classes. Members found ways to have the digital stories shown at the annual Watsonville Film Festival and other venues within the high school, social service non-profits, local chapter of the Brown Berets, and numerous academic settings.

The digital stories reached large audiences and left immeasurable impressions throughout the community. In late 2014, I was volunteering at a food pantry fundraiser with one of the Adelante members, Claudia. She was running the kitchen and she asked me to help serve for the event. During the event, the food pantry honored her with an award that was presented to her by the mayor of Watsonville, Karina Cervantez. During the mayor’s speech, she referenced Claudia’s digital story, highlighting her character, life story, and resilience as a first generation, Latina mother. The mayor had seen Claudia’s digital story at an education conference in New York. As a Latina from Watsonville, she was deeply moved by the story and called upon it to remind people of the dynamic and rich lives of people within the community and to honor the struggles and triumphs of Claudia. Who would have known that the mayor’s experience of watching this story in New York would have

---

151 See Chapter IV for an in depth account of this history
traveled back across the US and into an event years later? The impacts of these stories are immeasurable and uncapturable. Therefore, to measure the actions of Adelante against a theory of change that relies on actions that occurred within the public sphere acting upon the institutions will inevitably diminish the change effort.

Social change is not just about altering structures of society, but it is also about altering the relational dynamics within communities and in our perceptions of ourselves. Cristina, a community organizer and Latina mother within Adelante recognizes this power when she says, it is about making “a change in yourselves so that we can make, in the long way, in the long way… we can make a change in the school and not just school, but our society” (Cristina, 2014). Similarly, Richard states, 

The change that needs to happen; now this seems like modern, but the change that needs to happen is in us, is in everything we do. It’s not just struggling against some bad district that doesn’t understand the community I care about. It’s what am I doing with the community? What is my reaction to the community?... but it’s an outcome of my experience in there as much as learning how to organize a group of people to change the school system. It’s like learning how to organize a psychology about change… All of the adults involved were able to have the reflective moments that developed their thinking about who they are, what they value, what they want to do, what they’re capable of, what needs to get done. (Richard, 2014)

Richard’s account further explains how the people in Adelante operationalized what they learned cannot be contained.

Adelante members were able to share frustrations attached to the lack of action on institutions and an inability to create an organizational body within a
traditional Weberian framework of institutionalization, while simultaneously exploring the impact of their moments of rupture and relation. However, I argue that these actions are rooted in differing epistemes. It was quizzical to me that Adelante members mourned the lack of action in their work together when they knew that the current work of Adelante thrived on the ordinary every-day engagements with people and did not have the resources or capacity to engage large institutional actions. Could these dreams of large-scale change be lingering from the initiation of Adelante when those imaginaries were potential realities? Or is the desire for large-scale change a hegemonic production that Adelante members continue to animate? I do not have answers to these questions. Either way, this chapter seeks to bring to light the quieter actions, so we are not held captive to the dream of institutional change along with the affective stagnation of frustration or perceived failure.

In emphasizing these quieter actions of Adelante, I argue against the overrepresentation of actions toward social change that are reliant upon the promised futurity of institutional change because it forecloses the possibility for becoming otherwise. It remains within the purview of the nation-state and reproduces subjects of capitalist coloniality. This call to attend to the rupture and relation as actions within a social change effort asks readers to dwell in the immeasurable and uncapturable, or liminal spaces of embodied and relational ways of knowing as a necessary space for the production of new life and subjectivities.

---

152 One Adelante members expressed this well when she stated, “We shouldn’t measure it in terms of is it a tangible thing that you can go into in an office, find someone working… the effect has continued, maybe it has continued in other ways, maybe the institutionalization happens through the people who carry those ideas with them.”
If the actions of becoming is a collaborative embodied process where, in the words of Maxine Greene, we “wake up” our whole selves, then we need a praxis that attempts to account for our whole selves, that unsettles promised futurities attached to capitalist coloniality, and opens hermeneutical possibilities for building new subjectivities and lateral attachments. If we are to think about school reform and parent engagement these efforts need a similar praxis to no longer reproduce inequitable structures and outcomes.

In keeping with Tuck’s (2012) critique of critical consciousness raising as not enough, it is imperative that while I give time and credence to these quieter moments in Adelante, that this process is not perceived as a promotion of “free your mind” actions without material effects. Reflection, rupture, and relation have material effects however they cannot substitute institutional change. I argue that consciousness and consciousness raising have relational and embodied elements and consciousness itself engages the material and has material outcomes. To get caught in a separation of ideology and material would be to misunderstand the argument in this chapter.

In the end, this chapter explores how both our realities and the utopias we imagine are caught up in structures of domination that alienate subjects (dehumanize). I explore Adelante as a site where participants animated multiple forms of action derived from multiple epistemes and animates the complex ways people in the project grappled with the reproduction of domination at the same time they found ways to resist. This might not be where the work ends, but where it starts. Denying these processes and positioning social change as a project of fighting institutions forecloses
important steps to envisioning other worlds together. I hope this work opens new questions about the pedagogies and practices that move us into becoming otherwise and embracing this as action for social change. Particularly when imagining parent engagement in schools and community mobilizing for school and community change.
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION
AFTER ADELANTE

The data for this dissertation study was not collected in schools or from national databases on student achievement or teacher retention. The study did not focus on classroom instruction or curriculum design. However, this is an education dissertation organized under the assumption that the US schooling system was built to reproduce social inequities (Ogawa, 2015; Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Tobin 1994) and to this day, continues to do so. This study is about a nuanced critique of schooling animated by veteran teachers, administrators, education researchers, and parent leaders that were living in a state of dissatisfaction with the way the schools systematically and discursively dehumanized the young people and teachers in Watsonville. They deployed sophisticated and diverse critiques, and similarly, they engaged in powerful actions that raised consciousness and built community. To conclude, I provide a broad set of implications to this study that can lead future research and practice.

Reframing resistance and revisioning community mobilizations

Instead of beginning this study in the classroom or in the contexts of schools, this dissertation begins with a story of the land, labor, and sociopolitical and economic histories that built Watsonville in a structure akin to a colonial province. Within this colonial reality there are deep legacies of resistance, which inform the
community organizing and social change work of Adelante and other mobilizing efforts in and around Watsonville. From the perspective of a feminist politic, lasting social and political change should be grounded in these legacies of resistance that are only partially legible in academic language. Maria Lugones (2003) writes of a kind of resistance that is not a reaction or negation of injustice, but resistance as an embodied conscious praxis that moves through the body – the bodies of knowledge, bodies of the people, and bodies of the land – in creative and complex ways. This resistance is pedagogical and based in everyday lives (Aptheker, 1989; Motta & Esteves, 2014). In Chapter IV I identify this feminist politic and spend Chapters V and VI attending to the different ways Adelante members animate this politic of resistance.

This study traces the history of Adelante and through a particular kind of telling, one that attends to the perceived failures and productive tensions of the organizations history of formation, the process of digital storytelling, the anthology produced, and the quieter movements of social change. The findings highlight multiple ways that this particular form of resistance showed itself in Adelante. The group created dialogical and physical space and discussed the need to honor local knowledges and to connect to community power to build a change effort. Participants engaged in discussions about what it meant to “honor knowledges,” expressed skepticism and concerns of the intentions of the group and whether the effort would disband, dissolve, or disappear before any change happened. People felt impatient at the temporality of the effort and worked together to find patience. It was not until
eight months into the effort that parents from the community arrived through focus 
groups and members started sharing personal stories and creating a space to be 
moved, cultivate deeper connection, and believe in the movement of the effort. 
Elements of the emerging feminist politic are coded as expressions of ambiguity, 
unknowing, and instances where Adelante members challenge modernist 
temporalities.

This politic rested in the inevitability of failure based on a femininist 
definition of success and turned toward non-modern knowledges and practices as the 
ethos from which to organize. However this organizing was messy and in the process 
of working with and toward non-modern knowledges and practices, Adelante 
members inevitably reproduced hegemonic ways of being, knowing and acting. It 
could prove useful for researchers and practitioners alike to draw from the histories of 
women of color coalitonal work and decolonial feminisms analytic to reframe 
resistance work and open up different ways of analyzing success. Maybe researchers 
and practitioners need a politic similar to that which arose in Adelante; maybe it is 
time to get lost, embrace unknowing, and question normative temporalities to try to 
perceive otherwise.

**Shifting scales**

Similar to the move to reframe school reform and movement making, this 
study proposes a different attention to scales. Adelante is a response to matrices of 
oppression that date back to the US occupation of California and the colonial projects
that continue today through Watsonville’s political economy and power bloc. Framed as a response to the coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000; Lugones, 2010) that insidiously reproduces in everyday struggles, Adelante is one instantiation of a long history of decolonial practices of the people (and especially the women) of Watsonville. This longitudinal scale draws from the histories of struggle in Watsonville and could prove useful for framing school reform and social change, not as an intervention imposed upon the school or community, or practices that communities must adopt, but as a pedagogical process of locating change in the expertise already present and with/in the people and land.

Often, educational researchers scale studies for measurable outcomes. In this design, researchers often determine how the data will serve the goals of the research, even before data collection. This study argues for an emic research design and toward a decolonial methodology that takes seriously Patel’s notion of “answerability” and recognizing the ways in which investigation shifts and shapes the investigator and investigated through the relation. From this perspective, scales must shift, literally, politically, spatially and temporally.

Moving beyond counter-narratives to archival logics and the project of anthologizing

At the end of her dissertation, Cindy Cruz (2006) poses the question, “is it enough just to tell you my story?” (p. 177). One of the interventions in Adelante was a digital storytelling project to anthologize stories of parents, teachers, community members and students. This pedagogical process offered a modality for people to
come together and share their stories. Digital storytelling was an important and controversial practice in Adelante that attracted scrutiny and skepticism. In spite of this, people chose to participate in the story circles, write their stories, and collectively brainstorm how to use the digital stories as pedagogical tools in community settings to incite dialogue about the issues people face every day.

Findings show that many participants chose to tell their stories for political reasons: they believed the stories would support other parents and teachers to see the similarities in their everyday lives and struggles. Along with this perceived audience, which became an imagined element of this collective, participants began to form collectivities while writing their stories together. Through the structure of creating and telling their stories, participants experienced a testimonio-like process where the boundaries of their stories and the stories of others in the room sometimes blurred.

I also note in the findings moments where people refused and/or opted out of writing their stories. These refusals and gestures to opt out illuminate the “epistemological experiment” (Stoler, 2003) of building a collective of stories. Adelante members did not assume that the anthology would ever be a complete representation of Watsonville; however troubles of representation arise when embarking upon a political project of collecting stories, especially if the structures of representation available can be taken up by dominant discourses and subordinate the voices that the effort intended to highlight. Further exploration into the motivations to tell stories, the perceived audiences, and precarity of the digital form could prove
insightful for complicating the presence and use of counter-narratives in educational research.

Depending on how stories are canonized, read, and reproduced in diverse settings, the political motive behind the telling can be lost. I respond to Cruz’s question with a call to attend to the pedagogies of engaging the story and the anthology as a body of work. The histories of women of color writing and representation in history could prove important frameworks for thinking about the digital stories as pedagogical tools, or social texts for analysis. As educational researchers, we must move beyond the counternarrative moment to attend to the categorical readings and analytic costs of the stories as they are deployed in varying settings and explore ways pedagogical strategies can (and/or cannot) mitigate these costs.

School and community change efforts need to seek anchors outside of the institutional arrangements of school and promote a politics of difference

Sara Motta and Ana Margarida Esteves (2014) “reinvent emancipation in the 21st century” and center it around the “pedagogical practices of social movements,” in their introduction to Interface, a journal on social movements. Different from social reform efforts that locate the locus of change within the schools and among school personnel, this change effort locates change in cultural organizing, dialogue, and building relations. I end Chapter II (literature review) suggesting that if reformers

153 Examples include the context in which Harriet A. Jacobs wrote her narrative (white female audience), the obfuscation of Anna Julia Cooper as a black female intellectual (Lemert & Bhan, 1998; May, 2004), and Sacajawea (Pillow, 2007).
seek changes in the inequities of the US schooling system, they must anchor the change effort both inside and outside of the institutional arrangements of schooling.

Contrary to studies that focus only on parents or only on teachers, this study documents the interactions between multiple stakeholders. However there are many other inroads of analysis that could explore the dynamics in and across groupings in Adelante. These analyses extend beyond the scope of this study, but could prove helpful for imagining how different participants performed their professional identities in out-of-school contexts and worked to interrupt these identities to open space for humanizing dialogue and building solidarities.

*Unsettling promised futurities in popular education efforts*

I refocus the accumulation of power from masculinist inventions of social change, which rely on antagonistic conceptualizations of change – to dialogue, reflection, rupture and relation to explore a pedagogy of social movement making. This turn toward the quieter moments of movement making and critical consciousness raising opens analytic spaces that contest boundaries of what is political, and align with women’s liberation, women of color coalition building.

Between 2011 and 2014, Adelante members expressed frustration that Adelante had not achieved what people set out to achieve. These expressions suggest that the vision of Adelante displaced the work; the goals stopped being the motivation and became the measure of Adelante’s success. This finding raises questions regarding commitments to utopias within community change efforts. How can utopian visions
become a topic of dialogue to disrupt the urge participants have to turn goals into accountability measurements?

Troubling the role of researchers in university-district-community collaborations

The cautionary tale of researchers gaining access to community collaborations and the ensuing damage that researchers leave in the wake of their work is a widely known story in Watsonville and among overly researched communities. Throughout Adelante, there were discussions about the role of the researcher, the role of the district personnel, and the challenges with the transience of the graduate and undergraduate students. How do these institutional positions complicate allegiances? How did Adelante members work to overcome their own feelings of alienation via their professional identities? How did they find pedagogical strategies for building solidarities in spite of these challenges, and what can researchers and practitioners learn from this?

In interviews, Adelante members raised concern about the role of the researcher and university students. Almost all of the researchers, graduate and undergraduate students involved in Adelante shared stories of their reasons for participating in Adelante that extended beyond their roles as “researchers” and “students.” Jack shared how, within the space of Adelante he felt at home. The space reminded him of his activism in the Ethnic Studies movement and his relationship with the community where he grew up. Similarly, students recounted that they developed familial relationships with Adelante members.
Yet, when an Adelante member was reflecting on the role of the university, she said, “they’re here temporarily,” they say, “‘Oh, I’m interested in changing the blah, blah, blah.’” but “if you don’t live here, if you’re not here, your interest is it’s gone after you’re gone. You may have a great heart but that’s it.” While the researchers and students had good intentions, their commitment and attachments to the university limited their geographic stability and produced precarity for their participation in Adelante. Similarly, district personnel and other community members had to leave the organizing effort because institutional attachments and other responsibilities (school and work) limited their continued engagement in Adelante. I do not intend to absolve the potential damages that researchers and students can leave in the wake of their work in overly studied communities, but I have to wonder how a reading of institutional arrangements and attachments to these institutions might produce a more nuanced reading of the insider/outsider dichotomy in Participatory Action Research, feminist critiques to Paulo Freire, and ethical dimensions to community-engaged research.

*Anthologizing and institutionalizing as modernist “epistemological experiments”*

In this study I adopt Anne Stoler’s term “epistemological experiments” (Stoler, 2003) to speak of anthologies, but the concept could describe both the process of anthologizing and institutionalization. Both of these projects codify bodies of knowledge that extend beyond the people of the project. The work of Adelante was predicated on an understanding that these societal codifications of knowledge
(institutions and anthologies) are malleable and socially constructed. Through these experiments, the intention was to create a gravitational force that could one day move social structures. How can researchers and practitioners better understand the desires to archive (anthologize) and institutionalize as practices in organizing for social change and the relationship between the two?

The work continues

The productive “failures” of Adelante illuminate the colonial status of institutional structures in Watsonville and the coalitions needed to change the political and economic structure of Watsonville. The work of Adelante was not lost and did not fail, quite the contrary. Many Adelante members continue to do their work, informed by a feminist politic in multiple community settings in and outside of Watsonville. For example, after leaving El Centro, Edgar went on to work in a nearby urban school district. He helped build a parent leadership pipeline focused on parent-led focus groups. He and other staff teach about parent rights and how to navigate the school system. He saw Adelante as training for his current job and recognized that he would not be able to do the work he does with parents without the experiences he had in Adelante. In 2014, he was beginning a digital storytelling program with parents and staff.

Luisa continues to conduct parent literacy work with parents. She received a grant through the district to create digital stories with parents. She contracted a group of undergraduate students and media professionals to support the digital storytelling
workshops. By the spring of 2016, she had created approximately fourteen digital stories that share powerful and important narratives of the hopes and barriers of first generation Latino parents and continues to explore avenues for parents to tell their stories through the methodology of story circles and create digital stories.

Phoebe continues to use the digital stories in her teacher education classes. She often shows stories of teachers in a unit where she explores teacher identities. She found that sharing stories of parents and youth as fruitful in producing important conversation about race, class, gender, migration, and labor exploitation in Watsonville. Although challenging, she finds these conversations to be very important for future and current teachers in the Watsonville area.

Mark has been extending the ideas of Adelante while coordinating state-wide funding for youth development for a major California foundation. In spring of 2016, Sheila and Luisa presented a digital story of a Oaxacan middle school girl to a third grade classroom with a large Oaxacan population. The young people shared the themes of the digital stories and spoke together about racism toward indigenous peoples in Watsonville.

There are also more ways in which the digital stories continue to do representational work. The digital stories are often shown in different venues across Watsonville. In March 2016, a public library event honoring local leaders engaged a community dialogue about the rich knowledges and powerful Latino leaders in Watsonville. Some of Adelante’s members participated in this event and Sheila was one of the leaders represented that evening. In the spring of 2016, UC Santa Cruz
undergraduates linked up with Watsonville community organizations through a program at UC Santa Cruz to conduct community work. In preparation for this work, students watched the digital stories from Adelante as a form of cultural competency training. These are just a few of the stories that I have heard and due to the decentralized nature of Adelante, I am sure there are many more examples.

The lasting effects of the pedagogical work that happened in Adelante are immeasurable. Participants express and will continue to express their work as political actors wherever they are. The life of the struggle of Adelante was and is not contained in the events that define Adelante as a case study. Adelante, as a political formation manifested and dissolved on the political landscape of Watsonville, but the power cultivated with and among the people began before Adelante, will continue on through stories, relations, and a continued cultivation of a feminist politic of resistance.
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Memo on positionality

*Life beyond death and dying in Adelante: How people’s work continues in the wake of Adelante.*

September 25, 2014

When I began to research this project I had a lot of trepidation about working in a project that seemed to be at the end of its life. The heyday of Adelante happened around 2007 to 2009, when members of Adelante were situated in strategic positions throughout the community in Watsonville and people were gathering weekly in their respective groups to create and push the agenda of Adelante forward.

In 2009, multiple events happened that significantly impacted Adelante’s ability to root within the community. Two folks left the community center due to many factors, one being a conflict in ideology with the director of the community center. At the same time, Adelante members efforts to find funding failed. This was a heavy blow to the moral and stamina of the Adelante and one could tell the story that “things fall apart.” In the entropy of the moment, separate meetings collapsed into monthly meetings, scheduling difficulties came to the foreground and Adelante began to float to different meeting locations. This fragmented and infrequent meeting for Adelante in some ways was its death.

Parents and teachers’ interests began to wane (e.x. Luis’ interview for second year project). Scheduling became difficult and meetings more infrequent… a slow death? But, what is my work in writing about Adelante? Am I here to document the death of another social change effort that failed? What narrative strategies do I need
to deploy or what facts do I need to emphasize to tell a story that does not fall into the success/failure binary? Although the project did not create any concrete “actions,” or root itself within an institutional framework, transformational work occurred. In some cases, I would argue that the transformational work that happened in Adelante was a type of work that is imperative for social change to occur. Maybe it is time to shift our frame from seeing Adelante as an individual effort to seeing it as a collective with multiple iterations and ripple effects into the lives of folks that participated?

- What theory accounts for this ecological model? I am reminded of the idea that sometimes the flower has to die to bear the fruit. The seed never sees the flower. Just because Adelante did not fulfill it’s mission to transform the schools and communities, people have transferred their learning from Adelante into their daily lives in profound ways. Can I make this statement?

- How can we begin to think about closure as an important part of the process of praxis in social movement making? What if the community you are working with is one that you never leave? What does collaborative closure look like? How is this an ethical question?

- When I went to interview Phoebe, I told her a little about the idea that maybe we needed a moment of closure for Adelante. Her response was interesting. She didn’t see Adelante as ending, all she saw ending were the meetings, but the work of the digital stories continued on. She used the digital stories in her classes, is taking them to a conference this year and continues to work in other ways with the digital archive in the district with teachers.

- What does it mean to have this work continue on the digital platform? How important is it to continue the work of Adelante in the form of meetings and focus groups? Who gets to use the digital stories? Who thinks about the work of Adelante from different perspectives? How can I begin to think about these different perspectives and could they be related to positionality?
Appendix B: 2010 and 2014 Interview protocol

2010: Interview protocol

1. How did you first get involved with Adelante?
   FOLLOW-UP PROBES: What interested you about Adelante initially? Is it what you expected? How has your involvement with Adelante grown or changed since you first joined? Do you feel that you have a hand in shaping this project? Are you listened to (and, if so, how)?
   (in this answer you will hopefully get the details of how long they've been with it and how they got interested)

2. Why does Adelante focus on digital stories?

3. Why did you decide to tell your story?

4. Could you tell me about creating your story? What were the story circles like? What was it like to see your story for the first time—when it was done? Where were you?

5. What have others said to you about your stories? What does it feel like when others talk to you about your story?

6. Has creating your story for this project changed you at all? How?
   When people take your story out into the community to share and ask questions, what do you expect will happen? What do you hope will happen?

7. This work in Adelante has probably been an intense, emotional experience. How would you describe its effect on you? What are the good things about it—what are the frustrating or challenging things? If you had a magic wand and could change three things about this project or the process of creating these stories, what 3 changes would you make?
   Since joining Adelante, what do you think Adelante has accomplished so far?
   (setting the stage for the next two questions)
   What do you hope will be the future of Adelante?
   How will you make that "hope"/vision a reality?

   Thank you so much for your time!! It’s really valuable and interesting to learn about all this from you. If, over the next few days, you feel that there’s something else you want to tell me, or something that you said today that you want to change or take back—feel free to let me know. Thanks again for your time and your insight.
2014: Interview protocol for current members

i. Background:
   - What is your name?
   - What is your role in the Adelante?
   - When/how did you get involved?
   - Why did you get involved?
   - What did you hope to accomplish when you started?

ii. Describe Adelante:
   - What do you think Adelante is?
     - Show people the Mission statement on the website
     - Do you think that describes the Adelante? Why or why not?
   - Tell me the story of Adelante from its beginning, including your entry into Adelante, and from then up to now.
   - What is most important to understand or know about if one were really to get at the soul of Adelante?
   - From your perspective, what are the goals of the Adelante now?
   - Do you think Adelante has met (some of) its goals? Which ones? What enabled the achievements? What prevented more from being done?
   - What do you see were some of the key challenges Adelante faced?
   - Do you think the school district was resistant to partnering with Adelante? If so, why?
   - What were some of the most significant successes of Adelante?
   - Did you make a story? Did you participate in a story circle?
     - What happened? Tell me about the experience of making your story.
     - Tell me about the experience of being with others who are viewing and talking about your story?
     - Has your understanding of your own story changed from how you thought about it when you made the story to how you think about it now? If changed, please tell me about that change.

iii. Retention/Attrition: In looking back at the last seven years...
   - Did you accomplish what you set out to accomplish? Why or why not?
   - Why did you stay involved?
   - What were some moments you will not forget? Surprises?
   - Did your experiences in Adelante change your work in anyway? Change your self-understanding in some way? Your understanding of the community and schools? Your understanding of the other members of Adelante? Did it change your way of thinking about how things can get done?
   - Where do you see Adelante going?
2014: Interview Protocol for previous members

People that played an integral role in Adelante (n = 14)

Interview questions for previous members

i. Background:

• What is your name?
• What was your role in the Adelante?
• When did you get involved? Why did you get involved?
• What did you hope to accomplish when you started?
• When did you leave? Why did you leave?

ii. Describe Adelante:

• What do you think Adelante is?
  o Show people the Mission statement on the website
  o Do you think that describes Adelante? Why or why not?
• Tell me the story of Adelante from its beginning, including your entry into Adelante, and from then up to now.
• What is most important to understand or know about if one were really to get at the soul of Adelante?
• From your perspective, what were the goals of Adelante?
• Do you think Adelante met its goals? Why or why not?
• What do you see were some of the challenges Adelante faced?
• Do you think the school district was resistant to partnering with Adelante? If so, why?
• Describe El Centro’s role in working with Adelante.
• What were some of the successes of Adelante?
• Did you make a story? Did you participate in a story circle?
  o What happened? Tell me about the experience of making your story.
  o Tell me about the experience of being with others who are viewing and talking about your story?
  o Has your understanding of your own story changed from how you thought about it when you made the story to how you think about it now? If changed, please tell me about that change.

iii. Retention/Attrition: In looking back at the last seven years…

• Did you accomplish what you set out to accomplish? Why or why not?
• What were some moments you will not forget? Surprises?
• Did your experiences in Adelante change your work in anyway? Change your self-understanding in some way? Your understanding of the community and schools? Change your way of thinking about how things can get done?
• Where do you see Adelante going
Appendix C: Criteria for selection of interviewees

I will select members who are currently involved in Adelante. To select members from the past, I will identify their leadership affiliation, participation/attendance in Adelante, and significant activity within the reform effort. If the individual participated in more than one event and took on a leadership role within the organization, I will request an interview.

In addition, there are some individuals who were not part of Adelante, but interfaced with Adelante as community organizations or centers. I will email key informants within the community as well and will identify more through the process of research.

Current members (n = 7)

Previous members (n = 14)

Key informants:
Director of El Centro
Appendix D: Consent forms

INFORMED CONSENT for interviews with Adelante participants

With your consent, I would like to conduct research with Adelante members. The purpose of this research is to examine the use of digital stories as learning tools in the school and community reform effort. The data collection will occur from February 2014 to September 2014.

Research Procedure: I will observe and record (upon the consent of the dialogue circle participants) meetings and dialogue circles. In addition, I will ask to interview you at different times through the process of using the digital stories in your workshop or classroom.

Participation: Participation in this research study is completely voluntary. There are no obligations on the part of Adelante to allow me to do this. Any of you may decide to withdraw at any time from the study. A refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Risks and Benefits: The risks for you and the community dialogue circle participants are minimal, but may include observing you in an embarrassing or uncomfortable moment during discussions. The benefits may be significant, to the individuals in Adelante and to Adelante as a whole, as well as to others seeking to develop a similar project to create school and community change. There are few studies that currently look at this form of community organizing through stories and dialogue. Documentation of this process could prove useful for reflection and as a reference for others who may want to explore this form of organizing in their communities.

Confidentiality: In all of my writing about this study, and in any writing done in collaboration with any Adelante members or university collaborators, with the exception of what is provided directly to you and Adelante, care will be taken to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of all the participants in the study.

Please initial:

I consent to being recorded.
I understand that I have the right to refuse to answer any questions at any time.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions about this study, you may contact me at any time via phone or email (listed below). You may contact my faculty advisor, Ron Glass, at 831-459-5188 or rglass@ucsc.edu or the Office of Research (ORCA) at UCSC, at (831) 459-1473 or orca@ucsc.edu.

Sincerely,
Linnea Beckett
lbeckett@ucsc.edu
(415) 342-7127

Participant name (print): ____________________________________________
Participant signature and date: ________________________________________
Consentimiento de los participantes de Adelante

Procedimiento de la Investigación:

Participación: Participación en este estudio es totalmente voluntaria. Ustedes pueden rehusar a participar en este estudio y no tienen ninguna obligación por parte de Adelante para participar en esta investigación. Cualquier participante puede cambiar de opinión acerca de su participación en el estudio y salirse del mismo una vez que haya comenzado. No importa cual sea la decisión de participar o no su decisión no afectara en lo mas mínimo los beneficios que su participación en Adelante le brindan.

Riesgos y Beneficios: Los riesgos para usted y el diálogo en círculo con la comunidad son mínimos. Sin embargo, es posible que durante las observaciones exista un momento en el cual usted esta viviendo un momento penoso o incomodo durante las discusiones. Los beneficios pueden ser importantes para los individuos en Adelante así mismo que para Adelante en si. Existen beneficios para otros que también están tratando de desarrollar un proyecto similar para crear cambios en una escuela y en la comunidad. Existen pocos estudios describen esta forma de organización de la comunidad mediante historias y diálogo.

Confidencialidad: En todo lo que yo escriba acerca de este estudio, y en cualquier escritura realizada en colaboración con cualquier miembro de Adelante o colaboradores universitarios, con la excepción de la información que le brindare a usted y a Adelante, tomare todas las medidas para proteger la confidencialidad y el anonimato de todos los participantes en el estudio.

Muchas gracias por su tiempo. Si tiene alguna pregunta acerca de este estudio, usted puede comunicarse conmigo en cualquier momento por teléfono o correo electrónico (figuran a continuación), o puede comunicarse con la oficina de investigación (Office of Research), en UC Santa Cruz, (831) 459-1473 or orca@ucsc.edu o el profesor Ron Glass, al (831)459-5188 ó rglass@ucsc.edu, quien esta supervisando esta investigación:

Sinceramente, Linnea Beckett
lbeckett@ucsc.edu (415) 342-7127

Mi firma y mis iniciales a continuación indicaran que he decidido participar en este estudio voluntariamente, como individuo que participa en investigaciones. He leido y entiendo la información proporcionada anteriormente. Por favor escriba sus iniciales al lado de cada oración para indicar su consentimiento:

___ Yo les doy mi permiso para que la entrevista sea grabada.
___ Las grabaciones puede ser utilizada para el propósito de esta investigación.
___ Entiendo que tengo el derecho a rehusar de responder a las preguntas en cualquier momento.

Nombre del Participante: ____________________________________________
(Escribir con letra de molde)

Firma del Participante y Fecha ______________________________
(Favor de firmar las dos copias. Quédese con una copia.)
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INFORMED CONSENT for Adelante participants

With your consent, I would like to conduct research with Adelante members. The purpose of this research is to document the history and future of Adelante as a community-based educational reform effort. The data collection will occur from April 2014 to October 2014.

Research Procedure: I will ask to interview you in April or May of 2014 and then request your participation in a day-long focus group in September 2014 wherein I will audio and video record the meeting.

Participation: Participation in this research study is completely voluntary. There are no obligations on the part of Adelante to allow me to do this. Any of you may decide to withdraw at any time from the study. A refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Risks and Benefits: The risks for you and the community dialogue circle participants are minimal, but may include observing you in an embarrassing or uncomfortable moment during discussions. The benefits may be significant, to the individuals in Adelante and to Adelante as a whole, as well as to others seeking to develop a similar project to create school and community change. There are few studies that currently look at this form of community organizing through stories and dialogue. Documentation of this process could prove useful for reflection and as a reference for others who may want to explore this form of organizing in their communities.

Confidentiality: In all of my writing about this study, and in any writing done in collaboration with any Adelante members or university collaborators, with the exception of what is provided directly to you and Adelante, care will be taken to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of all the participants in the study.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions about this study, you may contact me at any time via phone or email (listed below). You may contact my faculty advisor, Ron Glass, at 831-459-5188 or rglass@ucsc.edu or the Office of Research (ORCA) at UCSC, at (831) 459-1473 or orca@ucsc.edu.

Sincerely,
Linnea Beckett
lbeckett@ucsc.edu, (415) 342-7127

Please initial:

___ I consent to being recorded.

___ The recordings may be used for the purpose of this research.

___ I understand that I have the right to refuse to answer any questions at any time.

Participant name (print): ______________________________________________________

Participant signature and date: ________________________________________

(Please sign two copies and remain with one for your records)
Consentimiento de los participantes de Adelante

Con su consentimiento, me gustaría llevar a cabo una investigación con los miembros Adelante. El propósito de esta investigación es examinar la historia y el futuro Adelante como una colaboración de los miembros de la comunidad para transformar las escuelas y la comunidad. La recolección de datos ocurrirá a partir de abril 2014 a octubre 2014.

Procedimiento de Investigación: Voy a pedir permiso para hacer una entrevista con los participantes en abril o mayo de 2014. Además, voy a pedir su participación en un (day-long focus group) en septiembre 2014 donde voy a grabar (audio and video) la junta.

Participación: Participación en este estudio es totalmente voluntaria. Ustedes pueden rehusar a participar en este estudio y no tienen ninguna obligación por parte de Adelante para participar en esta investigación. Cualquier participante puede cambiar de opinión acerca de su participación en el estudio y salirse del mismo una vez que haya comenzado. No importa cual sea la decisión de participar o no su decisión no afectara en lo mas mínimo los beneficios que su participación en Adelante le brindan.

Riesgos y Beneficios: Los riesgos para usted y el diálogo en círculo con la comunidad son mínimos. Sin embargo, es posible que durante las observaciones exista un momento en el cual usted está viviendo un momento penoso o incomodo durante las discusiones. Los beneficios pueden ser importantes para los individuos en Adelante así mismo que para Adelante en si. Existen beneficios para otros que también están tratando de desarrollar un proyecto similar para crear cambios en una escuela y en la comunidad. Existen pocos estudios describen esta forma de organización de la comunidad mediante historias y diálogo.

Confidencialidad: En todo lo que yo escriba acerca de este estudio, y en cualquier escritura realizada en colaboración con cualquier miembro de Adelante o colaboradores universitarios, con la excepción de la información que le brindare a usted y a Adelante, tomare todas las medidas para proteger la confidencialidad y el anonimato de todos los participantes en el estudio.

Muchas gracias por su tiempo. Si tiene alguna pregunta acerca de este estudio, usted puede comunicarse conmigo en cualquier momento por teléfono o correo electrónico (figuran a continuación), o puede comunicarse con la oficina de investigación (Office of Research), en UC Santa Cruz, (831) 459-1473 or orea@ucsc.edu o el profesor Ron Glass, al (831)459-5188 ó rglass@ucsc.edu, quien esta supervisando esta investigación:

Sinceramente, Linnea Beckett
lbeckett@ucsc.edu (415) 342-7127

Mi firma y mis iniciales a continuación indicaran que he decidido participar en este estudio voluntariamente, como individuo que participa en investigaciones. He leido y entiendo la información proporcionada anteriormente. Por favor escriba sus iniciales al lado de cada oración para indicar su consentimiento:

___ Yo les doy mi permiso para que la entrevista sea grabada.
___ Las grabaciones puede ser utilizada para el propósito de esta investigación.
___ Entiendo que tengo el derecho a rehusar de responder a las preguntas en cualquier momento.

Nombre del Participante: ____________________________________________
(Escribir con letra de molde)

Firma del Participante y Fecha______________________________________

(Favor de firmar las dos copias. Quédese con una copia.)
Appendix E: Examples of Analytic Memo in data analysis

Example #1: Digital stories as the soccer field

December 2, 2015

If I position the digital storytelling as part of the initial motivation of Adelante, then I look at the “collapse” or diminishing of resources, then – what would it look like to think of the history as it was related to the creation of these digital representations? How much of Adelante’s “soccer field” was wrapped up in these representations?

What if we thought of the digital stories as living archives/artifacts that folks can use as they wish, in different contexts – that potential energy, or acknowledging of it, could diminish the urge for kinetic… But this systematically leaves out anyone who does not have the access or does not feel like they have the facilitation skills or the power to use these digital stories in their professional settings. Phoebe says these stories are alive, but which ones? And for what reasons?
Example #2: *The Role of the Expert in Adelante*

March 16, 2011

Freire provides a research driven mechanism for critical examination of everyday life, but where does the expert fit? According to Dewey, the expert has an integral yet peripheral role in new knowledge production (Oakes, Rogers, & Lipton, 2006). I think of Adelante conversations where people are really reluctant to take on internal leadership. I just learned today that there were two Adelante members who said they would be willing to go ahead and step up into a leadership role. Unforeseen events occurred and both were unable to take on these positions. Now the group seems deflated, stuck and a bit unsure. I wonder if they will rally for inspiration? Maybe they need to go out and show people some of the digital stories and find the inspiration in conversation in the community.

I see the role of the facilitator and even the role of Daniel as the expert as a radical educator. This role is key, especially if Freire relies on it as part of his methodology. I sometimes wonder how much impetus can be invoked with internal work to create radical change. Is an outsider necessary to incite the types of transformation that took place for the worker’s movement in Brazil? I would be curious to see what organizational theory has to say about outsiders and insiders. But, back to the role of the expert as the radical educator and how s/he can facilitate a process wherein “the forms of cultural reproduction displayed by subordinate groups can be analyzed to reveal both their limitations and their possibilities for enabling critical thinking, analytical discourse, and learning through collective practice”
(Aronowitz & Giroux, 1994). This links the personal with the political to understand how power is mediated, flows, and is reproduced through daily life. This is the work of Adelante.
Example #3: Reproduction vs. Resistance for Adelante’s Spaces

January 5, 2011

Lately I have been reading about the iterative process of reproduction and resistance and how different theorists engage at different levels of analysis by attributing power to the structure and to the agents. According to Aronowitz & Giroux (1994), “schools represent contested terrain” (p. 231), but they go on to explain that subordinate cultures battle with producing both resistance and reproduction and these battles are often the internal reflections of the social landscape of capital, institutions, schools and neighborhoods.

In regards to Adelante, individuals are both producers and reproducers of their social, economic, cultural, political and historical realities. Because these conditions vary from neighborhood to neighborhood and context to context, as many contexts need to be studied as possible to shed light on the intersecting and complex interplay between these larger social technologies and the individual relationships with these technologies. Through collective focus groups, people were able to share dialogue about their realities and their conditions. Will they be able to shed light on the larger social and political contexts that dictate certain reproductive models and activities? Will they be able to move from the personal to the political?

Aronowitz & Giroux talk about the dialectic notion of human agency and domination as dynamic, never static nor complete. They ask the reader to explore the “complex ways people mediate and respond to the connection between their own experiences and structures of domination and constraint” (p. 233). When thinking
about this, counter stories (Yosso) and the work of testimonio (Beverely), I see how
the digital stories fit. The digital stories are a created art form, an amalgamation of
the storyteller’s own experience and the structure of domination and constraints
acting upon them. How are the storytellers responding to these structures? How are
the storytellers mediating and responding to these structures? How do these stories
depict these responses? In analyzing these stories as a community, dialogue starts
and collective investigation may begin as a community to explore how to connect
individual experiences with the structures that confine and reproduce.

Within this reading there is also a critique of individualism. It alienates the
individual from the collective. “Knowledge in the working class structure builds
around principles of solidarity, whereas middle class culture, knowledge is within
individual competition” (p. 235). This reminds me of Rogoff’s work. She refers to
schools as assembly-line instruction. The assembly-line model of learning formalizes
the learner as the receiver, docile and ready for factory work. A division of labor
constricts the collaborative spirit for fear of doing something that is outside of the
larger organizational structure or rules. This stance harkens a Marxist inspired
critique and further thought, not only from a class-based level of alienation, but
thinking about how assembly-line instruction may alienate individuals from their
collective identities. If the assembly-line model supports and promotes individualism
(a claim that I am not sure I could argue yet), then this work promotes the
humanization of individuals involved.

Theoretically I could see how not only does this work of linking the personal
to the political as a Freirian project humanizes the participants, but the process of learning itself - the generative dialogue is a form of resistance and humanization - through this public learning process, individuals have the possibility to engage in a process that is humanizing and leads to humanizing results.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Cruz, C. (2006) *Testimonial Narratives of Queer Street Youth: Towards and*


Annual Meeting Symposium: Freire and Vygotsky: Examining the Links between Critical Pedagogy and Dialectical Psychology of Learning and Development.


Research. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.


283


