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Consider the word “society” itself. What a chameleon-like word it is, what a host of adjectives can be placed in front of it, while throughout it continues to convey the broad notion of people living together rather than in isolation. We hear of the aberrant society, the abortive society, the acquiescent society, the acquisitive society, the affluent society, and we can continue on through the alphabet until we arrive at the zymotic society, which is one that is in a continuous state of ferment, not unlike our own (Adler & Van Doren, 1972, p. 300).
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Exploring Conceptions of Social Reality through Community-University Collaborations:  
A Critical Discourse Analysis

Introduction

While completing the Master of Arts Integrated Studies program, I chose my areas of specialization (Adult Education and Community Studies) with much forethought. I wanted to stimulate my inner ‘learner’ with the right mix of interdisciplinary study. I also wanted to contribute to positive social change.

My interest in discourse analysis developed as I pondered how various discourses situate academia and socially marginalized groups. To explore this idea, I would try to garner meaning from discourse on community-university collaborations in distressed neighborhoods. Think, for a moment, about academia. In an instant, we imagine a community of scholars and students engaged in learning. Now, think about socially marginalized groups. In another instant, we might imagine a community of individuals in hardship or exclusion. This is what Gladwell (2005) calls “thin-slicing.” According to Gladwell, our instincts are based on rapid cognition that let us form powerful thoughts based on “very narrow slices of experience” (p. 23).

Similarly, softer forms of social cognition derive from a schema we share on social opinions (van Dijk, 1993, p. 258). Halliday (1989) suggests our schema relies on certain aspects of our experience that represent the real world (p. 19), which Phillips & Jorgensen (2002) describe as “products of our ways of categorising [sic] the world” (p. 5). Perhaps we find the term ‘community’ awkward to link at once to academia and marginalized groups. The reason may be that an alternate ideology underlies our beliefs.
I decided to apply a critical discourse analysis to explore if the collective power of socially marginalized groups in community emerges differently from that of academia. I believe the lived experiences of marginalized groups do not openly define their community. A socially marginalized community is a social construct anchored in an oppressed economic and social process that prevents marginalized individuals from gaining control over their lives. This assumption evolved through the identification of Lewiston, St. Louis, Memphis, and Philadelphia as source areas for data collection and critical review using a qualitative software analysis tool. Critical discourse analysis analyzes language ‘in thin slices’ to gain a better understanding of societal issues, power, and ideologies (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000; Fairclough, 2003; Huckin, 2002; MacGregor, 2003; van Dijk, 1995) by putting “emphasis both on the fine-grained details of text and on the political aspects of discursive manipulation” (Huckin, 2002, p. 4).

Rationale

The application of critical discourse analysis to community-university collaborations is relevant. First, the last two decades have seen an increased interest in how language is used and deconstructed, particularly regarding discourse analysis and social linguistics. (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000; Fairclough, 2003; Huckin, 2002; van Dijk, 1995). Second, critical discourse analysis focuses on dominance issues in society as they are enacted and reproduced through language (Fairclough, 2003; van Dijk, 1995). Third, structured discourse creates an entry point for community-based learning, which should bring together academic and community perspectives that foster adult learning (Huckin, 2002, p. 1). Fourth, the dialectical process in community-university collaborations has a significant bearing on social constructionism. How academia and socially marginalized groups emerge in community, depends, in part, on the nature of the collaboration (Stoecker, 1999, pp. 842-845).
Exploring Conceptions of Social Reality

Research Purpose

The project is a preliminary qualitative study to explore if the collective power of socially marginalized groups in community emerges differently from that of academia. I will apply a critical discourse analysis to examine how representations of social structures, practices, and actors emerge through language. A critical approach will also support theoretical perspectives regarding the type of discourse emerging from collaborations. A key outcome is an interpretation of social reality based solely on representations of academia and marginalized groups captured from discourse on community-university collaborations in distressed neighborhoods.

Research Question

The question weighs the significance of taking a scholarly approach toward community issues: Does a scholarly approach to community collaboration correlate with the needs of a distressed community? I want to look at some ways in which discourse influences social reality as it unfolds for academia and marginalized groups.

Limitations

Although the research project is a contribution to research phenomenon of community-university collaborations, some limitations exist. The project does not rely on community fieldwork. It does not explore the relationship between academia and marginalized groups, nor does it distinguish marginalized groups, for example, gender and race. The research project is a qualitative study based primarily on secondary discourse written or authorized by community-university collaborations. Other documentary sources include original newspaper articles and resident plans that were produced at or near the time of the community collaboration.
Literature Review: Perspectives on Language

Conceptions of social reality are widely interpreted through language (Cook & DeFrain, 2005; Darcy, 1999; Marshak, Keenoy, Oswick & Grant, 2000; Martin 2003; van Dijk, 1998). A literature review examines how three aspects of language largely influence the phenomenon of community-university collaboration within community development: (1) language shapes assumptions in relation to social structures; (2) language reifies power-knowledge relations in social practices; and (3) language frames social actors in socially significant ways (Fairclough, 2003a).

Language shapes assumptions in relation to social structures. Education follows the path set by society’s dominant paradigm, which focuses on formal ways for social structures to maintain order or centralize control (Morin, 1998, pp. 59-70). Evidence shows that the advancement of discourse on 'institutionalization' between universities and community shapes assumptions. Institutionalization is a value-laden approach that goes beyond technical requirements implemented by universities to reach community partners and residents on matters of local concern (Vidal, Nye, Walker, Manjarrez, & Romanik, 2002, p. 4-1). In higher education, institutionalizing community-based research mimics the dominant paradigm because it creates the broad assumption that a scholarly approach benefits community change (Dorius, 2007, p. 4; Watson-Thompson, Fawcett & Schultz, 2008, pp. 26, 36). This assumption is explored within the context of community development.

Much literature covers the practical nature of community development (Barr, 2005; Charles, 2005; Dorius, 2007; Dunham, 1972; Kotval 2005; London, 1995; Rubin & Rubin, 2001) and its detachment from theoretical influences (Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones, 2002; Bhattacharyya, 2004; Cook, 1994). Community development is one of the most important
influences on society and social relationships in North America (Dunham, 1972, p. 11). As a pluralistic representation of society, community development is built on social capital (Rubin & Rubin, 2001, p. 105) and the collective quality of its citizens (Sirolli, 1999, p. 117).

Community development is also a form of social planning, according to Cox, Erlich, Rothman and Tropman (as cited in Julian, Hernandez & Hodges, 2006, p. 141), which takes its roots from policy analysis, a form of technical reason. By applying Friedmann’s (1987) focus to the four traditions of planning theory (policy analysis, social reform, social learning, and social mobilization), the assumption could be that policy analysis is the rational planning model most closely matching a scholarly approach to community development (pp. 177-178). Along the same lines, policy analysis functions effectively in education for strategic planning and data gathering. While this approach may provide a formal way for social structures to centralize control, discourse on collaborative planning offers a complementary approach.

‘Collaborative planning’ mitigates relations of power and systems of governance by not downplaying the practice-knowledge-practice cycle of traditional planning theory (p. 348). Healey introduced the term in the late 1990s, partly in response to Friedmann’s defence of a general concept for planning. The distinction is in its contemporary framework for practical action that is more closely associated with issues of social, economic, and environmental policy. Collaborative planning focuses attention on relation-building processes, grounded in an ‘institutionalist’ approach framed by power relations (Healey, 1997, p. 57). This combination strengthens the application of a scholarly perspective toward community collaboration.

Language reifies power-knowledge relations in social practices. Formal community-university partnerships increased substantially in the 1990s (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf & Goss, 2002, p. 3). Today, this means the national U.S. coalition, Campus Compact (1985), encourages
civic engagement throughout communities for its nearly 1100 colleges and universities. Likewise, Learn & Serve America (1993) advances the work of colleges and universities in the areas of civic engagement and service learning. The Council of Independent Colleges (1956) promotes higher education through 600 private U.S. colleges and universities, and, more recently, Project Pericles (2003) embraces citizenship, social responsibility, and community as inseparable in a pluralistic society. Additionally, the Association for Community-Higher Education Partnerships (2001) promotes the increase of institutional support (Vidal, et al., 2002, p. 6-11). As a result, the Federal Reserve Bank reports a growing number of universities engaged in institutionalized activities and relationships (p. i). Institutionalizing community-based research reinforces the dominant paradigm by treating education as a commodity to uphold power-knowledge relations in social practices.

Academic institutions emphasize the acquisition, publication, and exchange of community knowledge (Cottrell & Parpart, 2006, p. 18). Still, few publications from outreach work contribute to general knowledge or learning (Vidal et al., 2002, p. 5:30). In Canada, The J. W. McConnell Family Foundation reports a collection of “powerful research knowledge” unused by the community sector (Pearson, 2006, p. 48). Researchers suggest the knowledge may be multi-part and difficult for practitioners to access (p. 48), opportunities for research partnerships may be exacerbated by competing interests, funding, or community resistance (Savan, 2004, p. 382), or the research may be primarily of case study nature (Martin, Smith, & Phillips, 2005, p. 13). Perhaps the answer lies in the struggle philanthropic and corporate underwriters have in reporting community development initiatives (Dorius, 2007, p. 10).

At the same time, it is widely agreed that an understanding of complex community issues contributes to the large body of academic research in social science. The rich bed of experiential
knowledge created in and by the community has the potential to guide the sharing and
documenting of qualitative and quantitative research (p. 9-11) to establish new forms of theory
(Banks & Mangan, 1999, p. 127). Further, it has the potential to reify the significance of
community development and collaboration. As Tinkler (2004a) notes, problems arise when
academic research advances abundant knowledge within disciplines and insufficient knowledge
within society (p. 1-3). Consequently, with “relatively little” research recorded from a
community perspective (Leiderman et al., 2002, p. 3), it is necessary to find new ways to publish
the results and lessons of community outreach (Vidal, et al., 2002, pp. 5:30-31). The
connectedness between community-based learning and community development must be
recognized, not only through the dissemination of knowledge, as a first step, but through the
involvement of academia in turning knowledge into substantive change (Ebata, 1996, p. 77;

Language frames social actors in socially significant ways (Fairclough, 2003a). The role
of academia in community falls in line with Tillich’s (1952) theoretical correlation of self and
participation. Five decades ago, Tillich suggested individualization and participation correlated
to self and world because they could be a part of something while, simultaneously, being
separate from it (pp. 87-88). The involvement of academia in community embodies this
correlation. In many instances, institutionalizing community-based research is a condition for
awarding grants and increasing tenure projects (Leiderman et al., 2002, p. 3). In addition, few
institutions have modified their guidelines to reward faculty for community outreach (Vidal et
al., 2002, p. vii), and the lack of practical outreach experience challenges a community with
limited resources. These findings are consistent with Tinkler’s (2004b) study on the process of
conducting research from a researcher’s perspective. Part of Tinkler’s study considers why
educational institutions stray from their original missions, particularly land-grant institutions that link academic research to community needs. The fragmentation, it appears, stems from research agendas that tend to insulate academia from the real world (p. 2).

London (1995, 1996) puts forward the idea that engaging in the process of community collaboration should have widespread appeal to academia because it supports more than one concept of public participation (p. 2; p. 8). Community collaboration emphasizes the *worldview* of ‘coming together’ through dialogue, shared purpose, shared resources, and joint decision-making (London, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 2001; Sirolli, 1999), but a *unified view* of ‘coming together’ may be harder to distinguish. The worldview of ‘coming together,’ espoused by Thomas Kuhn, draws its value as a ‘whole that is greater than the sum of its parts’. Some theoreticians consider the whole by first distinguishing each part (Adler & Van Doren, 1972, p. 142). Others rest on a biological claim of the whole being different from the sum of its parts (Westley et al., 2006, p. 7). Having academia emerge as Tillich’s ‘part of the whole’ (the world) from which they are simultaneously detached (the community) may question the viability of their commitment to community needs.

Overall, the core issues identified in the literature review contribute favorably to academia realizing their identity in community, and in controlling the discourse that emerges from community-university collaborations.

**Methodology**

*Research Approach*

We have seen that language can yield a different set of meanings within multiple frameworks. Critical discourse analysis offers these insights. Central to its purpose is a multidisciplinary approach that allows researchers a way to focus on societal issues from various
theoretical domains. Because the nature of its interpretative process draws on a wide range of discourses, few clear-cut techniques exist (Bazerman & Prior, 2004; Fairclough, 2003; Huckin, 2002; Luke, 2008; MacGregor, 2003; Phillips & Jorgensen, 2002; Seale, 2004a; van Dijk, 1993). Further, each researcher should identify his/her specific criticisms because critical discourse analysis is not considered a “holistic paradigm” (Wodak, 2002, p. 7). For these reasons, we cannot consider critical discourse analysis as a single theory (p. 7).

After careful consideration, I decided to base my research approach on Fairclough’s (2003a) interpretation of critical discourse analysis and van Dijk’s (1995) propositions on ideology. I want to look at ways in which discourse influences social reality as it unfolds for academia and marginalized groups.

Research Design

The research design included two stages. In the first stage, I researched the composition of a number of American community-university collaborations, looking for evidence of community based-learning programs and long-term commitment to social capital initiatives in distressed neighborhoods. The following collaborations matched the criteria: Downtown Education Collaborative (Bates College, Lewiston, Maine), East St. Louis Action Research Project (University at Urbana-Champaign, St. Louis, Illinois), Rhodes Hollywood-Springdale Partnership (Rhodes College, Memphis, Tennessee) and West Philadelphia Initiative (Pennsylvania State University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) (see Appendix A). The corpus of documents collected (newspaper articles, press releases, community reports, and topical academic articles) is publicly accessible. In the second stage, I used a qualitative software analysis tool, QSR International’s NVivo 8 software, to import, code, and classify the documents (Figure 1).
The aim of such a collaborative research practice is to deconstruct the research process to participants (Heinemann, 1999; Gomm & Hegg, 1999) and break down barriers created by captures and dissemination. Whittaker (1994) recognized how the self-disclosure helped break down barriers between herself and her participants. The underlying goal of this is to make the collaborative between researchers and participants to reach an understanding of the issues. (Leuten, 1994, cited in Leuten et al., 2000).

Reference 2: Percentage Coverage

Table 1: Critical social science perspective in research adopted a more critical view of social partnerships and made partnerships working as an analytical process involving the validation of interest groups with differential access to resources and roles.

Reference 3: Percentage Coverage

I relied on the method of constant comparison to reclassify an extensive number of significant phrases or terms with more clearly defined categories (Seale, 2004b, p. 235). A condensed list of key terms would then reflect consistency in later analyses (Table 1).
**TABLE 1 Key Terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td>A person who is academic in background, outlook, or methods. Scholarly to the point of being unaware of the outside world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors</td>
<td>Actor, doer, worker; a person who acts and gets things done (WordNet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency</td>
<td>Linked to sociologies which focus on the individual as a subject and view social action as something purposively shaped by individuals within a context to which they have given meaning (Online Dictionary of the Social Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>A society where people’s relations with each other are direct and personal and where a complex web of ties link people in mutual bonds of emotion and obligation (Online Dictionary of the Social Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse analysis</td>
<td>The way people talk about the world does not reflect some objective truth about that world, but instead reflects the success of particular ways of thinking and seeing. These ways of thinking and seeing tend to become invisible, because they are simply assumed to be truthful and right, and in this way people's thought processes themselves can come to represent and reinforce particular regimes of power and coercion. (Online Dictionary of the Social Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distressed community</td>
<td>A community where indicators of economic standing show significant weakness: unemployment, underemployment, homeownership rates, business formation rates, capital investment, valuations, percentage of substandard housing, outmigration and population loss. (Economic Development America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>A cluster of ideas and language/discourse that defines the way most people behave and think about a particular subject and that increasingly form the bases of major cleavages among people (In Theoretical Perspectives on Gender and Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideology</td>
<td>Any body of discourse that has the effect of masking and sustaining relations of power and inequality (In Theoretical Perspectives on Gender and Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalized</td>
<td>Relegated to a lower or outer edge, as of specific groups of people (WordNet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social construction</td>
<td>Rejecting the notion that events or social phenomena have an independent and objective existence, they examine the methods that members of society use to create or construct reality (Online Dictionary of the Social Sciences)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Method of Analysis**

It is my intention to examine community-university discourse as a relational approach to textual analysis, assessed at three basic levels (Fairclough, 2003b; Huckin, 2002, p. 26). At the ‘word’ level, I examine classification, connotation, and modality, which are useful for exploring how identities emerge through language. At the ‘sentence’ level, I analyze intertextuality to discern how texts recontextualize words and phrases from other texts. This is central to understanding that scholarly reports reuse existing text to frame new text and events. At the
‘text’ level, I examine access to discourse and use of the authorial voice. Lastly, I explore the significance of assumptions and their relation to ideology.

Word Level. Classification is one of the most challenging aspects of this research because the range of terms used to describe key domains is extensive. One document lists 23 synonyms for ‘civic engagement’ (Charles, 2005, p. 13) and 27 keywords or principles for ‘giving back to the community’ (p. 6-7). Community-university collaborations are “education, socialization, or research and development interventions” (Stephenson, 2003, p. 9) as well as “grassroots, community organizing” partnerships (Charles, 2005, p. 14). The concept of community-based learning is widely classified as integrated (Ramaley, 2007, pp. 2-3), experiential, student, or work-based learning, service learning, youth apprenticeship, place-based education, environmental education, and civic engagement (Owens & Wang, 1996, pp. 1-2; Reardon, 2006, p. 96; Zepke, 2005, pp. 171-173). These classifications support the general query I conducted that reveals the most frequent terms found in this data. The top five terms (over five characters in length) are community, research, social, development, and education (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register on Frequent Terms (over 5 characters)</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Source: All Data % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46.7 (2542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3 ( 776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.4 ( 730)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9 ( 700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7 ( 691)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (5439)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2 Word Frequency Query

Classification also plays a role in how social actors are realized in text in terms of identity. In this study, a word frequency query presented social actors primarily as generic representations.
In other words, residents, people, women, children, or populations were most often realized as residents ‘in general’ or people ‘in general’ (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Query on Social Actors (in order of frequency)</th>
<th>Source: Collaborations % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>27.0 (529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>11.6 (228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>10.8 (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>8.4 (164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6.5 (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>4.5 (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3.6 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>2.7 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2.4 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.3 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>2.1 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>2.1 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>2.1 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1.9 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.9 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1.2 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>1.1 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>1.0 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0.9 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>0.9 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0.9 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>0.6 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>0.5 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>0.4 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>0.4 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>0.4 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>0.3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>0.3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0.2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>0.2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>0.1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporters</td>
<td>0.1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities</td>
<td>0.1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>0.1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>0.1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>0.1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars</td>
<td>0.1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Social Actors</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 (1961)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3  Text Query on Social Actors

Connotations have “more conventionalized and changeable associative meanings” (Hall, 1999, p. 512). For example, in 1995, the Kellogg Commission exchanged the terms ‘research, teaching and service’ for ‘discovery, learning and engagement’ (Ramaley, 2007, p. 4). Community partnerships require a commitment to a “culture of evidence” (p. 13). Community
benefits range from “social capital” (Rubin & Rubin, 2001, p. 106), to “common good” to “planning gains” (Baxamusa, 2008, p. 263).

These examples show how classification and connotation may signify a “richer conception of public scholarship” (Ramaley, 2007, p. 6) for teacher and student experiences in community, but the range of terms and nuances (Huckin, 2002, p. 7) makes it difficult for social actors outside the domain to understand or contribute fully to something of which they are a part. The question becomes one of identity, “how people identify themselves and are identified by others” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 159).

Modality uses a number of techniques for deepening an understanding of identity through text. In this study, I wanted to examine the tone of the texts to determine how universities represented themselves in their commitments to distressed neighborhoods. Determining the tone of texts is done by looking for use of specific words, such as should, would, may, will, or be, that would indicate a degree of conviction on behalf of an individual or group (MacGregor, 2003, pp. 6-7).

Some of the language used evokes a strong sense of purpose. For example, during the early stages of the East St. Louis Action Research Project, the residents outlined their working relationship with the university. “Residents, not the university, would decide which issues to tackle. Residents would be involved in every part of the planning and development process” (Fischer, 2003a, p. 3). In turn, “[t]he University will assist the residents of Emerson Park in establishing their own community development corporation” (Reardon, 2006, p. 104).

Another article (“Partnership Fosters Ties,” 2007) supports local initiatives in Maine: “We want the downtown center … to be at once a home and a crossroads, a place where
educators and community partners can work together in new ways” [on launch of Education Collaborative].

Undoubtedly, the depth of institutional commitment undertaken by Penn State University is distinctive in its language because it addressed neighborhood revitalization as an “administratively driven approach that was academically informed” (Kromer & Kerman, 2004, p. 9). The initiative, they said, would not be part of an academic program, but would be “led and managed” by the University President and senior administrators (p. 9). The degree of conviction was discernible: “Only one entity had the capacity, the resources, and the political clout to intervene to stabilize the neighborhood quickly and revitalize it within a relatively short time period, and that was Penn [State University]” (p. 11).

The public statement from Penn State feeds into an important part of a relational approach to textual analysis. Text governs action. Thus, it becomes a matter of observing how those “who commit themselves to strong truth claims” exercise their convictions (Fairclough, 2003, p. 167). For Penn State, this meant a broad internal restructuring and the 1992 creation of the Center for Community Partnerships. For University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, empowerment planning emerged through the East St. Louis Action Research Project. The Rhodes College Hollywood-Springdale Partnership initiated community outreach. For the Downtown Education Collaborative (Bates College), their innovative model of inter-college cooperation and community partners signified a new direction in community collaboration.

**Sentence Level.** It is difficult to determine a specific focus for intertextuality because it does not reference a “standard shared analytic vocabulary” (Bazerman & Prior, 2004, p. 86) for borrowed words or phrases. Further, intertextuality is selective regarding what is included or excluded in text, depending on the use of a specific genre. Existing academic discourse
circulates frequently in research settings but has difficulty penetrating the community. Tinkler (2004a) points out that “research is not just about creating knowledge for the purpose of expanding academic disciplines but also about allowing individuals to understand their own realities” (p. 3).

At the sentence level, I apply Bazerman & Prior’s approach (p. 86-90) to distinguish how text draws on other texts:

- The text may draw on prior texts as a source of meanings to be used at face value. Examples located from this study include use of Boyer’s concepts of engaged institutions and public scholarships (Fogel & Cook, 2006, pp. 595-596; Ramaley, 2007, pp. 3-5; Reardon, 2006, pp. 95-107), Mezirow’s transformative learning model (Zepke, 2005, pp. 170-171), and Freire’s popular education concepts (Reardon, 2006, p. 98).


- A text relies on the available resources of language of the period. Some examples include digital divide (Turner & Pinkett, 2000, pp. 1-2), deliberative dialogue (Cherry & Sheftner, 2004, p. 230), co-operative planning (Mitchell, 200, para. 9), “trying to think beyond the walls” (Walker Davies, 2007, p. 2), and information poverty (Bennett & Roberts, 2004, p. 49). Note: Information poverty means people in poverty would benefit more in the collaboration process if they informed themselves on government policies and their own rights (p. 49).
• *The text may use language recognizably associated with the university, research, and textbooks.*

Common language includes community-based research, participatory research, action research and community empowerment (Banks & Mangan, 1999; Bazerman & Prior, 2004; Flicker, Savan, McGrath, Mildenberger & Kolenda, 2008; Owens & Wang, 1996; Radermacher & Sonn, 2007; Savan, 2004).

**Text Level.** At the text level, discourse is framed in relation to the authorial voice based on who has access to a particular genre (Fairclough, 2003, p. 67). I recorded 26 newspaper articles, newsletters, or other media. Of 36 voices ‘heard’, 62.1% were *directly reported* scholarly or business perspectives. Only 13.7% represented *directly reported resident perspectives*, and of those, most voices did not emerge from community-related publications (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News Genre</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly Reported (Scholarly)</td>
<td>62.1 (18.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly Reported (Scholarly) *</td>
<td>12.1 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly Reported (Residents)</td>
<td>13.7 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly Reported (Residents) *</td>
<td>12.1 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0 (29.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indirectly reported are assessed at 0.5 value.

**TABLE 4** Instances in News Genre at Text Level

Although the East St. Louis features (Kline, 2007) and the Rhodes “Discovering Wisdom” story (Kepple, 2006) moved the reader through a number of well-written accounts, these and other articles were recontextualized stories sanctioned by the academic community and directed to those readers. The stories focused mainly on the roles of professors and students as community partners (see Appendix B).
Identifying who has access to a genre also shows how a narrative is recontextualized for its readership. Two contrasting examples illustrate the polarization surrounding text and its consistency in a “particular social world” (Bazerman & Prior, 2004, p. 87). From the university, “Penn University Communications staff and consultants worked on strategic story placement with local and national print and broadcast media, in order to highlight the progress of the Initiatives and to establish Penn’s identity as an urban institution that was working successfully with its neighbors to complete an ambitious neighborhood revitalization agenda” (Kromer & Kerman, 2004, p. 14, italics added).

From the community, “[t]he People's Plan was created by and for those most impacted by development decisions in the downtown - its residents. We created a process inclusive of the many people who have felt unheard and undervalued in previous decision-making” (Saddlemire, 2008a, italics added).

Analysis at the text level provides the first documented acknowledgement to recognize marginalized groups as active partners in the collaborative efforts.

Assumptions and Ideologies. The last aspect of the critical discourse analysis project considers whether academia and marginalized groups could create a shared vision based on assumptions that emerge in text. Assumptions are significant in ideology because they support the notion that our taken-for-granted truths rest on the capacity of the dominant social order to shape ‘common ground’ (Fairclough, 2003, p. 55). As well, the use of preferred meanings (Hall, 1999, p. 513) and predetermined decisions (Briton, 1996, p. 44) embed everyday knowledge of social structures (Hall, p. 513). To complete this analysis, I inserted reflections recorded on each group into one of three tables representing the main types of assumptions associated with
ideology: ‘what exists’ (existential), ‘what can be’ (propositional) and ‘what is good and desirable’ (value) (Fairclough, 2003, p. 55) (see Appendix C).

Reflecting on assumptions in ideology illustrates four points. First, it situates van Dijk’s notion of ideology as the “interface between cognitive representations and processes underlying discourse…and the societal position and interests of social groups” (van Dijk, 1995, p. 18). Second, it helps us make practical sense of representations of academia and marginalized groups as social actors, to which Hebdige (1994) would challenge that a specific representation or ideology would prevail at any time, in any situation (p. 14). Third, it shows that the present reality (‘what exists’ or ‘what can be’) restricts those who are ready to act (‘what is desirable’), especially if they are consciously aware of their reality as a dynamic process, in constant transformation (Briton, 1996, p. 44; Freire, 2005, pp. 75-83; Newman, 1999, p. 85). Fourth, categorizing assumptions reveals a lessening ambiguity toward ‘difference’ and a move toward finding common ground. It is worthwhile to examine how approaches to ‘handling difference’ have gradually altered the taken-for-granted truths internalized by some socially marginalized groups in these collaborations.

One emerging theme finds marginalized groups emphasizing ‘difference’ as a way of normalizing hardship, “[w]henever she told people where she lived, they immediately defined her by her neighborhood’s deficiencies” (Fischer, 2003b, p. 4). Defined by others in this way extends a disempowering self-image for marginalized residents, as in feeling imprisoned “by outsider’s views of what [their] community was like” (p. 4) or in seeing faculty or students emerge as the authorial voice for their neighborhoods.

A second theme emphasizes the complexity surrounding attempts to resolve difference for and by marginalized groups. As one faculty member recounted, “The neighborhood and its
people have been demonized by the press for decades” (Reardon, 1999, p. 22). Additionally, published images of distressed communities compound the problem: “deteriorating homes and homelessness, desperation, drugs, and crime (Kepple, 2006, p. 1) to “poverty, heavy traffic, and recurrent crime” (Tyler, 2005, p. 12).

A third theme reveals how responsiveness to difference helps academia and marginalized groups find common solutions to drive community change. The following accounts show how actively responding to difference helps some marginalized groups recognize their collective power in community.

When Rhodes Urban Studies students toured the Hollywood-Springdale (Memphis) neighborhood, they wanted to make improvements immediately. The university quickly supported the student initiative and demonstrated its long-term commitment to the community with a neighborhood clean-up campaign. This was the beginning of the Rhodes Hollywood-Springdale Partnership. “I sat on a lot of front porches last summer, and I didn’t make any promises. Cox [resident and community organizer] reassured people that if they became involved, they would see results… even cleaning off a front porch or repairing a broken window can start a domino effect among neighbors on a single street” (Walker Davies, 2007, p. 3). Now, Cox manages Shasta Central, the local community resource center. With the university’s help and the strong determination of residents, neighborhood capacity building and housing renewal has improved.

In 2004, the Visible Community, a group of downtown Lewiston, Maine residents, initially formed to oppose a revitalization plan “to replace blocks of [downtown] apartments and tenement buildings with a boulevard” (Taylor, 2008, p. B2). They succeeded, and in doing so, gained enough momentum to champion “downtown development causes” (p. B2). In 2008, they
continued to create social capital by unveiling *The People’s Downtown Master Plan*, an 18-page document charting a course of action on matters of interest to downtown residents and the greater community (Saddlemire, 2008b). In 2009, they released a 90-minute feature-length documentary called “Neighbor by Neighbor: Mobilizing an Invisible Community in Lewiston, Maine” (Hartill, 2009). Although the film was produced by a Bates College graduate-‘turned downtown resident’, neither the People’s Plan document nor the feature film were discourse produced on behalf of a community-university collaboration. It was during this time (2004-2007), however, that discussions began with interested community partners to establish a Downtown Education Collaborative in Lewiston. The Collaborative made inroads early in 2007 by offering computer lab classes for residents, and by having students conduct a service-learning project on food assessment. A storefront operation opened in fall 2008.

Marginalized groups from these communities developed a critical consciousness of their environment, because they “own[ed] the focus and the outcome of a community development process” (Banks, 1999, p. 231). Publishing, distributing and presenting a resident plan demonstrated how the determination and solidarity of one low-income community group gave them a “sense of obligation to the group” (Charles, 2005, p. 12; Rubin & Rubin, 2001, pp. 90-91, 410). By seeing small victories emerge, marginalized groups are often, but not always, able to bootstrap successfully. The objective of Lewiston’s Visible Community group is simple, “to make things a little bit better for people. We can’t [sic] do big things, because we can’t [sic] afford to do big things. But we can do little things, like the bicycles [on chance for downtown residents to win one of 11 used bicycles]” (Taylor, 2008, p. B1).

This brings Tillich’s ‘part of the whole’ concept to the forefront for marginalized groups. Their contribution to the community development process helps them to become ‘part’ of the
whole (as they interpret it) even though they remain consciously aware of their ongoing struggle
to belong to the greater whole (society).

Theoretical Considerations

Exploring theoretical considerations in this study is not an easy task because I need to
link text to the very social structures and practices in society from which text is drawn. In order
to do this, I will explore concepts from both poststructuralist and postmodernist perspectives. To
begin, the findings from this analysis emphasize how social practices influence ways of acting
and being that come to bear on community change. This is not surprising to poststructuralists,
given the dialectical and interconnected relationship between discourse and social practices. It is
also not surprising when we consider “how discourse internalizes and is internalized…without
the different elements [of social practices] being reducible to each other” (Fairclough, 2003a). In
that sense, social practices “circulate as [different] discourses” (p. 207) in government, politics,
medicine, and social science. Accordingly, they emerge in community as representations of
what is, what can be, and what is good and desirable. As reflected by Macedo, social practices
also underscore how ways of acting and being are marked by representations that people identify
with in terms of comfort or level of understanding (Freire, 2005, p. 23). This is true of academia
and marginalized groups.

In taking this further, Foucault questions the way in which knowledge circulates and
functions (Foucault, 1994, p. 331). He suggests that ways of acting and being form knowledge
“that’s [sic] extracted from the individuals themselves and derived from their own behavior”
(Foucault, 1994, p. 84). From this knowledge, Foucault suggests that a second knowledge about
individuals emerges that could influence a dialectical relationship, such as the one involving
academia and marginalized groups:
“The individuals over whom power is exercised are either those from whom the knowledge they themselves form will be extracted, retranscribed, and accumulated according to new norms, or else objects of a knowledge that will also make possible new forms of control” (p. 84).

In particular, Foucault posits the interplay in power relationships as the core element in the relational character of power (Foucault, 1997, p. 168). Based on discourse analyzed in this study, I found that academia are likely to agree on an outcome of ‘addressing social needs’ but may have difficulty reaching a consensus on how to achieve this (Roberts & Woods, 2005, p 46). Likewise, marginalized groups are likely to be skeptical of the intentions of collaborative arrangements. Theoretically, a postmodern approach would support converging standpoints from both groups. A postmodern approach would indicate, while we may be a product of an institutional society, we need to recognize old and new patterns and be prepared to take “intellectual risks” (Newman, 1999, p. 201). The hard lesson here, what Stoecker (as cited in Tinkler, 2004a) calls a “radical construct of collaboration,” would be an attempt to share the power relationship between these groups.

Secondly, we need to explore truth claims as a theoretical consideration. If we pay attention to taken-for-granted truths, we observe how structured discourse tends to universalize particular meanings (Fairclough, 2003, p. 58). This would appeal to poststructuralists because of the “constructive function” of text and its recognition to the “centrality of language and discourse” (Luke, 2008, section 2, para. 2). Producing truth claims through universalized meaning may try to control knowledge circulation. Poststructuralists would argue that this does not necessarily contribute to real meaning, given the scope of discourses available. There are too many patterns from which to make a reasonable stand (Phillips & Jorgensen, 2002, p. 11).
Likewise, Foucault would try to determine what rules govern structured discourse. Ideally, there should be no questions about the dialectical process other than the issue that language cannot mirror social reality (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000, p. 138). Both postmodernists and discourse analysts have reached common ground in this conclusion (p. 137). Yet, the notion of universalizing meanings creates a paradox. On the one hand, community-university collaborations seek to empower marginalized groups by offering community services, educational opportunities, and job-training sessions. On the other hand, institutionalizing community-based research governs the order of discourse and confines subordinate groups to an ideological space in which dominant activity and behaviours are sustained (Hebdige, 1994, p. 16).

Conclusion

My research project applied a critical discourse analysis to explore if the collective power of socially marginalized groups in community emerges differently from that of academia. To explore this assumption, I analyzed discourse on community-university collaborations in distressed neighborhoods. From the outset, the following thoughts prevailed; namely, (1) discourse is shaped by participants, and discourse shapes participants, and (2) discourse is shaped by purpose, and discourse shapes possible purposes (Johnson, as cited in Somekh & Lewin, 2005, p. 148). I also relied on a fundamental question to guide my project because I wanted to look at some ways in which discourse influences social reality as it unfolds for academia and marginalized groups: *Does a scholarly approach to community collaboration correlate with the needs of a distressed community?*

Overall, the research suggests the possibility that entry points for change emerge in distressed neighbourhoods regardless of a scholarly approach to community change. At the same
time, however, community change is more inclined to succeed within a structured, controlled environment. A structured environment creates a good entry point for community-based education, which holds considerable promise for academia as a means of connecting with socially marginalized groups. These are positive entry points for change.

Conversely, institutionalizing community outreach is not a panacea for socially marginalized groups. Lack of access to knowledge and shared processes is one obstacle confronting these individuals. Therefore, we must be acutely aware of issues of power that stem from the increase in the institutionalization of activities and relationships in community, even though we look at community as an institution with pre-determined practices and identities.

In this analysis, I attempted to point out that texts are structured for specific readers, and that social actors are represented as particular identities in discourse. During my review, I looked at how theorists and researchers were addressing my research questions in terms of social constructionism. As I reflected on the dialectical process in community-university collaborations, I was disappointed to find the type of discourse that emerges is not truly representative of a community perspective. Further, it is ineffective in its representation of socially marginalized groups. I also found little evidence that addressed systemic issues in community. Instead, too many ‘good new stories’ disguised core issues in distressed neighbourhoods. While there is room to construct a shared vision for academia and marginalized groups in community, I believe this is an unresolved issue because the ideological differences between these groups are wide. Yet, the collective power of socially marginalized groups does not emerge under its own ideology. It emerges based on society’s pre-existing dominant paradigm implemented through controlled social practices. I was disappointed in my
explorations at this point because I hoped to discover extensive discourse of social transformation within community-university collaborations.

Yet, there is much to be learned through language alone. Language is a critical focus of attention in written text. It can also be a complicated medium to transport meaning (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000, p. 141-142). We must be alert to metaphors, assumption, and hidden meanings because we simply cannot ignore “how language is being used to make social inequality invisible” (Freire, 2005, p. 20).

Overall, I suggest that it should come down to meeting the needs of socially marginalized groups in the community. In Freire’s words, “the point of departure must always be with men and women in the here and now, which constitutes the situation within which they are submerged, from which they emerge, and in which they intervene” (Freire, 2005, p. 85). Fortunately, there is hope that radical new thinking will make us more alert to the influence of discourse in community-university collaborations, and the necessity to narrow the gap between these groups. I would welcome further research in this regard.
Note

[1] More information on these organizations can be found at http://www.compact.org/

References


Exploring Conceptions of Social Reality


December 6, 2008, from


NVivo qualitative data analysis software; QSR International Pty Ltd. Version 8, 2008. Reproduced with permission.


Exploring Conceptions of Social Reality

References

Appendix A Community-University Collaborations


References

Appendix B   News Genre at Text Level


Center for community partnerships: Ira Harkavy. Retrieved October 2, 2007 from http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v54/n06/harkavy.html


Appendix A  Community-University Collaborations

The sample represents a progressive view of capacity building and community renewal.

**Downtown Education Collaborative:** The Harward Center for Community Partnership (2002) was endowed by Bates College in Lewiston, Maine. The Center links civic responsibility and community engagement through academic endeavours. The Downtown Education Collaborative (2007) is a project of the Center, funded by seven partners and a grant from the Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust.

- **Model:** Community-based education and shared governance
- **Focus:** Community capacity; educational partnership; downtown community
- **Neighbourhood:** “census tracts that suffer from pervasive poverty, unemployment, and general distress” (Empower Lewiston. Strategic Plan Executive Summary, 2004)

**East St. Louis Action Research Project:** Community involvement as a university initiative began in 1987 in East St. Louis, Illinois. With the aid of numerous State and Federal grants, the East St. Louis Project, sponsored by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, grew from urban research initiatives and neighbourhood planning workshops to an expansive participatory action research project.

- **Model:** Action research; empowerment planning
- **Focus:** Capacity building; economic development; environmental restoration; public health
- **Neighbourhood:** “America’s Poorest Small City” (p. 86) (HUD as cited in Reardon, 2005)

**Rhodes Hollywood-Springdale Partnership:** Since 1995, Rhodes College has connected with the Hollywood-Springdale community in Memphis, Tennesee, through civic engagement and service learning. The Rhodes Hollywood-Springdale Partnership was formed in 2005 with a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

- **Model:** Community-based education and outreach
- **Focus:** Capacity building; housing renewal; community health; opportunities for youth
- **Neighbourhood:** “the zip code [38108] with the nation’s highest infant mortality rate” (Walker Davies, 2007, p. 1)

**West Philadelphia Initiative:** The Center for Community Partnership was founded in 1992. Its strategy of linking distressed neighbourhoods to public schools, community organizations and the faith community is a nationally recognized model of university civic engagement.

- **Model:** Academically-based community service, community development
- **Focus:** Environment, Health, Arts, Education
- **Neighbourhood:** deteriorated neighbourhood, population decline, crime, vandalism
### Appendix B  News Genre at Text Level

#### East St. Louis Project (ESL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Voices Heard</th>
<th>Point of View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| News-Gazette                    | 12-23-07  | Positive Partnership - UI Program changes lives in East St. Louis - but maybe in Champaign-Urbana more (Kline, 2007a) | Directly Reported: professors, students and mayor | Scholarly Discourse  
Indirectly Reported: resident's comments; neighbourhood concerns |
| News-Gazette                    | 12-23-07  | Project has become a family affair (Kline, 2007b)                                                 | Directly Reported: professor and daughter, (student)            | Scholarly Discourse  
Stresses strength of community partners and reciprocity of relationships |
| News UIUC                       | 10-25-07  | 20-year-old partnership with East St. Louis reaps many benefits for residents, students (Mitchell, 2007) | Directly Reported: professors                                    | Scholarly Discourse  
Praises student achievement |
| News-Gazette                    | 05-11-03  | "A Win-Win Opportunity for all of us” - UI students design house to help revitalize East St. Louis (Wurth, 2003a) | Directly Reported: professor                                    | Scholarly Discourse  
Discusses joys and challenges of architectural program in East St. Louis |
| News-Gazette                    | 05-11-03  | UI alum builds homes where others won’t (Wurth, 2003b)                                            | Directly Reported: project developer (former UIUC student)      | Business article;  
discusses give back  
Built 80 homes in East St Louis |
| ‘Bridges’ of Federal Reserve Bank | 2002-03  | East St. Louis: One City's Story (Fischer, 2003a)                                                 | Directly Reported: professor                                    | Scholarly Discourse  
Describes revitalization  
Credits local resident association |
| ‘Bridges’ of Federal Reserve Bank | 2002-03  | A Fresh Start in Distressed Cities (Fischer, 2003b)                                              | Directly Reported: CD specialist; professor, Board governor     | Financial Industry perspective  
Short coverage on progress of East St Louis project |
| Liberal Education (85) 3        | 1999      | A Sustainable Community/University Partnership (Reardon, 1999)                                      | Directly Reported: student                                      | Scholarly Discourse  
Timeline and Milestones  
Discusses transformation for students |
Describes effort of faculty, students and activities in transforming community |
### Rhodes Hollywood-Springdale Partnership (RHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Headline</strong></th>
<th><strong>Voices Heard</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point of View</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Coverage: WMCTV</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Mid-South community taking back neighborhood with name change (Birch, 2008)</td>
<td>Directly Reported: residents and program manager of community center</td>
<td>Community Discourse, Describes name change as part of neighborhood facelift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes Magazine</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Discovering Wisdom in a Whole New World (Kepple, 2006)</td>
<td>Directly Reported: professors Directly Reported: residents</td>
<td>Scholarly Discourse, Celebrates achievements of partnership, for professors, students and residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media WMCTV</td>
<td>06-27-06</td>
<td>Locals comment on community outreach program (2006)</td>
<td>Directly Reported: interview with residents and program manager of community center</td>
<td>Community discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media WHBQ</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>A model for revitalization (as cited in Kepple, 2006)</td>
<td>Indirectly Reported: professors Indirectly Reported: residents</td>
<td>Community discourse, Summarizes positive change for neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media: WREG</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>People who live in the area say the program makes the neighbourhood a better place to live (as cited in Kepple, 2006)</td>
<td>Indirectly Reported: professors Indirectly Reported: residents</td>
<td>Community discourse, Summarizes positive change for neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media: WMC</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>A credit to the community (as cited in Kepple, 2006)</td>
<td>Indirectly Reported: professors Indirectly Reported: residents</td>
<td>Community discourse, Summarizes positive change for neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Downtown Education Collaborative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Voices Heard</th>
<th>Point of View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun Journal</td>
<td>07-24-08</td>
<td>YADA L-A celebrates positive interactions (2008)</td>
<td>Directly Reported: City Manager</td>
<td>Community Discourse, Downtown Youth Civic Engagement Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Journal</td>
<td>03-23-08</td>
<td>Group unveils downtown plan (2008)</td>
<td>Directly Reported: downtown residents</td>
<td>Community Discourse, Describes overview of People’s Downtown Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Center for Community Partnerships, West Philadelphia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Voices Heard</th>
<th>Point of View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPenn website</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>UPenn COPC Center Announces Release of Neighborhood Revitalization Toolkit</td>
<td>Directly Reported: -----</td>
<td>Scholarly Discourse, Guide for neighbourhood renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPenn website</td>
<td>10-02-07</td>
<td>Center for Community Partnerships: Ira Harkavy</td>
<td>Directly Reported: dean</td>
<td>Scholarly Discourse, Provides overview of Center and Harkavy’s role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netter Center website</td>
<td>10-02-07</td>
<td>The Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships</td>
<td>Directly Reported: president, founding director</td>
<td>Scholarly Discourse, Honours benefactors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Pennsylvanian</td>
<td>02-01-00</td>
<td>West Philadelphia Initiative looks to improve city (Ambrogi, 2000)</td>
<td>Directly Reported: vice-president</td>
<td>Community Discourse, Describes neighbourhood improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C  Assumptions

### Table 1. EXISTENTIAL (What Exists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC</th>
<th>MARGINALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “I had no frame of reference for how dilapidated it was...It took several visits and several trips down...before I realized that people could possibly live there” (Reardon, 1999, p. 3)</td>
<td>• “Under your partnership model, we’re not even the tail on the dog, not even the flea on the tail, but the little flealet hoping to land on the flea, hoping to land on the tail of the dog.” (Reardon, 2005, p. 94).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Claiming that the participants and I were all ‘equals’ in the research relationship when I clearly had more decision-making authority and an academic report to write provides just one example of how an attempt to be empowering may have been compromised” (Radermacher &amp; Sonn, 2007, p. 71).</td>
<td>• “The myths come in the form of disparaging remarks about how none of us work and none of us pay taxes, suggesting that we aren’t really worth much as human beings” (Saddlemire, 2008b, p. 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “You can tutor until you are blue in the face, but until you are out there in the community, actually meeting families and performing tangible services for community adults, you are merely scratching the surface of this complex problem we call educational inequality (“Rhodes receives $5000 grant”, 2005).”</td>
<td>• “We internalize these negative ideas about ourselves since we see and hear them all the time” (Saddlemire, 2008b, p. 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Under your partnership model, we're not even the tail on the dog, not even the flea on the tail, but the little flealet hoping to land on the flea, hoping to land on the tail of the dog.” (Reardon, 2005, p. 94).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. PROPOSITIONAL (What Can Be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC</th>
<th>MARGINALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “What they often lack are the organizational and financial resources necessary to bring about change” (Participatory Planning, 2002)</td>
<td>• “When I used to come back here, I would get off the interstate and drive through the neighborhood, and think ‘somebody ought to do something,’” she says. “Little did I know I would be that someone” (Walker Davies, 2007, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “We’ve always kind of nibbled at these things...but we never had the institutional support for it to be – quote, unquote – part of our regular job. Suddenly, it was.” (Walker Davies, 2007, p. 2)</td>
<td>• “Most [of the residents here] have been taught, ‘They will change it for us,’” Cox says. “I tell them ‘No, we’re going to do it together.’” (Walker Davies, 2007, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. VALUE (What is Good or Desirable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC</th>
<th>MARGINALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We learn from the residents, it’s not one-way (Mitchell, 2007).</td>
<td>• I think the project will have succeeded when it is administered entirely by neighborhood residents (Kepple, 2006, p. 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “We had a thousand dots but we weren’t connecting them. Now, we can envision all kinds of important projects: research into community health, computer projects that teach grassroots groups how to use digital technologies” (“Partnership fosters ties, 2008)</td>
<td>• What I see is more sense of community. People looking out for each other, talking more. They want to get involved. (“Locals comment”, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “In every encounter with our community partners I am learning something new! Where else would I get this kind of opportunity” (Origins, 2002)</td>
<td>• “If you eliminate derelict houses and empty lots, keep streets clean and cut down on crime, you have a neighborhood” (Wurth, 2003b, p. A3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>