

Copyright
by
Jessica L. Dunning-Lozano
2015

**The Dissertation Committee for Jessica L. Dunning-Lozano Certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:**

**Removal, Isolation, and Discipline in Texas Schools: An Ethnographic
Study of a 6th - 12th Grade Disciplinary Alternative Education
Program**

Committee:

Javier Auyero, Co-Supervisor

Robert Crosnoe, Co-Supervisor

Simone Browne

Ben Carrington

John Hartigan

**Removal, Isolation, and Discipline in Texas Schools: An Ethnographic
Study of a 6th - 12th Grade Disciplinary Alternative Education
Program**

by

Jessica L. Dunning-Lozano, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

**The University of Texas at Austin
May 2015**

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my parents, Rosa and Edward.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisers and dissertation committee co-chairs, Dr. Javier Auyero and Dr. Robert Crosnoe, for all of their support and guidance throughout the long process of conducting fieldwork and writing the dissertation. Dr. Auyero and Dr. Crosnoe have been invaluable mentors to me; they believed in my project and provided me with the methodological and theoretical tools to successfully undertake this research. I sincerely thank you both for everything.

I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Simone Browne, Dr. Ben Carrington, and Dr. John Hartigan for their valuable feedback and generous giving of their time over the years to discuss various aspects of my project.

I also want to recognize and thank the various funding sources that supported this research: Center for Mexican-American Studies Dissertation Fellowship, the C.B. Smith Endowment in Mexico-US Relations, University of Texas President's Fellowship, the American Sociological Association Minority Fellowship Program, the Marilyn Yarbrough Dissertation/ Teaching Fellowship Program, and the National Academy of Education/ Spencer Dissertation Fellowship Program.

There many other key people and mentors who have been vital to my academic trajectory and the completion of this dissertation. I would also like to thank Dr. Omar McRoberts, my Master's thesis adviser at the University of Chicago, for encouraging my early research interests in ethnography and alternative education. Dr. Mary Kelsey, my undergraduate honors thesis adviser at UC Berkeley, who suggested so many years ago

that I consider pursuing a PhD in Sociology. Manuel Alcala, my academic advisor at Laney College, for lighting a fire under me and pushing me to pursue a four-year college degree. My continuation high school principal and vice principal, Mrs. Constance Hubbard and the late Barry Shapiro; I thank you both for every single opportunity - the second, third, and fourth chances - you gave me, and for envisioning more for me at a time when I could not.

I also want to thank my family, my mother Rosa and my father Edward, and my sisters Audra and Suzette. My niece Marisa, whose presence in this world changed my life and gave me something to fight for. Johnny, whose dreams and ambition inspired me to strive for more, and David and Eric, whose compassion and friendship kept me afloat. Lastly, my partner Sergio and our daughter Naela, thank you for being my family, for supporting me, and for giving me hope.

Removal, Isolation, and Discipline in Texas Schools: An Ethnographic Study of a 6th - 12th Grade Disciplinary Alternative Education Program

Jessica L. Dunning-Lozano, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2015

Co-Supervisors: Javier Auyero and Robert Crosnoe

Abstract: This dissertation investigates the school-level impact of punitive zero-tolerance education policies through an ethnographic study of the daily practices in place at a 6th – 12th grade Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) in Texas. This is the first ethnography of a public DAEP in Texas, a product of zero-tolerance policy designed to punish and secondly to educate. The analysis draws from a rich set of data consisting of 27 months of participant observations, 12 of these months as a substitute teacher, 90 in-depth interviews with program staff, students, parents, student survey, and an archive of student disciplinary documents. The study addresses four research questions: 1) How does the penetration of the carceral arm of the criminal justice system into public schools affect the quality of education? 2) How is discipline accomplished in this program, specifically, what are its forms, how does it vary, what is the extent of its operation, and what are its effects? 3) How does this experience vary by race, gender, class, and citizenship status? And 4) How do these disciplinary practices impact teachers, students, and families? DAEPs have little state oversight, a dropout rate five times higher than mainstream schools in Texas, and have become a more common academic transition point for boys, Latinos, black, and low-income youth. This in-depth study of a DAEP

offers a nuanced understanding of the form, effects, variation, and extension of discipline within and beyond the program's bounds, and contributes to our understanding of the micro-effects of punitive school policies on children, their families, and school authorities. Additionally, it examines one way the punitive state exerts discipline over marginalized youth populations through disciplinary school practices. Lastly, the dissertation provides the knowledge needed to improve the educational experiences of the most vulnerable youth populations.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	xii
List of Figures	xiii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Setting the Stage	5
DAEP Field Site.....	5
Alternative Education	8
Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs in Texas.....	9
Organization of Dissertation	12
Chapter Three: School Ethnography.....	15
Gaining Access	16
27 Months in the Field	16
Ethnography	19
Recruitment.....	20
Interviews.....	20
Ethical Considerations	22
Becoming a Substitute	23
Interviewee Demographics	24
Data Analysis	25
Student Survey	27
2011 - 2012 Archive of Disciplinary Documents	27
Reflexivity in the Field	28
A Note on Teachers	31
Chapter Four: From Deficient Students to Docile Bodies: School Discipline, Race, and Rehabilitation in Texas	36
School Discipline	40
The Induction Period.....	44
Orientation: an Introduction to the Rules.....	46

Moralizing Speeches	57
Variation in Student Discipline.....	61
Discussion	63
Transforming "Culturally Deficient" Students into Docile Bodies	65
Conclusion	68
Chapter Five: Gang Members, Hood Rats, and Decent Kids: How Teachers Draw Distinctions between students in a Disciplinary School Setting.....	73
Schools, Zero Tolerance, & Inequalities.....	75
Findings.....	82
The Largest Concentration of Gangs in Central Texas.....	83
Threatening and Unpredictable Kids	88
We don't need Hoochie Mama up in here!	90
The Decent Kids	98
Who Gets a Successful Day?	109
Discussion	112
Chapter Six: Punishing Students, Punishing Families: How Parents are incorporated into the Disciplinary Mission of Alternative Schools.....	118
Conceptual Argument	120
Systems, Families, and Inequality	122
Forms of Discipline: "Your son is out of dress code, can you bring him a new pair of shoes?"	125
New Parent/Student Orientation	125
Night Classes	128
Request for Parent's Presence at the DAEP	130
Parents' Experiences: "Parents, you are here too"	132
Making it to Class	138
Parent Meetings with Staff.....	144
How Parents Make Sense of Punishment: "I'd rather have her in DAEP than, like I said, here at the house falling farther behind"	153
Middle-Class Parents	159
Discussion	164

Chapter Seven: Conclusion.....	170
Brief Summary of Dissertation Findings	172
Future Research Directions.....	175
Assessing "Tough Love Academies"	175
Revisiting the Goals of Alternative Education	176
The Objectives of DAEP Legislation	177
An Alternative to DAEPs.....	180
Appendix 1: Recruitment Flyer	183
Appendix 2: Interviewee Demographics	184
Appendix 3: Staff Interview Guide	200
Appendix 4: Student Interview Guide	203
Appendix 5: Parent Interview Guide	207
Appendix 6: Staff & Teacher Consent Form	210
Appendix 7: Parent / Legal Guardian Consent Form for Students	213
Appendix 8: Parent / Legal Guardian Consent Form.....	216
Appendix 9: Student Survey	219
References.....	225

List of Tables

Table 1: Parent Interviewee Demographics	184
Table 2: Teacher Interviewee Demographics	187
Table 3: Student Interviewee Demographics	190

List of Figures

Figure 1: Condemned DAEP Hallway.....	7
Figure 2: Number 1 Rule English.....	49
Figure 3: Number 1 Rule Spanish.....	49
Figure 4: Boys Town Life Skills Scripts.....	60
Figure 5: DAEP Student Dress Code.....	133

Chapter One: Introduction

Between 1970 and 2009, the rate of incarceration in the United States increased at an astronomical pace (Garland 2001; Pew Center 2009; Wacquant 2009; Western and Muller 2013) making the U.S. the most incarcerated nation in the world (Pew Center 2009). This growth has not been experienced uniformly across the American populace, but disproportionately affects poor and nonwhite communities (Bobo and Thompson 2006, 2010). At the same time, juvenile offenders - low income youth and children of color in particular - faced more punitive sentencing for nonviolent crimes and continue to be subject to heightened forms of surveillance (Feld 1999; Rios 2007, 2011; Deitch et al. 2009; Chavez-Garcia 2012). Significantly, the criminalization of nonviolent offenses and intensified management of "criminal" populations have spread beyond carceral facilities and moved into other social institutions (Braman 2004; Clear 2007; Simon 2007; Alonso et al. 2009). In this novel pattern of surveillance and law enforcement, family members, community based organizations, and public schools have come to assume many of the disciplinary and policing tasks traditionally held by the criminal justice system (Comfort 2008; Haney 2010; Rios 2011). Scholars have contextualized this phenomenon as an example of punitive social control by the state over marginalized populations (Wacquant 2009; Simon 2007; Soss, Fording and Schram 2011).

A major source of this encroachment in public education has been the implementation of zero tolerance policies by school districts across the country (Casella 2003; Reyes 2006; Meiners 2007; Hirschfield 2008; Alonso et al. 2009). My research

examines one way the punitive state exerts discipline over marginalized youth populations through disciplinary school practices. By design, zero tolerance entangles public schools with the juvenile justice system and creates a symbiotic relationship between the two as they frequently exchange information on students' misbehavior both inside and outside of school bounds (Reyes 2006; Kupchik and Monahan 2006). The growth of zero-tolerance school policies and novel relationships between public schools and the criminal justice system left me with several overarching questions: What happens when the criminal justice system becomes enmeshed with public education? What types of educational structures do these odd bedfellows produce, who matriculates through them, and what is their experience?

To address these questions my dissertation investigates the daily operation and accomplishment of discipline in a public Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) in Texas, which are a product of punitive zero-tolerance school level policies and emblematic of the growing carceral reach of the juvenile justice system into the institution of public education. I scrutinize this growing phenomenon in the establishment of DAEPs through the first ethnography of a single 6th – 12th grade public DAEP in the state.¹ In Texas, state-wide legislation to remove so called "terrorist" youth to DAEPs was successfully passed in 1995; at the height of zero tolerance school policy implementation (Fowler and Lightsey 2007: 130). DAEPs often operate in lockdown facilities and house students who have been removed from their school of origin for

¹This research has been approved under study number: 2010-07-0059 by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Texas, Austin.

violating the student code of conduct at their regular schools or engaging in criminal activity.

This research addresses four sociological questions aimed at enhancing our knowledge of what happens in these programs and to illuminate how children on the margins of society experience schooling: 1) How does the penetration of the carceral arm of the criminal justice system into public schools affect the quality of education children receive in DAEPs? 2) How is discipline accomplished in this program, specifically, what are its forms, how does it vary, what is the extent of its operation, and what are its effects? 3) How does this process and the way it is experienced vary by the multiple categories of race, gender, class, and citizenship status that youths occupy? And 4) How do these disciplinary practices impact the teachers, students and the families of the children who attend them?

Unlike mainstream public schools, DAEPs are designed first to discipline, contain, and isolate students from their mainstream peers, and secondly to provide them with an education (Fowler and Lightsey 2007; Cortez and Danini 2009). But *how* this punitive and remediating process unfolds within these programs is largely unknown. Research into the day-to-day practices and processes that occur in DAEPs is limited, in particular research that is focused on the modes of discipline present in DAEPs, their academic structure, and the experiences of students, parents, staff and teachers who work in them. Studies conducted on school discipline in Texas have demonstrated that black, Latino, and special education students are overrepresented in referrals to DAEPs, which

mirrors the overall disparate trend in school disciplinary actions across the state (Levin 2006; Fowler and Lightsey 2010; Fabelo et al. 2011). DAEPs in Texas are overrepresented by boys (74%), Latinos (48%), Black (26%), low-income children, and youths identified as having an intellectual disability or emotional disorder (25%) (Cortez and Danini 2009).

In Texas, DAEPs operate with very little state oversight with respect to their disciplinary and academic structure. After 14 years of DAEP implementation it was only in 2009 that the Texas Legislature required a set of uniform standards to be developed and enforced across DAEPs in the state, yet there is no system in place that requires the Texas Education Agency to enforce these standards or evaluate their application (Fowler and Lightsey 2010). Additionally, DAEP referral and enrollment in Texas increases a child's risk for early school dropout and probability for future involvement in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems (Carmichael, Whittan, and Voloudakis 2005; Fowler and Lightsey 2007). This in-depth study of a DAEP illuminates the school-level consequences of zero-tolerance education policies and offers a nuanced understanding of the form, effects, variation, and extension of discipline within and beyond the program's bounds. In doing so, the study demonstrates one way zero-tolerance policies are experienced and implemented on the ground and facilitate the interpenetration between the criminal justice system and public schools.

Chapter Two: Setting the Stage

The current chapter will set the stage for readers to think about where this work was situated and how Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs came into existence.

DAEP FIELD SITE

The DAEP field site was located in Hawthorne, Texas; a diverse city with a booming high tech industry and ancillary business growth that has increased race/ ethnic and class cleavages across the city, making it one of the most racially and economically segregated cities in the U.S. This pattern of isolation and segregation of certain communities in particular areas of Hawthorne is reflected in the racial composition of the numerous public high schools and middle schools across the school district.

The Hawthorne DAEP is situated on a small hillcrest in an eastside neighborhood of the city. The program is housed in a traditional 1940s-era school building with a chain-link fence along the eastern side of the structure and a series of portable classrooms on the western side. To the north the DAEP overlooks the Marcus Garvey Housing Project, from which many DAEP students walk at the beginning of the day or disappear to after an "LWOP," the acronym for "Leaving Campus Without Permission," and hosts clusters of neighborhood youth and DAEP students throughout the school day. Beyond the eastern chain-link fence is a local community college, and in the distant, but visible western horizon appears a high-rise dotted city skyline.

The DAEP building itself is antiquated and a third of it has been officially condemned by the city. In the condemned area, exposed wires hang from the ceiling and

water stained perforated ceiling slats remain hazardously interspersed between these openings. Stacks of school desks and electronic equipment, akin to giant Jenga towers on the verge of collapse, precariously line the hallways. Even with these dilapidated conditions, DAEP staff have fashioned areas of the condemned sector into storage space, a break station, and a janitor's office. The building has had several lives, previously serving as a satellite campus for the neighboring community college, and up until the late 1970's as one of the cities' segregated all black high schools. The facility's current incarnation as a DAEP began in 1996. Program director Dr. Hernandez describes the DAEP as a "lockdown" public education facility during parent-student orientations. The building has a total of four double-door and three single-door exits, all of which remain locked throughout the day and are managed by two security guards.

The building has the shape of an upper-case H. The long sides make up the high school and middle school wings of the program and the remaining hall contains a series of bathrooms, two locked restrooms for staff and two gender segregated restrooms for students. The entryways to the student restrooms have no doors. The school cafeteria is located in the far northern corner, across from the on-site Hawthorne Unified School District Police hub, which is shared by two armed police officers, one assigned to the middle school and the other to the high school, and hosts various law enforcement and professional personnel throughout the week. In addition to the 6th through 8th grade classrooms, the "middle school side" of the program houses the rooms for youths of all ages with severe intellectual and emotional disabilities, the student orientation classroom for all grades, the counselors' offices, and the library.



Figure 1: Condemned DAEP Hallway

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION

Alternative education encompasses a variety of public and private schools, ranging from charter schools and community day schools to punitive education programs such as DAEPs (Lange and Sletten 2002; Aron 2006; Lehr, Tan, and Ysseldyke 2009). Alternative education enrollment has increased over the past decade, in part due to zero tolerance policies, but also due to the charter school movement (Reyes 2006; Saltman 2007). Students of color, in particular black and Latino male youths, low-income children, and youths identified as learning disabled are overrepresented in this growth. These demographics have raised concerns over the quality of education in the alternative school realm (Kelley 1993; Dunbar 1999, 2001; Muñoz 2004; Foley and Pang 2006; Simmons 2007).

Critics of alternative schools geared towards "at-risk" youths have criticized these educational alternatives for utilizing curriculums that neither prepares youths for post-secondary success or counts towards high school completion (Kelley 1993; Dunbar 2001, 1999; Muñoz 2004; Foley and Pang 2006; Simmons 2008). Instead of focusing on academic rigor, the structure of these schools and pedagogical emphasis on rote memory tasks and "behavioral techniques" may support the assessment that they have become intermediary spaces in the early life-course to prepare youths for direct entry into the adult correctional system or easy slippage in to low-wage work (Dunbar 2001, 1999; Casella 2003; Lipman 2003). Rather than provide an alternative schooling space

conducive to reach students otherwise disenchanted with mainstream schooling, DAEPs exist to punish, remediate, and contain students.

DISCIPLINARY ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN TEXAS

Within the broad range of public alternative options, DAEPs in Texas have a unique origin (Aron 2006). During former Texas Governor George W. Bush's State of the State address to the 74th legislature, he implored senate and house representatives to adopt zero tolerance school legislation: "We must adopt one policy for those who terrorize teachers or disrupt classrooms—zero tolerance" (Fowler and Lightsey 2007). The Governor's endorsement of "Tough Love Academies" - or DAEPs - to house disruptive students led to the insertion of Chapter 37 into the Texas Education Code as a central feature of The Texas Safe Schools Act of 1995 (Fowler and Lightsey 2007: 130). Chapter 37 sought to ensure a safe and effective learning environment for students and educators by removing errant and violent students from the classroom while simultaneously providing an alternative schooling space for those removed to continue their education. Despite the official policy objectives of the legislation that created DAEPs, theory is not always borne out in reality. By expanding the categories for alternative school referral to include discretionary violations, Chapter 37 collapsed trivial, nonviolent transgressions with more serious offenses, such as violent assault and weapons possession to qualify for forced placement into a DAEP (Cortez and Montecel 1999; Reyes 2001; Fowler and Lightsey 2007). DAEPs also now serve as a point of re-entry to the public school system

for recent juvenile releases from the Texas Juvenile Justice Department in lieu of a direct transition into regular public schools.

To date, discretionary referrals constitute 80% percent of all student removals to DAEPs in Texas (Cortez and Danini 2009: 30). Problematically, grounds for a discretionary removal to a DAEP is determined by the teachers and school administrators at a child's school of origin, who operate within broad state guidelines to justify this type of removal (Reyes 2006; Cortez and Danini 2009: 30). As a result, discretionary referrals, most commonly offenses such as acts of "student insubordination" (i.e. talking back to teachers, disrupting the teacher's ability to teach class) (Reyes 2006; Cortez and Danini 2009: 30), are highly subjective and variable within and across school districts (Reyes 2001; Fabelo et al. 2011)

Importantly, the general outcomes of students who attend DAEPs are quite bleak. Despite their public endorsement as a means to safeguard schools, referrals to DAEPs have exacerbated the low academic outcomes of youths who attend them (Reyes 2001). DAEPs have a dropout rate five times higher than mainstream schools in Texas and, similar to other states, a large number of people involved in the adult criminal justice system in Texas are school dropouts (Pettit and Western 2004; Carmichael et al.2005). DAEP students are more likely to face severe disciplinary actions, such as expulsion from the public school district, for minor rule breaking and misbehavior than their mainstream school peers. The implementation of zero tolerance education policies across Texas has significantly increased the likelihood of public school students' future involvement in the

juvenile justice system (Fabelo et al. 2011). Moreover, removal to DAEPs may criminalize children with perceived disciplinary problems, which, when substantiated, typically indicate academic struggle, not proclivities to violence (Reyes 2001; Lipman 2003). Given evidence that educational attainment factors into life-long earnings, health, family formation, fertility, not to mention criminal activity (Mirowsky and Ross 2003; Goldin and Katz 2008), these programs may in fact contribute to the very societal problems they were established to reduce.

Organizations such as the public interest law center Texas Appleseed and education researchers have critiqued DAEPs as an integral pathway into the "school-to-prison pipeline" for many working-class, black, and Latino youth. Specifically, scholars argue that biased student removal practices and the unregulated operation of DAEPs in Texas position these programs as "feeders" into the criminal justice system (Carmichael et al. 2005; Reyes 2006; Fowler and Lightsey 2007; Fabelo et al. 2011). Thus far, however, studies have not examined the micro-level institutional practices by which DAEPs may operate to funnel youths into the criminal justice system. This dissertation fills this void by focusing on how power is enforced through DAEP disciplinary practices, students' prescribed interactions with school and police authorities, and the program's expectations for bodily comportment and behavior.

In the case study DAEP, the demographic breakdown of the student body is even more skewed by race, class, and gender than the state averages. Whereas the average white student enrollment for the district as a whole is 24%, this population accounts for

7% of the enrollment at the DAEP, these numbers for black students: 9.5% and 26%, and Latinos: 60% and 64% respectively, show these latter two groups to be overrepresented at the DAEP, especially black and Latino boys. While the district has a near even distribution of male and female students, the DAEP student body is approximately 80% male, and the majority of enrolled students are free lunch eligible (85%). In terms of referral offenses, during the 2011 - 2012 school year, 50% of students were referred to the DAEP for being under the influence of drugs, or suspicion of being under the influence of drugs, most commonly marijuana; 10% were referred for "possession of alcohol"; 20% were referred for "insubordination," a broad behavioral category that could indicate a variety of behaviors such as being "rude to an adult" or student; 5% were sent for making a "terroristic threat"; and the remaining 15% were removed to the DAEP for violent offenses, ranging from fights with other students, "physical harm to an adult," "aggravated robbery," or more severe Title 5 offenses, which include assaultive offenses and sexual offenses (see last pages 43–49 of this chapter for teacher, student, and parent interviewee demographics).

ORGANIZATION OF DISSERTATION

The dissertation is organized in the following order: Chapter 3 covers my methodological strategy, data sources, analysis and ethical considerations. Chapter 4 examines the formal rules and disciplinary practices in place at the DAEP and how students are oriented to them during their new student enrollment and introductory period, what I term the "induction period." The analysis focuses on students' introductory experience as a

“strategic research site” to illuminate the program’s formal objectives, methods to achieve their institutional goals, and their effects on students. Drawing from Michel Foucault's (1977) concept of docile bodies and Ann Arnett Ferguson's (2001) conceptualization of culturalism and double displacement, I argue that the practices and procedures in place at the DAEP constitute “disciplinary technologies” devoted to the transformation of "culturally deficient" students - a racialized and gendered classification - into docile bodies. I find that students are disciplined through punitive and rehabilitative methods premised on the discursive construction of "deficient" students and families and examine how DAEPs may form integral links in the school to prison pipeline.

Chapter 5 examines the categories DAEP staff draw on to make distinctions across the DAEP student body, who arrive at the program as an undifferentiated mass of "bad" students. The chapter illuminates how DAEP practices and dominant repertoire of student categories (re)produces social inequality, in particular race and gender biases, and class inequality. Extending Pierre Bourdieu's (1989) concept of "academic taxonomies," and Gilda Ochoa's (2013) "academic profiling," the chapter demonstrates how, despite the ostensible homogeneity of the student body in terms of misbehavior, DAEP staff make distinctions between the "legitimately bad" students and those who momentarily lacked good judgment or made innocuous mistakes. I find that these dominant categories drawn on by teachers tend to privilege white and middle-class students, and doubly subjects black and Latino students to academic profiling. The chapter discusses the implications of these findings, particularly with respect to the inconsistent enforcement of

discipline, how privilege operates in programs like DAEPs, and the importance of staffs' evaluation of students and the disciplinary practices staff enact at the DAEP.

Chapter 6 considers how the discipline and remediation aimed at DAEP students extends to their parents/ guardians. I qualify Megan Comfort's (2008) reconceptualization of Donald Clemmer's (1958) concept of "prisonization" into "secondary prisonization," which describes how punishment focused on male prisoners is extended to their non-criminal female partners, into the universe of the DAEP. The findings suggest that DAEP rules subject families, in particular low-income black and Latina mothers, to what I term "secondary discipline," where they are drawn into the disciplinary regime of the program and subject to penal scrutiny and surveillance alongside their children. Parents are subjected to many of the same consequences for student rule-breaking as their children. Most prominent among them being "dress code," infractions, attendance of night classes, and mandatory and nonobligatory meetings with staff. Through this secondary discipline, parents are forced to endure lengthy wait times in the administrative office; numerous phone calls during work hours; requests to visit the DAEP, all of which result in loss of time from work and reduced income.

The concluding chapter summarizes the major dissertation findings, a discussion of the observed DAEP practices as one manifestation of the punitive state's disciplining and criminalization of low-income populations, and implications for education policy making. Finally, I end with a discussion of viable educational alternatives to disciplinary based education programs.

Chapter Three: School Ethnography

In the case of DAEPs, the quantitative data that exists on these programs provide little more than aggregate observations of race, age, grade, sex, free school lunch eligibility, referral and recidivism rates. The data limitations render the lived experience of youths who attend these schools, the education team who serves them, and the institutional practices and process they are subject to invisible. Although there have been some efforts to collect school superintendent and principal survey data from DAEPs, the rate of voluntary participation and completion of these surveys are inconsistent (Reyes 2006; TEA 2007; Lehr 2009). Moreover, large data sets typically used for quantitative research in education do not collect sufficient data for analysis on programs that serve dropout or "deviant" youth. Consequently, one of the foremost alternative education research groups, The University of Minnesota Alternative Schools Research Project, has encouraged the pursuit of local level research on alternative education programs (Lehr 2009). Due to these limitations and calls to undertake qualitative studies of alternative education programs, ethnography presented itself as the best means to research DAEPs in Texas.

I spent a total of 27 months conducting ethnographic field research over three academic schools years (Spring 2010 through Spring 2013). I collected a diverse range of data through a combination of classroom observations; embedded participant observation as a substitute teacher over 12 of the 27 months, more than 1,000 pages of systematically written field notes; 90 in-depth interviews with parents, teachers, students, police officers

and other school personnel; a student survey of 107 respondents; and a redacted archive of students disciplinary documents for the 2011-2012 school year.

Gaining Access

My entry into this particular DAEP was a unique and exceptional opportunity in one of the most punitive States in the Union (Perkinson 2010). I was originally told that I would not be able to gain access to the Hawthorne DAEP. This changed, however, when I shared my personal biography with the program director, Dr. Hernandez, and my prior experience studying Continuation High Schools in California. My identity as a Chicana/Mexican-American from a working-class background, former high school dropout, and product of an alternative high school afforded me unprecedented access to this DAEP by an external researcher. The DAEP staff viewed me as a resource, an ideal mentor and "good example" for the majority Latino student body at the program and were therefore very receptive to my research project.

27 Months in the Field

I began my field research at the DAEP in the Spring of 2010 after my initial meeting with the program director. I submitted an external research application to the Hawthorne Public School District's Department of Research and Evaluation that had already been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Texas, Austin. I received approval from the school district and began to visit the program on a regular basis, at least three times a week. I established a strong rapport with Dr.

Hernandez, and the High School Administrator Mrs. Lewis, who fully supported my research and presence at the DAEP.

My initial observations at the DAEP were of the new parent/student orientation each newly referred student and their parent were required to participate in. During this time students and their parents were introduced to the basic disciplinary rules and expectations of the program. I observed 25 new parent-student orientations in total. I then followed students into the two-day new student orientation room where they reviewed the behavioral rules, point sheet system, and were introduced to the BoysTown Character Education Curriculum. I spent a couple of months in these two areas of the DAEP before I transitioned into the middle and high school classrooms to expand my observations of disciplinary practices, teacher-student, peer-to-peer interactions, and academic instruction. I spent a brief time observing classrooms in the middle school side of the program, and eventually gained access to a mixed 11th and 12th grade high school classroom where I remained for most of the 2009 - 2010 academic school year. The high school classroom was co-taught by two teachers, Mrs. Jones, a black woman in her late 40's and the DAEP's only "Master Teacher,"² and Ms. Jenkins, a mixed black/Latina female teacher in her early 30's. Both of whom were well liked by students. This was the standard for all classes at the DAEP: two teachers and one teaching assistant per classroom. Their teaching assistant was Mr. Jackson, a black man in his early 40's, who also worked the morning dress code. Student fights and altercations were rare in this

² . As a Master Teacher, this meant that Mrs. Jones passed the Texas Examination for Master Teachers (TExMAT), which qualified her as an authority in several of the subjects she was certified to teach in, and as a mentor to other teachers in her discipline.

classroom as the majority of students were upper-classmen and the teachers were proactive in diffusing student tensions. Across the hallway, however, was a 9th grade classroom from which yelling could frequently be heard and teacher(s) and student(s) could often be found engaged in "hallway talks" (discussions following the temporary removal of a disruptive student to the hallway). After a month in the 11th/ 12th grade classroom, I migrated across the hallway to the 9th grade classroom and other high school classrooms where I was exposed to a variety of teaching styles and students in grades 9 - 12.

Midway through the 2010 - 2011 school year, I began to work as a substitute teacher at the DAEP on a daily basis. The decision to make this shift was a combination of my desire to sustain support in the field and to reciprocate in some way to the program staff and students for the generous giving of their time and willingness to share aspects of their lives and experiences with me. The program was always in need of substitute teachers; many substitutes in the school district declined to work at the DAEP and the pool of substitutes who would take jobs at the program were often ineffective in the classroom or afraid of the students. This change in my role at the program allowed me to extend my research and observations to DAEP staff who were generally eager to share their experiences with me. Importantly, this gave me access to the DAEP staff's "backstage," such as the teacher's lounge, staff meetings, and information on ideological differences and other fissures amongst the staff, as well as their professional relationships with students and parents. This transition, however, also complicated my relationships with students.

I spent most of 2011 - 2012 school year substitute teaching, except for the last six weeks of the school year (mid-April through May) when I conducted interviews with students and DAEP staff. I was pregnant for most of the 2011 - 2012 academic school year and this significantly altered my relationships with staff and students. In possession what I referred to as my "pregnancy capital," students tended to be kinder toward me and more receptive to participating in one-on-one interviews. This was particularly the case with boys who had made me a target of sexual harassment during the prior 2010 - 2011 school year. DAEP staff were also more inclined to participate in interviews with me and even organized a surprise baby shower for me at the end of the school year.

My final months collecting data and doing observations at the DAEP ran from November 2012 - March of 2013. These last months in the field mainly consisted of observations of the parent-student night classes, time spent looking through archival disciplinary data, and recruiting parents for interviews.

Ethnography

Ethnography of the DAEP enabled a nuanced and grounded understanding of the meaningful student categories activated by staff, and the form, effects, variation, and extension of discipline and surveillance within and beyond the program's bounds. I wrote detailed ethnographic field notes, which Emerson et al. (1995: 2) describes as a process of "getting close" to the daily activity of others' lives while becoming immersed in these activities themselves, allowing the researcher to develop an understanding of what research participants "experience as meaningful and important... the field researcher sees

from the inside how people lead their lives, how they carry out their daily rounds of activities, what they find meaningful, and how they do so.” I conducted close-up, on-the-ground observation of students and teachers in this school, in real time and space (Desmond 2007; Wacquant 2003), and embedded myself as close as possible to this particular educational phenomenon to explore how students experience and make sense of the ways teachers enforce discipline and facilitate rehabilitation. In-class observations were drawn on to refine my staff, student, and parent interview guides. I promptly wrote-up and revised my field notes after direct observation of classrooms.

Recruitment

During recruitment for staff, student, and parent interviewees, I was transparent about the major aim of my study: to learn about how teachers, parents, and students experienced the DAEP, and reassured all prospective research participants that their participation in the study was optional. I created flyers in English and Spanish that described my project and distributed them to students and left stacks of them in the front office near the visitor sign-in sheet (see appendix1). The front office received significant parent and student foot traffic on a daily basis making this an ideal location to place the flyers.

Interviews

I conducted face-to-face in-depth interviews with students, their parents/guardians, and school personnel, including but not limited to school principals, teachers, counselors, security, police officers, and administrative staff. I completed 90 in-depth

interviews in total: 43 student, 20 parents, and 33 DAEP staff members (see appendices 2-5 for interviewee demographics and interview guides). I exercised flexibility with meeting times and locales for parent/ guardian and staff research participants, often meeting before or after school hours. These interviews occurred at fast food restaurants, coffee shops, their homes, and the DAEP. All interviews conducted with students occurred during school hours in either a private and secure room on the DAEP campus (not equipped with surveillance cameras), or outdoors if students felt uncomfortable answering interview questions in the secured room.

Program staff interview data was used to contextualize student interviews, provide a holistic analysis of students' experiences at the DAEP, and to illuminate how staff experience teaching and working in this program. On average, student interviews lasted 60 minutes in length, however, interviews with staff and teachers ranged between an hour to 2.5 hours long. After each interview with parents/guardians, DAEP staff and students was completed, I transcribed my notes and interview recordings to ensure accuracy at a place off of the program grounds.

The interview guides covered questions about students' and staffs' experiences in the school with the rules, behavioral curriculum, students' future aspirations and goals, whether students perceive their teachers as supportive of their goals, and the level of support teachers and staff experienced at the school. I asked parents/ guardians about their experiences with DAEP staff, what it was like to have a child enrolled at the DAEP, and what they viewed to be the biggest benefits and drawbacks to their child's removal to

the program. The class backgrounds of parent interviewees ranged from upper-middle class to working class parents and educational levels ranged from Master's degree to elementary grade school education.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

During recruitment for research participants, I was transparent and reassured all prospective participants that their participation in the present study was optional. The students, parents, and program staff who participated in this study were informed of their right to withdraw participation from my project at any time. I obtained informed consent from all adult interviewees through a signed consent form and provided a copy of my project description to them in English and/or Spanish. I read this description aloud to each participant, in their language of preference, prior to the start of our interview and answered any questions participants had about the project before proceeding with each interview. I also explained that the risk associated with this study is no greater than everyday life and there were also no direct benefits to participating in this study, but that their participation may increase knowledge and understanding of schooling practices at DAEPs and the experiences of staff and students. For all interviews conducted with minors, age 17 and under, I received parental consent and secured student assent in advance. I also provided students and their parents with a copy of the project description in English and/or Spanish to retain for their own records (see appendices 5-7 for consent forms)

I used pseudonyms for all research participants. To maintain confidentiality, I did not divulge research participants' responses to peers, other parents or other staff as outlined in the consent and student assent forms. I kept participant confidentiality foremost through all phases of the project: planning, implementation, data storage, publication, and sharing of data.

BECOMING A SUBSTITUTE

After 9 months in the field I began to substitute teach at the DAEP. Following my transition to the role of substitute teacher, my relationship with many students was temporarily, and in some cases, permanently strained. Prior to this shift in my role at the program, I was little more than a classroom observer; I spoke with teachers and students, and was ear to interactions between students that would be immediately halted if a staff person had been privy to them. As a DAEP staff person I now assumed a position of authority at a program focused on disciplining and rehabilitating students. Despite the enforcement of rules being a significant part of my job as a substitute teacher at the DAEP, I went out of my way to avoid enforcing them or marking students' point sheets. I actively worked against filling out any disciplinary documents as I did not want to be complicit in amassing a paper trail of evaluative disciplinary documents that could potentially follow students outside of the program. Although I was generally successful at doing this, there were times when I had to assign points on point sheets. When this occurred, regardless of students' behavior, I would typically assign a number of points that would not negatively impact the status of a student's day at the program or include

commentary that could be used by third parties, such as probation officers and juvenile court judges, to punish them outside of the DAEP. In the case of disciplinary referrals, there was one instance in which I filled out a disciplinary referral for a male student who had become especially aggressive and cruel to me. Soon after he left the program I was informed by his homeroom teacher, and my occasional co-teacher, a middle-aged white woman named Mrs. Schmidt, that this student had been sent to the DAEP for physically assaulting and stalking his ex-girlfriend. At this time Mrs. Schmidt also shared that she knew he "held something against" me because I was "Mexican and a female." Aside from this singular event, I typically overlooked behavior that was prohibited at the DAEP, and in the case of sexual comments and innuendo made to me by students, I would ignore them or address students directly.

INTERVIEWEE DEMOGRAPHICS

Independent of a slight oversampling of white male student interviewees, my pool of student interview respondents was highly representative of the student body at the DAEP. I decided to over-sample white students mid-way through the student interview process as their interview responses were distinct from those of other students at the program. I wanted to determine if this was a consistent trend across white male students at the DAEP or the result of a few unique cases. In total, I interviewed 43 students: 12 females, 31 males, 21 Latino, 1 Latino/white, 11 black, 2 black/ Latino, 6 white students, 1 Pacific Islander student, and 1 multi-racial student who identified as black, white, and Asian.¹⁰ of the 43 student interviewees were foreign born (6 Mexico, 1 Honduras, 1

Cuba, 1 Bosnia, 1 Samoa), and of the total sample, 20 students had at least one parent born outside of the U.S. The level of educational attainment of parents followed this distribution: 18 less than high school; 4 high school; 1 GED; 6 some college; 1 parent had a 2 year college degree; 4 four-year college degree, 5 Master's degree; 1 Doctorate. I am using parental level of education as a proxy for class status. Of the children enrolled at the DAEP for the entire 2011 - 2012 school year, 95% of them were identified as "at-risk," and 85% of the student body was free lunch eligible.

The majority of the parents I interviewed were women (17 out of 20). A disproportionate number of parent interviewees were white relative to the number of white students enrolled in the program (5 out of 20). This was due to the fact that close to half of my recruitment of parents occurred during parent night classes. Given the stringent rules around night class attendance and greater ability for parents who work standard 9-5 jobs to attend these programs, middle-class, and often white parents were more representative of the parent groups that attended these evening courses. The demographic breakdown is as follows: 10 Latino parents, 5 black parents, and 5 white parents; 7 parents had less than a high school degree, 2 high school graduates, 1 General Education Degree, 2 some college, 3 two-year or trade school degrees, 3 four-year college degree holders, and 2 with Master's degrees.

DATA ANALYSIS

All field notes and interview transcripts were coded using open coding. This is a systematic approach to organizing and analyzing qualitative data by submitting all field

notes and transcripts to a detailed reading and re-reading process to identify the most salient and recurrent themes (Emerson et al. 1995). Open coding reduces the mass of original data into these dominant themes and organizes them into codes, what is also referred to as segmenting. These codes are then analyzed for variation and patterns across them to arrive at a credible set of conclusions (Luker 2008). Employing the evidentiary criteria typically used for ethnographic research (Becker 1958, 1970; Katz 1983, 2001, 2002; Desmond 2007), I assigned higher evidentiary value to behavior and events I observed rather than those recounted to me by research participants. Interviews with parents/ legal guardians were also coded for dominant, recurrent themes to make analytical connections between school context, interview responses, and actual practice.

In addition to systematic and rigorous analysis of field note and transcribed interview data, I have used the qualitative data analysis software program NVivo as a "reliability coder" to reduce researcher bias in my coding strategy (Luker 2008: 203). NVivo allows users to classify, sort, and arrange qualitative data and highlight recurrent themes and phrases. This analytical strategy allows for a reading of the data that reflects the universe of the DAEP and not only evidence that is compatible with the theoretical concerns that originally inspired my research and hypotheses. In addition, I actively pursued disconfirming evidence for any conclusion I arrived at to limit the possibility of selectively choosing data to support my hypotheses.

STUDENT SURVEY

The student survey was anonymous and administered for descriptive purposes, such as student characteristics and prior DAEP involvement. I asked questions regarding student age, race/ethnicity, grade level, reason for referral, parents' level of education, and student interaction with the juvenile justice system (see appendix 8 for student survey instrument). With this survey I also sought to gain a better sense of what out-of-school factors, such as immigration status, family formation, and family history of incarceration, may interact with in-school processes at the DAEP. The survey is composed of open and close-ended questions and based on a convenience sample, which means it was not randomly selected and therefore not a representative sample of the DAEP student body (Groves et al. 2004). Despite this being the case, the survey findings provide information on members of a youth population that is extremely difficult to access otherwise (Groves et al. 2004; Simmons 2007). I manually coded the survey responses into an Excel file to obtain simple frequencies and cross-tabulations using the statistical software STATA. I will input the open-ended answers into the Nvivo software to ascertain recurrent themes, keywords, and phrasing.

2011 - 2012 ARCHIVE OF DISCIPLINARY DOCUMENTS

Near the end of my time in the field, I was presented with the opportunity to access a redacted archive of students' disciplinary documents for every student that attended the DAEP for the entire 2011 - 2012 academic school year. My engagement with this archive has been minimal given the sheer size of the archive and writing

constraints. I have analyzed the dress code infraction log and incorporated that analysis into the current dissertation.

REFLEXIVITY IN THE FIELD

The following is a field note from my first day doing observations at the DAEP:

Field Note Excerpt 2/4/2010: I spent a few seconds in the doorway feeling stunned. Many years and more than 1400 miles separated this visit to the DAEP and my own experience as a student at a continuation high school for truant and dropout youths in California. But for a moment there, when the police officer yelled at a group of kids lined against the wall to keep their hands behind their backs or somewhere visible to the officer, I was 15 years-old again. My chest clenched and my body responded to an immediate impulse to stand up straight and keep my own hands at my sides or behind my back. I avoided making eye contact with the officer and quickly slid into the front office to get a visitors pass.

Perhaps this momentary feeling had nothing to do with my own past experiences, maybe in the face of law enforcement most people would experience the same immediate impulse to comply with the police officers orders. Regardless of whether that was the case, I distinctly remember the wave of anxiety that came over me. I desired to do this research, I had secured access to the field site and spent most of my first year of graduate school learning everything I could about DAEPs and the legislation and political environment that brought them into existence, but maybe I was incapable of undertaking

an embedded ethnographic study of this program. Could it be that I was too biased or not impartial enough to successfully complete this project?

This was a possibility that I had given a lot of thought. I had already been forewarned of the complications that could arise, most notably that I might identify too closely with DAEP students or impute my own experiences onto theirs. In my quest to resolve this quandary, and at the urging of a mentor in the Department of Anthropology at UT, I engaged ethnographies by Angela Valenzuela (1999), Ruth Behar (1987, 2003) transcripts of Renato Rosaldo's 1986 lecture "When Natives Talk Back: Chicano Anthropology Since the Late Sixties," and scholarship on the political potential and value of ethnography undertaken by Native/Othered scholars - those academics from race/ethnic minority groups in the U.S. and marginalized populations elsewhere in the world. Though not without its caveats (Narayan 1993; Jacobs-Huey 2002), namely the complications of being "native enough" or existing in an in-between space as both an outsider scholar and cultural insider, the notion that my membership in the majority group at the DAEP could be an asset and not a liability in the field was novel to me.

Historically, the ethnographic method was a tool and extension of the colonial project, exclusion and othering of non-Western and other dominated populations. While not to denounce the contemporary richness and potential of ethnography to unveil micro sociological practices, illuminate how people make meaning out of and cope with their material and social conditions, and to develop social theory, this history has nonetheless been formative to prevailing notions of who can serve as an impartial researcher and

producer of knowledge. Traditionally, when white and often male ethnographers entered into the social worlds and communities they lacked significant ties to, their “distance” was taken as proof of this very impartiality and empirical rigor (Lassiter 2005). Many of these early ethnographers kept separate journals cataloging their emotions around the field, the idea being that this practice – recording proper field notes and emotional ponderings as separate written records – resolved the dilemma of observer bias. As Victor Rios (2011) notes, when the so-called “native” takes on the role of researcher there is for some an ontological rupture in what was once very clearly delineated boundaries between who was to fill the capacity of observer and the subject to be observed.

I came to eschew any positivistic notion that myself or anyone can somehow be "neutral observers" in the field. The ethnographic method is rooted in the basic tenets of symbolic interactionism, namely that people construct meaning through their everyday interactions, and as an embedded researcher I became a part of those social interactions. I also could not abide the idea that since I was Mexican-American, a former school dropout, and had spent three of my high school years at an alternative school, that I was somehow incapable of undertaking this ethnographic study. Many prominent ethnographers have returned to their community of origin, or worked within a subpopulation they are identified with (Rios 2011; Contreras 2012; Khan 2012; Kirkland 2013). Younger ethnographers such as Victor Rios (2011), Randol Contreras (2012), Shamus Khan (2012), have very successfully undertaken such research in recent years.

It is my awareness of how I figure into the school community, how my very presence influenced those around me – what ethnographers refer to broadly as being reflexive in the field – that I was able to remain reflexive of my positionality and role in the program. By doing so, I consciously built in epistemological breaks to ensure that I was not conflating my personal experience with what I had observed in the field. While my personal biography gave me access to this DAEP field site and afforded me a unique perspective in the study of this DAEP, it certainly posed obstacles in the field. My awareness, however, of these obstacles and potential challenges made me all the more vigilant and rigorous in my data collection and analysis.

A NOTE ON TEACHERS

I do not desire to demonize DAEP staff. Nearly every staff person I interviewed remarked on some level of emotional connection and genuine commitment to not only the teaching profession, but to working with vulnerable student populations. The commitment of most teachers to their vocation as educators bore out most significantly when teachers discussed the despair they feel when current or former DAEP students were involved in local crimes or tragedy. This was also evident in my field observations, such as the time when I consoled Mrs. Jones while she stood in the corner of her room crying after the two Hawthorne city police officers arrested a Latino male from her classroom. The officers refused to allow the student to take his jacket despite Mrs. Jones insistence that he wear it due to the cold. Or the time when Latrice, a black female student grabbed the wrong jacket from her mother's car when she was dropped off for the

security check one morning. When the officers emptied her pockets they found numerous baggies of crack cocaine. Realizing that her daughter had grabbed the wrong jacket, Latrice's mother hurried back to the school and pleaded with the officers to not arrest Latrice. Officer Burkes and Officer Owens were devastated, but they had to follow DAEP protocol and drive her to the local juvenile detention facility to be booked. Officer Owens commented during our interview that this day was among his worst at the DAEP.

As I had heard many other DAEP staff mention before me, I too began to dread the local evening news. Since starting my fieldwork at the DAEP in 2010, four of the students I worked with or got to know are now deceased, one of which was a student I interviewed for this project. Seven other students have been perpetrators of high profile violent crimes, two of which resulted in homicide. Many others transitioned in and out of juvenile justice system during this time and made appearances in local newspapers such as "Busted" magazine.

Teachers at the DAEP also faced constant job insecurity due to persistent threats of school closure that made for an incredibly stressful work environment. The 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years ended with uncertainty about the future of the current DAEP program. Midway through the 2011 - 2012 school year, administrators from the district's main office requested a last minute meeting with DAEP staff that was held onsite in the library. I was working as a substitute teacher in the high school section of the DAEP that day and attended the meeting alongside the rest of the staff. The district representatives announced the decision to contract management of the district's two

DAEPs to a private education company and to limit referrals to the DAEP to mandatory referrals only. They posed the last minute meeting as an opportunity to discuss privatization as one potential option with DAEP staff and to achieve what one of the district representatives described as "transparency."

The district administrators cited race and gender disparities in referral rates, particularly for discretionary non-violent referrals, to justify the move toward contracting the management of DAEPs out to an external agency. DAEP staff members vehemently challenged how they were implicated in the referral practices which were the domain of home schools in the district, and argued that certain schools would only find a way to reclassify what would have been discretionary referrals as mandatory referrals in the future. At the meeting, a mix of fear, uncertainty, and slowly brewing anger grew amongst DAEP staff. A first-year Latino high school teacher, Mr. Romero, asked "how is this any different from the privatization of prisons?!" Mrs. Schmidt inquired "Where will I work next year? What about our contracts?" Tears and rattled voices could be heard from various sections of the library. The district administrators reassured teachers that they would do everything they could to find positions for them elsewhere in the district for the next school year. Mr. Stevens, a black male teacher and parent support specialist, testified to how important his job as educator and mentor was to him and the students he worked with. He was distraught; this job was his life.

After the DAEP staff was dismissed from the meeting, we walked en masse from the library to our respective classrooms. There was an odd mix of silence, some sighs and

groans about what we had just sat through, and unusual commentary from some staff members as I heard one teacher announce "let's burn this motherfucker down!" In the weeks that followed, with half of the school year still left to go, teachers preemptively went on job searches in neighboring school districts and we lost a high school math teacher and front office personnel shortly thereafter. During this time, a series of other proposals to close mainstream schools and replace them with charter schools in predominantly low-income and non-white neighborhoods in the school district were overshadowing events at the DAEP. The DAEP staff spent the months that followed pouring over newspaper articles in the break room and discussing their mutual fears and anxieties about the future of the DAEP. The day following the district vote to determine the fate of the DAEP was a somber one. Not only did the district vote to contract the DAEP to a separate entity, this happened with little fanfare or objection from the large group of citizens present at the vote that had mobilized against proposals for other school shutdowns and charter school growth. That morning, Mrs. Linney, a white female high school teacher, paraphrased the coverage of the district proceedings in the newspaper for a group of staff in the break room, "in less than five minutes they voted to shut us down." She shook her head. She added that no one objected the decision.

Most DAEP students were aware of these events and the likelihood of a school shutdown. The degree of tension at the DAEP was palpable and students, given that they were required to do roughly an hour and a half of silent reading each day, would often pick up the same newspapers teachers poured over when they ran out of other materials to read. The sentiments of students ranged from concern over the fate of their favorite

teachers, to, in moments of frustration and anger, quips about how the district was "shutting down this school anyway." After months of indeterminacy, by early May the district announced that it had rejected the proposals from private educational management organizations it had thus far received, and therefore modified their plans for the 2012 - 2013 school year to only enforce the mandatory referral rule. The district run DAEP would remain open for another year.

This background is necessary to better understand the context in which staff members labored and the various layers of stress they contended with as they attempted to enforce program discipline and manage their classrooms. I am not attempting to justify the sometimes injurious and biased behavior of DAEP staff, but I also do not want to railroad all of them as people who consciously made decisions that could be harmful to students. I contend that DAEP staff operated within, and were therefore constrained by a larger institutional system set-up, and that their decision making processes, the norms and standards they adopted, were influenced by the constraints of this system. Importantly, however, despite DAEP staff being well-intentioned for the most part, intentions matter very little when the objective outcomes of students and their experiences are particularly negative.

Chapter Four: From Deficient Students to Docile Bodies: School

Discipline, Race, and Rehabilitation in Texas

Orientation Field Note, 11/16/2010: I'm sitting in the back of the orientation room and notice a familiar quote from the children's book: "Oh, The Places You'll Go!" by Dr. Seuss written on a dry erase board. Mr. Stevens, a black man in his late 50's, leads these mandatory orientations and reads the first line of the quote aloud to the room filled with kids, the vast majority of whom are black or Latino boys ranging in age from 11 to 19 years old: "you have brains in your head." He pauses, purses his lips and quickly injects, "use 'em!" He takes another pause and proceeds, "Y'all know the law but yet *y'all still break it*. Ain't that stupid?" He returns his focus to the board and reads the next line of the quote: "You can steer yourself in any direction you choose." Mr. Stevens elaborates: "You made a choice to hang with friends to do the wrong things...Y'all know everything about drugs, weed. Y'all know how to roll a nice sweeeet!" He draws out the word "sweet," placing a heavy emphasis on the long "e" sound, and begins to shake his body while he brings the pinched thumb and pointer finger of his right hand to his mouth as if he's toking an invisible joint. "Some of the things y'all know won't get you out of school. You can't pass a test because of new *Nikes*!" Mr. Stevens moves from child to child attempting to make eye contact with each of them. "Y'all know how to look good. *Style*." He shifts his weight from foot to foot, tracing both hands up and down the sides of his body to showcase his outfit. "Yet,

how much do y'all know about *science*?" Mrs. Willis, an older black woman who works as morning security personnel bluntly adds: "*NONE*." Mr. Stevens asks, in a condescending and exasperated tone: "*Can you read?*" One child, a Latino boy, raises his hand. Mr. Stevens acknowledges him and responds: "Good... but a lot of kids can't read at grade level." He is still focused on this particular child and asks him: "Do you know what that [grade level] is?" He nods yes. Despite this response, Mr. Stevens continues: "But y'all know how to cuss a teacher out ALL day. Get high all day... but can't read." He shakes his head and resumes with the final line of the quote: "You're on your own and you know what you know. You are the guy who'll decide where to go."

This chapter scrutinizes the behavioral rules and disciplinary documentary procedures in place at the Hawthorne DAEP. The analysis focuses specifically on the parent and new student orientation process to the program, what I term the "induction period," that occurs during the first two days of a student's removal period or, in program parlance, their "sentence" to the DAEP. The opening field note was recorded during a two-day new student orientation to the DAEP. The scene described is typical and routine; this DAEP holds parent and student orientations four times a week throughout most of the school year.

This chapter argues, by way of ethnographic demonstration, that daily on-the-ground practices in place at the DAEP constitute, borrowing and adapting from Foucault (1977) and Ferguson (2001), what I call disciplinary technologies devoted to the

transformation of so-called "culturally deficient" students into docile bodies. I define docile bodies as self-regulating subjects who internalize the program's norms and codes of behavior and draw upon these meanings to make sense of their forced removal to the DAEP. Utilizing Ferguson's analysis of "cultural representations of racial 'difference'" (80), I complicate Foucault's conceptualization of power by demonstrating how normalizing power is conveyed through the construction of students as "deficient," a category that maps on racial and gender classifications at the program.

Drawing upon and extending research on the increased surveillance and punitive management of poor communities and black and Latino youths (Rios 2011), and poverty governance through carceral and paternalist approaches (Wacquant 2009; Soss et al. 2011), I investigate the everyday accomplishment of disciplinary and rehabilitative efforts in the management of vulnerable youth populations in the school context. I scrutinize the relationship between intensified surveillance, enforcement, and rehabilitative focus of the rules at the DAEP to illuminate their impact on the children forced to attend them. I draw on Michel Foucault's (1977) concept of disciplinary "technologies," specifically hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and the examination, to illuminate the practices employed during the induction period and the program's initial attempts to produce students as "docile bodies." Following Ferguson (2001), I demonstrate how these disciplinary technologies operate through the racialized discursive construction of "culturally deficient" students. In the tradition of Burawoy's extended case method (1998), I qualify Ferguson's concepts of "culturalism," and the "doubly displaced" position of black boys, and extend her analysis, into the

predominantly male, Mexican/Mexican-American and black school setting of a DAEP in Texas. The chapter reveals that the punitive intervention of the DAEP is deemed necessary by the discursive construction of "deficient" students and families whose moral baseness is believed to produce youths intergenerationally predisposed to be miscreants and "bad choice" makers.

During the induction period, students are introduced to the Boys Town character education curriculum that is designed to impart good morals, values, re-socialize children to curtail misbehavior, and reform ingrained negative habits through a behavioral approach to developing social skills (Dowd and Tierney 2005). The product of a boy's home, the Boys Town Model centers on repairing children and families, and is typical of character education curriculums utilized in juvenile detention facilities, group homes, and other disciplinary based alternative programs. At the DAEP, this reformed behavioral repertoire is cultivated through a set of "Boys Town life skills" to be adopted and adhered to by students at all times, and what I term "moralizing speeches," which describes the routine extension of the BoysTown Curriculum by DAEP staff through lectures and story-telling that emphasize the moral imperative to be well-mannered, compliant, and to assume personal responsibility for their current circumstances. Moralizing speeches frequently take the form of cautionary tales of irascible juveniles who failed to change their behaviors and met with heinous fates; generally negative assumptions about students' character and intentions verbalized by DAEP staff; predictions of the likely dubious path students were headed down; and potential alternative routes to these paths should students alter their behavior and make "good" choices. A prominent trend in the

literature in poverty and welfare reform demonstrates a similar focus on repairing cultural deficiencies and moral conduct among low-income people and aid recipients. This is likewise accomplished through the enactment of regulative programs, often coupled with penalties for substandard or non-compliance, that require mothers and welfare recipients to develop good morals, ethics, and accept personal responsibility to receive assistance (Neubeck and Cazenave 2001; Haney 2011; Levine 2013; Raz 2014).

The following section of this chapter provides a brief sketch of prominent research on school discipline. Second, I examine the prototypical new parent-student referral experience to the DAEP, the program's "Number One Rule," and the Boys Town (Life) Skills scripts students are required to learn and assimilate in their behavioral repertoire. Finally, I end with a discussion of my findings and their implications for the study of vulnerable youth populations and their families.

SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

The argument that schools reproduce class and race inequalities, in some cases even prepare certain groups of students for imprisonment, is well established (Willis 1977; Bowles and Gintis 1976; Oakes 1985; Simmons 2009a). Recent literature on discipline in schools and the spread of zero tolerance has focused on how punitive disciplinary policies prepare students for entry into remedial jobs and an insecure labor market (Kupchik and Monahan 2006; Hirschfield 2008; Gregory, Skiba and Noguera 2010); encourage the deployment of paramilitary security forces in schools that alter teacher/student relationships (Devine 1996); rob students of their democratic participation

(Kupchik 2010; Wacquant 2009); and encourage their removal from schools or condition them for the adult criminal justice system (Noguera 2003; Reyes 2006; Kupchik and Monahan 2006; Hirschfield 2008; Simmons 2009a; Wacquant 2009; Nolan 2011). Building on this body of literature, I inspect the disciplinary techniques at work inside the DAEP.

Prior researchers have examined the interplay of mass incarceration and the new economy in the punitive schooling shift from a quantitative or macro perspective. Also adopting a Foucauldian starting point, Kupchik and Monahan (2006) cite the simultaneous rise in mass incarceration and transition to a post-industrial society as the progenitor of education policies that effect punitive social control regimes in schools. Forming what the authors term the "New American School," they produce students as "flexible" or "compliant bodies" prepared for a tenuous job market and employment insecurity typical of the postindustrial economy. In a similar vein, Hirschfield (2008) asserts the confluence of a downward economy, lowered employment rates and epidemic of mass incarceration have influenced education policy toward a more punitive orientation and forged a "criminal justice track" in which students of color are overrepresented. This forms a modern school environment where learning is sacrificed in favor of criminalizing student misbehavior and operates as a socializer for prison. This chapter similarly investigates the socializing and productive power of zero tolerance discipline in schools, however, distinct from these aforementioned studies, my analysis draws on rich ethnographic observations to examine the on-the-ground, embedded

practices through which schools attempt to accomplish disciplinary training and socialization.

Several qualitative studies have examined the effects of zero tolerance policies in alternative schools, revealing a pattern of severe and disproportionate punishment of boys, children of color, low-income youths, and the growing use of reparative socialization programs to correct misbehavior (Birnbaum 2001; Simmons 2007, 2009a; Fader 2013). The majority of these studies, however, have been conducted in alternative schools and programs that are managed by the juvenile justice system, in contrast to a public DAEP. One exception is Simmons' (2007; 2009b) case-study of a publicly funded disciplinary alternative school in New Orleans, Louisiana. Her findings demonstrate the routine criminalization of student misbehavior and disposable status conferred on low-income, black male students who were forced to attend a penal school environment housed on the grounds of an adult prison. Undertaking what she terms "a situated analysis of power relations" (2009b 69), Simmons (2009b) critiques Foucault's theory of power as a neutral, indiscriminate force with capillary spread throughout the whole of society. Instead, she asserts that disciplinary power and its attendant "arts of distribution" assume a pernicious effect alongside social divisions of race and gender. While I similarly highlight the racial and gender dimensions of the operation of power in a punitive school setting, my research builds upon hers to demonstrate how the disparate operation of power by race, class, and gender is accomplished at the cultural level through the discursive formation of the "culturally deficient" student.

Of particular relevance to my study, Fader's (2013) recent ethnography of a juvenile justice reform school for male juvenile offenders in rural Pennsylvania illuminates how the use of a therapeutic behavioral program, similar to the character education curriculum found in the DAEP, to correct habitually ingrained "criminal thinking errors" can fail to connect rehabilitative strategies with the reality of youth offenders' material circumstances (2013 13). The employment of this corrective program at the reform school relied on a dominant cultural perspective that criminalized blackness by equating "urban street culture" with innate and fixed criminality and obscured this racialized process through the use of therapeutic language. Like Fader's study, I examine the implementation of a behavioral curriculum and frequent unconscious reliance on racialized and gendered cultural explanations to understand the forced enrolment of students at the DAEP. Uniquely, this chapter examines this phenomenon, not in a lock-down juvenile or criminal justice structure, but in the context of a public disciplinary education program in which the vast majority of enrolled students are there for nonviolent misbehavior in schools.

In contrast to most schools, including other public alternative education programs, DAEPs are designed to isolate, discipline and reintegrate students back into their mainstream schools (Levin 2006; Lehr, Tan, and Ysseldyke 2009). But how this punitive and remediating process unfolds within them is largely unknown. Importantly, my project aims to reveal some of these obscured practices to demonstrate how, in a punitive schooling space, the embodiment and internalization of power is achieved through the

construction of students of color, and secondarily their families, as culturally deficient and therefore in need of punishment and rehabilitation.

THE INDUCTION PERIOD

By focusing on the introductory experience of students and parents, which I call the induction period, the DAEPs' formal program objectives and methods to achieve their punitive and institutional goals emerge most clearly. During the induction period, program staff sets the tone for behavioral expectations, and states the formal rules in place at the DAEP and the consequences for, in the program's language, "breaking" them. Significantly, the DAEP also attempts to rehabilitate students and impart them with what school staff stresses to be imperative but woefully lacking "social skills" and "good decision making" practices.

These formative days of a students' sentence to the DAEP involve a mandatory parent-student morning orientation and a two-day student orientation. The latter includes an introduction to disciplinary documentary procedures, extended coverage of the school dress code, and "character education" curriculum. The first few days of a child's forced enrollment to the DAEP is the ideal research spatial and temporal site for an analysis of the program's rules and disciplinary documentary procedures and their impact for multiple key methodological and theoretical reasons. First, during this time the program staff most clearly and consistently articulates the school rules and disciplinary standards before they disperse students into different program areas. Second, the education literature on school transitions demonstrates that the adjustment period immediately

following a school transition is a "critical period," which exerts an outsized effect on students' overall experiences in the new schooling environment, and in their long-term academic and life course trajectories (Alexander et al. 1988; Benner 2011). Lastly, the induction period constitutes what Merton (1959) referred to as a "strategic research site" where the investigation of under-researched social phenomenon can unearth first-rate data, enable exceptional analyses, and illuminate further lines of investigation.

It is imperative to state that I am not attempting to pass judgment on DAEP personnel or assert that there is an explicit intent on their behalf to reproduce practices that may harm children. After the two-and-a-half years that I spent in the field with DAEP staff, and eventually joining their ranks as a substitute teacher, there is no doubt in my mind that they are well intended when it comes to the education and well-being of DAEP students. Instead, I contend the negative effects of program rules and their implementation are unintended consequences of the program set-up and disciplinary structure.

Below I provide a composite of the typical orientation experiences of parents and students. The narrative is a reconstruction of the events that occurred most frequently during the induction period. Here my methodological strategy differs from the "narrative ethnographic approach" (Behar 2003; Chase 2005), which focuses on the experiences of a single individual research participant or a small group of individuals. The following reconstructed field note is informed by the observation of 25 parent-student orientations, and three months of observation of the two-day student orientation room. Many elements

of the narrative are direct quotes that document real occasions and were incorporated into the reconstruction based on their general representativeness of the orientation process.

ORIENTATION: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE RULES

Jaime and his mother, Rosa, arrive at the DAEP at 7:45am, 15 minutes before the mandatory new parent-student orientation and enrollment process is scheduled to begin. They trek up a slight but lengthy incline to the blue double-doors at the front of the school that are guarded by a short Latina security guard named Mrs. Rios. Jaime and Rosa funnel into a cluster of other parent-child pairs surrounding Mrs. Rios' wooden school desk and wait for her to distribute orientation folders. As Mrs. Rios receives the students and parents, she undertakes a cursory evaluation of each new enrollees' "compliance" with the school dress code. Luckily for Jaime, he was one of the few students who received a pre-enrollment packet with a copy of the strict DAEP student dress code from his "home school," and arrived in dress code compliance.

Students are required to wear blue denim jeans or pants with no white stitching or logos larger than 2 inches in size. They may not wear "skinny" jeans or "sagging," baggy jeans. Blue denim shorts are allowed, but they must be knee length, no shorter, and cannot be a snug fit. Only plain white short or long-sleeved T-shirts or polo shirts are allowed, no v- or boat neck T-shirts, and absolutely no logos are permitted. Undergarments must be white and not visible through students' clothing or seen hanging outside of their pants or shorts. A black or brown belt is mandatory. Only black or white socks are permitted, and students must wear tennis shoes that are at least 97% white,

black, and/or gray, or a combination of the three colors. They cannot have more than 3% red, blue, green, purple, or any other color on them. Shoe laces must be white. The tongues of these shoes must be tucked behind their pant-leg. No jewelry or cell phones are permitted. Dyed hair and excessive make-up, what is frequently referred to by the high school administrator during orientation as doing the "Cleopatra," is not allowed.

Another new student, a black male named Johntay and his mother Felicia, who arrived minutes before Jaime and Rosa, are told they cannot stay for orientation because Johntay did not arrive "in compliance" with the dress code. He wore black, rather than blue, denim jeans. They are given the option to either return for tomorrow's orientation in compliance with the dress code or go home and change his clothing and attempt to make it back by 9:00am for the second and last orientation of the day. The program only offers two orientation slots, both in the morning. Johntay and Felicia live in the northeastern part of the city, easily a 40-minute drive from the DAEP during rush-hour traffic. Felicia is frustrated about being turned away; she has already taken this morning off from work and cannot take tomorrow off as well. She unsuccessfully pleads to stay for orientation today, and they exit the building in frustration. Johntay will miss the school day since he is no longer enrolled in his home school.

Mrs. Rios directs Jaime and his mother Rosa to the room where orientation will take place after providing them with a manila orientation folder that contains a detailed dress code and intake form. They take their seats at one of a dozen small tables in an antiquated chemistry lab. The group of 11 parent-student pairs ranges from first time

orientation goes to parent-student pairs who have been attending the same orientation for several years. Every new referral to the DAEP, despite any history of prior referral to the program, even if that referral occurred earlier in this current school year, requires parent-child participation in the "new student orientation." Similarly, students still must participate in two full school days of orientation every time they are re-referred to the DAEP.

The High School Administrator, Mrs. Lewis, and the Parent Support Specialist, Mr. Stevens, are running the 8:00am orientation. Before the orientation begins, a Spanish language translator, usually one of the bilingual Teacher Assistants, asks if anyone needs an interpreter. Two women and a man raise their hands and they are quickly fitted with headsets that will transmit the interpreter's voice. Mrs. Lewis opens the orientation with a basic summary of Chapter 37 of the Texas Education Code and an explanation of why parents and their children are sitting in orientation at the DAEP today. Mrs. Lewis implores parents to join the "No = No club" and draws the attention of parents and students to the laminated 4x6 inch yellow sheet that was placed on each desk before their arrival. The program's "Number One Rule" is printed and sealed on this sheet, in English on one side and Spanish on the other. Mrs. Lewis reads the English version aloud to the orientation room: "Follow the instructions the first time they are given to you: NO TALKING BACK, NO ARGUING, NO POUTING, so you can be successful."



Figure 2: Number 1 Rule English



Figure 3: Number 1 Rule Spanish

She tells parents that this yellow square is theirs to take and insists they practice the rule at home with their children to reinforce the exposure to the "Number One Rule" at the DAEP. It's all about "repetition, repetition, repetition," she assures them. This school rule serves as a primer to the behavioral modification curriculum, known as the "Boys Town Model," students encounter in their two-day orientation. Students' adherence to the "Number One Rule" and the appropriate performance of the "Boys Town Social (Life) Skills" scripts are foundational to the point system in place at the school, which ultimately determines a student's length of stay in the facility.³ Mrs. Lewis weaves her coverage of the rules with parenting and financial advice: "These kids have closets full of shoes because you throw money away on shoes, you're the one's buying them... YOU finance," and suggests instead that they, "put that [money] in a college fund."

Mr. Stevens leads the second half of the orientation. He prefaces his segment: "This is a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program... you can have a PO [probation officer] because you are here, in fact, you can be arrested today in this place if you cannot control yourself here. If you can't control yourself, *you can go home.*" He informs Jaime and Rosa that they are *both* students of the DAEP: "Parents, you have homework, while your child is here so are you." Mr. Stevens insists that they place the laminated yellow sheet somewhere visible, like "the refrigerator," where they can see it and practice the

³The rewards and docks of this point-system are recorded on student Point Sheets. If students accrue an insufficient number of "successful" days they will be defaulted to the maximum possible days assigned for referral, susceptible to an augmented stay at the DAEP, or a guaranteed re-referral to the DAEP upon return to their mainstream school for their unsuccessful performance or "incompletion of program." Conversely, the adequate performance and enactment of the Boys Town scripts are rewarded with a "successful" daily rating and early program release.

rule on a daily basis. He informs the parent-child pairs: "I'm a parent supporter, but I'm old school... you got to put something on these youngsters, I say you hit him before the state of Texas does." He reiterates Mrs. Lewis' request. "Parents, we've got a club here, it's called the No=No club. Parents, we ask for your membership... get them to follow the number one rule."

Rosa and Jaime are informed that cameras are located in every nook of the interior and exterior of the building, for "your protection." Mrs. Lewis and Mr. Stevens use the bulk of orientation to introduce parents and students to a litany of rules in place at the DAEP; they thoroughly cover the dress code and instruct students on how to manage their bodily comportment as they navigate various parts of the school. They emphasize the importance of being "in compliance" with all the rules and expectations in place at the program. This not only helps "take bad habits out and put new ones in," as Program Director Dr. Hernandez states when he runs orientation, but to protect students from gang violence. Since this is the only 6th through 12th grade DAEP in the city, the staff warns students and parents that "every high school and middle school is represented here, therefore every gang is represented here." Students are not allowed to talk to students from other classes, and must remain silent when moving through the school grounds, what is referred to as keeping their "voices off." Similarly, they are to avert their gaze from other students passing through the halls. Students' hands must remain behind their backs at all times since "students talk with their hands." This, Mrs. Lewis and Mr. Stevens assert, will further reduce the threat and potential for gang fights. When students' hands are behind their backs "no triangles are allowed." Touching their thumbs and index

fingers together is strictly prohibited as it indicates to other students that they have been locked-up in the local juvenile detention facility. Instead, hands and fingers must be clasped together, "hand over hand." Rosa and the other parents are reassured that the DAEP is the safest school in the district because of these rules.

Parents and students are then introduced to the DAEP "point sheet." The point sheet is a daily record of students' adherence to or transgression of the rules, "Adult/Peer Relations," and the completion of "Academic Responsibilities," which is recorded in the form of "points" and teacher feedback. At the end of each school day the total number of points earned by a student will determine if they receive a "successful," "pending," or "unsuccessful" day. "Unsuccessful" days do not count toward their sentence at the DAEP, but defaults them to the maximum time served. Mrs. Lewis and Mr. Stevens direct the students to leave their parents and line-up in a single file line in front of the door that exits the orientation room. They use this lining-up exercise as an opportunity to practice the rules and oversee each new students form. Knowing how to appropriately move through the hallways of the DAEP is an important skill for students to master as every transition out of their classroom requires that they quickly get into "compliance" or risk losing points for the day. Mrs. Lewis assumes a position in front of the line. She tells them that when walking in a single-file line they cannot "duck walk" to keep their "baggy jeans up," and demonstrates the "duck walk" with her feet splayed apart, heels touching. She then fits each child with a square's distance between them - the floor is made up of 12x12 linoleum squares - and informs them that when they stop in the hallway they must fit their feet in a single square, no toes sticking outside of the square's bounds, while still

leaving a 12'' x 12'' square space between them and the student in front of them. The girls are strategically lined up behind the boys to spare them from the ogling and "harassment" of male students. "Hands behind your back," she commands, and "voices off." Now each student is totally "in-compliance," and makes their way to the counselor's office in a single, orderly line through the middle of the hallway. Their parents follow behind them.

They walk across the small school campus to the middle school wing where parents write their names on a counselor waiting list to discuss their child's reason for referral to the DAEP and to develop a course schedule. As the program has only one bilingual counselor, the monolingual Spanish-speaking parents wait longer to be processed. Jaime and his mother wait 20 minutes before being called. After this meeting they take a short walk back across campus and lineup for a consult with the only school nurse, Mrs. Dominguez. This takes another 30 minutes of waiting and examination. Mrs. Dominguez asks about Jaime's vaccination schedule and medical history, including mental health. She makes these inquiries openly in her office, which typically contains 3 parent-student pairs at a time, with little respect for privacy or confidentiality. Once they finish the nurse's examination, Jaime and his mother walk across the hall to the registration office to complete his enrollment and get Jaime's school bus assignment. Finally, they return to Mrs. Rios' desk for a security check, the final step Jaime and Rosa must complete as a pair before Rosa is free to leave. The time is now 10:00am. One of the campus police officers, Officer Burkes, has Jaime lean against the wall, hands flat, legs spread apart to be patted down to check for weapons, drugs, or any other prohibited

items. The officer asks Jaime to raise his hands above his head and place them against the wall, and runs his hands along Jaime's shoulders, then into his underarms and pats down the sides of his torso, back and stomach. Officer Burkes then runs both hands down each leg, checks inside Jaime's pockets, feels along his waistline and tugs and shakes at his belt. Lastly, he inspects Jaime's shoes, placing his hand into the shoes' interior and knocking the soles together and then runs a few fingers across the bottoms of Jaime's sock-covered feet. With Jaime's pat down complete, Rosa gets the OK to leave and waves goodbye to her son.

Across from Jaime, a Latina middle school student named Mariela is in the process of being patted down by Mrs. Rios, who stops mid search after tugging at the center of her bra. She informs Mariela and her mother that she is "out of dress code compliance." She is wearing a purple bra. Mariela is not asked to leave, but instead Mrs. Rios tells her that she will start the day with a "pending" on her "point sheet," and will have to "make it right" tomorrow by wearing a white bra to school. The staff will check tomorrow to ensure her undergarment is white, otherwise, her pending day will become an unsuccessful one and not count toward her stay at the DAEP.

Jaime is directed to the two-day orientation room for students and is reminded to walk down the center of the hallway, keep his hands behind his back, and remain in compliance at all times. He walks in the direction of the orientation classroom and at the elbow of the hallway where the Police Officer's hub is located, the middle school police officer is perched against a brown table and watches Jaime's form. When Jaime arrives to

orientation he is greeted by the parent support specialist, Mr. Stevens, and his co-teacher, Mrs. Hodges, and sees statements and equations on the dry erase board such as "Make Good Choices," "early school dropout = early felon" and "lazy today = sorry tomorrow." Students continue to trickle into orientation for the first two periods of the school day as each gradually finishes the morning orientation process and the 9:00am orientation students file in.

Mr. Stevens supplies every new student with an orientation packet containing copies of the dress code, Chapter 37 of the Texas Education Code, a list of prohibited noises and facial expressions, and an excerpt on "documenting gang violence," that students must rewrite on sheets of lined paper. Mr. Stevens spends the majority of the day lecturing students on good decision making, valuing education, respecting parents, and the Boys Town behavioral curriculum. The students practice the Boys Town Social (Life) scripts, which focus on the development of "social skills" and, per the Boys Town Manual, a "proper" interactional repertoire.

Over the next two days Jaime will read and write about the school rules, especially the "Number One Rule," and put them into practice. They utilize bathroom breaks as opportunities to practice the program's rules for bodily comportment and behavior. Students are separated by gender and lined along the hallway with their backs flat against the wall, hands to their sides, as they wait for their classmates - only three students can enter the bathroom at a time - to finish their bathroom breaks. Another class has to pass through the hall where they are waiting, and Mr. Stevens directs them to "turn

and face the wall." Jaime must keep his hands behind his back or to his sides, never in his pockets. DAEP rules do not allow them to turn their heads to look at or to speak to students from other classes, so when Jaime's face curiously turns to glance at the group of passing 7th graders, Mr. Stevens quickly chides him to "face the wall." Mr. Stevens paces the length of the line back and forth with his hands behind his back. He reminds them to not make eye contact or communicate with anyone from the passing class. Every excursion out of class looks like this and how students perform these tasks and behave is recorded on their "point sheet."

Lunchtime feels similar. It's "voices off" in the hallway until they pass the threshold of the doorway to the cafeteria. At this point DAEP staff tells them they can chat, but not with any students from other classrooms already seated and eating. A police officer manages the lunch line to ensure that no more than three students at a time enter and pass through the lunch counter. Mrs. Hodges directs Jaime and his classmates to head to the orientation lunch tables where they are to sit and face forward at all times. She reminds them to not interact with students from other classes who are seated behind them or in front of them. If they are caught looking at or talking to other students, any teacher, security guard, or police officer in the cafeteria directs them to "face forward" and stop talking.

After lunch, students transcribe parts of the Texas Education Code and perform the Boys Town Social (Life) Skills scripts. For example, students practice: "Following Instructions: Look at the person, Say 'Okay,' Do what you've been asked right away,

Check back." At the end of the day, Mr. Stevens has students line-up against the wall in the hallway and hands each student their daily point sheet, those students who were out of dress code and allowed to remain in the program for the day have a dress code infraction form stapled to their point sheets, and watches them exit through one of the eastern exit doors. Jaime exits toward the buses with the rest of the DAEP students where he waits for his school bus to arrive. By 4:30pm all of the buses sit idling and ready for departure.

MORALIZING SPEECHES

As alluded to above, DAEP orientation staff undertakes concerted efforts to enact change in the bodily comportment and attitudes of students during the induction phase. DAEP staff who oversee the introductory period to the program incorporate what I call "moralizing speeches" about personal responsibility in the process of teaching the Boys Town Social (Life) Skills and orienting them to the school's other rules and practices. The program director and school administrators frequently use the notion of "strong-mindedness" vs. "weak-mindedness." These concepts suggests that with enough "head strength," which could be defined as will-power, smarts, or good decision making, these students can personally remove themselves from a negative social situation. The following field note excerpt illustrates a fairly typical orientation session:

Two-day orientation room field note, 8/31/2011: Mrs. Castro walks into the orientation room, switches off the lights, and begins her speech about good character, making the "right" decisions, and the consequences of "bad choices." She warns them "trouble won't tell you it's trouble" and that "it's sneaky." She

grabs Michael, a white male student, by the arm, pulls him up from his seat and walks him to the corner of the room. She says to him, "Hi, I'm trouble... we're gonna be here, in this cell, for the next 50 years, ok?" He starts pulling away and she yells, "Heck no!" and pulls him in closer. She concludes by asking students how many of them are "genuinely strong minded?"

As hinted in the typical orientation session reconstructed above, discipline talk significantly extends out to the families of DAEP students as well. The staff also impart the importance of strong-mindedness during the parent-student orientations and it is a central point of emphasis whenever the Program Director Dr. Hernandez leads these morning orientations. What follows is a field note excerpt that demonstrates a typical orientation session run by the director.

Parent orientation filed note, 10/04/2010: Dr. Hernandez impresses upon parents that the success of their children is enhanced if "parents and teachers work together," and emphasizes that "the ones we could not reach it's because we haven't been able to get in contact with parents." He advises parents to ask their children "let me see what you're wearing to school," and tells them "we are being taped 24/7, here they are safe, the problem is outside." He shares with the parents that he also directs the "DAEP" at the Hawthorne Juvenile Detention Center (HJDC), and says "there are two reasons why kids end-up at [HJDC]... they do whatever they want at school, home... because they do not practice the Number One Rule... The second reason... they hang out with the wrong set of

kids and develop what we call group think," he uses this as a segue into discussing gangs and the decision to fall in line with a gang as a matter of "strong" or "weak" mindedness. "You have to be very strong in your mind, only people who are weak minded do gang stuff... if you know you are strong minded, you say, 'No, this is NOT for me.'" He shifts his focus specifically to parents and explains another strategy they need to employ at home: "pay attention to what they're talking about and be STRONG... as a society, we are losing a lot of kids (he is speaking in a serious and alarming tone)... listen to your son or daughter." He elaborates on how important it is to listen to the conversations kids are having with friends so that they can identify the bad elements: "draw the line and tell your son or daughter you will NOT be friends with that kid anymore!" He raises his hand and points his index finger at the parents, "... YOU have to be strong!"

The admonition to be "strong minded" by the program director and staff is buttressed by the Boys Town Character Education Curriculum students encounter during the induction period. The primary objectives of the Boys Town model are to promote an ethic of individual responsibility in its student/family clients and to develop "a repertoire of effective social behaviors" (Dowd and Tierney 1992: 1). The model operates under the assumption that, due to deficient cultural backgrounds and lack of an appropriate "behavioral repertoire," students and their errant families must be retrained and brought under institutional and social control (Dowd and Tierney 1992: 3). At the DAEP, the development of "effective social behaviors" is attempted through the assimilation of the

Boys Town Social (Life) Skills scripts and the interactional model promoted through routine practice and performance. The structure of the "Life Skills" scripts designates the hierarchical roles of participants by positioning students as disempowered, targets of action and are comprised of what Searle (1969: 25) referred to as directive "perlocutionary acts," which command behavior change and conformity. How well students display the Social (Life) Skills or the extent to which they deviate from their appropriate use is documented on the school point sheet.

Boys Town Life Skills	
Following instructions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look at the person. 2. Say "Okay". 3. Do what you've been asked right away. 4. Check back. 	Getting the Teachers Attention <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look at the teacher 2. Raise your hand and stay calm. 3. Wait until the teacher says your name. 4. Ask your question
Accepting Criticism or a Consequence <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look at the person. 2. Say "Okay" 3. Stay calm. 	Disagreeing Appropriately <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look at the person. 2. Use a pleasant voice. 3. Tell why you fell differently. 4. Give a reason. 5. Listen to the other person.
Accepting "No" for an Answer <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look at the person. 2. Say "Okay". 3. Stay calm. 4. If you disagree, ask later. 	Making an Apology <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look at the person. 2. Use a serious, sincere voice. 3. Say 'I'm sorry for ... or 'I want to apologize for.' 4. Explain how you plan to do better in the future. 5. Say 'Thanks for listening.'
Greeting others <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look at the person. 2. Use a pleasant voice. 3. Say 'Hi' or 'Hello'. 	Accepting Compliments <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look at the person. 2. Use a pleasant voice. 3. Say 'Thank you.'

Figure 4: Boys Town Life Skills Scripts

The DAEP staff employs the Boys Town character education curriculum and behavioral model to rehabilitate and retrain adolescents with what staff deem "poor social skills." Most of whom, to reiterate, are low-income, male, and nonwhite. The components of the "skills" are listed as commands and directives, which communicate an expectation of docility to keep, per the Boys Town training manual, "resistance and noncompliance" to a minimum while cultivating behavioral change in youths (Dowd and Tierney 1992). The structure of the "Number One Rule" and the Boys Town curriculum positions students who are subject to their enforcement as in need of rehabilitation, and consequently, submit these youths to the micro-policing of their bodily comportment, gestures, facial expressions, and modes of interaction.

VARIATION IN STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Throughout the induction period, how students are oriented to the rules and which students are positioned as the primary targets of these moralizing speeches varies by the race and gender categories students occupy. Student enrollment at the DAEP is made up of predominantly black and Latino youths, with a small minority of white students. The experiences of white students tended to deviate significantly from the majority student body and this initially manifests during the induction period. White students were typically treated with less contempt than black and Latino children, they were less likely to be assumed criminal or troubled, and this was reflected in staff evaluations of student behavior, perceptions of danger, and eventually recorded on disciplinary documents. Sometimes this happened despite white students being referred to the DAEP for violent

or serious offenses. What follows is a representative field note of the disparate treatment experienced by subgroups of students at the DAEP during the induction period, the targeting of "moral speeches" at students of color and the cultural assumptions they inhere:

Two-day orientation room field note, 9/1/2011: I'm in the Orientation room working as a substitute when Mrs. Hudson, a black female teacher, pulls me aside and hands me a disciplinary referral form for Stan, a white male student from one of the districts more affluent high schools. The referral was issued by Stan's home school and lists the reason for his referral to the DAEP. Mrs. Hudson points to the uncharacteristically low number of days he was assigned to the DAEP, just seven. A true rarity considering the average removal period to the DAEP was for 20 days. Coinciding with my review of Stan's referral, the orientation teacher, Mr. Stevens, was in the middle of an acrostic exercise with students on RESPONSIBILITY. Mr. Stevens informed students that it is their "responsibility to respect your parent, teachers, the law, " and then called out two black male students by name, Raheem and Deandre, in front of the orientation class. Mr. Stevens said that he was thinking about Raheem and Deandre yesterday "I was thinking about you two... I just knew you were doing something bad" both boys let out annoyed sighs. Mr. Stevens told them they were not "bad kids, but kids who need the most help." Raheem was referred to the DAEP for being under the influence of marijuana at school and Deandre had been referred for insubordination. My attention was pulled back to Stan's referral, it described a

brutal scene involving a teacher, assistant principal and Stan's mother. According to the referral, Stan became enraged during a meeting with his mother and staff at his home school. He began to violently kick and strike at his mother and other school officials and was finally subdued after getting his hands on a pair of scissors he attempted to stab the school officials and his mother with.

The assumption that black and Latino students were "in need of the most help," and posed a greater risk than their white, typically affluent peers pervaded the induction process. Off-task discussions would emerge throughout the induction period among all students, however, black and Latino students were disproportionately sanctioned for disrupting orientation while similar behavior among white students were frequently overlooked or disregarded. This seemed to legitimate black and Latino children as the primary targets of DAEP discipline and moral speeches during these initial orientation days.

DISCUSSION

The induction process experienced by students demonstrates that discipline is accomplished by a series of what Foucault (1977) would call "disciplinary technologies." Prominent among them are 1) *hierarchical observation*, which operates through the ubiquitous and constant use of staff and security cameras to produce a disciplinary gaze over the behavior and mobility of youths; 2) *normalizing judgments* in the use of evaluative point sheets as a dividing practice to reaffirm the student as justifiably outside the bounds of mainstream schooling; and 3) *the examination*, which produces a

normalizing gaze over students in the retention of point sheets and other disciplinary documents, such as dress code infractions and disciplinary referrals. Foucault asserts that the transition to disciplinary power in the modern era operates to discipline the "soul" of individuals and assumes a capillary form extending across the whole of society. In the context of the DAEP induction period, rigid school rules and documentary disciplinary procedures are inculcated in the body, in every minute movement and mode of expression available to students. The mandates "NO TALKING BACK, NO ARGUING, NO POUTING" epitomize the silencing objectives of this totalizing discipline to transform students into docile bodies.

The implementation of these disciplinary technologies presupposes that youths arrive at the DAEP in a state of "indocility," as deficient bodies requiring disciplinary intervention. They know "everything about drugs" and nothing about science. They are "weak-minded," require social retraining, and must learn to constrict their bodies in public and institutional spaces. These discourses structure the relationship between the school, students, and families, and informs the disciplinary strategies established during the induction period. As I have demonstrated above, this process is exemplified through moralizing speeches, character education, daily evaluation focused on physical, behavioral, and mental transformation, and the distribution of students into the denigrated categories of "unsuccessful" and "pending."

These disciplinary practices aim to reorganize their bodies and psyches to become what the program defines as the "successful student." They create a specific type of

docile body, one that is habituated to inspection, monitoring, and confining its own movement. "Successful students" are the ones who are able to demonstrate that they have internalized this very particular set of school rules and expectations for students' transformation. They are the docile students. Through avenues such as point sheets, the aforementioned categories of the successful, unsuccessful, and pending student operate as what becomes various classes of DAEP students. During this process students amass a significant paper trail that extends outside of the DAEP. The documentary procedures in place at the program contribute to a network of legal documentation kept on students, including the transgression of DAEP rules, juvenile probation status, and "criminal" behavior on or off of school campuses. A practice that problematically criminalizes a largely nonviolent population of youths.

TRANSFORMING "CULTURALLY DEFICIENT" STUDENTS INTO DOCILE BODIES

In her analysis of black masculinities in public schools, Ferguson (2001) found that the structure of punishment in schools works to produce black boys as "bad boys" through disciplinary practices replicated in the criminal justice system. In the context of zero tolerance school policies, this chapter demonstrates that many elements of her analysis cannot only be reaffirmed, but amplified. Punitive zero tolerance education policies in Texas have encouraged the growth of public educational programs that mirror detention facilities and operate with similar organizational objectives: to discipline and isolate. Significantly, the DAEP disciplinary practices under investigation are even more extreme than those observed by Ferguson. My data demonstrates that these schools undertake

concerted efforts to alter the minds and bodies of youths deemed culturally deficient upon their forced arrival to the program and attempt to (re)produce them as self-monitoring "docile students." The dominant discourse among program personnel asserts that these students lack discipline, social skills, and a moral compass. Notably, this "deficiency" discourse includes a critique of youths' families and their "culture." Through calls to be "strong minded" and join the "no=no club," or to inform parents that they too have "homework" and should think of themselves as DAEP students, parents also emerge as targets of program discipline.

This punitive shift toward children and their parents can be understood through Ferguson's (2001) concepts of the "doubly displaced" position of black boys and dominance of "culturalism" as a frame for interpreting racial disparities in educational outcomes. Historically, the socially constructed category of "childhood," as an emotional and developmental stage between infancy and adulthood, routinely excluded black children. Through enduring racist discourses, black boys are now "doubly displaced"(Ferguson 2001: 80): they are both "adultified" as either "criminals" or "endangered species," and their behavior is perceived as "willfully bad." Ferguson argues that these stereotypes operate as "mirror images" in which black males as supposed "criminals" are individually responsible for their own fate, and as "endangered species" combat an internal, self-imposed predation. Consequently, the dangers and challenges faced by black boys are portrayed as dangers they construct for themselves. Culturalism is the practice of defining and interpreting disparities in school discipline and outcomes as the result of deficient "culture," not institutionalized or individual manifestations of

racism or classism. Applied to the DAEP, Ferguson's concepts highlight the racialized and gendered stereotypes about students and their "culture" that pervade the program. In particular, the association of "bad" personal values and dysfunctional belief systems with the ascribed racial traits of black and mainly Mexican/ Mexican-American children and their families.

Students' forced placement in this DAEP is understood not as an outcome informed by institutional effects, but as the result of personal bad decision making, or, in the words of one DAEP teacher, "barriers they put up for themselves." DAEP personnel chastise students for their bad behavior and their families for lax parenting, and tell students that they are the ones, to quote Dr. Seuss, "in charge of where they'll go." The implementation of character education aimed at developing "social skills," combined with moralizing speeches, reflects an investment in this position and validates the punitive methods for disciplining the majority nonwhite student body of the DAEP. Mr. Stevens epitomizes this when he asserts that incoming students know nothing about school and academics, but everything about illegal behavior, and that they only possess interest in dangerous and unproductive activities.

Given the particular historical and political experiences of the Mexican and Mexican-American population in Texas as targets of de jure and de facto racial segregation policies in public schools (Valencia 2008), economic marginalization and racial violence (Acuña 1981; Montejano 1987; Moran Gonzalez 2009), Ferguson's analysis of the racialized nature of punitive schooling suggests a similar, though certainly

not identical, process here in the perception of student misbehavior of poor Latino boys. Future research should investigate these nuances in disciplinary school environments, noting points of conversion and diversion in the experiences of youth populations and the interpretation of their behavior by school staff and authorities.

CONCLUSION

While rates of violent crime committed by adults and juveniles have continued to decline over the past two decades, the enforcement of zero tolerance education policies aimed at curbing violent crimes have flourished. As a consequence, youths across the country have increasingly become involved in the juvenile justice system due to the heightened criminalization of nonviolent rule-breaking in schools. In some cases, they are removed to public education programs modeled after juvenile detention centers. This mass movement toward the punitive management of student misbehavior has been diversely supported by public fears of insecurity and violence (Kupchik 2010); conservative led efforts to increase security measures at "violence prone schools" through the institutionalization of paramilitary security personnel (Devine 1996); and efforts to remove students identified as disruptive from mainstream school campuses to alternative education programs, the streets, or jail (Kupchik and Monahan 2006; Reyes 2006; Nolan 2011). In the state of Texas, this process is accomplished through the removal of youths from their school of origin and their subsequent placement and isolation in a DAEP.

This chapter has focused on the induction period to illuminate the on-the-ground practices in place at a DAEP. My findings suggest that the DAEP enforces discipline

through the implementation of a rigid dress code, a behavior and academic based point sheet, and school behavioral rules and scripts that aim to produce students as docile bodies: self-regulating student subjects who internalize the norms of the DAEP and the discursive construction of students and families as deficient. The school's "Number One Rule," which prefaces the "Boys Town" scripts, reflects this approach. Although the vast majority of youths enrolled in these programs are there for nonviolent offenses, the induction period routinely and indiscriminately subjects students to institutional practices and expectations that position them as deviant and in need of discipline and remediation. The organizational imperative to wring students under the control of the program has resulted in the implementation of disciplinary technologies that aim to transform youths from "culturally deficient" students into "successful" docile bodies. Following Foucault's theorization of power relations and disciplinary technologies, if successful, the transformation of DAEP students into docile bodies would prompt an internalization of this deficiency discourse, therefore obscuring structural forces that contribute to their DAEP status.

Given the variability across DAEPs in Texas and other states that operate DAEPs (Reyes 2006), these findings are not generalizable to the whole of disciplinary alternative schools. Quantitative analyses could help determine if these findings indeed indicate a broader pattern in similar public alternative schools across the country. While such an analysis would constitute an important step toward investigating national-level patterns on enrollment and referral types in place at DAEPs, the findings of this study stand alone as a significant contribution to the literature and efforts to reform school disciplinary

policies. In 2014, the U.S. Department of Education announced ground-breaking national guidelines on school discipline aimed at discontinuing the use of punitive disciplinary sanctions to punish nonviolent offenses. Citing the negative consequences of 30 years of zero-tolerance education policies in public schools across the country, disproportionate targeting of students of color, and tighter alignment between schools and the juvenile justice system, punitive school discipline and its link to the school-to-prison-pipeline has been identified as a national concern. The current findings help us understand how vulnerable youths experience schooling, illuminate heretofore unknown practices in place at a disciplinary schooling environment, and the processes that may situate DAEPs as integral links in the school-to-prison pipeline. The analysis and results exemplify the subtle patterns and nuances only attainable through embedded, qualitative research and suggests further lines of inquiry into the every-day micro practices and accomplishment of discipline at the school level.

Despite the aforementioned methodological shortcomings typical of ethnographic research, this study demonstrates the on-the-ground effects of macro policy implementation and political shifts in governance (Soss et al.2011). This chapter and larger research project from which it is derived offers insight into the broader and localized effects of neoliberal shifts in economic, political, and social policy on arguably the most vulnerable segment of the U.S. population: children. Public education not only represents an open market for the unbridled movement of capital under the neoliberal economic state (Saltman 2007), but also functions as a space for the lateral movement of power and surveillance, discipline, and assessment of poor children and their families. In

line with Wacquant's (2009) identification of the neoliberal wedding of "prisonfare" and "workfare," as crucial to the "architecture" of the neoliberal state to exact routine punishment on the poor, the school house arguably represents a space where children experience acute discipline and regulation by the neoliberal state.

While these first two days of program enrollment mark a "critical period" in the DAEP experience to illuminate sociological processes in place at the program, most students complete the majority of their sentence in a space other than the orientation room. Students' eventual transition to their "homeroom" and interaction with other program staff offer more insight into the complexity of school rules and the use and implementation of disciplinary documents. For youths who have experienced multiple referrals to this program over the course of their middle and high school years, these rules are familiar and routine. Interestingly, these "frequent flyers" or "distinguished alumni" in the words of DAEP staff and police, understand the rules to be flexible and the assignment of points to "point sheets" as subject to negotiation. Some students do break the rules, and frequently with harmful results. It is important to note that previous research has demonstrated how students' rejection of school discipline through "counter school culture" can be reproductive of students' own dominated position within the economic and social hierarchy (Willis 1977). Perhaps a similar process is taking place within the DAEP as some students regularly subvert the rules and disciplinary structure. They stick both feet out of their linoleum square and shake hands with friends from other classrooms when they pass through the hall. Despite the strict rules and pat-downs, they

manage a way to smuggle phones, urine, candy, and other prohibited paraphernalia into the program or strategically hide them on school grounds.

Moreover, the implementation of the rules and documentation of their transgression is often not applied evenly and presents important variations by the race, class, and gender categories occupied by youth. The salience of race and gender biases in place at various stages of DAEP sentence fulfillment demand further interrogation, particularly the institutional assessments of black and brown masculinities and the parenting of black and Latina women.

Chapter Five: Gang Members, Hood Rats, and Decent Kids: How Teachers Draw Distinctions between students in a Disciplinary School

Setting

Research on teacher bias demonstrates how teacher perceptions impact children's schooling experiences (Farkas 1990; Downey and Pribesh 2004; Ochoa 2013). Much of this research reveals how teachers' own cultural repertoires - which tend to be predominantly middle-class - inform their perceptions of student behavior, learning ability, and consequent treatment of students (Ladson-Billings 1995; Delpit 2006; Ochoa 2013). The preexisting evaluative categories that teachers and school administrators bring with them and activate in the classroom impact the immediate schooling experiences of children and can have enduring consequences for future academic outcomes. This phenomenon has been shown to be heightened in the case of predominantly nonwhite, inner-city schools where there is an even greater cultural and class mismatch between teaching staff, administrators, and students (Delpit 2006; Picower 2009). In the context of zero-tolerance alternative education programs such as Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs) in Texas, where all students have been forcibly removed to for engaging in criminal or "bad" behavior, how do teachers and staff draw on and enact categories of distinction among students?

This chapter examines the dominant categories DAEP teachers and staff draw on to make sense of and impose distinctions between an otherwise undifferentiated student body already marked as "bad" or deviant by virtue of their referral to the DAEP. I find

that teachers and staff routinely draw distinctions across the student body and produce a hierarchy which situates some students as legitimately "bad," and relationally, students whose misbehavior was perceived to be innocuous. The categorical repertoire drawn on by DAEP staff entailed the following seven dominant student categories that students were slotted into: "gang members," "creepy kids," "unpredictable and threatening kids" "hoochie mamas," "thuggettes/ hoodrats" "decent kids," and "scary kids." DAEP Teachers and staff relied on perceptions of the degree of "danger" students pose during their stay at the DAEP to make these evaluations. The DAEP staff assessment process not only influenced whose behavior was deemed harmless, but decisions about how and whom to punish, and therefore whose bodies were rendered more or less visible in the disciplinary process.

Drawing on extensive interview data with DAEP staff and students, a disciplinary archive, participant observation, and the enforcement of program discipline, this chapter interrogates the formation of student categories that teachers draw on and their effects on staffs' implementation of disciplinary and evaluative practices. I examine the on-the-ground embedded categories that teachers draw on in the DAEP setting, how they are (re)produced, and how the enforcement of these categories varies between groups of students. The data demonstrates that these dominant categories at the DAEP fall along race, class, and gender lines, and therefore reinforce preexisting racial and class inequalities. By examining the dominant categories of distinction in use at the DAEP, this chapter also offers an alternative to prevailing research on the role teachers assume in disciplinary school settings. Contrary to previous studies that argue teachers in the era of

zero-tolerance school discipline have withdrawn from the enforcement of discipline in schools, the current study demonstrates how teachers can operate foremost and quite powerfully as disciplinarians, and secondarily as educators.

SCHOOLS, ZERO TOLERANCE, & INEQUALITIES

Compulsory schooling in the U.S. has been hailed as a great achievement. Public schooling, to varying degrees across US history, has served the purpose of preparing new generations of Americans for the workforce, to “Americanize” the children of recent immigrants, and to instill the principles of democracy in the young (Tyack and Cuban 1995; Kupchik 2010). During the political and social upheavals of the 1960’s, education was viewed as an equalizer - the primary means through which the great ill of the day – racial inequality, could be eliminated. Over the past 30 years, public schools in the U.S. have taken a punitive turn and many education researchers argue that they function more as institutions of punitive social control than democratizing entities (Hirschfield 2008; Kupchik 2010). This qualitative shift in the perception of how schools should be run and to what end, are reflective of social fears external to schools themselves. According to Simon (2007), the penalization of schools is a response to a larger crisis of governance in U.S. in the post-civil rights era. Overstated preoccupations with civil unrest and violence triggered a shift to govern through crime and the hovering specter of urban violence guided future policy making. According to this theory, policy platforms and politicians themselves gain legitimacy when they adopt a crime deterrent or anti-crime stance. Various social, fiscal, and other policy interventions likewise now assume a crime

deterrent focus to gain said legitimacy. The reverberations of this shift have been felt nationwide and manifested in the school context as policy reform and structural reorganization designed to address fears and perceived potential for crime. The social problematic of the civil rights era - racial inequality - was supplanted by a new and corrosive threat to the social and political order: crime (Simon 2007).

The shift towards governing through crime occurred across the political spectrum. Both liberal and conservative alike made tackling crime and creating "safety zones" a central part of their platforms. Zero-tolerance policies migrated to school reform policy, and with it came the language, logics, and metaphors of the criminal justice system (Simon 2007; Rios 2011). The case of disciplinary schools, such as DAEPs in Texas, are perhaps the purest representation of this phenomenon. Children are removed to these programs to "do their time," or complete their "sentences." Similar to the mental patient or inmate in Erving Goffman's *Asylums* (1961), students at the DAEP undergo a mortification "lite" process. Isolated from their home school peers, exposed daily to invasive pat down procedures, and forced to adhere to a litany of punitive institutional practices are just a few of these parallels. For example, the DAEP in a neighboring city is popularly referred to as "the rock;" a clever play on the name of the city in which it is set, but also an oblique reference to the notoriously inescapable Alcatraz prison that occupies a small island in the San Francisco Bay.

Similarly, a disciplinary/ behavioral point sheet system, common to juvenile lock-up facilities, reform schools, and behavioral reform programs, is utilized at the study-site

DAEP. For students who had transitioned in and out of the DAEP, local juvenile justice facilities, and/ or in group homes, the point sheet system was similar to what they encountered in these other punitive institutions. For example, during my interview with a white male student named Kirk, who resided in a transitional group home after his release from a juvenile state school, told me that between the DAEP and his half-way house, he felt as though he was in school "14 hours a day."

Schools are a primary site for the reproduction of race, cultural, and gender norms (Eder 1995; Ferguson 2001; Perry 2003). To illuminate how this phenomenon operates in a DAEP, I draw on Pierre Bourdieu's (1989) concept of academic taxonomies and Gilda Ochoa's (2014) concept of "academic profiling" to interrogate the formation of dominant student categories at the program that may serve as rearticulations of other social markers. According to Bourdieu, what constitutes good versus bad categories in a field such as education, are social constructions that reflect larger structures of domination and inequalities that undergird the schooling structure. Beneath the system of education lies the power relations of groups and classes out of which arises an arbitrary power – the power of the dominant – presented as objective truth and misrecognized as “natural” or reflective of innate ability or “intelligence” possessed by children of the dominant (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977). Consequently, the school is misrecognized as the legitimate agency to sort and categorize individuals and reinforces the structure of symbolic relations of domination between classes and groups. All agents within the field of education are disposed to recognize the legitimacy of the schooling structure, method for stratifying students, evaluation, and classification that reinforce disparate power

relations. These symbolic impositions are internalized by both the dominant and dominated, however, the former come to understand their ability to reach success as the result of their own “hard-work” or through the “ideology of the gift” (129), while the latter internalize their lack of success as either deficient motivation or inherent inferiority.

For Bourdieu, the process of categorizing and classifying students is performed through “academic taxonomies” (36: 1989) invested in by teachers to differentiate and pass valuations on students and to obscure, through numerical grades and academic language, that they represent euphemized social judgments. These “academic taxonomies” are productive and reproductive devices in that they “produce according to the same logic of the structures that have produced them” (39; 1989). They represent cognitive schemes drawn upon by teachers and students to facilitate the “transmutation of social labels into academic labels” (40) that reinforce and legitimize preexisting categories relied upon by teachers and other school agents.

While Bourdieu tends to focus on the rearticulation of class status, I extend this concept into an examination of how these categories also align with race and gender stereotypes. Numerous studies have examined how the work of schools reproduce race, class and gender biases and how these might impact student’s school going experiences (Ferguson 2001; Lewis 2003; Perry 2003). Much of this research has focused purely on black/white relations. Though in recent years, studies have taken on a more pluralistic analysis that moves beyond the black/white binary to examine how multiple categories that students fall into, including class, racial gender, and citizenship status interact with

one another to fashion distinctive schooling experiences (Ochoa 2013).Ochoa's concept of academic profiling maintains that, given deeply entrenched racial and gender stereotypes, teachers perceive certain groups of students to be more ambitious and capable of performing at a higher academic level. Academic profiling, therefore results in higher expectations and privileges accorded to relatively advantaged groups over and above traditionally marginalized groups. Ochoa states that "[academic] profiling occurs individually and is rooted in historic and systemic processes, and similar to police profiling, academic profiling teaches students their place in society" (2013: 2). Regardless of the degree to which students who are perceived as less capable of achieving academically resist the student categories they are slotted into, Ochoa asserts that they are "nonetheless schooled in unequal ways that have significant implications for their life trajectories and community relations" (2013: 3).

Students from historically marginalized groups are academically profiled by teachers as less capable and lacking the motivation and desire to excel in school. This becomes naturalized as biological and/or indicative of superior versus "deficient cultural" values. Moreover, situating her study in a predominantly nonwhite school, Ochoa demonstrates how whiteness operated as the unnamed norm against which students in her study, mainly Latino and Asian, were set. This was due in part to the predominantly white and middle-class make-up of the teaching staff but also dominant discourses in school reform policy. Particularly the black-white achievement gap, which promotes binary and hierarchical thinking and positions white students in an unproblematic, privileged category (2013: 5). This not only rendered white students as unproblematic

students, but obscured the specific needs and challenges they faced in the school setting. I extend Ochoa's findings into the context of a punitive educational program ostensibly designed to punish all referred students equally. My findings, however, demonstrate that certain groups of students are arbitrarily organized into "good" student categories and deemed non-threatening. This penalization trend and the subsequent creation of DAEPs has intensified and complicated the persistent phenomenon of academic profiling in schools as students who have already been profiled as problematic by virtue of being sent to DAEPs in the first place are then subjected to a new profiling process that internally stratifies them. All students in DAEPs, therefore, have been subjected to profiling, but some are doubly profiled in ways that further marginalize them. How does this double profiling play out?

DAEP staff's evaluation of students' behavior informs the completion of a major disciplinary tool: the point sheet. School district police officers and security guards do not fill out the point sheet, this metric is purely under the control of teachers, teaching assistants, and administrators. Point sheets can be referenced by staff from a child's home school to inform their decision to accept a student back to their regular school or to re-refer them to the DAEP for "incompletion of program." For students on criminal probation, these point sheets are regularly drawn upon by probation officers to evaluate their charge's behavior and improvement. They can also be drawn on by juvenile court judges and inform decisions about extending or ending their probation, or to temporarily incarcerate them. To make sense of the evaluation process DAEP staff undergo when allocating "points" or disciplining students, I apply the "focal concerns" theory of judicial

decision making (Steffensmeier, Kramer, and Streifel 1993; Steffensmeier, Ulmer, Kramer 1998) into the DAEP. According to this theory, criminal court Judges - usually short on time and full breadth of information about the offense and the defendant's criminal history - will draw from stereotypical attributes linked to race, gender, class, etc., to sentence defendants. They draw on a "perceptual shorthand" comprised of stereotypes related to the aforementioned race/gender/class categories that the defendant falls into. Research utilizing the focal concerns framework demonstrates this practice to be common and advantageous to white men, the elderly, and women, while disadvantaging black and Latino men. In the case of the former, black men have traditionally been perceived as a "dangerous class," (Anderson 1999) and Latinos, due to their "cultural dissimilarity," are also perceived as a threat and danger (Steffensmeier, Kramer, and Streifel 1993)

In the context of DAEPs, and arguably other schools that have taken on a punitive orientation, teaching has assumed a novel form. John Devine's (1996) influential work on zero tolerance discipline in schools argued that teacher's work is now bifurcated. Where teacher's work once focused on instruction, discipline/ classroom management, and mentoring, Devine argues that the work of teachers is now concentrated on instruction alone. Instead, to manage classroom conflict, teachers elicit the help of ubiquitously placed School Resource Officers (SRO's) to address misbehavior. In the context of DAEPs, however, an opposing dynamic exists. Rather than disconnect teachers from the punishment of students, DAEP staff assume an acutely corrective and disciplinary role in the classroom and wield tremendous power to this end. While school district police were

ever-present on the DAEP campus, the evaluative and disciplinary system in place at the program, namely the use of a “point sheet” locates teachers and staff in a powerful position to evaluate successful and unsuccessful days, write referrals and complete probation officer reports. They work in a position of judge and jury beyond what had been determined in earlier studies on the effect of zero tolerance discipline in schools. The primacy of the successful completion of the DAEP sentence can have long lasting impacts on a student's disciplinary and academic record. By illuminating the categories in place at the program and how they influence disciplinary practices, this paper also reveals a significant shift in how teachers accomplish disciplining, teaching, and other job tasks in the context of zero tolerance schooling in a way that contradicts prevailing studies.

FINDINGS

Drawing on field note, interview, and disciplinary archival data, the following section examines the dominant categories in place at the program: "gang members," "creepy kids," "unpredictable and threatening kids," "hoochie mamas," "thuggettes/ hoodrats" "decent kids," and "scary kids." This section of the chapter highlights representative examples of how teachers (re)produce and draw on student categories, and how this process variously impacts how students are disciplined. Moreover, the section considers how these dominant student categories correspond to racialized, gendered, and class categories that prevail in the larger society. Ultimately, the categorical scheme in place at the program subjects certain subgroups of students to double-profiling: first, at the level of their home-school in the removal to the DAEP, and secondly, at the DAEP as students

are arbitrarily slotted into a hierarchy of decent and bad students. As a consequence, some students behavior and bodies were amplified in the DAEP while others, who were not perceived as dangerous or a threat, were less visible in the disciplining process.

The Largest Concentration of Gangs in Central Texas

Assembly field note, 11/23/2010: I arrived to the DAEP at around 10:00 AM and was directed to the gym where DAEP students and staff members had collected for an assembly. When I got there I was surprised to hear laughter and conversations among students that were, in my experience thus far, prohibited at the program. There were three sets of bleachers against the northern wall of the gym. Amidst the hustle and bustle of kids talking and socializing, teachers and other DAEP staff were busy directing children to not occupy the top three benches of the bleachers. I was looking for a place to sit when Mr. Wynn, a tall white male teaching assistant in his early 30's from the middle school motioned for me to occupy a spot he had just cleared on the bench next to him. I thanked Mr. Wynn for the seat and scanned my eyes across the crowd of students now seated behind me. Mr. Wynn leaned over to me and asked: "you do realize that you're in the middle of the largest concentration of gangs in Central Texas," and raised his eyebrows at me. A bit perplexed by this comment, and unsure if I had heard him correctly - it was hard to hear much over the din of student chatter - I leaned in closer to him and explained that it was hard to hear over all of the

talking and asked if he'd repeat what he had just said. Mr. Wynn repeated with an expression of caution on his face, "right now, you are sitting with the *largest* concentration of gang members in Central Texas." I looked over my shoulder again to the mass of students, the majority of whom were Latino boys, ranging from ages 12 – 18, sitting behind me. At this moment, a seventh grade Latino boy sitting in the row immediately behind Mr. Wynn and I started to tell us a story about one of his friends who stole a "Four Loko," (a malt liquor beverage) and got "out of his mind," wasted on it. Mr. Wynn looked at me and nodded his head so as to reaffirm his earlier statement and told me they had a dangerous population of kids at the DAEP. Things like "Four Loko," was just one of a few substances that DAEP students regularly used. He told me, "you've got to be careful... you won't believe what these kids are into... there's *always* something new."

These sentiments about the potential dangerousness of DAEP students were not particular to Mr. Wynn nor confined to the beginning stages of my fieldwork. For example, when I began to show in the second trimester of my pregnancy in the Spring of 2012, I was forewarned by several DAEP staff members that students may threaten to "stab" my stomach and "cut your baby." While some of the DAEP students were removed to the DAEP for committing violent crimes, this population made up the minority of students. Likewise, although a population of gang members was certainly present at the DAEP, most students removed to the program were not in gangs at all. I interviewed 43 students and worked with numerous others. Some of them were in gangs, most were not, and some had been falsely identified as gang members and entered into the gang registry

due to name confusion or familial ties with legitimate gang member(s). Leilani, for example, a 12 year-old black female student in the 6th grade, shared that she was in the Texas Gang Intelligence Index, but was put on there because of her brothers: “I’m not in a gang, I wear all different colors, but my brothers are bloods so I guess they figured I was too.” Due to Leilani's entry into the Texas Gang Intelligence Index, qualifying her as a "documented gang member," she is no longer allowed to wear red to her home school as it will be interpreted as a form of gang activity.

I interviewed a subset of male students that had either transitioned from a juvenile correctional facility in Texas to the DAEP and were residing in a nearby group home, or had committed an aggravated offense and were ineligible for enrollment in a mainstream public school. Each of these boys spent an extensive period of time - more than a year - incarcerated at a juvenile correctional facility. The boys in this group expressed doubts about the authenticity of gang members at the program. One of these young men was involved in a large Latino gang the *Sureños* while incarcerated, another had joined an “M” *Mexican Mafia* affiliate for protection after being incarcerated for a serious crime at the age of 11, and the other student had not joined any juvenile prison gangs, but was well versed in how gangs operated and communicated in lock-down settings. Other DAEP students also expressed uncertainty about legitimate gang members at the program, but instead cited the DAEP staffs' misinterpretation of the common student practice of whistling and calling out area codes as explicitly gang related activity.

This bore out in my data as well as students were frequently penalized for whistling or calling out area codes in the hallways. If a staff person could not discern who had done the whistling, the entire class would be forced to return to their classroom and retry transitioning into the hallway again. Whistling was a practice predominantly engaged in by boys at the DAEP. It was most common to hear Latino male students whistle through the hallways during class, lunch, and bathroom transitions, which was typically perceived as some type of gang communiqué by staff.⁴ Similarly, many students, in particular black and Latino boys would call out the last two digits of their neighborhood's zip code, which could be heard either repeated by students from other classrooms or countered with the hollering of another zip code. This practice was also perceived by most DAEP staff members to be an indication of gang activity, however, in my student interviews, with the exception of four students who had not heard such practices at their home schools, students indicated that neither activity is distinctively gang related. As one Latino student named Ricardo shared with me during our interview when I asked about the practice, "It's just a way of *repping* [representing] where you're from, some gang members do do it, but like, you'll hear an '0-2' or a '1-4,' and people will either say it too. Like, just so you know they're from the eastside or southside or wherever... It happens at my home school [MLK High School] all the time." Although

⁴Based on my interviews with Latino students - mostly Mexican and Mexican-American students, and observations at the DAEP, this subgroup of students would whistle for comedic purposes and/or to creatively say curse words. A quite common one at the DAEP was the whistling of "*chinga tu madre*," [fuck your mother], which would get kids chuckling in the classroom, but reinforce notions that they were partaking in covert communications about illegal and gang activity. Some Latino teachers were familiar with the cultural practice of whistling and could distinguish it as an innocuous form of rule breaking as opposed to gang communication.

this practice did not usually signal gang affiliation, for staff however, this was interpreted as a pervasive form of gang activity.

Latino students who did have a history of incarceration or gang activity, or were perceived as such, were often identified as unsalvageable and designated to negative social categories. One representative example of how Latino boys were perceived by most staff members was that of Antonio and Rafa, two Latino boys in the 9th/ 10th grade mixed classroom, and is illustrated in the following two field notes:

Field note excerpt, 05/19/2011: Ms. Torres, a Latina teacher, was sitting near Antonio during homeroom period, a male Latino student. Antonio was sketching an image of a car when he volunteered “I’m getting locked up tomorrow” and Ms. Torres asked if he got a “suspension.” Antonio said that he was going back in for “robbery” and “aggravated assault” and that he was originally going to get “four years” but that his lawyer got him down to “three months.” He asked her, “you think four years is good for stealing?” and Ms. Torres says, “no, but it’s different if you’re trying to hurt people.” He was still drawing and said: “I *want* four years, it’s boring out here” and added that when he was locked up he was able to “read a lot of books.”

Field note excerpt, 05/26/2011: I was in the teacher’s lounge for lunch and I see Ms. Torres, she told me that Antonio got “locked-up.” I said “that’s so sad,” and she quickly responded that “it is sad” but that Antonio got locked-up “based on the choices that he made. He’d rather gang-bang” and added that he had gotten

into “car trouble” (he was stealing vehicles), and cited as a source of support for her position that just the other day “he said he wanted to stay in jail even longer because it’s ‘*more interesting*’.” Ms. Torres rolled her eyes. I’m surprised that she failed to mention how he talked up the reading he got to do while locked-up. Ms. Torres elaborated: “he’s in the 9th grade and he’s supposed to be in the 11th grade” and raised this as proof that “he’d rather be” engaging in illegal activity and locked-up than do school. “Some will get out and not learn... they wanna be an OG (Original Gangster)... in their thirties thinking they’re still 16, 20’s” and that they get out and are “training younger kids... those are the worst... creepy.” I am surprised that Antonio has already been consigned to this “creepy” category by her. She continued, “my boyfriend has a few uncles that just got out [of prison] and they’ll be like ‘let me hold twenty’ (in reference to drugs)... there’s only so much we can do, but sadly, that’s the way a lot of these kids are going” she added that some of these kids, like Rafa, another Latino male in class, are “tatted by 10” and “proud of it,” sharing that Rafa’s “mom is in rehab.” She assured me that “we can try to teach them” however, “they’re gonna do what they want to do.”

Threatening and Unpredictable Kids

Both Latino and black students were subjected to extensive scrutiny. In the case of black males, this subgroup of students received some critique for potentially being in gangs, but were more often viewed as dangerous and unpredictable bodies in need of constant supervision and control. The following field note involving Kevin, a black/Latino mixed

male high school student, who had just been released from juvenile criminal probation demonstrates this phenomenon:

Dress code field note, 05/20/2011: Mr. Jackson, a black male teacher assistant, and I were working morning dress code together and were focused on the school busses that were arriving to drop students off for the school day. After getting off the bus, students would pass through an open chain-link gate and walk through the door we were manning, and enter into the security check line. We heard screaming and reprimands coming from inside the security check-in area that was soon followed by Kevin walking out of the door leading into the security check-in area, back outside. Kevin was yelling and cursing. Officer Burkes, a black man in his late 40's, followed after him and told him to get off of school grounds. Kevin called Officer Burkes: "hoe ass law" and said that he would "box" Officer Burkes and win. Officer Burkes was infuriated by this comment and replied: "I bet you \$150.00 you won't box me and beat my ass!" they both departed with expletives. Kevin was soon out of sight. Officer Burkes shared that Kevin had brown suede on his shoes and that he told Kevin he couldn't wear those shoes at the DAEP. According to Officer Burkes, Kevin overreacted, and rather than call someone to bring him shoes or offer to go home and change his shoes and come back, he started cursing at Burkes. Mr. Jackson, Officer Burkes, and Mrs. Willis commented on how Kevin's antics have kicked up since he got off of juvenile criminal probation last month and knows that "he can get away" with a lot more

now. They lamented the fact that he was no longer on probation and were hopeful he would find himself under state supervision again soon.

Kevin's new freedom instilled apprehension and frustration in teachers who pined for the days when he was on juvenile probation and better controlled. The police officer and teachers discussed Kevin's movement out of the surveillance and control of the court system as problematic and complained that this enabled Kevin's "disrespect" and transgression of the school rules. The case of Rakeem, another black male student attests to this trend in how black males were perceived in the program. I discuss Rakeem's story in greater length in a subsequent subsection of this chapter to contrast his experience with that of a white male student of the same age who had committed an identical dress code infraction.

We don't need Hoochie Mama up in here!

DAEP teachers' evaluation of students typically fell along the lines of gender and race. While black and Latino boys were harangued for being in gangs, creepy, or as threatening and unpredictable kids, black and Latina girls were subject to a different type of policing of their bodies and sexuality. For girls at the DAEP, control over the body and what constituted "good" and "respectable" behavior extended beyond behavioral standards that DAEP students were subject to as a whole (e.g. whether one slouches, doesn't keep their hands behind their backs when walking through the hallways, etc.). Girls at the DAEP were routinely chastised for wearing clothes that were "too tight," most commonly "skinny jeans," shirts that were considered "too low-cut," and inappropriate

undergarments, which meant anything other than white bras or underwear. Getting girls to exercise "self-control" over their bodies was a frequent theme espoused by DAEP staff and what they characterized as the violent tendencies of DAEP boys, was used to emphasize this point. The following field notes are representative of this dynamic:

Parent-student orientation field note 10/20/2010: Mr. Stevens was going over the DAEPs dress code guidelines. He announced to the students: "you can wear jean shorts, but girls, you can't do hoochie mama up here... they got to be between ankle and knee ... We don't want boys up here saying 'ooh mama'- don't you dare put yourself out there like you got no control! These boys will hurt you! Ooh they will hurt you!" He shook his head from side to side. "You must wear those old-fashioned type of jeans, those skinny leg jeans are grabbing too tight. Showin' all this" and he cupped an imaginary rear behind his back. "You don't want a guy running up saying 'ooh baby.' You didn't come here to get hit on. Don't give them your number, your address... these guys are bad, and you don't even know why they're here... That's what guys do, we look at girls, and girls look at guys."

Parent-student orientation field notes 11/3/2012: Mr. Stevens was addressing parents and students, and then shifted his focus to a small number of girls in the parent-student orientation room. "We have young men here, and we want the focus on teachers, not you... present yourself as a *young lady*... you are not here to make friends - or get a *boyfriend* - they'll talk to you..." Mr. Stevens focused

his attention on a young Latina student who was there with her mother. Once she realized that he had honed in on her, she quickly darted her eyes down to the small table she was seated at. Mr. Stevens continued: "Look at me, LOOK AT ME," and shifted his eyes up from the girl and scanned the rest of the classroom. He then returned his focus to the Latina student and said "don't give him your number, I don't care how cute he is" his voice shifted to a mocking tone and he made his wrists limp and flopped them around. "They're bad. They're not in a good place right now, hey – look at me," he hunkered down and placed both of his hands flat on the Latina student's table, "some of these are here for sexual assault on students ... they go out of their way to degrade ladies!"

Parent-student orientation field notes 11/3/2010: Mrs. Lewis was covering dress code, she stated "No skinny jeans, the shoe tongues can't be sticking out [over the cuff of the jean pant leg]... you don't want a guy saying 'baby, you look *good* the way jeans those are fitting you.' ...These schools are 95% male, and boys zoom in on the chest. It's the first thing guys look at. It's a fact of life, and these are things you have to learn about."

These discussions about natural expressions of female and male sexuality persisted throughout a student's stay at the program and the disciplining of male and female sexed bodies varied markedly in this respect. Significantly, when boys were inappropriate with students of the opposite sex, the DAEP enforced minimal punishment against boys for

behavior characterized by staff as “natural.” Girls, in contrast, faced disproportionate policing of their bodies, sexuality, and were also burdened with managing the “natural” impulses of boys. Most importantly to not serve as a “distraction.” While males at the DAEP would be punished for not following the dress code, whistling in the halls, or “disrespecting” teachers, they were rarely disciplined for making inappropriate sexual comments to female students or even to female teaching assistants for that matter. While this is not to say that all boys at the DAEP engaged in such behavior, when boys did make lewd comments to female students or staff, such as draw nude pictures of them and comment openly on their bodies, it rarely surfaced as a point of concern. In this respect, boys were allowed and arguably as a result, even encouraged to treat female staff and students in a derogatory manner. This common phenomenon and the DAEPs failure to discourage this behavior ended up reproducing gender inequalities in the program that matched prevailing gender inequality beyond school bounds.

Girls' bodies were frequently up for public critique and discussion at the DAEP. That girls faced disproportionate policing of their bodies and sexuality was evident in the enforcement of the dress code. Based on dress code referral data from the entire 2011 - 2012 school year, despite accounting for only 23% of the DAEP student body, of the 1080 dress code infractions recorded for that year, 43% of them were issued to female students. Latina students accounted for 59% of female DAEP enrollment and black female students accounted for 28% of the total female enrollment at the DAEP. The dress code, however, was unevenly enforced. The bodies and sexuality of Latinas were a primary target for DAEP staff regulation and policing, especially for wearing “skinny

jeans" (i.e. jeans that fit "too tightly"). When girls arrived to the morning security check-in, their dress code was typically evaluated by Mrs. Willis, an older black woman who was an teaching assistant and dress code enforcer at the program. Notorious for her curtness and "no nonsense" approach to dealing with students, Mrs. Willis earned the nickname of "Major Payne," in reference to the 1995 comedy film featuring Damon Wayans, who played an overly zealous former Marine turned JROTC drill sergeant at an all-boys academy. My observational data and analysis of dress code infraction data for the 2011 - 2012 academic year indicates that DAEP staff tended to enforce this infraction more frequently against Latina students, despite this being a common style of jeans worn by girls across the DAEP student body. Of the 466 dress code referrals made to female students, 116 of them (25%) were issued for skinny jeans, and of those skinny jean referrals, 72% were issued to Latinas. In fact, nearly 70% of all dress code infractions issued to Latinas involved skinny jeans, frayed jeans, inappropriate undergarments, unnatural hair color, and shirts that were either too tight, see through, or too low-cut.

In the case of black female students, the second largest group of female students in the program, 66% of all dress code infractions issued to black girls involved skinny jeans, frayed jeans, inappropriate undergarments, unnatural hair color, and shirts that were either too tight, see-through, or too low-cut. Interesting variations between black and Latina girls existed with respect to these numbers. While Latinas were more likely to be penalized for skinny jeans and ill-fitting shirts, black female students were more likely to be penalized for having hair styles that were out of dress code and for wearing inappropriate undergarments, mainly bras. Although white bras were mandatory at the

DAEP, many black female students preferred to wear black bras or darker hued bras. According to the black female students I interviewed who received dress code infractions for their undergarments, and based on my observations of the morning security check-in process, these students felt uncomfortable wearing white bras since this made it much easier for other students to see the outline of their undergarments under white t-shirts.

Black girls, whose sexuality was also policed by DAEP staff, were frequently accused of being "too loud," and therefore disruptive to the program. Program staff would alternately refer to this subgroup of female students as "hood rats" and "thugettes." This disparity in how black girls were perceived and evaluated at the DAEP was on the radar of the high school administrator and program director. As a result, one of the many morning trainings the administrator planned was designed to get teachers to think critically about the biases this caused teachers to activate when disciplining students. The high school administrator, Mrs. Lewis and a high school teacher, Mrs. Jones ran a diversity training workshop for several weeks to address this disparate practice. Their attempt was not successful. While in the teacher's lounge a few hours after the last of these early morning workshops, I was privy to a conversation among a group of three white teachers, 2 women and 1 man, and a Latina teacher about the workshop. The following field note resonates with numerous other conversations teachers had about race in the teacher's lounge:

Teacher's lounge field note, 12/9/2011: I was in the teacher's lounge with Ms.

Torres, a Latina teacher, and Mr. Banks, Mrs. Harmon, and Mrs. Weyand, all of

whom were white teachers. They had just completed a cultural proficiency workshop that lasted over a month and Ms. Torres was complaining about how she had to "be sensitive" to certain kids' behavior because "supposedly, *it's their culture.*" She referenced a black girl in one of her classes who she described as "loud" and added sarcastically that "I have to let her yell *because it's her culture.*" She shook her head and continued, "then I need to sleep in class because it's *my culture, I need a siesta*" she shook her head again and commented on how "racist" that was. Mrs. Harmon added, because of "my Euro heritage - they take long lunches - I have to take a *long lunch.*" All four of the teachers laughed and Mrs. Harmon, who also claimed that she was "part Native American" asserted that by that logic, she should be "selling turquoise along the river."

There were clear distinctions made between "ladies" and "hoochie mamas" and "thuggettes/ hood rats" at the DAEP. Theorists have interrogated the use of these categories to define and perpetuate negative stereotypes about black and Latina women. Patricia Hill Collin's (2000) concept of "controlling images" and their historic and contemporary use to inform modern day assessments of black femininity are particularly illuminating in the DAEP context. Collin's defines controlling images as "ideological justifications for intersecting oppressions" of black women, which emerged during the slave era in the U.S. and are maintained in the present through pernicious social practices (2000: 79). These images effectively regulate black women's behavior, sexuality, and function as a disciplinary mechanism and limits capacities for resistance. Similarly, scholars have examined the operation of similar "controlling images" of Latinas, most

salient being that of the "teen mother" and the sexually available "mamacita," which serves to perpetuate stereotypes about Latinas sexuality and reproductive capacities (Lopez 2003; Ramirez-Berg 1997).

My status as a former "high school dropout gone good," and life events experienced during my time at the DAEP (getting engaged, then married, and shortly thereafter expecting my first child), turned me into an "example" for DAEP students. While my biography and the life stages I passed through during my time at the DAEP were commonly referred to by a variety of DAEP staff members, including the DAEP director when he was lecturing students in his office, the place where this was most pronounced was the new student orientation room. Try as I might to steer clear of the new-student orientation, I was occasionally asked to drop-off materials and deliver students there. Without fail, I would be called on by one of the orientation room teachers to participate in an impromptu lesson on making "good life choices." I was often hailed as an example of a "lady" who did it "the right way." One of the orientation teachers, usually Mr. Stevens, would routinely pose the following questions to boys in the orientation room: "Do you want to be with a woman that looks all beat up, or *a lady* like Ms. Lozano?" and "Look at Ms. Lozano, isn't she beautiful? Tell them how old are you Ms. Lozano." With the girls, the angle was quite different and would fall along the lines of: look at Ms. Lozano, she did it right, she finished high school, she got married, *then* she got pregnant, and soon she's going to be a doctor. These events were very difficult for

me to sit through so I would usually remain silent during these moments or give short responses.⁵

The DAEP naturalizes a misogynistic masculinity in boys while simultaneously hyper-sexualizes and punishes girls for transgressing gender norms at the DAEP. Namely, that girls be proper ladies and not "hoochie mamas" or "thuggettes." These sexually deviant characterizations of boys and girls, most of whom are black or Latino, (re)produces racialized gender stereotypes.

The Decent Kids

White students were considered anomalous by DAEP staff, or as "bodies out of place," and as a result, were categorized as "decent kids" who had simply made mistakes. The inverse of Nirmal Puwar's (2003) discussion of the "space invader" status occupied by white women and men and women of color as "bodies out of place," in institutions of power where white, able-bodied men operate as the "somatic norm," in the DAEP context - a punitive and regulative institution - white bodies were deemed "out of place." Puwar's analysis asserts the presence of "out of place" bodies produced disorientation among the traditionally privileged occupants of these institutions and amplification as these new kinds of bodies were perceived as a menacing threat. Conversely, white students were viewed as out-of-place in the DAEP and set in contrast to the naturalized backdrop of

⁵At one point I reached my limit with another orientation teacher, Mrs. Hodges, who wanted me to film a public service announcement about my biography and how I "turned my life around," that would be played for every new cohort of students when they entered the two-day student orientation room. I refused to make the video and she refused to do an interview with me.

mainly low-income, black and Latino students. The following field notes are demonstrative of this common perception and positioning of white students at the DAEP.

Field Note Excerpt, 11/1/2011: I was working Mrs. Sanchez's position in the morning security check-in. It was my job to document dress code violations in the official dress code log of the day. The recently promoted Sergeant Burkes (Black male) was training his replacement in the high school wing on how to correctly perform the morning security pat down of students. His replacement was Officer Tucker, a very tall White male officer with a crew cut. Burkes explained the pat down process and demonstrated his approach on a White male student from the Smith/ Granger classroom. There were surprisingly very little students in line for morning pat down given that it was close to 9:30 am, the cut-off time for student arrival to the DAEP. Sergeant Burkes told Officer Tucker that "the Caucasian kids" were kids "you don't really have to worry about" with regard to how rigorously they pat them down. Sergeant Burkes told Tucker that "these kids" in reference to the White kids, were "decent kids," adding that they are usually at the DAEP for 10 days and get to take night classes two days a week to get out early. They were "just kids who did something stupid." He then compared them to "those kids" who keep coming back, he motioned to the now packed wall of students waiting to pass through security check, almost all of which were Black or Latino. The next student to walk through security also happened to be a White male; Sergeant Burkes indicated that he's going to use him as an example of what he was talking about. He said "see," while raising his eyebrow to Tucker and

motioned his head toward this student, he asked the kid, “where are you from, Thompson [high]?” which is a very wealthy high school in the district, to which the student responded: “yes.” Then Sergeant Burkes said to Tucker, “see, this is what I was telling you about” in a sarcastic manner, “these are the kids you *really* have to watch out for.” Steve (student identifies as Mexican and Black; his mother is mixed ½ Black, ½ Mexican and his Father is Mexican) and Johntay (student identifies as Black, is also a boy), were both in the same 9th grade class together, they followed about 10 students behind the two white students in line to be patted down. They had both been students at the DAEP for part of their middle school years and comprised a category that teachers and staff referred to as “returners,” “frequent flyers,” or “distinguished alumni.” Steve was joking and talking loudly in line while he was waiting to be patted down, which was not against the rules. Steve was also bipolar and this behavior was listed as one of his “manifestations” under his Behavioral Implementation Plan (BIP). Before Steve and Johntay stepped forward to begin the pat down, Sergeant Burkes started to chastise both of them for being loud and yelled at Johntay for not having taken his coat off before he walked through the door to line-up for the security check. He screamed at Johntay: “get the hell over here!” and Johntay cracked a smile as he started to move toward Sergeant Burkes.

As demonstrated by the last field note, white students were frequently perceived as "decent" kids and non-threatening to the DAEP staff, which was set in contrast to black and Latino kids at the program. The following field notes further attest to this common

assessment of white students as decent and less deserving of punishment and institutional scrutiny:

Middle school field note, 2/8/2011: I was working in Middle School when Mrs. Kennedy, a white female middle school teacher and one of the teacher aides were cracking jokes about a group of three white students, two girls and a boy, who arrived to one of the 7th grade home rooms the day before. The trio of white students had been sent to the DAEP for drinking alcohol on school grounds. Mrs. Kennedy mentioned, with laughter, that they were "scared shitless" to be in class with all the [DAEP] kids, and couldn't make eye contact with other students. Mrs. Kennedy commented that she was sure they'd never get in trouble again after this experience and having to be around all the "DAEP kids." A few hours later I returned to Mrs. Kennedy's class. When I arrived I sat next to a white middle-aged male teacher who was doing some work on a projector near the door way of the classroom. Mrs. Kennedy walked in our direction and made an expression of silent laughter and raised her left hand to the side of her face so as to hide the expression from the rest of the class. She pointed in the direction of the white students who were diagonal to her and mouthed to us to look at how "scared" they were.

Field note, 3/15/2012: I was in the high school co-teaching with Mrs. Schmidt, a middle-aged white female teacher known for her gruff personality and unpredictable temper. We were transitioning from the cafeteria to our classroom

to begin the first period of the day. A new student, Wendy, a white female student who had been sent to the program for being under the influence (the only white student in a class of 20), was near the end of the line. Before allowing students to enter class at the beginning of the day, students had to wait at a line in the middle of the hallway, with their hands behind their backs, to be sent into class in groups of three students at a time. Not typically a silent event, two Latino boys in line were talking about a mutual friend and a fight this friend had gotten into. Girls always walked in the back of the line behind the boys and Wendy was one of the last students to enter the room. Wendy walked into class with her hands behind her back and eyes averted to the floor. Mrs. Schmidt nudged me with her elbow, grinned and commented on how "scared" and "terrified" Wendy was. Another teacher, Ms. Torres, walked in and Mrs. Schmidt motioned for her step closer to us. Mrs. Schmidt told Ms. Torres to "look at the new girl... the white girl, she's scared as hell. She ain't never coming back to the DAEP" and indicated something along the lines that she'd be "scared straight" and let out a chuckle.

When white students misbehaved in class or didn't follow the rules, their misbehavior often went undetected, or was addressed in contrasting ways to that of their black and Latino peers. The following field note is demonstrative of this trend.

High school field note, 10/25/11: Mrs. Schmidt was leading math class and lecturing on "commutative property," I was assigned as her co-teacher for the period. Phillip, a white male student, Devon, a black male student, and Alberto, a

Latino male student were sitting close to each other and had finished their worksheets. They started to chat as a small group. I passed by their desks and Phillip told me that he was "bored," and I advised him to ask the lead teacher for more challenging work and reminded him to pay attention to the lecture. Mrs. Schmidt finished her lecture and students were to work independently on their math worksheets. There were lots of side conversations going on so I started to circulate around the classroom, helping those students that were struggling with the worksheets and reminding students who were talking to stay on an "appropriate" topic, which meant no conversations about drugs or committing crimes. Various students across the classroom began to discuss their referral reasons, which soon developed into conversations about drugs and other illicit behavior. I heard one student joke about how their parents reacted to the referral: "my mom was like, *you gonna give me my son's weed back!*" and this caused a few students to erupt in laughter. I was near Phillip, Devon, and Alberto and heard Phillip talk about having "\$40.00" worth of drugs on him when he was caught at his home school for being under the influence and joked that his excuse for having the weed was "my dad has glaucoma." Devon made a comment about smoking weed and being high and Phillip chimed in about how high he was at school. I approached the group and told them to keep the conversation appropriate and that there was only 5 minutes left of class. Phillip asked why I'm listening in on him and I responded that it's not that I'm listening in on him, but since the group was being so loud I couldn't help but overhear their conversation. He asked

me in a mocking tone "It's because I'm Caucasian, huh?" he asked again "because I'm Caucasian?" and then called out to Mrs. Harmon, who is within earshot of our conversation for confirmation that he's Caucasian and she gives me a sarcastic nod yes.

As mentioned in Chapter 4, students are required to follow a stringent dress code at the program. When a child is out of dress code, this is typically determined at the beginning of their day, and often sets the tone for a child's behavior and progress for the day. Importantly, the dress code is often arbitrarily and inconsistently enforced by different staff. For example, the most common dress code infraction at the DAEP was for wearing shoes that were no more than 3% of any color other than black, white, or grey. There was no metric in place to distinguish between what more or less than 3% of any other color looked like, and as a result, there was tremendous variation in how this rule was enforced. Since DAEP staffs' focus on the bodies and behavior of black and Latino students were amplified in this space, white students, perceived as bodies out of place, frequently fell off of their disciplinary radar. A prime example of the varied enforcement of the dress code against students by staff is demonstrated through the following field notes and interview excerpts:

Interview field note, 05/07/12: I met with Frank today for our interview, a tall, white male student who was sent to the DAEP for being under the influence of Marijuana. I noticed that he was thumbing a rubber bracelet on his wrist throughout our interview. Bracelets were in violation of the DAEP dress code and

Frank's had the name and insignia of a large smoke shop in the area imprinted on it. I asked him about the bracelet and if it was out of dress code (I was no longer working as a teacher at the time of the interview), and Frank told me it was, but that no one had said anything to him about it being against the rules and that he'd been wearing the bracelet to the DAEP every day for the past week.

Interview field note, 5/10/12: I interviewed Rakeem, a black male student sent to the DAEP for assaulting a campus police officer at his home school after refusing to allow the officer to search his backpack. Nothing illegal was found in his bag. When Rakeem and I started our interview I could tell he was quite agitated. I asked him if something was wrong and he shared that one of the teachers, Mrs. Harmon, had been "messaging" with him. She wrote a disciplinary referral on Rakeem for wearing a rubber bracelet to school and refusing to take it off when she asked him to. The bracelet was confiscated and bagged, which was DAEP protocol in these situations, and delivered to the front office where it would be stored until Rakeem's mother could come to the school to retrieve it. Rakeem's plastic bracelet had the name of the local Historically Black College/ University his mother recently transferred to from a nearby community college to complete her undergraduate degree.

During our interview, Rakeem elaborated on other challenges he faced with this Mrs. Harmon since arriving to the school:

Rakeem: "When you talk to [Mrs. Harmon], there's no talking to her, she don't wanna talk.

JDL: Talk to me about that.

Rakeem: Ok. Say you need some help, like we doing a review right now - I kid you not - the way that we doing this review, I have never ever did a review like this. I have never done a review like how she having us do it... At my home school, we do the whole packet together and this is what you have to study for your semester exam. Like, she not applying it, like I'm not learning, like I'm learning, but I'm learning on my own and some stuff I'm getting wrong and I'm trying to tell her. When I try to tell her that, she feels like I'm arguing with her, like my voice is at a high, like, I don't know how to explain it. I guess my voice is high a little bit or whatnot, but she's very, I don't know - you can't talk to her. She kills you with kindness a little bit, like she tries to, like I don't know how to explain it. [She's] like, 'well ok, I feel like you're threatening me, you need to move around please.'

JDL: She's actually said that to you?

Rakeem: Yeah, yeah, like she actually said 'I feel like you threatening me verbally.' Verbally? How am I threatening you? I'm trying to talk to you, you making me, she don't understand like when I'm trying to talk to her, like I can't talk to her because every time we try to talk to her, she always feels like I'm, I don't know, like I'm putting her in danger. I'm not fixing to hit you or you know

what I'm saying, I'm not that type of dude, like I don't know how to explain it, she feels threatened by me for some reason. Like is it something about me that's threatening her? Like what she do, she told the teacher, she told Ms. Lewis [the high school administrator] that I threatened her with words, something about 'I'm not going to leave until you answer my question.' Like yeah, I said that, but like what I'm saying is I need help, I'm not leaving until you answer my question and then they gonna call the police over this? Is it really that serious?

JDL: So the police were actually called?

Rakeem: Yeah. This happened yesterday.

While Frank's bracelet from a smoke shop was completely overlooked and the drug conversation involving Phillip, who was giving me a tough time for intervening in their conversation was not taken seriously, the "illicit" conversations of nonwhite students and their innocuous rule breaking were attended to with great fervor. Rakeem's experience with the bracelet was distinct from Frank's; while Frank flew under the radar of DAEP staff and his dress code infraction went undetected and unaddressed, Rakeem was put through the formal confiscation, bag and tag, process when his transgression was discovered. Like Kevin's situation described earlier, and many other black and Latino males at the school, Rakeem's behavior and dress were rendered more visible than that of white students. In the case of black male students, their behavior was viewed with caution and it was common to hear staff discuss police or criminal intervention, or, as was the case with Mrs. Harmon, contact campus police to intervene with a student.

Although DAEP staffs' discussions about white students and their perceived discomfort at the DAEP was certainly a way to demean or poke fun at these "scary" and "terrified" white students, this served another function: marking white students as bodies out of place. This mode of discussing white students and making sense of their removal to the DAEP reinforced the notion that these were students who did not really belong at the DAEP, they fell into innocent categories such as "decent kids" and the "prom kids." The fact that white students more frequently participated in night classes and received shortened sentences, which will be discussed in Chapter 6, only fueled this sentiment. This, however, relationally situated black and Latino students as belonging to this punitive space and more deserving of punishment. Black and Latino kids tended to fall into categories that connoted more ominous character flaws or innate deviant qualities. As "distinguished alumni" and "frequent flyers," the regularity with which they were assumed to move in and out of the DAEP lent credence to this perspective.

Among the predominantly nonwhite student body, there were important variations in how students were perceived by other gender and class categories they fell into. In the case of white students, they were generally seen to be an undifferentiated mass in terms of class. There was some basis to this estimation by DAEP staff. White students at the DAEP often came from the wealthiest schools in the district, so their status as white students at the DAEP tended to be conflated with also being middle class. White female students were a distinct minority at the DAEP and their perceived level of fear and "scariness" was accentuated in DAEP staffs rendering of this subset of students. For black and Latino students, the most salient variations in how they were perceived and the

categories they were placed into were by gender and race, and class to a lesser extent. In the case of Latino males, and black males to a smaller degree, these majority groups at the DAEP were perceived with great distrust and slotted into a gang member or creepy category. Latinos boys were perceived to be gang members, unpredictable in their propensity toward violence and, as illustrated by Antonio and Rafa, were characterized as predatory in their desire to recruit future gang members. Black males at the program, while also experiencing some of the aforementioned gang member categorization, were seen as dangerous and unpredictable bodies that required institutional and criminal control.⁶

WHO GETS A SUCCESSFUL DAY?

The dominant student categories drawn on by DAEP staff aligned with racial, gender and class stereotypes. The lumping of most Latino boys into the category of gang member, and to a lesser extent to black male students, and gendered perceptions of Latina students as hypersexual and black female students as loud and "unlady-like" have major repercussions for how point sheets were completed by teachers. Similarly, that white students behavior was often overlooked at the DAEP and their bodies were deemed out of place, also manifested in the point sheet in important ways. This was often the case during peak referral periods, such as the two weeks leading up to testing and after homecoming, as teachers would frequently fall behind in filling out the point sheets

⁶Although I describe teachers in a uniform way with respect to the dominant student categories operating at the DAEP, there were certain variations across the DAEP staff. A discussion of these variations is beyond the scope of this paper.

during their teaching period. When this happened, teachers would hustle to the various point sheet binders maintained for each classroom to fill out student point sheets. On occasion, when a teacher had not managed to accomplish this catch-up process, the student's homeroom teacher would fill out the other teacher's section of the point sheet. In both of these cases, teachers would often rely on their assessment of a given student beyond the course period for which they were being evaluated. The following field note is an example of one such event.

High school field note, 2/12/2012: I was with Mrs. Anderson and Mrs. Shields, two white female teachers, in Mrs. Anderson's home room. They were both complaining about how they had been falling behind on preparing for their classes and keeping up with the point sheets. Mrs. Anderson shared that to save time filling out the point sheet she would give students she already knew to not be "problems in class" automatic 3's and 4's on their point sheets. I asked her if she did this for classes/ period other than the one's she taught for the day and led by other teachers and she responded that she did. Mrs. Shield's then added that she does the same thing since "I know my students."

High school field note, 3/25/2012: I was in Mrs. Shield's class working as her co-teacher. It was the final period of the day. Mrs. Shield's was going over the point sheets one last time to ensure that students had points filled-in for every period so that she could circle one of the final statuses students can receive for their day on the point sheet: unsuccessful, successful, and pending. It was my job to photocopy

the completed point sheets that had one of the aforementioned statuses circled, so I was standing right next to her as she went through the point sheets arbitrarily adding 3's, 4's, and 2's into empty cells.

According to the "focal concerns" theory of judicial decision making court judges rely on three main criteria when sentencing defendants: 1) Blameworthiness; 2) Threat to Community; and 3) Organizational and practical considerations (Steffensmeier, Kramer, and Streifel 1993; Steffensmeier, Ulmer, Kramer 1998). When determining how to sentence and adjudicate the accused, court Judges will frequently draw from attributes linked to race, gender, and class to sentence defendants, paying particular attention to the aforementioned three criteria. These attributes echo predominant race, gender, and class stereotypes, which colors how various crimes are interpreted and punished by court judges. Consequently, this evaluative process disadvantages low-income and non-white populations for whom negative racialized, gendered, and classed preconceptions influence sentencing practices

The focal concerns theory is illuminating here in how these dominant student categories inform the disciplinary practices of DAEP. While all DAEP students were removed from their home schools for transgressing a school or other rule, when they entered into the DAEP, students were subject to unequal surveillance and therefore punishment for their misbehavior in the program. For Latino/a and black students, this manifested in varied, sometimes overlapping ways, to subject them to double academic profiling. For the vast majority of white students, decisions rendered about their behavior

at the DAEP, even the ability of staff to fully see their behavior, benefitted this group of students. This even allowed them to automatically receive positive marks and points on their point sheet, arguably the most important disciplinary document in place at the program.

DISCUSSION

This chapter posed the following questions: In the context of zero-tolerance alternative education programs such DAEPs in Texas, where all students have been forcibly removed to for engaging in criminal or "bad" behavior, how do teachers and staff draw on and enact categories of distinction among students? Drawing on Bourdieu's (1989) concept of academic taxonomies and Ochoa's (2013) concept of academic profiling, I further inquired, that if all DAEP students have been subjected to academic profiling, a process of differentiation that occurs in regular school contexts, are some students doubly profiled in ways at the DAEP that further marginalize them? How does this double profiling play out?

The DAEP staff engages language which situates students within a relational hierarchy, some as better or worse, "decent kids" versus "creepy." The reliance on these categories to describe youths' character or innate ability actually serve as euphemisms for classifications that are preset in the cognitive schemes used by staff members. In a program designed to punish, where all students have been forcibly sent for having broken school rules or transgressing some other law, this chapter demonstrates how teachers (re)produced distinctions and categories within the DAEP student body, which they drew

on to make assessments of students. Importantly, these dominant categories drawn on in the DAEP, what Bourdieu referred to as academic taxonomies, aligned with race, class, and gender stereotypes, thereby reproducing social inequalities in school and out of school.

In theory, all DAEP students fall into a “bad” category, yet teachers hierarchically situated some students as relatively better than others. The variation in discipline at the DAEP is not homogeneous but differs by the gender, race, and class statuses that students occupy. Students at the DAEP are lumped into overlapping categories by teachers and other school staff, which serve as common points and categories of reference at the program. Bourdieu’s (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977; Bourdieu 1989) work on the classificatory schemes employed by teachers, who operate as agents of the institution of education or “social classifiers,” (1989:39) to divide and assess students speaks to this process as it occurs at the DAEP. Ochoa’s (2013) concept of “academic profiling,” is particularly illuminating here to understand how these categories correspond to racial stereotypes about traditionally marginalized groups and inform students’ experiences at the DAEP. Applied to the punitive DAEP context, my research demonstrates that certain DAEP subgroups are subjected to a double profiling, in the first instance by their home school as all DAEP students are universally viewed as “bad” and having committed a punishable offense. Secondly, students are doubly profiled at the DAEP as certain subgroups of students within this otherwise uniform group of rule-breakers, are perceived and categorized as more problematic, dangerous, and troubling than others.

My field note data and interviews with students and DAEP staff reveals a categorization scheme composed of the following seven dominant student categories: "gang members," "creepy kids," "unpredictable and threatening kids," "hoochie mamas," "thuggettes/ hoodrats" "decent kids," and "scary kids." There was a dominant pattern of characterizing white students as "decent kids" who made bad decisions, as bodies out of place at the DAEP, and therefore placing them in a positive student category. While this took the form of making fun of white students, making them the target of DAEP staff's jokes, this also had the effect of portraying their presence at the DAEP as anomalous while normalizing the presence of black and Latino students in the program. Teachers would delight in what they interpreted as the look of fear on white students faces when they arrived at the DAEP, often commenting that they were certain to "learn their lesson," and never return. By positioning white students as anomalous, as bodies out of place, that black and Latinos are over-represented in their classes at alarming rates is taken as normative, and by extension, natural.

In contrast, black and Latino students, with important variations and some overlap by race, gender, and class, were relationally set as students who warranted removal to the DAEP - they were the genuinely truant and "bad" students. Latino males were perceived to be gang members and organized into a creepy and criminal category, black males were seen as unpredictable and potentially violent students and therefore in need of institutional control and oversight. Latinas were perceived as hypersexual, as were black females to a lesser extent, and black females at the program were categorized as "loud" and as "thuggettes/ hood rats." Both sets of girls were generally perceived to be unlady-

like. DAEP staff were vigilant in the policing of girls bodies and sexuality and intent on socializing them to meet gendered norms of being a "lady" instead of a "hoochie mama" or "thuggette/ hood rat." Consequently, a misogynistic masculinity was normalized at the DAEP, as well as the expectation that girls would be tasked with managing both their own bodies and sexuality, and temper that of the boys. When boys did harass girls at the program, they were rarely held accountable for sexually harassing female DAEP students and staff.

Importantly, there was variation across the DAEP staff in terms of how and the degree to which these categories were drawn on. It was not a uniform experience. Despite this being the case, black, white, and Latino male and female teachers, middle-class and working-class alike, would engage in biased practices against certain DAEP students, in particular black and Latino students, and privilege others. A future paper on the experiences of DAEP staff will explore this variation further. Significantly, the variation in how different students were perceived and slipped into these categories by teachers impacted who in their eyes was criminal, who was deserving of more surveillance and discipline, and whose bodies and behavior could be ignored. When DAEP staff fill out the point sheet, they draw in part on these categories to do so.

Just as Simon (2007) suggests that many of the metaphors of the criminal justice system have moved to schools, this chapter demonstrates that in a punitive school setting committed to enforcing rules, altering behavior, and punishing students, the role teachers take on can mirror that of a prison authority figure or judge. Teachers at the DAEP are

primarily judges of bad behavior, punishable actions, and charged with making assessments of students. To do so, they draw on a schema of student behavior to evaluate students' culpability, belonging, and degree of danger they pose. What focal concerns theorists refer to as a "perceptual shorthand," of criminal offenders, but in context of the DAEP, of students. As Ochoa's research documents, although the DAEP is a "minority" dominant school, whiteness remained the norm against which students are assessed and how whiteness can operate as a default, and privileged category. Not only is this harmful to nonwhite students at the school, this practice obscures the challenges and needs of white students in the program. It also doubly subjects nonwhite students to academic profiling, both in their removal to the DAEP from their home school and in the staff and institutional biases they encounter as DAEP students.

Lastly, this chapter highlights the dangers of adapting criminal justice practices and metaphors into public schools, both with respect to transforming schools into pseudo criminal justice facilities and turning teachers into prison guards or judges. In doing so, the DAEP certainly fails as a democratizing space, and as a truly viable alternative for students who might perform better in a smaller school setting. While prevailing research on the role of teachers in punitive school settings argue that teacher's work is now confined to teaching alone and rarely extends to administering discipline (Devine 1996), this paper demonstrates the opposite. DAEP staff, teachers in particular are the most important and powerful disciplinarians in the program as their assessments of students behavior determines how quickly and successfully a student can progress through the program. This is important as it demonstrates the ways in which schools can (re)produce

race, class, and gender inequalities, and compound the marginalization of certain student groups by doubly profiling them.

Future research will look at how students internalize and potentially perpetuate these categories, stereotypes, and make sense of biased and preferential treatment.

Chapter Six: Punishing Students, Punishing Families: How Parents are incorporated into the Disciplinary Mission of Alternative Schools

In the 30 years since the introduction of zero tolerance disciplinary policies in schools, police personnel and an assortment of criminal surveillance technologies, such as security cameras and metal detectors, have become commonplace in schools across the U.S. (Devine 1996; Kupchik and Monahan 2006; Nolan 2011). Research on the negative impacts of zero tolerance disciplinary policies in schools has flourished over the past decade (Skiba et al. 2002; Reyes 2006; Kim et. al. 2010; Kupchik 2010; Nolan 2011; Bahena et al. 2012; Fuentes 2013), documenting an array of negative effects on the children disproportionately subject to them. Most prominently, higher rates of school dropout (Charmichael et al. 2005; Fowler and Lightsey 2007, 2010); excessive school absences and loss of instruction time (Fabelo et al. 2011); disproportionate impact on black and Latino children and low-income youths; potential negative health effects for children (Skiba et al. 2004; Reynolds et al. 2008; Morgan et al. 2014); and unprecedented partnerships between schools and the juvenile justice system contributing to a "school-to-prison-pipeline" (Reyes 2006; Simmons 2009; Bahena et.al 2012).

The criminalization of students has fundamentally transformed children's school going experiences (Hirschfield 2008). Children, however, do not experience schooling or interact with school institutions independently. They are typically embedded in larger family structures that may potentially weather the impact of intense punishment in schools alongside them. Significantly, very little research on zero-tolerance school

policies have examined their impact on the parents/ guardians of children disproportionately subjected to them. This is important for several reasons, chief among them being that they may disadvantage already disadvantaged parents and encourage parents to disengage from the educational system.

In the current era of hypercriminalization and punitive surveillance of poor and often nonwhite communities, many "institutions of care" such as schools now assume a penalizing function in the lives of the population they are designed to serve (Simon 2007; Comfort 2008; Rios 2011; Nolan 2010). Research in criminology and the family demonstrates how the punitive practices in place in jails and prisons now extend to the lives of their significant others and home communities (Comfort 2008). Parents, as the primary socializers of their children, carry a heavy burden. They are tasked with cultivating academically successful students (Epstein 1985, 1996), providing financial and emotional security, and accomplishing the moral socialization of their children so that they grow to function as productive, law abiding members of society (Robinson and Harris 2014). Likewise when children engage in criminal activity, misbehave in schools, or demonstrate other behavior labeled as deviant, deficient parenting is identified as the primary cause of such behavior (Gottfredsen and Hirschi 1990; Raz 2014). Despite the responsibilities placed on parents to accomplish this massive undertaking, we know little about their experiences with punitive school policies, how they impact parents in their daily lives, and how they make sense of them.

This chapter illuminates parents' experiences with zero-tolerance policies through the first study of family-school relations in a disciplinary school environment with the goal of illuminating how inequality operates. I examine a heretofore understudied aspect of punitive school policies: how the families of children inordinately subject to these policies experience this punitive action against their children and make sense of their experiences at the DAEP. Specifically, the chapter scrutinizes the effects of DAEP rules and discipline on parents, how parents understand their involvement in the disciplinary regime of the program, and the broader ramifications of these issues for the reproduction of social inequality.

CONCEPTUAL ARGUMENT

My conceptual framework for this chapter draws from Megan Comfort's (2008) reconceptualization of Donald Clemmer's (1958) concept of "prisonization," as "secondary prisonization." Clemmer defined prisonization as the process through which inmates become socialized and assimilated into the prison and adopt "the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary" (1958: 299). Comfort's ethnographic study of the experiences of the female partners of incarcerated men with the prison system demonstrates how punishment administered to male inmates extends to the lives of their female significant others, subjecting them to "secondary prisonization." The women involved in her study became acclimated to the demands of the prison on their time, modes of dress and self-presentation, and the structure of their lives in both the prison visit and the domestic sphere. I qualify Comfort's findings in the universe of the

DAEP to demonstrate how a similar phenomenon occurs with the parents of children subject to punitive zero tolerance disciplinary policies. Similar to the effects of secondary prisonization on the female partners of imprisoned men, the DAEP extends discipline to parents as a way of imposing social control and disadvantage on already disadvantaged communities. Parents' reactions to this process and the extent to which the DAEP encroaches on their lives varied by parents' class position. The DAEP, however is not a traditional criminal justice institution, and unlike the women involved in Comfort's study, parents' presence at the DAEP is mandatory. I find that parents in the DAEP endure what I term "secondary discipline," akin to the women in Comfort's study.

As the parents and legal guardians of children drawn into the punitive exercises of zero tolerance disciplinary policies in schools, families can receive fines associated with school rule breaking and truancy tickets (Fowler and Lightsey 2007). These, however, only account for the direct financial costs of zero tolerance disciplinary school policies accrued by families. The parents of children enrolled at the Hawthorne DAEP face an additional set of program and staff expectations, most notably demands on parents' time, clothing costs to meet the strict DAEP dress code, that have latent, unintended consequences. This process appears to fall harder on students from low-income families of color. In this way, what happens to young people in DAEPs becomes a channel in the intergenerational reproduction of inequality, and likely what happens to parents in the DAEP setting is part of this very same channel.

SYSTEMS, FAMILIES, AND INEQUALITY

As discussed when laying out the conceptual argument, this research is primarily informed by Megan Comfort's (2008) concept of secondary prisonization, which I will explicate more fully here. Comfort's (2008) research demonstrates how the punitive power of prisons extend beyond its physical boundaries to punish the significant others of male prisoners through "secondary prisonization" (15). This concept is an extension of Donald Clemmer's (1958) concept of "prisonization," which examines the various ways in which men adjust to the routines and norms in place in prison. Comfort asserts that women endure secondary prisonization as a result of their status as "quasi inmates" who are subject to various punitive exercises of the prison, such as extended waiting, lengthy trips to visit the prison facility, and the screening of letters between partners (22). In the prison visit, women are subjected to the punitive and regulative functions experienced by their partners, exposing them to the "pains of imprisonment," they are marked with "courtesy stigma" (60), as their bodies become extensions of their imprisoned partner through security pat-downs, regulations over their use of time, and style of dress.

Comfort outlines five modes of communication permitted through the prison that facilitated secondary prisonization: 1) letters, which were censored by the prison; 2) sending packages to an incarcerated partner, which is a costly and constraining endeavor; 3) arranging their schedules to receive phone calls from their imprisoned partner, imposing financial stress and impinging on the personal freedom of women; 4) presence creation, which entailed the use of props, fantasy, and synchronization to maintain a

connection with their partners and demonstrates how the prison directs the behavior of women outside of its bounds; and 5) the inclusion of traditional domestic activities in the prison. In the case of the latter, events such as family meals, weddings, and spending the night together, reveal how the enactment of domestic activities transform the prison into a domestic satellite. However, due to their entrenchment in the punitive practices of the prison and limited resources available to women and their partners following the completion of their sentence, some of the women drew on the police and probation officers when men engaged in harmful behaviors.

In Comfort's study, the prison structured the romantic relationships of the wives and girlfriends with their incarcerated partners, constrained women's freedom, and exacted significant financial costs. Analogous to this, the rules at the DAEP structure how parents parent their children, and in the context of zero-tolerance school policies, expectations for parenting in the DAEP takes on a particularly punitive form. Like the female significant others in Comfort's research, as a side effect of the disciplinary program, parents of DAEP students are pulled into the disciplinary and surveillance practices trained on their children. DAEP parents are expected to make their schedules flexible to the demands of the disciplinary regime in place at the DAEP, and are likewise forced to pay hefty costs for clothing that meets the program dress code and transportation.

In a similar vein, Victor Rios' (2007; 2011) examines the social effects of mass incarceration and criminalization on low-income black and Latino boys. He demonstrates

how the boys in his study experience what he terms "hypercriminalization," which describes the multispatial criminalization of youths through a "Youth Control Complex," comprised of schools, communities, businesses, families, and traditional criminal justice agents such as the police and probation officers. The boys involved in his study, regardless of their status as violent or nonviolent offenders or if they had not been involved the juvenile justice system at all, were not immune to the criminalizing effects of the youth control complex. Such a phenomenon treats "deviant youths like criminal threats" and transforms nurturing institutions, such as schools and the family, into penal institutions. Parents and other community members are incorporated into this punishing complex, and frequently relied on probation officers and police to regulate the boys' behavior. However, Rios maintains that parents resorted to criminal justice resources due to the lack of support systems that were not somehow oriented toward criminalizing youths or the parents themselves. Like Rios' research, my study may reveal how some of these institutions, such as the family and schools, operate in tandem and often unintentionally, to exert disciplinary control over DAEP students. By focusing specifically on how parents are impacted by punitive zero tolerance policies, my research reveals how parents are directly subjected to these disciplinary and criminalizing activities alongside their children.

To understand parent's experiences with the DAEP and how program discipline extends to them, the analysis focuses on three specific disciplinary practices aimed at upholding school order, but that actually operate as mechanisms for social control and to

maintain inequalities: 1) Mandatory Parent/ Student Orientation; 2) Night Classes; and 3) Mandatory and non-obligatory requests for parents to visit the DAEP.

FORMS OF DISCIPLINE: "YOUR SON IS OUT OF DRESS CODE, CAN YOU BRING HIM A NEW PAIR OF SHOES?"

Parents' involvement in their child's removal to the DAEP is a requirement of the program and essential to their child's "successful" and timely completion of their sentence to the DAEP. Bottom line: the program requires a lot of parents' time. The expectation that parents will make themselves available to the demands of DAEP staff, even for non-compulsory requests, are ever-present in the operation of the DAEP, their disciplinary efforts, and is instrumental to a student's progression through the program. The timely completion of a child's sentence is dependent on their parents' participation in these three domains. In the subsections that follow I detail the three ways parents are incorporated into the disciplinary regime in place at the DAEP: a mandatory new parent/ student orientation; night classes for parent and child; and frequent requests for their presence at the DAEP.

New Parent/Student Orientation

When a student is referred to the DAEP their parents are required to participate in a mandatory new parent/ student orientation to the program. The purpose of these orientations are to introduce them to the program rules, the character education curriculum, the point sheet system, and to emphasize the importance of parents in their child's successful completion of the program. The new parent/student orientation sessions

are held twice a day, at 8:00 and 9:00AM Monday - Thursday, for most of the school year. They can run anywhere from 1.5 to 3 hours, and include meetings with various school staff, including the school nurse, counselors, and security officers or district police officers during their child's mandatory security pat-down. Parents complete a registration packet consisting of basic demographic questions about themselves and their children, an intake form for their initial consultation with school counselors, and a medical background form for their child's medical screening with the DAEP's registered nurse. A parent/ guardian is required to participate in this orientation each time their child is referred to the DAEP, regardless of how many prior stays they've completed in the program, even if one of them occurred earlier in the current school year. Nearly 25 percent of students referred to the DAEP during the 2011 - 2012 academic year had experienced at least one prior referral to the program. During the mandatory orientation, parents are introduced to most of the school rules alongside their children, in particular the importance of adhering to the student dress code. Parents must initial a copy of the dress code and sign a "Notice of Dress Code" form indicating they have read and understood the dress code, agree "to comply with it daily," and to take a copy home for reference.

Parents are informed at this time that as long as their child is a student at the DAEP, so are they. In the words of DAEP program staff, this means they have "homework," mainly to incorporate the disciplinary rules and behavioral skills that students practice at the DAEP in their homes. Parent(s) are required to sign two separate formal agreements with the DAEP administrators in which they acknowledged: 1) the

central role they play in their child's successful completion of the program and instituting long-term behavioral and character change in their children; 2) commit themselves to implementing DAEP disciplinary practices and behavioral rules at home; and 3) agree to return to the DAEP at the request of staff and administrators, including an acknowledgement that their child will not be able to complete their stay until they meet with the DAEP staff. Below is the "Parental Support" subsection of the first formal agreement between administrators, student, and parents that parents must sign during the orientation:

I [the parent] understand that I play a key role in helping he/she [the student] develop new habits that will help he/she turn his/her life around. I will:

1. Sign the point sheet daily after discussing he/she learning.
2. I will verify that he/she comes to school wearing the school uniform, with school materials and homework completed.
3. I will make sure that he/she does not bring any jewelry, “temporary grills”, cell phones, other electronic devices, uncovered tattoos or any item(s) that may become a distraction to my child’s goals at the DAEP or that are prohibited in the students code of conduct.
4. I will collaborate with school teachers and administrators.
5. I will maintain this parent/ student relationship after he has completed his assignment at the DAEP and has returned to he/she home school.

As a parent I understand that my involvement in my son/daughter school life will determine he/she level of success and that I play a key role in assisting he/she in developing habits of success.

This form, along with the second agreement form "The [DAEP] Policy Regarding Parent Contact/Notification and Student Release During Suspensions" is signed by both students and parents. Here the DAEP outlines the formal requirement that if students are suspended from the program then a parent must attend a conference with the high school administrator before the student can to return to the DAEP to complete their stay.

Night Classes

Students for whom their current removal to the DAEP was either a first offense, or the first offense of the school year, were given the option to attend night classes with their parents (at the discretion of their home schools), in exchange for a reduced stay of 10 days at the program. The average length of stay for first offenses was 20 days. There were two different types of night classes offered at the DAEP: 1) INVEST (INVIERTA), designed for students sent to the DAEP for low-level offenses involving drug or alcohol use; and 2) Positive Families (Familias Positivas), which is tailored for students who were sent to the DAEP for fighting or "gang activity." At least two sets of each class ran for most of the school year every Tuesday and Thursday evening. Below is an overview of each night course and who is eligible to take them.

According to the school district guidelines, the DAEP will provide a drug and alcohol awareness program, INVEST, for secondary students and their parents/ guardians

for first-time misdemeanor-level drug and alcohol offenses. This includes misdemeanor alcohol, Marijuana, and dangerous drug offenses. Participation of the parent/ guardian is required. Use of this program for selling and distribution offenses is at the discretion of the campus administration. Students will be returned to their regular instructional program upon completion of the program. If the student and parent or guardian do not successfully complete this program, the appropriate removal guidelines will be followed.

The District will provide an anti-violence program for secondary students and their parents/guardians (Positive Families) for discretionary removals for fighting or physical aggression during the current school year. Parent or guardian participation is required. Campus administrators must offer Positive families, a program that includes communication skills, anger management, conflict resolution, and problem solving, to students who are removed for fight or for physical aggression and to their parents/guardians. Likewise, if the student and parent or guardian do not successfully complete this program, the appropriate removal guidelines will be followed.

The guidelines that students and parents must follow to successfully participate in these classes and secure an earlier release date are quite strict. A student can have no more than two unexcused absences from school, and all four sessions of either INVEST or Positive Families must be attended with the same parent/ guardian. Students must also be in dress code while participating in the classes. If a student is suspended they can no longer participate in the night sessions and the student will be defaulted to their original sentence. Lastly, parents are not to bring siblings under the age of 13 to the sessions.

Request for Parent's Presence at the DAEP

Parents are subject to frequent requests by school staff to attend mandatory meetings with DAEP administrators and non-obligatory requests to bring their child new clothing if they are out of dress code, or to retrieve a prohibited item brought to the program by their child (e.g. cell phone, more than \$5.00 in cash, jewelry, etc.). Parents/guardians are typically given short notice of their required presence at the DAEP as these mandatory meetings are always made at the discretion and convenience of DAEP staff. For example, when a student has been suspended from the program, a parent/guardian must return with them to the school for a meeting with the DAEP administrator, usually the high school administrator, Mrs. Lewis. She typically requests a specific time and date for the required meeting which is then communicated to the parent/ guardian through an office staff person or other DAEP personnel. This allows for little to no negotiation room for parents. Requests for meetings are mandatory when a child leaves the DAEP without permission (referred to as an "LWOP" by school staff), are suspended from the program, or if the child arrives to school after the start of the school day. A parent must come to the school to meet with the high school administrator before their child is allowed to return to the program to complete their sentence. Importantly, failing to meet even non-obligatory requests for parents presence at the DAEP can extend their child's stay at the program.

Students at the DAEP are on a point-system, the rewards and docks of this point-system are recorded on student behavioral/ disciplinary point sheets, and it is parents responsibility to sign each point sheet at the end of the school day. As mentioned in

Chapter 5, DAEP students can have their daily statuses assigned to one of three categories on the point sheet: Successful, Pending, or Unsuccessful. If students accrue an insufficient number of “successful” days they are susceptible to an augmented stay at the DAEP or a guaranteed re-referral to the DAEP upon return to their home school. Whenever a child arrives to the program out of dress code, usually detected during the morning security check, a DAEP staff person must call a parent/ guardian to inform them of the dress code infraction and to request that they bring new items of clothing (shoes, tape to cover tattoos, nail polish remover, etc.), to "make their dress code right." While a parent is not obligated to meet this request, if they do not their child will be deemed "out of dress code" for the day and receive an unsuccessful on their point sheet, and will therefore lose this day toward the completion of their sentence.

These three disciplinary practices: the mandatory new parent/ student orientation; night classes for parent and child; and frequent requests for their presence at the DAEP, converge to subject parents to stringent program rules and punishment. They require that parents, as much as students, be held accountable for their child's removal to the program and for any transgression of program rules. By positioning parents as perpetrators of usually low-level and nonviolent offenses alongside their children, the extension of discipline to parents becomes a logical step within the DAEP to discipline and rehabilitate students. Given the close connection between schools and the juvenile justice system in the era of zero tolerance, the blameworthiness of parents and the disciplinary focus trained on them problematically subjects parents to punitive social control. This

expectation for parental involvement in the program then may both subject parents to secondary discipline and disengage them from the educational system.

PARENTS' EXPERIENCES: "PARENTS, YOU ARE HERE TOO"

The following section illustrates how parents experience the aforementioned three disciplinary domains in the program through ethnographic demonstration and interview excerpts with parents.

To reiterate, when parents go through the new parent/ student orientation, they are not only informed of their semi-student status, but also sign agreements acknowledging the role they play in their child's success and their commitment to meet the demands of DAEP staff throughout their child's stay at the program. The orientations are co-taught by two of four DAEP staff members: the high school administrator, the middle school administrator, the program director, or the parent support specialist. When parents go through the new parent/student orientation, much of the discussion around school rules and penalties are directed at both parent and student. At some point, typically in the beginning of orientation, the staff direct their attention to students and inform them that their inability to follow the rules has caused their parents a major "inconvenience." The staff specifically referenced the time parents' had to "take off from work" to attend the mandatory parent/student orientation, and frequently stated that students had put their "parents' livelihoods at risk." Of all the DAEP rules covered during orientation, the dress code garners the greatest attention. Parents and students are thoroughly introduced to every aspect of the dress code, this is due to both the presence of gangs at the program

that are said to wear certain colors that are prohibited at the DAEP and the consequences faced by parents and students when a child arrives out of dress code. When a student is out of dress code parents receive a phone call and are asked to bring a new item of clothing to the school to fix their child's dress code.




Student Dress Code 2011-2012	
Pants, Shorts, and Skirts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Plain blue pants/jeans that require a belt.</u> 2. A black belt <u>must</u> be worn daily. Belt buckle may not have initials/logos. 3. No fraying, tears, or holes in pants/jeans. 4. No nylon, sweats, vinyl, wind suits, or plastic. 5. Shorts and skirts must reach the top of the knee. 6. No overalls, suspenders, or jumpers. 7. No logos, insignias, or emblems larger than 2 inches on clothing. 8. No layering (ie, shorts under pants). No baggy, sagging, or oversized pants. 	
Shirts and Sweatshirts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Plain white rounded necks. No logos.</u> 2. No V-necks or hoods. 3. <u>Only White</u> Undergarments i.e. Undershirts, Tank tops, Spaghetti Strap, Bras 4. No tight, see-through, frayed, torn, or holes in shirts. 5. Shirts must be long enough to be tucked in at all times. 6. Long-sleeved shirts must be worn <u>on top</u> of short-sleeved shirts. 7. Shirts and sweatshirts must be worn right side out. No oversized shirts or sweatshirts. 8. Sweatshirts must have an elastic or ribbed bottom or they must be tucked in. 	
Shoes and Socks <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Black, white or gray tennis shoes with matching laces.</u> 2. Multicolored tennis shoes must be mostly (97 %) white, black, or gray with white laces. 3. White or Black Sock only. 	
Coats and Jackets <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coats and jackets may be worn to school but will be stored and returned at the end of the school day. 2. Coats and jackets will not be worn inside the building. <u>Students should wear a plain white long sleeved sweatshirt in the building during cold weather or in a cold classroom.</u> 	
Jewelry and Other Information <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No jewelry of any kind, including piercing (tongue, nose, eyebrow, etc.) <u>Only</u> wristwatches are allowed. 2. No hats, purses, bags, backpacks, totes, or sacks. 3. No hairbrushes or combs of any type. 4. Hairpieces (barrettes or elastic) must be black, white or gray. 5. Hair must be its natural color. No dyes or coloring or straits ie. green, pink, orange etc. 6. No hair cut designs of any kind. 7. No cosmetics of any kind, including lip-gloss or lip balm. 8. No colored nail polish on the nails. 9. Students with tattoos <u>must have them covered at all times.</u> 10. No pagers, cell phones. Ipods, or other electronic devices/equipment. 11. No more than \$5 in a student's possession. 12. No gum or candy. No outside food or drinks of any kind. 13. Students must bring a yellow number 2 pencil and a package of notebook paper after orientation. 	
<p>All Students with Tattoos at the ALC must have them covered at all times. Students with uncovered tattoos may risk an unsuccessful day. (It is the student and parent's responsibility to cover the tattoos.)</p> <p>Final judgment about dress code issues is at the discretion of campus administration. Any issue not listed in this dress code but determined by administration to have an impact on the educational environment or management system will be dealt with accordingly.</p>	
<p>Student Initials: _____ Parent/Guardian Initials: _____</p>	

Figure 5: DAEP Student Dress Code

While parents are not required to bring a change of clothing to the school, when students are out of dress code more than once, additional days are tacked onto their sentence until they max out their stay at the DAEP. A students' maximum stay will vary depending on the reason for referral and how their home school decides to adjudicate the transgression. For the average referral length of 20 days, students are expected to receive 20 "successful days," and the maximum number of days they can be forced to remain at the DAEP is 30. For a 40 day referral, the Maximum number of days a student can be forced to remain in the program is 60. The DAEP staff warn parent and student, however, that if they do not return to their home school with a sufficient amount of successful days, they risk being immediately rereferred to the DAEP for "failure to complete" their sentence to the program. As the parent support specialist regularly stated to students and parents/ guardians when he co-taught orientation: "If you go back to school and don't have enough successful days, your home school will send you back. Students come back, and who else comes back? Parents."

When the high school administrator, Mrs. Lewis, runs the orientation, she emphasizes that parents must have working phone numbers, "Tell me how to get in touch with you. Give me numbers that *work*, no Cricket (in reference to a low-cost cell phone service provider known as "Cricket Wireless")... Parents, don't screen my call. You see a [Hawthorne School District] number, and won't pick-up... *Do not hold me hostage with your child.*" Parents are told they must leave the contact information of another adult contact, but are sternly warned that each individual who visits the school is ran through the district system and the state's criminal database to check for criminal background and

arrest warrants. As a result, several of the students I interviewed whose parents were undocumented immigrants discussed the sense of dread their parent felt upon hearing this warning. Two of the bilingual teachers assistants I interviewed similarly shared stories of having to reassure undocumented parents that their citizenship status would not be detected through this system and that it was safe for them to come to the school when they were requested to do so.

While parents are expected to ensure that their child meets the DAEP rules covered during orientation, the dress code in particular, DAEP staff occasionally subjected parents to the dress code as well. When this occurred, there was frequent talk amongst the security guards about how they stopped a parent, usually black women, who were "dressed inappropriately" from entering the building. Below are two field notes that are representative of such practices:

Field note, 05/25/2011: I see Mrs. Rios, a Latina security guard, during first period and she asked me: "Did I tell you I had to throw a parent out of here yesterday?" I gave her a shocked look to feign my disbelief; I had already personally witnessed and heard several second-hand accounts of throwing parents out of the DAEP, so this actually came as no surprise to me. Mrs. Rios continued: "she [the parent] came in here with short shorts, this all hanging out" and gestured to her own rear end. She proceeded, recalling with full conviction how she addressed the situation with the mother: "I'm sorry, you're not coming in my school like that... getting my boys all horny and wanting to jack up on you!"...

She was like ‘*What?*’ I told her ‘you’re not coming into my school like *that*.’” Mrs. Rios made a scoffing noise and continued. “I was about to say that’s why your son is in here every other day (in reference to the office)... she’s [the mother] a stripper so it makes sense” I commented on how that must have been a "tense" interaction. Mrs. Rios added, in a disgusted tone, that the mom “has four kids” and that “one is a two-year old!”

Although they were the predominant focus of this practice, mothers were not the only targets of dress code enforcement. Below is a field note observation describing the selective enforcement of the student dress code against a black father whose son was starting his first day at the DAEP.

Field note, 01/24/2012: A new parent and student pair arrived at the DAEP for the morning orientation. They were both black males. The security guard, Mrs. Rios told the parent, in a gruff tone, that he had "too much red on" (he was wearing a checkered black and red Pendleton jacket, black shorts and socks, and black and red Nike Air Jordan Shoes), the parent is confused and responded to Mrs. Rios, with a quizzical "Me?" and pointed his finger at himself. The parent quickly explained that he did not plan to stay for the day and reiterated that he was "a parent, not a student." Mrs. Rios asked "well, who's gonna stay with the [son] kid for orientation?" The father, now very confused, responded that he would, but he doesn't "plan to stay all day." Mrs. Rios tells him that neither kids nor parents can be in the school "wearing so much red." He seemed to get a little frustrated by this

comment and scanned the hallway around him as though he was looking for another security officer or teacher. Mrs. Rios curtly stated that he could either "turn it [jacket] inside out or take it off." He responded that he would just "take it off." The father proceeded down the hallway with his child toward the cafeteria to sit with other new parent/student pairs who were waiting to be escorted to the orientation room. The father was removing his jacket while walking down the hall. When he and his son were half-way to the cafeteria, Mrs. Rios shouted down the hall in their direction, "tuck in your shirt!" The father and son turned around and the father responded, once again in a perplexed tone, "Who? *Me as a parent?*" and Mrs. Rios replied "no, the young man," in reference to his son.

These field notes demonstrate how discipline at the DAEP, in particular those rules covered during the orientation period, extend to both students and their parents, particularly low-income black parents. This father and son pair were treated and even scolded in the same way. Similarly, the mother's body and sexuality was policed by the security guard. During orientation, parents are informed of their semi-student status and the various ways they can face the consequences of DAEP rule-breaking alongside their child. In many ways, parents' relationship to the DAEP staff and rules mimics their child's relationship with DAEP staff; they are both students at the DAEP and subject to the program rules and disciplinary action taken by the DAEP for transgressing them.

Making it to Class

The night classes at the DAEP are treated as a privilege for parents and students, not a right. Considering that not everyone qualifies for these classes, and of those who technically do, only some parent/students are offered the INVEST or Positive Families option, there is some truth to this. At the DAEP parents and students are upheld to strict guidelines and expectations for their successful participation in these classes. While an option that most want to avail themselves of, many of the students and parents are unable to participate in these classes, and those who do make numerous sacrifices to be present at the DAEP to partake in them.

The experiences of middle class and low-income parents at the DAEP were very distinct in this respect. Since class was highly correlated with race at the program, these also manifested as racially and gender disparate experiences. The evening classes tended to be wealthier and whiter than average DAEP classrooms; for the 2011 - 2012 academic year, while white students comprised 7% of the DAEP student body, they accounted for 30% of night class enrollment. Only some of these disparities could be explained by whether or not the student's home school extended the option to participate in these classes to reduce their sentence to 10 days. The ability to participate in these night classes, and to do so successfully, was contingent on numerous factors. To attend the Tuesday/ Thursday classes, parents needed to have a flexible work schedule or to not work at all. Given the prompt 6:00PM start time for classes, parents required reliable transportation, and if they had other children, access to childcare during the evenings. It

was a rule that parents could not bring other children with them to attend night classes, and the same parent/ guardian had to be present for each class. Parents had to abide by these guidelines, if not, they would be unable to participate in the program and their child would remain at the DAEP for the duration of their original sentence to the program. When parents failed to meet all of these requirements, not only did their child lose the opportunity to leave the program early, parents/guardians would be asked to leave the DAEP and may also be subject to threats of criminal prosecution. Below is an example of one such instance:

Night class field note,(5/10/13): I was working in the front office when parents were starting to file into the DAEP for evening classes. A Latina mother had entered the building with two smaller children, one was a toddler, I guessed around two-years old, which she held in her arms, and the other was closer to 5 or 6. Upon entering the school with her additional children, a teacher (female black), manning the front door immediately told the mother that she wouldn't be able to stay for class with her other two children. Her son, a boy from the middle school side of the DAEP, walked over to her and translated what the teacher was saying from English to Spanish. The mother appeared to be confused and informed her son that she would call another family member to stay with her children while she participated in the class. The mom got a hold of someone and they were now on their way to meet her at the DAEP, however, it was 5 minutes to 6:00 and the teachers informed the mother and her son that they would have to close the doors in a few minutes and they would be forced to leave. The mother remained in the

doorway. When 6:00 hit, she was still waiting and the person she had contacted to stay with her children had not yet arrived. Another teacher, Mrs. Jones, approached the mom and told her she had to move out of the doorway and leave. The mom told her son in Spanish that she knew they [the family member she had called] would be here any minute. The teacher repeats again that the mother had to leave. The mother is rocking the younger child in her arms and looks at the teacher but does not respond. Her son tells the teacher that his uncle is on his way. Mrs. Jones informed him, "I don't care.. you have to leave." The teacher then threatened to call the police if the parent did not immediately move from the doorway. This appeared to resonate with the parent and she stared at the teacher, clearly upset. The teacher raised her voice even louder and said "I'm not playing, I'm going to call security!" The mother remained in the doorway, alternating glances down the high school hallway where other parents were filing into classrooms and down to the parking lot. The teacher screamed to another DAEP staff person "that's it! call Officer Burkes right now to come down here and deal with her!" in reference to one of the District Police officers that happened to still be on campus that evening. Mrs. Jones said "I'm calling the police!" and stomped into the front office where the phones were. The mother is visibly upset, and, in broken English stated "Why call police?!" This enraged the teacher further and she yelled for the assistance of Officer Burkes again. The son then nudged the mother out of the door and told her, "Let's just go" and she reluctantly moved with him. I looked to the clock and it was now 6:05. After the mother left I could still

hear the teacher complaining about the mom and remarking "I don't care if she can't speak English!... that's not my problem!" I walked to the doorway where the mother had been waiting and looked out of the small glass windows of the double doors. I saw the mother talking to someone in a vehicle that had just pulled into the lot.

Importantly, only two of the teachers who taught the night classes were bilingual, therefore monolingual Spanish-speaking parents, typically low-income women, were rarely fully integrated into these classes. I spent numerous evenings at the DAEP when these classes were underway in the capacity of a classroom observer, to recruit parents for interviews, or when I stayed late in the evenings to comb through my field notes for the day. It was only by being at the DAEP in these various capacities that I was able to observe how pervasive the language barrier was between most night class teachers and parents.

The low-income parents that were able to successfully participate in these classes usually patched together networks of friends and family to provide childcare for their other children, to borrow a vehicle for use on these days, and/ or changed their work schedules. For example, Oracio, A Mexican-American father of a female high school student referred to the DAEP for fighting another girl at school, worked nights as a custodian. A single father of three children, Oracio had to change his work schedule to morning shifts on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Oracio had moved in with his parents to reduce his overhead costs prior to his daughter's referral to the DAEP. His mother kindly

agreed to watch his other children on Tuesdays and Thursdays since, given his new schedule and commute time from work to the DAEP to meet his daughter by 4:30PM, he was unable to see his other two children on those days. The change to his schedule also caused him to lose hours at work since the morning shifts were shorter. Oracio was hoping to make up these hours on Sundays until he got his old work schedule back.

Although night classes aren't scheduled to start until 6:00PM, the DAEP school day ends at 4:30PM, and children are not allowed back inside the program building once they have left campus. Most children do not live close to the DAEP and cannot take the city or school bus home and make it back in time for classes to start by 6:00PM. Oracio lives in the southernmost part of the city, a good 45 minute drive from the program, as he told me during our interview:

She [daughter] was scared...she worries, so what I do? I come here before 4:30, I changed my afternoon schedule for that and try to see my other kids in the morning. I took her out to eat real quick and feed her before [class]. We're here [at the DAEP] for two hours and by the time we get home it's 9:30 pm. In the morning, I'm right back to work.

Similarly, Luisa, a Mexican-American mother whose son was sent to the DAEP for suspicion of being under the influence of Marijuana, shared the challenges she faced making it to the DAEP for classes. She is a single mother of two boys, both of whom had been sent to the DAEP, her eldest son was referred twice and her youngest son was in the middle of his first referral to the program when we met for our interview. When I asked

Luisa whether she faced challenges making it to the evening classes she let out a large exhale and told me "Oh gosh yes! Because I don't have just one job, I have two!... I'm the lead at my job at the shelter and I've lost some income because of these classes." Luisa works two jobs, one as a part-time secretary and the other as a part-time employee at a homeless shelter where she typically works evenings. Luisa's income was dependent on coordinating her work schedules to accrue enough hours to maintain a steady and predictable income.

Making it to these evening classes is not a simple task for middle class parents either. Nadine, a middle-class white woman who worked as an office manager in the financial district of the city, attended the INVEST classes with her teenage daughter who was sent to the DAEP for being drunk at a homecoming dance. Although strongly middle class, Nadine was a single-parent of two children. Her ex-husband's business keeps him overseas for 8 months of the year. As she tells it:

He is a total absentee father, except for the money, you know, that's all he thinks he has to do. Just write a check or give 'em the money, but [he] never got to do any of these things that I have to, I have to do it all the time, it's kept me back from my career. It's lost. I've lost probably 10 jobs because of the stuff I have to continually go through with these kids and he just goes off and continues to make a whole lot of money. He does *nothing*.

Unlike Oracio and Luisa, however, Nadine is able to afford childcare for her other child and works a standard 9 - 5:00, Monday - Friday job. Her workplace is relatively close to

the DAEP and she was able to leave work early on these four days of classes, leaving her with enough time to pick her daughter up from school at 4:30 with a "surprise Jamba Juice" and to have a "sit-down" meal. Low-income monolingual Spanish-Speaking parents faced the added challenge of sitting through classes that they struggled to follow given the language barrier or relied on the help of bilingual parents or their own children to translate the for them.

Parent Meetings with Staff

When a student misbehaves to a point that the administrators deem warrants an intervention, parents are required to come to the school to discuss their child's behavior. If a student is suspended, or LWOPS, leaves the school without permission, the parent must return with the child for a meeting, scheduled at the high school administrators convenience, before the student can return to the program. These meetings sometimes involve the student and parent, at other times just the parent. However, this often turns into a protracted waiting game, as parents are frequently left to wait in the office for extended periods of time before they can meet with the administrator.

Most requests for parents to come to the DAEP are not mandatory, but result from their child being out of dress code for the day. Typically, a child is given one opportunity to be "out of dress code" and still earn a day at the program toward the completion of their stay as long as they returned to the DAEP on the next school day with that dress code infraction fixed or "made right." For example, if a student arrives to school with black jeans on instead of blue jeans, and this is their first offense, they are given a dress

code slip notifying them of their infraction with a “pending” listed in the “outcome” section of the slip. With a pending, they have the opportunity to “make it right” by coming to the program the next day wearing the appropriate jeans. Then that "pending" day will be changed to a "successful" day. For all other instances following that, however, students are given an immediate unsuccessful for the day and therefore that day will not count toward the completion of their stay in the program. This can be averted if the student’s parent or guardian brings the child a new item of clothing. Whenever a child is out of dress code a parent/guardian must be called and asked to bring a new change of clothing to the school. The most common dress code violations were for "jeans," either "too skinny" or "too baggy," and colorful shoes (i.e. shoes with more than three percent of any other color on them except for white, black, or grey). Low-income parents/guardians and black and Latino parents frequently received these non-obligatory requests to bring a new change of clothing to the DAEP. Low-income parents were less likely to have reliable transportation, tended to work hourly wage jobs, and regularly risked loss of hours from work to bring clothes to the program, or had to enlist the help and money of other family and friends.

Field note, 9/29/2010: I was in the front office waiting to meet with the DAEP director. The office is filled with kids waiting to meet with the high school administrator and a few parents waiting to give their children new changes of clothes for being out of dress code for the day. An elderly black man with thick framed glasses and a foam trucker style hat walked into the office with two pairs of denim jeans in his hands. Moments later, Portia, a black female high school

student arrived to the office with a teacher, Mrs. Hudson, and greeted the elderly man who it turned out was her grandfather. He handed her the jeans and Mrs. Hudson thanked him for coming. The teacher tells Portia that "the bathroom is clear" for her to change into her new jeans and she disappeared into the hallway. Portia had received a dress code violation for wearing shorts that were deemed "too tight" and therefore out of DAEP dress code. After a few minutes, Portia returned to the office and handed her grandfather the shorts she changed out of. I am within earshot of their exchange and I heard the grandfather say to Portia, in a strong tone, that he took a "risk in the car" and that he "could've got stopped, and if I do you gonna regret it!" Portia said "I know, I'm sorry" and stared down at the ground... Later that day I saw Portia in class and she mentioned that her grandfather didn't have "his car registered."

Similarly, in my interviews with parents/ guardians, many of the parents without reliable transportation, or transportation at all, described requests to bring new clothing items to the program and how they went about meeting them. Evelyn, an elderly black grandmother of two granddaughters enrolled at the DAEP, both of whom had been sent to the DAEP for fighting, lived in the Northeastern part of the city. A few years shy of 70, Evelyn's movements were quite slow. She walked with small shuffling steps as she moved around her living room before settling in for our interview. Evelyn was widowed and on a fixed income and was recently tasked with caring for four of her grandchildren after their mother, Evelyn's daughter, was involved in debilitating car accident. Unfortunately, several months after our interview Evelyn's daughter succumbed to her

injuries and passed away in the hospital. Evelyn was required to attend multiple new parent/ student orientations and received numerous requests to bring new items of clothing to the DAEP. During the 2011 - 2012 school year, over a four month period, Evelyn received 15 different requests from DAEP staff to bring various items to the program, ranging from tape to cover tattoos, new bras, and nail polish remover. Evelyn shared that every time she received a call from the DAEP she would do everything she could to get there. Evelyn, however, does not own a vehicle and had to commute to the DAEP on the city bus. A native of the city, she told me "I'm originally from [Hawthorne]... but I still don't know everything about Hawthorne though, how to go places, I take the bus." I asked Evelyn to recall the length and route she would take to travel to the DAEP:

Oh, if I leave at 8:00, I'll probably be there at 9:00. I'd mostly catch the bus out here (she pointed her finger toward the front door of her house), transfer from one bus to this bus. This one here on Sycamore Street, transfer - it's two busses - then the 300 hundred bus, and walkup the hill [to the DAEP]. So three busses.

Michelle, a middle-aged black mother whose son, Chris, was sent to the DAEP for a physical assault that occurred off of school grounds, lived in the central part of the city. She worked in child care and lost several hours of work to attend the new parent/student orientation. Michelle was already familiar with the program since Chris was sent to the DAEP two times prior to his most recent referral. Michelle shared a vehicle with her husband who worked a job in construction, so like Evelyn, she had to

rely on the city bus to attend the orientation. On a couple of occasions when Michelle was asked to bring new clothing items to the DAEP for Chris, once for a belt and another time to bring a new pair of jeans with a logo smaller than 2 inches on it, she was able to pay a neighbor to drive her to the program. This came as a relief to her as the city busses did not operate on a consistent schedule.

When a child is consistently out of dress code, the high school administrator will usually schedule a mandatory meeting with the students' parent to discuss the transgressions. The following field note illustrates one such meeting with a parent, a Mexican mom named Petra, whose daughter had been sent to the DAEP for making a "terroristic threat" at her home school.

High school administrator's office field note, 01/2013: A Mexican mom, Petra, arrived to the DAEP to meet with the high school administrator, Mrs. Lewis, to discuss her daughter, Veronica's dress code infraction. Veronica had a small blue polo logo on her t-shirt, smaller than a square inch, but t-shirt logos are prohibited at the DAEP and in violation of the student dress code. Petra explained that she recently purchased this long sleeved T-shirt for 30 dollars to cover Veronica's tattoos. Petra said she understood that Veronica will need more shirts, but she has no money right now and wouldn't be paid until next week. Mrs. Lewis told Petra, "stop buying Veronica all those expensive things... you could have bought 30 shirts" with the money she spent on the long-sleeved shirt Veronica wore that day. Petra became very emotional and her voice began to quiver and crack, "me siento

mal cuando Veronica no obedece las reglas," [I feel bad when Veronica doesn't follow the rules].Mrs. Lewis responded "Veronica makes excuses," and that "Veronica needs a job"... Petra was now in tears and she tugged at the roots of her hair, "mira mi pelo miss!" [miss, look at my hair!] and sharply pointed to the two inches of grey hair along her hairline. She stated in a tone of desperation "Mira mis manos!" [look at my hands!] and raised her hands up to show the calluses and cracks on her palms and fingers. Mrs. Lewis responded, "your hands don't have to be like that behind Veronica," and told Petra that she understands, but she is "spoiling Veronica." Petra said that Veronica's issues with school and the law has run her ragged, stating that she works 14 hours every day and drives over to the DAEP to bring Veronica lunch from her job at a local restaurant during her only break. In an overwhelmed tone she lamented that she was tired of the daily calls from the DAEP and the courts.

As discussed earlier, parents attend mandatory meetings with the high school administrator or program director when their child has been suspended. These meetings, however, often resulted in extended wait times, similar to what I observed DAEP students experiencing throughout the school day as they waited to meet with the high school administrator. Parents, mostly mothers, waited 30 to 45 minutes on average to meet with the DAEP administrator and in some cases were forced to wait even longer. The following field note is an example of an extended waiting period:

Front office field note excerpt, 04/18/2012: I am working in the front office today when Eladio's mother, Monica, (Latina) arrived at the school around 12:00 noon to speak with Mrs. Lewis, who was in a meeting in her office with two teachers. Eladio received a three day suspension for LWOPing, leaving the school without permission, last week. Mrs. Lewis requested that Monica arrive with her son on the morning of his return to the DAEP which was scheduled for the next day, however, Monica had already missed multiple days at work due to an illness that sent her to the emergency room and it would be impossible for her to make the morning meeting. Monica and my co-worker, Mrs. Sanchez discussed the reason for Eladio's suspension. Eladio had worn blue jeans, as per the DAEP dress code, but they had white stitching on the pant seams, which was against the program rules. Eladio had worn these jeans to the DAEP before, but this was the first time he received a dress code violation for doing so. When he was informed of the dress code infraction during the morning security check he became very upset and left the school without permission. Forty minutes passed and Monica was still waiting in the front office to meet with Mrs. Lewis. At this point, Monica started to share her frustration with me and Mrs. Sanchez about the entire situation, "it's his fault, not mine... I told him not to wear the pants," but, Monica adds that he insisted on wearing them anyways. She described driving Eladio to the bus stop and asking him if his pants would be OK, he told her they were fine. A few more minutes passed and Monica breaks her silence again, sharing that when she was a student at HISD they didn't have "these schools." Monica told us she "got into a

fight once" and her school kept her "in a different room on campus for a few days and that was it." Another 40 minutes has passed and Monica is still waiting to speak with Mrs. Lewis. Almost an hour and a half in total had now passed since Monica arrived to the DAEP. Monica asked if there was any way she could just call later and talk to Mrs. Lewis over the phone. Mrs. Sanchez responded: "she's more than likely going to say you have to be here." Monica started to pace around the office, and eventually sits on a chair directly in front of Mrs. Lewis's office. There is a window on Mrs. Lewis's door that Monica, like many other parents and students before her, strategically placed themselves in front of to ensure that Mrs. Lewis would see them waiting in the front office. Another 20 minutes passed and Monica approached us again, now with a panicked tone in her voice, "I have to pick up my baby." She repeated this several times over "I have to pick up my baby, I have to pick up my baby" in reference to her youngest son who was scheduled to be released from his pre-k class within the hour. After a one and a half hour wait Mrs. Lewis exited her office and waved to Monica indicating that she was now ready to meet with her.

Parents' time is frequently impeded on by DAEP expectations for parental involvement. Namely, that they will make themselves available when requested to do so, and mostly for minor reasons. In the case of mandatory meetings, if a parent failed to make this request, their child could not return to the program, thereby extending both the students stay at the DAEP, and the parents stay as well. Like the women in Comfort's study, parents' freedom was compromised by the demands of the program and their

finances took a toll. Parents/ guardians were expected to meet each request made by the DAEP staff, and when they did not, even if the request was non-obligatory, parents were disciplined like their children through the extension of their time at the DAEP and lingering consequence of re-referral if their child was unable to successfully complete their stay at the program.

This section illustrated how parents experience the aforementioned three disciplinary domains in the program. Similar to the women in Comfort's study who are conferred a "quasi-inmate" status, DAEP parents become quasi-students who are subject to the some of the same disciplinary scrutiny as their children. Parents endure a form of secondary discipline as they endure heavy and unpredictable demands on their time, extensive waiting periods to ensure their children can remain at the program to complete their stays, and for many parents, lengthy trips across the city in car or bus, which impinges on their time and finances. What was particularly the case for low-income black parents, akin to the women in Comfort's study, they were assigned a "courtesy" stigma, as their bodies were policed and subjected to the disciplinary rules in a way that mirrored their children.

DAEP parents, many of whom are in already in economically precarious situations, risk lost time and wages from work when they adhere to the DAEP rules and requests. For those parents that do not meet these expectations, they face an extended sentence at the DAEP alongside their children. While the DAEP was ostensibly designed to punish and rehabilitate students, an unintended consequence of this system set-up is

the punishment and discipline these program rules extend to parents. Such interactions with the DAEP can produce feelings of alienation among parents and encroach on their home and work lives in ways that may compromise their income and family dynamics, therefore further disadvantaging already disadvantaged families.

HOW PARENTS MAKE SENSE OF PUNISHMENT: “I’D RATHER HAVE HER IN DAEP THAN, LIKE I SAID, HERE AT THE HOUSE FALLING FARTHER BEHIND”

The data revealed somewhat of a paradox. The parents I interviewed whose work schedules were most negatively impacted by DAEP rules and demands, received frequent requests to meet with DAEP staff, and possessed fewer monetary resources, tended to view the DAEP in a more positive light. This contrasted with the opinions of middle class parents who characterized their child's enrollment in the program as a "damaging" experience for their child and the removal to the DAEP as excessive punishment. This is not to say that working class parents strongly preferred the DAEP over their child's home school, but unlike middle-class parents, they were able to name benefits to their child's referral to the DAEP.

Jacinta was a Mexican-American single mother of 5 whose daughter, a middle school student, was sent to the DAEP for selling "dollar bags" of marijuana at school. She was in the middle of completing the INVEST night classes when I conducted our interview. Jacinta works at a day care in the city. Jacinta was already familiar with the DAEP, her oldest son was sent to the DAEP twice in high school and had since dropped

out of school and was working toward his GED. I asked Jacinta about what she thought the DAEP was trying to accomplish with her daughter:

I think it'll be eye opening for her because she, last year she was kind of rocky like being sent to ISS (In School Suspension), but it's like, it feels like - it feels more than a slap on the hand... my daughter the other day, she, I was looking at her point sheet, she had 2 points deducted because she asked for a piece of paper from somebody, and that's when I go 'well this is why I need you to understand, they ask you to raise your hand to go to the bathroom, they ask you to get permission,' I go 'you lost all your privileges of just being able to turn around and ask somebody for something.' So she's kind of seeing ok, well you know I'd rather go back to regular school than, than be where I'm at now.

According to Jacinta, her daughter's home school did a bad job of monitoring her behavior and stopping her from skipping classes. Last school year Jacinta's daughter spent a lot of time in ISS, however, this year her home school started to give her Out of School Suspensions (OSS), which kept her out of school and unsupervised at home during school hours when Jacinta was at work. This troubled Jacinta because, not only was she unsure of her daughter's whereabouts throughout the day, her daughter has a learning disability and Jacinta feared that by removing her from the school environment, her daughter would fall farther behind in school. When I asked Jacinta about how she feels about her daughter being at the DAEP, she addressed this concern:

I'm not happy she's [at the DAEP], but I'm glad she's at least, instead of being here at the house while I'm at work. I know she's continuing where she needs to be at so she doesn't fall behind because she does have a learning disability and just her being able to keep up with where she needs to be at. I'd rather have her in DAEP than, like I said, here at the house falling farther behind... the DAEP at least gives them a chance to continue their education and most [Hawthorne] schools in general just want to suspend them and send them home when I would rather they have like a specific room where they say 'OK, you stay in here'... I would like if she had to do 10 days at the DAEP. I wouldn't mind her doing it, instead of being suspended 3 days or 10 days [OSS from her home school].

Jacinta discussed what she perceived to be the advantages and disadvantages of being at the DAEP for her daughter. She again highlighted the lesson she hoped her daughter would get out of the program as a positive and cited the helpfulness of the INVEST classes to encourage open communication between her and her daughter.

An advantage is that she sees that what she's done has consequences and it shows her how, like a glimpse of how [the juvenile detention center] would be cuz I've already been through like the whole system with my older one and I keep trying to tell her "this is where your brother started out. *That's where he ended up.* Are you gonna follow down that road or are you gonna go back to school and follow your own road?"

INVEST is really, I was just talking to my parents, especially about this this morning, it's really an eye opening experience... I really appreciated it because the first day at least a couple of them [students] stand up and speak to us as a group about why they were there. And there was one person there that's father just got out jail and he told my daughter, and this is like what made her really like snap and think he's like, 'you know what you did, you could have had your mom put in jail' ... and like, little by little I notice she's making like bigger changes in her, in like, in her ways of trying to be.

In terms of disadvantages, Jacinta emphasized the financial constraints of having a child at the DAEP: "And the disadvantages is that since it is so far away, like if today she would have missed the bus again I don't have the gas to go get her and I didn't have money in my pocket to give her in case she missed the bus."

Ana was a Mexican-American mother whose son was sent to the DAEP for being in possession of a small (misdemeanor level) amount of marijuana. Ana worked in housekeeping and her husband worked in construction. This was her son's first referral to the DAEP and both Ana and her husband were very unhappy with him. Ana did not attend the orientation, but her husband did, according to her: "He just said he didn't, he never thought one of his kids would be here and it made him feel bad to see his son, what he was gonna go through, because he say that they pat him down, that they - it's like as if they were in jail." Ana adds, "I'm not happy with my son being here either but if it's gonna help or it'll keep him in shape or get better or think about it twice before coming

back. Hopefully it will get him to think." Similar to Jacinta, when Ana and I discussed the advantages and disadvantages of being at the DAEP, she shared that the biggest advantages she perceived was that she knew that her son was in school, not leaving campus or getting in trouble: "I'll know he'll be there, I know he's there for sure," and participation in the INVEST classes. As Ana explained to me:

It's good [INVEST classes], I just wish I, I guess it's not enough time. I mean I'm glad it's only two weeks because I want him to get out, but, it would be more like counseling, maybe that type of thing like we need to get deeper into that. I think that'll help a lot.

The major disadvantage Ana discussed was quite different from those Jacinta mentioned, but reflects a criticism of the program shared by the majority of parent interviewees, irrespective of class background. Ana viewed the lower academic standards in place at the DAEP as a significant issue for her child and indicated that he was already behind in his classes at his home school as a result of his removal to the program.

Like Jacinta, Yolanda a middle-aged Afro-Latina single mother of 7, had four different children go through the DAEP and was already very familiar with the DAEP rules and expectations. Her son that was enrolled at the DAEP at the time of our interview was diagnosed with ADHD and regularly took medication. Yolanda's other three children that attended the DAEP have all graduated from high school and two were in college. Yolanda identified as "self-employed," doing "odds and ends" to make a living. At the time of our interview, Yolanda could occasionally be found near a busy

freeway onramp in the city asking for spare change. While Yolanda found the orientation long and tedious, she told me: “I thought it was a big hassle in the beginning, but for me to sit there and be there while he got the rules was inspiring for me because *I knew he knew what was what* and they were pretty strict, so, that was a good thing.”

Yolanda found the rules and structure in place at the DAEP to be hugely beneficial to her son who in her words "struggled" with his behavior and frequently asked to leave his home school due to persistent stomach aches. Yolanda told me that her son disliked large classrooms and would intentionally take his ADHD medication in the morning on an empty stomach so he could have an excuse to leave school. Unlike her other three children who disliked being at the DAEP, her youngest son enjoyed it:

Well [my youngest son] liked it... the other two [sons] never said they liked it, but he actually said for himself, 'I learned more and I got better grades when I was at DAEP.' I wonder if he could go to DAEP all the year. He did say that... the classes were smaller and that he could learn more and focus better without having a lot of students and a lot of things going on around him. So I think that was one of his big things was just that it was more focused, more attentive to him.

For Yolanda, dealing with the DAEP rules was more than an acceptable trade-off as her son was able to work on his academics and never asked to leave the DAEP as he did at his home school. When I asked Yolanda about the advantages and disadvantages of being at the DAEP, she found it difficult to name disadvantages in the case of her

younger son, for her older children that was much easier. After a short pause, she shared the following:

The only disadvantage is, for me at the time was that it was so far away and you had to drop whatever you were doing and go deal with it... One time he forgot his belt and I had to come pick him up... well, we live so far away by the time I would have got over there [with his belt] he wasn't being counted, so I might as well picked him up... So, I think - just the distance.

Middle-Class Parents

Distinct from the majority of working class parents, middle class parents were hard pressed to list a single redeemable quality of the DAEP. Nadine, the middle class single mother of two discussed in the "making it to class" subsection, expressed an extremely negative view of the DAEP. When I asked her about what she thought the DAEP was doing for her child, she responded:

I have a real, real, real serious issue with what's gonna happen to my daughter now that she's been sent off to this DAEP to 'learn a lesson.' No, she hasn't learned a lesson, she's been, let's see, what's the word? She's been damaged, held back, and that would make me as a child very angry and pissed off and want to give up. Or you commit suicide, you never know what could happen with any of these people.

Nadine also participated in the INVEST night classes, but her opinion of INVEST was markedly different from those expressed by Jacinta, Ana, and other working-class parents I interviewed. In Nadine's assessment:

The four nights that I had to attend for the INVEST program was a total waste of my time. Well, maybe not all of it, but, the majority was a waste of my time. The advice that I got, I could have got in about an hour. The information that I received in the 4 two hours, which is 8 hours of my time, I could have gotten in one hour. Ok, It was just - why do you want to torture parents on top of this because students are growing up and learning reality, what not to do and what to do? That's just part of life, but you're gonna punish the parents on top of that, and then you're gonna punish the child on top of that for possibly failing school?

For Nadine, the referral to the DAEP was not only a waste of her and her daughter's time, but an unjust penalty for her daughter's offense. When queried about the advantages and disadvantages to attending the DAEP, Nadine's responded in the following way:

There are no advantages. There are all disadvantages in my, in our case. In our case, it was totally extreme, the punishment did not fit the crime and therefore you have a non-participating child, a teenager - number one - who sees no reason why she had to be there, and, but made it in to a thing that she got herself at least through it and will *never, ever* want to be there again.

Karen was middle class white parent and stay at home mom of four who, like Nadine, had few positive things to say about the DAEP. Her son was referred to the

program for "distribution" of drugs (cocaine). When I asked Karen how she felt about her son attending the DAEP she told me that she felt "conflicted":

I guess it's not an easy answer. On one hand, we understood that [he] did things that were against school policy, but we didn't see that what he did was equal to what a lot of the kids had done to be at the DAEP. So we didn't see, it just seems like there isn't a straight, especially, with the discipline in regards to discipline through the school district, it's not straight forward if your child does this, this is the appropriate consequence, if your child does this, this is the appropriate consequence.

While Karen acknowledges that her son had to face the consequences of his offense, she quickly challenged the legitimacy of the punishment and whether it was equal in severity to her son's offense. Karen was also worried about her son's new DAEP peers.

He would get on the bus in the morning, the kid at the same bus stop as him would be smoking pot each morning. So the kid didn't care, he would either get caught with it or not, it didn't matter to him, he was in and out of [the DAEP], you know, but my kid's standing right there. So it's like, ok, you take a kid who's had, never had an item on him and you put him on the same bus with kids that have it on them, you know, it's like you take a kid [my son] that, you know, was in over his head, doing something he shouldn't have been involved in at all and then you give him all these resources for which, that it's available? It's like, that makes no

sense to me... This was his first time doing anything and you stick him with kids like *that*?

Like Nadine and most of the other middle class parents interviewed, Karen saw no advantages to her son being at the DAEP, only drawbacks. Karen's son was an honors student at his home school, a member of the school marching band, and was cultivating his budding interest in architecture and design in the architectural modeling class he signed up for before he was removed to the DAEP. He spent 5 months at the DAEP, was dropped from band, and could not complete any of his architecture or foreign language assignments. According to Karen, her son was absolutely miserable.

The field note excerpts demonstrate salient trends in how parents perceived the DAEP and made sense of their interactions with the disciplinary regime of the program. While each parent interviewed, with the exception of Yolanda and Jacinta, independent of class background or immigration status, voiced concerns about the quality of education their children were receiving at the DAEP, low-income and immigrant parents tended to voice more positive opinions of the program. According to parents, this was the result of two dominant reasons: 1) it was harder for their child to leave the DAEP, unlike at their home schools where it was much easier to skip classes and go unnoticed; and 2) many of their children had experienced multiple out-of-school-suspensions, and their parents preferred to have a child at the DAEP rather than removing them from an educational setting, at home unsupervised, or out on the streets in harm's way. Like Comfort (2008) and Rios (2009) argue, due to the retracted welfare state and commensurate penalization

of institutions across U.S. society, punitive social control effected through non-traditional means, such as the school, community centers, etc., have become a dominant force in the lives of low-income families. Are the low-income parents more inclined to view aspects of DAEP removal as a positive intervention in their children's lives as it is one of the few resources available to them to support their families? To access some form of family based counseling like Ana and Jacinta highlighted, or to provide parents with the reassurance of knowing where their child is during school hours?

While low-income parents were more likely to express positive opinions of the DAEP, they did not embrace them whole heartedly. However, this was a salient trend across parent interviewees by class. While parents who were most economically and socially marginalized espoused more positive opinions of the DAEP and strove to meet the demands of the DAEP, typically with far less challenge than that posed by middle-class parents, their children were far more vulnerable to future referral to the program. Of the 25% of students referred to the DAEP during the 2011 - 2012 school year that had experienced prior referrals to the program, 98% of them were black or Latino, and the majority were low-income, 100% of them were categorized as "at-risk." Akin to the "brothers" in Jay MacLeod's (2008) seminal work "Ain't no Makin' it," a group of black, low-income boys that ascribed to the American achievement ideology and fully embraced and invested themselves in the school system as a means to upward mobility, these DAEP parents from the most vulnerable subpopulation accept, sometimes even embrace many of the punitive practices of the program. However, as was the case for the brothers who, despite efforts and investment put toward schooling, by mid adulthood they

possessed educational and occupational outcomes comparable to the anti-school, predominantly white subgroup referred to as the "hallway hangers." Despite the degree of conformity parents exhibit to the program, adherence to the rules, and embrace aspects of the disciplinary structure in place at the DAEP, parents alongside their children may just be subject to further institutionally sanctioned discipline.

DISCUSSION

In the context of a punitive school environment in which low-income, black and Latino children are overrepresented, their parents are not only tasked with maintaining an acceptable level of involvement with the school, but are disciplined by the school as well. Significantly, the most economically disadvantaged parents and families that I interviewed expressed more favorable views of the DAEP. Working class parents tended to praise the DAEP for serving an extremely important function: keeping their kids off of the streets, away from violence, and in the classroom learning.

Utilizing ethnographic data collected over three academic school years at a public DAEP in Texas, this chapter demonstrates how the parents and families of children forced to attend this program are subjected to many of the disciplinary practices their children encounter through zero tolerance policies. The chapter investigates the forms through which parents are incorporated into the disciplinary regime in place at the DAEP and how parents make sense of their experiences at the program. In this chapter I argue that many of the stringent rules used to discipline students at the DAEP are extended to parents, in particular low-income, black and Latina mothers, subjecting them to

"secondary discipline." Discipline is extended to parents through three disciplinary practices designed to uphold school order and punish students: 1) Mandatory Parent/Student Orientation; 2) Night Classes; and 3) Mandatory and non-obligatory requests for parents to visit the DAEP. However, the aforementioned disciplinary practices actually operate as mechanisms for punitive social control and to maintain inequalities.

To make sense of this phenomenon at the DAEP, I draw from Megan Comfort's concept of "secondary prisonization," which describes how the female significant others of male prisoners are subjected to the many of the punitive practices of the prison. Namely, that women adhere and become assimilated into the norms and expectations that the prison holds for inmates in their efforts to maintain relationships with their partners. As "quasi-inmates," they endure many of the pains of imprisonment their partners are subject to, such as security searches, extensive waiting periods, etc. The extension of prison punishment also constrains women's' personal freedom, imposes on the organization of their daily activities, and places a financial burden on them.

I extend Comfort's findings by applying them to a disciplinary school context and unveil how, like the prison, the DAEP exposes parents to heightened surveillance, turns their bodies into extensions of their children by enforcing the dress code against them, and also impinges on their personal time and finances. I qualify her findings by demonstrating variations in how parents reacted to this discipline, the involuntary presence demanded of DAEP parents at the program, and the disparate familial dynamics - parents/ child versus male/ female romantic relationships - that existed across research

contexts. First, there were variations in how parents from different class backgrounds reacted to disciplinary encroachment in their lives. Middle-class families were consistently unhappy with their child's referral to the DAEP and viewed their forced participation as a form of unfair and unreasonable punishment. Whereas working class parents, despite also exhibiting some criticism of the DAEP's disciplinary reach, also expressed an appreciation of aspects of the DAEP in their child's lives. Another distinction between mine and Comfort's findings is that parents were required to participate and interact with the DAEP institution, unlike the partners of imprisoned men who could come and go as they so choose. Moreover, the relationship dynamic the DAEP disciplinary regime imposed itself on was that of parent/child not a romantic partnership. These combine to make what I term "secondary discipline" all the more pervasive and encompassing of parents' and students' experiences within the DAEP setting. I complement Comfort's findings in the context of the DAEP as my research demonstrates how both traditional and nontraditional criminal justice structures that have taken on a punitive function extend discipline and punishment beyond their primary targets into the family and domestic sphere.

Significantly, as the first study of family-school relations in a punitive school setting, the chapter findings demonstrates how, in the context of zero-tolerance school policies, expectations for parenting can take on a particularly punitive form. The push to increase parental involvement can be particularly injurious to parents in a such school settings. Rather than bridge closer partnerships and connections between schools, families and communities, it can make more vulnerable already vulnerable

populations and withdraw parents from the school setting. The negative outcomes associated with DAEP referral, higher recidivism, dropout rates, greater likelihood of future involvement in the criminal justice system, indicate that these programs operate as one channel in the reproduction of inequalities. Secondary discipline imposes punitive social control over an already disadvantaged population and, likewise, work to reproduce social inequalities through the varied punishment and alienation of parents, illuminating how this school level phenomenon can contribute to the intergenerational reproduction of inequality. Furthermore, in the case of students, the experience of having a parent undergo many of the disciplinary practices they are forced to endure may have long lasting, negative consequences for their relationships with educators and create further strain between students and school institutions.

Importantly, research in poverty studies on the criminalization of welfare recipients in the post 1996 welfare reform era, most acutely low-income, and black and Latina mothers, indicate parallel treatment to that of DAEP parents. In the post-Keynesian era, poverty in the U.S. has increasingly been addressed through punishment and criminal surveillance (Simon 2007; Comfort 2008; Wacquant 2009; Rios 2011; Soss et. al. 2012). Those resources made available to the most economically vulnerable members of society are delivered through penal sanctions and discipline by both criminal and traditionally non-criminal justice structures (Comfort 2008; Wacquant 2009; Rios 2011; Soss et. al. 2012). Drawing on discourses about the "deserving" and "undeserving poor" and theories of welfare dependency, 1996 welfare reform focused on moving recipients from welfare to work, and effectively reduced aid levels across the U.S. and

enforced lifetime limits on accessing public assistance. Most notably, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) was transformed into Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and limited aid to 5 years in most states and disproportionately targeted women and families. These macro policy reforms triggered major changes in how families would be evaluated for public assistance through both new eligibility guidelines and various evaluative methods employed by welfare caseworkers (Watkins-Hayes 2009).

Research in poverty studies on the criminalization of welfare and other public aid recipients reveals a long history of surveillance, moral evaluation, "making poor women's bodies legible" (Gilliom 2001), and assessment of one's "deservingness" of assistance (Hays 2003; Edin and Kefalas 2005; Watkins-Hayes 2009; Edin and Nelson 2013; Levine 2013). The term "parenting" typically obscures the heavily gendered work of "parenting" by mothers (Hays 2003) and the degree of responsibility they are charged with when children fail to meet normative behavioral standards. Low-income mothers, due to their economically disempowered position, frequently encounter persistent job instability or underemployment, increased scrutiny by the state (Gilliom 2001), and face inordinate social and institutional sanctions for their parenting. Historically, low-income, black and Latina mothers have received more criticism for their parenting style than their middle-class, typically white counterparts (Hill-Collins 2000; Raz 2014; Levine 2013). As noted by Raz (2014), while mothers across the economic and racial spectrum faced heightened critique for their parenting styles, low-income black mothers faced the added charge of

emasculating black men, subverting appropriate gender roles, and contravening middle-class norms for mothering.

DAEP parents face comparable expectations to the contemporary welfare recipient now subjected to evaluations and assessments that position them as disingenuous, in need of personal transformation, and who contend with possible punitive sanctions for not meeting eligibility requirements. The provision of a public good through either welfare assistance or compulsory public schooling through DAEP enrollment, suggest a parallel ethic of punishment infused into administering these services. In the case of low-income families at the DAEP, some of whom are also on some form of public assistance, various penalizing interactions may illuminate the degree to which low-income families encounter various forms of punishment throughout their everyday lives. These analogous connections between the secondary discipline encountered by DAEP parents and sanctioning of welfare recipients in the welfare-to-work climate, is reflective of a larger practice of addressing poverty through punishment. Future research should examine these parallels more thoroughly as these same populations experience compounded discipline and punishment by the retrenched welfare state.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

This dissertation project illuminates how marginalized youth populations experience punishment at the hands of the state by focusing specifically on the case of DAEPs in Texas as one manifestation of the enmeshment of the punitive state with public education. A phenomenon Jonathan Simon (2007) described as "governing through crime," the current study examined the on-the-ground consequences of infusing public education policy with zero tolerance disciplinary rhetoric and practices, forming novel hybridized public education and juvenile detention facilities. By posing the broad question of what happens to children, teachers, and families in the nexus of public schools and the juvenile justice system, this project increases our knowledge of how vulnerable youth populations experience schooling, the mechanisms that may facilitate the school-to-prison-pipeline, and the impact of the punitive state and neoliberalism on the lives of marginalized populations in the U.S.

My conclusion includes an overview of the research questions I set out to address when I initiated the DAEP study. I then briefly summarize the three empirical chapters and how my conclusions speak to macro-level policy and economic practices. Next, I discuss the logical sequencing of these chapters and future directions in which I will take this research. Then, I revisit the objectives of Chapter 37 legislation and assess whether the DAEP field site can provide us with any reassurance that DAEPs are viable educational alternatives that protect teachers and students and keep schools safe. Lastly, I discuss alternatives to DAEPs and recommendations for school policy reform.

The growth of zero-tolerance school policies and novel relationships between public schools and the criminal justice system left me with several overarching questions. To address these questions, my dissertation investigated the daily operation and accomplishment of discipline in a public DAEP in Texas. I scrutinized this growing phenomenon in the establishment of DAEPs through the first ethnography of a single 6th – 12th grade public DAEP in the state. This research addressed four sociological questions: 1) How does the penetration of the carceral arm of the criminal justice system into public schools affect the quality of education children receive in DAEPs? 2) How is discipline accomplished in this program, specifically, what are its forms, how does it vary, what is the extent of its operation, and what are its effects? 3) How does this process and the way it is experienced vary by the multiple categories of race, gender, class, and citizenship status that youths occupy? And 4) How do these disciplinary practices impact the teachers, students and the families of the children who attend them?

The in-depth study of a DAEP illuminates the school-level consequences of zero-tolerance education policies and offers a nuanced understanding of the form, effects, variation, and extension of discipline within and beyond the program's bounds. In doing so, the study demonstrates one way zero-tolerance policies are experienced and implemented on the ground and facilitate the interpenetration between the criminal justice system and public schools.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF DISSERTATION FINDINGS

The empirical chapters developed here reveal the modes through which discipline was accomplished at the DAEP - its form, variation, extent and effects - variation in how discipline was enforced across the student body by race, class, and gender, and how these disciplinary practice impacted students' families. To illuminate the forms that discipline takes at the DAEP, Chapter 4 examined the formal rules and disciplinary practices in place at the program and how students were oriented to them during the "induction period." It was during this time that the DAEP formally and most clearly articulated their organizational objectives, methods to achieve their institutional goals, and their disciplinary philosophy. To interrogate how discipline was being accomplished at the DAEP, I drew from Foucault's (1977) concept of docile bodies and Ferguson's (2001) conceptualization of culturalism and double displacement. I found that practices and procedures in place at the DAEP constituted "disciplinary technologies" devoted to the transformation of "culturally deficient" students - a racialized and gendered classification - into docile bodies. Students were disciplined through punitive and rehabilitative methods premised on the discursive construction of "deficient" students and families. Moreover, this embedded examination of the disciplinary practices enforced at this time demonstrated how DAEPs may form integral links in the school to prison pipeline.

To address variations in how discipline was enforced and accomplished at the DAEP, Chapter 5 examined the categories DAEP staff drew on to make distinctions across the DAEP student body. All students removed to the DAEP, irrespective of

identity markers such as race, class, and gender, should presumably arrive at the program as an undifferentiated mass of "bad" students. This chapter revealed how distinctions nonetheless were made across the students body. I extended Pierre Bourdieu's (1989) concept of "academic taxonomies," and Gilda Ochoa's (2013) concept of "academic profiling," to illuminate how, despite the ostensible homogeneity of the student body in terms of misbehavior that led to their referral, DAEP staff make distinctions between the "legitimately bad" students and those who momentarily lacked good judgment or made mistakes. The dominant repertoire of student categories teachers drew on fell along the lines of students' race, class, and gender. The categories tended to rely on dominant stereotypes and (re)produced social inequality, in particular race and gender bias, within the school. I found that these dominant categories drawn on by teachers tend to privilege white and middle-class students, and "doubly profiles" black and Latino students. The chapter discussed the implications of these findings, particularly with respect to how discipline variously unfolds in a program designed to punish students equally, how privilege operates in such programs, and the importance of staff's formal evaluation of students and disciplinary practices they enact at the DAEP.

Lastly, Chapter 6 examined how DAEP discipline extended beyond students to their families, and focused specifically on parents/ guardians experiences of having a child enrolled in the DAEP. I qualified Megan Comfort's (2008) reconceptualization of Donald Clemmer's (1958) concept of "prisonization" into "secondary prisonization," into the unknown universe of the DAEP. The findings suggest that DAEP rules subject families, in particular low-income black and Latina mothers, to what I term "secondary

discipline," where they are drawn into the disciplinary regime of the program and subject to penal scrutiny and surveillance alongside their children. Parents were subjected to many of the same consequences for student rule-breaking, most prominent among them were: dress code infractions, attendance of night classes, and mandatory and nonobligatory meetings with staff. Through this secondary discipline, parents are forced to endure lengthy wait times to meet with DAEP administrators, as well as numerous phone calls and requests to visit the DAEP; all of which result in loss of time from work and reduced income.

Collectively, these three empirical chapters reveal a great deal about how macro-level policy making and political shifts in governance plays out on the ground in practice and every day interactions between power disparate groups. The findings likewise illuminate the consequences of implementing zero tolerance discipline in schools that produce educational programs modeled after juvenile justice structures. The reach of such policies, zero tolerance school disciplinary policies in particular, extend beyond students to exact discipline and punishment against their parents/guardians. The dissertation also reveals how dominant gendered, racial, and classist ideologies that attribute students' involvement in programs such as the DAEP to "deficient" cultural values, rather than to bad policy making or the criminalization of marginalized communities. In the contemporary era of neoliberalism and trend in governance toward crime management and aversion, the hypercriminalization of largely low-income communities and communities of color, and transformation of schools into institutions of punitive social control combine with an individualist narrative or "trope of cultural responsibility," that

further marginalizes communities already beset by the retrenched welfare state (Wacquant2009).

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Future research will focus on 1) the experiences of teachers at the DAEP; 2) how students made sense of dominant student categories at the DAEP; 3) and the dominant discourses in place at the DAEP that inform staff's treatment of students and families. First, I plan to highlight the experiences of teachers - how they negotiated bureaucratic challenges, academic instruction, and divisions amongst staff - that informed the school climate of the DAEP. Secondly, I will explore how students made sense of the dominant student categories in place at the program, if they incorporated them into their own categorical repertoires, internalized and/or resisted them. Lastly, I will examine the dominant gendered, racial, and classed discourses drawn on by DAEP staff to explain why parents were subjected to secondary discipline. These powerful ideologies had the effect of vilifying students and their parents, and encouraged many teachers to ignore Behavioral Implementation Plans (BIPs) for students diagnosed with learning and/or emotional disabilities.

ASSESSING "TOUGH LOVE ACADEMIES"

What can this study tell us about the relative success or failure of DAEP legislation to achieve their original mission and goals? While my observations and analysis cannot be generalized to the whole of disciplinary alternative programs in the U.S., or Texas for that matter, it offers the first demonstration of how one such program operates and

accomplishes discipline. What follows is a brief overview of the goals and objectives of alternative schools and DAEPs more broadly, and a discussion of how well DAEPs have met their policy objectives based on my field observations.

Revisiting the Goals of Alternative Education

Alternative education is a broad umbrella category that encompasses a variety of public and private schools (Lange and Sletten 2002; Aron 2006; Lehr, Tan, and Ysseldyke 2009). Contemporary alternative education programs are generally considered to be a product of the civil rights movement and embodied much of the ideological tenor of the civil rights era; in particular, that student populations who had historically received inadequate access to a quality education would encounter dynamic curriculums (Dunbar, 1999; Lange and Sletten, 2002). The Free School Movement, which began outside of the public educational system, had the greatest impact on the public alternatives that emerged during the late sixties and incorporated the same anti-racist principles and ethos of social equality as the civil rights movement (Miller 2002). Alternative education programs were to serve as a revolutionary means of self-actualization for the individual child, which would enable each student "... to mature as a maker of choices rather than to be a mere victim of circumstances" (Wood 1970: 40).

Most alternative education growth in the past decade has been the result of zero-tolerance policies and the charter school movement. The increase in punitive alternative education programs has led many education researchers to critique the liberatory power of alternative education. Currently, the issue of whether or not alternative education

programs can uphold basic academic standards and provide supportive school environments to the students they serve persists as primary areas of concern and doubt (Kelley 1993; Dunbar 2001; Muñoz 2004; Foley and Pang, 2006; Lehr et al. 2009). Rather, a growing number of critics maintain that these schools function as spaces for remediation, human warehousing, or as links in the school to prison pipeline (Oakes 1985; Kelley 1993; Donelan, Neal, and Jones 1994; Ravitch 1995; Dunbar 1999).

The Objectives of DAEP Legislation

Reflective of this trend toward zero-tolerance disciplinary school policies and alternative school growth, in 1995 the Texas Legislature passed school legislation to create DAEPs through the addition of Chapter 37 “Discipline; Law and Order Unit” into the Texas Education Code. This was a central feature of The Texas Safe Schools Act of 1995 (Fowler and Lightsey 2007: 130). In theory, these punitive alternative schools were designed to produce safe and productive learning environments in mainstream schools (i.e. standard public schools) by removing disruptive and dangerous students from regular classrooms. Such policies are designed to divert students deemed as unsafe or a “threat” to regular public schools into alternative education programs so that districts can continue to educate them while protecting the students and staff at their former schools (Fowler and Lightsey 2007). In this way, zero-tolerance policies and the disciplinary alternative schools they create represent the unique wedding of a juvenile detention facility with a public school, the idea being in theory that their pairing represents a mutual reinforcement of educational and public safety goals.

The degree to which DAEPs make schools and society safer is questionable (Carmichael et al. 2005). What has become quite evident is their diminished capacity to serve the educational interests of the young people they target (Springer et al. 2007), and their positive correlation with future involvement in the adult criminal justice systems (Carmichael et al. 2005; Carmichael et al. 2005; Reyes 2006; Fowler and Lightsey 2007; Blue Ribbon Task Force 2007; Fabelo et al. 2011). Thus, a strategy to make schools safer effectively became a diversion system, where students deemed as problems were sent into academic "dead ends" and potential pathways to the criminal justice system.

Based on my observations of the Hawthorne DAEP, this alternative school has certainly failed to meet the original objectives of the free school movement. In the era of zero tolerance and hypercriminalization, as was manifested in the study site DAEP, students were highly regulated and provided minimal academic options. Chapter 37 was designed with the safety of students and teachers in mind, in particular the fear of gun toting teens. In theory, by keeping schools safe from violent students and exposing rule-breakers to swift discipline, crime in schools would be deterred and teachers better able to instruct their students. Problematically, nearly two decades since their inception, the vast majority of students removed to DAEP were sent for minor and non-violent offenses, not the serious and violent offenses DAEPs were original designed to address. Therefore, in practice, DAEPs operate to not only punish the "classroom terrorist," but the minor school-level offender. Even more troubling is the overrepresentation of black and Latino boys, low-income students, and children identified as having an intellectual or emotional disability, are in these programs.

In Chapter 4, I outlined the induction process all students were subject to regardless of their offenses, the rigid rules, and strict dress code in place at the program. The primary focus of the DAEP was on regulating the bodies and behaviors of students. Consequently, the punitive orientation of the DAEP, coupled with the lack of formal academic instruction, produced a school environment that resembled a juvenile detention facility more than it did a public school. Returning to Foucault's disciplinary technologies, the normalizing power enforced through DAEP disciplinary practices, expectations for how students should interact with school and police authorities, may create student subjects who easily transition from the DAEP to other punitive settings. One of the significant conclusions of this project has been that processes in place at the DAEP work to produce a very specific type of docile body – one that is habituated to inspection, to monitoring and confining its own movement. If these disciplinary technologies are successful at molding DAEP students into docile students, the subjectivity this produces is not one that is prepared for success in mainstream education or the white collar labor market, or to be successful anywhere else but institutions that mirror the DAEP. My research suggests that, rather than protect students and teachers, DAEP practices indicate a pattern of criminalizing nonviolent offenses and students and compromise student-teacher relationships as teachers fill the role of a judge or prison guard more than they do an educator.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO DAEPs

The dissertation findings should give education reformers and policy makers some pause when considering the implementation of zero tolerance education policies, or evaluating how to reduce their enforcement in public school systems across the U.S. In this final section I discuss alternatives to DAEPs in Texas and recommendations for school policy reform. Importantly, if DAEPs are not a viable option for the students that are sent to them, then what alternative could the Hawthorne Independent School District avail itself of to meet district wide challenges with student misbehavior?

Numerous problematic aspects of DAEPs surfaced throughout the course of this research project. The most troubling feature of DAEPs is that they were created to address a non-existent crisis of school violence (Reyes 2006; Fowler and Lightsey 2007). While there were episodes of brutal and deadly school violence in the early and mid-1990's, they were uncommon events (Kupchik 2010). Rather, Chapter 37 and other zero tolerance school legislation that emerged at this time were responses to a crisis of governance and commensurate shift to govern through crime (Simon 2007). The spread of zero-tolerance school policies in the U.S. since the passage of the 1994 Safe Schools Act, reflected larger policy trends towards amending juvenile sentencing laws to allow for more extreme and punitive consequences for criminal activity (Giroux 2006). Most notably charging juveniles as adults, and "broken windows" policing, which encouraged swift and punitive action in response to low-level crimes (Reyes 2006; Parenti 2008). "Moral panics" around violent crime and juvenile violence in particular, triggered

public school districts across the U.S. to systematically enforce zero-tolerance education policies that imposed uniform and punitive consequences for disciplinary infractions, regardless of their severity. An unintended consequence of the spread of zero tolerance to schools, DAEP legislation encourages the criminalization of students for minor rule-breaking, most of whom are low-income, black and Latino, and transformed public schools into institutions of punitive social control.

The prevalence of non-violent discretionary referrals to DAEPs, lack of consistency in how referrals are meted out, and how DAEPs operate across Texas, further compromises the viability of these programs. Importantly, however, there were several positive aspects of the case-study DAEP: 1) for students who struggled in larger school settings, the DAEP offered a smaller school environment and teacher to student ratio; 2) students were less able to skip classes or leave the program without putting DAEP staff on alert; and 3) unlike most schools in the Hawthorne School District, the DAEP served as an educational option for students transitioning from a juvenile justice facility or state school, and students who resided in group homes.

In my assessment, an optimal alternative to DAEPs would entail a return to the original objectives of the Free School Movement. Specifically, that these educational alternatives operate with an awareness of pervasive class and racial inequalities that exist in society at large and with the intent to disrupt the (re)production of structural inequalities through schooling. This would also entail providing a liberatory education, and offering students some agency and freedom in the direction of their studies (Miller

2002). Given the overstated need to curb school violence on which Chapter 37 was premised, an effective alternative to DAEPs would be their decriminalization. A decriminalized DAEP, transformed into an alternative school focused on the needs of non-traditional learners and students who do not thrive in standard public schools, could effectively provide the three aforementioned positive aspects in a far less punitive environment detached from the juvenile justice system. Future education reform should capitalize on creating public alternative schools that are neither charter schools nor modeled after juvenile detention centers, and can broadly meet the educational needs of a range of students.

Appendix 1: Recruitment Flyer

DAEP Students, Parents or Guardians, and Teachers Wanted!

DAEP teachers, students and parent(s) or guardians(s) wanted to participate in a research study about their experiences as students and educators in an alternative learning environment.

Research study participants will be asked to participate in face-to-face interviews and allow the Principal Investigator/ Researcher Jessica Dunning-Lozano, to observe them in classrooms and on school grounds. Ms. Dunning-Lozano is a doctoral student in Sociology at the University of Texas at Austin, and a former alternative education student herself.

If you are interested in participating or have any questions for the Principal Investigator, please call Jessica Dunning-Lozano at (512) 293-9362 or email her: jdunninglozano@utexas.edu. You can also volunteer to participate in this research study by writing your name on the project sign-in sheet located in the front office of the DAEP. If you are a student who is interested in participating and are below the age of 18, you must have a parent or guardian's permission to participate in the study. This study has been approved by The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board.

Thank You.

Appendix 2: Interviewee Demographics

Table 1: Parent Interviewee Demographics							
	Parent Name	Parent Race	Parent Gender	Child Race	Child Gender	Parent Occupation	Parent Ed Level
1	Petra	Latina/Mex	Female	Latina/Mex	Female	Food Service	Elementary
2	Luisa	Latina/Mex	Female	Black	Male	Multi	Associates Degree
3	Elizabeth	White	Female	Latino	Male	Paralegal	Bachelor's
4	Oracio	Latino/Mex	Male	Latina	Female	Custodial Services	High School
5	Marie	White	Female	White, (1/4) Mex	Male	Accounting	AA
6	Joan	White	Female	White	Male	Stay Home Mom	Trade School
7	Ana	Latina/Mex	Female	Latino	Male	Housekeeper	11th

8	Desiree	Black	Female	Black	Male	IT specialist	High School, 2 year college no degree
9	Evelyn	Black (GM)	Female	Black	Female	On Social Security	12th
10	Rogelio	Latino/Tejana/Mex	Male	Latino	Male	Director of JJAEP	Master's
11	Karen	White	Female	White	Male	Stay home mom	Some college
12	Michelle	Black	Female	Black	Male	Child care	12th grade
13	Laurie	Black	Female	Black	Male	Stay at home	BS
14	Nadine	White	Female	White	Female	Office Manager	BA, almost Master's
15	Jacinta	Latina/Tejana/Mex	Female	Latina	Female	School TA	GED, 9th grade

16	Yolanda	Afro- Latina/ Puerto Rican/ Black	Female	Black/ Latino	Male	Self- employed	1 year of college
17	Tamika	Black	Female	Black	Male	Office worker	High School
18	Sonia	Latina/ Mex	Female	Latino	Male	Housekeepe r	Elementary
19	Patricia	Latina/ Mex	Female	Latino	Male	Unemploye d	Elementary
20	Jose	Latino/ Mex	Male	Latino	Male	Line cook	Elementary

Table 2: Teacher Interviewee Demographics

	Name	Race	Gender	Age	Education Level	Teaching/ certification areas
1	Mrs. Jones	Black	Female	52	Master's	Social Sciences/ English
2	Dr. Hernandez	Latino/Mex	Male	55	Doctorate	Program Director
3	Mr. Jackson	Black	Male	55	High School	Teaching Assistant
4	Mr. Stevens	Black	Male	63	Bachelor's	Parent Support Specialist
5	Mrs. Sanchez	Latina	Female	32	High School	Teaching Assistant
6	Mrs. Willis	Black	Female	60	High School	Teaching Assistant
7	Mrs. Lewis	Black	Female	62	Master's	High School Administrator
8	Mrs. Schmidt	White	Female	48	Bachelor's	Mathematics, Science

9	Mrs. Harmon	White	Female	46	Bachelor's	Science
10	Mr. Lopez	Latino	Male	40	High School	Security Guard
11	Officer Turlock	White	Male	39	High School	Police Officer
12	Officer Owens	Black	Male	42	High School	Police Officer
13	Mr. Gomez	Latino	Male	47	High School	Office Assistant
14	Mr. Cabrera	Latino	Male	38	High School	Office Assistant
15	Mr. Banks	White	Male	46	Bachelor's	Mathematics
16	Mrs. Torres	Latina	Female	31	Bachelor's	English
17	Mrs. Shields	White	Female	26	Bachelor's	English, Social Sciences
18	Mrs. Dominguez	Asian	Female	42	Bachelor's	School Nurse
19	Mr. Harrison	White	Male	44	Master's	School Counselor

20	Mrs. Richards	Black	Female	54	Finishing Bachelor's	Mathematics
21	Mr. Smith	Black	Male	39	Bachelor's	Social Sciences
22	Mrs. Lopez	Latina	Female	24	Working on Bachelor's	Teaching Assistant
23	Mrs. Garcia	Latina	Female	44	High School	Teaching Assistant
24	Mr. Flay	White	Male	45	Master's	School Counselor
25	Mrs. Hudson	Black	Female	56	Master's	Special Education/ Resource Teacher
26	Mrs. Ward	White	Female	33		Special Education/ Resource Teacher
27	Mr. Ortiz	Latino	Male	55	High School	

Table 3: Student Interviewee Demographics							
	Name	Race	Gender	Age	Sentence Length	Offense/ referral reason	Parent Ed.
1	Jenae	Bl/Wh/Asian	Female	15	20 days	Fighting	Some College
2	Kirk	White	Male	18	Been at DAEP 6.5 months; locked up 15 months before that	Aggravated Assault	Parents unknown
3	Dino	Black	Trans male	18	40 days	Fighting	Mom 9th/10th grade, think dad graduated b/c was in military.
4	Grace	Black	Female	14		Suspicion of being under the	Mom in college

						influence/ weed	
5	Trevor	Black	Male	18		Suspicion of being under the influence/ weed	Think father went to college, mother no
6	Mateo	Latino	Male	17		Broke disciplinary contract	Not know dad, but mom did three years of college (in Latin America)
7	Linda	Latina	Female	15		Making terroristic threat to another student	Dad 4 year college, mom unsure
8	Rosa	Latina	Female	16	Rest of year, arrived	Hit a School Cop	Dad dropout of high school,

					Feb. 16		thinks mom graduated from high school
9	Mauricio	Latino	Male	17	10 days - INVEST	Drugs	Mom a dentist, dada a journalist
10	Aiden	White	Male	18	40 days - full school year	Tagging	High school in Bosnia
11	Miguel	Latino	Male	17	252 Days	Fighting/ Due to prior homicide charge, Miguel is unable to attend regular schools in the district	Dad 9th grade in Mex; mom 7th or 8th grade in U.S.

12	Hernan	Latino	Male	18		First degree felony - aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon	Both parents not finish elementary school in Honduras
13	Lucas	White/Latino Native Mix	Male	18		Playing Nerf Assassins	Dad 4 year college graduate, mom h.s and some college
14	Milagros	Latina	Female	18	30 days	Possession of Marijuana and Liquor - off campus	Elementary (Mexico)
15	Victor	Latino	Male			Sexual Assault	Mom elementary school in Mexico

16	Carmen	Latina	Female	15		Fighting	Parents less than high school, but father taking classes to learn English
17	Eli	Latino	Male	15		Possession of marijuana and paraphernalia	Dad has Master's
18	Rodolfo	Latino	Male	16		Under the influence	Both parents less than high school (Mexico)
19	Terrence	Black/ Puerto Rican	Male	14		Suspicion of being under the influence	Mom finished high school
20	Gary	Samoan	Male	15		Possession of Marijuana	Mom has doctorate,

							father less than high school
21	Donald	Black	Male	15		Under the influence	Mom less than high school, father high school, army, 2 year college.
22	Rakeem	Black	Male	14		Disruptive/ insubordination	Mom less than high school, dad GED
23	Adolfo	Latino	Male	15		Violated Gang Contract	Elementary/ 6th Grade (Mexico)
24	Raymond	Black/Latin o	Male	16		Gang Activity	Mom finished

							high school, mom dropped out, but mom's girlfriend did some college
25	Veronica	Latina	Female	15		Terroristic threat	Elementary (Mexico)
26	Neveah	Latina	Females	15		Fighting	Dad Masters, mom MA
27	Antonio	Latino	Male	16		Possession of marijuana	Elementary (Mexico)
28	Talia	Latina	Female	14		Making terroristic threat to teacher	Elementary (Mexico)
29	Marcos	Latino	Male	18		Fighting	Elementary (Mexico)

30	Jake	Black	Male	17		Brought Taser to School	Thinks College
31	Tina	Latino	Female	12		Fighting/ Assaulting Teacher (spit gum in teacher's face)	Mom and dad less than high school
32	Sergio	Latino	Male	15		Possession of drugs off campus	Elementary (Mexico)
33	Frank	White	Male	18		Under the Influence of Marijuana	Mom and dad have Bachelor's
34	Lewis	White	Male	17		Possession of Marijuana	Lives with uncles, both are working on their Master's
35	Gregory	White	Male	16		Possession of	Dad

						drugs and distribution	bachelor's, mom less than high school
36	James	Black	Male	15		Disruptive	
37	Lawrence	Black	Male			For criminal trespassing and evading arrest	Mom completing bachelors, father dropped out of high school
38	Ricardo	Latino	Male	16		Under the influence of marijuana	Parents went to college (Latin America)
39	Larry	Black	Male	14		Arrested at home on a	Mom and dad some

						felony charge	college
40	Mark	Latino	Male	12		Aggravated assault with a deadly weapon	Less than high school
41	Kamaya	Black	Female	15		Fighting	Mom finished high school, unsure about dad
42	Leilani	Black	Female	12			
43	Jonathon	White	Male	17		Possession of marijuana and paraphernalia	Both parents have Master's degrees

Appendix 3: Staff Interview Guide

How long have you been teaching/counseling youths/working in law enforcement?

How long have you been working for HISD? Have you worked at the DAEP the entire time? If not, what campus did you teach at before the DAEP?

How did you come to work at the DAEP? How long have you been here?

Can you describe the differences and similarities between working here and at a regular school?

Categories of Students:

Why are students usually referred to the DAEP?

If you had to describe the student body at the DAEP, what kind of students would you say are here?

How often are students re-referred to the DAEP?

Why do you think they return on multiple referrals?

Who are the students that come to the school once and never return to the DAEP?

Perceived institutional problems/ function

What are the goals of the DAEP?

In your opinion, what do you think is working in the program?

How could the program be improved?

I know that there are two different character education curriculums in place at the DAEP, *The Boys Town Social and Life Skills* and *Why Try?* Have you worked with either of these?

Do you think these two curriculums work well together?

How helpful is the point sheet system in getting students through the program?

Can you explain how the point sheet works to me?

Are these point sheets used/ referenced outside of the DAEP, at students' home schools, with their probation officers, or in other spaces?

I've been here for a year and a half now, and I know that you work with kids from all over the district that are here for a variety of reasons, I know it's tough to teach and work here, how do you do it?

The DAEP is a school with a lot of rules, what do you think of the rules? What's it like to work in a school with so many rules (Dress code, compliance in hallways, morning security check-in?"

Teacher-Peer, Peer-to-Peer, and DAEP-family relationships

How important is it that students' families are involved in their successful completion of the program?

How involved are most parents in their students' progress, behavioral and academic, at the DAEP?

I know that the amount of time a student is required to stay here varies from case to case, are you able to make connections with students that you would like to?

When a new student enters your classroom/ the school, how aware are you and/or the school personnel and principals of their reason for referral and prior behavioral history, or any special needs they may have (medical, emotional, learning disabilities)?

Do you think that all students are treated the same by teachers and staff at the DAEP?

Do you keep in touch with former DAEP students after they have completed the program and returned to their home schools?

How much power does the DAEP have in extending a student's stay at the DAEP?

Do you like your job? What do you like about this job?

Is there anything you dislike about this job?

What was your best day at the DAEP?

What was your worst day at the DAEP?

What is the trajectory for most kids who attend the DAEP? Where do they go after a stay at the DAEP?

Lastly, do you ever work with undocumented students or children with undocumented parents? Do they ever discuss options for obtaining their US citizenship with you?

Is there anything else you would like to share with me?

DEMOGRAPHICS

What is your age?

What is your highest level of education?

Do you have a teaching credential? If so, what subjects are you certified in?

What is your race/ ethnicity?

Appendix 4: Student Interview Guide

What grade are you in? What school do you attend?

How many schools have you attended over the last few years?

How long have you been at the DAEP? How long are you supposed to be here?

Why were you referred to the DAEP?

What kind of school is the DAEP? How is it different from your home school?

Prior involvement in DAEP?

Have you been referred to the DAEP before or any other Disciplinary Alternative Education Program outside of the HISD? How about HCES?

If so, how many referrals have you had? How old were you when you received your first referral?

Has your home school put you on a contract?

Are you treated differently by your home school when you return? Have you seen other students treated differently?

Have you been to the Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program?

Interaction with school personnel

What did you think about the two day orientation?

What did you think of the school after the parent/student orientation? How long did it take?

Was the staff helpful? Did you understand what was going on?

Were you able to do the orientation the first time you attempted to do it? Were you sent home for dress code or any other reason?

Compared to other schools in the district, the DAEP has a lot more police and security guards on campus and tougher rules. How do you feel about attending a school like this?

Did you have to purchase new clothing to meet the school's dress code? What kind of clothing? How much money did you spend on new clothing?

Did the school offer to pay for new clothing or help out with costs? Such as referring you to operation school bell?

Do you qualify for free or reduced lunch?

Have you ever been out of dress code?

Has a family member ever had to bring new clothing or shoes to the DAEP following a dress code phone call? How does that make you feel? Your parents?

Have your parents ever been called by staff about your behavior? More often than at your home school?

Have you ever been suspended from the DAEP?

What do you think of the rules?

Do you ever break the rules?

Do you ever call home from school? More often than at your home school?

Have you participated in either the INVEST or Positive Families after school program at the DAEP? If so, did you like the program?

Are boys and girls treated differently at the DAEP?

DAEP enrollment

Do you think the DAEP does a better job of maintaining discipline than your home school?

What are the advantages (positives) and disadvantages (negatives) of being at the DAEP?

What do you think of the teachers, administrators, and principals at the DAEP? Do you like them?

Are there any teachers that you have a good relationship with?

Any teachers that you don't get along well with?

Do you think you've learned anything at this school? Have your grades improved at the DAEP?

Is it easier to earn credits here? Have you been able to make up credits?

Do you learn anything from character education?

What do you think the DAEP is trying to do with you?

Do you think that the teachers here treat all students the same?

Did you make new friends at the DAEP?

Any non-friends?

What Kind of kids come to this school? Are they all the same

Whistling in the halls and calling out of zip codes, does that happen at your home school?

Juvenile Court/ DAEP interaction

Do you know how the point sheet system works? Have you ever seen another point sheet here?

Why/do students get points? How do you lose points?

How important is the point sheet to get kids through their time at the DAEP?

Have you ever received a pending day or an unsuccessful day? Why?

What does it mean to "make it right?"

How often do you check your point sheet throughout the day?

Has your exit day been pushed back because of pending or unsuccessful days?

Do you think that's fair?

Do your home school teachers or principal look over these point sheets?

Are you or have you been on probation? While a student at the DAEP? If so, does your probation officer visit you at the DAEP?

Have copies of the point sheets been collected by your probation officer? Judges in juvenile court?

Have probation reports written by DAEP teachers been used in court? Have these documents, point sheets and/ or probation reports played a role in extending your length of probation?

Future Aspirations:

Where do you think you'll be in five years?

Do you want to go to college?

What career do you want for yourself as an adult?

Is there anything else you want to share with me?

DEMOGRAPHICS

How old are you?

Are you male or female?

What is your race/ethnicity?

What is your parents' highest level of education?

Appendix 5: Parent Interview Guide

What was your impression of the school following the parent/student orientation? How long did the orientation take?

Was the staff helpful? Did you understand what was going on?

Compared to other schools in the district, the DAEP has tougher rules. How do you feel about your child attending this type of school?

Did you have to purchase new clothing for your child to meet the school's dress code? What kind of clothing? How much money did you spend on new clothing?

Did the school offer to help you pay for some of the new clothing? Did they mention operation school bell to you?

Have you ever received a call from the school because your child was out of dress code? If so, how often and how do those phone conversations usually go?

Have you or a family member ever had to bring new clothing or shoes to the DAEP following a dress code phone call? Has this affected your work schedule or that of anyone else on your family?

Have you ever received a call from DAEP school personnel about your child's behavior in class, notification of suspension, or to notify you that they left school grounds without permission?

Has your child called you from school to tell you they are sick or to ask if they can leave school early? More often than at their home school?

How often do you communicate with DAEP school personnel, teachers, counselors, or principals? How are they?

Do you know what's going at the DAEP? Is this any different from your familiarity with what goes on at your child's home school?

Are you now participating or have you participated in either the INVEST or Positive Families after school program at the DAEP? If so, did you and your child like the program?

DAEP enrollment on child's affect and mood

How do you feel about your child being a student at the DAEP? Is it a better school than their home school?

Do you think the DAEP does a better job of disciplining than their home school?

Does your child like the DAEP more than their home school? What are the advantages and disadvantages of being at the DAEP?

What do they think of the teachers, administrators, and principals at the DAEP? Do they like them?

Did your child meet new friends at the DAEP?

Has your child's academics/ grades improved at the DAEP?

What do you think the DAEP is trying to do with your kid?

Prior involvement in DAEP?

Has your child been referred to the DAEP before or any other Disciplinary Alternative Education Program outside of the Hawthorne Independent School District? How about HCES?

If so, how many referrals has he/she had? How old were they when they received their first referral?

Have they been to the Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program?

Why was your child referred to the DAEP? How did you feel about the referral?

Juvenile Court/ DAEP interaction

Is your child on probation? Have they been on probation in the past while a student at the DAEP? Do you know if their probation officer visit them at the DAEP?

I was told that students must have their point sheets signed by parents every school day.

Do you always receive a point sheet from your child?

Do you know how the point sheet system works? Why do students get points?

Are these point sheets looked at by teachers or administrators at their home school? Have their home school teachers or principals asked to look over these point sheets?

If your child is on probation, have copies of the point sheets been collected by or referred to by their probation officer? Have they ever been referred to by their probation officers or judges in juvenile court?

Have probation reports written by DAEP teachers been used in court? Have these documents played a role in extending your child's length of probation?

DEMOGRAPHICS

How old is your child? Is your child a boy or girl?

What grade are they in and what is their homeschool?

What is your race/ethnicity?

What is the race/ethnicity of your child?

What is your highest level of education?

Appendix 6: Staff & Teacher Consent Form

Title: An Exploratory Study of Teacher/Staff and Students Enrolled in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) in Hawthorne, Texas.

Conducted By: Jessica L. Dunning-Lozano
0059

IRB PROTOCOL # 2010-07-

Email: jdunninglozano@utexas.edu

Of The University of Texas at Austin: *Department of Sociology* Telephone: 512-293-9362

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The person in charge of this research will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Please read the information below and ask any questions you might have before deciding whether or not to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary. You can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can stop your participation at any time and your refusal will not impact current or future relationships with UT Austin or participating sites. To do so simply tell the researcher you wish to stop participation. The researcher will provide you with a copy of this consent for your records.

The purpose of this study is to increase our knowledge about the day-to-day lived experiences of teachers, staff, and students who attend Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs. The project requires 40 student interview participants and 10 staff/teacher interview participants.

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to do the following things:

- Participate in an audio recorded open-ended interview with the researcher.
- Permit the researchers presence in classrooms for general observations of daily life and practices at the DAEP.

Total estimated time to participate in this study is a 60 minute open-ended interview and a series of classroom observations, twice per week, which should span the duration of

the school year.

The risk associated with this study is no greater than everyday life. There are no direct benefits to participating in this study, but we think your participation will increase knowledge and understanding of schooling practices at Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs and the experiences of staff, teachers, and students who attend them.

Compensation:

- There is no compensation for participating in this study.

Confidentiality and Privacy Protections:

- The data resulting from your participation may be made available to other researchers in the future for research purposes not detailed within this consent form. In these cases, the data will contain no identifying information that could associate you with it, or with your participation in any study.
- Confidentiality will be broken if you or a child discloses information about familial child abuse. If I acquire this information, I am required to report it to Child and Family Protective Services, 1-800-252-5400. Additionally, if you indicate that you are considering harming yourself or others, I am required to notify school personnel.
- I will audio record all interviews, these tapes will be coded so that no personally identifying information is visible on them. The tapes will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the investigator's office and will be heard or viewed only for research purposes by the investigator and his or her associates. I will erase all tapes after they are transcribed or coded. I will keep the transcriptions of our interview indefinitely.

The records of this study will be stored securely and kept confidential. Authorized persons from The University of Texas at Austin, members of the Institutional Review Board, and (study sponsors, if any) have the legal right to review your research records and will protect the confidentiality of those records to the extent permitted by law. All publications will exclude any information that will make it possible to identify you as a subject. Throughout the study, the researchers will notify you of new information that may

become available and that might affect your decision to remain in the study.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have any questions about the study please ask now. If you have questions later, want additional information, or wish to withdraw your participation call the researchers conducting the study. Their names, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses are at the top of this page.

If you would like to obtain information about the research study, have questions, concerns, complaints or wish to discuss problems about a research study with someone unaffiliated with the study, please contact the IRB Office at (512) 471-8871 or Jody Jensen, Ph.D., Chair, The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at (512) 232-2685. Anonymity, if desired, will be protected to the extent possible. As an alternative method of contact, an email may be sent to orsc@uts.cc.utexas.edu or a letter sent to IRB Administrator, P.O. Box 7426, Mail Code A 3200, Austin, TX 78713.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and have sufficient information to make a decision about participating in this study. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

_____ Date: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

Appendix 7: Parent / Legal Guardian Consent Form for Students

Title: An Exploratory Study of Teacher/Staff and Students Enrolled in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) in Hawthorne, Texas.

Conducted By: Jessica L. Dunning-Lozano
0059

IRB PROTOCOL # 2010-07-

Email: jdunninglozano@utexas.edu

Of The University of Texas at Austin: *Department of Sociology* Telephone:
512-293-9362

You are being asked to allow your child to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The person in charge of this research will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Please read the information below and ask any questions you might have before deciding whether or not to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary. You can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can stop your participation at any time and your refusal will not impact current or future relationships with UT Austin or participating sites. To do so simply tell the researcher you wish to stop participation. The researcher will provide you with a copy of this consent for your records.

The purpose of this study is to increase our knowledge about the day-to-day lived experiences of teachers, staff, and students who attend Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs. The project requires 40 student interview participants and 10 staff/teacher interview participants.

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask your child to do the following things:

- Allow your child to participate in an audio recorded open-ended interview with the researcher.
- Allow observation of your child in classrooms, school hallways, main office, and lunchroom by the researcher twice a week for the duration of the school year.

Total estimated time to participate in this study is a 60 minute open-ended interview and observation by the researcher twice a week for the duration of the school year.

The risk associated with this study is no greater than everyday life. There are no direct benefits to participating in this study, but we think your child's participation will increase knowledge and understanding of schooling practices at Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs and the experiences of staff, teachers, and students who attend them.

Compensation:

- There is no compensation for participating in this study.

Confidentiality and Privacy Protections:

- The data resulting from your participation may be made available to other researchers in the future for research purposes not detailed within this consent form. In these cases, the data will contain no identifying information that could associate you with it, or with your participation in any study.
- Confidentiality will be broken if you or your child discloses information about familial child abuse. If I acquire this information, I am required to report it to Child and Family Protective Services, 1-800-252-5400. Additionally, if the research participant indicates that they are considering harming themselves or others, I am required to notify the school counselor or school personnel.
- I will audio record all interviews, these tapes will be coded so that no personally identifying information is visible on them. The tapes will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the investigator's office and will be heard or viewed only for research purposes by the investigator and his or her associates. I will erase all tapes after they are transcribed or coded. I will keep the transcriptions of our interview indefinitely.

The **records** of this study will be stored securely and kept confidential. Authorized persons from The University of Texas at Austin, members of the Institutional Review Board, and (study sponsors, if any) have the legal right to review your child's research records and will protect the **confidentiality** of those records to the extent permitted by law. All publications will exclude any information that will make it possible to identify you as a subject. Throughout the study, the researchers will notify you of new information that may become available and that might affect your decision to remain in the study.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have any questions about the study please ask now. If you have questions later, want additional information, or wish to withdraw your child's participation call the researchers conducting the study. Their names, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses are at the top of this page. If you have questions about your child's rights as a research participant, complaints, concerns, or questions about the research please contact **Jody Jensen, Ph.D., Chair, The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the** Protection of Human Subjects at (512) 232-2685 or the Office of Research Support at (512) 471-8871.or email: orsc@uts.cc.utexas.edu.

You may keep the copy of this consent form.

You are making a decision about allowing your (son/daughter/child/infant/adolescent youth) to participate in this study. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above and have decided to allow him or her to participate in the study. If you later decide that you wish to withdraw your permission for your (son/daughter/child/infant/adolescent youth) to participate in the study, simply tell me. You may discontinue his or her participation at any time.

Printed Name of (son/daughter/child/infant/adolescent youth)

Signature of Parent(s) or Legal Guardian

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

Signature of Investigator:_____ Date: _____

Appendix 8: Parent / Legal Guardian Consent Form

Title: An Exploratory Study of Teacher/Staff and Students Enrolled in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) in Hawthorne, Texas.

Conducted By: Jessica L. Dunning-Lozano

IRB PROTOCOL # 2010-07-0059

Email: jdunninglozano@utexas.edu

Of The University of Texas at Austin: *Department of Sociology* Telephone: 512-293-9362

Introduction

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The person in charge of this research will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Please read the information below and ask any questions you might have before deciding whether or not to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary. You can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can stop your participation at any time and your refusal will not impact current or future relationships with UT Austin or participating sites. To do so simply tell the researcher you wish to stop participation. The researcher will provide you with a copy of this consent for your records.

Purpose of the Study is to increase our knowledge about the day-to-day lived experiences of teachers, staff, and students who attend Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs and their parents/ legal guardians. The project requires 40 student interview participants, 10 staff/teacher interview participants, and 20 parent/ legal guardian interview participants.

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to do the following things:

- Participate in an audio recorded open-ended interview with the researcher.

Total estimated time to participate in this study is a 60 minute open-ended interview.

The risk associated with this study is no greater than everyday life. There are no direct benefits to participating in this study, but we think your participation will increase

knowledge and understanding of schooling practices at Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs and the experiences of staff, teachers, and students who attend them and their parents/ legal guardians.

Confidentiality and Privacy Protections:

- The data resulting from your participation may be made available to other researchers in the future for research purposes not detailed within this consent form. In these cases, the data will contain no identifying information that could associate you with it, or with your participation in any study.
- Confidentiality will be broken if you or a child discloses information about familial child abuse. If I acquire this information, I am required to report it to Child and Family Protective Services, 1-800-252-5400. Additionally, if you indicate that you are considering harming yourself or others, I am required to notify school personnel.
- I will audio record all interviews, these tapes will be coded so that no personally identifying information is visible on them. The tapes will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the investigator's office and will be heard or viewed only for research purposes by the investigator and his or her associates. I will erase all tapes after they are transcribed or coded. I will keep the transcriptions of our interview indefinitely.

The records of this study will be stored securely and kept confidential. Authorized persons from The University of Texas at Austin, members of the Institutional Review Board, and (study sponsors, if any) have the legal right to review your research records and will protect the confidentiality of those records to the extent permitted by law. All publications will exclude any information that will make it possible to identify you as a subject. Throughout the study, the researchers will notify you of new information that may become available and that might affect your decision to remain in the study.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have any questions about the study please ask now. If you have questions later, want additional information, or wish to withdraw your participation call the researchers conducting the study. Their names, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses are at the top

of this page.

If you would like to obtain information about the research study, have questions, concerns, complaints or wish to discuss problems about a research study with someone unaffiliated with the study, please contact the IRB Office at (512) 471-8871 or Jody Jensen, Ph.D., Chair, The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at (512) 232-2685. Anonymity, if desired, will be protected to the extent possible. As an alternative method of contact, an email may be sent to orsc@uts.cc.utexas.edu or a letter sent to IRB Administrator, P.O. Box 7426, Mail Code A 3200, Austin, TX 78713.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Appendix 9: Student Survey

May 19, 2013

Dear Participant:

My name is Jessica Dunning-Lozano and I am a graduate student at The University of Texas, Hawthorne. For my dissertation project, I am trying to learn more about the experiences of students enrolled in Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs). Because you are a student at the DAEP, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing this student survey.

The survey will take 15 minutes to complete and is completely anonymous, meaning I will not connect any of your answers to your personal identity. There is no compensation for taking this survey nor is there any known risk. In order to ensure that all information will remain confidential, please do not include your name anywhere on the survey.

If you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible. Once you complete the survey, please place it in the envelope I have provided and seal it before returning the survey to me or a teacher. This will ensure your privacy and anonymity. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me with my project. The data collected will provide useful information on the experiences of youths who are enrolled in DAEPs.

Sincerely,

Jessica L. Dunning-Lozano

Mail code A1700,

Austin, TX 78712

512-293-9362

jdunninglozano@utexas.edu.

1. How long were you sent to the DAEP by your home school?

2. Were you given the option to do INVEST or Positive Families to reduce your stay at the DAEP?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. Are you doing INVEST or Positive Families?

☐ Yes

☐ No

4. If yes, who is attending class with you?

☐ Mother ☐ Father ☐ Grandmother ☐ Grandfather ☐ Other _____

5. Do you have a job?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many hours a week do you work? _____

☐ No

6. Have you lost hours at your job due to being sent to the DAEP?

☐ Yes

☐ No

7. Have you lost your job due to being sent to the DAEP?

☐ Yes

☐ No

8. How many times have you been sent to the DAEP since the 6th grade?

☐ This is my first time ☐ 2- 4 times ☐ 5-7 times ☐ More than 7 times

9. How many times have you been sent to the DAEP this year? _____

10. Do you have any family members who have also attended to the DAEP? (Check all that apply)

☐ Mother ☐ Father ☐ Brother ☐ Sister ☐ Father ☐ Grandmother
☐ Grandfather ☐ Aunt ☐ Uncle ☐ Cousins
☐ Other Family Member _____ ☐ None

11. Were you ever sent to HCES, the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program for elementary school students?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many times? _____

☐ No

12. Do you have any family members who have also attended HCES? (Check all that apply)

☐ Mother ☐ Father ☐ Brother ☐ Sister ☐ Father ☐
Grandmother
☐ Grandfather ☐ Aunt ☐ Uncle ☐ Cousins ☐ Other Family Member _____ ☐
None

13. Before being sent to the DAEP this year, had you been sent to after school detention, or had any in-school (ISS) or out of school suspensions (OSS)? (Check all that apply)

☐ After School Detention ☐ In-School Suspension ☐ Out of School Suspension
☐ Other _____ ☐ None of the above

14. Why were you sent to the DAEP this time?

15. Have you been suspended from the DAEP this year?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many times _____

☐ No

16. Have you had any pending days at the DAEP this year?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many _____

☐ No

17. Have you had any unsuccessful days at the DAEP this year?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many _____

☐ No

18. Have you ever been on juvenile or adult probation?

☐ Yes

☐ No

19. Are you on probation now?

☐ Yes

☐ No

20. Have you spent any time at Gardner-Bettes?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many times and for how long? _____

☐ No

21. Have you been to the Texas Youth Commission?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many times and for how long? _____

☐ No

22. Have you been sent to any other juvenile detention center?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many times and for how long? _____

☐ No

23. Have you been to the Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many times and for how long? _____

☐ No

24. Have you ever received a ticket from a police officer from the Hawthorne Police Department or Hawthorne Independent School District police?

☐ Yes

If yes, how many? _____

☐ No → skip to question 28

25. Why did they give you a ticket?

26. Did you have to go to court?

☐ Yes

☐ No

27. How much money did you have to pay? _____

28. Who lives in your home? (Check all that apply)

☐ Mother

☐ Father

☐ Brothers

☐ Sister

☐ Father

☐ Grandmother

☐ Grandfather ☐ Aunt ☐ Uncle ☐ Cousins
☐ Other Family Member _____ ☐ Group Home or Half-way House _____

29. Do you have any children?

☐ Yes

If yes how many children do you have? How old are they? _____

☐ No

30. What do the adults in your household do for a living? Mention one or two.

31. Has anyone in your family been incarcerated? Check all boxes that apply

☐ Mother ☐ Father ☐ Brother ☐ Sister ☐ Father ☐ Grandmother
☐ Grandfather ☐ Aunt ☐ Uncle ☐ Cousins
☐ Other Family Member _____ ☐ None

32. Are any members of your family on juvenile or adult probation? Check all boxes that apply

☐ Mother ☐ Father ☐ Brother ☐ Sister ☐ Father ☐ Grandmother
☐ Grandfather ☐ Aunt ☐ Uncle ☐ Cousins
☐ Other Family Member _____ ☐ None

33. Are you an English Language Learner (ELL) student?

☐ Yes

☐ No

34. How old are you? _____

35. Are you a Male or Female? _____

36. What grade are you in? _____

37. What is your home school? _____

38. Mark the highest education level of your parents:

- ☐ Some Elementary
- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ Some Middle School
- ☐ Middle School
- ☐ Some High School
- ☐ High School
- ☐ Some College
- ☐ Associate's Degree/ Technical school
- ☐ Bachelor's Degree
- ☐ Master's Degree
- ☐ Doctoral Degree

39. What is your race/ ethnicity?

- ☐ African-American/ Black ☐ Asian/ Pacific Islander ☐ Caucasian/ White
- ☐ Hispanic/ Latino ☐ Native American ☐ Other

40. If you checked the "Other" box, please describe your nationality, race, and/or ethnicity

41. Were you born in the United States?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

References

- Acuña, Rodolfo. 1981. *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Alexander, Karl L., Doris R. Entwisle, Dale A. Blyth and Harriet Pipes McAdoo. 1988. "Achievement in the First 2 Years of School: Patterns and Processes." *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 53: 1-157.
- Anderson, Elijah. [1990] 2000. *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Alonso, Gaston, Noel S. Anderson, Celina Su and Jeanne Theoharis. 2009. *Our Schools Suck! Students Talk Back to a Segregated Nation on the Failures of Urban Education*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Aron, Laudan Y. [1993] 2006. "An Overview of Alternative Education." Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Arum, Richard. 2003. *Judging School Discipline: The Crisis of Moral Authority*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sofia Bahena, North Cooc, Rachel Currie-Rubin, Paul Kuttner, Monica Ng. 2012. *Disrupting the School-to-Prison-Pipeline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Behar, Ruth. 2003. *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press Books.
- .1997.*The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology that Breaks your Heart*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Becker, Howard S. 1970. *Sociological Work: Methods and Substance*. Chicago, IL: Adline Publishing Company.
- .1958. Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation.*American Sociological Review* 23: 652-60.
- Benner, Aprile D.2011. "The Transition to High School: Current Knowledge, Future Directions."*Educational Psychology Review* 23: 299-328.
- Birnbaum, Shira. 2001. *Law and Order and School: Daily Life in an Educational Program for Juvenile Delinquents*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Bobo, Lawrence D. and Victor Thompson. 2010. "Racialized Mass Incarceration: Poverty, Prejudice, and Punishment." Pp. 322-55 in*Doing Race: 21 Essays for the 21st Century*, edited by H.R. Markus and Paula M.L. Moya. New York, NY: Norton.
- .2006. "Unfair by Design: The War on Drugs, Race, and the Legitimacy of the Criminal Justice System." *Social Research* 73: 445-472.
- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1979.*Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York, NY: Basic Books, HarperCollins.
- Braman, Donald. 2004. *Doing Time on the Outside: Incarceration and Family Life in Urban America*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. [1977] 2000. *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1989. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Stanford,

- CA: Stanford University Press.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1998. "The Extended Case Method." *Sociological Theory* 16: 4-33.
- Carmichael, Dottie, Guy Whittan, and Michael Voloudakis. 2005. "The Public Policy Research Institute, Study of Minority Over-representation in the Texas Juvenile Justice System, Final Report." College Station: Texas A&M University.
- Casella, Ronnie. 2003. "Punishing Dangerousness Through Preventative Detention: Illustrating the Institutional Link Between School and Prison." *New Directions for Youth Development* 99: 55-70.
- Chase, S. E. 2005. "Narrative inquiry: Multiple Lenses, Approaches, Voices." Pp. 651-679 in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, 3rd Edition*, edited by N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chavez-Garcia, Miroslava. 2012. *States of Delinquency: Race and Science in the Making of California's Juvenile Justice System*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Clear, Todd. 2007. *Imprisoning Communities: How Mass Incarceration Makes Disadvantaged Neighborhoods Worse*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Clemmer, Donald. [1940] 1958. *The Prison Community*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. [1990] 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Comfort, Megan. 2008. *Doing Time Together: Love and Family in the Shadow of the Prison*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Contreras, Randol. 2012. *The Stickup Kids: Race, Drugs, Violence, and the American Dream*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.
- Cortez, Albert and María Robledo Montecel. 1999. "Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs in Texas - What is Known?" San Antonio TX: Intercultural Development Research Agency.
- Cortez, Albert and Josie Danini. 2009. "Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs in Texas: A 2009 Update." San Antonio, TX: Intercultural Development Research Agency.
- Delpit, Lisa. [1995] 2006. *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Desmond, Matthew. 2007. *On The Fireline: Living and Dying with Wildland Firefighters*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Deitch, Michele, Amanda Barstow, Leslie Lukens and Ryan Reyna. 2009. "From Time Out to Hard Time: Young Children in the Adult Criminal Justice System." Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, LBJ School of Public Affairs.
- Devine, John. 1996. *Maximum Security: The Culture of Violence in Inner-City Schools*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Donelan, R.W., G.A. Neal, and D.L. Jones. 1994. "The Promise of Brown and the Reality of Academic Grouping: The Tracks of my Tears." *The Journal of Negro Education* 63:376-387.
- Dowd, Tom and Jeff Tierney. 1992. *Teaching Social Skills to Youth: A Curriculum for Child-Care Providers*. Omaha, NE: The Boys Town Home Press.

- Downey, Douglas B. and Shana Pribesh. 2004. "When Race Matters: Teachers' Evaluations of Students' Classroom Behaviors." *Sociology of Education* 77(4): 267-282.
- Dunbar Jr., Christopher. 2001. *Alternative Schooling for African American Youth: Does Anyone Know We're Here?* New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- . 1999. "African American Males and Participation: Promising Inclusion, Practicing Exclusion." *Theory Into Practice* 38:241-246.
- Edin, Kathryn and Maria Kefalas. 2005. *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood before Marriage*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Edin, Kathryn and Timothy J. Nelson. 2013. *Doing the Best I Can: Fatherhood in the Inner City*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Eder, Donna. 1995. *School Talk: Gender and Adolescent Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I Fretz and Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, Joyce. 1985. "Home and School Connections in Schools of the Future: Implications of Research on Parental Involvement." *Peabody Journal of Education* 62 18-41.
- . 1996. "Perspectives and Previews on Research and Policy for School, Family, and Community Partnerships." Pp. 209-246 in *Family-School Links: How do They Affect Educational Outcomes?* edited by A. Booth and J. Dunn, 209 -246. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

- Fabelo, Tony, Michael E. Thompson, Martha Plotkin, Dottie Carmichael, Miner P. Marchbanks, and Eric A. Booth. 2011. "Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement." New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center.
- Fader, Jamie. 2013. *Falling Back: Incarceration and Transitions to Adulthood among Urban Youth*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Farkas, George, Robert P. Grobe, Daniel Sheehan, and Yuan Shuan. 1990. "Cultural Resources and School Success: Gender, Ethnicity, and Poverty Groups within an Urban School District." *American Sociological Review* 55 (1):127-142.
- Feld, Barry C. 1999. *Bad Kids: Race and the Transformation of the Juvenile Court*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, Ann Arnett. 2001. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Foley, Regina M. and Lan-Sze Pang. 2006. "Alternative Education Programs: Program and Student Characteristics." *The High School Journal* 89: 10-21.
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison System*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Fowler, Deborah Fitzgerald and Rebecca Lightsey. 2010. "Texas' School-to-Prison Pipeline School Expulsion: The Path from Lockout to Dropout." Austin, TX: Texas Appleseed Inc.
- . 2007. "Texas' School-to-Prison Pipeline Dropout to Incarceration: The Impact of School Discipline and Zero Tolerance." Austin, TX: Texas Appleseed Inc.

- Fuentes, Annette. 2013. *Lockdown High: When the Schoolhouse becomes a Jailhouse*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso Books.
- Garland, David. 2001. "Introduction." Pp 1-3 in *Mass Imprisonment: Social Causes and Consequences*, edited by D. Garland. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gilliom, John. 2001. *Overseers of the Poor: Surveillance, Resistance, and the Limitations of Privacy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2006. *American on the Edge: Henry Giroux on Politics, Culture, and Education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Garden City, NY: First Anchor Books.
- Goldin, Claudia & Lawrence F. Katz. 2008. *The Race Between Education and Technology*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Gottfredson, Michael R. and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gregory, Anne, Russell J. Skiba, Pedro A. Noguera .2010. "The Achievement Gap and The Discipline Gap: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" *Educational Researcher* 39(1), 59-68.
- Groves, Robert M., Floyd J. Fowler Jr., Mick P. Couper, James M. Lepkowski, Eleanor Singer, and Roger Tourangeau. 2004. *Survey Methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Haney, Lynne A. 2010. *Offending Women: Power, Punishment, and the Regulation of Desire*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.

- Hays, Sharon. 2003. *Flat Broke with Children: Women in the Age of Welfare Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirschfield, Paul J. 2008. "Preparing for prison? The criminalization of school discipline in the USA." *Theoretical Criminology* 12: 79-101.
- Jacobs-Huey, Lanita. 2002. "The Natives are Gazing and Talking Back: Reviewing the Problematics of Positionality, Voice, and Accountability among "Native" Anthropologists." *American Anthropologist* 104(3) 791-804.
- Katz, Jack. 2002. "From How to Why: On Luminous Description and Causal Inference in Ethnography (Part 2)." *Ethnography* 3: 63-90.
- . 2001. "From How to Why: On Luminous Description and Causal Inference in Ethnography (Part 2)." *Ethnography* 2: 443-473.
- . 1983. "A Theory of Qualitative Methodology: The Social System of Analytic Fieldwork." Pp. 127-148 in *Contemporary Field Research: A Collection of Readings*, edited by R.M. Emerson. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Kelley, Deirdre M. 1993. *Last Chance High: How Boys and Girls Drop in and Out of Alternative Schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Khan, Shamus Rahman. 2012. *Privilege: The Making of an Adolescent Elite at St. Paul's School*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kim, Catherine Y., Daniel J. Losen, and Daniel T. Hewitt. 2010. *The School-to-Prison Pipeline: Structuring Legal Reform*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Kirkland, David E. 2013. *A Search Past Silence: The Literacy of Young Black Men*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

- Kupchik, Aaron. 2010. *Homeroom Security: School Discipline in an Age of Fear*. New York, NY: New York University Publishing.
- Kupchik, Aaron and Monahan. 2006. "The New American School: preparation for post-industrial discipline." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 27: 617-631.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 1995. "Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy." *American Educational Research Journal* 32(3): 465-491.
- Lange, Cheryl M. and Sandra Sletten J. 2002. "Alternative Education: A Brief History and Research." Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.
- Lassiter, Luke Eric. 2005. *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lehr, Camilla A., Chee Soon Tan and Jim Ysseldyke. 2009. "Alternative Schools: A Synthesis of State-Level Policy and Research." *Remedial and Special Education* 30: 19-32.
- Levine, Judith A. 2013. *Ain't No Trust: How Bosses, Boyfriends, and Bureaucrats Fail Low-Income Mothers and Why it Matters*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Levin, Marc. 2006. "Schooling a New Class of Criminals? Better Disciplinary Alternatives for Texas Students." Austin, TX: Texas Public Policy Foundation.
- Lewis, Amanda E. 2003. *Race in the Schoolyard: Negotiating the Color Line in Classrooms and Communities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Lipman, Pauline. 2003. "Cracking Down: Chicago School Policy and the Regulation of Black and Latino Youth." Pp. 81-102 in *Education as Enforcement: the Militarization and Corporatization of Schools*, edited by K.J. Saltman and D. Gabbards. New York, NY: RouteledgeFalmer.
- Lopez, Nancy. 2003. *Hopeful Girls, Troubled Boys: Race and Gender Disparity in Urban Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Luker, Kristin. 2010. *Salsa Dancing into the Social Sciences: Research in an Age of Infoglut*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MacLeod, Jay. [1989] 2008. *Ain't No Makin' it: Aspirations and Attainment in a Low-Income Neighborhood, 3rd Edition*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Meiners, Erica. 2007. *Right to Be Hostile: Schools, Prisons, and the Making of Public Enemies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Merton, Robert K. 1959. "Notes on Problem-Finding in Sociology." Pp. 17-42 in *Sociology Today; Problems and Prospects*, edited by L. Broom and L.S. Catterell. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Miller, Ron. 2002. *Free Schools, Free People: Education and Democracy After the 1960's*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mirowsky, John and Catherine E. Ross. 2003. *Education, Social Status, and Health*. New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.
- Montejano, David. 1987. *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas 1839 - 1986*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.
- Morgan, E., Salomon, N., Plotkin, M., and Cohen, R., *The School Discipline Consensus*

- Report: Strategies from the Field to Keep Students Engaged in School and Out of the Juvenile Justice System (New York: The Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2014).
- Moran Gonzalez, John. 2010. *Border Renaissance: The Texas Centennial and the Emergence of Mexican Literature*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.
- Muñoz, Juan Sanchez. 2004. "The Social Construction of Alternative Education: Re-examining the Margins of Public Education for At-Risk Chicano/a Students." *High School Journal* 88: 3-22.
- Narayan, Kirin. 1993. "How Native is a "Native" Anthropologist?" *American Anthropologist* 95: 671-685.
- Neubeck, Kenneth J., and Noel A. Cazenave. 2001. *Welfare Racism: Playing the Race Card Against America's Poor*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Noguera, Pedro A. 2003. "Schools, Prisons, and Social Implications of Punishment: Rethinking Disciplinary Practices." *Theory into Practice* 42(4), 341-350.
- Nolan, Kathleen. 2011. *Police in the Hallways: Discipline in an Urban High School*. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Oakes, Jeannie. [1985] 2005. *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ochoa, Gilda L. 2013. *Academic Profiling: Latinos, Asian Americans, and the Achievement Gap*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Parenti, Christian. [1999] 2008. *Lockdown America: Police and Prisons in the Age of Crisis*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Verso Publishers.

- Perkinson, Robert. 2010. *Texas Tough: The Rise of America's Prison Empire*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.
- Perry, Pamela. 2003. *Shades of White: White Kids and Racial Identities in High School*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Pettit, Becky and Bruce Western. 2004. "Mass Imprisonment and the Life Course: Race and Class Inequality in U.S. Incarceration." *American Sociological Review* 69: 151-169.
- The Pew Center on the States. 2009. "One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections." Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Picower, Bree. 2009. "The Unexamined Whiteness of Teaching: How White Teachers Maintain and Enact Dominant Racial Ideologies." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 12:197-215.
- Puwar, Nirmal. 2004. *Space Invaders: Race, Gender, and Bodies out of Place*. New York, NY: Berg Oxford International Publishers Ltd.
- Ramirez-Berg, Charles. 1997. "Stereotyping Films in General and of the Hispanic in Particular." Pp. 104-120 in *Latin Looks: Images of Latinas and Latinos in the U.S. Media*, edited by C.E. Rodriguez. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ravitch, Diane. 1995. *National Standards in American Education: A Citizen's Guide*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Raz, Mical. 2014. *What's Wrong with the Poor? Psychiatry, Race, and the War on Poverty*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

- Reyes, Augustina H. 2006. *Discipline, Achievement, Race: Is Zero Tolerance the Answer?* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- . 2001. "Alternative Education: The Criminalization of Student Behavior." *Fordham Urban Law Journal* 29: 539-559.
- Reynolds, Cecil R., Russell J. Skiba, Sandra Graham, Peter Sheras, Jane Close-Conoley, Eneida Garcia-Vasquez. 2008. "Are Zero Tolerance Policies Effective in Schools? An Evidentiary Review and Recommendations." *American Psychologist* 63(9) 852-862.
- Rios, Victor M. 2011. *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- . 2007. "The Hypercriminalization of Black and Latino Male Youth in the Era of Mass Incarceration." Pp. 17-34 in *Racializing Justice, Disenfranchising Lives: The Racism, Criminal Justice, and Law Reader*, edited by M. Marable, I. Steinberg, and K. Middlemass. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Robinson, Keith and Angel L. Harris. 2014. *The Broken Compass: Parental Involvement with Children's Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1985. "When Natives Talk Back: Chicano Anthropology since the Late Sixties." In *The Renato Lectures*, 1985. Pp 3-20. Tucson, AZ: Mexican-American Studies and Research Center.
- Saltman, Kenneth J. 2007. *Schooling and the Politics of Disaster*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simmons, Lizbet. 2009a. "End of the Line: Tracing Racial Inequality from School to Prison." *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts* 2: 215-241.
- Simmons, Lizbet. 2009b. "The Docile Body in School Space." Pp. 55-69 in *Schools Under Surveillance: Cultures of Control in Public Education*, edited by T. Monahan and R.D. Torres. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- . 2007. "Research Off Limits and Underground: Street Corner Methods for Finding Invisible Students." *The Urban Review* 39: 319-347.
- Simon, Jonathan. 2007. *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. 2002. "The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment." *Urban Review* 34, 317–342.
- Skiba, R. J., Ritter, S., Simmons, A., Peterson, R., & Miller, C. 2006. "The Safe and Responsive Schools Project: A school reform model for implementing best practices in violence prevention." Pp. 631–650 in *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice*, edited by R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Soss, Joe, Richard C. Fording and Sanford F Schram. 2011. *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Springer, David W. 2007. Transforming Juvenile Justice in Texas: A Framework for Action. Blue Ribbon Task Force Report. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, School of Social Work.
- Steffensmeier, Darrell, John Kramer, and Cathy Streifel .1993. "Gender and Imprisonment Decisions." *Criminology* 31(3) 411-446.
- Steffensmeier, Darrell, Jeffrey Ulmer, and John Kramer. 1998. "The Interaction of Race, Gender, and Age in Criminal Sentencing: The Punishment Cost of Being Young, Black, and Male." *Criminology* 36 (4) 763-798.
- Texas Department of Criminal Justice. 2004. "Offender Orientation Handbook." Approved by the Director of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division. Austin, TX.
- Texas Education Agency. 2007. "Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Practices." Policy Research Report No. 17 (Document No. GE07 601 11). Austin, TX.
- Tyack, David and Larry Cuban. 1995. *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Valencia, Richard R. 2008. *Chicano Students and the Courts: The Mexican-American Legal Struggle for Educational Equality*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Valenzuela, Angela. 1999. *Subtractive Schooling: U.S. - Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. New York, NY: State University of New York Publishing.
- Wacquant, Loic. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- .2003. "Ethnographic: A Progress Report on the Practice and Promise of Ethnography." *Ethnography* 4: 5-13.
- Wald, Johanna and Daniel J. Losen. 2003. "Defining and Redirecting a School-to-Prison-Pipeline." *New Directions for Youth Development* 99: 9-16.
- Ward, Mike. 2010. Texas Youth Commission still plagued with problems, advocacy group says. Austin-American Statesman. Retrieved September 3, 2014 (<http://www.statesman.com/news/news/state-regional-govt-politics/texas-youth-commission-still-plagued-with-problems/nRxGw/>).
- Watkins-Hayes, Celeste. 2009. *The New Welfare Bureaucrats: Entanglements of Race, Class, and Policy Reform*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Western, Bruce. 2007. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Western, Bruce and Christopher Muller. 2013. "Mass Incarceration, Macrosociology, and the Poor." *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 647: 166-89.
- Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.